

FILE NO. 221016

Petitions and Communications received from September 15, 2022, through September 22, 2022, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on September 27, 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 the following appointment to the following body.  
Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

Appointment pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18):

- Arts Commission
  - Jeanne Anyanwu-McCoy - term ending August 31, 2026

From the Office of the City Attorney, submitting update to Order of the Health Officer No. C19-07. Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From the Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector, pursuant to California State Government Code, Section 53646, submitting the Pooled Investment Report for the month of August 2022. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From Police Commission, regarding the election of a new commission president and vice-president. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From Behavioral Health Commission, pursuant to California Welfare and Institutions Code, Sec. 5604.2, submitting FY 2020-2021 Annual Report. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From Golf Course Superintendents Association of Northern California, regarding proposed Ordinance Ban on Gas-Powered Landscaping Equipment. File No. 220199. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From concerned citizens, regarding proposed Ordinance Street and Public Service Easement Vacation Order - Parkmerced Development Project. File Nos. 220735 and 220736. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From concerned organizations, regarding Southeast Plant Biosolids Digester Facilities resolution. File No. 220791. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From concerned citizens, regarding proposed Resolution urging the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Board of Directors to remove Third Party

Dispatch from its Taxi Upfront Fare Pilot Program. File No. 220886. 8 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From concerned citizens, regarding algal blooms in the San Francisco Bay. 69 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From concerned citizen, regarding the Great Highway. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From concerned citizens, regarding John F. Kennedy (JFK) Drive. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From concerned citizens, regarding public comment at Board meetings. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (13)

From concerned citizens, regarding Slow Streets and Lake Street. 29 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From concerned citizen, regarding safety improvements to address traffic death on Lombard Street. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From Irina Torrey, regarding nomination of Kate Stacy to the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. File No. 220938. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From Corbett Heights Neighbors, regarding San Francisco Police Department Draft General Order 9.01 Traffic Enforcement and Curtailing the Use of Pretext Stops. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From the California Fish and Game Commission, submitting a notice of proposed changes in regulations concerning pink shrimp. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From Aaron Goodman, regarding San Francisco State University student housing. Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From Julie Chun, regarding Change of Use notice for 100 Broadway. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From Dana Glenn, regarding City College tennis courts. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From concerned citizens, regarding the 2013 Development Agreement for the Sutter Health/CPMC Mission Bernal Campus. 8 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (22)

From various Departments, submitting Chapter, Section 12B, Waiver Request Forms, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 12B.5-1. 6 Contracts. Copy: Each Supervisor. (23)

From Behavioral Health Commission, submitting a resolution urging the investment of funds to improve the standard and quality of behavioral health services. Copy: Each Supervisor: (24)

From Supervisor Safai, regarding a request to draft legislation to create the Concrete Building Safety Program. Copy: Each Supervisor. (25)

**From:** [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Lagunte, Richard \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: TIME SENSITIVE: Mayoral Appointment - Arts Commission  
**Date:** Thursday, September 22, 2022 4:32:38 PM  
**Attachments:** [Clerk's Memo 9.22.22 - Arts Commission.pdf](#)  
[Jeanna Anyanwu-McCoy Appointment Letter 2022.pdf](#)  
[Jeanne Anyanwu McCoy Bio.pdf](#)  
[Jeanne Anyanwu McCoy Form 700.pdf](#)

---

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 22, 2022 4:31:20 PM  
**To:** BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative\_aides@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; De Asis, Edward (BOS) <edward.deasis@sfgov.org>; Entezari, Mehran (BOS) <Mehran.Entezari@sfgov.org>; PEARSON, ANNE (CAT) <Anne.Pearson@sfcityatty.org>; Fennell, Tyra (MYR) <tyra.fennell@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** TIME SENSITIVE: Mayoral Appointment - Arts Commission

Dear Supervisors,

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

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](mailto: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 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: September 22, 2022  
To: Members, Board of Supervisors  
From:  Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board  
Subject: Mayoral Appointment - Arts Commission

---

The Office of the Mayor submitted the following complete appointment package pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18). Appointments in this category are effective immediately unless rejected by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (October 19, 2022).

**Appointment to the Arts Commission**

- Jeanne Anyanwu-McCoy - term expiring August 31, 2026

Pursuant to Board Rule 2.18.3, 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 end of day Wednesday September 28, 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 Commission Affairs

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR  
SAN FRANCISCO



LONDON N. BREED  
MAYOR

## Notice of Appointment

September 19, 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 Charter Section 3.100(18), of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following appointment of **Jeanne Anyanwu-McCoy** to the Arts Commission for a term ending August 31, 2026. She will be filling the seat once held by Linda Parker-Pennington.

I am confident that Mrs. Anyanwu-McCoy will serve our community well. Attached are her qualifications to serve, which 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 Breed".

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

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Update to Safer Return Together Order (Order No. C19-07y)  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 10:17:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [2022.09.15 FINAL Signed Health Officer Order No. C19-07y \(Update 18\).pdf](#)  
[2022.09.15 Redline of Health Officer Order No. C19-07y \(9.15 version against 6.16 version\).pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the Updated Health Officer Order C19-07y.

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:** Pearson, Anne (CAT) <Anne.Pearson@sfcityatty.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, September 16, 2022 8:21 AM  
**To:** BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative\_aides@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Update to Safer Return Together Order (Order No. C19-07y)

Supervisors –

Yesterday the Health Officer updated the Safer Return Together COVID-19 Order. The revisions to the Order are relatively minor and do a few key things:

- The Health Officer has lifted the booster requirement under the local COVID-19 health order for firefighters, EMTs, and paramedics (that requirement would otherwise have become operative on September 30). The booster requirement under the local health order remains for workers in health care and other designated high-risk settings (*e.g.*, general acute care hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, intermediate care facilities, residential care facilities for the elderly, homeless shelters, and jails) consistent with what the state health orders still mandate.
  - Firefighters, EMTs, and paramedics, regardless of vaccination status, must wear a well-fitted mask while working indoors at a health care or other designated high-risk setting, along with any other person indoors in healthcare settings as outlined by the order.

- Based on current COVID-19 health conditions, the Health Officer does not intend to impose any new booster requirement on any workers or residents in San Francisco. The only booster requirement that remains in effect is the requirement for the one booster (in addition to the initial series) for workers in health care and other designated high-risk settings consistent with the requirements under current state health orders. To clarify, any one booster dose meets the requirement, whether the booster was the original formulation or a bivalent booster available starting this week.
- But the Health Officer will continue to reserve her authority to impose vaccine booster or other health requirements in the future, if COVID-19 health conditions worsen significantly and the Health Officer determines those requirements are appropriate to address the public health needs of the community.
- The updates to the order also contain other changes to conform with the current state of the pandemic and state and federal guidance. These changes include:
  - Making clear that the order no longer requires COVID-19 health precautions for schools or programs for children and youth. But the school district, individual schools, and operators of programs for children and youth may choose to adopt their own health policies and precautions.
  - Re Masking:
    - Clarifying that everyone indoors in healthcare settings, including, but not limited to, the designated high-risk settings, must wear a well-fitting mask or more protective face covering. That general requirement remains subject to the exceptions for masking where, for instance, a worker is alone in a closed office. This masking requirement for healthcare settings is consistent with the requirements of current CDPH masking guidance.
    - Continuing to strongly recommend that everyone, regardless of vaccination status, wear a well-fitted mask when riding on—or waiting inside to ride—public transit, including everyone who is inside the vehicle or other mode of transportation or is indoors at a public transit stop or station. This strong recommendation extends to all modes of transportation other than private vehicles, such as airplanes, trains, subways, buses, taxis, ride-shares, maritime transportation, street cars, and cable cars.
  - Removing the prior routine testing requirement for healthcare workers who are exempt from vaccination or boosting in healthcare settings where vaccination and boosters are required, consistent with this week's updated CDPH orders removing the testing requirement.

The order, a copy of which is attached, will be posted online soon and is effective immediately on issuance. The attached redline shows changes against the June 16, 2022 version of the order. This summary and the attached documents are public records.

Attachments:

- Safer Return Together Order, No. 19-07y, updated September 15, 2022
- Copy of updated Safer Return Together Order, marked to show changes from Order dated June 16, 2022

Thanks,  
Anne

**Anne Pearson (she/her/hers)**

Deputy City Attorney

Office of the City Attorney

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Suite 234

San Francisco, CA 94102

Cell: (646)-241-7670 – ***please use this number during current period of remote work***

Tel: (415) 554-4706

[anne.pearson@sfcityattty.org](mailto:anne.pearson@sfcityattty.org)

**Attorney-Client Communication - Do Not Disclose**

**Confidential Attorney-Work Product - Do Not Disclose**



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER  
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
ENCOURAGING COVID-19 VACCINE COVERAGE  
AND REDUCING DISEASE RISKS  
(Safer Return Together)**

DATE OF ORDER: June 11, 2021, updated multiple times, most recently on  
September 15, 2022

**Please read this Order carefully. Violation of or failure to comply with this Order is a misdemeanor punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both. (California Health and Safety Code § 120295, *et seq.*; California Penal Code §§ 69, 148(a)(1); and San Francisco Administrative Code § 7.17(b).)**

Summary: As of September 15, 2022, this Order replaces the prior update of this health order, Health Officer Order No. C19-07y (issued June 16, 2022), in its entirety. This Order largely aligns with the COVID-19 orders of the State. The main changes made by the September 15, 2022 update are to (1) remove the requirement for firefighters, paramedics, and EMTs who routinely work in High-Risk Settings to receive their first Booster and require them, regardless of vaccination status, to wear a Well-Fitting Mask or other, more protective respirator when inside such High-Risk Settings, (2) update masking, vaccination, and testing requirements and recommendations consistent with updated United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and California Department of Public Health guidelines and orders, making clear that masks are still required in healthcare settings in San Francisco and removing the requirement for people claiming an exemption from receipt of a Booster to test regularly, and (3) making other updates based on the current status of the pandemic.

The Health Officer is updating the Order in light of State guidelines and the relatively low number of hospitalizations in the community associated with the spread in San Francisco and the Bay Area region of SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19. There remains the ongoing threat that the virus, including other future variants or subvariants, pose particularly to the health of medically vulnerable residents. But, based on current scientific knowledge, San Francisco is well positioned to address the current level of the virus and future increases in cases due in large part to the high rate of vaccination in the community, greater availability of effective treatments for those who are vulnerable to severe disease, and effective use of mitigation strategies, such as masking in indoor public settings when there are high levels of community transmission. The best pathway for San Francisco to continue to move forward in the face of the virus is for as many people as possible to complete their initial series of vaccination and receive their boosters when eligible. Vaccines and Boosters that target SARS-CoV-2 continue to protect against severe disease. The United States Centers for Disease Control



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

and Prevention and the California Department of Public Health recommend that everyone who has been vaccinated receive a booster shot as soon as they are eligible because immunity wanes several months after completion of the initial vaccine series. In the future, the Health Officer may need to adjust health precautions depending on the specific characteristics of future variants, and if so, the Health Officer will continue to use the least restrictive health measures to prevent severe disease on a population level basis in the community.

Even though a high percentage of people are vaccinated in San Francisco and the Bay Area region and a significant percentage are boosted against the virus that causes COVID-19, there remains a risk that people may come into contact with others who have COVID-19 when outside their residence, particularly during periods of moderate or high community transmission. Many COVID-19 infections are caused by people who have no symptoms of illness. Also, there are people in San Francisco who have not completed their initial vaccine series or who are not yet Boosted or eligible to receive a Booster, including some young children, and people who are immuno-compromised and may be particularly vulnerable to infection and disease.

Based on current health conditions and balancing those considerations with acknowledgement that there remains ongoing risk to vulnerable populations and the potential for future surges, this Order maintains face covering guidelines based on an individual risk-focused approach. In this Order the Health Officer recommends that individuals wear a Well-Fitted Mask in indoor public settings based on three factors. First, you should consider your own risk tolerance. Second, you should consider the overall level of community transmission, such as when future variants occur (*e.g.*, the higher the rate of community transmission, the more seriously you should consider wearing a mask in indoor public settings). Third, you should consider whether you or someone with whom you work or live is at risk of severe disease.

At the same time, wearing a Well-Fitted Mask is still required under federal and state health rules in certain settings, including: in emergency shelters and cooling centers; in healthcare settings; in state and local correctional facilities and detention centers; in homeless shelters; and in long term care settings and adult and senior care facilities. A copy of the current CDPH masking order is available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/guidance-for-face-coverings.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/guidance-for-face-coverings.aspx). Consistent with changes by the State of California on April 20, 2022, (and subject to any future state or federal masking mandates), the Health Officer continues to strongly recommend, but does not require, that all people, regardless of vaccination status, wear a Well-Fitted Mask on public transportation and in indoor public transportation facilities.

This Order maintains the requirement, layered on top of the recently revised CDPH health orders, for (1) Personnel working in designated High-Risk Settings—meaning general acute care hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, intermediate care facilities, residential care facilities for the elderly, homeless shelters, and jails, all as further defined below—as well as (2) Personnel working in other higher-risk settings—including adult





**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

care facilities, adult day programs, dental offices, home health care workers, and pharmacists—to both receive the full initial course of vaccination and, once they are eligible, to receive a Booster. But, based on changed health conditions, the moderate to low number of cases and hospitalizations in the community, high levels of vaccination, availability of effective treatments, and reduced outbreak risk as determined by federal, state, and local public health officials, Personnel who are not permanently stationed or regularly assigned to High-Risk Settings but who in the course of their duties may enter or work in High-Risk Settings on an intermittent or occasional basis or for short periods of time (such as police and lawyers who visit people in the jails) are no longer required to receive a Booster, but are strongly encouraged to do so. And such people must wear a Well-Fitting Mask whenever they are onsite at a High-Risk Setting. Additionally, Personnel at homeless shelters (other than congregate living health facilities) are not required to receive a Booster under this Order, but are strongly encouraged to do so.

California and San Francisco have been fully reopened since June 15, 2021. Consistent with State guidelines, this Order maintains other minimum COVID-19 safety requirements on businesses and governmental entities, such as a general requirement to report outbreaks in the workplace.

**UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE  
SECTIONS 101040, 101085, AND 120175, THE HEALTH OFFICER OF THE CITY AND  
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORDERS:**

1. Definitions.

For purposes of this Order, the following initially capitalized terms have the meanings given below.

- a. *Booster.* A “Booster” means an additional dose of a vaccine authorized to prevent COVID-19 by the FDA, including by way of an emergency use authorization, or by the World Health Organization (WHO), for which a person is Booster-Eligible. Consistent with CDC and CDPH guidance, either the Pfizer-BioNTech (Comirnaty) or Moderna (Spikevax) COVID-19 vaccine is preferred for the Booster. The term “Booster” includes any such additional dose authorized by the FDA, including formulations that are different than the original COVID-19 vaccines (such as bivalent boosters available starting September 2022 or other future formulations). For clarity, if this Order mandates a Booster dose, it does not require that the formulation be an updated formulation, but the Order strongly encourages everyone to follow CDC vaccine and booster recommendations, including recommendations for receipt of subsequent Booster doses when indicated.
- b. *Booster-Eligible.* A person is “Booster-Eligible” once they meet criteria to receive a Booster under CDC guidance. Consistent with CDC guidance (available online at



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

[www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/booster-shot.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/booster-shot.html)), anyone who received a WHO-authorized vaccine or a combination of vaccines should receive the Pfizer-BioNTech (Comirnaty) vaccine as their booster pursuant to the timing listing in that guidance. Those preferences apply to all initial vaccination series, regardless of which vaccine an individual received. The CDC has been frequently updating booster eligibility. More up-to-date information on booster eligibility may be found online at <https://sf.gov/get-your-covid-19-booster>, and individuals, Businesses, and governmental entities are urged to stay informed about changes.

- c. *Business*. A “Business” includes any for-profit, non-profit, or educational entity, whether a corporate entity, organization, partnership or sole proprietorship, and regardless of the nature of the service, the function it performs, or its corporate or entity structure.
  - d. *Cal/OSHA*. “Cal/OSHA” means the California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Occupational Safety and Health, better known as Cal/OSHA.
  - e. *CDC*. “CDC” means the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
  - f. *CDPH*. “CDPH” means the California Department of Public Health.
  - g. *Close Contact*. “Close Contact” means sharing the same indoor airspace with a Person With COVID-19 for a total of 15 minutes or more in a 24-hour period while the person is in their Infectious Period. In turn, a “Person With COVID-19” means a person who tests positive for the virus that causes COVID-19 (SARS-CoV-2) or has been clinically diagnosed with COVID-19 by a healthcare provider. A Person with COVID-19 is in their Infectious Period as follows:
    - i. For symptomatic infected people, starting two days before the infected person had any symptoms through when all three of the following criteria are met: the earlier of day 10 after symptoms first appeared or the day on which they test negative between days five and 10; and 24 hours have passed with no fever without the use of fever-reducing medications; and symptoms have improved.
    - ii. For asymptomatic infected people, starting two days before the positive specimen collection date through the earlier of day 10 after the positive specimen collection date or the day on which they test negative between days five and 10 after the specimen collection date for their first positive COVID-19 test.
- (Note that Cal/OSHA may have different rules regarding being a close contact in the workplace, and those rules apply in the workplace setting.)
- h. *County*. The “County” means the City and County of San Francisco.
  - i. *COVID-19*. “COVID-19” means coronavirus disease 2019, the disease caused by the SARS-CoV-2 virus and that resulted in a global pandemic.



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

- j. *DPH*. “DPH” means the San Francisco Department of Public Health.
- k. *DPH Core Guidance*. “DPH Core Guidance” means the webpage and related materials that DPH regularly updates and includes health and safety recommendations for individuals and Businesses as well as web links to additional resources, available online at <https://sf.gov/covid19>.
- l. *Face Covering Requirements*. “Face Covering Requirements” means the limited requirements to wear a Well-Fitted Mask (i) under federal or state law including, but not limited to, California Department of Public Health guidance and Cal/OSHA’s regulations; (ii) in indoor common areas of homeless shelters, emergency shelters, and cooling centers, except while sleeping, showering, engaged in personal hygiene that requires removal of face coverings, or actively eating or drinking; (iii) in indoor common areas of jails except while sleeping, showering, engaged in personal hygiene that requires removal of face coverings, or actively eating or drinking; and (iv) under Section 3(b), below and Appendix A, attached to the Order. If a separate state, local, or federal order or directive imposes different face covering requirements, including requirements to wear respirators or surgical masks in certain settings, the more health protective requirement applies.
- m. *FDA*. “FDA” means the United States Food and Drug Administration.
- n. *Fully Vaccinated*. “Fully Vaccinated” has the same meaning as the newer term “Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series,” defined below. Because other pre-existing Health Officer orders and directives and other DPH or County guidance materials may still use the term Fully Vaccinated that term continues to be defined in this Order.
- o. *Health Officer*. “Health Officer” means the Health Officer of the City and County of San Francisco.
- p. *High-Risk Settings*. “High-Risk Settings” means certain care or living settings involving many people, including many congregate settings, where vulnerable populations reside out of necessity and where the risk of COVID-19 transmission is high, consisting of general acute care hospitals, skilled nursing facilities (including subacute facilities), intermediate care facilities, residential care facilities for the elderly, homeless shelters, and jails (including, but not limited to, the Juvenile Justice Center Juvenile Hall).
- q. *Household*. “Household” means people living in a single Residence or shared living unit. Households do not refer to individuals who live together in an institutional group living situation such as in a dormitory, fraternity, sorority, monastery, convent, or residential care facility.
- r. *Mega-Event*. “Mega-Event” means an event with either more than 1,000 people attending indoors or more than 10,000 people attending outdoors. As provided in the



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

State's Post-Blueprint Guidance, a Mega-Event may have either assigned or unassigned seating, and may be either general admission or gated, ticketed and permitted events.

- s. *Personnel*. "Personnel" means the following people who provide goods or services associated with a Business in the County: employees; contractors and sub-contractors (such as those who sell goods or perform services onsite or who deliver goods for the Business); independent contractors; vendors who are permitted to sell goods onsite; volunteers; and other individuals who regularly provide services onsite at the request of the Business. "Personnel" includes "gig workers" who perform work via the Business's app or other online interface, if any.
- t. *Qualifying Medical Reason*. "Qualifying Medical Reason" means a medical condition or disability recognized by the FDA or CDC as a contra-indication to COVID-19 vaccination.
- u. *Religious Beliefs*. "Religious Beliefs" means a sincerely held religious belief, practice, or observance protected by state or federal law.
- v. *Residence*. "Residence" means the location a person lives, even if temporarily, and includes single-family homes, apartment units, condominium units, hotels, motels, shared rental units, and similar facilities. Residences also include living structures and outdoor spaces associated with those living structures, such as patios, porches, backyards, and front yards that are only accessible to a single family or Household.
- w. *Schools*. "Schools" mean public and private schools operating in the County, including independent, parochial, and charter schools.
- x. *State's Post-Blueprint Guidance*. The "State's Post-Blueprint Guidance" means the guidance entitled "Beyond the Blueprint for Industry and Business Sectors" that the California Department of Public Health issued on May 21, 2021 and updated as of May 2, 2022, including as the State may further extend, update or supplement that guidance in the future. (See [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Beyond-Blueprint-Framework.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Beyond-Blueprint-Framework.aspx).)
- y. *Test and Tested*. "Tested" means to have a negative test (a "Test") for the virus that causes COVID-19 within the applicable timeframe as listed in this Order. Both nucleic acid (including polymerase chain reaction (PCR)) and antigen tests are acceptable. The following are acceptable as proof of a negative COVID-19 test result: a printed document (from the test provider or laboratory) or an email, text message, webpage, or application (app) screen displayed on a phone or mobile device from the test provider or laboratory. The information should include person's name, type of test performed, negative test result, and date the test was administered. If any state or federal agency uses a more restrictive definition of what it means to be Tested for specified purposes (such as Cal/OSHA rules for employers in workplaces), then that more restrictive definition controls for those purposes. Some sections of this



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

Order require antigen tests to be third-party verified (meaning administered or observed by the third-party) to meet requirements for showing proof of a negative Test.

- z. *Unvaccinated*. “Unvaccinated” refers to a person age two or older who is eligible for COVID-19 vaccination and who is either (i) not at least Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or (ii) in an indoor setting where this Order requires proof of being Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series as a condition of entry but has not provided such proof.
- aa. *Up-to-Date on Vaccination*. “Up-to-Date on Vaccination” means when a person both (i) is Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series and (ii) has received each Booster recommended by the CDC for that person once the person is Booster-Eligible. A person is Up-to-Date on Vaccination immediately on receipt of all recommended Boosters for which that person is then eligible. Until a person is Booster-Eligible, they are considered Up-to-Date on Vaccination two weeks after completing their full initial series of vaccination.
- bb. *Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series*. “Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series” means two weeks after completing the entire recommended initial series of vaccination (usually one or two doses) with a vaccine authorized to prevent COVID-19 by the FDA, including by way of an emergency use authorization, or by the World Health Organization (WHO). For example, as of the date of issuance of this Order, an individual has completed an initial vaccination series at least two weeks after receiving a second dose of the Pfizer-BioNTech (Comirnaty) or Moderna (Spikevax) COVID-19 vaccine or two weeks after receiving the single dose Johnson & Johnson’s Janssen COVID-19 vaccine. A list of FDA-authorized vaccines is available at [www.fda.gov/emergency-preparedness-and-response/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19/covid-19-vaccines](https://www.fda.gov/emergency-preparedness-and-response/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19/covid-19-vaccines). A list of WHO-authorized vaccines is available at <https://extranet.who.int/pqweb/vaccines/covid-19-vaccines>. On August 23, 2021, the FDA granted full approval for the Pfizer-BioNTech (Comirnaty) vaccine for people age 16 and older, and on January 31, 2022, the FDA granted full approval for the Moderna (Spikevax) vaccine for people age 18 and older. And, on October 29, 2021, the FDA granted emergency use authorization for the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine for children age five to 11. On June 17, 2022, the FDA granted emergency authorization for the Pfizer-BioNTech (Comirnaty) and Moderna (Spikevax) COVID-19 vaccines to include use in children who are at least six months old.

Unless otherwise specified, the following are acceptable as proof of being Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or Up-to-Date on Vaccination: (i) the CDC vaccination card, which includes name of person vaccinated, type of vaccine provided, and date last dose administered, or similar documentation issued by another foreign governmental jurisdiction, (ii) a photo of a vaccination card as a separate document, (iii) a photo of the a vaccination card stored on a phone or electronic device, (iv) documentation of vaccination from a healthcare provider, (v) unless prohibited elsewhere in this Order in a specific context, written self-attestation of



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

vaccination signed (including an electronic signature) under penalty of perjury and containing the name of the person vaccinated, type of vaccine taken, and date of last dose administered, or (vi) a personal digital COVID-19 vaccine record issued by the State of California and available by going to <https://myvaccinerecord.cdph.ca.gov> or similar documentation issued by another State, local, or foreign governmental jurisdiction, or by an approved private company (a list of approved companies offering digital vaccine verification is available at <https://sf.gov/information/digital-vaccine-cards>). If any state or federal agency uses a more restrictive definition of what it means to be Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or to prove that status for specified purposes (such as Cal/OSHA rules for employers in workplaces), then that more restrictive definition controls for those purposes. Also, to the extent Cal/OSHA approves an alternate means of documenting whether an employee has completed the full initial series or is “fully vaccinated,” even if less restrictive than the definition contained here, employers may use the Cal/OSHA standard to document their employees’ vaccination status.

- cc. *Ventilation Guidelines*. “Ventilation Guidelines” means ventilation guidance from recognized authorities such as the CDC, the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers, or the State of California (available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Interim-Guidance-for-Ventilation-Filtration-and-Air-Quality-in-Indoor-Environments.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Interim-Guidance-for-Ventilation-Filtration-and-Air-Quality-in-Indoor-Environments.aspx)), including Cal/OSHA.
- dd. *Well-Fitted Mask*. A “Well-Fitted Mask” means a face covering that is well-fitted to an individual and covers the nose and mouth especially while talking, consistent with the Face Covering Requirements. CDC guidance regarding Well-Fitted Masks may be found at [www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/your-health/effective-masks.html](http://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/your-health/effective-masks.html). A well-fitting non-vented N95, KN95, or KF94 respirator is strongly recommended as a Well-Fitted Mask, even if not fit-tested, to provide maximum protection. A well-fitting surgical/procedural mask with a cloth mask worn over it to increase fit is also recommended. Given higher transmissibility of the Omicron variant, cloth masks alone are no longer recommended. A Well-Fitted Mask does not include a scarf, ski mask, balaclava, bandana, turtleneck, collar, or single layer of fabric or any mask that has an unfiltered one-way exhaust valve.

**2. Purpose and Intent.**

- a. Purpose. The public health threat of serious illness or death from COVID-19 is much lower in the County and the Bay Area than many parts of the State and country due to the high rate of vaccination of the community. But COVID-19 continues to pose a risk especially to individuals who are not eligible to be vaccinated or are not yet Up-to-Date on Vaccination, and certain safety measures continue to be necessary or strongly recommended to protect against COVID-19 cases and deaths. Being Up-to-Date on Vaccination, including receiving all recommended Boosters as soon as Booster-Eligible, is the most effective method to prevent transmission and ultimately COVID-19 hospitalizations and deaths. It is important to ensure that as many eligible





**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

people as possible are vaccinated against COVID-19. Further, it is critical to ensure there is continued reporting of cases to protect individuals and the larger community. Accordingly, this Order allows Businesses, schools, and other activities to resume fully while at the same time maintaining certain requirements or recommendations designed to (1) extend vaccine coverage to the greatest extent possible; (2) limit transmission risk of COVID-19; (3) contain any COVID-19 outbreaks; and (4) generally align with guidance issued by the CDC and the State relating to COVID-19 except in limited instances where local conditions require more restrictive measures. This Order is based on evidence of continued community transmission of SARS-CoV-2 within the County as well as scientific evidence and best practices to prevent transmission of COVID-19. The Health Officer will continue to monitor data regarding the evolving scientific understanding of the risks posed by COVID-19, including the impact of vaccination, and may amend or rescind this Order based on analysis of that data and knowledge. It is possible that the Health Officer will determine in the future that prior health precautions that have been relaxed or removed need to be imposed again, based on changes in local health conditions and the course of the pandemic.

- b. Intent. The primary intent of this Order is to continue to protect the community from COVID-19, including by providing health recommendations as requirements are lifted, and to also increase vaccination rates to reduce transmission of COVID-19 long-term, so that the whole community is safer and the COVID-19 health emergency can come to an end.
- c. Interpretation. All provisions of this Order must be interpreted to effectuate the purposes and intent of this Order as described above. The note and summary at the beginning of this Order as well as the headings and subheadings of sections contained in this Order are for convenience only and may not be used to interpret this Order. In the event of any inconsistency between the summary, headings, or subheadings and the text of this Order, the text will control. Certain initially capitalized terms used in this Order have the meanings given them in Section 1 above. The interpretation of this Order in relation to the health orders or guidance of the State is described in Section 10 below.
- d. Application. This Order applies to all individuals, Businesses, and other entities in the County. For clarity, the requirements of this Order apply to all individuals who do not currently reside in the County when they are in the County. Governmental entities must follow the requirements of this Order that apply to Businesses, unless otherwise specifically provided in this Order or directed by the Health Officer.
- e. DPH Core Guidance. All individuals and Businesses are strongly urged to refer to, and where applicable follow, the DPH Core Guidance (available online at <https://sf.gov/topics/coronavirus-covid-19>) containing health and safety recommendations for COVID-19.



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

- f. Effect of Failure to Comply. Failure to comply with any of the provisions of this Order constitutes an imminent threat and menace to public health, constitutes a public nuisance, and is punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both, as further provided in Section 12 below.

3. General Requirements for Individuals.

- a. Vaccination. Individuals are strongly urged to be Up-to-Date on Vaccination, meaning, as further provided in Section 1, that they are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series and, as soon as they are Booster-Eligible, receive their recommended Boosters. In particular, people at risk for severe illness with COVID-19—such as unvaccinated older adults and unvaccinated individuals with health risks—and members of their Household, are urged to be Up-to-Date on Vaccination, including receiving all recommended Boosters, as soon as they can. Information about who is at increased risk of severe illness and people who need to take extra precautions can be found at [www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/need-extra-precautions/people-with-medical-conditions.html](http://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/need-extra-precautions/people-with-medical-conditions.html). For those who are not yet Up-to-Date on Vaccination, making informed choices about the risk of different activities, wearing a Well-Fitted Mask indoors when appropriate, testing before risky gathering indoors, or choosing outdoor activities when appropriate are also ways to prevent the risk of COVID-19 transmission. Individuals who are Up-to-Date on Vaccination have the best protection against COVID-19.
- b. Face Coverings. Everyone, and especially those who remain Unvaccinated, is recommended to wear a Well-Fitted Mask in the following situations:
- When an individual wants added protection based on individual risk tolerance, for example, when indoors with people whose vaccination status is unknown. People should respect an individual's decision to wear face coverings even in settings where they are not required, and no Business or other person should take an adverse action against individuals who chose to wear a face covering to protect their health.
  - When there is a higher risk of community spread and infection, such as when COVID-19 case numbers increase, and case numbers in San Francisco can be found online at <https://sf.gov/data/covid-19-cases-and-deaths>.
  - When an individual, or someone with whom an individual lives or works, is at a higher risk of a negative health outcome, such as older and immuno-compromised individuals.
- i. Masks Required or Strongly Recommended in Certain Settings. Everyone is required to wear a Well-Fitted Mask, regardless of vaccination status, in the following indoor settings: High-Risk Settings; health care settings as required by CDPH guidance and by this Order; other workplaces or settings where





**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

masking is required by the Business or setting or by regulatory orders and rules; and anywhere else that federal or state health orders or regulatory rules (including, but not limited to, Cal/OSHA and federal requirements) require doing so. In addition, and subject to any future state or federal masking mandates, everyone, regardless of vaccination status, is strongly recommended to wear a Well-Fitted Mask when riding or waiting inside to ride on public transit, including everyone who is inside the vehicle or other mode of transportation or is indoors at a public transit stop or station. This strong recommendation extends to all modes of transportation other than private vehicles, such as airplanes, trains, subways, buses, taxis, ride-shares, maritime transportation, street cars, and cable cars.

Appendix A lists exceptions and allowances in such settings when a Well-Fitted Mask is not required. And, wearing a Well-Fitted Mask is strongly recommended for those in isolation or quarantine.

- ii. Fit and Filtration Guidance. When wearing a mask, everyone should consistently wear the best mask they can obtain, considering fit and filtration (and without using a one-way exhalation valve that is not filtered). As provided in the definition of a Well-Fitted Mask, a well-fitting non-vented N95, KN95, or KF94 respirator is strongly recommended. A well-fitting surgical/procedural mask with a cloth mask worn over it to increase fit is also recommended. More information about fit and filtration and the best mask options is available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Get-the-Most-out-of-Masking.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Get-the-Most-out-of-Masking.aspx).
- c. Monitor for Symptoms. Individuals should monitor themselves for symptoms of COVID-19. A list of COVID-19 symptoms is available online at [www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/symptoms-testing/symptoms.html](http://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/symptoms-testing/symptoms.html). Anyone with any symptom that is new or not explained by another condition must comply with subsections 3(d) and 3(e) below regarding isolation and quarantine.
- d. Isolation. Anyone who has or likely has COVID-19, meaning that person (i) has a positive COVID-19 test result, (ii) is diagnosed with COVID-19, or (iii) has a COVID-19 symptom that is new or not explained by another condition, must refer to the latest COVID-19 isolation and quarantine health directive issued by the Health Officer (available online at <https://sf.gov/healthrules>) and follow the requirements detailed there. There are special requirements for healthcare workers and emergency medical services personnel in healthcare settings.
- e. Quarantine. Anyone who had Close Contact must refer to the latest COVID-19 isolation and quarantine health directive issued by the Health Officer (available online at <https://sf.gov/healthrules>) and follow the requirements detailed there. There are special requirements for healthcare workers and emergency medical services personnel in healthcare settings. Additional quarantine requirements may exist for Businesses and governmental entities and their employees under applicable



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

regulatory rules (including, but not limited to, Cal/OSHA and federal requirements).

- f. Moving to, Traveling to, or Returning to the County. Everyone is strongly encouraged to comply with CDC travel guidelines (available online at [www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/travelers/travel-during-covid19.html](http://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/travelers/travel-during-covid19.html)).
  - g. Minimum Requirements. Based on their risk preferences, individuals may decide for themselves to take greater safety precautions than required or even recommended under this Order. Also, nothing in this section limits any requirements that apply under this Order to indoor public settings, indoor Mega-Events, or that Cal/OSHA or other State authority may impose on any indoor setting involving gatherings.
4. General Requirements for Businesses and Governmental Entities.
- a. Vaccination. Businesses and governmental entities are generally encouraged to consider whether to require Personnel and patrons to be Up-to-Date on Vaccination, meaning they are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series and have received all recommended Boosters when they are Booster-Eligible.
    - i. Vaccination or Testing Recommendation for Certain Indoor Businesses. The following Businesses are encouraged to consider whether to require patrons and staff to provide either proof of being Up-to-Date on Vaccination (including receipt of all recommended Boosters once Booster-Eligible) or proof of a negative Test before entry or service, especially during periods when COVID-19 infections are increasing in the County:
      - Operators or hosts of establishments or events where food or drink is served indoors—including, but not limited to, dining establishments, bars, clubs, theaters, and entertainment venues.
      - Gyms, recreation facilities, yoga studios, dance studios, and other fitness establishments, where any patrons engage in cardiovascular, aerobic, strength training, or other exercise involving elevated breathing.
      - Operators and hosts of indoor and outdoor Mega-Events, as set forth in Section 7 below.
  - b. Masking.
    - i. Mask Requirements and Allowances. Businesses and governmental entities designated by this Order must follow the requirements for masking listed in this Order and Appendix A to this Order, and other businesses and governmental entities may, but are not required by this Order to, require masks be worn indoors.
      - a. Healthcare Settings. Everyone is required to wear a Well-Fitted Mask, regardless of vaccination status, or more protective face covering (like



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

a respirator) in all health care settings subject to the exceptions listed in Appendix A to this Order. For clarity, a Well-Fitted Mask or more protective face covering must be worn by everyone in healthcare settings, except that people who reside in facilities at which they receive care are also allowed to not wear a Well-Fitting Mask consistent with state and federal guidance and rules applicable to those facilities. This local requirement is consistent with but not dependent on the requirements listed in the CDPH "Guidance for the Use of Face Masks" dated April 20, 2022, available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Guidance-for-Face-Coverings.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Guidance-for-Face-Coverings.aspx).

- ii. Providing a Well-Fitted Mask. Businesses and other entities subject to this Order are encouraged to provide a Well-Fitted Mask at no cost to people (patrons and Personnel) who do not have one upon entry inside the facility.
- iii. Cal/OSHA Requirements. Businesses and other entities should also follow any additional Cal/OSHA regulations relating to COVID-19 health and safety measures in the workplace, including regarding masking, and more information can be found online at [www.dir.ca.gov/dosh/coronavirus/covid19faqs.html](http://www.dir.ca.gov/dosh/coronavirus/covid19faqs.html). Nothing in this Order is intended to reduce any of those requirements or otherwise modify them in a way that is less protective of public health, or to limit an individual's own choices to take more health protective measures.
- c. Personnel Health Screening. Businesses and governmental entities are encouraged to develop and implement a process for screening Personnel for COVID-19 symptoms, but this requirement does not mean they must perform on-site screening of Personnel. Businesses and governmental entities should ask Personnel to evaluate their own symptoms before reporting to work. If Personnel have symptoms consistent with COVID-19, they should follow subsections 3(d) and 3(e) above. Businesses and governmental entities may be required to conduct such screenings for Personnel under Cal/OSHA's regulations or other state or federal requirements. Businesses and other entities must adhere to applicable Cal/OSHA regulations relating to COVID-19 health and safety measures in the workplace and should frequently check for updates to those regulations such as by checking online at [www.dir.ca.gov/dosh/coronavirus/covid19faqs.html](http://www.dir.ca.gov/dosh/coronavirus/covid19faqs.html).
- d. Signage. All Businesses and governmental entities are encouraged to conspicuously post signage reminding individuals of the following COVID-19 prevention best practices to reduce transmission:
  - Get vaccinated and boosted;
  - Stay home if sick;
  - Wear a mask indoors if you are unvaccinated; and



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

Clean your hands.

Businesses and governmental entities are also encouraged to include in signage any custom requirements the business or entity requires of its patrons or Personnel regarding testing, vaccination, and masking. Sample signage is available online at <https://sf.gov/outreach-toolkit-coronavirus-covid-19>.

- e. Ventilation Guidelines. All Businesses and governmental entities with indoor operations are urged to review the Ventilation Guidelines and implement ventilation strategies for indoor operations as feasible. Nothing in this subsection limits any ventilation requirements that apply to particular settings under federal, state, or local law.
- f. Mandatory Reporting by Businesses and Governmental Entities. Consistent with Cal/OSHA regulations, Businesses and governmental entities must require that all Personnel immediately alert the Business or governmental entity if they test positive for COVID-19 and were present in the workplace either (1) within 48 hours before onset of symptoms or within 10 days after onset of symptoms if they were symptomatic; or (2) within 48 hours before the date on which they were tested or within 10 days after the date on which they were tested if they were asymptomatic. If a Business or governmental entity is concerned about a workplace outbreak among Personnel, it may get additional information <https://sf.gov/step-by-step/what-do-if-someone-work-has-covid-19>. Businesses and governmental entities must also comply with all case investigation and contact tracing measures directed by DPH including providing any information requested within the timeframe provided by DPH, instructing Personnel to follow isolation and quarantine protocols specified by CDPH and Cal/OSHA and any additional protocols specified by DPH, and excluding positive cases and unvaccinated close contacts from the workplace during these isolation and quarantine periods.
- g. Compliance with CDPH Guidance for the Use of Face Masks. Businesses and governmental entities with Personnel in homeless shelters, emergency shelters, cooling and heating centers, healthcare settings, state and local correctional facilities and detention centers, and Long Term Care Settings & Adult and Senior Care Facilities—as those terms are used in the CDPH “Guidance for the Use of Face Masks” dated April 20, 2022, available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Guidance-for-Face-Coverings.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Guidance-for-Face-Coverings.aspx)—must require a Well-Fitting Mask (or more protective face covering if appropriate or mandated) in the listed settings so long as required by that guidance, regardless of vaccination status, subject to the exceptions listed in Appendix A to this Order and subject to any other exceptions listed in state or federal guidelines or rules.
- h. Minimum Requirements; Ability to Adopt More-Restrictive Measures. This Order establishes the minimum requirements related to COVID-19 protections. Nothing in this Order is intended to reduce any other federal, state, or local legal requirements or otherwise modify them in a way that is less protective of public health, or to limit an



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

individual Business' or governmental entity's choices to take more health protective measures. Businesses or governmental entities may impose further restrictions that are more protective of public health than the minimum requirements or recommendations under this Order, including requiring patrons or Personnel to be Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or Up-to-Date on Vaccination, requiring them to wear a Well-Fitted Mask, requiring them to have a negative Test, or taking other more restrictive measures that are more protective of public health and meet their operational needs.

5. Schools and Programs for Children and Youth. There are no longer special requirements under this Order for Schools or Programs for Children and Youth. Individual schools, the school district, and programs for children and youth can determine their own COVID-19 health requirements consistent with state rules.
6. Vaccination Requirements for Personnel in High-Risk Settings and Other Health Care Personnel.
  - a. High-Risk Settings. Except for some Personnel as provided in subsections (a)(iii), (b), and (c) below, and for Personnel exempt under subsection (d) below, all of the following requirements apply in High-Risk Settings:
    - i. Businesses and governmental entities with Personnel in High-Risk Settings must:
      1. As of September 30, 2021, ascertain vaccination status of all Personnel in High-Risk Settings who routinely work onsite;
      2. As of September 30, 2021, ensure that before entering or working in any High-Risk Setting, all Personnel who routinely work onsite have received their first dose of a one-dose COVID-19 vaccine regimen or their second dose of a two-dose COVID-19 vaccine regimen authorized to prevent COVID-19 by the FDA, including by way of an emergency use authorization, or by the World Health Organization. Until such Personnel are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series, they are subject to at least the minimum public health and safety requirements in subsection (a)(iv) below; and
      3. As of March 1, 2022, ensure that all such Personnel who routinely work onsite, within 15 days of being Booster-Eligible, receive their first Booster. And for the period between when such Personnel are Booster-Eligible but have not yet received one, the operator of the High-Risk Setting must ensure that each such person comply with the public health and safety requirements in subsection (a)(iv) below regarding testing even though they have already received their full initial course of vaccination. For clarity, those who are Booster-Eligible on or before February 14, 2022 must have received their first Booster by March 1, 2022, and those who



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

are Booster-Eligible after February 14, 2022 must receive it within 15 days after they become eligible.

And consistent with updated CDPH “Health Care Worker Vaccine Requirement” guidance (linked below in Section 6(b)), such Personnel who provide proof of COVID-19 infection after being Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series (a “Recent Pre-Booster Infection”) may defer Booster administration under this subsection for up to 90 days from the date of their first positive COVID-19 test or clinical diagnosis, which in some situations may extend the deadline for receipt of a Booster beyond March 1, 2022. Such Personnel who are not eligible for a Booster by March 1, 2022 must be in compliance no later than 15 days after the timeframe specified in this paragraph for receiving the Booster. Personnel with a deferral due to a proven COVID-19 infection must be in compliance no later than 15 days after the expiration of their deferral.

- ii. As of September 30, 2021, Personnel who routinely work onsite in High-Risk Settings must have received their first dose of a one-dose COVID-19 vaccine regimen or their second dose of a two-dose COVID-19 vaccine regimen authorized to prevent COVID-19 by the FDA, including by way of an emergency use authorization, or by the World Health Organization. Until such Personnel are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series, they are subject to at least the minimum public health and safety requirements in subsection (a)(iv) below. As of March 1, 2022, Personnel who routinely work onsite in High-Risk Settings must, within 15 days of being Booster-Eligible, receive their first Booster. For clarity, those who are Booster-Eligible on or before February 14, 2022 must have received their first Booster by March 1, 2022, and those who are Booster-Eligible after February 14, 2022 must receive it within 15 days after they become eligible. Personnel who are required by this subsection 6(a)(ii) to receive a Booster may use the Recent Pre-Booster Infection deferral described above in subsection 6(a)(i)(3) and must be in compliance no later than 15 days after the expiration of the deferral described in that subsection. For clarity, Personnel who routinely work onsite in High-Risk Settings and subject to this subsection 6(a)(ii) includes jail staff subject to CDPH’s State and Local Correctional Facilities and Detention Centers Health Care Worker Vaccination Requirement (available at: <https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Correctional-Facilities-and-Detention-Centers-Health-Care-Worker-Vaccination-Order.aspx>). Notwithstanding the foregoing, firefighters, paramedics, and emergency medical technicians (EMTs), as well as Personnel who routinely work onsite at homeless shelters (other than congregate living health facilities), are strongly recommended (but not required) to be Up-to-Date on Vaccination when they are Booster-Eligible. In September 2022, based on changed health conditions the Health Officer changed the vaccination requirement for firefighters, paramedics, and EMTs to be consistent with State rules. That means they are no longer





**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

required to receive a Booster and rather are strongly recommended to receive one. If health conditions were to worsen in the future, the Health Officer may impose updated COVID-19 precautions as necessary to protect public health.

For purposes only of this subsection (ii), any such firefighters, paramedics, and EMTs—as well as all other Personnel—who work inside at any High-Risk Setting must, regardless of vaccination status, wear a Well-Fitted Mask at all times when they are working inside any High-Risk Setting.

- iii. Businesses and governmental entities with Personnel who are not permanently stationed or regularly assigned to a High-Risk Setting but who in the course of their duties may enter or work in High-Risk Settings on an intermittent or occasional basis or for short periods of time—including police, other law enforcement, and attorneys who enter jail settings or other High-Risk Settings as part of their work—are required to (1) ascertain vaccination status of all such Personnel and (2) ensure that before entering or working in any High-Risk Setting, all such Personnel are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series with any vaccine authorized to prevent COVID-19 by the FDA, including by way of an emergency use authorization, or by the World Health Organization, unless exempt under subsection (d) below. Additionally, as of September 29, 2021, all such Personnel must have received their first dose of a one-dose COVID-19 vaccine regimen or their second dose of a two-dose COVID-19 vaccine regimen authorized to prevent COVID-19 by the FDA, including by way of an emergency use authorization, or by the World Health Organization. Until such Personnel are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series, they are subject to at least the minimum public health and safety requirements in subsection (a)(iv) below. Personnel who are not permanently stationed or regularly assigned to a High-Risk Setting but who in the course of their duties may enter or work in High-Risk Settings even on an intermittent or occasional basis or for short periods of time are strongly recommended (but not required) to receive a Booster when they are Booster-Eligible. For clarity, Personnel subject to this subsection (a)(iii) who have not received their Booster but are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial series are not subject to the health and safety requirements in subsection (a)(iv) below, but must follow the Face Covering Requirements and any other applicable federal, state, or local requirements.
- iv. All Businesses and governmental entities subject to this Section 6 must require any Personnel who routinely work onsite at a High-Risk Setting and are exempt or who have otherwise not received their first Booster to comply with at least the following public health and safety measure:
  - 1. at all times at the worksite in the High-Risk Setting wear a face covering in compliance with this Order, as well as the CDPH “Guidance for the Use of Face Masks” dated April 20, 2022, available online at



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

[www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Guidance-for-Face-Coverings.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Guidance-for-Face-Coverings.aspx).

Because of the COVID-19 risks to any exempt Personnel who have not received a Booster, the High-Risk Setting must provide such Personnel, on request, with a well-fitting non-vented N95 respirator and strongly encourage such Personnel to wear that respirator at all times when working with patients, residents, clients, or incarcerated people.

Regular masking as required under this Section 6 is not as protective of public health as being Up-to-Date on Vaccination in helping prevent transmission of COVID-19; accordingly, those measures are a minimum safety requirement for exempt Personnel in High-Risk Settings. Businesses and governmental entities subject to this Section 6 may require additional safety measures for such Personnel. For example, factors a Business or governmental entity may consider in determining appropriate safety measures for exempt Personnel include, but are not limited to:

- a) Whether the Personnel will place other people at risk of transmission of COVID-19 because they are required to come into contact (including on an emergency basis) with other Personnel or with persons whose vaccination status is unknown, who are not yet eligible for the vaccine, or who are members of a vulnerable population (*e.g.*, the elderly, incarcerated people, and acute care patients);
- b) The type and frequency of testing available to the Personnel and whether the Business or governmental entity has the ability to provide testing to Personnel, without relying on public health resources, and track the requisite testing;
- c) Whether the Business or governmental entity can ensure compliance with the mask mandate whenever the Personnel are around other people in the workplace; and
- d) Whether the proposed accommodation imposes an undue burden because it is costly, infringes on other Personnel's job rights or benefits, compromises workplace safety, decreases workplace efficiency, or requires other Personnel to do more than their share of potentially hazardous or burdensome work.

Nothing under the Order limits the ability of a Business or governmental entity under applicable law to determine whether they are unable to offer a reasonable accommodation to unvaccinated Personnel with an approved exemption and to exclude such exempt Personnel from a High-Risk Setting.





**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

- v. All Businesses and governmental entities subject to this Section 6 must, consistent with applicable privacy laws and regulations, maintain records of employee vaccination or exemption status.
- vi. All Businesses and governmental entities subject to this Section 6 must provide these records to the Health Officer or other public health authorities promptly upon request, and in any event no later than the next business day after receiving the request.
- vii. This mandated vaccination schedule allows Businesses, governmental entities, and affected Personnel adequate time to comply with this Order. In the interest of protecting residents of High-Risk Settings, Personnel, and their families, Businesses, governmental entities, and affected Personnel are strongly urged to meet these vaccination requirements as soon as possible.

For clarity, this requirement applies to Personnel in other buildings in a site containing a High-Risk Setting, such as a campus or other similar grouping of related buildings, where such Personnel do any of the following: (i) access the acute care or patient, resident, client, or incarcerated person areas of the High-Risk Setting; or (ii) work in-person with patients, residents, clients, or incarcerated people who visit those areas. All people in San Francisco who work in a clinical setting with a population that is more vulnerable to COVID-19 are strongly urged to be Up-to-Date on Vaccination, including receiving any recommended Boosters as soon as Booster-Eligible.

If a person covered by the requirements of this Section 6 to have received their first Booster recently had COVID-19 when that person would otherwise have been Booster-Eligible based on the period since becoming Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series, then that person should try to obtain the Booster as soon as possible at least 10 days after recovering and ending isolation. But to continue working in the High-Risk Setting that person does not need to receive the Booster until 30 days after recovering from infection and discontinuing isolation, unless a healthcare provider recommends in a note that the Booster be delayed for a longer specified period.

- b. CDPH Requirements For Adult Care Facilities, Direct Care Workers, Other Health Care Workers, and Pharmacists. Businesses and governmental entities with Personnel in certain types of facilities and contexts, including those that provide health care, certain other care services, services in congregate settings, and the Personnel who work in those settings must comply with the following CDPH Orders and All Facilities Letters, including as they are updated in the future, which require Personnel of such Businesses and governmental entities to be Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series and receive a Booster when Booster-Eligible, unless exempt under those Orders and All Facilities Letters by the deadlines listed in each order or letter:



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

“Adult Care Facilities and Direct Care Worker Vaccine Requirement”, updated September 13, 2022, available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Adult-Care-Facilities-and-Direct-Care-Worker-Vaccine-Requirement.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Adult-Care-Facilities-and-Direct-Care-Worker-Vaccine-Requirement.aspx)

“Health Care Worker Vaccine Requirement”, updated September 13, 2022, available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Health-Care-Worker-Vaccine-Requirement.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Health-Care-Worker-Vaccine-Requirement.aspx)

“Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Testing, Vaccination Verification and Personal Protective Equipment for Health Care Personnel (HCP) at Health Care Facilities” (AFL 21-29.3), updated February 22, 2022, available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CHCQ/LCP/Pages/AFL-21-29.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CHCQ/LCP/Pages/AFL-21-29.aspx)

“Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Testing, Vaccination Verification and Personal Protective Equipment for Health Care Personnel (HCP) at the Various Types of Intermediate Care Facilities” (AFL 21-30.3), updated February 22, 2022, available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CHCQ/LCP/Pages/AFL-21-30.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CHCQ/LCP/Pages/AFL-21-30.aspx)

“Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Vaccine Requirement for Healthcare Personnel (HCP)” (AFL 21-34.3), updated February 22, 2022, available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CHCQ/LCP/Pages/AFL-21-34.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CHCQ/LCP/Pages/AFL-21-34.aspx).

- c. Dental Offices. Personnel who provide healthcare in dental offices are considered to provide care in “Clinics & Doctor Offices (including behavioral health, surgical)” under the following CDPH order and must comply with the requirements in that order: “Health Care Worker Vaccine Requirement”, updated September 13, 2022, available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Health-Care-Worker-Vaccine-Requirement.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Health-Care-Worker-Vaccine-Requirement.aspx).
- d. Limited Exemptions. Personnel covered by this Section 6 may be exempt from the vaccination requirements under this section only upon providing the requesting Business or governmental entity a declination form stating either of the following: (1) the individual is declining vaccination based on Religious Beliefs or (2) the individual is excused from receiving any COVID-19 vaccine due to Qualifying Medical Reasons. A sample ascertainment and declination form is available online at <https://sf.gov/healthrules>. As to declinations for Qualifying Medical Reasons, to be eligible for this exemption Personnel must also provide to their employer or the Business a written statement signed by a physician, nurse practitioner, or other licensed medical professional practicing under the license of a physician stating that the individual qualifies for the exemption (but the statement should not describe the underlying medical condition or disability) and indicating the probable duration of the individual’s inability to receive the vaccine (or if the duration is unknown or permanent, so indicate). As to declinations based on Religious Beliefs, a Business or governmental entity may seek additional information as allowed or required by



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

applicable law to determine whether Personnel have a qualifying Religious Belief. Personnel who qualify for and are granted by the employing Business or governmental entity an exemption due to Religious Beliefs or Qualifying Medical Reasons, as provided above, must still follow at least the minimum health and safety requirements in subsection (a)(iv), above. Nothing in this Order is intended to limit any Business's or governmental entity's ability under applicable law to determine whether they are able to offer a reasonable accommodation to Personnel with an approved exemption. Because testing and masking is not as effective as being Up-to-Date on Vaccination at preventing the spread of COVID-19, a Business may determine that the minimum requirements in subsection (a)(iv) above are not sufficient to protect the health and safety of people in High-Risk Settings.

- e. Record Keeping Requirements. Businesses or governmental entities subject to this Section 6 must maintain records with following information:
  - i. For Personnel who are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series, and also for Personnel where having received their first Booster is required by this Order: (1) full name and date of birth; (2) vaccine manufacturer; and (3) date of vaccine administration (for first dose and, if applicable, all subsequent doses required by this Order). Nothing in this subsection is intended to prevent an employer from requesting additional information or documentation to verify vaccination status, to the extent permissible under the law.
  - ii. For unvaccinated Personnel: signed declination forms with written health care provider's statement where applicable, as described in subsection (d) above.
- f. Compliance with CDPH Orders. In addition to the requirements set forth above:
  - i. Until any more health protective requirements in this section take effect, Businesses and governmental entities with Personnel in High-Risk Settings must comply with the requirements of the CDPH "Guidance for the Use of Face Masks" dated April 20, 2022, available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Guidance-for-Face-Coverings.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Guidance-for-Face-Coverings.aspx); and
  - ii. Businesses and governmental entities with Personnel in adult care facilities and Other Health Care Settings—as that term is defined in the CDPH Vaccination Status Order—must be in full compliance with the requirements of the CDPH Vaccination Status Order.
  - iii. Businesses and governmental entities with Personnel who provide services or work in facilities covered by the State Public Health Officer Order of August 5, 2021, updated most recently on September 13, 2022 (titled "Health Care Worker Vaccine Requirement"), must comply with the requirements of that order, including as that order may be amended in the future. See [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-)



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

[State-Public-Health-Officer-Health-Care-Worker-Vaccine-Requirement.aspx](#).

- g. Cooperation with Public Health Authorities. Businesses or governmental entities with Personnel subject to this Section 6 must cooperate with Health Officer or DPH requests for records, documents, or other information regarding the Business or governmental entity's implementation of these vaccination requirements. This cooperation includes, but is not limited to, identifying all jobs or positions within the organization and describing: (1) whether a given job or position is subject to the vaccination requirements of this Section 6, (2) how the Business or governmental entity determined a job or position is subject to vaccination requirements of this Section 6, and (3) how the Business or governmental entity is ensuring full compliance with the vaccination requirements set forth in this Section 6. Complete responses to these requests must be provided to the Health Officer or DPH promptly upon request, and in any event within three business days after receiving the request.
7. Mega-Events. All Businesses, governmental entities, and other organizations hosting Mega-Events are strongly urged (but not required) to continue to follow the recommendations in the State's Post-Blueprint Guidance for Mega-Events, available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Beyond-Blueprint-Framework.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Beyond-Blueprint-Framework.aspx), including requiring patrons and staff to either show proof of being Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or having received a negative COVID-19 Test as a condition to entry for indoor Mega-Events.
8. COVID-19 Health Indicators. The County will, for the time being, continue to make publicly available on its website updated data on COVID-19 case rates, hospitalizations and vaccination rates. That information can be found online at <https://sf.gov/resource/2021/covid-19-data-and-reports>. The Health Officer will monitor this data, along with other data and scientific evidence, in determining whether to modify or rescind this Order, as further described in Section 2(a) above.
9. Incorporation of State and Local Emergency Proclamations and Federal and State Health Orders. The Health Officer is issuing this Order in accordance with, and incorporates by reference, the emergency proclamations and other federal, state, and local orders and other pandemic-related orders described below in this Section. But this Order also functions independent of those emergency proclamations and other actions, and if any State, federal, or local emergency declaration, or any State or federal order or other guidance, is repealed, this Order remains in full effect in accordance with its terms (subject to Section 13 below).
  - a. State and Local Emergency Proclamations. This Order is issued in accordance with, and incorporates by reference, the March 4, 2020 Proclamation of a State of Emergency issued by the Governor, the February 25, 2020 Proclamation by the Mayor Declaring the Existence of a Local Emergency, and the March 6, 2020 Declaration of Local Health Emergency Regarding Novel Coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) issued by the Health Officer, as each of them have been and may be modified, extended, or supplemented.



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

- b. State Health Orders. This Order is also issued in light of the various orders, directives, rules, and regulations of the State, including, but not limited to, those of the State's Public Health Officer and Cal/OSHA. The State has expressly acknowledged that local health officers have authority to establish and implement public health measures within their respective jurisdictions that are more restrictive than those implemented by the State Public Health Officer.
- c. Federal Orders. This Order is further issued in light of federal emergency declarations and orders.

10. Obligation to Follow Stricter Requirements of Orders.

Based on local health conditions, this Order includes a limited number of health and safety restrictions that are more stringent or more detailed than those contained under State orders. Where a conflict exists between this Order and any state or federal public health order related to the COVID-19 pandemic, the most restrictive provision (*i.e.*, the more protective of public health) controls. Consistent with California Health and Safety Code section 131080 and the Health Officer Practice Guide for Communicable Disease Control in California, except where the State Health Officer may issue an order expressly directed at this Order and based on a finding that a provision of this Order constitutes a menace to public health, any more restrictive measures in this Order continue to apply and control in this County.

11. Obligation to Follow Health Officer Orders and Directives and Mandatory State Guidance.

In addition to complying with all provisions of this Order, all individuals and entities, including all Businesses and governmental entities, must also follow any applicable orders and directives issued by the Health Officer (available online at <https://sf.gov/healthrules>) and any applicable mandatory guidance issued by the State Health Officer or California Department of Public Health. To the extent that provisions in the orders or directives of the Health Officer and the mandatory guidance of the State conflict, the more restrictive provisions (*i.e.*, the more protective of public health) apply. In the event of a conflict between provisions of any previously-issued Health Officer order or directive and this Order, this Order controls over the conflicting provisions of the other Health Officer order or directive.

12. Enforcement.

Under Government Code sections 26602 and 41601 and Health and Safety Code section 101029, the Health Officer requests that the Sheriff and the Chief of Police in the County ensure compliance with and enforce this Order. The violation of any provision of this Order (including, without limitation, any health directives) constitutes an imminent threat and immediate menace to public health, constitutes a public nuisance, and is punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both. DPH is authorized to respond to such public nuisances by issuing Notice(s) of Violation and ordering premises vacated and closed



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

until the owner, tenant, or manager submits a written plan to eliminate all violations and DPH finds that plan satisfactory. Such Notice(s) of Violation and orders to vacate and close may be issued based on a written report made by any County employees writing the report within the scope of their duty. DPH must give notice of such orders to vacate and close to the Chief of Police or the Chief's designee to be executed and enforced by officers in the same manner as provided by San Francisco Health Code section 597. As a condition of allowing a Business to reopen, DPH may impose additional restrictions and requirements on the Business as DPH deems appropriate to reduce transmission risks, beyond those required by this Order and other applicable health orders and directives.

**13. Effective Date.**

This Order is effective at 12:01 a.m. on June 15, 2021 and will continue, as updated, to be in effect until the Health Officer rescinds, supersedes, or amends it in writing. The changes made in the September 15, 2022 update are effective immediately on issuance.

**14. Relation to Other Orders of the San Francisco Health Officer.**

Immediately on issuance, this Order revises and entirely replaces the prior update to Health Officer Order No. C19-07y (issued June 16, 2022). Leading up to and in connection with the effective date of this Order, the Health Officer has rescinded a number of other orders and directives relating to COVID-19, including those listed in the Health Officer's Omnibus Rescission of Health Officer Orders and Directives, dated June 11, 2021. On and after the effective date of this Order, the following orders and directives of the Health Officer shall continue in full force and effect: Order Nos. C19-16 (hospital patient data sharing), C19-18 (vaccine data reporting), C19-19 (minor consent to vaccination), and C19-20 (test collection sites); and the directives that this Order references in Sections 3 and 4, as the Health Officer may separately amend or later terminate any of them. Health Officer Order No. C19-15 was also reinstated on August 19, 2021, and remains in effect as outlined in that order (including as it is amended in the future). Also, this Order also does not alter the end date of any other Health Officer order or directive having its own end date or that continues indefinitely.

**15. Copies.**

The County must promptly provide copies of this Order as follows: (1) by posting on the County's website (<https://sf.gov/healthrules>); (2) by posting at City Hall, located at 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102; and (3) by providing to any member of the public requesting a copy.

**16. Severability.**

If a court holds any provision of this Order or its application to any person or circumstance to be invalid, then the remainder of the Order, including the application of such part or provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected and shall



**City and County of  
San Francisco**

**Department of Public Health  
Order of the Health Officer**

**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

continue in full force and effect. To this end, the provisions of this Order are severable.

**IT IS SO ORDERED:**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Susan Philip", written over a horizontal line.

Susan Philip, MD, MPH,  
Health Officer of the  
City and County of San Francisco

Dated: September 15, 2022

Attachment:

- Appendix A – Face Covering Requirements (last updated September 15, 2022)



## **Order No. C19-07y – Appendix A: Face Covering Requirements**

**[September 15, 2022]**

1. **General Recommendation to Wear a Well-Fitted Mask; Requirement in Limited Indoor Settings.**

The intent of this Order and the masking rules in this Appendix is to align with the masking rules and recommendations issued by the State of California and the federal government, with this Appendix providing additional information for specific situations to help Businesses, governmental entities, and individuals comply with those rules and recommendations and make informed choices to improve safety during the pandemic.

Everyone, including even people who are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or are Up-to-Date on Vaccination (meaning they have completed their initial course of vaccination and have received a Booster once eligible for a Booster, as further defined in Section 1 of the body of the Order), is recommended to wear a Well-Fitted Mask in indoor public settings in the following situations:

- When an individual wants added protection based on individual risk tolerance, for example, when indoors with people whose vaccination status is unknown. People should respect an individual's decision to wear face coverings even in settings where they are not required, and no Business or other person should take an adverse action against individuals who chose to wear a face covering to protect their health.
- When there is a higher risk of community spread and infection, such as when COVID-19 case numbers increase, and case numbers in San Francisco can be found online at <https://sf.gov/data/covid-19-cases-and-deaths>.
- When an individual, or someone with whom an individual lives or works, is at a higher risk of a negative health outcome, such as older and immuno-compromised individuals.

Additional Face Covering Requirements may be imposed elsewhere in this Order or by state or federal rules or regulations.

Also, everyone is required to wear a Well-Fitted Mask, regardless of vaccination status, in the following indoor settings: emergency shelters and cooling and heating centers; High-Risk Settings (as defined in Section 1 of the Order); health care settings as required by CDPH and by this Order; other workplaces or settings where masking is required by the Business or setting or by regulatory orders and rules; and anywhere else that federal or state health orders or regulatory rules (including, but not limited to, Cal/OSHA and federal requirements) require doing so, as described in Section 3(b)(i) of the Order and this Appendix. For public transportation and public transportation facilities, subject to any future state or federal masking mandates, masks are strongly recommended for all



## **Order No. C19-07y – Appendix A: Face Covering Requirements**

**[September 15, 2022]**

people indoors, regardless of vaccination status, consistent with the CDPH Guidance for the Use of Face Masks.

Employees may be subject to additional restrictions or be required to provide additional documentation under state or federal laws and regulations, including Cal/OSHA's regulations. Businesses and other entities must adhere to applicable Cal/OSHA regulations relating to COVID-19 health and safety measures in the workplace and should frequently check for updates to those regulations such as by checking online at [www.dir.ca.gov/dosh/coronavirus/covid19faqs.html](http://www.dir.ca.gov/dosh/coronavirus/covid19faqs.html).

And as provided in Section 6 below, individual Businesses, governmental entities, or venue operators or hosts may impose requirements regarding masking, in addition to those in this Order, that are more protective of public health.

### **2. Ventilation.**

Businesses and operators of other public and private facilities where people may remove their Well-Fitted Masks indoors are encouraged to use at least one of the following ventilation strategies: (1) all available windows and doors accessible to fresh outdoor air are kept open as long as air quality and weather conditions permit; (2) fully operational HVAC system; or (3) appropriately sized portable air cleaners in each room. For clarity, if windows and doors are closed due to air quality or weather conditions, then a Business or operator of a public or private facility should whenever feasible follow at least one of remaining ventilation strategies before allowing people to remove their Well-Fitted Masks under this Order.

### **3. Proof of Vaccination.**

Businesses, governmental entities, and other venue operators or hosts are encouraged to consider whether to require people to provide proof that they are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or are Up-to-Date on Vaccination (including receipt of a Booster once Booster-Eligible) before allowing people to remove their Well-Fitted Mask indoors. And as provided in the Order, each Business, governmental entity, and other entity that is required to confirm proof of being Vaccinated with the Complete Initial Series is strongly urged to implement measures as soon as possible to require its patrons and staff (as distinct from Personnel) to be Up-to-Date on Vaccination, including requiring them to show proof of receipt of a Booster once they are eligible.

Despite the easing of masking requirements under this update to the Order, Businesses, governmental entities, and other venue operators or hosts may still require all patrons to wear a Well-Fitted Mask in their facilities. And no person can be prevented from wearing a Well-Fitted Mask as a condition of participation in an activity or entry into a Business.

## **Order No. C19-07y – Appendix A: Face Covering Requirements**

**[September 15, 2022]**

4. Status-Based Exemptions. The following exemptions apply in the limited situations where Well-Fitted Masks are still required under this Order.
- a. Medical or Safety Exemption. A person does not need to wear a Well-Fitted Mask when they can show: (1) a medical professional has provided a written exemption to the Face Covering Requirement, based on the person's medical condition, other health concern, or disability; or (2) that they are hearing impaired, or communicating with a person who is hearing impaired, where the ability to see the mouth is essential for communication; or (3) wearing a Well-Fitted Mask while working would create a risk to the person related to their work as determined by local, state, or federal regulators or workplace safety guidelines. In accordance with CDPH and CDC guidelines, if a person is required by this Order to wear a Well-Fitted Mask but is exempt from wearing one under this paragraph, they still must wear an alternative face covering, such as a face shield with a drape on the bottom edge, unless they can show either: (1) a medical professional has provided a written exemption to this alternative face covering requirement, based on the person's medical condition, other health concern, or disability; or (2) wearing an alternative face covering while working would create a risk to the person related to their work as determined by local, state, or federal regulators or workplace safety guidelines.

A Well-Fitted Mask should also not be used by anyone who has trouble breathing or is unconscious, incapacitated, or otherwise unable to remove the Well-Fitted Mask without assistance.

- b. Children. In accordance with CDPH and CDC guidelines, any child younger than two years old must not wear a Well-Fitted Mask because of the risk of suffocation. When required to do so by this Order, Children age two to nine years must wear Well-Fitted Masks to the greatest extent feasible. Children age two to nine years may wear an alternative face covering (as that term is described in Section 4(a), above) if their parent or caregiver determines it will improve the child's ability to comply with this Order. Children age two to nine and their accompanying parents or caregivers should not be refused any essential service based on a child's inability to wear a Well-Fitted Mask (for example, if a four-year old child refuses to keep a Well-Fitted Mask on in a grocery store), but the parent or caregiver should when possible take reasonable steps to have the child, when required to do so by this Order, wear a Well-Fitted Mask to protect others and minimize instances when children without Well-Fitted Masks are brought into settings with other people. Parents and caregivers of children age two to nine years must supervise the use of Well-Fitted Masks to ensure safety and avoid misuse. Children must wear face coverings in schools as required under State health rules.
- c. Personal Protective Equipment. A person required by this Order to wear a Well-Fitted Mask does not need to do so when wearing personal protective equipment ("PPE") that is more protective than a Well-Fitted Mask, including when required by (i) any workplace policy or (ii) any local, state, or federal law, regulation, or other mandatory guidance. When a person is not required to wear such PPE and in an indoor public setting, they

## **Order No. C19-07y – Appendix A: Face Covering Requirements**

**[September 15, 2022]**

must wear a Well-Fitted Mask or PPE that is more protective unless otherwise exempted under this Order.

### **5. Activity- and Location-Based Exemptions.**

The activity- and location-based exemptions in this Section apply to everyone in the designated settings where this Order requires everyone, regardless of vaccination status, to wear a Well-Fitted Mask. To the extent allowed under Face Covering Requirements and subject to any additional health restrictions a particular Business, governmental entity, or other venue operator or host may impose for a facility or other setting it owns, operates, or controls, people in settings where this Order requires wearing a Well-Fitted Mask are not required do so in any of the following situations:

- a. Indoor Public Setting While Alone or With a Member of Household. A person does not need to wear a Well-Fitted Mask when they are alone or with a member of their Household in a public building or completely enclosed space such as an office, and people who are not part of their Household are not likely to be in the same space. If someone who is not part of a person's Household enters the enclosed space, both people must wear a Well-Fitted Mask for the duration of the interaction unless otherwise exempt under Sections 4 and 5 of this Appendix.
- b. Active Eating and Drinking. People may remove their Well-Fitted Mask while actively eating or drinking.
- c. Showering, Personal Hygiene, or Sleeping. People may remove their Well-Fitted Mask only while showering or actively engaging in personal hygiene that requires removal of the Well-Fitted Mask. People may remove their Well-Fitted Mask while sleeping in indoor public settings.

### **6. Minimum Requirements; Ability to Adopt More-Restrictive Measures.**

This Order establishes the minimum requirements related to indoor masking. Nothing in this Order, including this Appendix A, is intended to reduce any other federal, state, or local legal requirements or otherwise modify them in a way that is less protective of public health, or to limit an individual Business' or governmental entity's choices to take more health protective measures. Businesses or governmental entities may impose further restrictions that are more protective of public health than the minimum requirements under this Order, including, without limitation, requiring patrons or Personnel to be Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or Up-to-Date on Vaccination, requiring them to wear a Well-Fitted Mask, or taking other measures that meet their operational needs (such as, by way of example only, mandating that people be Up-to-Date on Vaccination and only allowing a testing alternative if someone has an exemption to vaccination based on Religious Beliefs or a Qualifying Medical Reason.)



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER  
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
ENCOURAGING COVID-19 VACCINE COVERAGE  
AND REDUCING DISEASE RISKS  
(Safer Return Together)**

DATE OF ORDER: June 11, 2021, updated multiple times, most recently on ~~June 16~~  
September 15, 2022

**Please read this Order carefully. Violation of or failure to comply with this Order is a misdemeanor punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both. (California Health and Safety Code § 120295, *et seq.*; California Penal Code §§ 69, 148(a)(1); and San Francisco Administrative Code § 7.17(b).)**

Summary: As of ~~June 16~~September 15, 2022, this Order replaces the prior update of this health order, Health Officer Order No. C19-07y (issued ~~April 24~~June 16, 2022), in its entirety. This Order largely aligns with the COVID-19 orders of the State. The main changes made by the ~~June 16~~September 15, 2022 update are to (1) ~~extend~~remove the ~~deadline requirement~~ for firefighters, paramedics, and EMTs who routinely work in High-Risk Settings to ~~have received~~receive their first Booster; ~~(2) align the definition of “Up-to-Date on Vaccination” with the CDC’s definition for purposes and require them, regardless of the recommendation that everyone be vaccinated but not for the purposes of the Booster requirements for certain Personnel in vaccination status, to wear a Well-Fitting Mask or other, more protective respirator when inside such High-Risk Settings under this Order, and (3), (2) update the definition of “Close Contact”~~masking, vaccination, and testing requirements and recommendations consistent with recent changes to both Health Officer Directive No. 2020-02 as well as the recently updated isolation and quarantine guidance from the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and California Department of Public Health- guidelines and orders, making clear that masks are still required in healthcare settings in San Francisco and removing the requirement for people claiming an exemption from receipt of a Booster to test regularly, and (3) making other updates based on the current status of the pandemic.

The Health Officer is updating the Order in light of State guidelines and the relatively low ~~and stable~~ number of hospitalizations in the community associated with the spread in San Francisco and the Bay Area region of SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19. There remains the ongoing threat that the virus, including other future variants or subvariants, pose particularly to the health of medically vulnerable residents. But, based on current scientific knowledge, San Francisco is well positioned to address the current level of the virus and future increases in cases due in large part to the high rate of vaccination in the community, greater availability of effective treatments for those who are vulnerable to severe disease, and effective use of mitigation strategies, such as



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

masking in indoor public settings when there are high levels of community transmission. The best pathway for San Francisco to continue to move forward in the face of the virus is for as many people as possible to complete their initial series of vaccination and receive their boosters when eligible. ~~Medical data to date show that individuals who have received a booster shot increase their immunity to a level that confers significantly more protection from all circulating SARS-CoV-2 variants, including the Omicron variant and BA.2 subvariant, compared to completing just the initial vaccine series, and generally prevents severe disease. Vaccines and Boosters that target SARS-CoV-2 continue to protect against severe disease.~~ The United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the California Department of Public Health recommend that everyone who has been vaccinated receive a booster shot as soon as they are eligible because immunity wanes several months after completion of the initial vaccine series. In the future, the Health Officer may need to adjust health precautions depending on the specific characteristics of future variants, and if so, the Health Officer will continue to use the least restrictive health measures to prevent severe disease on a population level basis in the community.

Even though a high percentage of people are vaccinated in San Francisco and the Bay Area region and a significant percentage are boosted against the virus that causes COVID-19, there remains a risk that people may come into contact with others who have COVID-19 when outside their residence, particularly during periods of moderate or high community transmission. Many COVID-19 infections are caused by people who have no symptoms of illness. Also, there are people in San Francisco who have not completed their initial vaccine series or who are not yet bBboosted or eligible to receive a Booster, including some young children ~~under five years old~~, and people who are immuno-compromised and may be particularly vulnerable to infection and disease.

Based on current health conditions and balancing those considerations with acknowledgement that there remains ongoing risk to vulnerable populations and the potential for future surges, this Order maintains face covering guidelines based on an individual risk-focused approach. In this Order the Health Officer recommends that individuals wear a Well-Fitted Mask in indoor public settings based on three factors. First, you should consider your own risk tolerance. Second, you should consider the overall level of community transmission, such as when future variants occur (*e.g.*, the higher the rate of community transmission, the more seriously you should consider wearing a mask in indoor public settings). Third, you should consider whether you or someone with whom you work or live is at risk of severe disease.

At the same time, wearing a Well-Fitted Mask is still required under federal and state health rules in certain settings, including: in emergency shelters and cooling centers; in healthcare settings; in state and local correctional facilities and detention centers; in homeless shelters; and in long term care settings and adult and senior care facilities. A copy of the current CDPH masking order is available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/guidance-for-face-coverings.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/guidance-for-face-coverings.aspx). Consistent with changes by the State of California on April 20, 2022, (and subject to any future state or federal masking mandates), the Health Officer



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

~~now~~continues to strongly recommends, but does not require, that all people, regardless of vaccination status, wear a Well-Fitted Mask on public transportation and in indoor public transportation facilities.

This Order maintains the requirement, layered on top of the recently revised CDPH health orders, for (1) Personnel working in designated High-Risk Settings—meaning general acute care hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, intermediate care facilities, residential care facilities for the elderly, homeless shelters, and jails, all as further defined below—as well as (2) Personnel working in other higher-risk settings—including adult care facilities, adult day programs, dental offices, home health care workers, and pharmacists,~~and (3) Personnel who routinely visit hospitals as part of their work and are part of the County's first responder medical care system, such as firefighters, paramedics and emergency medical technicians~~—to both receive the full initial course of vaccination and, once they are eligible, to receive a Booster. But, based on changed health conditions, the ~~lower~~moderate to low number of cases and hospitalizations in the community, high levels of vaccination, availability of effective treatments, and reduced outbreak risk as determined by federal, state, and local public health officials, Personnel who are not permanently stationed or regularly assigned to High-Risk Settings but who in the course of their duties may enter or work in High-Risk Settings on an intermittent or occasional basis or for short periods of time (such as police and lawyers who visit people in the jails) are no longer required to receive a Booster, but are strongly encouraged to do so. ~~Because of critical staffing shortages and the previously described changed health conditions, firefighters, paramedics, and EMTs now have until September 30, 2022 under this Order to receive a Booster. And such people must wear a Well-Fitting Mask whenever they are onsite at a High-Risk Setting.~~ Additionally, Personnel at homeless shelters (other than congregate living health facilities) are ~~no longer~~not required to receive a Booster under this Order, but are strongly encouraged to do so.

California and San Francisco have been fully reopened since June 15, 2021. Consistent with State guidelines, this Order maintains other minimum COVID-19 safety requirements on businesses and governmental entities, such as a general requirement to report outbreaks in the workplace.

**UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE  
SECTIONS 101040, 101085, AND 120175, THE HEALTH OFFICER OF THE CITY AND  
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ORDERS:**

1. Definitions.

For purposes of this Order, the following initially capitalized terms have the meanings given below.





**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

- a. *Booster.* A “Booster” means an additional dose of a vaccine authorized to prevent COVID-19 by the FDA, including by way of an emergency use authorization, or by the World Health Organization (WHO), for which a person is Booster-Eligible. Consistent with CDC and CDPH guidance, either the Pfizer-BioNTech (Comirnaty) or Moderna (Spikevax) COVID-19 vaccine is preferred for the Booster. The term “Booster” includes any such additional dose authorized by the FDA, including formulations that are different than the original COVID-19 vaccines (such as bivalent boosters available starting September 2022 or other future formulations). For clarity, if this Order mandates a Booster dose, it does not require that the formulation be an updated formulation, but the Order strongly encourages everyone to follow CDC vaccine and booster recommendations, including recommendations for receipt of subsequent Booster doses when indicated.
- b. *Booster-Eligible.* A person is “Booster-Eligible” once they meet criteria to receive a Booster under CDC guidance. ~~For example, as of the date of issuance of this update to the Order, individuals who are 18 or older may receive a booster of the Pfizer-BioNTech (Comirnaty), Moderna (Spikevax), or Johnson & Johnson’s Janssen COVID-19 vaccine at least five months after receiving a second dose of the Pfizer-BioNTech (Comirnaty) or Moderna (Spikevax) COVID-19 vaccine or two months after receiving the single dose Johnson & Johnson’s Janssen COVID-19 vaccine, and adolescents who are 5 to 17 years old may receive a booster of the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine at least five months after their second dose of that vaccine.~~ Consistent with CDC guidance (available online at [www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/booster-shot.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/booster-shot.html)), anyone who received a WHO-authorized vaccine or a combination of vaccines should receive the Pfizer-BioNTech (Comirnaty) vaccine as their booster pursuant to the timing listing in that guidance. Those preferences apply to all initial vaccination series, regardless of which vaccine an individual received. The CDC has been frequently updating booster eligibility. More up-to-date information on booster eligibility may be found online at <https://sf.gov/get-your-covid-19-booster>, and individuals, Businesses, and governmental entities are urged to stay informed about changes.
- c. *Business.* A “Business” includes any for-profit, non-profit, or educational entity, whether a corporate entity, organization, partnership or sole proprietorship, and regardless of the nature of the service, the function it performs, or its corporate or entity structure.
- d. *Cal/OSHA.* “Cal/OSHA” means the California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Occupational Safety and Health, better known as Cal/OSHA.
- e. *CDC.* “CDC” means the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- f. *CDPH.* “CDPH” means the California Department of Public Health.
- g. *Close Contact.* “Close Contact” means sharing the same indoor airspace with a Person With COVID-19 for a total of 15 minutes or more in a 24-hour period while



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

the person is in their Infectious Period. In turn, a “Person With COVID-19” means a person who tests positive for the virus that causes COVID-19 (SARS-CoV-2) or has been clinically diagnosed with COVID-19 by a healthcare provider. A Person with COVID-19 is in their Infectious Period as follows:

- i. For symptomatic infected people, starting ~~2~~two days before the infected person had any symptoms through when all three of the following criteria are met: the earlier of ~~D~~day 10 after symptoms first appeared or the day on which they test negative between ~~Days 5~~days five and 10; and 24 hours have passed with no fever without the use of fever-reducing medications; and symptoms have improved.
- ii. For asymptomatic infected people, starting ~~2~~two days before the positive specimen collection date through the earlier of ~~D~~day 10 after the positive specimen collection date or the day on which they test negative between ~~Days 5~~days five and 10 after the specimen collection date for their first positive COVID-19 test.

(Note that Cal/OSHA may have different rules regarding being a close contact in the workplace, and those rules apply in the workplace setting.)

- h. *County*. The “County” means the City and County of San Francisco.
- i. *COVID-19*. “COVID-19” means coronavirus disease 2019, the disease caused by the SARS-CoV-2 virus and that resulted in a global pandemic.
- j. *DPH*. “DPH” means the San Francisco Department of Public Health.
- k. *DPH Core Guidance*. “DPH Core Guidance” means the webpage and related materials that DPH regularly updates and includes health and safety recommendations for individuals and Businesses as well as web links to additional resources, available online at <https://sf.gov/covid19>.
- l. *Face Covering Requirements*. “Face Covering Requirements” means the limited requirements to wear a Well-Fitted Mask (i) under federal or state law including, but not limited to, California Department of Public Health guidance and Cal/OSHA’s regulations; (ii) in indoor common areas of homeless shelters, emergency shelters, and cooling centers, except while sleeping, showering, engaged in personal hygiene that requires removal of face coverings, or actively eating or drinking; (iii) in indoor common areas of jails except while sleeping, showering, engaged in personal hygiene that requires removal of face coverings, or actively eating or drinking; and (iv) under Section 3(b), below and Appendix A, attached to the Order. If a separate state, local, or federal order or directive imposes different face covering requirements, including requirements to wear respirators or surgical masks in certain settings, the more health protective requirement applies.
- m. *FDA*. “FDA” means the United States Food and Drug Administration.





**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

- n. *Fully Vaccinated*. “Fully Vaccinated” has the same meaning as the newer term “Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series,” defined below. Because other pre-existing Health Officer orders and directives and other DPH or County guidance materials may still use the term Fully Vaccinated that term continues to be defined in this Order.
- o. *Health Officer*. “Health Officer” means the Health Officer of the City and County of San Francisco.
- p. *High-Risk Settings*. “High-Risk Settings” means certain care or living settings involving many people, including many congregate settings, where vulnerable populations reside out of necessity and where the risk of COVID-19 transmission is high, consisting of general acute care hospitals, skilled nursing facilities (including subacute facilities), intermediate care facilities, residential care facilities for the elderly, homeless shelters, and jails (including, but not limited to, the Juvenile Justice Center Juvenile Hall).
- q. *Household*. “Household” means people living in a single Residence or shared living unit. Households do not refer to individuals who live together in an institutional group living situation such as in a dormitory, fraternity, sorority, monastery, convent, or residential care facility.
- r. *Mega-Event*. “Mega-Event” means an event with either more than 1,000 people attending indoors or more than 10,000 people attending outdoors. As provided in the State’s Post-Blueprint Guidance, a Mega-Event may have either assigned or unassigned seating, and may be either general admission or gated, ticketed and permitted events.
- s. *Personnel*. “Personnel” means the following people who provide goods or services associated with a Business in the County: employees; contractors and sub-contractors (such as those who sell goods or perform services onsite or who deliver goods for the Business); independent contractors; vendors who are permitted to sell goods onsite; volunteers; and other individuals who regularly provide services onsite at the request of the Business. “Personnel” includes “gig workers” who perform work via the Business’s app or other online interface, if any.
- t. *Qualifying Medical Reason*. “Qualifying Medical Reason” means a medical condition or disability recognized by the FDA or CDC as a contra-indication to COVID-19 vaccination.
- u. *Religious Beliefs*. “Religious Beliefs” means a sincerely held religious belief, practice, or observance protected by state or federal law.
- v. *Residence*. “Residence” means the location a person lives, even if temporarily, and includes single-family homes, apartment units, condominium units, hotels, motels, shared rental units, and similar facilities. Residences also include living structures



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

and outdoor spaces associated with those living structures, such as patios, porches, backyards, and front yards that are only accessible to a single family or Household.

- w. *Schools*. “Schools” mean public and private schools operating in the County, including independent, parochial, and charter schools.
- x. *State’s Post-Blueprint Guidance*. The “State’s Post-Blueprint Guidance” means the guidance entitled “Beyond the Blueprint for Industry and Business Sectors” that the California Department of Public Health issued on May 21, 2021 and updated as of May 2, 2022, including as the State may further extend, update or supplement that guidance in the future. (See [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Beyond-Blueprint-Framework.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Beyond-Blueprint-Framework.aspx).)
- y. *Test and Tested*. “Tested” means to have a negative test (a “Test”) for the virus that causes COVID-19 within the applicable timeframe as listed in this Order. Both nucleic acid (including polymerase chain reaction (PCR)) and antigen tests are acceptable. The following are acceptable as proof of a negative COVID-19 test result: a printed document (from the test provider or laboratory) or an email, text message, webpage, or application (app) screen displayed on a phone or mobile device from the test provider or laboratory. The information should include person’s name, type of test performed, negative test result, and date the test was administered. If any state or federal agency uses a more restrictive definition of what it means to be Tested for specified purposes (such as Cal/OSHA rules for employers in workplaces), then that more restrictive definition controls for those purposes. Some sections of this Order require antigen tests to be third-party verified (meaning administered or observed by the third-party) to meet requirements for showing proof of a negative Test.
- z. *Unvaccinated*. “Unvaccinated” refers to a person age two or older who is eligible for COVID-19 vaccination and who is either (i) not at least Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or (ii) in an indoor setting where this Order requires proof of being Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series as a condition of entry but has not provided such proof.
- aa. *Up-to-Date on Vaccination*. “Up-to-Date on Vaccination” means when a person both (i) is Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series and (ii) has received each Booster recommended by the CDC for that person once the person is Booster-Eligible. A person is Up-to-Date on Vaccination immediately on receipt of all recommended Boosters for which that person is then eligible. Until a person is Booster-Eligible, they are considered Up-to-Date on Vaccination two weeks after completing their full initial series of vaccination.
- bb. *Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series*. “Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series” means two weeks after completing the entire recommended initial series of vaccination (usually one or two doses) with a vaccine authorized to prevent COVID-19 by the FDA, including by way of an emergency use authorization, or by the World



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

Health Organization (WHO). For example, as of the date of issuance of this Order, an individual has completed an initial vaccination series at least two weeks after receiving a second dose of the Pfizer-BioNTech (Comirnaty) or Moderna (Spikevax) COVID-19 vaccine or two weeks after receiving the single dose Johnson & Johnson's Janssen COVID-19 vaccine. A list of FDA-authorized vaccines is available at [www.fda.gov/emergency-preparedness-and-response/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19/covid-19-vaccines](https://www.fda.gov/emergency-preparedness-and-response/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19/covid-19-vaccines). A list of WHO-authorized vaccines is available at <https://extranet.who.int/pqweb/vaccines/covid-19-vaccines>. On August 23, 2021, the FDA granted full approval for the Pfizer-BioNTech (Comirnaty) vaccine for people age 16 and older, and on January 31, 2022, the FDA granted full approval for the Moderna (Spikevax) vaccine for people age 18 and older. And, on October 29, 2021, the FDA granted emergency use authorization for the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine for children age five to 11. ~~The~~ On June 17, 2022, the FDA may soon grant ~~granted~~ emergency authorization for the Pfizer-BioNTech (Comirnaty) and Moderna (Spikevax) COVID-19 vaccines to include use in ~~children under age five to receive an initial vaccination series~~ who are at least six months old.

Unless otherwise specified, the following are acceptable as proof of being Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or Up-to-Date on Vaccination: (i) the CDC vaccination card, which includes name of person vaccinated, type of vaccine provided, and date last dose administered, or similar documentation issued by another foreign governmental jurisdiction, (ii) a photo of a vaccination card as a separate document, (iii) a photo of the a vaccination card stored on a phone or electronic device, (iv) documentation of vaccination from a healthcare provider, (v) unless prohibited elsewhere in this Order in a specific context, written self-attestation of vaccination signed (including an electronic signature) under penalty of perjury and containing the name of the person vaccinated, type of vaccine taken, and date of last dose administered, or (vi) a personal digital COVID-19 vaccine record issued by the State of California and available by going to <https://myvaccinerecord.cdph.ca.gov> or similar documentation issued by another State, local, or foreign governmental jurisdiction, or by an approved private company (a list of approved companies offering digital vaccine verification is available at <https://sf.gov/information/digital-vaccine-cards>). If any state or federal agency uses a more restrictive definition of what it means to be Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or to prove that status for specified purposes (such as Cal/OSHA rules for employers in workplaces), then that more restrictive definition controls for those purposes. Also, to the extent Cal/OSHA approves an alternate means of documenting whether an employee has completed the full initial series or is "fully vaccinated," even if less restrictive than the definition contained here, employers may use the Cal/OSHA standard to document their employees' vaccination status.

- cc. *Ventilation Guidelines*. "Ventilation Guidelines" means ventilation guidance from recognized authorities such as the CDC, the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers, or the State of California (available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Interim-](https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Interim-)



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

[Guidance-for-Ventilation-Filtration-and-Air-Quality-in-Indoor-Environments.aspx](#)), including Cal/OSHA.

- dd. *Well-Fitted Mask*. A “Well-Fitted Mask” means a face covering that is well-fitted to an individual and covers the nose and mouth especially while talking, consistent with the Face Covering Requirements. CDC guidance regarding Well-Fitted Masks may be found at [www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/your-health/effective-masks.html](http://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/your-health/effective-masks.html). A well-fitting non-vented N95, KN95, or KF94 respirator is strongly recommended as a Well-Fitted Mask, even if not fit-tested, to provide maximum protection. A well-fitting surgical/procedural mask with a cloth mask worn over it to increase fit is also recommended. Given higher transmissibility of the Omicron variant, cloth masks alone are no longer recommended. A Well-Fitted Mask does not include a scarf, ski mask, balaclava, bandana, turtleneck, collar, or single layer of fabric or any mask that has an unfiltered one-way exhaust valve.

2. Purpose and Intent.

- a. Purpose. The public health threat of serious illness or death from COVID-19 is much lower in the County and the Bay Area than many parts of the State and country due to the high rate of vaccination of the community. But COVID-19 continues to pose a risk especially to individuals who are not eligible to be vaccinated or are not yet Up-to-Date on Vaccination, and certain safety measures continue to be necessary or strongly recommended to protect against COVID-19 cases and deaths. Being Up-to-Date on Vaccination, including receiving all recommended Boosters as soon as Booster-Eligible, is the most effective method to prevent transmission and ultimately COVID-19 hospitalizations and deaths. It is important to ensure that as many eligible people as possible are vaccinated against COVID-19. Further, it is critical to ensure there is continued reporting of cases to protect individuals and the larger community. Accordingly, this Order allows Businesses, schools, and other activities to resume fully while at the same time ~~putting in place~~maintaining certain requirements or recommendations designed to (1) extend vaccine coverage to the greatest extent possible; (2) limit transmission risk of COVID-19; (3) contain any COVID-19 outbreaks; and (4) generally align with guidance issued by the CDC and the State relating to COVID-19 except in limited instances where local conditions require more restrictive measures. This Order is based on evidence of continued community transmission of SARS-CoV-2 within the County as well as scientific evidence and best practices to prevent transmission of COVID-19. The Health Officer will continue to monitor data regarding the evolving scientific understanding of the risks posed by COVID-19, including the impact of vaccination, and may amend or rescind this Order based on analysis of that data and knowledge. It is possible that the Health Officer will determine in the future that prior health precautions that have been relaxed or removed need to be imposed again, based on changes in local health conditions and the course of the pandemic.
- b. Intent. The primary intent of this Order is to continue to protect the community from COVID-19, including by providing health recommendations as requirements are



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

lifted, and to also increase vaccination rates to reduce transmission of COVID-19 long-term, so that the whole community is safer and the COVID-19 health emergency can come to an end.

- c. Interpretation. All provisions of this Order must be interpreted to effectuate the purposes and intent of this Order as described above. The note and summary at the beginning of this Order as well as the headings and subheadings of sections contained in this Order are for convenience only and may not be used to interpret this Order. In the event of any inconsistency between the summary, headings, or subheadings and the text of this Order, the text will control. Certain initially capitalized terms used in this Order have the meanings given them in Section 1 above. The interpretation of this Order in relation to the health orders or guidance of the State is described in Section 10 below.
  - d. Application. This Order applies to all individuals, Businesses, and other entities in the County. For clarity, the requirements of this Order apply to all individuals who do not currently reside in the County when they are in the County. Governmental entities must follow the requirements of this Order that apply to Businesses, unless otherwise specifically provided in this Order or directed by the Health Officer.
  - e. DPH Core Guidance. All individuals and Businesses are strongly urged to refer to, and where applicable follow, the DPH Core Guidance (available online at <https://sf.gov/topics/coronavirus-covid-19>) containing health and safety recommendations for COVID-19.
  - f. Effect of Failure to Comply. Failure to comply with any of the provisions of this Order constitutes an imminent threat and menace to public health, constitutes a public nuisance, and is punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both, as further provided in Section 12 below.
3. General Requirements for Individuals.
- a. Vaccination. Individuals are strongly urged to be Up-to-Date on Vaccination, meaning, as further provided in Section 1, that they are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series and, as soon as they are Booster-Eligible, receive their recommended Boosters. In particular, people at risk for severe illness with COVID-19—such as unvaccinated older adults and unvaccinated individuals with health risks—and members of their Household, are urged to be Up-to-Date on Vaccination, including receiving all recommended Boosters, as soon as they can. Information about who is at increased risk of severe illness and people who need to take extra precautions can be found at [www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/need-extra-precautions/people-with-medical-conditions.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/need-extra-precautions/people-with-medical-conditions.html). For those who are not yet Up-to-Date on Vaccination, making informed choices about the risk of different activities, wearing a Well-Fitted Mask indoors **when appropriate**, testing before **risky** gathering indoors, or choosing outdoor activities **as much as possible when appropriate** are also ways to prevent the risk of COVID-19 transmission. Individuals who are Up-to-Date on Vaccination



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

have the best protection against COVID-19.

- b. Face Coverings. Everyone, and especially those who remain Unvaccinated, is recommended to wear a Well-Fitted Mask in the following situations:
- When an individual wants added protection based on individual risk tolerance, for example, when indoors with people whose vaccination status is unknown. People should respect an individual's decision to wear face coverings even in settings where they are not required, and no Business or other person should take an adverse action against individuals who chose to wear a face covering to protect their health.
  - When there is a higher risk of community spread and infection, such as ~~during surges caused by future variants when~~ COVID-19 case numbers increase, and case numbers in San Francisco can be found online at <https://sf.gov/data/covid-19-cases-and-deaths>.
  - When an individual, or someone with whom an individual lives or works, is at a higher risk of a negative health outcome, such as older and immuno-compromised individuals.
- i. Masks Required or Strongly Recommended in Certain Settings. Everyone is required to wear a Well-Fitted Mask, regardless of vaccination status, in the following indoor settings: High-Risk Settings; health care settings as required by CDPH guidance and by this Order; other ~~long-term care facilities~~ workplaces or settings where masking is required by the Business or setting or by regulatory orders and rules; and anywhere else that federal or state health orders or regulatory rules (including, but not limited to, Cal/OSHA and federal requirements) require doing so. In addition, and subject to any future state or federal masking mandates, everyone, regardless of vaccination status, is strongly recommended to wear a Well-Fitted Mask when riding or waiting inside to ride on public transit, including everyone who is inside the vehicle or other mode of transportation or is indoors at a public transit stop or station. This strong recommendation extends to all modes of transportation other than private vehicles, such as airplanes, trains, subways, buses, taxis, ride-shares, maritime transportation, street cars, and cable cars.
- Appendix A lists exceptions and allowances in such settings when a Well-Fitted Mask is not required. ~~Face covering requirements in Schools and Programs for Children and Youth are covered in Health Officer Directive Nos. 2020-33 and 2020-14, respectively, including as those directives are further updated in the future, so long as those directives are still in place.~~ And, wearing a Well-Fitted Mask is strongly recommended for those in isolation or quarantine.





**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

- ii. Fit and Filtration Guidance. When wearing a mask, everyone should consistently wear the best mask they can obtain, considering fit and filtration (and without using a one-way exhalation valve that is not filtered). As provided in the definition of a Well-Fitted Mask, a well-fitting non-vented N95, KN95, or KF94 respirator is strongly recommended. A well-fitting surgical/procedural mask with a cloth mask worn over it to increase fit is also recommended. More information about fit and filtration and the best mask options is available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Get-the-Most-out-of-Masking.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Get-the-Most-out-of-Masking.aspx).
  - c. Monitor for Symptoms. Individuals should monitor themselves for symptoms of COVID-19. A list of COVID-19 symptoms is available online at [www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/symptoms-testing/symptoms.html](http://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/symptoms-testing/symptoms.html). Anyone with any symptom that is new or not explained by another condition must comply with subsections 3(d) and 3(e) below regarding isolation and quarantine.
  - d. Isolation. Anyone who has or likely has COVID-19, meaning that person (i) has a positive COVID-19 test result, (ii) is diagnosed with COVID-19, or (iii) has a COVID-19 symptom that is new or not explained by another condition, must refer to the latest COVID-19 isolation and quarantine health directive issued by the Health Officer (available online at <https://sf.gov/healthrules>) and follow the requirements detailed there. There are special requirements for healthcare workers and emergency medical services personnel in healthcare settings.
  - e. Quarantine. Anyone who had Close Contact must refer to the latest COVID-19 isolation and quarantine health directive issued by the Health Officer (available online at <https://sf.gov/healthrules>) and follow the requirements detailed there. There are special requirements for healthcare workers and emergency medical services personnel in healthcare settings. Additional quarantine requirements may exist for Businesses and governmental entities and their employees under applicable regulatory rules (including, but not limited to, Cal/OSHA and federal requirements).
  - f. Moving to, Traveling to, or Returning to the County. Everyone is strongly encouraged to comply with CDC travel guidelines (available online at [www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/travelers/travel-during-covid19.html](http://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/travelers/travel-during-covid19.html)).
  - g. Minimum Requirements. Based on their risk preferences, individuals may decide for themselves to take greater safety precautions than required or even recommended under this Order. Also, nothing in this section limits any requirements that apply under this Order to indoor public settings, indoor Mega-Events, or that Cal/OSHA or other State authority may impose on any indoor setting involving gatherings.
4. General Requirements for Businesses and Governmental Entities.
- a. Vaccination. Businesses and governmental entities are generally encouraged to consider whether to require Personnel and patrons to be Up-to-Date on Vaccination,



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

meaning they are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series and have received all recommended Boosters when they are Booster-Eligible.

- i. Vaccination or Testing Recommendation for Certain Indoor Businesses. The following Businesses are ~~strongly~~ encouraged ~~(though not mandated)~~ to consider whether to require patrons and staff to provide either proof of being Up-to-Date on Vaccination (including receipt of all recommended Boosters once Booster-Eligible) or proof of a negative Test before entry or service, especially during periods when COVID-19 infections are increasing in the County:

- Operators or hosts of establishments or events where food or drink is served indoors—including, but not limited to, dining establishments, bars, clubs, theaters, and entertainment venues.
- Gyms, recreation facilities, yoga studios, dance studios, and other fitness establishments, where any patrons engage in cardiovascular, aerobic, strength training, or other exercise involving elevated breathing.
- Operators and hosts of indoor and outdoor Mega-Events, as set forth in Section 7 below.

b. Masking.

- i. Mask Requirements and Allowances. Businesses and governmental entities designated by this Order must follow the requirements for masking listed in this Order and Appendix A to this Order, and other businesses and governmental entities may, but are not required by this Order, to, require masks be worn indoors.

- a. Healthcare Settings. Everyone is required to wear a Well-Fitted Mask, regardless of vaccination status, or more protective face covering (like a respirator) in all health care settings subject to the exceptions listed in Appendix A to this Order. For clarity, a Well-Fitted Mask or more protective face covering must be worn by everyone in healthcare settings, except that people who reside in facilities at which they receive care are also allowed to not wear a Well-Fitting Mask consistent with state and federal guidance and rules applicable to those facilities. This local requirement is consistent with but not dependent on the requirements listed in the CDPH “Guidance for the Use of Face Masks” dated April 20, 2022, available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Guidance-for-Face-Coverings.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Guidance-for-Face-Coverings.aspx).





**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

- ii. Providing a Well-Fitted Mask. Businesses and other entities subject to this Order are encouraged to provide a Well-Fitted Mask at no cost to people (patrons and Personnel) who do not have one upon entry inside the facility.
- iii. Cal/OSHA Requirements. Businesses and other entities should also follow any additional Cal/OSHA regulations relating to COVID-19 health and safety measures in the workplace, including regarding masking, and more information can be found online at [www.dir.ca.gov/dosh/coronavirus/covid19faqs.html](http://www.dir.ca.gov/dosh/coronavirus/covid19faqs.html). Nothing in this Order is intended to reduce any of those requirements or otherwise modify them in a way that is less protective of public health, or to limit an individual's own choices to take more health protective measures.
- c. Personnel Health Screening. Businesses and governmental entities ~~shouldare~~ encouraged to develop and implement a process for screening Personnel for COVID-19 symptoms, but this requirement does not mean they must perform on-site screening of Personnel. Businesses and governmental entities should ask Personnel to evaluate their own symptoms before reporting to work. If Personnel have symptoms consistent with COVID-19, they should follow subsections 3(d) and 3(e) above. Businesses and governmental entities may be required to conduct such screenings for Personnel under Cal/OSHA's regulations. ~~or other state or federal requirements~~. Businesses and other entities must adhere to applicable Cal/OSHA regulations relating to COVID-19 health and safety measures in the workplace and should frequently check for updates to those regulations such as by checking online at [www.dir.ca.gov/dosh/coronavirus/covid19faqs.html](http://www.dir.ca.gov/dosh/coronavirus/covid19faqs.html).
- ~~d. Businesses Must Allow Personnel to Stay Home When Sick. Businesses are required to follow Cal/OSHA regulations allowing Personnel to stay home where they have symptoms associated with COVID-19 that are new or not explained by another condition or if they have been diagnosed with COVID-19 (by a test or a clinician) even if they have no symptoms, and to not to have those Personnel return to work until they have satisfied certain conditions, all as further set forth in the Cal/OSHA rules. Also, Businesses must comply with California Senate Bill 114 (Labor Code, sections 248.6 and 248.7), which provides that employers with more than 25 employees must give every employee up to 80 hours of COVID-related sick leave retroactive to January 1, 2022 and through September 30, 2022 (pro-rated for less than full-time employees), including that employees may use this paid sick leave to get vaccinated or for post-vaccination illness. Each Business is prohibited from taking any adverse action against any Personnel for staying home in any of the circumstances described in this subsection.~~
- e.d. Signage. All Businesses and governmental entities are encouraged to conspicuously post signage reminding individuals of the following COVID-19 prevention best practices to reduce transmission:

Get vaccinated and boosted;



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

Stay home if sick;

Wear a mask indoors if you are unvaccinated; and

Clean your hands.

Businesses and governmental entities are also encouraged to include in signage any custom requirements the business or entity requires of its patrons or Personnel regarding testing, vaccination, and masking. Sample signage is available online at <https://sf.gov/outreach-toolkit-coronavirus-covid-19>.

f.e. **Ventilation Guidelines.** All Businesses and governmental entities with indoor operations are urged to review the Ventilation Guidelines and implement ventilation strategies for indoor operations as feasible. Nothing in this subsection limits any ventilation requirements that apply to particular settings under federal, state, or local law.

g.f. **Mandatory Reporting by Businesses and Governmental Entities.** Consistent with Cal/OSHA regulations, Businesses and governmental entities must require that all Personnel immediately alert the Business or governmental entity if they test positive for COVID-19 and were present in the workplace either (1) within 48 hours before onset of symptoms or within 10 days after onset of symptoms if they were symptomatic; or (2) within 48 hours before the date on which they were tested or within 10 days after the date on which they were tested if they were asymptomatic. If a Business or governmental entity is concerned about a workplace outbreak among Personnel, it may get additional information <https://sf.gov/step-by-step/what-do-if-someone-work-has-covid-19>. Businesses and governmental entities must also comply with all case investigation and contact tracing measures directed by DPH including providing any information requested within the timeframe provided by DPH, instructing Personnel to follow isolation and quarantine protocols specified by CDPH and Cal/OSHA and any additional protocols specified by DPH, and excluding positive cases and unvaccinated close contacts from the workplace during these isolation and quarantine periods.

~~Schools and Programs for Children and Youth are subject to separate reporting requirements set forth in Health Officer Directive Nos. 2020-33 and 2020-14, respectively, including as those directives are further updated in the future.~~

h.g. **Compliance with CDPH ~~Vaccination Status Order's Mask Requirements Guidance~~ for the Use of Face Masks.** Businesses and governmental entities with Personnel in ~~Acute Health Care Settings, Long-term homeless shelters, emergency shelters, cooling and heating centers, healthcare settings, state and local correctional facilities and detention centers, and Long Term Care Settings, High-Risk Congregate Settings, & Adult and Other Health Senior Care Settings Facilities~~—as those terms are ~~defined~~ used in the CDPH ~~Vaccination Status Order~~ “**Guidance for the Use of Face Masks**” dated April 20, 2022, available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Unvaccinated-Workers-In-High-Risk-](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Unvaccinated-Workers-In-High-Risk-)



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)

~~Settings.aspx~~[www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Guidance-for-Face-Coverings.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Guidance-for-Face-Coverings.aspx)—must ~~provide~~require a Well-Fitting Mask (or more protective face covering if appropriate ~~face coverings~~or mandated) in the listed settings so long as required by ~~that guidance, regardless of vaccination status, subject to the CDPH Vaccination Status Order~~exceptions listed in Appendix A to this Order and subject to any other exceptions listed in state or federal guidelines or rules.

~~i.h.~~ **Minimum Requirements; Ability to Adopt More-Restrictive Measures.** This Order establishes the minimum requirements related to COVID-19 protections. Nothing in this Order is intended to reduce any other federal, state, or local legal requirements or otherwise modify them in a way that is less protective of public health, or to limit an individual Business' or governmental entity's choices to take more health protective measures. Businesses or governmental entities may impose further restrictions that are more protective of public health than the minimum requirements or recommendations under this Order, including requiring patrons or Personnel to be Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or Up-to-Date on Vaccination, requiring them to wear a Well-Fitted Mask, requiring them to have a negative Test, or taking other more restrictive measures that are more protective of public health and meet their operational needs.

5. **Schools and Programs for Children and Youth.** ~~There are no longer special requirements under this Order for Schools or Programs for Children and Youth. Individual schools, the school district, and programs for children and youth can determine their own COVID-19 health requirements consistent with state rules.~~
  - ~~a. **Schools.** Largely because many children are not yet Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or eligible for a Booster, schools must follow the health and safety requirements set forth in Health Officer Directive No. 2020-33, including as it may be amended in the future, to ensure the safety of all students and Personnel at the school site. All children who are Booster-Eligible (including under an emergency use authorization) are strongly urged to receive all recommended Boosters as soon as possible. Also, adult Personnel in TK-12 schools, including educators, aides, administrators, and other staff, are strongly encouraged to be Up-to-Date on Vaccination.~~
  - ~~b. **Programs for Children and Youth.** Largely because some children are not eligible to be vaccinated against COVID-19 at this time and many children are not yet Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or eligible for a Booster, the following Programs for Children and Youth must operate in compliance with the health and safety requirements set forth in Health Officer Directive No. 2020-14, including as it may be amended in the future: (1) group care facilities for children who are not yet in elementary school—including, for example, licensed childcare centers, daycares, family daycares, and preschools (including cooperative preschools); and (2) with the exception of schools, which are addressed in subsection (a) above, educational or recreational institutions or programs that provide care or supervision for school-aged children and youth—including for example, learning hubs, other programs that~~



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

~~support and supplement distance learning in schools, school-aged childcare programs, youth sports programs, summer camps, and afterschool programs.~~

~~e. Mega Events. Operators or hosts of events held at schools or under Programs for Children and Youth that meet the definition of a Mega Event are strongly recommended to comply with the State's Post-Blueprint Guidance concerning Mega Events.~~

6. Vaccination Requirements for Personnel in High-Risk Settings and Other Health Care Personnel.

- a. High-Risk Settings. Except for some Personnel as provided in subsections (a)(iii), (b), and (c) below, and for Personnel exempt under subsection (d) below, all of the following requirements apply in High-Risk Settings:
  - i. Businesses and governmental entities with Personnel in High-Risk Settings must:
    1. As of September 30, 2021, ascertain vaccination status of all Personnel in High-Risk Settings who routinely work onsite;
    2. As of September 30, 2021, ensure that before entering or working in any High-Risk Setting, all Personnel who routinely work onsite have received their first dose of a one-dose COVID-19 vaccine regimen or their second dose of a two-dose COVID-19 vaccine regimen authorized to prevent COVID-19 by the FDA, including by way of an emergency use authorization, or by the World Health Organization. Until such Personnel are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series, they are subject to at least the minimum public health and safety requirements in subsection (a)(iv) below; and
    3. As of March 1, 2022, ensure that all such Personnel who routinely work onsite, within 15 days of being Booster-Eligible, receive their first Booster. And for the period between when such Personnel are Booster-Eligible but have not yet received one, the operator of the High-Risk Setting must ensure that each such person comply with the public health and safety requirements in subsection (a)(iv) below regarding testing even though they have already received their full initial course of vaccination. For clarity, those who are Booster-Eligible on or before February 14, 2022 must have received their first Booster by March 1, 2022, and those who are Booster-Eligible after February 14, 2022 must receive it within 15 days after they become eligible.

And consistent with updated CDPH "Health Care Worker Vaccine Requirement" guidance (linked below in Section 6(b)), such Personnel who provide proof of COVID-19 infection after being Vaccinated with a



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

Complete Initial Series (a “Recent Pre-Booster Infection”) may defer Booster administration under this subsection for up to 90 days from the date of their first positive COVID-19 test or clinical diagnosis, which in some situations may extend the deadline for receipt of a Booster beyond March 1, 2022. Such Personnel who are not eligible for a Booster by March 1, 2022 must be in compliance no later than 15 days after the timeframe specified in this paragraph for receiving the Booster. Personnel with a deferral due to a proven COVID-19 infection must be in compliance no later than 15 days after the expiration of their deferral.

- ii. As of September 30, 2021, Personnel who routinely work onsite in High-Risk Settings must have received their first dose of a one-dose COVID-19 vaccine regimen or their second dose of a two-dose COVID-19 vaccine regimen authorized to prevent COVID-19 by the FDA, including by way of an emergency use authorization, or by the World Health Organization. Until such Personnel are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series, they are subject to at least the minimum public health and safety requirements in subsection (a)(iv) below. As of March 1, 2022, Personnel who routinely work onsite in High-Risk Settings must, within 15 days of being Booster-Eligible, receive their first Booster. For clarity, those who are Booster-Eligible on or before February 14, 2022 must have received their first Booster by March 1, 2022, and those who are Booster-Eligible after February 14, 2022 must receive it within 15 days after they become eligible. Personnel who are required by this subsection 6(a)(ii) to receive a Booster may use the Recent Pre-Booster Infection deferral described above in subsection 6(a)(i)(3) and must be in compliance no later than 15 days after the expiration of the deferral described in that subsection. For clarity, Personnel who routinely work onsite in High-Risk Settings and subject to this subsection 6(a)(ii) includes ~~firefighters, paramedics, emergency medical technicians (EMTs), and~~ jail staff subject to CDPH’s State and Local Correctional Facilities and Detention Centers Health Care Worker Vaccination Requirement (available at: <https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Correctional-Facilities-and-Detention-Centers-Health-Care-Worker-Vaccination-Order.aspx>). Notwithstanding the foregoing, ~~firefighters, paramedics, and emergency medical technicians (EMTs), as well as~~ Personnel who routinely work onsite at homeless shelters (other than congregate living health facilities)), are strongly recommended (but not required) to be Up-to-Date on Vaccination when they are Booster-Eligible. In September 2022, based on changed health conditions the Health Officer changed the vaccination requirement for firefighters, paramedics, and EMTs to be consistent with State rules. That means they are no longer required to receive a Booster and rather are strongly recommended to receive one. If health conditions were to worsen in the future, the Health Officer may impose updated COVID-19 precautions as necessary to protect public health.





ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)

For purposes only of this subsection (ii) ~~and because of critical staffing shortages and changed health conditions, firefighters, paramedics, and EMTs, have until September 30, 2022 to receive their first Booster, or if they are not yet eligible before that date, then within 15 days of being Booster Eligible. Until), any~~ such firefighters, paramedics, and EMTs ~~receive a Booster, they—~~as well as all other Personnel—who work inside at any High-Risk Setting must ~~be Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series, free of any COVID-19 symptom, regardless of vaccination status,~~ wear a Well-Fitted Mask, ~~and have a negative Test in the manner required by subsection (a)(iv) below, to continue to work in a~~ at all times when they are working inside any High-Risk Setting.

- iii. Businesses and governmental entities with Personnel who are not permanently stationed or regularly assigned to a High-Risk Setting but who in the course of their duties may enter or work in High-Risk Settings on an intermittent or occasional basis or for short periods of time—including police, other law enforcement, and attorneys who enter jail settings or other High-Risk Settings as part of their work—are required to (1) ascertain vaccination status of all such Personnel and (2) ensure that before entering or working in any High-Risk Setting, all such Personnel are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series with any vaccine authorized to prevent COVID-19 by the FDA, including by way of an emergency use authorization, or by the World Health Organization, unless exempt under subsection (d) below. Additionally, as of September 29, 2021, all such Personnel must have received their first dose of a one-dose COVID-19 vaccine regimen or their second dose of a two-dose COVID-19 vaccine regimen authorized to prevent COVID-19 by the FDA, including by way of an emergency use authorization, or by the World Health Organization. Until such Personnel are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series, they are subject to at least the minimum public health and safety requirements in subsection (a)(iv) below. Personnel who are not permanently stationed or regularly assigned to a High-Risk Setting but who in the course of their duties may enter or work in High-Risk Settings even on an intermittent or occasional basis or for short periods of time are strongly recommended (but not required) to receive a Booster when they are Booster-Eligible. For clarity, Personnel subject to this subsection (a)(iii) who have not received their Booster but are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial series are not subject to the health and safety requirements in subsection (a)(iv) below, but must follow the Face Covering Requirements and any other applicable federal, state, or local requirements.
- iv. All Businesses and governmental entities subject to this Section 6 must require any Personnel who routinely work onsite at a High-Risk Setting and are exempt or who have otherwise not received their first Booster to comply with at least the following public health and safety measures:

~~1. get Tested for COVID-19 at least once a week—and at least twice a week~~



ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)

~~for Personnel who are in general acute care hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, intermediate care facilities, and jails—using either a nucleic acid (including polymerase chain reaction (PCR)) or antigen test; and~~

~~2.1.~~ at all times at the worksite in the High-Risk Setting wear a face covering in compliance with ~~the State Public Health Officer~~this Order ~~of July 26, 2021 (“~~, as well as the ~~CDPH Vaccination Status Order”); “Guidance for the Use of Face Masks” dated April 20, 2022, available online at~~ <https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Unvaccinated-Workers-In-High-Risk-Settings.aspx>~~www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Guidance-for-Face-Coverings.aspx.~~

Because of the COVID-19 risks to any exempt Personnel who have not received a Booster, the High-Risk Setting must provide such Personnel, on request, with a well-fitting non-vented N95 respirator and strongly encourage such Personnel to wear that respirator at all times when working with patients, residents, clients, or incarcerated people.

Regular ~~testing and~~ masking as required under this Section 6 ~~are~~is not as protective of public health as being Up-to-Date on Vaccination in helping prevent transmission of COVID-19; accordingly, those measures are a minimum safety requirement for exempt Personnel in High-Risk Settings. Businesses and governmental entities subject to this Section 6 may require additional safety measures for such Personnel. For example, factors a Business or governmental entity may consider in determining appropriate safety measures for exempt Personnel include, but are not limited to:

- a) Whether the Personnel will place other people at risk of transmission of COVID-19 because they are required to come into contact (including on an emergency basis) with other Personnel or with persons whose vaccination status is unknown, who are not yet eligible for the vaccine, or who are members of a vulnerable population (*e.g.*, the elderly, incarcerated people, and acute care patients);
- b) The type and frequency of testing available to the Personnel and whether the Business or governmental entity has the ability to provide testing to Personnel, without relying on public health resources, and track the requisite testing;
- c) Whether the Business or governmental entity can ensure compliance with the mask mandate whenever the Personnel are around other people in the workplace; and
- d) Whether the proposed accommodation imposes an undue burden because it is costly, infringes on other Personnel’s job rights or



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

benefits, compromises workplace safety, decreases workplace efficiency, or requires other Personnel to do more than their share of potentially hazardous or burdensome work.

Nothing under the Order limits the ability of a Business or governmental entity under applicable law to determine whether they are unable to offer a reasonable accommodation to unvaccinated Personnel with an approved exemption and to exclude such exempt Personnel from a High-Risk Setting.

- v. All Businesses and governmental entities subject to this Section 6 must, consistent with applicable privacy laws and regulations, maintain records of employee vaccination or exemption status.
- vi. All Businesses and governmental entities subject to this Section 6 must provide these records to the Health Officer or other public health authorities promptly upon request, and in any event no later than the next business day after receiving the request.
- vii. This mandated vaccination schedule allows Businesses, governmental entities, and affected Personnel adequate time to comply with this Order. In the interest of protecting residents of High-Risk Settings, Personnel, and their families, Businesses, governmental entities, and affected Personnel are strongly urged to meet these vaccination requirements as soon as possible.

For clarity, this requirement applies to Personnel in other buildings in a site containing a High-Risk Setting, such as a campus or other similar grouping of related buildings, where such Personnel do any of the following: (i) access the acute care or patient, resident, client, or incarcerated person areas of the High-Risk Setting; or (ii) work in-person with patients, residents, clients, or incarcerated people who visit those areas. All people in San Francisco who work in a clinical setting with a population that is more vulnerable to COVID-19 are strongly urged to be Up-to-Date on Vaccination, including receiving any recommended Boosters as soon as Booster-Eligible.

If a person covered by the requirements of this Section 6 to have received their first Booster recently had COVID-19 when that person would otherwise have been Booster-Eligible based on the period since becoming Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series, then that person should try to obtain the Booster as soon as possible at least 10 days after recovering and ending isolation. But to continue working in the High-Risk Setting that person does not need to receive the Booster until 30 days after recovering from infection and discontinuing isolation, unless a healthcare provider recommends in a note that the Booster be delayed for a longer specified period.

- b. CDPH Requirements For Adult Care Facilities, Direct Care Workers, Other Health Care Workers, and Pharmacists. Businesses and governmental entities with





**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

Personnel in certain types of facilities and contexts, including those that provide health care, certain other care services, services in congregate settings, and the Personnel who work in those settings must comply with the following CDPH Orders and All Facilities Letters, including as they are updated in the future, which require Personnel of such Businesses and governmental entities to be Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series and receive a Booster when Booster-Eligible, unless exempt under those Orders and All Facilities Letters by the deadlines listed in each order or letter:

“Adult Care Facilities and Direct Care Worker Vaccine Requirement”, updated ~~February 22~~September 13, 2022, available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Adult-Care-Facilities-and-Direct-Care-Worker-Vaccine-Requirement.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Adult-Care-Facilities-and-Direct-Care-Worker-Vaccine-Requirement.aspx)

“Health Care Worker Vaccine Requirement”, updated ~~February 22~~September 13, 2022, available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Health-Care-Worker-Vaccine-Requirement.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Health-Care-Worker-Vaccine-Requirement.aspx)

“Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Testing, Vaccination Verification and Personal Protective Equipment for Health Care Personnel (HCP) at Health Care Facilities” (AFL 21-29.3), updated February 22, 2022, available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CHCQ/LCP/Pages/AFL-21-29.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CHCQ/LCP/Pages/AFL-21-29.aspx)

“Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Testing, Vaccination Verification and Personal Protective Equipment for Health Care Personnel (HCP) at the Various Types of Intermediate Care Facilities” (AFL 21-30.3), updated February 22, 2022, available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CHCQ/LCP/Pages/AFL-21-30.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CHCQ/LCP/Pages/AFL-21-30.aspx)

“Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Vaccine Requirement for Healthcare Personnel (HCP)” (AFL 21-34.3), updated February 22, 2022, available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CHCQ/LCP/Pages/AFL-21-34.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CHCQ/LCP/Pages/AFL-21-34.aspx).

- c. Dental Offices. Personnel who provide healthcare in dental offices are considered to provide care in “Clinics & Doctor Offices (including behavioral health, surgical)” under the following CDPH order and must comply with the requirements in that order: “Health Care Worker Vaccine Requirement”, updated ~~February 22~~September 13, 2022, available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Health-Care-Worker-Vaccine-Requirement.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Health-Care-Worker-Vaccine-Requirement.aspx).
- d. Limited Exemptions. Personnel covered by this Section 6 may be exempt from the vaccination requirements under this section only upon providing the requesting Business or governmental entity a declination form stating either of the following:



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

(1) the individual is declining vaccination based on Religious Beliefs or (2) the individual is excused from receiving any COVID-19 vaccine due to Qualifying Medical Reasons. A sample ascertainment and declination form is available online at <https://sf.gov/healthrules>. As to declinations for Qualifying Medical Reasons, to be eligible for this exemption Personnel must also provide to their employer or the Business a written statement signed by a physician, nurse practitioner, or other licensed medical professional practicing under the license of a physician stating that the individual qualifies for the exemption (but the statement should not describe the underlying medical condition or disability) and indicating the probable duration of the individual's inability to receive the vaccine (or if the duration is unknown or permanent, so indicate). As to declinations based on Religious Beliefs, a Business or governmental entity may seek additional information as allowed or required by applicable law to determine whether Personnel have a qualifying Religious Belief. Personnel who qualify for and are granted by the employing Business or governmental entity an exemption due to Religious Beliefs or Qualifying Medical Reasons, as provided above, must still follow at least the minimum health and safety requirements in subsection (a)(iv), above. Nothing in this Order is intended to limit any Business's or governmental entity's ability under applicable law to determine whether they are able to offer a reasonable accommodation to Personnel with an approved exemption. Because testing and masking is not as effective as being Up-to-Date on Vaccination at preventing the spread of COVID-19, a Business may determine that the minimum requirements in subsection (a)(iv) above are not sufficient to protect the health and safety of people in High-Risk Settings.

- e. Record Keeping Requirements. Businesses or governmental entities subject to this Section 6 must maintain records with following information:
  - i. For Personnel who are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series, and also for Personnel where having received their first Booster is required by this Order: (1) full name and date of birth; (2) vaccine manufacturer; and (3) date of vaccine administration (for first dose and, if applicable, all subsequent doses required by this Order). Nothing in this subsection is intended to prevent an employer from requesting additional information or documentation to verify vaccination status, to the extent permissible under the law.
  - ii. For unvaccinated Personnel: signed declination forms with written health care provider's statement where applicable, as described in subsection (d) above.
- f. Compliance with CDPH Orders. In addition to the requirements set forth above:
  - i. Until any more health protective requirements in this section take effect, Businesses and governmental entities with Personnel in High-Risk Settings must comply with the requirements of the CDPH ~~Vaccination Status Order~~; "Guidance for the Use of Face Masks" dated April 20, 2022, available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Guidance-for-Face-Coverings.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Guidance-for-Face-Coverings.aspx); and



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

- ii. Businesses and governmental entities with Personnel in adult care facilities and Other Health Care Settings—as that term is defined in the CDPH Vaccination Status Order—must be in full compliance with the requirements of the CDPH Vaccination Status Order.
- iii. Businesses and governmental entities with Personnel who provide services or work in facilities covered by the State Public Health Officer Order of August 5, 2021, updated most recently on ~~February 22~~September 13, 2022 (titled “Health Care Worker Vaccine Requirement”), must comply with the requirements of that order, including as that order may be amended in the future. See [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Health-Care-Worker-Vaccine-Requirement.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Order-of-the-State-Public-Health-Officer-Health-Care-Worker-Vaccine-Requirement.aspx).
- g. Cooperation with Public Health Authorities. Businesses or governmental entities with Personnel subject to this Section 6 must cooperate with Health Officer or DPH requests for records, documents, or other information regarding the Business or governmental entity’s implementation of these vaccination requirements. This cooperation includes, but is not limited to, identifying all jobs or positions within the organization and describing: (1) whether a given job or position is subject to the vaccination requirements of this Section 6, (2) how the Business or governmental entity determined a job or position is subject to vaccination requirements of this Section 6, and (3) how the Business or governmental entity is ensuring full compliance with the vaccination requirements set forth in this Section 6. Complete responses to these requests must be provided to the Health Officer or DPH promptly upon request, and in any event within three business days after receiving the request.
- ~~h. Chart. For convenience of reference, a chart summarizing which settings and Personnel are subject to which state and local vaccination requirements is available at <https://sf.gov/file/facility-and-care-worker-vaccination-requirements>.~~
- 7. Mega-Events. All Businesses, governmental entities, and other organizations hosting Mega-Events, ~~including when held at schools or under Programs for Children and Youth as provided in Section 5 above~~, are strongly urged (but ~~no longer~~not required) to continue to follow the recommendations in the State’s Post-Blueprint Guidance for Mega-Events, available online at [www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Beyond-Blueprint-Framework.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Beyond-Blueprint-Framework.aspx), including requiring patrons and staff to either show proof of being Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or having received a negative COVID-19 Test as a condition to entry for indoor Mega-Events.
- 8. COVID-19 Health Indicators. The County will, for the time being, continue to make publicly available on its website updated data on COVID-19 case rates, hospitalizations and vaccination rates. That information can be found online at <https://sf.gov/resource/2021/covid-19-data-and-reports>. The Health Officer will monitor this data, along with other data and scientific evidence, in determining whether to modify or rescind this Order, as further described in Section 2(a) above.



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

9. Incorporation of State and Local Emergency Proclamations and Federal and State Health Orders. The Health Officer is issuing this Order in accordance with, and incorporates by reference, the emergency proclamations and other federal, state, and local orders and other pandemic-related orders described below in this Section. But this Order also functions independent of those emergency proclamations and other actions, and if any State, federal, or local emergency declaration, or any State or federal order or other guidance, is repealed, this Order remains in full effect in accordance with its terms (subject to Section 13 below).
  - a. State and Local Emergency Proclamations. This Order is issued in accordance with, and incorporates by reference, the March 4, 2020 Proclamation of a State of Emergency issued by the Governor, the February 25, 2020 Proclamation by the Mayor Declaring the Existence of a Local Emergency, and the March 6, 2020 Declaration of Local Health Emergency Regarding Novel Coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) issued by the Health Officer, as each of them have been and may be modified, extended, or supplemented.
  - b. State Health Orders. This Order is also issued in light of the various orders, directives, rules, and regulations of the State, including, but not limited to, those of the State's Public Health Officer and Cal/OSHA. The State has expressly acknowledged that local health officers have authority to establish and implement public health measures within their respective jurisdictions that are more restrictive than those implemented by the State Public Health Officer.
  - c. Federal Orders. This Order is further issued in light of federal emergency declarations and orders, ~~including, but not limited to, the January 20, 2021 Executive Order on Protecting the Federal Workforce and Requiring Mask Wearing, which requires all individuals in Federal buildings and on Federal land to wear masks, maintain physical distance, and adhere to other public health measures, as each of them may have been and may be modified, extended or supplemented.~~
10. Obligation to Follow Stricter Requirements of Orders.

Based on local health conditions, this Order includes a limited number of health and safety restrictions that are more stringent or more detailed than those contained under State orders. Where a conflict exists between this Order and any state or federal public health order related to the COVID-19 pandemic, the most restrictive provision (*i.e.*, the more protective of public health) controls. Consistent with California Health and Safety Code section 131080 and the Health Officer Practice Guide for Communicable Disease Control in California, except where the State Health Officer may issue an order expressly directed at this Order and based on a finding that a provision of this Order constitutes a menace to public health, any more restrictive measures in this Order continue to apply and control in this County.



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

11. Obligation to Follow Health Officer Orders and Directives and Mandatory State Guidance.

In addition to complying with all provisions of this Order, all individuals and entities, including all Businesses and governmental entities, must also follow any applicable orders and directives issued by the Health Officer (available online at <https://sf.gov/healthrules>) and any applicable mandatory guidance issued by the State Health Officer or California Department of Public Health. To the extent that provisions in the orders or directives of the Health Officer and the mandatory guidance of the State conflict, the more restrictive provisions (*i.e.*, the more protective of public health) apply. In the event of a conflict between provisions of any previously-issued Health Officer order or directive and this Order, this Order controls over the conflicting provisions of the other Health Officer order or directive.

12. Enforcement.

Under Government Code sections 26602 and 41601 and Health and Safety Code section 101029, the Health Officer requests that the Sheriff and the Chief of Police in the County ensure compliance with and enforce this Order. The violation of any provision of this Order (including, without limitation, any health directives) constitutes an imminent threat and immediate menace to public health, constitutes a public nuisance, and is punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both. DPH is authorized to respond to such public nuisances by issuing Notice(s) of Violation and ordering premises vacated and closed until the owner, tenant, or manager submits a written plan to eliminate all violations and DPH finds that plan satisfactory. Such Notice(s) of Violation and orders to vacate and close may be issued based on a written report made by any County employees writing the report within the scope of their duty. DPH must give notice of such orders to vacate and close to the Chief of Police or the Chief's designee to be executed and enforced by officers in the same manner as provided by San Francisco Health Code section 597. As a condition of allowing a Business to reopen, DPH may impose additional restrictions and requirements on the Business as DPH deems appropriate to reduce transmission risks, beyond those required by this Order and other applicable health orders and directives.

13. Effective Date.

This Order is effective at 12:01 a.m. on June 15, 2021 and will continue, as updated, to be in effect until the Health Officer rescinds, supersedes, or amends it in writing. The changes made in the ~~June 16~~September 15, 2022 update are effective immediately on issuance.

14. Relation to Other Orders of the San Francisco Health Officer.

Immediately on issuance, this Order revises and entirely replaces the prior update to Health Officer Order No. C19-07y (issued ~~April 21~~June 16, 2022). Leading up to and in connection with the effective date of this Order, the Health Officer has rescinded a number of other orders and directives relating to COVID-19, including those listed in the



**ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER No. C19-07y (updated)**

Health Officer's Omnibus Rescission of Health Officer Orders and Directives, dated June 11, 2021. On and after the effective date of this Order, the following orders and directives of the Health Officer shall continue in full force and effect: Order Nos. C19-16 (hospital patient data sharing), C19-18 (vaccine data reporting), C19-19 (minor consent to vaccination), and C19-20 (test collection sites); and the directives that this Order references in Sections 3 and ~~54~~, as the Health Officer may separately amend or later terminate any of them. Health Officer Order No. C19-15 was also reinstated on August 19, 2021, and remains in effect as outlined in that order (including as it is amended in the future). Also, this Order also does not alter the end date of any other Health Officer order or directive having its own end date or that continues indefinitely.

15. Copies.

The County must promptly provide copies of this Order as follows: (1) by posting on the County's website (<https://sf.gov/healthrules>); (2) by posting at City Hall, located at 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102; and (3) by providing to any member of the public requesting a copy.

16. Severability.

If a court holds any provision of this Order or its application to any person or circumstance to be invalid, then the remainder of the Order, including the application of such part or provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected and shall continue in full force and effect. To this end, the provisions of this Order are severable.

**IT IS SO ORDERED:**

~~Naveena Bobba, MD, MPH,~~ \_\_\_\_\_ ~~Dated: June 16, 2022~~  
~~Deputy Director of Health~~

~~Under Delegation From:~~

Susan Philip, MD, MPH, \_\_\_\_\_ Dated: September 15, 2022  
Health Officer of the  
City and County of San Francisco

Attachment:

- Appendix A – Face Covering Requirements (last updated ~~April 24~~ September 15, 2022)



## Order No. C19-07y – Appendix A: Face Covering Requirements

[April 21 September 15, 2022]

### 1. General Recommendation to Wear a Well-Fitted Mask; Requirement in Limited Indoor Settings.

The intent of this Order and the masking rules in this Appendix is to align with the masking rules and recommendations issued by the State of California and the federal government, with this Appendix providing additional information for specific situations to help Businesses, governmental entities, and individuals comply with those rules and recommendations and make informed choices to improve safety during the pandemic.

Everyone, including even people who are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or are Up-to-Date on Vaccination (meaning they have completed their initial course of vaccination and have received a Booster once eligible for a Booster, as further defined in Section 1 of the body of the Order), is recommended to wear a Well-Fitted Mask in indoor public settings in the following situations:

- When an individual wants added protection based on individual risk tolerance, for example, when indoors with people whose vaccination status is unknown. People should respect an individual's decision to wear face coverings even in settings where they are not required, and no Business or other person should take an adverse action against individuals who chose to wear a face covering to protect their health.
- When there is a higher risk of community spread and infection, such as ~~during surges caused by future variants~~when COVID-19 case numbers increase, and case numbers in San Francisco can be found online at <https://sf.gov/data/covid-19-cases-and-deaths>.
- When an individual, or someone with whom an individual lives or works, is at a higher risk of a negative health outcome, such as older and immuno-compromised individuals.

Additional Face Covering Requirements may be imposed elsewhere in this Order or by state or federal rules or regulations.

Also, everyone is required to wear a Well-Fitted Mask, regardless of vaccination status, in the following indoor settings: emergency shelters and cooling and heating centers; High-Risk Settings (as defined in Section 1 of the Order); health care settings as required by CDPH and by this Order; ~~other long-term care and adult and senior care facilities~~workplaces or settings where masking is required by the Business or setting or by regulatory orders and rules; and anywhere else that federal or state health orders or regulatory rules (including, but not limited to, Cal/OSHA and federal requirements) require doing so, as described in Section 3(b)(i) of the Order and this Appendix. For public transportation and public transportation facilities, subject to any future state or

## **Order No. C19-07y – Appendix A: Face Covering Requirements**

**[April 21September 15, 2022]**

federal masking mandates, masks are strongly recommended for all people indoors, regardless of vaccination status, consistent with the CDPH Guidance for the Use of Face Masks.

Employees may be subject to additional restrictions or be required to provide additional documentation under state or federal laws and regulations, including Cal/OSHA's regulations. Businesses and other entities must adhere to applicable Cal/OSHA regulations relating to COVID-19 health and safety measures in the workplace and should frequently check for updates to those regulations such as by checking online at [www.dir.ca.gov/dosh/coronavirus/covid19faqs.html](http://www.dir.ca.gov/dosh/coronavirus/covid19faqs.html).

And as provided in Section 6 below, individual Businesses, governmental entities, or venue operators or hosts may impose requirements regarding masking, in addition to those in this Order, that are more protective of public health.

### **2. Ventilation.**

Businesses and operators of other public and private facilities where people may remove their Well-Fitted Masks indoors are encouraged to use at least one of the following ventilation strategies: (1) all available windows and doors accessible to fresh outdoor air are kept open as long as air quality and weather conditions permit; (2) fully operational HVAC system; or (3) appropriately sized portable air cleaners in each room. For clarity, if windows and doors are closed due to air quality or weather conditions, then a Business or operator of a public or private facility should whenever feasible follow at least one of remaining ventilation strategies before allowing people to remove their Well-Fitted Masks under this Order.

### **3. Proof of Vaccination.**

Businesses, governmental entities, and other venue operators or hosts are encouraged to consider whether to require people to provide proof that they are Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or are Up-to-Date on Vaccination (including receipt of a Booster once Booster-Eligible) before allowing people to remove their Well-Fitted Mask indoors. And as provided in the Order, each Business, governmental entity, and other entity that is required to confirm proof of being Vaccinated with the Complete Initial Series is strongly urged to implement measures as soon as possible to require its patrons and staff (as distinct from Personnel) to be Up-to-Date on Vaccination, including requiring them to show proof of receipt of a Booster once they are eligible.

Despite the easing of masking requirements under this update to the Order, Businesses, governmental entities, and other venue operators or hosts may still require all patrons to wear a Well-Fitted Mask in their facilities. And no person can be prevented from wearing a Well-Fitted Mask as a condition of participation in an activity or entry into a Business.



## **Order No. C19-07y – Appendix A: Face Covering Requirements**

**[April 21 September 15, 2022]**

4. **Status-Based Exemptions.** The following exemptions apply in the limited situations where Well-Fitted Masks are still required under this Order.
- a. **Medical or Safety Exemption.** A person does not need to wear a Well-Fitted Mask when they can show: (1) a medical professional has provided a written exemption to the Face Covering Requirement, based on the person's medical condition, other health concern, or disability; or (2) that they are hearing impaired, or communicating with a person who is hearing impaired, where the ability to see the mouth is essential for communication; or (3) wearing a Well-Fitted Mask while working would create a risk to the person related to their work as determined by local, state, or federal regulators or workplace safety guidelines. In accordance with CDPH and CDC guidelines, if a person is required by this Order to wear a Well-Fitted Mask but is exempt from wearing one under this paragraph, they still must wear an alternative face covering, such as a face shield with a drape on the bottom edge, unless they can show either: (1) a medical professional has provided a written exemption to this alternative face covering requirement, based on the person's medical condition, other health concern, or disability; or (2) wearing an alternative face covering while working would create a risk to the person related to their work as determined by local, state, or federal regulators or workplace safety guidelines.

A Well-Fitted Mask should also not be used by anyone who has trouble breathing or is unconscious, incapacitated, or otherwise unable to remove the Well-Fitted Mask without assistance.

- b. **Children.** In accordance with CDPH and CDC guidelines, any child younger than two years old must not wear a Well-Fitted Mask because of the risk of suffocation. When required to do so by this Order, Children age two to nine years must wear Well-Fitted Masks to the greatest extent feasible. Children age two to nine years may wear an alternative face covering (as that term is described in Section 4(a), above) if their parent or caregiver determines it will improve the child's ability to comply with this Order. Children age two to nine and their accompanying parents or caregivers should not be refused any essential service based on a child's inability to wear a Well-Fitted Mask (for example, if a four-year old child refuses to keep a Well-Fitted Mask on in a grocery store), but the parent or caregiver should when possible take reasonable steps to have the child, when required to do so by this Order, wear a Well-Fitted Mask to protect others and minimize instances when children without Well-Fitted Masks are brought into settings with other people. Parents and caregivers of children age two to nine years must supervise the use of Well-Fitted Masks to ensure safety and avoid misuse. Children must wear face coverings in schools as required under State health rules.
- c. **Personal Protective Equipment.** A person required by this Order to wear a Well-Fitted Mask does not need to do so when wearing personal protective equipment ("PPE") that is more protective than a Well-Fitted Mask, including when required by (i) any workplace policy or (ii) any local, state, or federal law, regulation, or other mandatory guidance. When a person is not required to wear such PPE and in an indoor public setting, they

## **Order No. C19-07y – Appendix A: Face Covering Requirements**

**[April 21September 15, 2022]**

must wear a Well-Fitted Mask or PPE that is more protective unless otherwise exempted under this Order.

### **5. Activity- and Location-Based Exemptions.**

The activity- and location-based exemptions in this Section apply to everyone in the designated settings where this Order requires everyone, regardless of vaccination status, to wear a Well-Fitted Mask. To the extent allowed under Face Covering Requirements and subject to any additional health restrictions a particular Business, governmental entity, or other venue operator or host may impose for a facility or other setting it owns, operates, or controls, people in settings where this Order requires wearing a Well-Fitted Mask are not required do so in any of the following situations:

- a. Indoor Public Setting While Alone or With a Member of Household. A person does not need to wear a Well-Fitted Mask when they are alone or with a member of their Household in a public building or completely enclosed space such as an office, and people who are not part of their Household are not likely to be in the same space. If someone who is not part of a person's Household enters the enclosed space, both people must wear a Well-Fitted Mask for the duration of the interaction unless otherwise exempt under Sections 4 and 5 of this Appendix.
- b. Active Eating and Drinking. People may remove their Well-Fitted Mask while actively eating or drinking.
- c. Showering, Personal Hygiene, or Sleeping. People may remove their Well-Fitted Mask only while showering or actively engaging in personal hygiene that requires removal of the Well-Fitted Mask. People may remove their Well-Fitted Mask while sleeping in indoor public settings.

### **6. Minimum Requirements; Ability to Adopt More-Restrictive Measures.**

This Order establishes the minimum requirements related to indoor masking. Nothing in this Order, including this Appendix A, is intended to reduce any other federal, state, or local legal requirements or otherwise modify them in a way that is less protective of public health, or to limit an individual Business' or governmental entity's choices to take more health protective measures. Businesses or governmental entities may impose further restrictions that are more protective of public health than the minimum requirements under this Order, including, without limitation, requiring patrons or Personnel to be Vaccinated with a Complete Initial Series or Up-to-Date on Vaccination, requiring them to wear a Well-Fitted Mask, or taking other measures that meet their operational needs (such as, by way of example only, mandating that people be Up-to-Date on Vaccination and only allowing a testing alternative if someone has an exemption to vaccination based on Religious Beliefs or a Qualifying Medical Reason.)

**From:** [Dion, Ichieh \(TTX\)](#)  
**Subject:** CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for August 2022  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 20, 2022 11:48:54 AM  
**Attachments:** [CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for August 2022.pdf](#)

---

All-

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

Regards,

Ichieh Dion  
City and County of San Francisco  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 140  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
415-554-5433

Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector  
City and County of San Francisco

Tajel Shah, Chief Assistant Treasurer  
Hubert R White, III CFA, CTP, Chief Investment Officer



José Cisneros, Treasurer

Investment Report for the month of August 2022

September 15, 2022

The Honorable London N. Breed  
Mayor of San Francisco  
City Hall, Room 200  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4638

The Honorable Board of Supervisors  
City and County of San Francisco  
City Hall, Room 244  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4638

Colleagues,

In accordance with the provisions of California State Government Code, Section 53646, we forward this report detailing the City's pooled fund portfolio as of August 31, 2022. These investments provide sufficient liquidity to meet expenditure requirements for the next six months and are in compliance with our statement of investment policy and California Code.

This correspondence and its attachments show the investment activity for the month of August 2022 for the portfolios under the Treasurer's management. All pricing and valuation data is obtained from Interactive Data Corporation.

**CCSF Pooled Fund Investment Earnings Statistics \***

|                       | Current Month |             | Prior Month |           |
|-----------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| (in \$ million)       | Fiscal YTD    | August 2022 | Fiscal YTD  | July 2022 |
| Average Daily Balance | \$ 14,086     | \$ 13,963   | \$ 14,208   | \$ 14,208 |
| Net Earnings          | 29.30         | 15.38       | 13.92       | 13.92     |
| Earned Income Yield   | 1.22%         | 1.30%       | 1.15%       | 1.15%     |

**CCSF Pooled Fund Statistics \***

| (in \$ million)      | % of          | Book               | Market             | Wtd. Avg.    | Wtd. Avg.    |            |
|----------------------|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| Investment Type      | Portfolio     | Value              | Value              | Coupon       | YTM          | WAM        |
| U.S. Treasuries      | 30.55%        | \$ 4,330.3         | \$ 4,077.0         | 0.82%        | 0.80%        | 846        |
| Federal Agencies     | 38.39%        | 5,334.5            | 5,121.9            | 1.23%        | 1.30%        | 746        |
| Public Time Deposits | 0.30%         | 40.0               | 40.0               | 1.41%        | 1.41%        | 61         |
| Negotiable CDs       | 14.63%        | 1,960.0            | 1,952.0            | 2.08%        | 2.08%        | 161        |
| Commercial Paper     | 3.21%         | 426.9              | 428.5              | 0.00%        | 2.26%        | 46         |
| Money Market Funds   | 8.07%         | 1,076.7            | 1,076.7            | 2.19%        | 2.17%        | 1          |
| Supranationals       | 4.85%         | 676.1              | 647.0              | 0.95%        | 1.10%        | 618        |
| <b>Totals</b>        | <b>100.0%</b> | <b>\$ 13,844.6</b> | <b>\$ 13,343.1</b> | <b>1.29%</b> | <b>1.35%</b> | <b>600</b> |

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

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "José Cisneros", written over a horizontal line.

**José Cisneros**  
Treasurer

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

# Portfolio Summary

## Pooled Fund

As of August 31, 2022

| <i>(in \$ million)</i>          |                    |                    |                     |                          |                             |                               |                   |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Security Type</b>            | <b>Par Value</b>   | <b>Book Value</b>  | <b>Market Value</b> | <b>Market/Book Price</b> | <b>Current % Allocation</b> | <b>Max. Policy Allocation</b> | <b>Compliant?</b> |
| U.S. Treasuries                 | \$ 4,325.0         | \$ 4,330.3         | \$ 4,077.0          | 94.15                    | 30.55%                      | 100%                          | Yes               |
| Federal Agencies                | 5,330.6            | 5,334.5            | 5,121.9             | 96.02                    | 38.39%                      | 100%                          | Yes               |
| State & Local Government        |                    |                    |                     |                          |                             |                               |                   |
| Agency Obligations              | -                  | -                  | -                   | -                        | 0.00%                       | 20%                           | Yes               |
| Public Time Deposits            | 40.0               | 40.0               | 40.0                | 100.00                   | 0.30%                       | 100%                          | Yes               |
| Negotiable CDs                  | 1,960.0            | 1,960.0            | 1,952.0             | 99.59                    | 14.63%                      | 30%                           | Yes               |
| Bankers Acceptances             | -                  | -                  | -                   | -                        | 0.00%                       | 40%                           | Yes               |
| Commercial Paper                | 430.0              | 426.9              | 428.5               | -                        | 3.21%                       | 25%                           | Yes               |
| Medium Term Notes               | -                  | -                  | -                   | -                        | 0.00%                       | 30%                           | Yes               |
| Repurchase Agreements           | -                  | -                  | -                   | -                        | 0.00%                       | 10%                           | Yes               |
| Reverse Repurchase/             |                    |                    |                     |                          |                             |                               |                   |
| Securities Lending Agreements   | -                  | -                  | -                   | -                        | 0.00%                       | \$75mm                        | Yes               |
| Money Market Funds - Government | 1,076.7            | 1,076.7            | 1,076.7             | 100.00                   | 8.07%                       | 20%                           | Yes               |
| LAIF                            | -                  | -                  | -                   | -                        | 0.00%                       | \$50mm                        | Yes               |
| Supranationals                  | 668.5              | 676.1              | 647.0               | 95.70                    | 4.85%                       | 30%                           | Yes               |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                    | <b>\$ 13,830.9</b> | <b>\$ 13,844.6</b> | <b>\$ 13,343.1</b>  | <b>96.38</b>             | <b>100.00%</b>              | <b>-</b>                      | <b>Yes</b>        |

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

Please note the information in this report does not include cash balances. Due to fluctuations in the market value of the securities held in the Pooled Fund and changes in the City's cash position, the allocation limits may be exceeded on a post-trade compliance basis. In these instances, no compliance violation has occurred, as the policy limits were not exceeded prior to trade execution. The full Investment Policy can be found at <https://sftreasurer.org/banking-investments/investments>

Totals may not add due to rounding.


# City and County of San Francisco

## Pooled Fund Portfolio Statistics

For the month ended August 31, 2022

|                           |                  |
|---------------------------|------------------|
| Average Daily Balance     | \$13,963,452,792 |
| Net Earnings              | \$15,375,549     |
| Earned Income Yield       | 1.30%            |
| Weighted Average Maturity | 600 days         |

| Investment Type      | (\$ million) | Par Value          | Book Value         | Market Value       |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| U.S. Treasuries      | \$           | 4,325.0            | \$ 4,330.3         | \$ 4,077.0         |
| Federal Agencies     |              | 5,330.6            | 5,334.5            | 5,121.9            |
| Public Time Deposits |              | 40.0               | 40.0               | 40.0               |
| Negotiable CDs       |              | 1,960.0            | 1,960.0            | 1,952.0            |
| Commercial Paper     |              | 430.0              | 426.9              | 428.5              |
| Money Market Funds   |              | 1,076.7            | 1,076.7            | 1,076.7            |
| Supranationals       |              | 668.5              | 676.1              | 647.0              |
| <b>Total</b>         |              | <b>\$ 13,830.9</b> | <b>\$ 13,844.6</b> | <b>\$ 13,343.1</b> |




**Asset Allocation by Market Value**


# Portfolio Analysis

## Pooled Fund

### Par Value of Investments by Maturity





### Asset Allocation by Market Value





## Yield Curves



# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

As of August 31, 2022

|                    |           |                        | Maturity   |        |    |            |    | Amortized  |    |              |
|--------------------|-----------|------------------------|------------|--------|----|------------|----|------------|----|--------------|
| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name            | Date       | Coupon |    | Par Value  |    | Book Value |    | Market Value |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912796U56 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 9/22/2022  | 0.00   | \$ | 50,000,000 | \$ | 49,759,821 | \$ | 49,939,479   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912796U64 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 9/29/2022  | 0.00   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 49,734,584 |    | 49,959,167   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912796M89 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 10/6/2022  | 0.00   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 49,719,417 |    | 49,891,597   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912796V63 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 10/20/2022 | 0.00   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 49,684,028 |    | 49,829,521   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828TY6 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 11/15/2022 | 1.63   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 51,201,172 |    | 49,867,188   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912796P94 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 12/1/2022  | 0.00   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 49,878,019 |    | 49,636,632   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828Z86 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 2/15/2023  | 1.38   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 50,166,016 |    | 49,578,125   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828Z86 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 2/15/2023  | 1.38   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 50,923,828 |    | 49,578,125   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZD5 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 3/15/2023  | 0.50   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 50,335,938 |    | 49,273,438   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBU4 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 3/31/2023  | 0.13   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 49,972,656 |    | 49,101,563   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZU7 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 6/15/2023  | 0.25   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 49,998,047 |    | 48,781,250   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZU7 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 6/15/2023  | 0.25   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 50,066,406 |    | 48,781,250   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZU7 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 6/15/2023  | 0.25   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 50,072,266 |    | 48,781,250   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828S35 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 6/30/2023  | 1.38   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 49,605,469 |    | 49,164,063   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828S35 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 6/30/2023  | 1.38   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 51,138,672 |    | 49,164,063   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCK5 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 6/30/2023  | 0.13   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 49,865,234 |    | 48,656,250   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828S92 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 7/31/2023  | 1.25   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 51,218,750 |    | 49,000,000   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828S92 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 7/31/2023  | 1.25   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 51,220,703 |    | 49,000,000   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAK7 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 9/15/2023  | 0.13   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 49,886,719 |    | 48,289,063   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828WE6 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 11/15/2023 | 2.75   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 51,960,938 |    | 49,585,938   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBA8 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 12/15/2023 | 0.13   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 49,402,344 |    | 47,921,875   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBA8 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 12/15/2023 | 0.13   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 49,443,359 |    | 47,921,875   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBA8 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 12/15/2023 | 0.13   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 49,767,578 |    | 47,921,875   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828S29 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 1/31/2024  | 2.50   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 52,511,719 |    | 49,328,125   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDV0 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 1/31/2024  | 0.88   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 48,605,469 |    | 48,203,125   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDV0 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 1/31/2024  | 0.88   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 49,390,625 |    | 48,203,125   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828B66 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 2/15/2024  | 2.75   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 50,250,000 |    | 49,492,188   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBR1 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 3/15/2024  | 0.25   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 48,708,984 |    | 47,601,563   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCC3 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 5/15/2024  | 0.25   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 49,718,750 |    | 47,351,563   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828XT2 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 5/31/2024  | 2.00   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 52,263,672 |    | 48,773,438   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCL3 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 7/15/2024  | 0.38   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 47,572,266 |    | 47,242,188   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCL3 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 7/15/2024  | 0.38   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 49,960,938 |    | 47,242,188   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCL3 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 7/15/2024  | 0.38   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 49,998,047 |    | 47,242,188   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828Y87 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 7/31/2024  | 1.75   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 52,210,938 |    | 48,437,500   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCT6 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 8/15/2024  | 0.38   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 49,898,438 |    | 47,109,375   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828YM6 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 10/31/2024 | 1.50   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 51,746,094 |    | 47,984,375   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828G38 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 11/15/2024 | 2.25   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 53,160,156 |    | 48,734,375   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828G38 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 11/15/2024 | 2.25   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 53,228,516 |    | 48,734,375   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828YY0 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 12/31/2024 | 1.75   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 52,226,563 |    | 48,109,375   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828Z52 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 1/31/2025  | 1.38   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 51,515,625 |    | 47,593,750   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828Z52 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 1/31/2025  | 1.38   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 51,507,813 |    | 47,593,750   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZC7 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 2/28/2025  | 1.13   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 50,998,047 |    | 47,218,750   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZC7 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 2/28/2025  | 1.13   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 51,011,719 |    | 47,218,750   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZF0 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 3/31/2025  | 0.50   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 49,779,297 |    | 46,367,188   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZF0 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 3/31/2025  | 0.50   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 49,839,844 |    | 46,367,188   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZL7 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 4/30/2025  | 0.38   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 49,615,234 |    | 46,085,938   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828XB1 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 5/15/2025  | 2.13   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 52,849,609 |    | 48,265,625   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 6/30/2025  | 0.25   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 48,628,906 |    | 45,710,938   |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | UNITED STATES TREASURY | 6/30/2025  | 0.25   |    | 50,000,000 |    | 49,042,969 |    | 45,710,938   |

# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name                  | Maturity   | Coupon      | Par Value               | Book Value              | Amortized               | Market Value            |
|--------------------|-----------|------------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
|                    |           |                              | Date       |             |                         |                         | Book Value              |                         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 6/30/2025  | 0.25        | 50,000,000              | 49,140,625              | 49,436,359              | 45,710,938              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 6/30/2025  | 0.25        | 50,000,000              | 49,183,594              | 49,441,121              | 45,710,938              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 6/30/2025  | 0.25        | 50,000,000              | 49,253,906              | 49,487,557              | 45,710,938              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 6/30/2025  | 0.25        | 50,000,000              | 49,281,250              | 49,508,299              | 45,710,938              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 6/30/2025  | 0.25        | 50,000,000              | 49,310,547              | 49,508,485              | 45,710,938              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 6/30/2025  | 0.25        | 50,000,000              | 49,406,250              | 49,569,281              | 45,710,938              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 6/30/2025  | 0.25        | 50,000,000              | 49,500,000              | 49,637,544              | 45,710,938              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAB7 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 7/31/2025  | 0.25        | 50,000,000              | 49,363,281              | 49,534,386              | 45,562,500              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAB7 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 7/31/2025  | 0.25        | 50,000,000              | 49,458,984              | 49,604,642              | 45,562,500              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAM3 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 9/30/2025  | 0.25        | 50,000,000              | 49,109,375              | 49,374,561              | 45,343,750              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAM3 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 9/30/2025  | 0.25        | 50,000,000              | 49,281,250              | 49,470,469              | 45,343,750              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAT8 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 10/31/2025 | 0.25        | 50,000,000              | 49,048,828              | 49,353,963              | 45,210,938              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAT8 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 10/31/2025 | 0.25        | 50,000,000              | 49,078,125              | 49,374,597              | 45,210,938              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAT8 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 10/31/2025 | 0.25        | 50,000,000              | 49,298,828              | 49,525,714              | 45,210,938              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBC4 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 12/31/2025 | 0.38        | 50,000,000              | 49,271,484              | 49,498,811              | 45,171,875              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBC4 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 12/31/2025 | 0.38        | 50,000,000              | 49,455,078              | 49,625,328              | 45,171,875              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBW0 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 4/30/2026  | 0.75        | 50,000,000              | 49,662,109              | 49,744,335              | 45,406,250              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBW0 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 4/30/2026  | 0.75        | 50,000,000              | 49,730,469              | 49,795,597              | 45,406,250              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828R36 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 5/15/2026  | 1.63        | 50,000,000              | 51,890,625              | 51,484,393              | 46,890,625              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828R36 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 5/15/2026  | 1.63        | 50,000,000              | 52,203,125              | 51,695,290              | 46,890,625              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 6/30/2026  | 0.88        | 50,000,000              | 49,027,344              | 49,169,857              | 45,453,125              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 6/30/2026  | 0.88        | 50,000,000              | 49,593,750              | 49,669,804              | 45,453,125              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 6/30/2026  | 0.88        | 50,000,000              | 49,931,641              | 49,947,606              | 45,453,125              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 6/30/2026  | 0.88        | 50,000,000              | 49,937,500              | 49,949,784              | 45,453,125              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 6/30/2026  | 0.88        | 50,000,000              | 50,070,313              | 50,054,248              | 45,453,125              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 6/30/2026  | 0.88        | 50,000,000              | 50,240,234              | 50,188,150              | 45,453,125              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 6/30/2026  | 0.88        | 50,000,000              | 50,328,125              | 50,254,279              | 45,453,125              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 6/30/2026  | 0.88        | 50,000,000              | 50,345,703              | 50,267,901              | 45,453,125              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 6/30/2026  | 0.88        | 50,000,000              | 50,406,250              | 50,317,461              | 45,453,125              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCW9 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 8/31/2026  | 0.75        | 50,000,000              | 49,449,219              | 49,552,758              | 45,062,500              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCZ2 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 9/30/2026  | 0.88        | 50,000,000              | 49,318,359              | 49,437,939              | 45,226,563              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCZ2 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 9/30/2026  | 0.88        | 50,000,000              | 49,671,875              | 49,731,075              | 45,226,563              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCZ2 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 9/30/2026  | 0.88        | 50,000,000              | 49,689,453              | 49,745,481              | 45,226,563              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDK4 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 11/30/2026 | 1.25        | 50,000,000              | 47,078,125              | 47,345,150              | 45,804,688              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDK4 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 11/30/2026 | 1.25        | 50,000,000              | 50,072,266              | 50,061,483              | 45,804,688              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDK4 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 11/30/2026 | 1.25        | 50,000,000              | 50,117,188              | 50,099,922              | 45,804,688              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDQ1 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 12/31/2026 | 1.25        | 50,000,000              | 47,107,422              | 47,367,055              | 45,750,000              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CEF4 | UNITED STATES TREASURY       | 3/31/2027  | 2.50        | 25,000,000              | 24,768,058              | 24,777,507              | 24,109,375              |
| <b>Subtotals</b>   |           |                              |            | <b>0.82</b> | <b>\$ 4,325,000,000</b> | <b>\$ 4,330,342,754</b> | <b>\$ 4,322,857,979</b> | <b>\$ 4,076,956,778</b> |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385E28 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 9/1/2022   | 0.00        | \$ 50,000,000           | \$ 49,997,000           | \$ 50,000,000           | \$ 49,997,100           |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385E28 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 9/1/2022   | 0.00        | 50,000,000              | 49,997,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,997,100              |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385E28 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 9/1/2022   | 0.00        | 50,000,000              | 49,997,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,997,100              |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385E28 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 9/1/2022   | 0.00        | 50,000,000              | 49,997,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,997,100              |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385F92 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 9/16/2022  | 0.00        | 25,000,000              | 24,899,667              | 24,988,333              | 24,976,850              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EHZP1 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 9/20/2022  | 1.85        | 25,000,000              | 25,718,750              | 25,014,909              | 24,989,800              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ELVL5 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 10/3/2022  | 0.70        | 40,000,000              | 39,990,000              | 39,999,650              | 39,931,520              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMS45 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 12/14/2022 | 0.11        | 50,000,000              | 49,992,900              | 49,998,575              | 49,626,650              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMWK4 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 1/19/2023  | 0.14        | 60,000,000              | 59,987,400              | 59,997,113              | 59,385,480              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ELJH8 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 1/23/2023  | 1.60        | 10,140,000              | 10,384,141              | 10,174,000              | 10,089,949              |

# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name                  | Maturity   | Coupon | Par Value   | Book Value | Amortized  | Market Value |
|--------------------|-----------|------------------------------|------------|--------|-------------|------------|------------|--------------|
|                    |           |                              | Date       |        |             |            | Book Value |              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMPH9 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 2/3/2023   | 0.13   | 45,500,000  | 45,096,315 | 45,314,329 | 44,975,067   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133827H0 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 2/6/2023   | 2.14   | 44,400,000  | 44,826,684 | 44,600,643 | 44,257,476   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENDQ0 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 2/10/2023  | 0.16   | 50,000,000  | 49,899,789 | 49,964,320 | 49,404,550   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMUH3 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 3/23/2023  | 0.13   | 65,000,000  | 64,955,150 | 64,987,390 | 63,967,605   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMVP4 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 4/13/2023  | 0.13   | 20,000,000  | 19,973,600 | 19,991,899 | 19,644,020   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMVP4 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 4/13/2023  | 0.13   | 25,000,000  | 24,967,000 | 24,989,874 | 24,555,025   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMVP4 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 4/13/2023  | 0.13   | 50,000,000  | 49,934,000 | 49,979,748 | 49,110,050   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMXM9 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 4/27/2023  | 0.13   | 44,500,000  | 44,462,233 | 44,487,551 | 43,647,202   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMYX4 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 5/10/2023  | 0.13   | 12,500,000  | 12,484,000 | 12,494,499 | 12,243,013   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMYX4 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 5/10/2023  | 0.13   | 25,000,000  | 24,968,000 | 24,988,997 | 24,486,025   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMYX4 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 5/10/2023  | 0.13   | 75,000,000  | 74,904,000 | 74,966,992 | 73,458,075   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AMRY0 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 6/2/2023   | 0.13   | 15,000,000  | 14,986,200 | 14,994,806 | 14,654,910   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMF31 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 6/2/2023   | 0.13   | 100,000,000 | 99,938,000 | 99,976,729 | 97,699,400   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMH96 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 6/14/2023  | 0.13   | 50,000,000  | 49,864,850 | 49,946,016 | 48,788,100   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EM3S9 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 6/26/2023  | 0.20   | 48,067,000  | 47,826,184 | 47,938,622 | 46,870,757   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EM3S9 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 6/26/2023  | 0.20   | 50,000,000  | 49,979,892 | 49,991,043 | 48,755,650   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMS37 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 7/14/2023  | 0.13   | 50,000,000  | 49,907,253 | 49,959,852 | 48,631,950   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMS37 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 7/14/2023  | 0.13   | 50,000,000  | 49,927,791 | 49,968,742 | 48,631,950   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENEY2 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 7/24/2023  | 0.45   | 50,000,000  | 49,998,500 | 49,998,120 | 48,726,950   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EM2E1 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 8/10/2023  | 0.16   | 50,000,000  | 49,970,000 | 49,985,904 | 48,527,200   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3137EAEV7 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE   | 8/24/2023  | 0.25   | 40,776,000  | 40,542,761 | 40,642,987 | 39,553,617   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AJXD6 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 9/8/2023   | 0.13   | 20,975,000  | 20,806,361 | 20,875,895 | 20,293,606   |
| Federal Agencies   | 313383YJ4 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 9/8/2023   | 3.38   | 25,000,000  | 25,395,781 | 25,063,824 | 24,995,125   |
| Federal Agencies   | 313383YJ4 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 9/8/2023   | 3.38   | 25,000,000  | 25,397,531 | 25,065,419 | 24,995,125   |
| Federal Agencies   | 313383YJ4 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 9/8/2023   | 3.38   | 40,000,000  | 40,627,000 | 40,093,229 | 39,992,200   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3135G0U43 | FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE A  | 9/12/2023  | 2.88   | 29,648,000  | 30,793,302 | 30,318,769 | 29,493,237   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EM6N7 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 9/27/2023  | 0.17   | 50,000,000  | 49,950,000 | 49,973,219 | 48,311,450   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENGf1 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 12/1/2023  | 0.50   | 25,000,000  | 24,963,750 | 24,977,294 | 24,109,825   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENGf1 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 12/1/2023  | 0.50   | 25,000,000  | 24,963,750 | 24,977,294 | 24,109,825   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENGf1 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 12/1/2023  | 0.50   | 75,000,000  | 74,891,250 | 74,931,882 | 72,329,475   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130A3VC5 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 12/8/2023  | 2.25   | 10,000,000  | 10,301,000 | 10,191,433 | 9,853,900    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130A3VC5 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 12/8/2023  | 2.25   | 30,000,000  | 30,903,000 | 30,574,298 | 29,561,700   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENHR4 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 12/20/2023 | 0.68   | 25,000,000  | 24,987,600 | 24,991,932 | 24,129,900   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENHR4 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 12/20/2023 | 0.68   | 25,000,000  | 24,988,000 | 24,992,192 | 24,129,900   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENHR4 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 12/20/2023 | 0.68   | 62,000,000  | 61,970,488 | 61,980,797 | 59,842,152   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENLF5 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 1/18/2024  | 0.90   | 11,856,000  | 11,738,815 | 11,769,905 | 11,452,635   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENLF5 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 1/18/2024  | 0.90   | 50,000,000  | 49,701,000 | 49,789,531 | 48,298,900   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AFW94 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 2/13/2024  | 2.50   | 39,010,000  | 40,648,810 | 40,065,370 | 38,487,656   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ELNE0 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 2/14/2024  | 1.43   | 20,495,000  | 20,950,604 | 20,664,416 | 19,911,999   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMRZ7 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 2/26/2024  | 0.25   | 5,000,000   | 4,998,200  | 4,999,107  | 4,769,860    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMRZ7 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 2/26/2024  | 0.25   | 5,000,000   | 4,998,200  | 4,999,107  | 4,769,860    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMRZ7 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 2/26/2024  | 0.25   | 100,000,000 | 99,964,000 | 99,982,148 | 95,397,200   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARHG9 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 2/28/2024  | 2.13   | 11,000,000  | 10,987,460 | 10,990,306 | 10,789,196   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARHG9 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 2/28/2024  | 2.13   | 25,000,000  | 24,971,500 | 24,977,968 | 24,520,900   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMTW2 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 3/18/2024  | 0.30   | 50,000,000  | 49,939,450 | 49,968,841 | 47,636,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMTW2 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 3/18/2024  | 0.30   | 50,000,000  | 49,939,500 | 49,968,867 | 47,636,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMWV0 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 4/22/2024  | 0.35   | 16,545,000  | 16,549,633 | 16,547,560 | 15,727,048   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMWV0 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 4/22/2024  | 0.35   | 29,424,000  | 29,432,239 | 29,428,553 | 27,969,336   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMWV0 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 4/22/2024  | 0.35   | 39,000,000  | 39,010,920 | 39,006,034 | 37,071,918   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENWP1 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 5/16/2024  | 2.63   | 45,000,000  | 44,939,250 | 44,948,225 | 44,362,980   |



# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name                  | Maturity   | Coupon | Par Value  | Book Value | Amortized  | Market Value |
|--------------------|-----------|------------------------------|------------|--------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
|                    |           |                              | Date       |        |            |            | Book Value |              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENWP1 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 5/16/2024  | 2.63   | 50,000,000 | 49,932,500 | 49,942,473 | 49,292,200   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENYH7 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 6/10/2024  | 2.63   | 50,000,000 | 49,935,500 | 49,942,824 | 49,257,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENYH7 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 6/10/2024  | 2.63   | 50,000,000 | 49,935,500 | 49,942,824 | 49,257,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130A1XJ2 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 6/14/2024  | 2.88   | 15,955,000 | 16,008,449 | 16,000,975 | 15,784,920   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130A1XJ2 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 6/14/2024  | 2.88   | 17,980,000 | 18,043,829 | 18,034,903 | 17,788,333   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130A1XJ2 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 6/14/2024  | 2.88   | 25,500,000 | 25,552,530 | 25,544,829 | 25,228,170   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130A1XJ2 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 6/14/2024  | 2.88   | 50,000,000 | 50,204,000 | 50,175,011 | 49,467,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASHK8 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 6/14/2024  | 3.13   | 28,000,000 | 27,979,867 | 27,910,169 | 27,821,808   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASHK8 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 6/14/2024  | 3.13   | 28,210,000 | 28,190,845 | 28,120,557 | 28,030,472   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENYX2 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 6/17/2024  | 3.25   | 25,000,000 | 24,970,500 | 24,973,567 | 24,893,925   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENYX2 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 6/17/2024  | 3.25   | 25,000,000 | 24,970,750 | 24,973,791 | 24,893,925   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENYX2 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 6/17/2024  | 3.25   | 50,000,000 | 49,970,000 | 49,973,119 | 49,787,850   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENZS2 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 6/28/2024  | 3.10   | 25,000,000 | 24,986,500 | 24,987,700 | 24,826,525   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENZS2 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 6/28/2024  | 3.10   | 25,000,000 | 24,987,500 | 24,988,611 | 24,826,525   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENZS2 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 6/28/2024  | 3.10   | 50,000,000 | 49,973,000 | 49,975,401 | 49,653,050   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASME6 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 7/8/2024   | 3.00   | 10,000,000 | 9,980,600  | 9,982,060  | 9,910,570    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASME6 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 7/8/2024   | 3.00   | 15,000,000 | 14,970,900 | 14,973,089 | 14,865,855   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASME6 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 7/8/2024   | 3.00   | 17,500,000 | 17,466,050 | 17,468,604 | 17,343,498   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMV25 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 7/23/2024  | 0.45   | 50,000,000 | 50,092,000 | 50,058,754 | 47,226,850   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENJ84 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 8/26/2024  | 3.38   | 50,000,000 | 49,916,500 | 49,917,185 | 49,870,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EM5X6 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 9/23/2024  | 0.43   | 25,000,000 | 24,974,750 | 24,982,652 | 23,476,425   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EM5X6 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 9/23/2024  | 0.43   | 50,000,000 | 49,949,500 | 49,965,304 | 46,952,850   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EM5X6 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 9/23/2024  | 0.43   | 50,000,000 | 49,949,500 | 49,965,304 | 46,952,850   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENEJ5 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 11/18/2024 | 0.88   | 10,000,000 | 9,988,500  | 9,991,511  | 9,436,960    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENEJ5 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 11/18/2024 | 0.88   | 10,000,000 | 9,988,500  | 9,991,511  | 9,436,960    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENEJ5 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 11/18/2024 | 0.88   | 50,000,000 | 49,942,500 | 49,957,557 | 47,184,800   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ELCP7 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 12/3/2024  | 1.63   | 25,000,000 | 24,960,000 | 24,981,959 | 23,964,550   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENGQ7 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 12/9/2024  | 0.92   | 50,000,000 | 49,963,000 | 49,971,980 | 47,151,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENGQ7 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 12/9/2024  | 0.92   | 50,000,000 | 49,985,000 | 49,988,641 | 47,151,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENKS8 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 1/6/2025   | 1.13   | 20,000,000 | 19,955,000 | 19,964,610 | 18,911,880   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENKS8 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 1/6/2025   | 1.13   | 25,000,000 | 24,943,750 | 24,955,763 | 23,639,850   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENKS8 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 1/6/2025   | 1.13   | 25,000,000 | 24,943,750 | 24,955,763 | 23,639,850   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3135G0X24 | FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE A  | 1/7/2025   | 1.63   | 39,060,000 | 40,632,556 | 40,055,450 | 37,368,858   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3137EAEP0 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE   | 2/12/2025  | 1.50   | 5,000,000  | 4,996,150  | 4,998,112  | 4,759,340    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3137EAEP0 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE   | 2/12/2025  | 1.50   | 5,000,000  | 4,996,150  | 4,998,112  | 4,759,340    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3137EAEP0 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE   | 2/12/2025  | 1.50   | 5,000,000  | 4,996,150  | 4,998,112  | 4,759,340    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3137EAEP0 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE   | 2/12/2025  | 1.50   | 15,000,000 | 14,988,450 | 14,994,336 | 14,278,020   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3137EAEP0 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE   | 2/12/2025  | 1.50   | 50,000,000 | 49,961,500 | 49,981,119 | 47,593,400   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3137EAEP0 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE   | 2/12/2025  | 1.50   | 53,532,000 | 55,450,052 | 54,764,345 | 50,955,398   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ELQY3 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 3/3/2025   | 1.21   | 16,000,000 | 15,990,720 | 15,995,303 | 15,098,480   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ELQY3 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 3/3/2025   | 1.21   | 24,000,000 | 23,964,240 | 23,981,902 | 22,647,720   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMWT5 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 4/21/2025  | 0.60   | 50,000,000 | 49,973,500 | 49,982,533 | 46,289,900   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3135G03U5 | FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE A  | 4/22/2025  | 0.63   | 37,938,000 | 37,367,792 | 37,491,468 | 35,152,858   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3135G03U5 | FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE A  | 4/22/2025  | 0.63   | 50,000,000 | 49,243,950 | 49,407,935 | 46,329,350   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3135G03U5 | FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE A  | 4/22/2025  | 0.63   | 50,000,000 | 50,108,000 | 50,075,443 | 46,329,350   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENXE5 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 5/23/2025  | 2.85   | 6,000,000  | 5,991,600  | 5,992,374  | 5,889,816    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENXE5 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 5/23/2025  | 2.85   | 20,000,000 | 19,972,000 | 19,974,580 | 19,632,720   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASG86 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 6/13/2025  | 3.38   | 11,940,000 | 12,055,027 | 11,998,564 | 11,881,160   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASG86 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 6/13/2025  | 3.38   | 12,700,000 | 12,863,195 | 12,803,102 | 12,637,414   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENYQ7 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 6/13/2025  | 2.95   | 50,000,000 | 49,975,500 | 49,977,288 | 49,195,350   |

# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name                  | Maturity   | Coupon | Par Value  | Book Value | Amortized  | Market Value |
|--------------------|-----------|------------------------------|------------|--------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
|                    |           |                              | Date       |        |            |            | Book Value |              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3135G04Z3 | FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE A  | 6/17/2025  | 0.50   | 4,655,000  | 4,556,640  | 4,577,046  | 4,279,113    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3135G04Z3 | FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE A  | 6/17/2025  | 0.50   | 10,000,000 | 9,789,600  | 9,833,249  | 9,192,510    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AN4A5 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 6/30/2025  | 0.70   | 17,680,000 | 17,734,631 | 17,718,947 | 16,329,195   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3135G05X7 | FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE A  | 8/25/2025  | 0.38   | 25,000,000 | 24,684,250 | 24,789,693 | 22,770,925   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3135G05X7 | FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE A  | 8/25/2025  | 0.38   | 72,500,000 | 71,862,000 | 72,076,868 | 66,035,683   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130A8ZQ9 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 9/12/2025  | 1.75   | 10,295,000 | 10,575,333 | 10,515,091 | 9,763,747    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3137EAEX3 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE   | 9/23/2025  | 0.38   | 22,600,000 | 22,295,352 | 22,395,315 | 20,535,128   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENEG1 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 11/17/2025 | 1.05   | 39,675,000 | 39,622,232 | 39,632,634 | 36,660,176   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENEG1 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 11/17/2025 | 1.05   | 55,000,000 | 54,923,000 | 54,938,179 | 50,820,660   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENHM5 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 12/16/2025 | 1.17   | 45,000,000 | 44,954,100 | 44,962,237 | 41,679,180   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENHM5 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 12/16/2025 | 1.17   | 50,000,000 | 49,949,000 | 49,958,041 | 46,310,200   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENJ35 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 2/25/2026  | 3.32   | 35,000,000 | 34,957,650 | 34,957,882 | 34,743,310   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMZ21 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 4/6/2026   | 0.69   | 15,500,000 | 15,458,150 | 15,467,696 | 14,027,206   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENUD0 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 4/8/2026   | 2.64   | 20,000,000 | 19,961,200 | 19,965,077 | 19,405,300   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENUD0 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 4/8/2026   | 2.64   | 30,000,000 | 29,947,800 | 29,947,616 | 29,107,950   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANNM8 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 7/13/2026  | 1.05   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 22,790,125   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANNM8 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 7/13/2026  | 1.05   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 22,790,125   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANNM8 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 7/13/2026  | 1.05   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 22,790,125   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANNM8 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 7/13/2026  | 1.05   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 22,790,125   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANMP2 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 7/27/2026  | 1.07   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 22,788,125   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANMP2 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 7/27/2026  | 1.07   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 22,788,125   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANMP2 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 7/27/2026  | 1.07   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 22,788,125   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANMP2 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 7/27/2026  | 1.07   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 22,788,125   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANTG5 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 8/10/2026  | 1.05   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 22,752,950   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANTG5 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 8/10/2026  | 1.05   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 22,752,950   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANTG5 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 8/10/2026  | 1.05   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 22,752,950   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANTG5 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 8/10/2026  | 1.05   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 22,752,950   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AP6T7 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 9/3/2026   | 1.08   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 22,742,625   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AP6T7 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 9/3/2026   | 1.08   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 22,742,625   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AP6T7 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 9/3/2026   | 1.08   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 22,742,625   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AP6T7 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 9/3/2026   | 1.08   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 22,742,625   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130APPR0 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 10/19/2026 | 1.43   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 22,992,950   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130APPR0 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 10/19/2026 | 1.43   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 22,992,950   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130APPR0 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 10/19/2026 | 1.43   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 22,992,950   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130APPR0 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 10/19/2026 | 1.43   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 22,992,950   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQ7L1 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 11/16/2026 | 1.61   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 23,113,025   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQ7L1 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 11/16/2026 | 1.61   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 23,113,025   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQ7L1 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 11/16/2026 | 1.61   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 23,113,025   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQ7L1 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 11/16/2026 | 1.61   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 23,113,025   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQJ95 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 12/14/2026 | 1.65   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 23,110,525   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQJ95 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 12/14/2026 | 1.65   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 23,110,525   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQJ95 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 12/14/2026 | 1.65   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 23,110,525   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQJ95 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 12/14/2026 | 1.65   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 23,110,525   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARB59 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 3/8/2027   | 2.35   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 23,616,625   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARB59 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 3/8/2027   | 2.35   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 23,616,625   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARB59 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 3/8/2027   | 2.35   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 23,616,625   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARB59 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS      | 3/8/2027   | 2.35   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 23,616,625   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENRD4 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 3/10/2027  | 1.68   | 48,573,000 | 47,445,621 | 47,537,968 | 45,066,029   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENTS9 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 4/5/2027   | 2.60   | 22,500,000 | 22,393,963 | 22,401,068 | 21,734,775   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENTS9 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU | 4/5/2027   | 2.60   | 24,500,000 | 24,378,779 | 24,386,984 | 23,666,755   |

# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment   | CUSIP     | Issuer Name                         | Maturity   |  | Coupon      | Par Value               | Book Value              | Amortized               |                         |
|----------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|------------|--|-------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
|                      |           |                                     | Date       |  |             |                         |                         | Book Value              | Market Value            |
| Federal Agencies     | 3133ENTS9 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU        | 4/5/2027   |  | 2.60        | 25,000,000              | 24,805,806              | 24,819,895              | 24,149,750              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3130ASGU7 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS             | 6/11/2027  |  | 3.50        | 10,000,000              | 10,173,583              | 10,138,018              | 10,049,790              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3130ASGU7 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS             | 6/11/2027  |  | 3.50        | 12,375,000              | 12,592,532              | 12,548,453              | 12,436,615              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3130ASGU7 | FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS             | 6/11/2027  |  | 3.50        | 21,725,000              | 22,088,363              | 22,009,534              | 21,833,169              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3133ENZK9 | FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANKS FU        | 6/28/2027  |  | 3.24        | 27,865,000              | 28,121,637              | 28,091,852              | 27,684,992              |
| <b>Subtotals</b>     |           |                                     |            |  | <b>1.23</b> | <b>\$ 5,330,594,000</b> | <b>\$ 5,334,482,276</b> | <b>\$ 5,331,153,479</b> | <b>\$ 5,121,921,121</b> |
| Public Time Deposits | PPE4E8VT6 | Bank of San Francisco               | 9/19/2022  |  | 0.81        | \$ 10,000,000           | \$ 10,000,000           | \$ 10,000,000           | \$ 10,000,000           |
| Public Time Deposits | PPEEE5T97 | Bridge Bank                         | 9/19/2022  |  | 0.81        | 10,000,000              | 10,000,000              | 10,000,000              | 10,000,000              |
| Public Time Deposits | PPFT6Q6D2 | Bank of San Francisco               | 12/5/2022  |  | 1.64        | 10,000,000              | 10,000,000              | 10,000,000              | 10,000,000              |
| Public Time Deposits | PPFR6ZB99 | Bridge Bank                         | 12/19/2022 |  | 2.39        | 10,000,000              | 10,000,000              | 10,000,000              | 10,000,000              |
| <b>Subtotals</b>     |           |                                     |            |  | <b>1.41</b> | <b>\$ 40,000,000</b>    | <b>\$ 40,000,000</b>    | <b>\$ 40,000,000</b>    | <b>\$ 40,000,000</b>    |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CSP3 | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch   | 9/12/2022  |  | 0.82        | \$ 50,000,000           | \$ 50,000,000           | \$ 50,000,000           | \$ 49,974,050           |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78012U3V5 | Royal Bank of Canada New York Bran  | 9/12/2022  |  | 0.85        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,974,550              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78012U4G7 | Royal Bank of Canada New York Bran  | 9/22/2022  |  | 1.42        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,969,650              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78012U4H5 | Royal Bank of Canada New York Bran  | 9/26/2022  |  | 1.44        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,964,300              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78012UW84 | Royal Bank of Canada New York Bran  | 9/26/2022  |  | 0.28        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,922,850              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CTT4 | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch   | 9/28/2022  |  | 1.42        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,960,550              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 65602YF47 | Norinchukin Bank - New York Branch  | 10/20/2022 |  | 2.50        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,990,850              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78012UW68 | Royal Bank of Canada New York Bran  | 10/24/2022 |  | 0.30        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,823,050              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 89114WU52 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Br | 10/24/2022 |  | 1.50        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,911,950              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 96130ALC0 | Westpac Banking Corporation - New Y | 10/24/2022 |  | 0.30        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,823,050              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78012U2E4 | Royal Bank of Canada New York Bran  | 12/2/2022  |  | 0.48        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,666,400              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 89114WM36 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Br | 12/2/2022  |  | 0.48        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,666,400              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CPS0 | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch   | 12/7/2022  |  | 0.52        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,652,050              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 89114WP58 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Br | 12/30/2022 |  | 0.57        | 10,000,000              | 10,000,000              | 10,000,000              | 9,909,830               |
| Negotiable CDs       | 89114WP58 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Br | 12/30/2022 |  | 0.57        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,549,150              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 89114WWV3 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Br | 1/4/2023   |  | 2.26        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,815,300              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CTW7 | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch   | 1/13/2023  |  | 1.92        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,727,550              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 89114WU94 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Br | 1/13/2023  |  | 1.92        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,727,550              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CUZ8 | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch   | 1/18/2023  |  | 2.28        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,780,650              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 89114WWX9 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Br | 1/24/2023  |  | 2.36        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,779,050              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78012U5C5 | Royal Bank of Canada New York Bran  | 1/27/2023  |  | 2.00        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,696,700              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CSR9 | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch   | 1/30/2023  |  | 1.18        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,517,150              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 89114WQL2 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Br | 1/30/2023  |  | 0.95        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,469,650              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CSM0 | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch   | 2/13/2023  |  | 1.35        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,495,850              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 89114WRW7 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Br | 2/13/2023  |  | 1.35        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,495,850              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 89114WUU7 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Br | 2/27/2023  |  | 2.16        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,635,200              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 89114WUU7 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Br | 2/27/2023  |  | 2.16        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,635,200              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CV46 | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch   | 3/27/2023  |  | 2.60        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,672,950              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78012U5Z4 | Royal Bank of Canada New York Bran  | 3/27/2023  |  | 2.58        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,667,850              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78012U6W0 | Royal Bank of Canada New York Bran  | 6/15/2023  |  | 3.71        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,901,200              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78012U7H2 | Royal Bank of Canada New York Bran  | 6/15/2023  |  | 3.68        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,890,750              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 89115B3A6 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Br | 6/15/2023  |  | 3.60        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,861,000              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 89115B3A6 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Br | 6/15/2023  |  | 3.60        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,861,000              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CX51 | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch   | 6/30/2023  |  | 3.92        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,972,400              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 89115BAW0 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Br | 6/30/2023  |  | 3.90        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,963,950              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CWT0 | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch   | 7/3/2023   |  | 3.75        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,899,000              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CXA0 | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch   | 7/3/2023   |  | 3.84        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,938,400              |



# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment  | CUSIP     | Issuer Name                          | Maturity   | Coupon      | Par Value                | Book Value               | Amortized                | Market Value             |
|---------------------|-----------|--------------------------------------|------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|                     |           |                                      | Date       |             |                          |                          | Book Value               |                          |
| Negotiable CDs      | 06417MB87 | Bank of Nova Scotia - Houston Branch | 7/3/2023   | 3.73        | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 49,894,200               |
| Negotiable CDs      | 78015J3N5 | Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch | 7/3/2023   | 3.73        | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 49,890,800               |
| Negotiable CDs      | 78015JAJ6 | Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch | 7/3/2023   | 4.02        | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,014,300               |
| <b>Subtotals</b>    |           |                                      |            | <b>2.08</b> | <b>\$ 1,960,000,000</b>  | <b>\$ 1,960,000,000</b>  | <b>\$ 1,960,000,000</b>  | <b>\$ 1,951,962,180</b>  |
| Commercial Paper    | 03785EJ62 | Apple Inc.                           | 9/6/2022   | 0.00        | \$ 40,000,000            | \$ 39,841,333            | \$ 39,993,333            | \$ 39,984,440            |
| Commercial Paper    | 62479MJE4 | MUFG Bank - New York Branch          | 9/14/2022  | 0.00        | 40,000,000               | 39,774,222               | 39,976,889               | 39,958,600               |
| Commercial Paper    | 62479MKC6 | MUFG Bank - New York Branch          | 10/12/2022 | 0.00        | 50,000,000               | 49,639,111               | 49,867,889               | 49,836,650               |
| Commercial Paper    | 89233HKL7 | Toyota Motor Credit Corporation      | 10/20/2022 | 0.00        | 50,000,000               | 49,611,597               | 49,840,069               | 49,821,550               |
| Commercial Paper    | 62479MKM4 | MUFG Bank - New York Branch          | 10/21/2022 | 0.00        | 50,000,000               | 49,629,500               | 49,828,472               | 49,798,450               |
| Commercial Paper    | 89233HKM5 | Toyota Motor Credit Corporation      | 10/21/2022 | 0.00        | 50,000,000               | 49,610,111               | 49,831,944               | 49,817,500               |
| Commercial Paper    | 62479MKS1 | MUFG Bank - New York Branch          | 10/26/2022 | 0.00        | 50,000,000               | 49,588,264               | 49,812,847               | 49,776,800               |
| Commercial Paper    | 89233HL28 | Toyota Motor Credit Corporation      | 11/2/2022  | 0.00        | 50,000,000               | 49,586,667               | 49,786,444               | 49,768,900               |
| Commercial Paper    | 89233HL77 | Toyota Motor Credit Corporation      | 11/7/2022  | 0.00        | 50,000,000               | 49,571,167               | 49,768,292               | 49,748,650               |
| <b>Subtotals</b>    |           |                                      |            | <b>0.00</b> | <b>\$ 430,000,000</b>    | <b>\$ 426,851,972</b>    | <b>\$ 428,706,181</b>    | <b>\$ 428,511,540</b>    |
| Money Market Funds  | 09248U718 | BLKRK LQ:T-FUND INSTL                | 9/1/2022   | 2.10        | \$ 11,653,218            | \$ 11,653,218            | \$ 11,653,218            | \$ 11,653,218            |
| Money Market Funds  | 262006208 | DREYFUS GVT CSH MGT INST             | 9/1/2022   | 2.11        | 268,716,907              | 268,716,907              | 268,716,907              | 268,716,907              |
| Money Market Funds  | 31607A703 | FIDELITY IMM:GOVT INSTL              | 9/1/2022   | 2.20        | 11,407,935               | 11,407,935               | 11,407,935               | 11,407,935               |
| Money Market Funds  | 608919718 | FEDERATED HRMS GV O PRMR             | 9/1/2022   | 2.19        | 371,838,497              | 371,838,497              | 371,838,497              | 371,838,497              |
| Money Market Funds  | 61747C707 | MORG STAN I LQ:GV I                  | 9/1/2022   | 2.13        | 11,235,562               | 11,235,562               | 11,235,562               | 11,235,562               |
| Money Market Funds  | 85749T517 | SS INST INV:US GV MM OPP             | 9/1/2022   | 2.26        | 401,894,613              | 401,894,613              | 401,894,613              | 401,894,613              |
| <b>Subtotals</b>    |           |                                      |            | <b>2.19</b> | <b>\$ 1,076,746,731</b>  | <b>\$ 1,076,746,731</b>  | <b>\$ 1,076,746,731</b>  | <b>\$ 1,076,746,731</b>  |
| Supranationals      | 459058ES8 | INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECON         | 10/7/2022  | 1.88        | \$ 64,387,000            | \$ 65,187,330            | \$ 64,484,667            | \$ 64,328,923            |
| Supranationals      | 459058JV6 | INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECON         | 4/20/2023  | 0.13        | 100,000,000              | 99,793,000               | 99,934,497               | 97,950,300               |
| Supranationals      | 4581X0CC0 | INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT E         | 10/4/2023  | 3.00        | 25,756,000               | 26,837,752               | 26,410,312               | 25,588,097               |
| Supranationals      | 45906M3B5 | INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECON         | 6/14/2024  | 1.98        | 100,000,000              | 100,000,000              | 100,000,000              | 97,296,000               |
| Supranationals      | 4581X0EE4 | INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT E         | 7/1/2024   | 3.25        | 30,000,000               | 29,997,000               | 29,997,254               | 29,844,000               |
| Supranationals      | 4581X0EE4 | INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT E         | 7/1/2024   | 3.25        | 50,000,000               | 49,995,000               | 49,995,424               | 49,740,000               |
| Supranationals      | 459056HV2 | INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECON         | 8/28/2024  | 1.50        | 50,000,000               | 50,984,250               | 50,694,708               | 48,044,550               |
| Supranationals      | 4581X0DZ8 | INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT E         | 9/23/2024  | 0.50        | 50,000,000               | 49,595,500               | 49,711,017               | 47,004,100               |
| Supranationals      | 45950VQG4 | INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORP           | 9/23/2024  | 0.44        | 10,000,000               | 9,918,700                | 9,942,625                | 9,311,830                |
| Supranationals      | 4581X0CM8 | INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT E         | 1/15/2025  | 2.13        | 100,000,000              | 105,676,000              | 103,618,450              | 96,762,300               |
| Supranationals      | 459058JB0 | INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECON         | 4/22/2025  | 0.63        | 40,000,000               | 40,086,000               | 40,060,558               | 37,047,360               |
| Supranationals      | 4581X0DN5 | INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT E         | 7/15/2025  | 0.63        | 28,900,000               | 28,519,098               | 28,604,745               | 26,582,249               |
| Supranationals      | 45818WDG8 | INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT E         | 2/27/2026  | 0.82        | 19,500,000               | 19,556,907               | 19,544,054               | 17,538,866               |
| <b>Subtotals</b>    |           |                                      |            | <b>1.58</b> | <b>\$ 668,543,000</b>    | <b>\$ 676,146,538</b>    | <b>\$ 672,998,312</b>    | <b>\$ 647,038,574</b>    |
| <b>Grand Totals</b> |           |                                      |            | <b>1.29</b> | <b>\$ 13,830,883,731</b> | <b>\$ 13,844,570,271</b> | <b>\$ 13,832,462,682</b> | <b>\$ 13,343,136,924</b> |

# Monthly Investment Earnings

## Pooled Fund

For month ended August 31, 2022

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name                              | Par Value | Coupon | YTM <sup>1</sup> | Settle Date | Maturity Date | Earned Interest | Amort. Expense | Realized Gain/(Loss) | Earned Income /Net Earnings |
|--------------------|-----------|------------------------------------------|-----------|--------|------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912796M89 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0      | 1.1318           | 4/7/22      | 10/6/22       | 0               | 47,792         | 0                    | 47,792                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912796P94 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0      | 0.2527           | 12/13/21    | 12/1/22       | 0               | 10,712         | 0.00                 | 10,712                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912796U56 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0      | 0.9954           | 3/29/22     | 9/22/22       | 0               | 42,065         | 0                    | 42,065                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912796U64 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0      | 1.0703           | 3/31/22     | 9/29/22       | 0               | 45,208         | 0                    | 45,208                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912796V63 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0      | 1.2754           | 4/21/22     | 10/20/22      | 0               | 53,819         | 0.00                 | 53,819                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 9128285Z9 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 2.5    | 0.3304           | 10/4/21     | 1/31/24       | 105,299         | -91,712        | 0.00                 | 13,587                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828B66 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 2.75   | 2.4706           | 4/11/22     | 2/15/24       | 116,696         | -11,481        | 0                    | 105,214                     |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828G38 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 2.25   | 0.5199           | 3/9/21      | 11/15/24      | 94,769          | -72,728        | 0                    | 22,041                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828G38 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 2.25   | 0.4798           | 3/12/21     | 11/15/24      | 94,769          | -74,467        | 0                    | 20,302                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828R36 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 1.625  | 0.8077           | 8/27/21     | 5/15/26       | 68,444          | -34,036        | 0                    | 34,409                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828R36 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 1.625  | 0.6941           | 7/23/21     | 5/15/26       | 68,444          | -38,871        | 0                    | 29,573                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828S35 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 1.375  | 0.2459           | 6/24/21     | 6/30/23       | 57,914          | -47,960        | 0                    | 9,954                       |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828S35 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 1.375  | 1.6051           | 1/9/20      | 6/30/23       | 57,914          | 9,645          | 0.00                 | 67,560                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828S92 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 1.25   | 0.2029           | 4/1/21      | 7/31/23       | 52,649          | -44,467        | 0                    | 8,182                       |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828S92 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 1.25   | 0.2046           | 4/1/21      | 7/31/23       | 52,649          | -44,396        | 0.00                 | 8,253                       |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828TY6 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 1.625  | 0.1255           | 4/8/21      | 11/15/22      | 68,444          | -63,543        | 0.00                 | 4,901                       |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828WE6 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 2.75   | 1.7265           | 12/17/19    | 11/15/23      | 115,829         | -42,540        | 0                    | 73,289                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828XB1 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 2.125  | 0.5683           | 9/2/21      | 5/15/25       | 89,504          | -65,387        | 0.00                 | 24,117                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828XT2 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 2      | 0.4302           | 7/6/21      | 5/31/24       | 84,699          | -66,202        | 0.00                 | 18,498                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828Y87 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 1.75   | 0.4178           | 3/30/21     | 7/31/24       | 73,709          | -56,226        | 0.00                 | 17,484                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828YA2 | United States Department of The Treasury | 0         | 1.5    | 1.5              | 3/30/21     | 8/15/22       | 58,011          | -53,818        | 0                    | 4,193                       |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828YM6 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 1.5    | 0.5059           | 4/15/21     | 10/31/24      | 63,179          | -41,798        | 0.00                 | 21,381                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828YY0 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 1.75   | 0.5654           | 3/15/21     | 12/31/24      | 73,709          | -49,765        | 0.00                 | 23,945                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828Z52 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 1.375  | 0.5773           | 3/30/21     | 1/31/25       | 57,914          | -33,489        | 0                    | 24,426                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828Z52 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 1.375  | 0.5723           | 4/15/21     | 1/31/25       | 57,914          | -33,700        | 0                    | 24,214                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828Z86 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 1.375  | 0.1396           | 8/17/21     | 2/15/23       | 58,348          | -52,356        | 0.00                 | 5,992                       |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828Z86 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 1.375  | 1.0249           | 3/3/22      | 2/15/23       | 58,348          | -14,746        | 0                    | 43,602                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZC7 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 1.125  | 0.6083           | 3/15/21     | 2/28/25       | 47,410          | -21,690        | 0                    | 25,720                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZC7 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 1.125  | 0.6095           | 3/31/21     | 2/28/25       | 47,410          | -21,636        | 0                    | 25,774                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZD5 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0.5    | 0.1627           | 3/18/21     | 3/15/23       | 21,060          | -14,325        | 0                    | 6,735                       |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZF0 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0.5    | 0.582            | 4/19/21     | 3/31/25       | 21,175          | 3,443          | 0                    | 24,618                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZF0 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0.5    | 0.6127           | 4/15/21     | 3/31/25       | 21,175          | 4,732          | 0.00                 | 25,906                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZL7 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0.375  | 0.5719           | 5/18/21     | 4/30/25       | 15,795          | 8,266          | 0                    | 24,061                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZU7 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0.25   | 0.252            | 6/24/21     | 6/15/23       | 10,587          | 84             | 0                    | 10,671                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZU7 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0.25   | 0.1838           | 4/8/21      | 6/15/23       | 10,587          | -2,807         | 0.00                 | 7,780                       |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZU7 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0.25   | 0.1912           | 3/12/21     | 6/15/23       | 10,587          | -2,495         | 0.00                 | 8,092                       |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0.25   | 0.6999           | 3/9/21      | 6/30/25       | 10,530          | 18,849         | 0.00                 | 29,379                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0.25   | 0.6499           | 5/13/21     | 6/30/25       | 10,530          | 16,772         | 0.00                 | 27,302                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0.25   | 0.6014           | 7/12/21     | 6/30/25       | 10,530          | 14,750         | 0                    | 25,280                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0.25   | 0.6015           | 5/12/21     | 6/30/25       | 10,530          | 14,756         | 0.00                 | 25,286                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0.25   | 1.035            | 12/7/21     | 6/30/25       | 10,530          | 32,670         | 0                    | 43,200                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0.25   | 0.6165           | 5/18/21     | 6/30/25       | 10,530          | 15,378         | 0.00                 | 25,908                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0.25   | 0.5087           | 8/5/21      | 6/30/25       | 10,530          | 10,877         | 0                    | 21,407                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0.25   | 0.6534           | 3/8/21      | 6/30/25       | 10,530          | 16,915         | 0.00                 | 27,445                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0.25   | 0.5577           | 8/6/21      | 6/30/25       | 10,530          | 12,926         | 0                    | 23,456                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAB7 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0.25   | 0.5731           | 8/6/21      | 7/31/25       | 10,530          | 13,566         | 0.00                 | 24,096                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAB7 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0.25   | 0.5241           | 8/5/21      | 7/31/25       | 10,530          | 11,519         | 0.00                 | 22,049                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAG6 | United States Department of The Treasury | 0         | 0.125  | 0.125            | 3/30/21     | 8/31/22       | 5,095           | -1,129         | 0                    | 3,966                       |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAK7 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0.125  | 0.2334           | 8/10/21     | 9/15/23       | 5,265           | 4,584          | 0.00                 | 9,849                       |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAM3 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0.25   | 0.6619           | 5/12/21     | 9/30/25       | 10,587          | 17,234         | 0                    | 27,822                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAM3 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0.25   | 0.5983           | 7/26/21     | 9/30/25       | 10,587          | 14,592         | 0                    | 25,179                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAT8 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0.25   | 0.5534           | 2/25/21     | 10/31/25      | 10,530          | 12,719         | 0                    | 23,249                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAT8 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000  | 0.25   | 0.6509           | 3/2/21      | 10/31/25      | 10,530          | 16,771         | 0                    | 27,301                      |

# Monthly Investment Earnings

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name                              | Par Value              | Coupon | YTM <sup>1</sup> | Settle Date | Maturity Date | Earned Interest     | Amort. Expense      | Realized Gain/(Loss) | Earned Income /Net Earnings |
|--------------------|-----------|------------------------------------------|------------------------|--------|------------------|-------------|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAT8 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.25   | 0.6643           | 3/4/21      | 10/31/25      | 10,530              | 17,325              | 0.00                 | 27,854                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBA8 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.125  | 0.2951           | 3/19/21     | 12/15/23      | 5,294               | 7,198               | 0.00                 | 12,492                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBA8 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.125  | 0.6864           | 12/15/21    | 12/15/23      | 5,294               | 23,638              | 0.00                 | 28,932                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBA8 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.125  | 0.7231           | 12/9/21     | 12/15/23      | 5,294               | 25,173              | 0.00                 | 30,467                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBC4 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.375  | 0.603            | 2/25/21     | 12/31/25      | 15,795              | 9,544               | 0                    | 25,339                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBC4 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.375  | 0.6805           | 2/26/21     | 12/31/25      | 15,795              | 12,767              | 0                    | 28,561                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBR1 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.25   | 1.5538           | 3/8/22      | 3/15/24       | 10,530              | 54,230              | 0.00                 | 64,760                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBU4 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.125  | 0.1537           | 5/4/21      | 3/31/23       | 5,294               | 1,218               | 0                    | 6,512                       |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBW0 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.75   | 0.8639           | 7/2/21      | 4/30/26       | 31,590              | 4,739               | 0                    | 36,329                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBW0 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.75   | 0.8926           | 6/28/21     | 4/30/26       | 31,590              | 5,928               | 0                    | 37,518                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCC3 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.25   | 0.4471           | 7/2/21      | 5/15/24       | 10,530              | 8,319               | 0.00                 | 18,849                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.875  | 1.3228           | 1/4/22      | 6/30/26       | 36,855              | 18,408              | 0.00                 | 55,263                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.875  | 0.7398           | 7/22/21     | 6/30/26       | 36,855              | -5,639              | 0                    | 31,216                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.875  | 0.9018           | 9/24/21     | 6/30/26       | 36,855              | 1,114               | 0.00                 | 37,968                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.875  | 0.903            | 7/2/21      | 6/30/26       | 36,855              | 1,162               | 0                    | 38,016                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.875  | 0.7749           | 8/10/21     | 6/30/26       | 36,855              | -4,172              | 0.00                 | 32,682                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.875  | 0.8461           | 7/14/21     | 6/30/26       | 36,855              | -1,203              | 0                    | 35,652                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.875  | 1.0519           | 10/14/21    | 6/30/26       | 36,855              | 7,322               | 0                    | 44,177                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.875  | 0.7063           | 8/6/21      | 6/30/26       | 36,855              | -7,040              | 0.00                 | 29,815                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.875  | 0.7326           | 7/22/21     | 6/30/26       | 36,855              | -5,941              | 0.00                 | 30,914                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCK5 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.125  | 0.2597           | 6/30/21     | 6/30/23       | 5,265               | 5,723               | 0.00                 | 10,988                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCL3 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.375  | 2.6013           | 4/12/22     | 7/15/24       | 15,795              | 91,224              | 0.00                 | 107,019                     |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCL3 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.375  | 0.3763           | 8/6/21      | 7/15/24       | 15,795              | 56                  | 0.00                 | 15,851                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCL3 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.375  | 0.4018           | 8/9/21      | 7/15/24       | 15,795              | 1,131               | 0.00                 | 16,925                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCT6 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.375  | 0.4437           | 8/25/21     | 8/15/24       | 15,913              | 2,899               | 0.00                 | 18,812                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCW9 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.75   | 0.9795           | 9/28/21     | 8/31/26       | 31,607              | 9,496               | 0.00                 | 41,103                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCZ2 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.875  | 1.0103           | 10/8/21     | 9/30/26       | 37,056              | 5,595               | 0.00                 | 42,651                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCZ2 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.875  | 1.003            | 10/8/21     | 9/30/26       | 37,056              | 5,295               | 0.00                 | 42,351                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCZ2 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.875  | 1.1589           | 10/19/21    | 9/30/26       | 37,056              | 11,694              | 0.00                 | 48,750                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDK4 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 1.25   | 1.2013           | 12/7/21     | 11/30/26      | 52,937              | -1,997              | 0.00                 | 50,940                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDK4 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 1.25   | 1.22             | 12/3/21     | 11/30/26      | 52,937              | -1,229              | 0.00                 | 51,708                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDK4 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 1.25   | 2.5854           | 3/29/22     | 11/30/26      | 52,937              | 53,063              | 0.00                 | 106,000                     |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDQ1 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 1.25   | 2.5489           | 3/29/22     | 12/31/26      | 52,649              | 51,594              | 0.00                 | 104,243                     |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDV0 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.875  | 2.4625           | 4/11/22     | 1/31/24       | 36,855              | 65,501              | 0                    | 102,355                     |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDV0 | United States Department of The Treasury | 50000000               | 0.875  | 1.5159           | 2/23/22     | 1/31/24       | 36,855              | 26,719              | 0.00                 | 63,574                      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CEF4 | United States Department of The Treasury | 25000000               | 2.5    | 2.7091           | 4/6/22      | 3/31/27       | 52,937              | 4,125               | 0                    | 57,062                      |
| <b>Subtotals</b>   |           |                                          | <b>\$4,325,000,000</b> |        |                  |             |               | <b>\$ 3,032,039</b> | <b>\$ (122,147)</b> | <b>\$ -</b>          | <b>\$ 2,909,892</b>         |

|                  |           |                         |               |      |      |          |         |           |            |      |           |
|------------------|-----------|-------------------------|---------------|------|------|----------|---------|-----------|------------|------|-----------|
| Federal Agencies | 3130A1XJ2 | Federal Home Loan Banks | \$ 15,955,000 | 2.88 | 2.71 | 5/18/22  | 6/14/24 | \$ 38,226 | \$ (2,186) | \$ - | \$ 36,040 |
| Federal Agencies | 3130A1XJ2 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 17,980,000    | 2.88 | 2.70 | 5/18/22  | 6/14/24 | 43,077    | (2,610)    | -    | 40,467    |
| Federal Agencies | 3130A1XJ2 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,500,000    | 2.88 | 2.77 | 5/12/22  | 6/14/24 | 61,094    | (2,131)    | -    | 58,962    |
| Federal Agencies | 3130A1XJ2 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 50,000,000    | 2.88 | 2.67 | 5/16/22  | 6/14/24 | 119,792   | (8,321)    | -    | 111,471   |
| Federal Agencies | 3130A3VC5 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 10,000,000    | 2.25 | 0.73 | 12/10/21 | 12/8/23 | 18,750    | (12,817)   | -    | 5,933     |
| Federal Agencies | 3130A3VC5 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 30,000,000    | 2.25 | 0.73 | 12/10/21 | 12/8/23 | 56,250    | (38,452)   | -    | 17,798    |
| Federal Agencies | 3130A8ZQ9 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 10,295,000    | 1.75 | 1.03 | 11/2/21  | 9/12/25 | 15,014    | (6,163)    | -    | 8,850     |
| Federal Agencies | 3130AFW94 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 39,010,000    | 2.50 | 0.62 | 11/12/21 | 2/13/24 | 81,271    | (61,729)   | -    | 19,542    |
| Federal Agencies | 3130AJXD6 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 20,975,000    | 0.13 | 0.59 | 12/14/21 | 9/8/23  | 2,185     | 8,259      | -    | 10,444    |
| Federal Agencies | 3130AMRY0 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 15,000,000    | 0.13 | 0.17 | 6/4/21   | 6/2/23  | 1,563     | 588        | -    | 2,150     |
| Federal Agencies | 3130AN4A5 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 17,680,000    | 0.70 | 0.62 | 7/12/21  | 6/30/25 | 10,313    | (1,169)    | -    | 9,145     |
| Federal Agencies | 3130ANMP2 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000    | 1.07 | 1.07 | 8/20/21  | 7/27/26 | 22,292    | -          | -    | 22,292    |
| Federal Agencies | 3130ANMP2 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000    | 1.07 | 1.07 | 8/20/21  | 7/27/26 | 22,292    | -          | -    | 22,292    |
| Federal Agencies | 3130ANMP2 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000    | 1.07 | 1.07 | 8/20/21  | 7/27/26 | 22,292    | -          | -    | 22,292    |
| Federal Agencies | 3130ANNM8 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000    | 1.05 | 1.05 | 8/19/21  | 7/13/26 | 21,875    | -          | -    | 21,875    |

# Monthly Investment Earnings

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name             | Par Value  | Coupon | YTM <sup>1</sup> | Settle Date | Maturity Date | Earned Interest | Amort. Expense | Realized Gain/(Loss) | Earned Income /Net Earnings |
|--------------------|-----------|-------------------------|------------|--------|------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANNM8 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 1.05   | 1.05             | 8/19/21     | 7/13/26       | 21,875          | -              | -                    | 21,875                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANNM8 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 1.05   | 1.05             | 8/19/21     | 7/13/26       | 21,875          | -              | -                    | 21,875                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANNM8 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 1.05   | 1.05             | 8/19/21     | 7/13/26       | 21,875          | -              | -                    | 21,875                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANTG5 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 1.05   | 1.05             | 9/13/21     | 8/10/26       | 21,875          | -              | -                    | 21,875                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANTG5 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 1.05   | 1.05             | 9/13/21     | 8/10/26       | 21,875          | -              | -                    | 21,875                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANTG5 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 1.05   | 1.05             | 9/13/21     | 8/10/26       | 21,875          | -              | -                    | 21,875                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANTG5 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 1.05   | 1.05             | 9/13/21     | 8/10/26       | 21,875          | -              | -                    | 21,875                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AP6T7 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 1.08   | 1.07             | 10/1/21     | 9/3/26        | 22,396          | -              | -                    | 22,396                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AP6T7 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 1.08   | 1.07             | 10/1/21     | 9/3/26        | 22,396          | -              | -                    | 22,396                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AP6T7 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 1.08   | 1.07             | 10/1/21     | 9/3/26        | 22,396          | -              | -                    | 22,396                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AP6T7 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 1.08   | 1.07             | 10/1/21     | 9/3/26        | 22,396          | -              | -                    | 22,396                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130APPR0 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 1.43   | 1.43             | 11/18/21    | 10/19/26      | 29,792          | -              | -                    | 29,792                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130APPR0 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 1.43   | 1.43             | 11/18/21    | 10/19/26      | 29,792          | -              | -                    | 29,792                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130APPR0 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 1.43   | 1.43             | 11/18/21    | 10/19/26      | 29,792          | -              | -                    | 29,792                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130APPR0 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 1.43   | 1.43             | 11/18/21    | 10/19/26      | 29,792          | -              | -                    | 29,792                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQ7L1 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 1.61   | 1.61             | 12/16/21    | 11/16/26      | 33,438          | -              | -                    | 33,438                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQ7L1 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 1.61   | 1.61             | 12/16/21    | 11/16/26      | 33,438          | -              | -                    | 33,438                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQ7L1 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 1.61   | 1.61             | 12/16/21    | 11/16/26      | 33,438          | -              | -                    | 33,438                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQ7L1 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 1.61   | 1.61             | 12/16/21    | 11/16/26      | 33,438          | -              | -                    | 33,438                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQJ95 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 1.65   | 1.65             | 1/14/22     | 12/14/26      | 34,271          | -              | -                    | 34,271                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQJ95 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 1.65   | 1.65             | 1/14/22     | 12/14/26      | 34,271          | -              | -                    | 34,271                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQJ95 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 1.65   | 1.65             | 1/14/22     | 12/14/26      | 34,271          | -              | -                    | 34,271                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQJ95 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 1.65   | 1.65             | 1/14/22     | 12/14/26      | 34,271          | -              | -                    | 34,271                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARB59 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 2.35   | 2.35             | 3/22/22     | 3/8/27        | 48,958          | -              | -                    | 48,958                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARB59 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 2.35   | 2.35             | 3/22/22     | 3/8/27        | 48,958          | -              | -                    | 48,958                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARB59 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 2.35   | 2.35             | 3/22/22     | 3/8/27        | 48,958          | -              | -                    | 48,958                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARB59 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 2.35   | 2.35             | 3/22/22     | 3/8/27        | 48,958          | -              | -                    | 48,958                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARHG9 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 11,000,000 | 2.13   | 2.18             | 3/25/22     | 2/28/24       | 19,479          | 551            | -                    | 20,031                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARHG9 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 2.13   | 2.18             | 3/25/22     | 2/28/24       | 44,271          | 1,253          | -                    | 45,524                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASG86 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 11,940,000 | 3.38   | 3.19             | 8/4/22      | 6/13/25       | 30,223          | (1,614)        | -                    | 28,609                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASG86 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 12,700,000 | 3.38   | 3.07             | 8/3/22      | 6/13/25       | 33,338          | (2,943)        | -                    | 30,395                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASGU7 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 10,000,000 | 3.50   | 3.19             | 7/19/22     | 6/11/27       | 29,167          | (2,453)        | -                    | 26,713                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASGU7 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 12,375,000 | 3.50   | 3.18             | 7/19/22     | 6/11/27       | 36,094          | (3,083)        | -                    | 33,011                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASGU7 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 21,725,000 | 3.50   | 3.20             | 7/20/22     | 6/11/27       | 63,365          | (5,058)        | -                    | 58,307                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASHK8 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 28,000,000 | 3.13   | 3.31             | 7/22/22     | 6/14/24       | 72,917          | 4,271          | -                    | 77,188                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASHK8 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 28,210,000 | 3.13   | 3.31             | 7/22/22     | 6/14/24       | 73,464          | 4,253          | -                    | 77,716                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASME6 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 10,000,000 | 3.00   | 3.10             | 7/8/22      | 7/8/24        | 25,000          | 823            | -                    | 25,823                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASME6 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 15,000,000 | 3.00   | 3.10             | 7/8/22      | 7/8/24        | 37,500          | 1,234          | -                    | 38,734                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASME6 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 17,500,000 | 3.00   | 3.10             | 7/8/22      | 7/8/24        | 43,750          | 1,440          | -                    | 45,190                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133827H0 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 44,400,000 | 2.14   | 1.08             | 3/7/22      | 2/6/23        | 79,180          | (39,367)       | -                    | 39,813                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 313383YJ4 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 3.38   | 3.12             | 7/27/22     | 9/8/23        | 70,313          | (5,319)        | -                    | 64,994                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 313383YJ4 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 25,000,000 | 3.38   | 3.11             | 7/27/22     | 9/8/23        | 70,313          | (5,452)        | -                    | 64,861                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 313383YJ4 | Federal Home Loan Banks | 40,000,000 | 3.38   | 3.14             | 7/28/22     | 9/8/23        | 112,500         | (7,769)        | -                    | 104,731                     |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385A55 | Federal Home Loan Banks | -          | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/2/22      | 8/3/22        | -               | 848            | -                    | 848                         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385A55 | Federal Home Loan Banks | -          | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/2/22      | 8/3/22        | -               | 1,993          | -                    | 1,993                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385A63 | Federal Home Loan Banks | -          | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/3/22      | 8/4/22        | -               | 1,424          | -                    | 1,424                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385C20 | Federal Home Loan Banks | -          | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/15/22     | 8/16/22       | -               | 2,062          | -                    | 2,062                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385C38 | Federal Home Loan Banks | -          | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/16/22     | 8/17/22       | -               | 883            | -                    | 883                         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385C46 | Federal Home Loan Banks | -          | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/17/22     | 8/18/22       | -               | 1,767          | -                    | 1,767                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385C46 | Federal Home Loan Banks | -          | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/17/22     | 8/18/22       | -               | 2,062          | -                    | 2,062                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385C53 | Federal Home Loan Banks | -          | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/18/22     | 8/19/22       | -               | 589            | -                    | 589                         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385C53 | Federal Home Loan Banks | -          | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/18/22     | 8/19/22       | -               | 2,944          | -                    | 2,944                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D29 | Federal Home Loan Banks | -          | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/23/22     | 8/24/22       | -               | 1,472          | -                    | 1,472                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D29 | Federal Home Loan Banks | -          | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/23/22     | 8/24/22       | -               | 1,472          | -                    | 1,472                       |



# Monthly Investment Earnings

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name                              | Par Value   | Coupon | YTM <sup>1</sup> | Settle Date | Maturity Date | Earned Interest | Amort. Expense | Realized Gain/(Loss) | Earned Income /Net Earnings |
|--------------------|-----------|------------------------------------------|-------------|--------|------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D29 | Federal Home Loan Banks                  | -           | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/23/22     | 8/24/22       | -               | 1,472          | -                    | 1,472                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D29 | Federal Home Loan Banks                  | -           | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/23/22     | 8/24/22       | -               | 1,472          | -                    | 1,472                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D37 | Federal Home Loan Banks                  | -           | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/24/22     | 8/25/22       | -               | 2,958          | -                    | 2,958                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D37 | Federal Home Loan Banks                  | -           | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/24/22     | 8/25/22       | -               | 2,958          | -                    | 2,958                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D37 | Federal Home Loan Banks                  | -           | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/24/22     | 8/25/22       | -               | 2,959          | -                    | 2,959                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D45 | Federal Home Loan Banks                  | -           | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/25/22     | 8/26/22       | -               | 3,014          | -                    | 3,014                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D45 | Federal Home Loan Banks                  | -           | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/25/22     | 8/26/22       | -               | 3,014          | -                    | 3,014                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D45 | Federal Home Loan Banks                  | -           | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/25/22     | 8/26/22       | -               | 3,014          | -                    | 3,014                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D78 | Federal Home Loan Banks                  | -           | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/26/22     | 8/29/22       | -               | 9,042          | -                    | 9,042                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D78 | Federal Home Loan Banks                  | -           | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/26/22     | 8/29/22       | -               | 9,042          | -                    | 9,042                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D78 | Federal Home Loan Banks                  | -           | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/26/22     | 8/29/22       | -               | 922            | -                    | 922                         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D78 | Federal Home Loan Banks                  | -           | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/26/22     | 8/29/22       | -               | 9,042          | -                    | 9,042                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D86 | Federal Home Loan Banks                  | -           | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/29/22     | 8/30/22       | -               | 2,873          | -                    | 2,873                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D86 | Federal Home Loan Banks                  | -           | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/29/22     | 8/30/22       | -               | 2,986          | -                    | 2,986                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D86 | Federal Home Loan Banks                  | -           | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/29/22     | 8/30/22       | -               | 2,986          | -                    | 2,986                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D86 | Federal Home Loan Banks                  | -           | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/29/22     | 8/30/22       | -               | 2,986          | -                    | 2,986                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D94 | Federal Home Loan Banks                  | -           | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/30/22     | 8/31/22       | -               | 3,014          | -                    | 3,014                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D94 | Federal Home Loan Banks                  | -           | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/30/22     | 8/31/22       | -               | 3,014          | -                    | 3,014                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D94 | Federal Home Loan Banks                  | -           | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/30/22     | 8/31/22       | -               | 3,014          | -                    | 3,014                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385D94 | Federal Home Loan Banks                  | -           | 0.00   | 0.00             | 8/30/22     | 8/31/22       | -               | 3,014          | -                    | 3,014                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385E28 | Federal Home Loan Banks                  | 50,000,000  | 0.00   | 2.17             | 8/31/22     | 9/1/22        | -               | 3,000          | -                    | 3,000                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385E28 | Federal Home Loan Banks                  | 50,000,000  | 0.00   | 2.17             | 8/31/22     | 9/1/22        | -               | 3,000          | -                    | 3,000                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385E28 | Federal Home Loan Banks                  | 50,000,000  | 0.00   | 2.17             | 8/31/22     | 9/1/22        | -               | 3,000          | -                    | 3,000                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385E28 | Federal Home Loan Banks                  | 50,000,000  | 0.00   | 2.17             | 8/31/22     | 9/1/22        | -               | 3,000          | -                    | 3,000                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 313385F92 | Federal Home Loan Banks                  | 25,000,000  | 0.00   | 1.13             | 5/10/22     | 9/16/22       | -               | 24,111         | -                    | 24,111                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EHZP1 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 25,000,000  | 1.85   | 0.70             | 3/18/20     | 9/20/22       | 38,542          | (24,325)       | -                    | 14,217                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ELCP7 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 25,000,000  | 1.63   | 1.66             | 12/3/19     | 12/3/24       | 33,854          | 679            | -                    | 34,533                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ELJH8 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 10,140,000  | 1.60   | 0.75             | 3/25/20     | 1/23/23       | 13,520          | (7,320)        | -                    | 6,200                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ELNE0 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 20,495,000  | 1.43   | 0.85             | 3/18/20     | 2/14/24       | 24,423          | (9,891)        | -                    | 14,533                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ELQY3 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 16,000,000  | 1.21   | 1.22             | 3/23/20     | 3/3/25        | 16,133          | 159            | -                    | 16,293                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ELQY3 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 24,000,000  | 1.21   | 1.24             | 3/23/20     | 3/3/25        | 24,200          | 614            | -                    | 24,814                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ELVL5 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 40,000,000  | 0.70   | 0.71             | 4/3/20      | 10/3/22       | 23,333          | 340            | -                    | 23,673                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EM2E1 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000  | 0.16   | 0.19             | 8/10/21     | 8/10/23       | 6,667           | 1,274          | -                    | 7,941                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EM3S9 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 48,067,000  | 0.20   | 0.53             | 12/14/21    | 6/26/23       | 8,011           | 13,355         | -                    | 21,366                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EM3S9 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000  | 0.20   | 0.22             | 8/26/21     | 6/26/23       | 8,333           | 932            | -                    | 9,265                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EM5X6 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 25,000,000  | 0.43   | 0.46             | 9/23/21     | 9/23/24       | 8,958           | 714            | -                    | 9,673                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EM5X6 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000  | 0.43   | 0.46             | 9/23/21     | 9/23/24       | 17,917          | 1,428          | -                    | 19,345                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EM5X6 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000  | 0.43   | 0.46             | 9/23/21     | 9/23/24       | 17,917          | 1,428          | -                    | 19,345                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EM6N7 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000  | 0.17   | 0.22             | 9/27/21     | 9/27/23       | 7,083           | 2,123          | -                    | 9,207                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMF31 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 100,000,000 | 0.13   | 0.16             | 6/2/21      | 6/2/23        | 10,417          | 2,633          | -                    | 13,050                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMH96 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000  | 0.13   | 0.26             | 6/28/21     | 6/14/23       | 5,208           | 5,851          | -                    | 11,060                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMPH9 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 45,500,000  | 0.13   | 1.10             | 3/3/22      | 2/3/23        | 4,740           | 37,134         | -                    | 41,874                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMRZ7 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 5,000,000   | 0.25   | 0.26             | 2/26/21     | 2/26/24       | 1,042           | 51             | -                    | 1,093                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMRZ7 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 5,000,000   | 0.25   | 0.26             | 2/26/21     | 2/26/24       | 1,042           | 51             | -                    | 1,093                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMRZ7 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 100,000,000 | 0.25   | 0.26             | 2/26/21     | 2/26/24       | 20,833          | 1,019          | -                    | 21,853                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMS37 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000  | 0.13   | 0.20             | 7/14/21     | 7/14/23       | 5,208           | 3,066          | -                    | 8,275                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMS37 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000  | 0.13   | 0.22             | 7/14/21     | 7/14/23       | 5,208           | 3,939          | -                    | 9,147                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMS45 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000  | 0.11   | 0.12             | 7/14/21     | 12/14/22      | 4,583           | 425            | -                    | 5,008                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMTW2 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000  | 0.30   | 0.34             | 3/18/21     | 3/18/24       | 12,500          | 1,711          | -                    | 14,211                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMTW2 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000  | 0.30   | 0.34             | 3/18/21     | 3/18/24       | 12,500          | 1,713          | -                    | 14,213                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMUH3 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 65,000,000  | 0.13   | 0.16             | 3/31/21     | 3/23/23       | 6,771           | 1,926          | -                    | 8,697                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMV25 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000  | 0.45   | 0.39             | 8/6/21      | 7/23/24       | 18,750          | (2,636)        | -                    | 16,114                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMVP4 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 20,000,000  | 0.13   | 0.19             | 4/13/21     | 4/13/23       | 2,083           | 1,121          | -                    | 3,204                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMVP4 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 25,000,000  | 0.13   | 0.19             | 4/13/21     | 4/13/23       | 2,604           | 1,401          | -                    | 4,006                       |

# Monthly Investment Earnings

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name                              | Par Value  | Coupon | YTM <sup>1</sup> | Settle Date | Maturity Date | Earned Interest | Amort. Expense | Realized Gain/(Loss) | Earned Income /Net Earnings |
|--------------------|-----------|------------------------------------------|------------|--------|------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMVP4 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000 | 0.13   | 0.19             | 4/13/21     | 4/13/23       | 5,208           | 2,803          | -                    | 8,011                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMWK4 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 60,000,000 | 0.14   | 0.15             | 5/18/21     | 1/19/23       | 7,000           | 639            | -                    | 7,639                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMWT5 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000 | 0.60   | 0.61             | 4/21/21     | 4/21/25       | 25,000          | 562            | -                    | 25,562                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMWV0 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 16,545,000 | 0.35   | 0.34             | 5/4/21      | 4/22/24       | 4,826           | (132)          | -                    | 4,693                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMWV0 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 29,424,000 | 0.35   | 0.34             | 5/4/21      | 4/22/24       | 8,582           | (236)          | -                    | 8,346                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMWV0 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 39,000,000 | 0.35   | 0.34             | 5/4/21      | 4/22/24       | 11,375          | (312)          | -                    | 11,063                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMXM9 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 44,500,000 | 0.13   | 0.17             | 5/5/21      | 4/27/23       | 4,635           | 1,622          | -                    | 6,257                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMYX4 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 12,500,000 | 0.13   | 0.19             | 5/10/21     | 5/10/23       | 1,302           | 679            | -                    | 1,982                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMYX4 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 25,000,000 | 0.13   | 0.19             | 5/10/21     | 5/10/23       | 2,604           | 1,359          | -                    | 3,963                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMYX4 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 75,000,000 | 0.13   | 0.19             | 5/10/21     | 5/10/23       | 7,813           | 4,077          | -                    | 11,889                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMZ21 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 15,500,000 | 0.69   | 0.75             | 8/9/21      | 4/6/26        | 8,913           | 763            | -                    | 9,675                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENDQ0 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000 | 0.16   | 0.32             | 11/12/21    | 2/10/23       | 6,667           | 6,828          | -                    | 13,494                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENEG1 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 39,675,000 | 1.05   | 1.08             | 11/17/21    | 11/17/25      | 34,716          | 1,120          | -                    | 35,835                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENEG1 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 55,000,000 | 1.05   | 1.09             | 11/17/21    | 11/17/25      | 48,125          | 1,634          | -                    | 49,759                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENEJ5 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 10,000,000 | 0.88   | 0.91             | 11/18/21    | 11/18/24      | 7,292           | 325            | -                    | 7,617                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENEJ5 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 10,000,000 | 0.88   | 0.91             | 11/18/21    | 11/18/24      | 7,292           | 325            | -                    | 7,617                       |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENEJ5 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000 | 0.88   | 0.91             | 11/18/21    | 11/18/24      | 36,458          | 1,626          | -                    | 38,085                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENEY2 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000 | 0.45   | 0.45             | 11/24/21    | 7/24/23       | 18,750          | 179            | -                    | 18,929                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENG1  | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 25,000,000 | 0.50   | 0.57             | 12/3/21     | 12/1/23       | 10,417          | 1,544          | -                    | 11,960                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENG1  | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 25,000,000 | 0.50   | 0.57             | 12/3/21     | 12/1/23       | 10,417          | 1,544          | -                    | 11,960                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENG1  | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 75,000,000 | 0.50   | 0.57             | 12/3/21     | 12/1/23       | 31,250          | 4,631          | -                    | 35,881                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENGQ7 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000 | 0.92   | 0.95             | 12/9/21     | 12/9/24       | 38,333          | 1,047          | -                    | 39,380                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENGQ7 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000 | 0.92   | 0.93             | 12/9/21     | 12/9/24       | 38,333          | 424            | -                    | 38,758                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENHM5 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 45,000,000 | 1.17   | 1.20             | 12/16/21    | 12/16/25      | 43,875          | 974            | -                    | 44,849                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENHM5 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000 | 1.17   | 1.20             | 12/16/21    | 12/16/25      | 48,750          | 1,082          | -                    | 49,832                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENHR4 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 25,000,000 | 0.68   | 0.70             | 12/20/21    | 12/20/23      | 14,167          | 527            | -                    | 14,693                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENHR4 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 25,000,000 | 0.68   | 0.70             | 12/20/21    | 12/20/23      | 14,167          | 510            | -                    | 14,676                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENHR4 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 62,000,000 | 0.68   | 0.70             | 12/20/21    | 12/20/23      | 35,133          | 1,253          | -                    | 36,387                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENJ35 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 35,000,000 | 3.32   | 3.36             | 8/25/22     | 2/25/26       | 19,367          | 232            | -                    | 19,598                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENJ84 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000 | 3.38   | 3.46             | 8/26/22     | 8/26/24       | 23,438          | 685            | -                    | 24,123                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENKS8 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 20,000,000 | 1.13   | 1.20             | 1/11/22     | 1/6/25        | 18,750          | 1,279          | -                    | 20,029                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENKS8 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 25,000,000 | 1.13   | 1.20             | 1/11/22     | 1/6/25        | 23,438          | 1,598          | -                    | 25,036                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENKS8 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 25,000,000 | 1.13   | 1.20             | 1/11/22     | 1/6/25        | 23,438          | 1,598          | -                    | 25,036                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENLF5 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 11,856,000 | 0.90   | 1.44             | 3/3/22      | 1/18/24       | 8,892           | 5,296          | -                    | 14,188                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENLF5 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000 | 0.90   | 1.21             | 2/1/22      | 1/18/24       | 37,500          | 12,946         | -                    | 50,446                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENRD4 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 48,573,000 | 1.68   | 2.18             | 3/16/22     | 3/10/27       | 68,002          | 19,434         | -                    | 87,436                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENTS9 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 22,500,000 | 2.60   | 2.70             | 4/6/22      | 4/5/27        | 48,750          | 1,829          | -                    | 50,579                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENTS9 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 24,500,000 | 2.60   | 2.71             | 4/6/22      | 4/5/27        | 53,083          | 2,089          | -                    | 55,172                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENTS9 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 25,000,000 | 2.60   | 2.77             | 4/6/22      | 4/5/27        | 54,167          | 3,329          | -                    | 57,496                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENUD0 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 20,000,000 | 2.64   | 2.69             | 4/8/22      | 4/8/26        | 44,000          | 823            | -                    | 44,823                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENUD0 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 30,000,000 | 2.64   | 2.69             | 4/8/22      | 4/8/26        | 66,000          | 1,235          | -                    | 67,235                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENWP1 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 45,000,000 | 2.63   | 2.69             | 5/16/22     | 5/16/24       | 98,438          | 2,576          | -                    | 101,014                     |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENWP1 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000 | 2.63   | 2.69             | 5/16/22     | 5/16/24       | 109,375         | 2,863          | -                    | 112,238                     |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENXE5 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 6,000,000  | 2.85   | 2.90             | 5/23/22     | 5/23/25       | 14,250          | 238            | -                    | 14,488                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENXE5 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 20,000,000 | 2.85   | 2.90             | 5/23/22     | 5/23/25       | 47,500          | 792            | -                    | 48,292                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENYH7 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000 | 2.63   | 2.69             | 6/10/22     | 6/10/24       | 109,375         | 2,735          | -                    | 112,110                     |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENYH7 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000 | 2.63   | 2.69             | 6/10/22     | 6/10/24       | 109,375         | 2,735          | -                    | 112,110                     |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENYQ7 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000 | 2.95   | 2.97             | 6/13/22     | 6/13/25       | 122,917         | 693            | -                    | 123,610                     |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENYX2 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 25,000,000 | 3.25   | 3.31             | 6/17/22     | 6/17/24       | 67,708          | 1,251          | -                    | 68,959                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENYX2 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 25,000,000 | 3.25   | 3.31             | 6/17/22     | 6/17/24       | 67,708          | 1,240          | -                    | 68,949                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENYX2 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 50,000,000 | 3.25   | 3.28             | 6/17/22     | 6/17/24       | 135,417         | 1,272          | -                    | 136,689                     |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENZK9 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 27,865,000 | 3.24   | 3.06             | 7/7/22      | 6/28/27       | 75,236          | (3,993)        | -                    | 71,242                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENZS2 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 25,000,000 | 3.10   | 3.13             | 6/28/22     | 6/28/24       | 64,583          | 573            | -                    | 65,156                      |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENZS2 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpoi | 25,000,000 | 3.10   | 3.13             | 6/28/22     | 6/28/24       | 64,583          | 530            | -                    | 65,113                      |

# Monthly Investment Earnings

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment   | CUSIP     | Issuer Name                              | Par Value               | Coupon | YTM <sup>1</sup> | Settle Date | Maturity Date | Earned Interest     | Amort. Expense   | Realized Gain/(Loss) | Earned Income /Net Earnings |
|----------------------|-----------|------------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------|------------------|-------------|---------------|---------------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Federal Agencies     | 3133ENZS2 | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding Corpor | 50,000,000              | 3.10   | 3.13             | 6/28/22     | 6/28/24       | 129,167             | 1,145            | -                    | 130,312                     |
| Federal Agencies     | 3135G03U5 | Federal National Mortgage Association    | 37,938,000              | 0.63   | 1.08             | 12/8/21     | 4/22/25       | 19,759              | 14,359           | -                    | 34,119                      |
| Federal Agencies     | 3135G03U5 | Federal National Mortgage Association    | 50,000,000              | 0.63   | 1.08             | 12/8/21     | 4/22/25       | 26,042              | 19,039           | -                    | 45,081                      |
| Federal Agencies     | 3135G03U5 | Federal National Mortgage Association    | 50,000,000              | 0.63   | 0.57             | 7/12/21     | 4/22/25       | 26,042              | (2,426)          | -                    | 23,616                      |
| Federal Agencies     | 3135G04Z3 | Federal National Mortgage Association    | 4,655,000               | 0.50   | 1.11             | 12/8/21     | 6/17/25       | 1,940               | 2,369            | -                    | 4,309                       |
| Federal Agencies     | 3135G04Z3 | Federal National Mortgage Association    | 10,000,000              | 0.50   | 1.11             | 12/8/21     | 6/17/25       | 4,167               | 5,068            | -                    | 9,235                       |
| Federal Agencies     | 3135G05X7 | Federal National Mortgage Association    | 25,000,000              | 0.38   | 0.66             | 3/4/21      | 8/25/25       | 7,813               | 5,987            | -                    | 13,799                      |
| Federal Agencies     | 3135G05X7 | Federal National Mortgage Association    | 72,500,000              | 0.38   | 0.57             | 2/25/21     | 8/25/25       | 22,656              | 12,045           | -                    | 34,701                      |
| Federal Agencies     | 3135G0U43 | Federal National Mortgage Association    | 29,648,000              | 2.88   | 0.66             | 12/9/21     | 9/12/23       | 71,032              | (55,303)         | -                    | 15,729                      |
| Federal Agencies     | 3135G0X24 | Federal National Mortgage Association    | 39,060,000              | 1.63   | 0.53             | 4/21/21     | 1/7/25        | 52,894              | (35,924)         | -                    | 16,969                      |
| Federal Agencies     | 3137EAEP0 | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation   | 5,000,000               | 1.50   | 1.52             | 2/14/20     | 2/12/25       | 6,250               | 65               | -                    | 6,315                       |
| Federal Agencies     | 3137EAEP0 | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation   | 5,000,000               | 1.50   | 1.52             | 2/14/20     | 2/12/25       | 6,250               | 65               | -                    | 6,315                       |
| Federal Agencies     | 3137EAEP0 | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation   | 5,000,000               | 1.50   | 1.52             | 2/14/20     | 2/12/25       | 6,250               | 65               | -                    | 6,315                       |
| Federal Agencies     | 3137EAEP0 | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation   | 15,000,000              | 1.50   | 1.52             | 2/14/20     | 2/12/25       | 18,750              | 196              | -                    | 18,946                      |
| Federal Agencies     | 3137EAEP0 | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation   | 50,000,000              | 1.50   | 1.52             | 2/14/20     | 2/12/25       | 62,500              | 654              | -                    | 63,154                      |
| Federal Agencies     | 3137EAEP0 | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation   | 53,532,000              | 1.50   | 0.55             | 4/21/21     | 2/12/25       | 66,915              | (42,685)         | -                    | 24,230                      |
| Federal Agencies     | 3137EAEP0 | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation   | 40,776,000              | 0.25   | 0.58             | 12/6/21     | 8/24/23       | 8,495               | 11,550           | -                    | 20,045                      |
| Federal Agencies     | 3137EAEX3 | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation   | 22,600,000              | 0.38   | 0.67             | 3/4/21      | 9/23/25       | 7,063               | 5,676            | -                    | 12,738                      |
| <b>Subtotals</b>     |           |                                          | <b>\$ 5,330,594,000</b> |        |                  |             |               | <b>\$ 5,241,037</b> | <b>\$ 26,593</b> | <b>\$ -</b>          | <b>\$ 5,267,630</b>         |
| Public Time Deposits | PPE4E8VT6 | Bank of San Francisco                    | \$ 10,000,000           | 0.81   | 0.81             | 3/21/22     | 9/19/22       | \$ 6,975            | \$ -             | \$ -                 | \$ 6,975                    |
| Public Time Deposits | PPEEE5T97 | Bridge Bank                              | 10,000,000              | 0.81   | 0.81             | 3/21/22     | 9/19/22       | 6,879               | -                | -                    | 6,879                       |
| Public Time Deposits | PPFR6ZB99 | Bridge Bank                              | 10,000,000              | 2.39   | 2.39             | 6/20/22     | 12/19/22      | 20,299              | -                | -                    | 20,299                      |
| Public Time Deposits | PPFT6Q6D2 | Bank of San Francisco                    | 10,000,000              | 1.64   | 1.64             | 6/6/22      | 12/5/22       | 14,122              | -                | -                    | 14,122                      |
| <b>Subtotals</b>     |           |                                          | <b>\$ 40,000,000</b>    |        |                  |             |               | <b>\$ 48,275</b>    | <b>\$ -</b>      | <b>\$ -</b>          | <b>\$ 48,275</b>            |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CPS0 | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch        | \$ 50,000,000           | 0.52   | 0.52             | 12/8/21     | 12/7/22       | \$ 22,389           | \$ -             | \$ -                 | \$ 22,389                   |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CSM0 | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch        | 50,000,000              | 1.35   | 1.35             | 2/28/22     | 2/13/23       | 58,125              | -                | -                    | 58,125                      |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CSP3 | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch        | 50,000,000              | 0.82   | 0.82             | 2/28/22     | 9/12/22       | 35,306              | -                | -                    | 35,306                      |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CSR9 | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch        | 50,000,000              | 1.18   | 1.18             | 3/1/22      | 1/30/23       | 50,806              | -                | -                    | 50,806                      |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CST5 | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch        | -                       | 0.83   | 0.83             | 3/2/22      | 8/29/22       | 32,278              | -                | -                    | 32,278                      |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CTT4 | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch        | 50,000,000              | 1.42   | 1.42             | 4/4/22      | 9/28/22       | 61,139              | -                | -                    | 61,139                      |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CTW7 | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch        | 50,000,000              | 1.92   | 1.92             | 4/6/22      | 1/13/23       | 82,667              | -                | -                    | 82,667                      |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CTZ0 | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch        | -                       | 1.17   | 1.17             | 4/11/22     | 8/17/22       | 26,000              | -                | -                    | 26,000                      |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CUZ8 | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch        | 50,000,000              | 2.28   | 2.28             | 5/12/22     | 1/18/23       | 98,167              | -                | -                    | 98,167                      |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CV46 | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch        | 50,000,000              | 2.60   | 2.60             | 5/17/22     | 3/27/23       | 111,944             | -                | -                    | 111,944                     |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CWT0 | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch        | 50,000,000              | 3.75   | 3.75             | 7/12/22     | 7/3/23        | 161,458             | -                | -                    | 161,458                     |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CX51 | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch        | 50,000,000              | 3.92   | 3.92             | 7/21/22     | 6/30/23       | 168,778             | -                | -                    | 168,778                     |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CXA0 | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch        | 50,000,000              | 3.84   | 3.84             | 7/27/22     | 7/3/23        | 165,333             | -                | -                    | 165,333                     |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CXR3 | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch        | 50,000,000              | 4.23   | 4.23             | 9/1/22      | 8/28/23       | -                   | -                | -                    | -                           |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06417MB87 | Bank of Nova Scotia - Houston Branch     | 50,000,000              | 3.73   | 3.73             | 8/1/22      | 7/3/23        | 160,597             | -                | -                    | 160,597                     |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06417MSJ5 | Bank of Nova Scotia - Houston Branch     | -                       | 0.24   | 0.24             | 11/2/21     | 8/1/22        | (0)                 | -                | -                    | (0)                         |
| Negotiable CDs       | 65602YF47 | Norinchukin Bank - New York Branch       | 50,000,000              | 2.50   | 2.50             | 7/11/22     | 10/20/22      | 107,639             | -                | -                    | 107,639                     |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78012U2E4 | Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch     | 50,000,000              | 0.48   | 0.48             | 12/2/21     | 12/2/22       | 20,667              | -                | -                    | 20,667                      |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78012U3T0 | Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch     | -                       | 0.80   | 0.80             | 2/28/22     | 8/29/22       | 31,111              | -                | -                    | 31,111                      |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78012U3V5 | Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch     | 50,000,000              | 0.85   | 0.85             | 3/1/22      | 9/12/22       | 36,597              | -                | -                    | 36,597                      |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78012U4G7 | Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch     | 50,000,000              | 1.42   | 1.42             | 3/15/22     | 9/22/22       | 61,139              | -                | -                    | 61,139                      |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78012U4H5 | Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch     | 50,000,000              | 1.44   | 1.44             | 3/15/22     | 9/26/22       | 62,000              | -                | -                    | 62,000                      |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78012U5C5 | Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch     | 50,000,000              | 2.00   | 2.00             | 4/14/22     | 1/27/23       | 86,111              | -                | -                    | 86,111                      |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78012U5Z4 | Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch     | 50,000,000              | 2.58   | 2.58             | 5/24/22     | 3/27/23       | 111,083             | -                | -                    | 111,083                     |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78012U6W0 | Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch     | 50,000,000              | 3.71   | 3.71             | 6/21/22     | 6/15/23       | 159,736             | -                | -                    | 159,736                     |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78012U7H2 | Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch     | 50,000,000              | 3.68   | 3.68             | 6/28/22     | 6/15/23       | 158,444             | -                | -                    | 158,444                     |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78012UW68 | Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch     | 50,000,000              | 0.30   | 0.30             | 10/25/21    | 10/24/22      | 12,917              | -                | -                    | 12,917                      |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78012UW84 | Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch     | 50,000,000              | 0.28   | 0.28             | 10/26/21    | 9/26/22       | 12,056              | -                | -                    | 12,056                      |



# Monthly Investment Earnings

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name                                  | Par Value               | Coupon | YTM <sup>1</sup> | Settle Date | Maturity Date | Earned Interest     | Amort. Expense    | Realized Gain/(Loss) | Earned Income /Net Earnings |
|--------------------|-----------|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------|------------------|-------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Negotiable CDs     | 78015J3N5 | Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch         | 50,000,000              | 3.73   | 3.73             | 7/12/22     | 7/3/23        | 160,597             | -                 | -                    | 160,597                     |
| Negotiable CDs     | 78015JA6  | Royal Bank of Canada New York Branch         | 50,000,000              | 4.02   | 4.02             | 8/8/22      | 7/3/23        | 134,000             | -                 | -                    | 134,000                     |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89114WM36 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch      | 50,000,000              | 0.48   | 0.48             | 12/2/21     | 12/2/22       | 20,667              | -                 | -                    | 20,667                      |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89114WP58 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch      | 10,000,000              | 0.57   | 0.57             | 1/6/22      | 12/30/22      | 4,908               | -                 | -                    | 4,908                       |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89114WP58 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch      | 50,000,000              | 0.57   | 0.57             | 1/6/22      | 12/30/22      | 24,542              | -                 | -                    | 24,542                      |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89114WQL2 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch      | 50,000,000              | 0.95   | 0.95             | 2/3/22      | 1/30/23       | 40,903              | -                 | -                    | 40,903                      |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89114WRW7 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch      | 50,000,000              | 1.35   | 1.35             | 2/28/22     | 2/13/23       | 58,125              | -                 | -                    | 58,125                      |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89114WU52 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch      | 50,000,000              | 1.50   | 1.50             | 4/4/22      | 10/24/22      | 64,583              | -                 | -                    | 64,583                      |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89114WU94 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch      | 50,000,000              | 1.92   | 1.92             | 4/6/22      | 1/13/23       | 82,667              | -                 | -                    | 82,667                      |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89114WUU7 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch      | 50,000,000              | 2.16   | 2.16             | 4/12/22     | 2/27/23       | 93,000              | -                 | -                    | 93,000                      |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89114WUU7 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch      | 50,000,000              | 2.16   | 2.16             | 4/12/22     | 2/27/23       | 93,000              | -                 | -                    | 93,000                      |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89114WWV3 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch      | 50,000,000              | 2.26   | 2.26             | 5/9/22      | 1/4/23        | 97,306              | -                 | -                    | 97,306                      |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89114WWX9 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch      | 50,000,000              | 2.36   | 2.36             | 5/9/22      | 1/24/23       | 101,611             | -                 | -                    | 101,611                     |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115B3A6 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch      | 50,000,000              | 3.60   | 3.60             | 7/5/22      | 6/15/23       | 155,000             | -                 | -                    | 155,000                     |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115B3A6 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch      | 50,000,000              | 3.60   | 3.60             | 7/5/22      | 6/15/23       | 155,000             | -                 | -                    | 155,000                     |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115BAW0 | Toronto-Dominion Bank - New York Branch      | 50,000,000              | 3.90   | 3.90             | 7/19/22     | 6/30/23       | 167,917             | -                 | -                    | 167,917                     |
| Negotiable CDs     | 96130ALC0 | Westpac Banking Corporation - New York I     | 50,000,000              | 0.30   | 0.30             | 10/27/21    | 10/24/22      | 12,917              | -                 | -                    | 12,917                      |
| <b>Subtotals</b>   |           |                                              | <b>\$ 2,010,000,000</b> |        |                  |             |               | <b>\$ 3,561,228</b> | <b>\$ -</b>       | <b>\$ -</b>          | <b>\$ 3,561,228</b>         |
| Commercial Paper   | 03785EJ62 | Apple Inc.                                   | \$ 40,000,000           | 0.00   | 1.21             | 5/10/22     | 9/6/22        | \$ -                | \$ 41,333         | \$ -                 | \$ 41,333                   |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MH30 | MUFG Bank - New York Branch                  | -                       | 0.00   | 0.00             | 3/28/22     | 8/3/22        | -                   | 3,333             | -                    | 3,333                       |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MH55 | MUFG Bank - New York Branch                  | -                       | 0.00   | 0.00             | 4/6/22      | 8/5/22        | -                   | 6,333             | -                    | 6,333                       |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MHA4 | MUFG Bank - New York Branch                  | -                       | 0.00   | 0.00             | 7/25/22     | 8/10/22       | -                   | 26,375            | -                    | 26,375                      |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MHA4 | MUFG Bank - New York Branch                  | -                       | 0.00   | 0.00             | 7/22/22     | 8/10/22       | -                   | 25,000            | -                    | 25,000                      |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MHQ9 | MUFG Bank - New York Branch                  | -                       | 0.00   | 0.00             | 4/12/22     | 8/24/22       | -                   | 38,333            | -                    | 38,333                      |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MJE4 | MUFG Bank - New York Branch                  | 40,000,000              | 0.00   | 1.61             | 5/10/22     | 9/14/22       | -                   | 55,111            | -                    | 55,111                      |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MKC6 | MUFG Bank - New York Branch                  | 50,000,000              | 0.00   | 2.34             | 6/22/22     | 10/12/22      | -                   | 99,889            | -                    | 99,889                      |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MKM4 | MUFG Bank - New York Branch                  | 50,000,000              | 0.00   | 2.49             | 7/5/22      | 10/21/22      | -                   | 106,347           | -                    | 106,347                     |
| Commercial Paper   | 62479MKS1 | MUFG Bank - New York Branch                  | 50,000,000              | 0.00   | 2.48             | 6/27/22     | 10/26/22      | -                   | 105,486           | -                    | 105,486                     |
| Commercial Paper   | 89233HH15 | Toyota Motor Credit Corporation              | -                       | 0.00   | 0.00             | 11/4/21     | 8/1/22        | -                   | -                 | -                    | -                           |
| Commercial Paper   | 89233HKL7 | Toyota Motor Credit Corporation              | 50,000,000              | 0.00   | 2.37             | 6/23/22     | 10/20/22      | -                   | 101,181           | -                    | 101,181                     |
| Commercial Paper   | 89233HKM5 | Toyota Motor Credit Corporation              | 50,000,000              | 0.00   | 2.44             | 6/27/22     | 10/21/22      | -                   | 104,194           | -                    | 104,194                     |
| Commercial Paper   | 89233HL28 | Toyota Motor Credit Corporation              | 50,000,000              | 0.00   | 2.51             | 7/5/22      | 11/2/22       | -                   | 106,778           | -                    | 106,778                     |
| Commercial Paper   | 89233HL77 | Toyota Motor Credit Corporation              | 50,000,000              | 0.00   | 2.52             | 7/6/22      | 11/7/22       | -                   | 107,208           | -                    | 107,208                     |
| <b>Subtotals</b>   |           |                                              | <b>\$ 430,000,000</b>   |        |                  |             |               | <b>\$ -</b>         | <b>\$ 926,903</b> | <b>\$ -</b>          | <b>\$ 926,903</b>           |
| Money Market Funds | 09248U718 | BlackRock Liquidity Funds - T-Fund           | \$ 11,653,218           | 2.10   | 2.04             | 8/31/22     | 9/1/22        | \$ 19,863           | \$ -              | \$ -                 | \$ 19,863                   |
| Money Market Funds | 262006208 | Dreyfus Government Cash Management F         | 268,716,907             | 2.11   | 2.10             | 8/31/22     | 9/1/22        | 721,195             | -                 | -                    | 721,195                     |
| Money Market Funds | 31607A703 | Fidelity Colchester Street Trust - Governme  | 11,407,935              | 2.20   | 2.10             | 8/31/22     | 9/1/22        | 21,417              | -                 | -                    | 21,417                      |
| Money Market Funds | 608919718 | Money Market Obligations Trust - Federate    | 371,838,497             | 2.19   | 2.16             | 8/31/22     | 9/1/22        | 500,446             | -                 | -                    | 500,446                     |
| Money Market Funds | 61747C707 | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Funds | 11,235,562              | 2.13   | 2.12             | 8/31/22     | 9/1/22        | 47,670              | -                 | -                    | 47,670                      |
| Money Market Funds | 85749T517 | State Street Institutional U.S. Government   | 401,894,613             | 2.26   | 2.23             | 8/31/22     | 9/1/22        | 745,453             | -                 | -                    | 745,453                     |
| <b>Subtotals</b>   |           |                                              | <b>\$ 1,076,746,731</b> |        |                  |             |               | <b>\$ 2,056,044</b> | <b>\$ -</b>       | <b>\$ -</b>          | <b>\$ 2,056,044</b>         |

# Monthly Investment Earnings

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment  | CUSIP     | Issuer Name                                 | Par Value             | Coupon | YTM <sup>1</sup> | Settle Date | Maturity Date | Earned Interest      | Amort. Expense      | Realized Gain/(Loss) | Earned Income /Net Earnings |
|---------------------|-----------|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------|------------------|-------------|---------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Supranationals      | 45818WDG8 | Inter-American Development Bank             | \$ 19,500,000         | 0.82   | 0.75             | 8/25/21     | 2/27/26       | \$ 13,325            | \$ (1,071)          | \$ -                 | \$ 12,254                   |
| Supranationals      | 4581X0CC0 | Inter-American Development Bank             | 25,756,000            | 3.00   | 0.66             | 12/15/21    | 10/4/23       | 64,390               | (50,964)            | -                    | 13,426                      |
| Supranationals      | 4581X0CM8 | Inter-American Development Bank             | 100,000,000           | 2.13   | 0.58             | 4/26/21     | 1/15/25       | 177,083              | (129,379)           | -                    | 47,704                      |
| Supranationals      | 4581X0DN5 | Inter-American Development Bank             | 28,900,000            | 0.63   | 0.99             | 11/1/21     | 7/15/25       | 15,052               | 8,734               | -                    | 23,786                      |
| Supranationals      | 4581X0DZ8 | Inter-American Development Bank             | 50,000,000            | 0.50   | 0.78             | 11/4/21     | 9/23/24       | 20,833               | 11,897              | -                    | 32,730                      |
| Supranationals      | 4581X0EE4 | Inter-American Development Bank             | 30,000,000            | 3.25   | 3.26             | 7/1/22      | 7/1/24        | 81,250               | 127                 | -                    | 81,377                      |
| Supranationals      | 4581X0EE4 | Inter-American Development Bank             | 50,000,000            | 3.25   | 3.26             | 7/1/22      | 7/1/24        | 135,417              | 212                 | -                    | 135,629                     |
| Supranationals      | 459056HV2 | International Bank for Reconstruction and I | 50,000,000            | 1.50   | 0.79             | 11/2/21     | 8/28/24       | 62,500               | (29,623)            | -                    | 32,877                      |
| Supranationals      | 459058ES8 | International Bank for Reconstruction and I | 64,387,000            | 1.88   | 0.34             | 12/16/21    | 10/7/22       | 100,658              | (84,103)            | -                    | 16,556                      |
| Supranationals      | 459058JB0 | International Bank for Reconstruction and I | 40,000,000            | 0.63   | 0.57             | 7/23/21     | 4/22/25       | 20,867               | (1,947)             | -                    | 18,919                      |
| Supranationals      | 459058JV6 | International Bank for Reconstruction and I | 100,000,000           | 0.13   | 0.23             | 4/20/21     | 4/20/23       | 10,500               | 8,790               | -                    | 19,290                      |
| Supranationals      | 45906M3B5 | International Bank for Reconstruction and I | 100,000,000           | 1.98   | 1.98             | 3/23/22     | 6/14/24       | 165,000              | -                   | -                    | 165,000                     |
| Supranationals      | 45950VQG4 | International Finance Corporation           | 10,000,000            | 0.44   | 0.72             | 10/22/21    | 9/23/24       | 3,667                | 2,362               | -                    | 6,029                       |
| <b>Subtotals</b>    |           |                                             | <b>\$ 668,543,000</b> |        |                  |             |               | <b>\$ 870,542</b>    | <b>\$ (264,965)</b> | <b>\$ -</b>          | <b>\$ 605,577</b>           |
| <b>Grand Totals</b> |           |                                             | #####                 |        |                  |             |               | <b>\$ 14,809,165</b> | <b>\$ 566,384</b>   | <b>\$ -</b>          | <b>\$ 15,375,549</b>        |

<sup>1</sup> Yield to maturity is calculated at purchase

# Investment Transactions

## Pooled Fund

For month ended August 31, 2022

| Transaction      | Settle  | Maturity | Type of Investment | Issuer Name                           | CUSIP     | Par Value               | Coupon      | YTM         | Price           | Interest            | Transaction Amount        |
|------------------|---------|----------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Purchase         | 8/1/22  | 7/3/23   | Negotiable CDs     | Bank of Nova Scotia - Houston Bran    | 06417MB87 | \$ 50,000,000           | 3.73        | 3.84        | \$ 100.00       | \$ -                | \$ (50,000,000)           |
| Purchase         | 8/1/22  | 9/1/22   | Money Market Funds | Dreyfus Government Cash Manager       | 262006208 | 80,000,000              | 2.13        | 2.04        | 1.00            | -                   | (80,000,000)              |
| Purchase         | 8/1/22  | 9/1/22   | Money Market Funds | BlackRock Liquidity Funds - T-Fund    | 09248U718 | 14,579                  | 2.10        | 2.01        | 1.00            | -                   | (14,579)                  |
| Purchase         | 8/2/22  | 8/3/22   | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385A55 | 14,890,000              | 0.00        | 2.08        | 99.99           | -                   | (14,889,152)              |
| Purchase         | 8/2/22  | 8/3/22   | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385A55 | 35,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.08        | 99.99           | -                   | (34,998,007)              |
| Purchase         | 8/3/22  | 6/13/25  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 3130ASG86 | 12,700,000              | 3.38        | 3.12        | 100.84          | (57,150)            | (12,863,195)              |
| Purchase         | 8/3/22  | 8/4/22   | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385A63 | 25,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.08        | 99.99           | -                   | (24,998,576)              |
| Purchase         | 8/4/22  | 6/13/25  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 3130ASG86 | 11,940,000              | 3.38        | 3.14        | 100.50          | (54,849)            | (12,055,027)              |
| Purchase         | 8/4/22  | 9/1/22   | Money Market Funds | Money Market Obligations Trust - F    | 608919718 | 30,000,000              | 2.19        | 2.11        | 1.00            | -                   | (30,000,000)              |
| Purchase         | 8/8/22  | 7/3/23   | Negotiable CDs     | Royal Bank of Canada New York Br      | 78015JAJ6 | 50,000,000              | 4.02        | 3.76        | 100.00          | -                   | (50,000,000)              |
| Purchase         | 8/10/22 | 9/1/22   | Money Market Funds | Money Market Obligations Trust - F    | 608919718 | 80,000,000              | 2.19        | 2.12        | 1.00            | -                   | (80,000,000)              |
| Purchase         | 8/15/22 | 8/16/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385C20 | 35,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.19        | 99.99           | -                   | (34,997,939)              |
| Purchase         | 8/15/22 | 9/1/22   | Money Market Funds | Money Market Obligations Trust - F    | 608919718 | 10,000,000              | 2.19        | 2.12        | 1.00            | -                   | (10,000,000)              |
| Purchase         | 8/16/22 | 8/17/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385C38 | 15,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.19        | 99.99           | -                   | (14,999,117)              |
| Purchase         | 8/17/22 | 8/18/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385C46 | 30,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.12        | 99.99           | -                   | (29,998,233)              |
| Purchase         | 8/17/22 | 8/18/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385C46 | 35,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.12        | 99.99           | -                   | (34,997,939)              |
| Purchase         | 8/18/22 | 8/19/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385C53 | 10,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.15        | 99.99           | -                   | (9,999,411)               |
| Purchase         | 8/18/22 | 8/19/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385C53 | 50,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.15        | 99.99           | -                   | (49,997,056)              |
| Purchase         | 8/19/22 | 9/1/22   | Money Market Funds | Money Market Obligations Trust - F    | 608919718 | 25,000,000              | 2.19        | 2.15        | 1.00            | -                   | (25,000,000)              |
| Purchase         | 8/22/22 | 9/1/22   | Money Market Funds | Money Market Obligations Trust - F    | 608919718 | 50,000,000              | 2.19        | 2.14        | 1.00            | -                   | (50,000,000)              |
| Purchase         | 8/23/22 | 8/24/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385D29 | 25,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.23        | 99.99           | -                   | (24,998,528)              |
| Purchase         | 8/23/22 | 8/24/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385D29 | 25,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.23        | 99.99           | -                   | (24,998,528)              |
| Purchase         | 8/23/22 | 8/24/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385D29 | 25,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.23        | 99.99           | -                   | (24,998,528)              |
| Purchase         | 8/23/22 | 9/1/22   | Money Market Funds | Money Market Obligations Trust - F    | 608919718 | 10,000,000              | 2.19        | 2.14        | 1.00            | -                   | (10,000,000)              |
| Purchase         | 8/24/22 | 8/25/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385D37 | 50,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.23        | 99.99           | -                   | (49,997,042)              |
| Purchase         | 8/24/22 | 8/25/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385D37 | 50,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.23        | 99.99           | -                   | (49,997,042)              |
| Purchase         | 8/24/22 | 8/25/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385D37 | 50,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.23        | 99.99           | -                   | (49,997,042)              |
| Purchase         | 8/25/22 | 2/25/26  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding     | 3133ENJ35 | 35,000,000              | 3.32        | 3.36        | 99.88           | -                   | (34,957,650)              |
| Purchase         | 8/25/22 | 8/26/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385D45 | 50,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.23        | 99.99           | -                   | (49,996,986)              |
| Purchase         | 8/25/22 | 8/26/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385D45 | 50,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.23        | 99.99           | -                   | (49,996,986)              |
| Purchase         | 8/25/22 | 8/26/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385D45 | 50,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.23        | 99.99           | -                   | (49,996,986)              |
| Purchase         | 8/26/22 | 8/26/24  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding     | 3133ENJ84 | 50,000,000              | 3.38        | 3.46        | 99.83           | -                   | (49,916,500)              |
| Purchase         | 8/26/22 | 8/29/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385D78 | 50,000,000              | 0.00        | 0.74        | 99.98           | -                   | (49,990,958)              |
| Purchase         | 8/26/22 | 8/29/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385D78 | 50,000,000              | 0.00        | 0.74        | 99.98           | -                   | (49,990,958)              |
| Purchase         | 8/26/22 | 8/29/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385D78 | 5,100,000               | 0.00        | 0.74        | 99.98           | -                   | (5,099,078)               |
| Purchase         | 8/26/22 | 8/29/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385D78 | 50,000,000              | 0.00        | 0.74        | 99.98           | -                   | (49,990,958)              |
| Purchase         | 8/29/22 | 8/30/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385D86 | 48,100,000              | 0.00        | 2.23        | 99.99           | -                   | (48,097,127)              |
| Purchase         | 8/29/22 | 8/30/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385D86 | 50,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.23        | 99.99           | -                   | (49,997,014)              |
| Purchase         | 8/29/22 | 8/30/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385D86 | 50,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.23        | 99.99           | -                   | (49,997,014)              |
| Purchase         | 8/29/22 | 8/30/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385D86 | 50,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.23        | 99.99           | -                   | (49,997,014)              |
| Purchase         | 8/29/22 | 8/30/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385D86 | 50,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.23        | 99.99           | -                   | (49,996,986)              |
| Purchase         | 8/30/22 | 8/31/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385D94 | 50,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.23        | 99.99           | -                   | (49,996,986)              |
| Purchase         | 8/30/22 | 8/31/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385D94 | 50,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.23        | 99.99           | -                   | (49,996,986)              |
| Purchase         | 8/30/22 | 8/31/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385D94 | 50,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.23        | 99.99           | -                   | (49,996,986)              |
| Purchase         | 8/31/22 | 9/1/22   | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385E28 | 50,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.12        | 99.99           | -                   | (49,997,000)              |
| Purchase         | 8/31/22 | 9/1/22   | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385E28 | 50,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.12        | 99.99           | -                   | (49,997,000)              |
| Purchase         | 8/31/22 | 9/1/22   | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 313385E28 | 50,000,000              | 0.00        | 2.12        | 99.99           | -                   | (49,997,000)              |
| Purchase         | 8/31/22 | 9/1/22   | Money Market Funds | Fidelity Colchester Street Trust - Go | 31607A703 | 21,417                  | 2.20        | 2.10        | 1.00            | -                   | (21,417)                  |
| Purchase         | 8/31/22 | 9/1/22   | Money Market Funds | Money Market Obligations Trust - F    | 608919718 | 10,000,000              | 2.19        | 2.16        | 1.00            | -                   | (10,000,000)              |
| Purchase         | 8/31/22 | 9/1/22   | Money Market Funds | State Street Institutional U.S. Goven | 85749T517 | 745,453                 | 2.26        | 2.23        | 1.00            | -                   | (745,453)                 |
| <b>Subtotals</b> |         |          |                    |                                       |           | <b>\$ 1,908,511,449</b> | <b>0.73</b> | <b>2.21</b> | <b>\$ 84.65</b> | <b>\$ (111,999)</b> | <b>\$ (1,908,561,511)</b> |

# Investment Transactions

## Pooled Fund

| Transaction      | Settle  | Maturity | Type of Investment | Issuer Name                            | CUSIP     | Par Value                 | Coupon      | YTM         | Price            | Interest    | Transaction Amount      |
|------------------|---------|----------|--------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| Sale             | 8/1/22  | 9/1/22   | Money Market Funds | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity | 61747C707 | \$ (160,000,000)          | 2.13        | 2.04        | \$ 1.00          | \$ -        | \$ 160,000,000          |
| Sale             | 8/2/22  | 9/1/22   | Money Market Funds | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity | 61747C707 | (90,000,000)              | 2.13        | 2.06        | 1.00             | -           | 90,000,000              |
| Sale             | 8/5/22  | 9/1/22   | Money Market Funds | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity | 61747C707 | (38,000,000)              | 2.13        | 2.05        | 1.00             | -           | 38,000,000              |
| Sale             | 8/8/22  | 9/1/22   | Money Market Funds | Dreyfus Government Cash Manager        | 262006208 | (75,000,000)              | 2.13        | 2.08        | 1.00             | -           | 75,000,000              |
| Sale             | 8/9/22  | 9/1/22   | Money Market Funds | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity | 61747C707 | (13,000,000)              | 2.13        | 2.07        | 1.00             | -           | 13,000,000              |
| Sale             | 8/11/22 | 9/1/22   | Money Market Funds | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity | 61747C707 | (15,000,000)              | 2.13        | 2.08        | 1.00             | -           | 15,000,000              |
| Sale             | 8/12/22 | 9/1/22   | Money Market Funds | Fidelity Colchester Street Trust - Go  | 31607A703 | (3,000,000)               | 2.20        | 2.02        | 1.00             | -           | 3,000,000               |
| Sale             | 8/23/22 | 9/1/22   | Money Market Funds | Dreyfus Government Cash Manager        | 262006208 | (125,000,000)             | 2.13        | 2.05        | 1.00             | -           | 125,000,000             |
| Sale             | 8/24/22 | 9/1/22   | Money Market Funds | Dreyfus Government Cash Manager        | 262006208 | (5,000,000)               | 2.13        | 2.11        | 1.00             | -           | 5,000,000               |
| Sale             | 8/25/22 | 9/1/22   | Money Market Funds | Dreyfus Government Cash Manager        | 262006208 | (22,000,000)              | 2.13        | 2.09        | 1.00             | -           | 22,000,000              |
| Sale             | 8/26/22 | 9/1/22   | Money Market Funds | Dreyfus Government Cash Manager        | 262006208 | (15,000,000)              | 2.13        | 2.11        | 1.00             | -           | 15,000,000              |
| <b>Subtotals</b> |         |          |                    |                                        |           | <b>\$ (561,000,000)</b>   | <b>2.13</b> | <b>2.06</b> | <b>\$ 1.00</b>   | <b>\$ -</b> | <b>\$ 561,000,000</b>   |
| Maturity         | 8/1/22  | 8/1/22   | Negotiable CDs     | Bank of Nova Scotia - Houston Bran     | 06417MSJ5 | \$ (50,000,000)           | 0.24        | 6.42        | \$ 100.00        | \$ -        | \$ 50,000,000           |
| Maturity         | 8/1/22  | 8/1/22   | Commercial Paper   | Toyota Motor Credit Corporation        | 89233HH15 | (50,000,000)              | 0.00        | 6.37        | 100.00           | -           | 50,000,000              |
| Maturity         | 8/3/22  | 8/3/22   | Commercial Paper   | MUFG Bank - New York Branch            | 62479MH30 | (50,000,000)              | 0.00        | 2.30        | 100.00           | -           | 50,000,000              |
| Maturity         | 8/3/22  | 8/3/22   | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks                | 313385A55 | (49,890,000)              | 0.00        | 2.08        | 100.00           | -           | 49,890,000              |
| Maturity         | 8/4/22  | 8/4/22   | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks                | 313385A63 | (25,000,000)              | 0.00        | 2.08        | 100.00           | -           | 25,000,000              |
| Maturity         | 8/5/22  | 8/5/22   | Commercial Paper   | MUFG Bank - New York Branch            | 62479MH55 | (50,000,000)              | 0.00        | 2.30        | 100.00           | -           | 50,000,000              |
| Maturity         | 8/10/22 | 8/10/22  | Commercial Paper   | MUFG Bank - New York Branch            | 62479MHA4 | (100,000,000)             | 0.00        | 2.34        | 100.00           | -           | 100,000,000             |
| Maturity         | 8/15/22 | 8/15/22  | U.S. Treasuries    | United States Department of The Tr     | 912828YA2 | (100,000,000)             | 1.50        | 1.49        | 100.00           | -           | 100,000,000             |
| Maturity         | 8/16/22 | 8/16/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks                | 313385C20 | (35,000,000)              | 0.00        | 2.19        | 100.00           | -           | 35,000,000              |
| Maturity         | 8/17/22 | 8/17/22  | Negotiable CDs     | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch      | 06367CTZ0 | (50,000,000)              | 1.17        | 2.31        | 100.00           | -           | 50,000,000              |
| Maturity         | 8/17/22 | 8/17/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks                | 313385C38 | (15,000,000)              | 0.00        | 2.19        | 100.00           | -           | 15,000,000              |
| Maturity         | 8/18/22 | 8/18/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks                | 313385C46 | (65,000,000)              | 0.00        | 2.12        | 100.00           | -           | 65,000,000              |
| Maturity         | 8/19/22 | 8/19/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks                | 313385C53 | (60,000,000)              | 0.00        | 2.15        | 100.00           | -           | 60,000,000              |
| Maturity         | 8/24/22 | 8/24/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks                | 313385D29 | (100,000,000)             | 0.00        | 2.23        | 100.00           | -           | 100,000,000             |
| Maturity         | 8/24/22 | 8/24/22  | Commercial Paper   | MUFG Bank - New York Branch            | 62479MHQ9 | (50,000,000)              | 0.00        | 2.56        | 100.00           | -           | 50,000,000              |
| Maturity         | 8/25/22 | 8/25/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks                | 313385D37 | (150,000,000)             | 0.00        | 2.23        | 100.00           | -           | 150,000,000             |
| Maturity         | 8/26/22 | 8/26/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks                | 313385D45 | (150,000,000)             | 0.00        | 2.23        | 100.00           | -           | 150,000,000             |
| Maturity         | 8/29/22 | 8/29/22  | Negotiable CDs     | Royal Bank of Canada New York Br       | 78012U3T0 | (50,000,000)              | 0.80        | 5.42        | 100.00           | -           | 50,000,000              |
| Maturity         | 8/29/22 | 8/29/22  | Negotiable CDs     | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch      | 06367CST5 | (50,000,000)              | 0.83        | 5.34        | 100.00           | -           | 50,000,000              |
| Maturity         | 8/29/22 | 8/29/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks                | 313385D78 | (155,100,000)             | 0.00        | 2.23        | 100.00           | -           | 155,100,000             |
| Maturity         | 8/30/22 | 8/30/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks                | 313385D86 | (198,100,000)             | 0.00        | 2.23        | 100.00           | -           | 198,100,000             |
| Maturity         | 8/31/22 | 8/31/22  | U.S. Treasuries    | United States Department of The Tr     | 91282CAG6 | (50,000,000)              | 0.13        | 0.12        | 100.00           | -           | 50,000,000              |
| Maturity         | 8/31/22 | 8/31/22  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks                | 313385D94 | (200,000,000)             | 0.00        | 2.23        | 100.00           | -           | 200,000,000             |
| <b>Subtotals</b> |         |          |                    |                                        |           | <b>\$ (1,853,090,000)</b> | <b>0.17</b> | <b>2.53</b> | <b>\$ 100.00</b> | <b>\$ -</b> | <b>\$ 1,853,090,000</b> |
| Interest         | 8/1/22  | 1/31/24  | U.S. Treasuries    | United States Department of The Tr     | 91282CDV0 | ---                       | 0.88        | 2.99        | ---              | -           | \$ 437,500              |
| Interest         | 8/1/22  | 7/31/24  | U.S. Treasuries    | United States Department of The Tr     | 912828Y87 | ---                       | 1.75        | 2.92        | ---              | -           | 437,500                 |
| Interest         | 8/1/22  | 1/31/24  | U.S. Treasuries    | United States Department of The Tr     | 9128285Z9 | ---                       | 2.50        | 2.98        | ---              | -           | 625,000                 |
| Interest         | 8/1/22  | 1/31/25  | U.S. Treasuries    | United States Department of The Tr     | 912828Z52 | ---                       | 1.38        | 2.90        | ---              | -           | 687,500                 |
| Interest         | 8/1/22  | 7/31/25  | U.S. Treasuries    | United States Department of The Tr     | 91282CAB7 | ---                       | 0.25        | 2.85        | ---              | -           | 125,000                 |
| Interest         | 8/1/22  | 8/1/22   | Negotiable CDs     | Bank of Nova Scotia - Houston Bran     | 06417MSJ5 | ---                       | 0.24        | 6.42        | ---              | -           | 90,667                  |
| Interest         | 8/1/22  | 7/31/23  | U.S. Treasuries    | United States Department of The Tr     | 912828S92 | ---                       | 1.25        | 3.00        | ---              | -           | 625,000                 |
| Interest         | 8/1/22  | 9/1/22   | Money Market Funds | BlackRock Liquidity Funds - T-Fund     | 09248U718 | ---                       | 2.10        | 2.01        | ---              | -           | 14,579                  |
| Interest         | 8/3/22  | 2/3/23   | Federal Agencies   | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding      | 3133EMPH9 | ---                       | 0.13        | 2.74        | ---              | -           | 28,438                  |
| Interest         | 8/8/22  | 2/6/23   | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks                | 3133827H0 | ---                       | 2.14        | 2.82        | ---              | -           | 475,080                 |
| Interest         | 8/10/22 | 8/10/23  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding      | 3133EM2E1 | ---                       | 0.16        | 3.17        | ---              | -           | 40,000                  |
| Interest         | 8/10/22 | 2/10/23  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding      | 3133ENDQ0 | ---                       | 0.16        | 2.83        | ---              | -           | 40,000                  |
| Interest         | 8/12/22 | 2/12/25  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp        | 3137EAP0  | ---                       | 1.50        | 3.33        | ---              | -           | 1,001,490               |
| Interest         | 8/15/22 | 2/13/24  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Home Loan Banks                | 3130AFW94 | ---                       | 2.50        | 3.25        | ---              | -           | 487,625                 |
| Interest         | 8/15/22 | 2/14/24  | Federal Agencies   | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding      | 3133ELNE0 | ---                       | 1.43        | 3.25        | ---              | -           | 146,539                 |

# Investment Transactions

## Pooled Fund

| Transaction  | Settle  | Maturity | Type of Investment            | Issuer Name                           | CUSIP     | Par Value | Coupon | YTM  | Price | Interest | Transaction Amount |               |
|--------------|---------|----------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|--------|------|-------|----------|--------------------|---------------|
| Interest     | 8/15/22 | 2/15/24  | U.S. Treasuries               | United States Department of The Tr    | 912828B66 | ---       | 2.75   | 3.22 | ---   | -        | 687,500            |               |
| Interest     | 8/15/22 | 8/15/24  | U.S. Treasuries               | United States Department of The Tr    | 91282CCT6 | ---       | 0.38   | 3.20 | ---   | -        | 93,750             |               |
| Interest     | 8/15/22 | 2/15/23  | U.S. Treasuries               | United States Department of The Tr    | 912828Z86 | ---       | 1.38   | 3.06 | ---   | -        | 687,500            |               |
| Interest     | 8/15/22 | 8/15/22  | U.S. Treasuries               | United States Department of The Tr    | 912828YA2 | ---       | 1.50   | 1.49 | ---   | -        | 750,000            |               |
| Interest     | 8/24/22 | 8/24/23  | Federal Agencies              | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corpr      | 3137EAEV7 | ---       | 0.25   | 3.33 | ---   | -        | 50,970             |               |
| Interest     | 8/25/22 | 8/25/25  | Federal Agencies              | Federal National Mortgage Associat    | 3135G05X7 | ---       | 0.38   | 3.46 | ---   | -        | 182,813            |               |
| Interest     | 8/26/22 | 2/26/24  | Federal Agencies              | Federal Farm Credit Banks Funding     | 3133EMRZ7 | ---       | 0.25   | 3.36 | ---   | -        | 137,500            |               |
| Interest     | 8/29/22 | 8/17/22  | Negotiable CDs                | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch     | 06367CTZ0 | ---       | 1.17   | 2.31 | ---   | -        | 208,000            |               |
| Interest     | 8/29/22 | 2/28/24  | Federal Agencies              | Federal Home Loan Banks               | 3130ARHG9 | ---       | 2.13   | 3.39 | ---   | -        | 325,125            |               |
| Interest     | 8/29/22 | 8/28/24  | Supranationals                | International Bank for Reconstructio  | 459056HV2 | ---       | 1.50   | 3.51 | ---   | -        | 375,000            |               |
| Interest     | 8/30/22 | 2/27/26  | Supranationals                | Inter-American Development Bank       | 45818WDG8 | ---       | 0.82   | 3.88 | ---   | -        | 79,950             |               |
| Interest     | 8/30/22 | 8/29/22  | Negotiable CDs                | Royal Bank of Canada New York Br      | 78012U3T0 | ---       | 0.80   | 5.42 | ---   | -        | 202,222            |               |
| Interest     | 8/30/22 | 8/29/22  | Negotiable CDs                | Bank of Montreal - Chicago Branch     | 06367CST5 | ---       | 0.83   | 5.34 | ---   | -        | 207,500            |               |
| Interest     | 8/31/22 | 8/31/26  | U.S. Treasuries               | United States Department of The Tr    | 91282CCW9 | ---       | 0.75   | 3.41 | ---   | -        | 187,500            |               |
| Interest     | 8/31/22 | 8/31/22  | U.S. Treasuries               | United States Department of The Tr    | 91282CAG6 | ---       | 0.13   | 0.12 | ---   | -        | 31,250             |               |
| Interest     | 8/31/22 | 2/28/25  | U.S. Treasuries               | United States Department of The Tr    | 912828ZC7 | ---       | 1.13   | 3.47 | ---   | -        | 562,500            |               |
| Interest     | 8/31/22 | 9/1/22   | Money Market Funds            | Fidelity Colchester Street Trust - Go | 31607A703 | ---       | 2.20   | 2.10 | ---   | -        | 21,417             |               |
| Interest     | 8/31/22 | 9/1/22   | Money Market Funds            | State Street Institutional U.S. Goven | 85749T517 | ---       | 2.26   | 2.23 | ---   | -        | 745,453            |               |
| Subtotals    |         |          |                               |                                       |           | \$        | -      | 1.57 | 3.06  | \$ -     | \$ -               | \$ 10,797,867 |
| Grand Totals |         |          |                               |                                       |           |           |        |      |       |          |                    |               |
|              |         | 52       | Purchases                     |                                       |           |           |        |      |       |          |                    |               |
|              |         | (11)     | Sales                         |                                       |           |           |        |      |       |          |                    |               |
|              |         | (23)     | Maturities / Calls            |                                       |           |           |        |      |       |          |                    |               |
|              |         | 18       | Change in number of positions |                                       |           |           |        |      |       |          |                    |               |

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Police Commission President and Vice President  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 3:06:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [Police Commission 091622.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see attached for communication from the Police Commission regarding a resolution appointing a new President and Vice President of the Commission.

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](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)



**The Police Commission** PH 3:53  
**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

September 15, 2022

Honorable Mayor London Breed  
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco  
#1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 200  
San Francisco, CA 94102

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

Dear Mayor Breed and Supervisors:

At the meeting of the Police Commission on Wednesday, September 14, 2022, the following resolution was adopted:

**RESOLUTION NO. 22-127**

**ELECTION OF PRESIDENT OF THE POLICE COMMISSION**

RESOLVED, that Commissioner Cindy Elias shall serve as President of the San Francisco Police Commission for a term of one year.

AYES: Commissioners Benedicto, Yanez, Carter-Oberstone, Elias  
NAYS: Commissioners Walker, Yee, Byrne

**ELECTION OF VICE PRESIDENT OF THE POLICE COMMISSION**

RESOLVED, that Commissioner Max Carter-Oberstone shall serve as Vice President of the San Francisco Police Commission for a term of one year.

AYES: Commissioners Benedicto, Yanez, Carter-Oberstone, Elias  
NAYS: Commissioners Walker, Yee, Byrne

Very truly yours,

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood  
Secretary  
San Francisco Police Commission

CINDY ELIAS  
President

MAX CARTER-OBERSTONE  
Vice President

LARRY YEE  
Commissioner

JAMES BYRNE  
Commissioner

JESUS YANEZ  
Commissioner

KEVIN BENEDICTO  
Commissioner

DEBRA WALKER  
Commissioner

Sergeant Stacy Youngblood  
Secretary

1211/rct



**From:** [Gray, Amber \(DPH\)](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Kunins, Hillary \(DPH\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Gray, Amber \(DPH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: Annual Report 2020-2021  
**Date:** Thursday, September 22, 2022 10:54:32 AM  
**Attachments:** [FY2020-21-BHC Annual Report-finalrev.08.12.22.pdf](#)

---

Attached is the 2020-2021 Annual Report for The San Francisco Behavioral Health Commission.

Ms. Amber Gray Pronouns(she & her) [What's this?](#)

Health Program Coordinator 1

San Francisco Behavioral Health Commission

Behavioral Health Services, DPH

1380 Howard Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor

San Francisco, California 94103

Personal Cell # (415) 518-9211

F: 415-255-3700

The SF Health Network is the City's only comprehensive system of care. Our top goal is to improve the value of services provided to our patients, staff and San Franciscans.

PRIVACY NOTICE: This email message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential, proprietary, and/or privileged information protected by law. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you believe you have received this email message in error, please contact the above sender immediately by a reply email and please destroy all copies of the original message.

Ms. Amber Gray Pronouns(she & her) [What's this?](#)

Health Program Coordinator 1

San Francisco Behavioral Health Commission

Behavioral Health Services, DPH

1380 Howard Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor

San Francisco, California 94103

Personal Cell # (415) 518-9211

F: 415-255-3700

The SF Health Network is the City's only comprehensive system of care. Our top goal is to improve the value of services provided to our patients, staff and San Franciscans.

PRIVACY NOTICE: This email message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential, proprietary, and/or privileged information protected by law. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is

prohibited. If you believe you have received this email message in error, please contact the above sender immediately by a reply email and please destroy all copies of the original message.

# **FY 2020 – 2021 Annual Report**

## **THE SAN FRANCISCO BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMISSION**



**Prepared for**

**The Mayor and Board of Supervisors of the  
City and County of San Francisco**

**Submitted August 12, 2022**

1380 Howard Street, 2nd Floor

San Francisco, CA 94103

Email: [mhb@mhbsf.org](mailto:mhb@mhbsf.org)

<https://sfbos.org/behavioral-health-commission>

**Prepared by**

Harriette S. Stevens, Ed.D., Board President  
San Francisco Mental Health Education Funds, Inc.  
Ph: 510-847-2823; Email: [hsstevens2@gmail.com](mailto:hsstevens2@gmail.com)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                             |   |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....                                                      | 3 |
| LETTER FROM THE SAN FRANCISCO (SF) BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMISSION CHAIR ..... | 4 |
| INTRODUCTION .....                                                          | 5 |
| SF BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMISSION MEMBERS AND STAFF.....                      | 6 |
| SF BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMISSION ACCOMPLISHMENTS in FY 2020–2021 .....       | 7 |
| A.    RESOLUTIONS AND COMMENDATIONS.....                                    | 7 |
| B.    PROGRAM REVIEWS .....                                                 | 7 |
| C.    EDUCATIONAL PRESENTATIONS AT COMMISSION MEETINGS .....                | 7 |
| D.    COMMISSIONER ACTIVITIES.....                                          | 8 |
| SF BEHAVIORAL HEALTH SERVICES NEEDS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....               | 9 |

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Behavioral Health Commission (BHC) of San Francisco submits this FY 2021 Annual Report in accordance with the California Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 5604.2. The Commission met twelve times during the year with a robust attendance on the part of membership. All meetings continued to be held virtually due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Commission meetings consisted of salient topics, including Mental Health SF legislation, presentations, discussions, and public participation.

Commission input and feedback were used in preparing the California Planning Council Data Notebook studying local residential facilities. Three program reviews were conducted by Commissioners with recommendations forwarded to the Director of Behavioral Health Services. Three Resolutions were proposed and forwarded to the Board of Supervisors. And two new committees were established to research residential beds, availability of telepsychiatry, and issues raised by the pandemic.

According to research findings from the Johns Hopkins University, about 14 percent of Americans reported symptoms of serious psychological distress in April 2020 during the peak of the coronavirus pandemic. The isolation of “Shelter in Place” also resulted in an increase in domestic violence cases, child abuse cases, suicide in Transitional Aged Youth (TAY) cases, depression, anxiety, trauma PTSD, and increased alcohol consumption as a coping mechanism.

The pandemic, likewise, continued to affect the work of the BHC. We were not able to meet our contract terms: we made three out of five site visits, which continued to be virtual, and propose three out of the ten resolutions. Three additional commendations were awarded to individuals and organizations for their outstanding contributions in serving our most vulnerable citizens.

The Commission pursued rebuilding its membership. In 2020-2021, seven Commissioners out of 17 had legal standing, of which three Commissioners were new appointees, seven seats were vacant (including the Board of Supervisors seat), three had termed out (each had two three-year terms) and three Commissioners were waiting reappointment. A recent State law, mandating Behavioral Health Boards and Commissions, amended the legislation to three-year terms for Commissioners/Board members, and was silent on reappointment requirements.

The behavioral health needs in the County continue to increase despite innovative programs (e.g., services for seniors living in the Tenderloin, transgender support, vocational training, school-based behavioral health programs). The BHC strongly recommends: adopting a comprehensive continuum of care system; creating culturally affirming and evidence-based practices for all services; strengthening the integration of substance use and mental health treatment to ensure both disorders are treated effectively; providing access to same day services for prescription medications; ensuring every client has a WRAP Plan with an advanced directive; and increasing the number of therapists. Homelessness and mental health are often intertwined. Thus, creating housing with supportive services and expanding our rapidly disappearing long-term board and care programs are critical.

## LETTER FROM THE CHAIR

The 2020–2021 fiscal year has been productive and challenging for the newly–constituted San Francisco BHC. The BHC moved forward with the hiring of a new Executive Director, through our contract with the San Francisco Mental Health Education Funds (SFMHEF), an organization that serves as the administrative arm of the Commission. In addition, the BHC continued its commitment to assuring that the Commission membership is more diverse. This year, we focused our outreach and recruitment efforts on increasing the number of African American and Asian American Pacific Island residents who apply for BHC Commission seats.

The COVID-19 pandemic continued to impact the ability of the Commissioners to meet in person. Throughout the year, the BHC provided access to the public through monthly virtual Zoom meetings held on the third Wednesday of each month, from 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm. Even though COVID-19 had an adverse effect on our ability to conduct in-person site visits, the BHC Co-Chairs (Richelle Slota and Carletta Jackson-Lane) were able to incorporate virtual interviews via Zoom with Executive Director/COO Marvin Davis and the clinical staff of Felton Institute. The BHC also chose to conduct a virtual review of the Senior Adult Clinical Program, which is one of the cornerstone programs of the Institute’s Mental Health Clinical Service Model. Our written report included a positive clinical evaluation, interviews with clients of the program via Zoom in separate rooms, and a detailed summary. The Commissioners also established, through the BHC Site Visit Committee, a COVID-19 Virtual Site Visit Questionnaire. The questionnaire was used in a virtual visit with the Dimensions Clinic, a program that provides comprehensive medical and mental health services to low-income or homeless LGBTQ+ youth (aged 12 to 25 years) living in San Francisco. The interview with the Dimensions staff was positive. Due to COVID mandates, no in person interviews were conducted with their clients.

The BHC also sponsored several resolutions and accommodations during 2020 – 2021 and presented them to the Mayor’s Office and Board of Supervisors. Some of the resolutions and commendations are included as follows:

- The Asian American Pacific Islander’s (AAPI’s) Anti Hate Crime Resolution in support of San Francisco’s AAPI Community
- A resolution/commendation for exemplary service honoring Marlo Simmons, Interim Director, SF Behavioral Health Services
- A commendation for outstanding community mental health services presented to Dr. Mary Ann Jones, PhD and CEO of the Westside Community Mental Health Services

In early spring 2021 the BHC held a Strategic Planning Retreat that resulted in a formal list of recommendations for better serving our mental health clients and consumers.

Respectfully,

Carletta Jackson-Lane, JD, Co-Chair



## INTRODUCTION

The Behavioral Health Commission (BHC) of San Francisco, formerly known as the Mental Health Board (MHB), established in 1983 as mandated by the Bronzan-McCorquodale Act within the Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 5604.2, is responsible for the following:

- Review and evaluate the community's behavioral health needs, services, facilities, and special problems
- Review County agreements entered into pursuant to Section 5650
- Advise the Board of Supervisors and the Director of Behavioral Health Services (BHS) as to any aspect of the local Behavioral Health system
- Review and approve the procedures used to ensure citizen and professional involvement at all stages of the planning process
- Submit an Annual Report to the Mayor and Supervisors on the needs and performance of the Behavioral Health system
- Review and make recommendations on applicants for the appointment of the director of Behavioral Health services prior to the vote of the governing body. The Commission shall be included in the selection process prior to the vote of the governing body
- Review and comment of the County's/City's performance outcome data and communicate its findings to the California Behavioral Health Planning Council
- Assess the impact of the realignment of services from the State to the County on services delivered to clients and on the local community

### **The Mission**

*The Behavioral Health Commission of San Francisco represents and ensures the inclusion of the diverse voices of consumers, citizens, and stakeholders in advising how behavioral health services are administered and provided.*

*Through its State and County mandates, the Behavioral Health Commission advises, reviews, advocates, and educates; with the aim of having that advice integrated, incorporated, and reflected in implementation of Behavioral Health policy; with the ultimate goal of ensuring quality behavioral health services.*

*Adopted October 12, 1994*

**SAN FRANCISCO BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMISSION  
MEMBERS AND STAFF**

| <b>FYE June 2020</b>                                 | <b>FYE June 2021</b>                    |
|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| Seat 1, vacant                                       | Seat 1, Bahlam Javier Vigil, MA         |
| Seat 2, vacant                                       | Seat 2, vacant                          |
| Seat 3, Carletta Jackson-Lane, JD****                | Seat 3, Carletta Jackson-Lane, JD       |
| Seat 4, Dawson Emmett Cooper II*****                 | Seat 4, Terezie Bohrer, RN, MSW, CLNC   |
| Seat 5, Judith Klain, MPH                            | Seat 5, Judith Klain, MPH               |
| Seat 6, Arthur Curry****                             | Seat 6, Arthur Curry/vacant*****        |
| Seat 7, Gregory Ledbetter****                        | Seat 7, Gregory Ledbetter****           |
| Seat 8, vacant                                       | Seat 8, Stephen Banuelos                |
| Seat 9, Richelle Slota, MA                           | Seat 9, Richelle Slota, MA              |
| Seat 10, Harriette Stevens, Ed.D.*                   | Seat 10, Harriette Stevens, Ed.D.*      |
| Seat 11, Judy Zalazar Drummond, MA****               | Seat 11, Judy Drummond, MA/vacant*****  |
| Seat 12, Toni Parks                                  | Seat 12, Toni Parks                     |
| Seat 13, Marylyn Tesconi, MA***                      | Seat 13, vacant                         |
| Seat 14, Dancer/vacant***                            | Seat 14, vacant                         |
| Seat 15, Ulash Thakore-Dunlap, MFT*****              | Seat 15, Ulash Thakore-Dunlap, MFT***** |
| Seat 16, Idell Wilson                                | Seat 16, Idell Wilson****               |
| Seat 17, Catherine Stefani, JD, LL.M**<br>Supervisor | Ahsha Safai+<br>Supervisor              |

\* Starting February 1, 2020, termed-out Commissioners may attend BHC meetings and vote until a new Commissioner appointed by a district supervisor or the Rules Committee

\*\* Supervisor Catherine Stefani resigned in April 2020

\*\*\* Commissioners resigned after June 2020

\*\*\*\* Commissioners waiting for reappointment

\*\*\*\*\* Commissioners resigned after July 2021

+ Supervisor Ahsha Safai never attended meetings

**Staff**

Geoffrey Grier, Executive Director

## **SAN FRANCISCO BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMISSION ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN FY 2020-2021**

### **A. RESOLUTIONS AND COMMENDATIONS**

#### **RESOLUTIONS**

- BHC Meeting, February 17, 2021: Resolved the San Francisco Behavioral Health Commission urges the City and County of San Francisco to provide additional police training and alternative and more appropriate first responder series 24/7 to adults experiencing mental health crisis.
- BHC Meeting, April 21, 2021: The San Francisco Behavioral Health Commission's Anti-hate position toward Asian American and Pacific Islanders (AAPI) and urging the appointment of members of the API community to the Commission
- BHC Minutes, Jan. 20, 2021: Resolved that the San Francisco Behavioral Health Commission commend Marlo Simmons, MPH, Acting Director of Behavioral Health Services in the role of Director of Mental Health Service Act programs, led a team that developed numerous innovative programs and responded to community needs.

#### **CERTIFICATES OF COMMENDATION**

- BHC Minutes, July 15, 2020
  - Felton Institute for their work on Suicide Prevention
  - Mother Brown's Kitchen for the wonderful work in providing COVID-19 tests in the Bayview Hunter's Point neighborhood
- BHC Minutes, Sept. 16, 2020: Dr. Mary Ann Jones, CEO of Westside Mental Health Services for her lifelong advocacy for mental health services in underserved communities
- BHC Minutes, Feb. 17, 2021: BART Officer Eric Hofstein for exceptional service in aiding and supporting people experiencing mental health crises at BART stations.

### **B. PROGRAM REVIEWS**

- Felton Institute, Family Service Agency, San Francisco, July 30, 2021
- Alkov Dimensions Clinic: COVID-19 Survey Questions for Behavioral Health Program Directors, August 8, 2021
- Episcopal Community Services—San Francisco: Program Review of housing and workforce development programs, July 2021

### **C. EDUCATIONAL PRESENTATIONS AT COMMISSION MEETINGS INCLUDED**

- Best Practices Training conducted by Theresa Comstock, Executive Director, California Behavioral Health Boards and Commissions, September 2020
- Mental Health Services Act Updates, Theresa Yu, BHS Acting Director, Oct. 2020
- SF Behavioral Health Commission Annual Retreat, March 2021
- Transgender 101 & DHR Gender Inclusion Policy Training, March and May 2021

Note: All agendas and minutes can be found at [www.sfgov.org/mental\\_health](http://www.sfgov.org/mental_health), or <https://sfbos.org/behavioral-health-commission>

## **COMMISSIONER ACTIVITIES**

In 2020-2021, the BHC's two Standing Committees are described below, and followed by additional activities conducted on behalf of the Commission.

**1. Implementation Committee:** Chair: Ms. Jackson-Lane, Ms. Parks, Ms. Slota, and Ms. Drummond

The Implementation Committee has continued to push forward and incorporate major issues facing the behavioral health population resulting from COVID-19 and the impact on funding for Behavioral Health Services for the residents of San Francisco.

In furthering that agenda, the Implementation Committee addressed the fact that, disproportionately, over 80 percent of the population in the County jail are part of the chronic homeless population, African American and suffering from mental health challenges. Housing, or the lack thereof, high cost and the need for on-site direct mental health and substance use/misuse services continue to be a problem in San Francisco. We have homeless persons suffering from chronic behavioral health issues throughout the City in multiple neighborhoods--why not give them direct quality mental health and behavioral health services where they live?

**2. Site Visit Committee:** Chair: Ms. Richelle Slota; various Commission members

The Site Visit Committee worked to help assure the evaluation of the community's behavioral health needs, services, facilities, and special problems and that mandated program reviews were implemented.

**3. Commissioners' contributions to the mission of the BHC are as follows:**




- Met with Supervisors and their staffs
- Membership on the California Association of Local Behavioral Boards and Commissions (Dr. Harriette Stevens (President of this organization)
- BHC representative on the DPH interview panel for the new Behavioral Health Services Director (Dr. Stevens)
- Met monthly with Dr. Hillary Kunins, the new BHS Director
- Represented the BHC on the Crisis Intervention Teamwork Group (Ms. Terezie Bohrer Chaired the CIT Work Group)
- Attended meetings with Mega Black San Francisco, a group that Mayor Breed put together seeking reparations with funding redirected from the police department (Mr. Gregory Ledbetter)
- Attended public community meetings as a representative of the Commission

## BEHAVIORAL HEALTH SERVICES NEEDS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In FY 2020-21, the Commission identified several needs for services and recommended:

- Continue supporting Mental Health San Francisco.
- Increase DPH/Behavioral Health Services funding for culturally responsive resources and services for case management services. Evidence-based results need to also be included.
- Ensure regular Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) training for all Police and Sheriffs.
- Increase behavioral health services and supportive housing for people who are homeless.
- Increase housing, board and care residential facilities and address the homeless crisis which is intrinsically entwined with issues related to mental health and substance use.
- Advocate for a Comprehensive Continuum of Care system within BHS.
- Strengthen the integration of substance use and mental health treatment to ensure that both conditions are treated effectively.
- Provide access to same day services for treatment and prescription medications.
- Increase the number of therapists, psychologists and psychiatrists in BHS to decrease waiting time and increase the ability to serve all in need, including TAY appropriate services. Provide enhanced therapeutic services, namely co-occurring disorder and trauma-informed services that are culturally affirming.

In the coming fiscal year, the BHC aims to become more involved in decision making and in working more closely with the Board of Supervisors, the Department of Public Health, the Health Commission, and the DPH/Behavioral Health Services staff.



**From:** [Jeff Jensen](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Ginsburg, Phil \(REC\)](#); [Teahan, Kevin \(REC\)](#); [Summers, Ashley \(REC\)](#); [Marc Connerly](#); [Andersen, Eric \(REC\)](#); [Jue, Tyrone \(ENV\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ADM\)](#); [Groffenberger, Ashley \(MYR\)](#); [Bo Links](#); [Potter, Spencer \(REC\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Richard Harris Jr.](#)  
**Subject:** Opposition to File 22-0199, Admin., Police Codes - Ban on Gas-Powered Landscaping Eqpt. - Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting- September 20, 2022  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 10:57:05 AM  
**Attachments:** [City of SF 09.19.22-1.pdf](#)

---

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

Good morning Brent,

Please accept the attached comments from the Golf Course Superintendents Association of Northern California in opposition to File 22-0199, Admin., Police Codes – Ban on Gas-Powered Landscaping Equipment. The comments are a supplement to our previously submitted comments on May 2, 2022, and September 13, 2022.

If you could please distribute to the Board of Supervisors prior to tomorrow's hearing it would be greatly appreciated. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

**Jeff Jensen** | Field Staff, Southwest Region  
 Golf Course Superintendents Association of America  
[1421 Research Park Drive | Lawrence, KS 66049](#)  
 800.472.7878, ext. 3603 | 785.840.7879 Direct  
[www.gcsaa.org](#) | [GCSAA Foundation](#) | [GCM](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#)







September 19, 2022

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

**Subject:** Opposition to File 22-0199, Admin., Police Codes - Ban on Gas-Powered Landscaping Eqpt.  
Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting, September 20, 2022, Item No. 1

Dear Board of Supervisors:

On behalf of the Golf Course Superintendents Association of Northern California (GCSANC) and our member facilities in the City and County of San Francisco, please accept the following comments in strong opposition to Administrative, Police Codes – Ban on Gas-Powered Landscaping Equipment. This supplements our previously submitted letters to the Board dated May 2, 2022, and September 13, 2022.

The ordinance as currently proposed does not provide enough detailed information to pass on the first reading. While it does address temporary waivers, a buy-back program, incentive program, outreach/education program, enforcement, and safe disposal initiative, it is woefully lacking in detail in each of these areas.

We share the City and County of San Francisco's ultimate goal to reduce emissions, but it needs to be done in a practical and responsible manner while mitigating financial, availability and safety concerns. Please refer to our comments submitted on May 2, 2022, for a detailed review of these concerns.

To reiterate, we are not opposed to the implementation of zero emission equipment, and we believe that it will play a large role in golf course maintenance operations moving forward, but we must be able to address issues with technology, manufacturing/supply chain and delivery infrastructure as well as meet the "fit for intended use" standard for large landscapes such as parks, golf courses, cemeteries, and sports fields.

GCSANC requests that the City and County of San Francisco follow the rulemaking process introduced by CARB on Dec. 9, 2021, that bans the manufacturing and sale of most small off-road engines by Jan. 1, 2024, but continues to allow use for those products manufactured and sold (including used equipment purchases) before that date while conducting an in-depth financial and feasibility analysis which will assist in establishing a more realistic timeframe for implementation of this ordinance.

We believe that this can be a win-win situation for both The City and County of San Francisco and our various landscape operations if we take the time to properly address the ordinance and establish a more realistic timeframe for implementation.

Sincerely,

*Jeff Jensen*

Jeff Jensen  
Southwest Field Staff Representative  
Golf Course Superintendents Association of America, Golf Course Superintendents Association of  
Northern California  
1421 Research Park Dr.  
Lawrence, KS 66049  
C: (785) 840-7879

cc:

Phil Ginsburg, Gen. Mgr., San Francisco Recreation and Park Department

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Agenda item 19 and 20 for BOS meeting September 20, 2022 - File Nos. 220735 and 220736  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 11:52:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [PmAC Resolution.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached communication regarding:

**File No. 220735** - Hearing - Committee of the Whole - Street and Public Service Easement Vacation Order - Parkmerced Development Project - September 20, 2022, at 3:00 p.m

**File No. 220736** - Street and Public Service Easement Vacation Order – Parkmerced Development Project

Regards

**Richard Lagunte**  
**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  
[richard.lagunte@sfgov.org](mailto:richard.lagunte@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

***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:** Glenn Rogers <[alderlandscape@comcast.net](mailto:alderlandscape@comcast.net)>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 19, 2022 9:18 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** Agenda item 19 and 20 for BOS meeting September 20, 2022

---

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

Hello,

We ask the following PmAC Resolution enclosed be part of the public record, please.

Glenn Rogers, RLA

Landscape Architect

License 3223

email: [alderlandscape@comcast.net](mailto:alderlandscape@comcast.net)

## **Parkmerced Action Coalition**

### **RESOLUTION TO STOP THE CONSTRUCTION OF PARCELS A, B. C AND D AT PARKMERCED**

**Whereas,** San Francisco has more people leaving the City than any other place in the nation, 1

**Whereas,** Parkmerced presently has a vacancy rate of 30%,

**Whereas,** recently it has been reported that 40,000 homes or condominiums are vacant, 2

**Whereas,** taking a loan today for construction will be more expensive because of the rise in interest making new construction more expensive than any time in recent history, 3

**Whereas,** expensive new construction is likely to have even fewer tenants than the existing housing stock in Parkmerced,

**Whereas,** working remotely in San Francisco has made the need to live in San Francisco unnecessary, 4

**Whereas,** building unnecessary construction that lies vacant for months or years can cause a recession,

**Whereas,** Parkmerced should be considered a historical monument, 5

**We Resolve,** that the construction of housing in the development of Parkmerced is no longer feasible after the COVID-19 pandemic,

**We Further Resolve,** any future construction in Parkmerced, Balboa Reservoir, Treasure Island or Hunters Point should occur only when the vacancy rates are no longer as high as they are today,

**We Further Resolve,** that the City should petition the State to relieve us from the unrealistic burden of providing 800 units of housing a year or 8,000 units of housing every 10 years.

**PO BOX 320445, San Francisco, CA 94132**

**FOOT NOTES:**

1. <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2022-07-29/california-exodus-continues-l-a-san-francisco-lead-the-way>
2. <https://www.sfgate.com/bayarea/article/how-many-vacant-homes-are-there-in-San-Francisco-16822916.php>
3. <https://www.nbcdfw.com/news/local/construction-costs-hit-highest-spike-in-50-years/2891677/>
4. <https://nypost.com/2022/07/18/san-francisco-mayor-worried-residents-leaving-working-from-home/>
5. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parkmerced, San Francisco](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parkmerced,_San_Francisco)



**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: File 220736 vacate of streets - Parkmerced (comment) SFBOS meeting.  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 4:36:00 PM

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the communication below regarding:

File No. 220736 - Street and Public Service Easement Vacation Order – Parkmerced Development Project

Regards,

Richard Lagunte  
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  
[richard.lagunte@sfgov.org](mailto:richard.lagunte@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

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: Aaron Goodman <[amgodman@yahoo.com](mailto:amgodman@yahoo.com)>  
Sent: Monday, September 19, 2022 7:32 AM  
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <[commissions.secretary@sfgov.org](mailto:commissions.secretary@sfgov.org)>  
Subject: File 220736 vacate of streets - Parkmerced (comment) SFBOS meeting.

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

SFBOS

I am unable to attend the hearing but wish to submit comments on the SFBOS hearing on the vacate of streets in parkmerced for first phase work on the site.

1) the muni M line has not developed far or fast enough to consider a direct link to Daly City Bart vs a dog-leg into parkmerced. Too much money spent downtown has crippled any serious west side transit planning and the lack of an L taraval extension up sloat or serious link of transit north to south along sunset or south along the west side of the three major developments coupled with westside multiple housing projects is a huge error in getting the transit systems online to promote use of them during construction phases at parkmerced for workers to get to any sites in the area.

2) the proposed regrading is a huge environmental impact including heavy trucks and methane gas release. The destruction of sound housing in the townhomes with no real reports of obsolescence and opportunity to preserve or provide an alternative infill option at this late stage due to ignoring the 11 unretrofitted towers and proposed towers next to dune and impacted earthquake prior towers at 55 Chumaseo and the unknown soil conditions at the 1952 interchange down brotherhood way.

3) no serious consideration of sfsu's enrollment changes and impacts on rent controlled housing was ever seriously investigated post the land grab of UPN and UPS which caused impacts to families and seniors living in parkmerced and stonestown apartments. Many people live in RVs and cannot afford new sfsu housing prices. Nor the flipped costs of units in parkmerced as students leave campus and units get renovated and increased in pricing.

4) the back room negotiations of Chiu with the developer has never been tested legally and if the transition to new ownership occurs post construction with multiple new buildings by different architects what occurs when they try to parcel sites off and sell and the rent controlled protections are challenged? There are serious impacts long range that were used in agreements for other large scale sites. The statements that these agreements are iron-clad may not hold water long range so the concerns for rent controlled housing and the rights of renters citywide becomes a serious concern long term.

5) why should st Francis woods be protected and the housing that was masterplan Ed and developed with 6 national organizations citing the need for protection of the site ignored. Seems that profit vs people still motivates the roles politicians play and the real need for housing is only tongue in cheek when large swaths of housing for millionaires is protected lands without any options for density and the poorer neighborhoods or renters are bulldozed constantly for 20-30 years of construction.

6) finances - what has been shown by the developers on their honesty to follow through on anything besides profits? Robert Rosania was only interested in "the preservation of my money" not the people who lived there. As supervisors your utmost concern is the rights and protections of people living in this city. Have you done the right thing in going forward on this project when vacancy rates of 30% or more exist in parkmerced currently and SFSU reports similar lacking enrollment and vacancies due to rising costs.

Think hard on these issues. We don't need a traffic construction Armageddon on the west side we need transit solutions up front housing protections and rental housing to be sustainably preserved and restored and some common sense injected into the building up of San Francisco.

When empty lots and single story buildings exist on many adjacent and near sites in D7 there are better ways to approve housing proposals and in phases and plans that get transit to the forefront lessen environmental methane release and solve our housing issues without destroying entire neighborhoods..

It will be a sad day when the bulldozers start to tear out streets. Even sadder to know that plans for a new era missed the environmental mark by a long and large amount. I just have to look at street trees and lacking efforts at parkmerced the entire time their proposa went forward to know that maintenance and care was not at g forefront or their plans only "green-\$-greed" the real dreams of the developer and sfsu in their land grabs on the west side....

Regards

Aaron Goodman D11

Cc: SF Planning Dept Director / SFMTA Director / Mayor London Breed

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Letters of Support File 220791  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 11:17:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [Brown and Caldwell Support 2022.pdf](#)  
[BC Letter of Support.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached letters of support for:

**File No. 220791** - Planning and Engineering Services Agreement - Brown and Caldwell -  
 Southeast Plant Biosolids Digester Facilities - Not to Exceed \$208,500,000

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**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  
[richard.lagunte@sfgov.org](mailto:richard.lagunte@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

***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:** Jacqueline Piccini <jacqueline@npgsf.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 19, 2022 9:49 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Letters of Support File 220791

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

Hello-

Attached please find letters of support to the Board of Supervisors for File 220791, Planning and Engineering Services for the Southeast Biosolids Facility.

Thank you,  
Jacqueline Piccini

Noyola Piccini Group  
c: 415 609 7197  
[jacqueline@npgsf.com](mailto:jacqueline@npgsf.com)



YOUNG COMMUNITY DEVELOPERS  
1715 Yosemite Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94124  
[www.ycdjobs.org](http://www.ycdjobs.org)

The Honorable Board of Supervisors  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
City Hall, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689  
[Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org)

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors:

I write to express Young Community Developers (YCD) support of Brown and Caldwell and their Engineering Services for the Southeast Biosolids Digester Facility. Brown and Caldwell have been working in our community since 2013 and they have been a great supporter of our internship efforts throughout this time. They have brought resources to community, including funding and hours spent, ensuring that community is at the forefront along with benefits from this major capital program.

Our youth empowerment initiative that Brown & Caldwell alongside many other partners has participated in since 2013 was designed to increase equity and access to opportunities for underrepresented minority youth across multiple professional sectors. We place young adults (ages 16-24) in the workplace, to gain skills necessary for academic and career success. Our paid internship has provided many young adults with valuable real-life work experience.

In total to date 97 students have come through the CityWorks program since 2012:

38 college graduates  
29 currently enrolled in college  
18 currently enrolled in community college

We strongly urge you to support this contract amendment as Brown & Caldwell has been valued partner in community.

Regards,

Dion-Jay L. Brookter, MBA  
Executive Director  
Young Community Developers





September 16<sup>th</sup>, 2022

Board of Supervisors  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Dear Supervisors:

I am writing to express our support of the amendment of the Planning and Engineering Services of the SFPUC's Southeast Plant Biosolids Digester Facility with Brown and Caldwell. The upgrades to the facility are critically important to the health, safety and quality of life in our community.

Brown and Caldwell has worked with many community partners since the inception of their contract. We are proud to partner with Brown and Caldwell to fund tutors in STEM at the Bayview YMCA for the duration of this school year. We hope that a successful school year will allow us to continue to build on the partnership with Brown and Caldwell for the following years.

Our community has waited decades to see this project move forward and we call upon you to continue to move this project forward immediately.

Sincerely,

*Tacing Parker*

Tacing Parker  
Senior Executive Director  
Bayview Hunters Point YMCA

**From:** [Robert Feinbaum](#)  
**To:** [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [MTABoard](#)  
**Subject:** Taxi Upfront Fare Pilot  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 11:25:38 AM

---

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

# SaveMUNI

September 20, 2022

San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
Government Audit and Oversight Committee

Re: File# 220886, Urging Removal of Third Party Dispatch from the Taxi Upfront Fare Pilot

Dear Supervisors

SaveMUNI supports Supervisor Connie Chan's resolution calling for removal of third party dispatch from the Taxi Upfront Pilot Program.

SFMTA's authorization of the deal between Uber and two cab companies was passed without proper vetting. It was not heard by the SFMTA Citizens Advisory Council, the Mayor's Disability Council, or the Paratransit Coordinating Council, and was never presented to SaveMUNI for our consideration.

By approving this deal, the SFMTA gives up charter mandated authority to set taxi meter rates. SaveMUNI regards this decision with alarm for several reasons:

- (1) People who do not have smartphones, and those who rely on taxi paratransit services, will be forced into competition with Uber passengers for cab rides, leading to longer wait times
- (2) All passengers booking through Uber may be subject to surge pricing dictated by a private corporation
- (3) Taxi drivers, on the other hand, may receive compensation below meter rates, further endangering their livelihoods.

SaveMUNI therefore urges the Oversight Committee, and after suitable consideration, the full Board of Supervisors to approve Supervisor Chan's resolution calling for the removal of third party dispatch from the Taxi Upfront Fare Pilot Program.

Sincerely,  
Bob Feinbaum  
President, SaveMUNI

**From:** [Patrick Villano](#)  
**To:** [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urging the SFMTA to remove Third Party Dispatch from its Taxi Upfront Fare Pilot Program  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 8:32:19 PM

---

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

Support: File No. 220886, *Urging the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Board of Directors to remove Third Party Dispatch from its Taxi Upfront Fare Pilot Program*

Dear GAO Clerk and Supervisors,

Please support Supervisor Connie Chan's resolution urging the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Board of Directors to remove Third Party Dispatch from its Taxi Upfront Fare Pilot Program. Uber is a notorious corporate bad actor, exploiter, and a polluter. It should never have been given power over the San Francisco taxi industry. Uber and other so-called 'ride share' services (taxis by any other name) do not operate under the same scrutiny as traditional taxis and should not have the same benefits granted to them. Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,  
Patrick Villano  
District 5

**From:** [Regina Islas](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [MTABoard@SFMTA.com](mailto:MTABoard@SFMTA.com); [CAC@sfmta.com](mailto:CAC@sfmta.com); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Support: File No. 220886, Urging the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Board of Directors to remove Third Party Dispatch from its Taxi Upfront Fare Pilot Program  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 9:15:21 PM

---

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

As attached-

Onward together,

Regina S Islas  
[she/her]  
[regina.islas@gmail.com](mailto:regina.islas@gmail.com)  
650.484.7706

It was the very confusion of my life that gave me a sense of my own existence  
Ai WeiWei

Though we did not know it wandering was our real work anyway  
Rebecca Solnit

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

**From:** **Regina Islas** <[regina.islas@gmail.com](mailto:regina.islas@gmail.com)>  
**Date:** Mon, Sep 19, 2022 at 9:14 PM  
**Subject:** Support: File No. 220886, Urging the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Board of Directors to remove Third Party Dispatch from its Taxi Upfront Fare Pilot Program  
**To:** <[alisa.somera@sfgov.org](mailto:alisa.somera@sfgov.org)>

Dear Supervisors,

Please support Supervisor Connie Chan's resolution urging the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Board of Directors to remove Third Party

Dispatch from its Taxi Upfront Fare Pilot Program. Uber is a notorious corporate bad actor, exploiter, and a polluter. It should never have been given power over the San Francisco taxi industry.

Onward together,

Regina S Islas/D1

[she/her]

[regina.islas@gmail.com](mailto:regina.islas@gmail.com)

650.484.7706

It was the very confusion of my life that gave me a sense of my own existence

Ai WeiWei

Though we did not know it wandering was our real work anyway

Rebecca Solnit

**From:** [SPIKE KAHN](#)  
**To:** [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](mailto:MTABoard@sfmta.com); [CAC@sfmta.com](mailto:CAC@sfmta.com); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support File No. 220886, Supervisor Connie Chan's resolution opposing the Uber takeover of SF taxis  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 20, 2022 1:41:08 AM

---

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

I Support: File No. 220886, *Urging the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Board of Directors to remove Third Party Dispatch from its Taxi Upfront Fare Pilot Program*

Dear Supervisors,

Please support Supervisor Connie Chan's resolution urging the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Board of Directors to remove Third Party Dispatch from its Taxi Upfront Fare Pilot Program. Uber is a notorious corporate bad actor, exploiter, and a polluter. It should never have been given power over the San Francisco taxi industry.

Sincerely,  
Spike Kahn  
District 9

CC: [MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org](mailto:MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org), [Jeffrey.Tumlin@sfmta.com](mailto:Jeffrey.Tumlin@sfmta.com), [MTABoard@sfmta.com](mailto:MTABoard@sfmta.com), [CAC@sfmta.com](mailto:CAC@sfmta.com), [Dean.Preston@sfgov.org](mailto:Dean.Preston@sfgov.org), [Rafael.Mandelman@sfgov.org](mailto:Rafael.Mandelman@sfgov.org), [Connie.Chan@sfgov.org](mailto:Connie.Chan@sfgov.org), [Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org)



**From:** [Kathy Howard](#)  
**To:** [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support: File No. 220886, Urging the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Board of Directors to remove Third Party Dispatch from its Taxi Upfront Fare Pilot Program  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 20, 2022 3:16:13 AM

---

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please support Supervisor Chan's resolution urging the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Board of Directors to remove Third Party Dispatch from its Taxi Upfront Fare Pilot Program.

Uber's stated goal is to [replace public transit](#). Since Ride-share companies first appeared in San Francisco, they have sought to undermine public transit and taxi service; as a result, public transit and taxi drivers have struggled to compete. Furthermore, for over a decade, government agencies and leaders across California and the nation have attempted to regulate ride-share companies, and yet the companies have violated data-sharing mandates and refuse to coordinate with transportation agencies and city government.

Giving Uber control over the taxi industry does not benefit the future of public transit in San Francisco. Please support this resolution.

Katherine Howard  
San Francisco

**From:** [Glenn Rogers](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support: File No. 220886, Urging the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Board of Directors to remove Third Party Dispatch from its Taxi Upfront Fare Pilot Program  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 20, 2022 9:40:46 AM

---

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please support Supervisor Connie Chan's resolution urging the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Board of Directors to remove Third Party Dispatch from its Taxi Upfront Fare Pilot Program. Uber is a notorious corporate bad actor, exploiter, and a polluter. It should never have been given power over the San Francisco taxi industry.

Sincerely,

Glenn Rogers, RLA  
District 7

**From:** [Edward Mason](#)  
**To:** [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](mailto:MTABoard@sfmta.com); [CAC@sfmta.com](mailto:CAC@sfmta.com); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** File 220886 to Remove Third Party Dispatch from Taxi Fare Pilot Program  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 21, 2022 4:23:48 PM

---

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

Support: File No. 220886, *Urging the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Board of Directors to remove Third Party Dispatch from its Taxi Upfront Fare Pilot Program*

Dear Supervisors,

Please support Supervisor Connie Chan's resolution urging the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Board of Directors to remove Third Party Dispatch from its Taxi Upfront Fare Pilot Program. I felt the MTA slide presentation was sketchy at best. For such a "Pilot" program, I expected a detailed Action Plan discussing / outlining Goals, Consequences, "What Ifs" , measures of success and failure. I did not realize only technologically qualified cell phone users had access. I do not have a cell phone, rely on a land line so by definition I am excluded from Taxi utilization in a unique situation.

I suspect Uber's motive is to collect free market research data on travel demand for eventually autonomous taxis. Currently, WAYMO (Google) sponsors the Moving Mobility Forward Study to gather daily data on participants transportation needs. WAYMO is paying participants for the participation data. The website is: <https://movingmobilityforward.com/>

Uber is a notorious corporate bad actor from inception. A recent Associated Press article cites: "Washington: As Uber aggressively pushes into markets around the world, the ride-sharing service lobbies political leaders to relax labor and taxi laws, used a "kill switch" to thwart regulators and law enforcement, channeled money through Bermuda and other tax havens and considered portraying violence against its drivers as a way to gain public sympathy, according a report released Sunday .... lobbyists pressed government officials to drop investigations, rewrite labor laws and taxi laws and relax background checks on drivers....."

The California Public Utility Commission oversee ridesharing rather than local government.

Government should not engage with a Corporate entity that historically disregards integrity and is a bad actor fueling selfish actions.

Remove Uber from the Third Party Dispatch program.

Edward Mason,  
District 8

.

an exploiter, and a polluter. It should never have been given power over the San Francisco taxi industry.

Sincerely,

Your name

District

**From:** [sflivingwage@riseup.net](mailto:sflivingwage@riseup.net)  
**To:** [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](mailto:MTABoard@sfmta.com); [CAC@sfmta.com](mailto:CAC@sfmta.com); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support: File No. 220886, Urging the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Board of Directors to remove Third Party Dispatch from its Taxi Upfront Fare Pilot Program  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 21, 2022 6:24:26 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please support Supervisor Connie Chan's resolution urging the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Board of Directors to remove Third Party Dispatch from its Taxi Upfront Fare Pilot Program. Uber is a notorious corporate bad actor, exploiter, and a polluter. It should never have been given power over the San Francisco taxi industry.

Sincerely,

Karl Kramer  
Campaign Co-director  
San Francisco Living Wage Coalition

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Marina via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 12:05:30 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
 CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Marina Moreno  
San Francisco, Ca



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Lynn via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 12:25:04 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Lynn Locher  
Fremont California USA, California

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Regina via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 12:49:43 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Regina Lester  
Mullins, SC

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Gina via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:**  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 12:50:38 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Gina Ness  
Eureka, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Greg via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:**  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 1:01:37 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what



kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Greg Thomson  
Sausalito, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Thomas via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 1:01:55 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Thomas Newmeyer  
San Francisco, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [glen via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 1:02:35 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

glen deardorff  
castro valley, ca

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Nora via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 1:04:28 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Nora Privitera  
Oakland, California



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Susan via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 1:13:35 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Susan Vance  
Pleasanton, ca

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Laura via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 1:19:15 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Laura Herndon  
Burbank, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Taylor via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:**  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 1:26:31 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Taylor Hogan  
San Francisco, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Evan Jane via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 1:27:28 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Evan Jane Kriss  
Sausalito , CA



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Cynthia via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 1:27:59 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Cynthia Alderson  
Santa Clara, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [I via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 1:31:30 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

I a  
san francisco, ca

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Aundi via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 1:33:37 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Aundi Mevoli  
Alameda, California

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Carol via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:**  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 1:36:18 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Carol Schaffer  
san pablo, ca



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [mark via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 1:41:07 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

mark barath  
Sacramento, ca

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [David via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 2:02:23 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

David E Mazariegos  
Folsom, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Laura via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 2:35:18 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I was shocked and horrified to witness the recent massive marine life die-off in our Bay.

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that “it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Laura Shifley  
Oakland, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Reetta via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 3:37:21 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Reetta Raag  
Orinda, CA



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Evan via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:**  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 3:48:33 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Evan Elias  
San Francisco, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Margaret via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 3:55:58 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Margaret Mischner  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Robert via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 4:05:19 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Robert Reed  
Laguna Beach, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Alan via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:**  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 4:33:15 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Alan Schenck  
Aptos, CA



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Lindsay via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 4:59:36 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Lindsay Mugglestone  
Berkeley, California

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Bonnie via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:**  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 5:30:10 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Bonnie Pannell  
Crockett, California

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Monica via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 5:52:28 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

This is why I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and

our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Monica DuClaud  
San Francisco, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Jennifer via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 6:29:10 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Jennifer Van Dyke  
Pleasant Hill, CA



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [L B via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 6:38:47 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

L B Nelson  
Morgan Hill, California

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Jules via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 8:53:29 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

jules weiss  
Berkeley, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Linda via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 9:20:07 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Linda Policarpio  
Pleasant Hill, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Alice via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:**  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 11:24:58 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Alice Polesky  
San Francisco, CA



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Jennifer via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 5:47:08 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Jennifer Devine  
Milpitas , California

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [David via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 5:55:40 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

David Burtis  
Calistoga, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Helen via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 6:06:24 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to increase the city's investment in water recycling immediately. In fact, I am shocked at the backward policies of this supposedly progressive city with regard to waste management.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that “it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Helen Londe,MD  
Richmond, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [DEBRA via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 8:26:26 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

DEBRA LEOW  
San Francisco, CA



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Irene via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 9:25:14 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Irene Moosen  
San Francisco, California

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Michael via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 11:04:06 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Michael Herz, Ph.D. (S.F. Baykeeper Emeritus  
Damariscotta, Maine

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Julian via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 12:01:15 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Julian Redwood  
Berkeley, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Jennifer via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 12:07:17 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Jennifer Daly  
Albany, CA



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Loren via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 1:26:39 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Loren Fraser  
San Francisco, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Oscar via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 1:50:22 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Oscar Mace  
Foster City, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Oscar via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 1:51:04 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Oscar Mace  
Foster City, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Paloma via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 2:51:19 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Paloma Garcia  
San Francisco, CA



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Eliza via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 3:25:28 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Eliza Lamson  
Berkeley, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [David via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 4:04:21 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

David Potovsky  
San Anselmo, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [A via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 4:21:31 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

A D  
Burbank, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Mary via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 4:44:34 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Mary Moycik  
San Francisco, CA



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Naomi via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 8:07:20 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Naomi O'Connor  
Richmond, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Tamara via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Saturday, September 17, 2022 1:30:56 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Tamara Voyles  
SEBASTOPOL, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Susan via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:**  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Saturday, September 17, 2022 2:21:11 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Susan King  
Concord, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [ralph via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Saturday, September 17, 2022 7:19:22 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

ralph szur  
richmond, ca.



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Anthony via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:**  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Sunday, September 18, 2022 10:18:31 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Anthony Lindsey  
San Francisco, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Bob via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Sunday, September 18, 2022 10:27:23 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Bob Skinner  
Novato, California

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Bob via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Sunday, September 18, 2022 1:52:23 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Bob Skinner  
Novato, California

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Quinne via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:**  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Sunday, September 18, 2022 2:16:29 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Quinne Fokes  
San Anselmo, CA



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Nancy via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Sunday, September 18, 2022 7:48:28 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Nancy Berman  
Kensington, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Pamela via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Sunday, September 18, 2022 10:32:42 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Pamela Brigg McKown  
El Cerrito, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Rachel via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 11:13:28 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Rachel Heron  
Oakland, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Layne via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:**  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 11:19:31 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Layne Friedrich  
Glen Ellen, California



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Deborah via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:**  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 11:44:27 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Deborah Corsiglia  
Burlingame, California

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Cindy via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 1:14:14 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Cindy Jarrett  
Santa Rosa, California

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Nina via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 2:52:55 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Nina Atkind  
San Francisco, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Peter via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:**  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 3:07:37 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Peter Belden  
San Francisco, California



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Vaughn via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 5:48:20 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Vaughn Korbin  
San Francisco, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Anne via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:**  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 20, 2022 2:12:33 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Anne Hamersky  
SF, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Joshua via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 20, 2022 5:31:10 PM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Joshua Nederhood  
Oakland, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Glenda via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 21, 2022 9:54:40 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Glenda Mahoney  
Half Moon Bay, CA



**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Karen via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:**  
**Subject:** Please Invest in Solutions to Prevent Harmful Algae Blooms & Fish Kills  
**Date:** Thursday, September 22, 2022 11:38:46 AM

---

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

To: Mayor London Breed  
CC: SFPUC General Manager Dennis Herrera, SFPUC Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to direct San Francisco's Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) to aggressively increase the city's investment in water recycling today.

Over the past month, a large harmful algal bloom has spread across the Bay, leaving unimaginable numbers of dead fish in its wake. We're still learning about this particular bloom, but what we do know is that San Francisco's sewage effluent contributes to excessive levels of nutrients in San Francisco Bay that make the Bay fertile territory for the spread of harmful algae blooms.

Water recycling and other wastewater management technologies can help by reducing the volume of polluted discharges into the Bay. In addition, by producing potable supplies, water recycling will reduce San Francisco's reliance on water diverted from the Tuolumne River, increasing the city's resilience to climate change effects on water supply.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on the ecosystem, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as San Francisco's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, the city currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low freshwater flows contribute to deteriorating water quality—including harmful algae blooms—in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

I agree with Supervisor Aaron Peskin that "it is time for San Francisco and our sister cities in the nine Bay Area counties to start looking at what

kinds of infrastructure investments will need to be made as this becomes, sadly, the new normal.” It’s unacceptable for the city with the nation’s greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to conserve California’s precious and unpredictable water supply.

I support increasing river flows to protect San Francisco Bay’s fisheries, water quality, and recreation. The city should do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city’s water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Karen Kirschling  
SF, CA

**From:** [Lauren Bradbury](#)  
**To:** [Commission, SFPark \(BCC\); mtboard@sfmts.com; Ginzburg, Phil \(BCC\); clerk@sfcta.org; Breed, Mayor London \(MYO\); Board of Supervisors \(BOS\); ChairStaff \(BOS\); Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\); Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\); Mar, Gordon \(BOS\); Preston, Dean \(BOS\); Harney, Matt \(BOS\); MajorStaff \(BOS\); MandelstamStaff \(BOS\); Boren, Hilary; Nathan, Schmann \(BOS\); Safir, Abigail \(BOS\); info@openthegreathighway.com](#)  
**Subject:** Opening of the Great Highway  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 3:44:30 PM

---

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

Hello Mayor London Breed and District Supervisors,

I am writing in response to Mayor London Breed's recent decision to reopen the Upper Great Highway. I appreciate this first step to relieving the distress and inconvenience that many residents in the Sunset and Richmond Districts, as well as others throughout the city and beyond, have experienced since the Highway was abruptly closed sixteen months ago. This may be a good start, but it is not enough.

The Upper Great Highway will still remain closed from Friday afternoon until Monday morning and on holidays, during which time all of the impacts of diverting thousands of cars into a quiet, residential neighborhood, and traffic congestion in Golden Gate Park will continue. Cars and trucks will clog quiet streets; pedestrian and traffic safety will be at risk; greenhouse gas emissions due to drivers spending more time in their cars while they detour around the Great Highway will increase, and emergency vehicle response will be slowed, when a few seconds can mean the difference between life and death.

Additionally, there are plans to replace this temporary Emergency Order with a pilot program that could again completely close the Great Highway for two more years, continuing the problems that have plagued the Western part of San Francisco for over a year. And this pilot program will be conducted without an Environmental Impact Report as mandated by the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please resist those who do not want the highway shared, and who have proposed introducing a skatepark, food trucks, and entertainment on the Upper Great Highway in total disregard of the impacts that will be suffered by the residential community, the pristine quiet beach, and the National Wildlife Sanctuary.

I urge you to fully reopen the Upper Great Highway as soon as possible and to keep it open until the City conducts an EIR to study the impacts of any pilot project. Any change to its use should be done only after a full and fair review of all of the impacts resulting from a closure.

As the Sierra Club has written: "Evaluating environmental damage after a Pilot Project has been in place for two years - or in this case a potential total of over 3 years - is a bit like closing the barn door after the horse has escaped."

Please, stop this Highway Robbery.

-----  
[https://url.ayanan.click/y2/\\_www.openthegreathighway.com\\_/\\_YXAzOnNmZHQyOnE6bzplMjE7ZDk1YTg1NzE0ZTVyNzBoOGNlZmYzTlYNTBINDo2OjllMjg5YjY2YzY2M2MWEZlUSMGE3TVlYZDlmNDgwMjY2JGJENmUyODQ2MDYwNjUuN2IsNTY3M6M3YzJmDE4ZDpwOKY#openthegreathighway](https://url.ayanan.click/y2/_www.openthegreathighway.com_/_YXAzOnNmZHQyOnE6bzplMjE7ZDk1YTg1NzE0ZTVyNzBoOGNlZmYzTlYNTBINDo2OjllMjg5YjY2YzY2M2MWEZlUSMGE3TVlYZDlmNDgwMjY2JGJENmUyODQ2MDYwNjUuN2IsNTY3M6M3YzJmDE4ZDpwOKY#openthegreathighway)

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [John Jackson](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** JFK  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 21, 2022 12:16:51 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

A compromise for John F. Kennedy Drive was reached in 2007 that allowed all users of Golden Gate Park to share the roads. It is time to reopen JFK Drive back to the way it was before COVID. The select few that are the most vocal are doing us all a disservice that want a reasonable compromise.

Please reopen JFK Drive like it was before COVID!

Regards,  
John Jackson  
95621

**From:** [Evelyn Graham](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Golden Gate Park  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 1:50:06 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

All families from around the City deserve access to Golden Gate Park. We must reopen JFK Drive to make access to Golden Gate Park a reality.

Not all can take public transportation or walk/bike to Golden Gate Park. Access isn't the same for everybody! JFK Drive should be open like it was pre-pandemic.

Evelyn Graham

**From:** [zrants](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Limiting public comment  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 21, 2022 3:53:58 PM

---

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

September 21, 2022

Supervisors:

re: Limiting public comment

Why is it suddenly important to limit public comment to those present? Public comment is already limited to specific times and conditions. Is it necessary or desirable to further limit the voice of the people?

Who wants to suggest to your constituents that their comments are less important than your time listening to them? Do you want to cut off people with physical limitations from participating by phone?

If you are limiting public comments to people who are present, will you require government officials and presenters to be present to speak and vote?

Concerns over lack of public awareness and input and voter turnout should encourage more, not less participation in public meeting and events.

Please reconsider how you may treat everyone with fairness and respect by ensuring equal opportunities for people who wish to contribute. Continue the online phone-in process that has brought a new inclusiveness and expanded awareness about how the government operates. The system allows people who cannot easily spend an afternoon attending a public meeting to call in and share their concerns for a few minutes.

It is in more important now than ever for everyone to have a voice in government as we struggle to protect our rights from those who would diminish them.

Sincerely,

Mari Eliza

Concerned Resident of the Mission

with CSFN and EMIA

*forgive my typos*

**From:** [Evelyn Posamentier](#)  
**To:** [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** The end of remote public comment  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 20, 2022 10:00:49 AM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Mandelman,

The idea that remote access will suddenly be cancelled is terrifying.

Broadband is here and has opened participatory democracy such as never before. There is no going back.

Eliminating remote public comment would sever access to civic engagement for a large slice of San Francisco. Barriers will once again be placed before seniors and people living with disabilities.

Dianna Hu, chairperson of the Boston Center for Independent Living, put it this way:

"Remote participation is the latest manifestation of universal design—alongside curb cuts, elevators, closed captioning, audiobooks, and other accessibility features that expanded to universal popularity. We now have a remarkable opportunity to not only uphold but to also optimize accessibility, making remote participation a curb cut 2.0 for the modern day and age."

Let's move forward together.

Sincerely,

Evy Posamentier

Sent from my iPad



**From:** [Patricia Arack](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [rafaelmandelman@yahoo.com](mailto:rafaelmandelman@yahoo.com); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [rafael.mandelman@sfgov](mailto:rafael.mandelman@sfgov); [Press Office, Mayor \(MYR\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Zrants](#)  
**Subject:** Limiting public comment to in person attendance  
**Date:** Saturday, September 17, 2022 4:19:26 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Mandelman and other Supervisors:

I just read an article in the San Francisco Examiner that you, Supervisor Mandelman, are suggesting that the city no longer have phone- in Public Comment for government meetings. I am outraged by this. I am disabled. I deserve that my voice, and the voice of others like me who cannot attend meetings in person, continue to be heard.

This is just another anti-disabled, pro-ableism move by a BOS out of touch with the voters. You cater to the able-bodied. The Bike Coalition, an able-bodied group you fund and pander to, is the group that abuses the phone in function. The Bike Coalition has members calling in from all the way from LA to Seattle. Just because this small special interest group violates the trust the city places in people who phone in, doesn't mean that seniors and disabled who can't travel downtown to your board room should be denied their right to speak at meetings. I would think you would want to improve your relevance to the voters instead of continuing to anger them.

I hope you back off on this anti-voter anti-taxpayer move and leave things as they are. You might crack down on the Bike Coalition for abusing the privilege by getting people from all over the western states to phone in. That would make more sense than taking away SF residents' right to be heard, no matter their physical disability.

Sincerely,

Patricia Arack  
Disabled Senior Voter  
Concerned Residents of the Sunset  
Ret. Faculty, CCSF

BCC: Members of the Concerned Residents of the Sunset  
Members of the OTGH Alliance

**From:** [Jim Mocchi](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](mailto:MTABoard@sfmta.com); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](mailto:SlowStreets@sfmta.com); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](mailto:LakeStreet@sfmta.com); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](mailto:Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](mailto:Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](mailto:Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#); [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](mailto:SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** Keep lake street slow  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 20, 2022 8:54:18 PM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

I love Slow Lake street because it allows me to walk with my family, see children playing, and have a thoroughfare that encourages transportation via bicycle, walking or other environmentally friendly means.

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

1. Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street
2. Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.
3. Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

Respectfully,

Jim Mocchi  
 Richmond District Resident  
 198 18th Ave  
 SF, CA 94121

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [David Hamsher](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 20, 2022 9:51:07 AM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed (**and Supervisor Chan, where have you been?**)

I love Slow Lake street because it allows me to spend time with my family safely - enjoy the outdoors in the City safely (or the prospect of safety, if the City does what it should!) with my young kids. I.e., doing things that people otherwise move to the suburbs to do! **This isn't a neighborhood dispute - the preferences are clear, and the minority that don't like it strident and unbending. We need leadership to implement a clearly right vision. You are leaders, lead!**

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. **Will you lead or default to the status quo?**

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

1. Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street
2. Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.
3. Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.
- 4. Educate the public on what the rules are.**
- 5. Enforce the rules.**

Respectfully,

David Hamsher, District 1

**From:** [Sharon Cook](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Keep Lake St a Permanent Slow Street  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 2:13:36 PM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

I love Slow Lake street because it enables me to exercise safely outdoors, interact with residents of the city, and traverse much of the city via the Slow Street connections.

There are 2 pre-schools on the Arguello end of Lake St. (at El Emmanuel and St. John's) and there is a real problem of people using Lake street as a cut through. Many of these people run the stop sign at Lake and 2nd Avenue (on the block of the pre-schools) which poses a lot of danger for the families and children who go to these schools. Making Lake St. a Slow Street from Arguello to 28th Ave. would hopefully help stop some of that dangerous driving.

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street

Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.

Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

Respectfully,

Sharon Harrison

District 1

**From:** [Michael Smith](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 11:09:27 AM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

I love Slow Lake street because it allows me to **travel safely!**

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

1. Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street
2. Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.
3. Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

Respectfully,

Michael Smith  
District 5

**From:** [A. Ozols](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [mtaboard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [slowstreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [lakestreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [assemblymember.haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#); [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#); [slowlakestreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Keep Lake Street Safe and Make it Permanently Slow  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 5:02:10 AM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

I love Slow Lake street because it allows me to safely walk on Lake Street.

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street

Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.

Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

Sincerely,

Linnea



**From:** [A. Ozols](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [mtaboard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [slowstreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [lakestreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [assemblymember.haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#); [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#); [slowlakestreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Lake Street Should be Permanently Slow  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 4:58:44 AM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

I love Slow Lake street because it makes it safe for me to walk on it.

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street

Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.

Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

Sincerely,

Sancha

**From:** [A. Ozols](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Keep Lake Street Slow Permanently  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 4:55:58 AM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

I love Slow Lake street because it allows me to be safe.

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street

Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.

Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

Sincerely,

Aase

**From:** [Randy Wiederhold](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets; LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Lake Street  
**Date:** Sunday, September 18, 2022 8:46:39 PM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed-

Tonight at twilight I was walking down Lake street. Every block had several people out on it. I passed a teen girl learning to roller skate, going back and forth on the level and smooth stretch by 2nd Ave. where my daughter 2 years ago taught herself to roller skate. (My daughter now runs the skate club in her college.) Right after that 2 kids and their mother rode down the street on bicycles - the mother told one kid to ride off the sidewalk on the street because it had pedestrians on it. A ice cream truck came slowly down the street, It stopped and some kids ran up to it. It was a lovely scene.

Then a car drove down the street fast, barely slowing down when swerving around the "no through traffic" signs. It passed within 2 feet of me at 25 MPH. The street has kids all around, the visibility is bad (twilight.) The signs that are up are being militantly ignored. Kids are endangered.

The proposed addition of a few "speed humps" and "stop signs" are going to be militantly ignored just like the current signs. Anything short of physical diverters continues a dangerous conflict between entitled drivers and pedestrians.

The reason the drivers care that Lake is not a slow street is obviously that they want the fastest way to get between Park Presidio Blvd. from the Presidio, Precideo Height and Sea Cliff. That impatience is a metal state that is inherently dangerous to any other users. Before the slow street was established, Lake was crazy busy at commute times. The evening commute is exactly when Lake is now most heavily used by families. The two uses are not compatible, and conflict and injury is inevitable.

Please keep Lake Street slow, and please install physical barriers that will stop the street from being the fastest way to get out of the city through my neighborhood.

-Randy

--

Randy Wiederhold  
Architect  
145 6th Avenue, #1  
San Francisco, CA 94118  
[randywiederhold@gmail.com](mailto:randywiederhold@gmail.com)  
415.999.0203

<http://www.randywiederhold.com/>

**From:** [A. Ozols](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Lake Street Should Permanently Be Slow  
**Date:** Sunday, September 18, 2022 3:30:03 PM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

I love Slow Lake street because it allows me to  
with my loved ones walk around my neighborhood safely!

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

1. Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street
2. Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.
3. Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

**From:** [Sarah Boudreau](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Why I love Slow Lake Street  
**Date:** Sunday, September 18, 2022 3:23:20 PM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

I love Slow Lake street because it allows me to get to work, dinner, the grocery store, and our City's parks on my own bike on my own schedule. I rode to work this week around school drop-off time in the morning (for the first time this fall) and was floored by how many families were getting to school on Lake Street - as well as others working out and getting to their own destinations for the day. What a wonderful space that allows safe and carbon-free travel to school/work/wherever! We literally can't afford to compromise this space and so many similar and connected spaces in the City if we want our kids to get to school in one piece, without waiting in traffic, and without contributing further to climate change. Electric cars and more transit are crucial to meeting our goals but there is not enough space on the roads to use only these solutions - we need to make it safe and possible for people who want to ride their bikes around for transportation to be able to do so.

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

- 1) Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street
- 2) Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.
- 3) Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic (not just very low/flat speed humps!)

Respectfully,

Sarah Boudreau, Lake Street D1 neighbor and D2 BOS Bicycle Advisory Committee Representative

--

**Sarah Boudreau**

she/her

[boudreau.sarah.m@gmail.com](mailto:boudreau.sarah.m@gmail.com)

[www.linkedin.com/in/sarahboudreau](http://www.linkedin.com/in/sarahboudreau)



**From:** [Lawrence Lui](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Slow Streets  
**Date:** Sunday, September 18, 2022 11:18:18 AM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

I love Slow Lake street because it allows me to:  
[ ] live at a leisurely pace

Enjoy my neighborhood

Get away from pollution of cars

Thank you

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

1. Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street
2. Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.
3. Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

Respectfully,

[ ] District [ ]

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Dani Riggs](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Keep Lake Street Slow  
**Date:** Saturday, September 17, 2022 5:37:22 PM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

I love Slow Lake street because it allows me to connect with friends and family in a safer environment without the fear of cars and traffic.

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street

Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.

Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

Respectfully,

Danielle Riggs, District 1

**From:** [Emily Rothrum](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Keep Lake Street Slow  
**Date:** Saturday, September 17, 2022 2:19:25 PM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

I love Slow Lake street because it allows me to:

- Travel safely by bike
- Walk and bike with my toddler safely
- Rely less on cars

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street

Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.

Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

Respectfully,

Emily Rothrum

**From:** [Jenny-Viva Collisson](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Slow Lake Street  
**Date:** Saturday, September 17, 2022 2:12:52 PM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

I love Slow Lake street because it allows me to:

Have my kids bike to middle school at Roosevelt, sports at Rossi Park, and see their friends after school safely. I ride my bike daily to China Beach to Swim, to appointments and work meetings, restaurants and stores, to my kids' schools, and sports activities. My husband rides his bike daily to and from Mission Bay UCSF from our home on 12th Ave. We are able to have the BIKE LIFE we always dreamed of and rarely use our cars. It has made a HUGE difference in our quality of life and the safety we experience for ourselves and children.

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

1. Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street
2. Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.
3. Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

Respectfully,

Jenny-Viva Collisson, MD Richmond District

**From:** [Katie Kwon-Brossman](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Slow Lake  
**Date:** Saturday, September 17, 2022 11:33:24 AM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

I love Slow Lake street because it allows me to: walk my dog safely; meet neighbors who are enjoying the slow street with their young families; access outdoor space easily.

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

Please:

1. Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street
2. Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.
3. Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

Respectfully,

Katie Kwon-Brossman, District 1 and Lake Street Resident

--



**From:** [Stephen P. Lambe](#)  
**To:** [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#)  
**Cc:** [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Please keep Lake Street safe and car light  
**Date:** Saturday, September 17, 2022 8:28:29 AM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

I love Slow Lake street because it allows me to safely + sustainably visit shops and restaurants throughout the Richmond on my bike, and to recreate in our beautiful neighborhood.

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

1. Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street
2. Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.
3. Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic. This should include effective/large speed bumps and concrete traffic diverters. See: Oakland, Berkeley, Seattle.

Respectfully,

Stephen Lambe  
District 1

--

Stephen P. Lambe  
email: [stephenlambe@gmail.com](mailto:stephenlambe@gmail.com)  
mobile: 206-920-8310



**From:** [Shannon McGilloway](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Support keeping slow lane open  
**Date:** Saturday, September 17, 2022 8:15:14 AM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

I love Slow Lake street because it allows my family a (relatively safe), open space to walk, bike, and get together with friends in our neighborhood. I've written multiple times on behalf of my 12 year old daughter (who regularly bikes the street with friends) and am growing tired of this process and the lack of receptivity from our city's leaders. Are you going to listen to community members or just people with deep pockets and the time to oppose what we already voted to move forward? There are few spaces within the city that are safe for multiple generations to walk, bike and gather. With traffic, crime, homelessness (even making golden gate park unsafe as we had a homeless encampment crash a birthday party which is ridiculous that people are permitted to sleep, do drugs, and loiter despite signs that say the park is closed in the evening— rules that only apply to some of us). Please keep slow lake open and DO MORE to make it safe (speeding cars is an issue as well as non-residents using the street recklessly) for families and all generations to use.

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

1. Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street
2. Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.
3. Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

Respectfully,

[ ] District [ ]

Shannon McGilloway  
[Smcgilloway@gmail.com](mailto:Smcgilloway@gmail.com)  
(415) 310.8460

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Brett Ferrara](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [slowstreets@sfmta.com](#); [lakestreet@sfmta.com](#); [senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [assemblymember.haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [mtaboard@sfmta.com](#)  
**Cc:** [slowlakestreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Keep Lake Street Slow  
**Date:** Saturday, September 17, 2022 12:46:55 AM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

I love Slow Lake street because it allows me to walk and run with less fear of cars. I see children playing, families doing activities, and people having fun as a result of the absence of cars.

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

1. Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street
2. Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.
3. Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

Respectfully,

Brett Ferrara District 1

**From:** [Mary Ann Smythe](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** PLEASE grant this Neighborhood Affirming SlowLake  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 4:36:13 PM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

I love Slow Lake street because it allows me to:

[

Spend time outdoors with my family, neighbors and visitors in a safer environment than ever before. Lake Street is suited for the partial closure because there are several major streets leading to Park Presidio (and the Bridge) that act as thoroughfares. Lake Street is predominantly residential, unlike Geary, California and Balboa, and does not need alternative traffic coming through the area - especially those that practice speeding. Please consider how much this improves all of our lives. Cars are always going to dominate our forms of transport but let's acknowledge that some curtailment can be a sign of the future.

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

1. Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street
2. Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.
3. Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

Respectfully,

Maryann Smythe  
1021 Lake Street

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [Chris Jones](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Keep Lake Street Slow  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 4:20:57 PM

---

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

Hi SF Government -

Please keep Lake Street slow.

My wife & I walk it everyday. We are elderly & disabled & love San Francisco.

Chris

--

-----  
Lake St, San Francisco, CA 94118  
[christopherejones@gmail.com](mailto:christopherejones@gmail.com)  
415-309-5615

**From:** [Chaitrika B](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Friend of Slow Lake Street - Your People Have Spoken  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 3:55:32 PM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

Slow Lake street has been pivotal in keeping morale and health bolstered while we weathered a pandemic and periods of extreme uncertainty. It is the reason many of us have chosen to stay in the city at all, and contribute to the growth and success of San Francisco. With the removal of safe pedestrian areas such as this slow street, I believe you will see an increase in empty lots and struggling landlords as people choose to leave the city that has become more inhospitable to them. With the advent of flexible working and remote job options, there is less and less tying people to stay in a specific area, especially if that area does not value their needs. I urge you to listen to what your people are saying, and not sell out for the sake of quick profit.

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street

Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.

Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

Respectfully,

Chaitrika Budamagunta

**From:** [Galen Avery](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Slow Lake for our children  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 3:12:59 PM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

I love Slow Lake street because it allows me to: safely walk my baby and dog every morning and afternoon, spend more time in nature, and get to know my community. We bought our house off of Lake Street early this year because we were promised it would permanently stay a slow street.

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

1. Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street
2. Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.
3. Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

Respectfully,  
Galen  
Lake Street Resident

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [Alexandra Ozols](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Keep Lake Street permanently Slow  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 3:05:55 PM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

I love Slow Lake street because it allows me and my loved ones - some of whom are seniors, some of whom are very young, some of whom have mobility concerns - safely enjoy walking around the neighborhood.

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

1. Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street
2. Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.
3. Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

**From:** [lisa.mroz@gmail.com](mailto:lisa.mroz@gmail.com)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](mailto:MTABoard@sfmta.com); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](mailto:SlowStreets@sfmta.com); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](mailto:LakeStreet@sfmta.com); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](mailto:Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](mailto:Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](mailto:Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](mailto:SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** I love SLOW LAKE STREET  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 2:39:14 PM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

I love Slow Lake Street because it allows me to engage with my neighbors, watch out for each other, feel safer, become more invested in my community, be proud of my community!

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

1. Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street
2. Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.
3. Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

Respectfully,

Lisa Mroz

**From:** [Axel Ancona Esselmann](#)  
**To:** [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#)  
**Cc:** [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Please keep Lake street closed to through traffic!  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 1:44:02 PM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

I love Slow Lake street because it allows me to:  
Choose the bike or to walk instead of using our car.

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

1. Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street
2. Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.
3. Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

Respectfully,

Axel Ancona Esselmann District 4

--

Axel

**From:** [Meredith Nelson](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** I support permanent slow Lake street  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 1:31:24 PM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

I love Slow Lake street because it allows me to:  
walk, run, bike, and drive safely. It Creates space for safe sustainable transit and costs the city virtually nothing.

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

1. Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street
2. Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.
3. Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

Respectfully,

Meredith Nelson, District 1

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Rachit Agarwal](#)  
**To:** [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#)  
**Cc:** [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Save lives and the planet with slow streets, NOW  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 12:59:56 PM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed, I love Slow Lake street because it allows me to walk and bike safely without worrying about being killed by people driving cars. Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo? Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor. We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars. 1. Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street 2. Implement the purple sign treatments immediately. 3. Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic. Respectfully, Rachit Agarwal

**From:** [Stephen Meeker](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Slow Lake St  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 9:26:03 AM

---

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

There is a campaign to keep Lake St a skow street but I am opposed to it under the current status. 75-80% of the drivers on Lake St pay NO attention to the slow street signs and fly down the street where children are walking and riding bikes. There is going to be a bad accident one of these days. I live on the cul de sac off Lake and it has bothered me from the very beginning. If there is no control over the drivers it makes no sense.

SM

--

[smeeker75@gmail.com](mailto:smeeker75@gmail.com)  
415-608-9487 (cell)

**From:** [Celeste Lee-Bobroff](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [Power, Andres \(MYR\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](#); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [SlowStreets@sfmta.com](#); [LakeStreet@sfmta.com](#); [Senator.Wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Assemblymember.Haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [SlowLakeStreet@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Keep Lake Street Closed  
**Date:** Thursday, September 15, 2022 12:58:35 PM

---

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

Dear SFMTA Board and Mayor Breed,

I love Slow Lake street because it allows me to:

Ride my bike to the west side of the city in relative safety.

Walk my dogs down the street without having to walk around others by stepping into the street to avoid pedestrians coming from the opposite direction.

And:

It builds community by providing a wide walkway for strolling with groups of friends.

It also allows parents with ebikes to get their kids to school efficiently without polluting the environment.

It provides older children a way to get to school in relative safety by creating a safe biking route.

Leaders in world class cities like Paris, Barcelona and New York City are listening to the people. We want a greener city, more transit options and safer streets for our most vulnerable citizens. The road to achieve a livable city where people and communities are prioritized over cars was not easy. It took bold leadership and fortitude to stand up for what is right. We are now at a crossroads. Will you lead or default to the status quo?

Over the last two years we have seen Slow Streets and community spaces transform San Francisco. Slow Lake is one of the most active streets connecting commuters from the West to East side. On any given day, you will see children independently biking to schools and afterschool activities, people all over the Richmond district and beyond biking to Clement or Geary to run errands and tourists biking in groups to see our beautiful attractions on the west side: Baker Beach, Lands End, the Presidio and The Legion of Honor.

We ask you to keep Lake Street slow so we can continue to build on the network of slow streets connecting all neighborhoods for our most vulnerable road users, our children, the elderly and people traveling without cars.

1. Keep Lake street a permanent Slow Street
2. Implement the purple sign treatments immediately.
3. Implement designs to prevent cut through traffic.

Respectfully,

Celeste Lee-Bobroff  
Presidio Heights, District 7

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [Garrick Naguit](#)  
**To:** [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [MTABoard@sfmta.com](mailto:MTABoard@sfmta.com); [Tumlin, Jeffrey \(MTA\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [LivableStreets@sfmta.com](mailto:LivableStreets@sfmta.com); [Parks, Jamie \(MTA\)](#); [Maguire, Tom \(MTA\)](#); [Lasky, Matt \(MTA\)](#); [Leung, Kimberly \(MTA\)](#); [Sweet, Alexandra C. \(MYR\)](#); [dina.el-tawansy@dot.ca.gov](mailto:dina.el-tawansy@dot.ca.gov); [rachel.carpenter@dot.ca.gov](mailto:rachel.carpenter@dot.ca.gov); [Tony.Tavares@dot.ca.gov](mailto:Tony.Tavares@dot.ca.gov)  
**Subject:** Safety improvements to address traffic death on Lombard & Steiner  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 5:00:13 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisor Stefani, Mayor Breed and staff, MTA Board & Staff, and Caltrans Directors,

Today, we held yet another Vision Zero vigil on Lombard & Steiner to bring attention to the pedestrian who was killed by a driver on September 8. This brings the total number of people killed by traffic violence in San Francisco this year to 21.

Lombard is on San Francisco's high-injury network and is a deadly corridor that must be immediately tamed. On June 18, the driver of an SUV traveling over 80 mph slammed into a 22 Fillmore bus just one block away, injuring 6 and sending 2 critically wounded to the hospital. In February a pedestrian crossing Lombard at Steiner was struck and injured. In 2016, Anthony Lowenstein was killed in a horrific crash at Lombard and Divisadero and in 2014 Lori Helmer was killed by a Golden Gate Transit bus driver at Lombard and Van Ness. Last year alone saw 11 collisions with pedestrians and bicyclists between Baker and Van Ness on the Lombard corridor. Steiner and Lombard has seen 18 collisions resulting in injury since 2012, 8 of them serious, and now a death.

SFMTA and Caltrans have ignored these clear warnings indicating a need for significant safety improvements, and as a result, failed to prevent this death. SFMTA needs to work with Caltrans to slow Lombard down. Drivers see Lombard as a highway and drive as if they were not in the middle of a vibrant residential and commercial district. Residents deserve calm, safe streets, and alternatives to driving for their own mobility choices. We are asking for:

A center-lane BRT, creating a fast, safe East-West transportation axis in the Marina, and connected to the Van Ness BRT.

Continuous protected bike lanes from the Presidio to Polk along Lombard.

A road diet. Lombard is a 6-lane freeway, and should instead be a 20 or 25 mph 2-lane street.

No turn-on-red intersections for all of Lombard between Baker and Van Ness.

Other traffic calming changes based on SFMTA analysis

If you, our elected officials, fail to take meaningful action now, more San Franciscans will continue to die. The 2024 Vision Zero deadline is just 15 months away, and we will only get there with decisive action.

We are asking you to honor your commitments to Vision Zero and prioritize permanent safety infrastructure improvements, as soon as possible, before someone is killed again. Please communicate publicly what is being done to address this fatality, and when we can expect improvements to be completed.

Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [irina.torrey](#)  
**To:** [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Catherine.Stephani@sfgov.org](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Mayoral Appointment , San Francisco Public Utilities Commission-Kate Stacy  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 2:53:50 PM  
**Attachments:** [Kate"s letter.docx](#)

---

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

Dear Rules Committee Members, President Walton and Supervisors,

I have attached a letter of support for the mayoral appointment of Kate Stacy to the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. Please do not hesitate to call me if you have any questions. Thank you for your consideration.

My best wishes,

Irina Torrey AICP

Recently retired Manager, Bureau of Environmental Management, SFPUC

September 19, 2022

**Re: Kate Stacy Mayoral Appointment to SFPUC Commission**

Dear Rules Committee Members:

My name is Irina Torrey and I live in the Richmond district. A year ago, I retired as the Manager of the Bureau of Environmental Management at the SFPUC. I strongly support Kate Stacy's appointment to the SFPUC Commission.

In 2006, the Water System Improvement Program (WSIP) was our top priority. Working with the Planning Department, we built the Bureau of Environmental Management to ensure compliance of the Program with all State, federal and City environmental laws and regulations. Hundreds of environmental documents were certified and approved. We also integrated environmental impact prevention measures into project designs and created the first Environmental Construction Compliance Program in the City. Kate Stacy's advice was instrumental to our accomplishment of these goals and the \$4.7 billion WSIP is now complete.

As manager of the City Attorney's Land Use Team, Kate led all legal reviews of draft CEQA documents. For these reviews, it is essential to be objective and to understand the intricacies of the subject matter. For the SFPUC, this means knowing how dams, reservoirs, pipelines, and treatment plants are built and how they function. This knowledge is invaluable in setting policies for water, power, and sewer infrastructure.

With the highest integrity and steadfast on compliance, Kate focuses on the essence of things, not wasting effort on irrelevant minutia. Kate commands high respect, and speaking the language of engineers, planners, scientists, and project managers, she invariably achieves cooperation and consensus.

Kate Stacy will bring a high level of decision making to the SFPUC and therefore I strongly urge you to approve Kate's appointment. Thank you for your consideration. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

With my best wishes,  
*Irina Torrey*

Irina P. Torrey AICP  
iptorrey@comcast.net

**From:** [paul allen](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Letter to Police Commission  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 1:14:01 PM  
**Attachments:** [CHNPolComTE.pdf](#)

---

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

To: San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Kindly see immediately below a PDF of a letter sent today to the Police Commission, with a copy to the Board of Supervisors, on SFPD Draft General Order 9.01 Traffic Enforcement and Curtailing the Use of Pretext Stops.

Thank you.

Paul Allen  
Secretary,  
Corbett Heights Neighbors



September 19, 2022  
[info@corbettneighbors.com](mailto:info@corbettneighbors.com)  
San Francisco, CA 94114

**San Francisco Police Commission**

Cindy Elias [cindy.elias@sfgov.org](mailto:cindy.elias@sfgov.org)  
Larry Yee [lawrence.yee1@sfgov.org](mailto:lawrence.yee1@sfgov.org)  
Jim Byrne [jim.byrne@sfgov.org](mailto:jim.byrne@sfgov.org)  
Max Carter-Oberstone [max.carter-orberstone@sfgov.org](mailto:max.carter-orberstone@sfgov.org)  
Jesus Yanez [jesus.g.yanez@sfgov.org](mailto:jesus.g.yanez@sfgov.org)  
Kevin Benedicto [kevin.benedicto@sfgov.org](mailto:kevin.benedicto@sfgov.org)  
Debra Walker [debra.walker@sfgov.org](mailto:debra.walker@sfgov.org)

**Copy:** San Francisco Board of Supervisors [board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org)  
Mayor London Breed [MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org](mailto:MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org)  
Stacy Youngblood [stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org](mailto:stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org)

**Re: SFPD Draft General Order 9.01 Traffic Enforcement & Curtailing the Use of Pretext Stops**

In connection with the above captioned matter, we write (1) *substantively*, to oppose the adoption in its present form of this SFPD Draft General Order that would bar officers from stopping or citing persons for violating numerous California motor vehicle laws and San Francisco codes; and (2) *procedurally*, to urge the Commission itself, not a proxy, to hold public hearings *en banc* throughout the city with adequate prior public notice if and when any draft order is ripe for Police Commission consideration; in which case the Commission should post on-line the draft and all evidence collected both pro and con, as well as a memorandum that explains the purpose of the proposal, the alternatives considered, and the likely effects on public safety and police department morale.

**Statement of Interest**

Corbett Heights Neighbors (CHN) is an 18 year old neighborhood organization in the Corona Heights section of the city. We seek to maintain and enhance the quality of our neighborhood. <https://www.corbettneighbors.com>

## **Substantively, There is No Basis to Abrogate More than a Dozen Traffic Laws.**

Of course, we oppose and condemn biased policing (as defined in the draft General Order) and we acknowledge that SFPD license plate stops have been reported to be vastly higher for black drivers than whites.<sup>1</sup> And we also acknowledge that city-wide per capita police stops (not just traffic related) for blacks are disproportionately high.<sup>2</sup> Biased policing has no place in San Francisco; and of course *any* police stop can pose a physical risk to officer and citizen alike.

At the same time, we believe that laws should be enforced; and we see no compelling reason to exempt more than a dozen traffic laws enumerated in the Draft Order, all of which were duly enacted for the purpose of enhancing public safety and welfare. Truly, this is an astonishing list: e.g. failure to signal while turning (unless the failure substantially increases the likelihood of injury or death); most otherwise illegal U-turns from the far left lane; any parking infraction if the car is occupied; a host of violations associated with failure to display registration tags or plates; malfunctioning lights unless after dark; and riding bikes or non-motorized scooters on sidewalks.<sup>3</sup> Notably, this particularized “no enforcement” list goes well beyond a ban on pre-textual stops. Should it make its way to the Police Commission for formal action, CHN would oppose draft General Order 9.01.

The purpose of the draft General Order is “...to reduce racial bias in the enforcement of our traffic laws.” 9.01.01. But may we start with first principles: if the problem is bias in making stops or issuing citations, one might have thought that the first and most obvious remedy is more officer training and accountability, not elimination of officers’ authority to enforce the law. We would support such additional training if it is necessary. If housing inspectors or fire marshals were abusing their authority or acting contrary to policy, would we think the remedy is to toss the fire and housing codes into the Big Belly trash bin — to the serious detriment of public health and safety at large — rather than improving training and holding accountable the inspectors and fire marshals? To ask the question is to answer it.

---

<sup>1</sup>See SFPD Stops Policy Public Advisory Group, p. 5. Session 2 Police Commission Powerpoint Presentation, August 25, 2022 accessible here: <https://sf.gov/resource/2022/departments-general-orders-under-submission>

<sup>2</sup> San Francisco Police Department Quarterly Activity and Data Report Quarter I 2022, p. 54, accessible here: <https://www.sanfranciscopolice.org/your-sfpd/published-reports/quarterly-activity-data-report-qadr> Hereafter: Police Activity Report.

<sup>3</sup> San Francisco Police Department Draft General Order, Traffic Enforcement & Curtailing the Use of Pretext Stops, at Sec. 9.01.04 Limiting Stops for Low-Level Offenses. [https://sf.gov/sites/default/files/2022-05/DGO%209.01\\_DRAFT\\_05.06.22\\_v2.pdf](https://sf.gov/sites/default/files/2022-05/DGO%209.01_DRAFT_05.06.22_v2.pdf) There are limited exceptions to the stop or detain prohibition. See Sec. 9.01.04(C)

Nowhere in the public record on this Draft have we seen a discussion of the likely effect on public safety or police department morale, the latter surely related to the former.

Regarding public safety, the most recent Police Department Quarterly Activity report notes that a whopping 54% of all City-wide stops were for traffic violations (41% for suspicion of criminal activity); and only 12% of all stops resulted in “no action.”<sup>4</sup> It is well known that the City is not on track to meet its “Vision Zero” goal for traffic deaths; and in a paradox that has apparently eluded the advocates of this proposal, “Black/African American individuals are disproportionately impacted by traffic collisions resulting in fatality, representing 30% of people killed in traffic collisions despite representing only 5% of the city’s race/ethnicity demographic.”<sup>5</sup> Seniors (aged 65 and above) and “people experiencing homelessness” are also disproportionately affected. *Ibid.* Just in the last 30 days, there were two serious traffic incidents within five blocks of each other in our neighborhood, one a fatality, the other a pedestrian injury. What are the likely knock-on effects, in addition to fatalities, when a baker’s dozen of motor vehicle violations are neutered? When, for example, an occupied car can park illegally (in front of a fire hydrant or an emergency MUNI exit?), turn signals become mostly optional, and automobile lights need not function in the fog.

We hope that police department morale is something about which the Police Commission is concerned. None of us is a police officer but we cannot help speculating that moving more than a dozen motor vehicle infractions (bicycle and non-motorized scooter as well) to the “never mind” list is detrimental to morale, retention, and recruitment. Naively, we had assumed until a few days ago that SFPD was down “only” 250 officers, but a September 14 report from ABC7 News quotes Chief Scott as saying that the Department is short 525 officers, and that many more might depart this year.<sup>6</sup> What would this do for public safety?

In its present form, the logic of the Draft Order is wanting and the implications for public safety generally and the SFPD specifically seem not to be taken seriously; worse, the Draft is utterly heedless of context. Particularly since the pandemic, San Francisco’s reputation is of a declining, even failed city.<sup>7</sup> Drugs, homelessness, tents, population decline, empty downtown office buildings, mentally distressed persons roaming the streets, brazen shoplifting, widespread theft of catalytic converters (just recently from

---

<sup>4</sup> Police Activity Report, p. 82. The same Report, at p. 105, notes the filing of only one bias complaint.

<sup>5</sup> Vision Zero Traffic Fatalities 2021 End of Year Report, May 2022. <https://www.visionzerosf.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/Vision-Zero-2021-End-of-Year-Traffic-Fatality-Report-FINAL-PUBLIC-1.pdf> at p. 6.

<sup>6</sup> <https://abc7news.com/sf-crime-police-staffing-car-break-ins/12230630/>

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2022/06/how-san-francisco-became-failed-city/661199/>

four police vehicles); that's the tableau. The public's perception is that law enforcement generally is *laissez faire*, traffic enforcement an after-thought<sup>8</sup>.

Perhaps for all of these reasons, the voters of San Francisco, by a margin of 55% to 45%, voted to remove the previous District Attorney so that the criminal justice system in our City could be altered significantly. Additionally, just a few days ago the San Francisco Chronicle's survey of 1653 City residents revealed how wide and deep is the distress in the community: 45% having experienced theft in the last 5 years, 65% think that life here is worse than it was when they moved here, and exceptionally low ratings were awarded for virtually all government entities.<sup>9</sup> On top of all this, we know that the present District Attorney has stated publicly that she opposes a ban on all pre-textual stops.

In sum, the sweeping terms of the Draft Order — particularly the baker's dozen of neutered motor vehicle code provisions — are alien to the Order's stated purpose, which itself could be realized through means less detrimental to public health and safety as well as Police Department morale. Furthermore, to entertain this order is to hurtle even faster down a path that has already led to overwhelming public disapproval of the criminal justice system and widespread disenchantment with conditions in the City as well as its elected and appointed officials.<sup>10</sup>

### **The Incomplete Process Being Used to Draft and Take Comment on the Draft Traffic Enforcement General Order**

As the Police Commission well knows, to date the process for drafting and considering this General Order has been to delegate the drafting to a Working Group that has periodically met for months; and, more recently, to the San Francisco Human Rights Commission (HRC) for "listening sessions" on public interactions with the police. To us, this seems almost deterministic and not a fair way to solicit public input. The general public cannot realistically be expected to attend the sausage making of the Working Group; and it seems incomplete to have the HRC be the main forum for public comment given that it has no authority over, or responsibility for, public safety or police department morale. Listening sessions to hear of interactions with the police within the domain of the SFHRC, of course; beyond that, no. A General Order adopted solely

---

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.sfchronicle.com/sf/bayarea/heatherknight/article/sfpd-traffic-tickets-17355651.php>

<sup>9</sup> See in general the September 13, 2022 Chronicle Article, "New SF Chronicle Poll Finds Pervasive Gloom." <https://www.sfchronicle.com/sf/article/sfnext-poll-sentiment-17435794.php>

<sup>10</sup> We think the Chronicle editorial board had it mostly right as it summed up the results of the survey cited in footnote 9: "There is no doubt this city is simmering in organic, home-grown discontent - born of a deep and personal understanding of the shortcomings of public life and the failure of leadership to meaningfully improve conditions on the ground, particularly as it relates to homelessness, public safety, and housing." <https://www.sfchronicle.com/opinion/editorials/article/sfnext-poll-san-francisco-17442479.php> Abrogating more than a dozen motor vehicle laws would take us in precisely the wrong direction.



pursuant to these procedures would be barren of any moral authority in the eyes of the general public; would reflect a cavalier approach to fashioning Orders with important public policy and safety implications; and, for these reasons, would tarnish the reputation of this Commission as well as the Mayor and Board of Supervisors who appointed or confirmed you.

Accordingly, in order to ensure that there will be a transparent, open, and fair process for the consideration *by the public at large* of a Draft Traffic Enforcement General Order in the event one becomes ripe for Commission review and public comment, we respectfully request:

- That you adopt a resolution that sets forth now what those additional hearing procedures will be once a Final Draft is prepared.
- That at such time as a Final Draft is ripe for full public review, you publish that Draft on your website along with a supporting memorandum that clearly describes the purposes of the policy changes and the reasons therefor; the alternatives considered that would not bar officers from issuing citations or making arrests in connection with the itemized list of traffic infractions; the evidence collected, pro and con; and the likely effects of the policy changes on public health and safety as well as police department morale.
- That at least 45 days advance notice be provided for submission of written comments.
- And that, thereafter, the entire Commission, meeting *en banc* following receipt of written submissions, hold its own public hearings — its own “listening sessions” — throughout the City, i.e. in at least a handful of neighborhoods, on the text and implications of the Draft Order.

Thank you for considering our views.

Sincerely,  
Paul Allen, Secretary  
On Behalf of the Board of Directors  
Corbett Heights Neighbors

**From:** [California Fish and Game Commission](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** 15-Day Notice of Modifications to Proposed Pink Shrimp Regulations  
**Date:** Thursday, September 22, 2022 9:35:47 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,

A 15-day notice of modifications to text of proposed regulations concerning pink shrimp has been posted to the Commission's website and is available at <https://fgc.ca.gov/Regulations/2022-New-and-Proposed#56>.

Please refer to the notice for additional information.

Sincerely,

Maurene Trotter  
**California Fish and Game Commission**



*Not yet signed up to receive our informative emails?*

Sign up

Facebook



Twitter



LinkedIn



California Fish and Game Commission | 715 P Street, 16th Floor, 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](mailto:fgc@fgc.ca.gov) powered by



Try email marketing for free today!



**From:** Aaron Goodman  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS)  
**Subject:** Where Are All the Undergrads? College Student Population in SF Drops by 10,000, New Data Shows  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 7:06:57 AM

---

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

So what's the vacant units at SFSU-CSU  
I'm university park north and university park south and is it due to increased housing and tuition costs in D7

Why allow profiteering off of the housing prior rental stock that was rent controlled?

Force SFSU aback to the table on their masterplan and regain some of that housing for families and working class citizens, including seniors and students who cannot afford the uptick in rents every move out and move in...

Ag D11

[https://url.avanan.click/v2/\\_\\_\\_https://sfstandard.com/uncategorized/college-student-population-in-sf-drops-by-10000/\\_\\_\\_YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzphNjI3OTRlZjhhNDM0M2RkM2YwOWY2NjhiMjc5MWQ2MDo2OmRlZTA6OWMyN2FiODBlODZmYjY1MTc1MWZiYzExODYwOGQwOGI4ZDNIODg3OWQyYzgzYzI5MmNhMjI5YjIjZTkzZTA3NDpwOIQ](https://url.avanan.click/v2/___https://sfstandard.com/uncategorized/college-student-population-in-sf-drops-by-10000/___YXAzOnNmZHQyOmE6bzphNjI3OTRlZjhhNDM0M2RkM2YwOWY2NjhiMjc5MWQ2MDo2OmRlZTA6OWMyN2FiODBlODZmYjY1MTc1MWZiYzExODYwOGQwOGI4ZDNIODg3OWQyYzgzYzI5MmNhMjI5YjIjZTkzZTA3NDpwOIQ)

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 100 Broadway concerns / Permit App 2022033311283  
**Date:** Friday, September 16, 2022 10:44:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Julie Chun regarding 100 Broadway Street.

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](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

---

**From:** BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, September 16, 2022 10:40 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** FW: 100 Broadway concerns / Permit App 2022033311283

C-pages please. Thank you.

**Jocelyn Wong**  
 San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
 San Francisco, CA 94102  
 T: 415.554.7702 | F: 415.554.5163  
[jocelyn.wong@sfgov.org](mailto:jocelyn.wong@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*



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:** Julie Chun <[minipower88@gmail.com](mailto:minipower88@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Friday, September 16, 2022 10:20 AM

**To:** [imgroups@gmail.com](mailto:imgroups@gmail.com)

**Cc:** Lane, Emily (CPC) <[Emily.Lane@sfgov.org](mailto:Emily.Lane@sfgov.org)>; BOS Legislation, (BOS) <[bos.legislation@sfgov.org](mailto:bos.legislation@sfgov.org)>

**Subject:** 100 Broadway concerns / Permit App 2022033311283

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

Dear Mr. Michelson,

We live nearby **100 Broadway**, therefore we received the Change of Use notice from the SF Planning Department. I am writing to express my concerns about the Cannabis retail store/smoking lounge which may eventually occupy the building.

I'm very alarmed that a **large smoking lounge is included in the plans**, but even so, people may opt to smoke just outside the building. The proximity of this building to a nearby daycare is a real concern (across the street at 735 Davis/Broadway Cove). John Yehall Chin Elementary School is also nearby at 350 Broadway. Ultimately children and seniors may be passing the building on a daily basis in front of an establishment that promotes and encourages the use of cannabis. Of course no one would expect patrons to loiter after visiting the store, however once "under the influence" – people may opt to stay in the area. The aroma of cannabis permeates and lingers in the air.

**And how does your organization plan to monitor these increased inhalation hazards and particulates for people in this mixed use neighborhood?** And how can you control people outdoors smoking and possibly loitering 20 feet away (or more) from a building when families, seniors and children live in very close proximity. This establishment may create more of a security and health risk for this neighborhood.

Please explain why this business is **exempt** from environmental review? Also, the aroma of cannabis may end up permeating the entire waterfront and greet SF visitors just landing at the port. Sir, this is not Amsterdam.

I question why you feel this is the perfect locale for your establishment? Or is it just the right price? Please reconsider your location.

Sincerely,  
Julie Chun





## Request for City Services - Clerk of the Board

[Enter Personal Details](#) > [Enter Service Request Details](#) > [Review & Submit](#) > [Attach Photo\(s\) / File\(s\)](#) > [Print & Track](#)

### Successfully Submitted

Thank you for your submission. You will receive an email confirmation with a link to follow the progress of your submission.

If you have any additional requests or questions, you can call us 7 days a week, 24 hours a day at 311 (for calls outside of San Francisco please dial 415-701-2311).

**Your Tracking Number is: 15843511**

Sep 19 2022 6:35PM

Please print a copy for your records. You may close your browser when done.

#### Location Information:

Location Description: City College

#### Request Details:

Category: Complaint  
Department: Board of Supervisors (BOS)  
Sub-Division: Clerk of the Board

#### Additional Information:

Additional Request Details: Dear city, Why is it that my tax dollars are paying for City College to be free and public but the tennis courts are open only to the +55k private school Lick Wilmerding? My child goes to Lowell, we support and attend the public system, but we pay for city owned courts to be only accessible to a private school team? These city owned courts are locked all the time to the community (even on weekends) unless open to the private schools?! Is Lick Wilmerding paying for court fees / usage in addition to our tax dollars paying for locked up, publicly inaccessible tennis courts? Please help in opening these city for our public community asap!

#### Customer Contact Information:

First Name: Dana  
Last Name: Glenn  
Primary Phone:  
Alternate Phone: 77  
Address Number: Cedro  
Street Name: San Francisco  
City, State: CA,  
ZIP Code:  
Email: danaglennsf@gmail.com

Customer requested to be contacted by the department servicing their request:

BACK OFFICE USE ONLY \*\*\*\*\*

Source Agency Request Number:

Responsible Agency Request Number:

Service Request Work Status:

Work Status Updated:

[Print](#)

**FROM:**

Ms. S. Patricia Lawrence  
 740 Rhode Island St Apt 103  
 San Francisco, CA 94107

SAN FRANCISCO CA 940

19 SEP 2022 PM 2 L



I call upon the Board of Supervisors to enforce the terms of the 2013 Development Agreement mandating that Sutter/CPMC maintain Labor and Delivery services at their Mission Bernal Campus (MBC), and extend the agreement from 2028 to 2040 while doubling the fines if Sutter violates it again. The board must demand that Sutter Health – a \$13 billion "not-for-profit" corporation:

1. Restore the Labor and Delivery unit at MBC with full support for the Women's Center.
2. Pay the \$4 million penalty stipulated in the Development Agreement for closing the service
3. Rebuild the census to 2018 levels and recruit sufficient nursing and support staff to comply with A.B. 394 Safe Staffing nurse-to-patient ratios.

Labor donated

**TO:**

The SF Board of Supervisors  
 1 Carlton B. Goodlett Pl. #244  
 San Francisco, CA 94102

**FROM:**

Isabella Rosen  
 320 Winfield - SF  
 94102

SAN FRANCISCO CA 940

19 SEP 2022 PM 2 L



I call upon the Board of Supervisors to enforce the terms of the 2013 Development Agreement mandating that Sutter/CPMC maintain Labor and Delivery services at their Mission Bernal Campus (MBC), and extend the agreement from 2028 to 2040 while doubling the fines if Sutter violates it again. The board must demand that Sutter Health – a \$13 billion "not-for-profit" corporation:

1. Restore the Labor and Delivery unit at MBC with full support for the Women's Center.
2. Pay the \$4 million penalty stipulated in the Development Agreement for closing the service
3. Rebuild the census to 2018 levels and recruit sufficient nursing and support staff to comply with A.B. 394 Safe Staffing nurse-to-patient ratios.

Labor donated

**TO:**

The SF Board of Supervisors  
 1 Carlton B. Goodlett Pl. #244  
 San Francisco, CA 94102

94102-468999

FROM: Micky Ostler  
671 Carolina St  
SF, CA 94107

I call upon the Board of Supervisors to enforce the terms of the 2013 Development Agreement mandating that Sutter/CPMC maintain Labor and Delivery services at their Mission Bernal Campus (MBC), and extend the agreement from 2028 to 2040 while doubling the fines if Sutter violates it again. The board must demand that Sutter Health – a \$13 billion "not-for-profit" corporation:

1. Restore the Labor and Delivery unit at MBC with full support for the Women's Center.
2. Pay the \$4 million penalty stipulated in the Development Agreement for closing the service
3. Rebuild the census to 2018 levels and recruit sufficient nursing and support staff to comply with A.B. 394 Safe Staffing nurse-to-patient ratios.

Labor donated

TO:

The SF Board of Supervisors  
1 Carlton B. Goodlett Pl. #244  
San Francisco, CA 94102



19 SEP 2022 PM 3 L

94102

FROM: RAYMOND O'CONNOR  
1483 KANSAS ST  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94107

I call upon the Board of Supervisors to enforce the terms of the 2013 Development Agreement mandating that Sutter/CPMC maintain Labor and Delivery services at their Mission Bernal Campus (MBC), and extend the agreement from 2028 to 2040 while doubling the fines if Sutter violates it again. The board must demand that Sutter Health – a \$13 billion "not-for-profit" corporation:

1. Restore the Labor and Delivery unit at MBC with full support for the Women's Center.
2. Pay the \$4 million penalty stipulated in the Development Agreement for closing the service
3. Rebuild the census to 2018 levels and recruit sufficient nursing and support staff to comply with A.B. 394 Safe Staffing nurse-to-patient ratios.

Labor donated

TO:

The SF Board of Supervisors  
1 Carlton B. Goodlett Pl. #244  
San Francisco, CA 94102



19 SEP 2022 PM 5 L

94102

MAKE THIS HAPPEN



**FROM:**

Mr. Jon Gatto  
1465 De Haro St.  
San Francisco, CA 94107



I call upon the Board of Supervisors to enforce the terms of the 2013 Development Agreement mandating that Sutter/CPMC maintain Labor and Delivery services at their Mission Bernal Campus (MBC), and extend the agreement from 2028 to 2040 while doubling the fines if Sutter violates it again. The board must demand that Sutter Health – a \$13 billion "not-for-profit" corporation:

1. Restore the Labor and Delivery unit at MBC with full support for the Women's Center.
2. Pay the \$4 million penalty stipulated in the Development Agreement for closing the service
3. Rebuild the census to 2018 levels and recruit sufficient nursing and support staff to comply with A.B. 394 Safe Staffing nurse-to-patient ratios.

Labor donated

**TO:**

The SF Board of Supervisors  
1 Carlton B. Goodlett Pl. #244  
San Francisco, CA 94102

*Jon Gatto*

**FROM:**

*Sean Young*  
695 5th St #11  
S.F. CA 94107



I call upon the Board of Supervisors to enforce the terms of the 2013 Development Agreement mandating that Sutter/CPMC maintain Labor and Delivery services at their Mission Bernal Campus (MBC), and extend the agreement from 2028 to 2040 while doubling the fines if Sutter violates it again. The board must demand that Sutter Health – a \$13 billion "not-for-profit" corporation:

1. Restore the Labor and Delivery unit at MBC with full support for the Women's Center.
2. Pay the \$4 million penalty stipulated in the Development Agreement for closing the service
3. Rebuild the census to 2018 levels and recruit sufficient nursing and support staff to comply with A.B. 394 Safe Staffing nurse-to-patient ratios.

Labor donated

**TO:**

The SF Board of Supervisors  
1 Carlton B. Goodlett Pl. #244  
San Francisco, CA 94102

*Sean Young*

**FROM:**

Paul Colfer  
1465 De Haro St  
San Francisco, CA 94107



I call upon the Board of Supervisors to enforce the terms of the 2013 Development Agreement mandating that Sutter/CPMC maintain Labor and Delivery services at their Mission Bernal Campus (MBC), and extend the agreement from 2028 to 2040 while doubling the fines if Sutter violates it again. The board must demand that Sutter Health – a \$13 billion "not-for-profit" corporation:

1. Restore the Labor and Delivery unit at MBC with full support for the Women's Center.
2. Pay the \$4 million penalty stipulated in the Development Agreement for closing the service
3. Rebuild the census to 2018 levels and recruit sufficient nursing and support staff to comply with A.B. 394 Safe Staffing, nurse-to-patient ratios.

Labor donated

*Paul D. Colfer*

**TO:**

The SF Board of Supervisors  
1 Carlton B. Goodlett Pl. #244  
San Francisco, CA 94102

**FROM:** Rose Marie OSTER  
- 671 Carolina  
SF, CA 94107

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94107

I call upon the Board of Supervisors to enforce the terms of the 2013 Development Agreement mandating that Sutter/CPMC maintain Labor and Delivery services at their Mission Bernal Campus (MBC), and extend the agreement from 2028 to 2040 while doubling the fines if Sutter violates it again. The board must demand that Sutter Health – a \$13 billion "not-for-profit" corporation:

1. Restore the Labor and Delivery unit at MBC with full support for the Women's Center.
2. Pay the \$4 million penalty stipulated in the Development Agreement for closing the service
3. Rebuild the census to 2018 levels and recruit sufficient nursing and support staff to comply with A.B. 394 Safe Staffing nurse-to-patient ratios.

Labor donated

*R. Oster*

**TO:**

The SF Board of Supervisors  
1 Carlton B. Goodlett Pl. #244  
San Francisco, CA 94102



**Sutter/CPMC Must  
Restore Labor and  
Delivery at the  
Mission Bernal  
Campus, Now!**

**Sutter/CPMC Must  
Restore Labor and  
Delivery at the  
Mission Bernal  
Campus, Now!**

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** 12B Waivers  
**Date:** Thursday, September 22, 2022 2:44:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [12b DBI membership.pdf](#)  
[12b DBI newspaper subscriptions.pdf](#)  
[12b DBI Subscription National Fire Codes.pdf](#)  
[12b DPH.pdf](#)  
[12b HSA training.pdf](#)  
[12b PUC powder activated carbon.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached recently approved 12B Waivers:

**Requester:** Johanna Gendelman

**Department:** HSA

**Waiver Justification:** 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

**Supplier ID:** 0000009034

**Requested total cost:** \$958,407.00

**Short Description:** Social work and related skills training to staff. Welfare fraud Detection and Prevention Training to SF HSA staff

**Requester:** Tsz Yin Ko

**Department:** DBI

**Waiver Justification:** 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

**Supplier ID:** 0000014503

**Requested total cost:** \$1,345.50

**Short Description:** Subscription for National Fire Codes

**Requester:** Tsz Yin Ko

**Department:** DBI

**Waiver Justification:** 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

**Supplier ID:** 0000014503

**Requested total cost:** \$175.00

**Short Description:** Membership Renewal

**Requester:** Samuel Hoffman

**Department:** DPH

**Waiver Justification:** 21A - GPO Health Related Commodities and Services (DPH Only)

**Supplier ID:** 0000049687

**Requested total cost:** \$300,000.00

**Short Description:** FOLLETT: Medical Grade Refrigerator/Freezer and related equipment and supplier; Maintenance & Repair of equipment

**Requester:** Tsz Yin Ko

**Department:** DBI

**Waiver Justification:** 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

**Supplier ID:** 0000011805

**Requested total cost:** \$969.80

**Short Description:** Subscription Renewal

**Requester:** David Agam

**Department:** PUC

**Waiver Justification:** 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

**Supplier ID:** 0000038033

**Requested total cost:** \$2,600,000.00

**Short Description:** Contract to procure powder activated carbon (PAC), an additive used in water treatment applications to remove taste and odor to the finished water supply.

Sincerely,

**Richard Lagunte**

**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

[richard.lagunte@sfgov.org](mailto:richard.lagunte@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

**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.*



**Report Title:** CMD 12B Waiver Details  
**Run Date and Time:** 2022-09-21 15:12:36 Pacific Daylight Time  
**Run by:** ServiceNow Admin  
**Table name:** u\_cmd\_12b\_waiver

**CMD 12B Waiver**

|                                      |                     |                        |                               |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Number:                              | CMD12B0001664       | Request Status:        | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval |
| Requested for:                       | Tsz Yin Ko          | State:                 | Work in Progress              |
| Department Head/Delegated authority: | Junko Laxamana      | Waiver Type:           | 12B Waiver                    |
| Opened:                              | 2022-09-21 12:16:12 | 12B Waiver Type:       | Limited (Under 250K)          |
|                                      |                     | Requesting Department: | DBI                           |
|                                      |                     | Requester Phone:       |                               |
|                                      |                     | Awaiting Info from:    |                               |
|                                      |                     | Awaiting Info reason:  |                               |
|                                      |                     | Opened by:             | Tsz Yin Ko                    |
|                                      |                     | Watch list:            |                               |

## Short Description:

## Membership Renewal

|                                                                          |                                                     |                             |            |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|
| Supplier ID:                                                             | 0000014503                                          | Requested Amount:           | \$175.00   |
| Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?: | New Waiver                                          | Increase Amount:            | \$0.00     |
| Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:                                        |                                                     | Previously Approved Amount: | \$0.00     |
|                                                                          |                                                     | Total Requested Amount:     | \$175.00   |
| Document Type:                                                           | Purchase Order                                      | Enter Contract ID:          |            |
| 12B Waiver Justification:                                                | 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)                   | Enter Requisition ID:       |            |
| City Treasurer:                                                          | Jose Cisneros                                       | Enter Purchase Order ID:    | 0000658725 |
| Admin Code Chapter:                                                      | Chapter 21 Goods and Services or MTA/DPH Equivalent | Enter Direct Voucher ID:    |            |
|                                                                          |                                                     | Waiver Start Date:          | 2022-11-03 |
|                                                                          |                                                     | Waiver End Date:            | 2023-11-02 |

|                                                               |       |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Advertising:                                                  | false |
| Commodities, Equipment and Hardware :                         | false |
| Equipment and Vehicle Lease:                                  | false |
| On Premise Software and Support:                              | false |
| Online Content, Reports, Periodicals and Journals:            | false |
| Professional and General Services:                            | true  |
| Software as a Service (SaaS) and Cloud Software Applications: | false |
| Vehicles and Trailers:                                        | false |

Detail the purpose of this contract is and what goods and/or services the contra:

- (a) National Fire Protection Association  
(b) 1 year membership of National Fire  
(c) Membership renewal from 11/3/22 to 11/2/23 to keep up to date on related codes/ trainings

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

I had emailed the vendor for encouraging them to be 12b compliant and have provided the 12B compliance process to vendor.

Cancel Notes:

#### CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:

CMD Analyst Decision:

CMD Analyst Comments:

CMD Director:

Select the reason for this request:

#### CMD Director

CMD Director:

CMD Director Decision:

Reason for Determination:

#### 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Non Property Contracts)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Sole Source – Non Property Contract

Justification Reason:

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

#### 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Property Contracts)

City Property Status:

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question1:

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question2:

#### 12B.5-1(a)(1)(Property Contracts)

Sole Source – Property Contract

Justification Reason:

#### 12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency)

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency) Question2:

#### 12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation)

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question1 :

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question2:

#### 12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Non Property)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Public Entity Sole Source – Non  
Property Contract Justification  
Reason:

Explain why this is a Sole Source (Public Entity):

#### 12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Property)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity SS-PC) Question1:

#### 12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity - Substantial)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-SPI)  
Question1:

#### 12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms)

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question1:

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question2:

#### 12B.5-1(e) Investments and Services

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question1:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question2:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question3:

#### 12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk Water, Power and

Bulk Water: false

Bulk Power: false

Bulk Gas: false

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG)  
Question2:

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG) Question1:

#### 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question5:

#### 12B.5-1(d)(1)(No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question1:

This is a sole source for the membership renewal.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question2 :

Continuing membership to keep up to date on related codes/ trainings. This is a sole source for the membership renewal.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question3:

it does not conflict. Membership renewal for the period 11/3/22 to 11/2/23.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question4:

Yes

#### 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question5:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question6:

#### 12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity)

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question4:

#### SEC 21.42 (DPH Only)

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

#### SEC 21A GPO (DPH Only)

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

#### Section 8A.102(b) (MTA Only)

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q1:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q2:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q3:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q4:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q5:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q6:

#### Activities

Additional comments:

**Related List Title:** Approval List

**Table name:** sysapproval\_approver

**Query Condition:** Approval for = CMD12B0001664

**Sort Order:** Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

| State    | Approver       | Approving                        | Created             | Approval set | Comments |
|----------|----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|----------|
| Approved | Junko Laxamana | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001664 | 2022-09-21 15:00:11 |              |          |

**Related List Title:** Metric List

**Table name:** metric\_instance

**Query Condition:** Table = u\_cmd\_12b\_waiver AND ID = 58c6a6421b46d9104cc655392a4bcb9a

**Sort Order:** None

8 Metrics

| Created             | Definition           | ID                               | Value                         | Start               | End                 | Duration           | Calculation complete |
|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| 2022-09-21 15:00:15 | OCA 12B Metric       | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001664 | Draft                         | 2022-09-21 15:00:11 | 2022-09-21 15:00:11 | 0 Seconds          | true                 |
| 2022-09-21 15:02:55 | OCA 12B Metric       | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001664 | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval | 2022-09-21 15:02:50 |                     |                    | false                |
| 2022-09-21 15:00:15 | OCA 12B Metric       | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001664 | Dept. Head approval           | 2022-09-21 15:00:11 | 2022-09-21 15:02:50 | 2 Minutes          | true                 |
| 2022-09-21 12:18:46 | OCA 12B Metric       | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001664 | Draft                         | 2022-09-21 12:18:44 | 2022-09-21 15:00:11 | 2 Hours 41 Minutes | true                 |
| 2022-09-21 15:02:55 | Assigned to Duration | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001664 | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval | 2022-09-21 15:02:50 |                     |                    | false                |
| 2022-09-21 15:00:15 | Assigned to Duration | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001664 | Draft                         | 2022-09-21 15:00:11 | 2022-09-21 15:00:11 | 0 Seconds          | true                 |
| 2022-09-21 12:18:47 | Assigned to Duration | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001664 | Draft                         | 2022-09-21 12:18:44 | 2022-09-21 15:00:11 | 2 Hours 41 Minutes | true                 |
| 2022-09-21 15:00:15 | Assigned to Duration | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001664 | Dept. Head approval           | 2022-09-21 15:00:11 | 2022-09-21 15:02:50 | 2 Minutes          | true                 |

**Report Title:** CMD 12B Waiver Details  
**Run Date and Time:** 2022-09-21 14:02:27 Pacific Daylight Time  
**Run by:** ServiceNow Admin  
**Table name:** u\_cmd\_12b\_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

|                                      |                     |                        |                               |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Number:                              | CMD12B0001656       | Request Status:        | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval |
| Requested for:                       | Tsz Yin Ko          | State:                 | Work in Progress              |
| Department Head/Delegated authority: | Junko Laxamana      | Waiver Type:           | 12B Waiver                    |
| Opened:                              | 2022-09-21 09:28:38 | 12B Waiver Type:       | Limited (Under 250K)          |
|                                      |                     | Requesting Department: | DBI                           |
|                                      |                     | Requester Phone:       |                               |
|                                      |                     | Awaiting Info from:    |                               |
|                                      |                     | Awaiting Info reason:  |                               |
|                                      |                     | Opened by:             | Tsz Yin Ko                    |
|                                      |                     | Watch list:            |                               |

Short Description:

Subscription Renewal

|                                                                          |                                                     |                             |            |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|
| Supplier ID:                                                             | 0000011805                                          | Requested Amount:           | \$969.80   |
| Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?: | New Waiver                                          | Increase Amount:            | \$0.00     |
| Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:                                        |                                                     | Previously Approved Amount: | \$0.00     |
|                                                                          |                                                     | Total Requested Amount:     | \$969.80   |
| Document Type:                                                           | Purchase Order                                      | Enter Contract ID:          |            |
| 12B Waiver Justification:                                                | 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)                   | Enter Requisition ID:       |            |
| City Treasurer:                                                          | Jose Cisneros                                       | Enter Purchase Order ID:    | 0000658530 |
| Admin Code Chapter:                                                      | Chapter 21 Goods and Services or MTA/DPH Equivalent | Enter Direct Voucher ID:    |            |
|                                                                          |                                                     | Waiver Start Date:          | 2022-10-12 |
|                                                                          |                                                     | Waiver End Date:            | 2023-10-12 |

|                                                               |       |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Advertising:                                                  | false |
| Commodities, Equipment and Hardware :                         | false |
| Equipment and Vehicle Lease:                                  | false |
| On Premise Software and Support:                              | false |
| Online Content, Reports, Periodicals and Journals:            | true  |
| Professional and General Services:                            | false |
| Software as a Service (SaaS) and Cloud Software Applications: | false |
| Vehicles and Trailers:                                        | false |

Detail the purpose of this contract is and what goods and/or services the contra:

(a) S F CHRONICLE- DIV OF HEARST COMMCTN INC

(b) Newspaper subscription, in order to stay up-to-date with current events

(c) Subscription renewal for 1 Year. The acquisition or use of newspapers that are unavailable from another source.

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

i had emailed the vendor encouraging them to be 12b compliant and have provided the 12B compliance process to vendor.

Cancel Notes:

#### CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:

CMD Analyst Decision:

CMD Analyst Comments:

CMD Director:

Select the reason for this request:

#### CMD Director

CMD Director:

CMD Director Decision:

Reason for Determination:

#### 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Non Property Contracts)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Sole Source – Non Property Contract

Justification Reason:

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

#### 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Property Contracts)

City Property Status:

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question1:

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question2:

#### 12B.5-1(a)(1)(Property Contracts)

Sole Source – Property Contract

Justification Reason:

#### 12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency)

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency) Question2:

#### 12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation)

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question1 :

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question2:

#### 12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Non Property)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Public Entity Sole Source – Non  
Property Contract Justification  
Reason:

Explain why this is a Sole Source (Public Entity):

#### 12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Property)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity SS-PC) Question1:

#### 12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity - Substantial)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-SPI)  
Question1:

#### 12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms)

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question1:

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question2:

#### 12B.5-1(e) Investments and Services

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question1:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question2:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question3:

#### 12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk Water, Power and

Bulk Water: false  
Bulk Power: false  
Bulk Gas: false

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG)  
Question2:

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG) Question1:

#### 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question5:

#### 12B.5-1(d)(1)(No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question1:

This is a sole source for the subscription renewal.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question2 :



in order to stay up-to-date with current events. This is a sole source for the subscription renewal.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question3:

it does not conflict. Subscription are unavailable from antoher source.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question4:

Yes

### 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question5:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question6:

### 12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity)

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question4:

### SEC 21.42 (DPH Only)

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

### SEC 21A GPO (DPH Only)

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

### Section 8A.102(b) (MTA Only)

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q1:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q2:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q3:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q4:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q5:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q6:

### Activities

Additional comments:

**Related List Title:** Approval List

**Table name:** sysapproval\_approver

**Query Condition:** Approval for = CMD12B0001656

**Sort Order:** Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

| State    | Approver       | Approving                        | Created             | Approval set | Comments |
|----------|----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|----------|
| Approved | Junko Laxamana | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001656 | 2022-09-21 09:42:19 |              |          |

**Related List Title:** Metric List

**Table name:** metric\_instance

**Query Condition:** Table = u\_cmd\_12b\_waiver AND ID = a96002461bce99104cc655392a4bcb49

**Sort Order:** None

8 Metrics

| Created             | Definition           | ID                               | Value                         | Start               | End                 | Duration   | Calculation complete |
|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------|----------------------|
| 2022-09-21 10:27:20 | OCA 12B Metric       | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001656 | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval | 2022-09-21 10:27:19 |                     |            | false                |
| 2022-09-21 09:42:20 | OCA 12B Metric       | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001656 | Draft                         | 2022-09-21 09:42:19 | 2022-09-21 09:42:19 | 0 Seconds  | true                 |
| 2022-09-21 09:42:20 | OCA 12B Metric       | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001656 | Dept. Head approval           | 2022-09-21 09:42:19 | 2022-09-21 10:27:19 | 45 Minutes | true                 |
| 2022-09-21 09:32:11 | OCA 12B Metric       | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001656 | Draft                         | 2022-09-21 09:32:08 | 2022-09-21 09:42:19 | 10 Minutes | true                 |
| 2022-09-21 10:27:20 | Assigned to Duration | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001656 | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval | 2022-09-21 10:27:19 |                     |            | false                |
| 2022-09-21 09:42:20 | Assigned to Duration | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001656 | Draft                         | 2022-09-21 09:42:19 | 2022-09-21 09:42:19 | 0 Seconds  | true                 |
| 2022-09-21 09:32:11 | Assigned to Duration | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001656 | Draft                         | 2022-09-21 09:32:08 | 2022-09-21 09:42:19 | 10 Minutes | true                 |
| 2022-09-21 09:42:20 | Assigned to Duration | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001656 | Dept. Head approval           | 2022-09-21 09:42:19 | 2022-09-21 10:27:19 | 45 Minutes | true                 |

**Report Title:** CMD 12B Waiver Details  
**Run Date and Time:** 2022-09-21 15:13:54 Pacific Daylight Time  
**Run by:** ServiceNow Admin  
**Table name:** u\_cmd\_12b\_waiver

**CMD 12B Waiver**

|                                      |                     |                        |                               |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Number:                              | CMD12B0001668       | Request Status:        | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval |
| Requested for:                       | Tsz Yin Ko          | State:                 | Work in Progress              |
| Department Head/Delegated authority: | Junko Laxamana      | Waiver Type:           | 12B Waiver                    |
| Opened:                              | 2022-09-21 14:36:23 | 12B Waiver Type:       | Limited (Under 250K)          |
|                                      |                     | Requesting Department: | DBI                           |
|                                      |                     | Requester Phone:       |                               |
|                                      |                     | Awaiting Info from:    |                               |
|                                      |                     | Awaiting Info reason:  |                               |
|                                      |                     | Opened by:             | Tsz Yin Ko                    |
|                                      |                     | Watch list:            |                               |

## Short Description:

## Subscription for National Fire Codes

|                                                                          |                                                     |                             |            |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|
| Supplier ID:                                                             | 0000014503                                          | Requested Amount:           | \$1,345.50 |
| Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?: | New Waiver                                          | Increase Amount:            | \$0.00     |
| Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:                                        |                                                     | Previously Approved Amount: | \$0.00     |
|                                                                          |                                                     | Total Requested Amount:     | \$1,345.50 |
| Document Type:                                                           | Purchase Order                                      | Enter Contract ID:          |            |
| 12B Waiver Justification:                                                | 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)                   | Enter Requisition ID:       |            |
| City Treasurer:                                                          | Jose Cisneros                                       | Enter Purchase Order ID:    | 0000658736 |
| Admin Code Chapter:                                                      | Chapter 21 Goods and Services or MTA/DPH Equivalent | Enter Direct Voucher ID:    |            |
|                                                                          |                                                     | Waiver Start Date:          | 2022-11-15 |
|                                                                          |                                                     | Waiver End Date:            | 2023-11-14 |

|                                                               |       |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Advertising:                                                  | false |
| Commodities, Equipment and Hardware :                         | false |
| Equipment and Vehicle Lease:                                  | false |
| On Premise Software and Support:                              | false |
| Online Content, Reports, Periodicals and Journals:            | true  |
| Professional and General Services:                            | false |
| Software as a Service (SaaS) and Cloud Software Applications: | false |
| Vehicles and Trailers:                                        | false |

Detail the purpose of this contract is and what goods and/or services the contra:

- (a) National Fire Protection Association  
(b) 1 year subscription fee for National Fire Codes  
(c) Subscription renewal from 11/15/22 to 11/14/23 to keep up to date on related codes/ trainings

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

I had emailed the vendor for encouraging them to be 12b compliant and have provided the 12B compliance process to vendor.

Cancel Notes:

#### CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:

CMD Analyst Decision:

CMD Analyst Comments:

CMD Director:

Select the reason for this request:

#### CMD Director

CMD Director:

CMD Director Decision:

Reason for Determination:

#### 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Non Property Contracts)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Sole Source – Non Property Contract

Justification Reason:

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

#### 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Property Contracts)

City Property Status:

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question1:

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question2:

#### 12B.5-1(a)(1)(Property Contracts)

Sole Source – Property Contract

Justification Reason:

#### 12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency)

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency) Question2:

#### 12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation)

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question1 :

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question2:

#### 12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Non Property)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Public Entity Sole Source – Non  
Property Contract Justification  
Reason:

Explain why this is a Sole Source (Public Entity):

#### 12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Property)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity SS-PC) Question1:

#### 12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity - Substantial)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-SPI)  
Question1:

#### 12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms)

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question1:

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question2:

#### 12B.5-1(e) Investments and Services

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question1:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question2:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question3:

#### 12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk Water, Power and

Bulk Water: false

Bulk Power: false

Bulk Gas: false

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG)  
Question2:

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG) Question1:

#### 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question5:

#### 12B.5-1(d)(1)(No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question1:

This is a sole source for the subscription renewal.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question2 :

To keep up to date on related codes/ trainings. This is a sole source for the subscription renewal.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question3:

It does not conflict. Subscription is unavailable from another source.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question4:

Yes

### 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question5:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question6:

### 12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity)

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question4:

### SEC 21.42 (DPH Only)

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

### SEC 21A GPO (DPH Only)

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

### Section 8A.102(b) (MTA Only)

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q1:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q2:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q3:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q4:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q5:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q6:

### Activities

Additional comments:

**Related List Title:** Approval List

**Table name:** sysapproval\_approver

**Query Condition:** Approval for = CMD12B0001668

**Sort Order:** Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

| State    | Approver       | Approving                        | Created             | Approval set | Comments |
|----------|----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|----------|
| Approved | Junko Laxamana | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001668 | 2022-09-21 15:01:04 |              |          |

**Related List Title:** Metric List

**Table name:** metric\_instance

**Query Condition:** Table = u\_cmd\_12b\_waiver AND ID = 25d64fce1b4ad9104cc655392a4bcbde

**Sort Order:** None

8 Metrics

| Created             | Definition           | ID                               | Value                         | Start               | End                 | Duration   | Calculation complete |
|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------|----------------------|
| 2022-09-21 15:01:05 | OCA 12B Metric       | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001668 | Dept. Head approval           | 2022-09-21 15:01:04 | 2022-09-21 15:03:10 | 2 Minutes  | true                 |
| 2022-09-21 14:45:06 | OCA 12B Metric       | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001668 | Draft                         | 2022-09-21 14:45:02 | 2022-09-21 15:01:04 | 16 Minutes | true                 |
| 2022-09-21 15:03:15 | OCA 12B Metric       | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001668 | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval | 2022-09-21 15:03:10 |                     |            | false                |
| 2022-09-21 15:01:05 | OCA 12B Metric       | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001668 | Draft                         | 2022-09-21 15:01:04 | 2022-09-21 15:01:04 | 0 Seconds  | true                 |
| 2022-09-21 15:03:15 | Assigned to Duration | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001668 | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval | 2022-09-21 15:03:10 |                     |            | false                |
| 2022-09-21 14:45:06 | Assigned to Duration | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001668 | Draft                         | 2022-09-21 14:45:02 | 2022-09-21 15:01:04 | 16 Minutes | true                 |
| 2022-09-21 15:01:05 | Assigned to Duration | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001668 | Draft                         | 2022-09-21 15:01:04 | 2022-09-21 15:01:04 | 0 Seconds  | true                 |
| 2022-09-21 15:01:05 | Assigned to Duration | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001668 | Dept. Head approval           | 2022-09-21 15:01:04 | 2022-09-21 15:03:10 | 2 Minutes  | true                 |

**Report Title:** CMD 12B Waiver Details  
**Run Date and Time:** 2022-09-21 14:05:45 Pacific Daylight Time  
**Run by:** ServiceNow Admin  
**Table name:** u\_cmd\_12b\_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

|                                      |                     |                        |                                                                                      |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Number:                              | CMD12B0001658       | Request Status:        | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval                                                        |
| Requested for:                       | Samuel Hoffman      | State:                 | Work in Progress                                                                     |
| Department Head/Delegated authority: | Michelle Ruggels    | Waiver Type:           | 12B Waiver                                                                           |
| Opened:                              | 2022-09-21 10:36:48 | 12B Waiver Type:       | Standard                                                                             |
|                                      |                     | Requesting Department: | DPH                                                                                  |
|                                      |                     | Requester Phone:       | (628) 206-4937                                                                       |
|                                      |                     | Awaiting Info from:    |                                                                                      |
|                                      |                     | Awaiting Info reason:  |                                                                                      |
|                                      |                     | Opened by:             | Samuel Hoffman                                                                       |
|                                      |                     | Watch list:            | Greg Chase, Debi Smith, Krystal Smith, Peterita Braganza, Mike Jazuk, Samuel Hoffman |

Short Description:  
FOLLETT: Medical Grade Refrigerator/Freezer and related equipment and supplier; Maintenance & Repair of equipment

|                                                                          |                                                              |                             |              |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Supplier ID:                                                             | 0000049687                                                   | Requested Amount:           | \$300,000.00 |
| Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?: | New Waiver                                                   | Increase Amount:            | \$0.00       |
| Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:                                        |                                                              | Previously Approved Amount: | \$0.00       |
|                                                                          |                                                              | Total Requested Amount:     | \$300,000.00 |
| Document Type:                                                           | Contract                                                     | Enter Contract ID:          | 1000026980   |
| 12B Waiver Justification:                                                | 21A - GPO Health Related Commodities and Services (DPH Only) | Enter Requisition ID:       |              |
|                                                                          |                                                              | Enter Purchase Order ID:    |              |
| City Treasurer:                                                          | Jose Cisneros                                                | Enter Direct Voucher ID:    |              |
| Admin Code Chapter:                                                      | Chapter 21 Goods and Services or MTA/DPH Equivalent          | Waiver Start Date:          | 2022-09-22   |
|                                                                          |                                                              | Waiver End Date:            | 2024-03-31   |
| Advertising:                                                             | false                                                        |                             |              |
| Commodities, Equipment and Hardware :                                    | true                                                         |                             |              |
| Equipment and Vehicle Lease:                                             | false                                                        |                             |              |
| On Premise Software and Support:                                         | false                                                        |                             |              |
| Online Content, Reports, Periodicals and Journals:                       | false                                                        |                             |              |
| Professional and General Services:                                       | true                                                         |                             |              |
| Software as a Service (SaaS) and Cloud Software Applications:            | false                                                        |                             |              |
| Vehicles and Trailers:                                                   | false                                                        |                             |              |



Detail the purpose of this contract is and what goods and/or services the contra:

Follett Products LLC (S: 0000049687)

All medication, specimen and patient food refrigerators and freezers on ZSFG campus are Follett (300+ units)

All ice machines and water filtration systems on ZSFG campus are Follett (50+ units)

All Follett equipment on ZSFG campus is OSHA approved in the original submittals for seismic bracing.

ZSFG Facilities staff are fully trained to maintain, service and install Follett equipment.

ZSFG Facilities contains full spectrum of Follett parts for maintenance and repair of all equipment.

Follett equipment has performed consistently and regularly passes annual hospital inspections from JACHO, CMS and other mandatory regulatory licensing bodies.

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

CMD has been in contact with Follett HR and provided detailed information on what is still required to become 12B compliant.

Cancel Notes:

### CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:

CMD Analyst Decision:

CMD Analyst Comments:

CMD Director:

Select the reason for this request:

### CMD Director

CMD Director:

CMD Director Decision:

Reason for Determination:

### 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Non Property Contracts)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Sole Source – Non Property Contract  
Justification Reason:

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

### 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Property Contracts)

City Property Status:

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question1:

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question2:

### 12B.5-1(a)(1)(Property Contracts)

Sole Source – Property Contract  
Justification Reason:

### 12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency)

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency) Question2:

### 12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation)

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question1 :

---

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question2:

### 12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Non Property)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Public Entity Sole Source – Non

Property Contract Justification

Reason:

Explain why this is a Sole Source (Public Entity):

### 12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Property)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity SS-PC) Question1:

### 12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity - Substantial)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-SPI)

Question1:

### 12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms)

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question1:

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question2:

### 12B.5-1(e) Investments and Services

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question1:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question2:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question3:

### 12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk Water, Power and

Bulk Water: false

Bulk Power: false

Bulk Gas: false

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG)

Question2:

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG) Question1:

### 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question5:

**12B.5-1(d)(1)(No Vendors Comply)**

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question2 :

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question4:

**12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)**

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question5:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question6:

**12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity)**

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question4:

**SEC 21.42 (DPH Only)**

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

**SEC 21A GPO (DPH Only)**

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

Vizient GPO contracts for Medical grade refrigerators/freezers, ice makers, water and ice dispensers.

**Section 8A.102(b) (MTA Only)**

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q1:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q2:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q3:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q4:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q5:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q6:

## Activities

Additional comments:

**Related List Title:** Approval List

**Table name:** sysapproval\_approver

**Query Condition:** Approval for = CMD12B0001658

**Sort Order:** Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

| State    | Approver         | Approving                        | Created             | Approval set | Comments |
|----------|------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|----------|
| Approved | Michelle Ruggels | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001658 | 2022-09-21 10:54:12 |              |          |

**Related List Title:** Metric List

**Table name:** metric\_instance

**Query Condition:** Table = u\_cmd\_12b\_waiver AND ID = 08009e4a1b42d9104cc655392a4bcbd4

**Sort Order:** None

8 Metrics

| Created             | Definition           | ID                               | Value                         | Start               | End                 | Duration   | Calculation complete |
|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------|----------------------|
| 2022-09-21 10:54:06 | OCA 12B Metric       | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001658 | Draft                         | 2022-09-21 10:54:04 | 2022-09-21 10:54:12 | 8 Seconds  | true                 |
| 2022-09-21 10:54:15 | OCA 12B Metric       | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001658 | Draft                         | 2022-09-21 10:54:12 | 2022-09-21 10:54:12 | 0 Seconds  | true                 |
| 2022-09-21 11:49:01 | OCA 12B Metric       | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001658 | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval | 2022-09-21 11:48:56 |                     |            | false                |
| 2022-09-21 10:54:15 | OCA 12B Metric       | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001658 | Dept. Head approval           | 2022-09-21 10:54:12 | 2022-09-21 11:48:56 | 54 Minutes | true                 |
| 2022-09-21 10:54:06 | Assigned to Duration | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001658 | Draft                         | 2022-09-21 10:54:04 | 2022-09-21 10:54:12 | 8 Seconds  | true                 |
| 2022-09-21 10:54:15 | Assigned to Duration | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001658 | Draft                         | 2022-09-21 10:54:12 | 2022-09-21 10:54:12 | 0 Seconds  | true                 |
| 2022-09-21 11:49:01 | Assigned to Duration | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001658 | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval | 2022-09-21 11:48:56 |                     |            | false                |
| 2022-09-21 10:54:15 | Assigned to Duration | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001658 | Dept. Head approval           | 2022-09-21 10:54:12 | 2022-09-21 11:48:56 | 54 Minutes | true                 |

**Report Title:** CMD 12B Waiver Details  
**Run Date and Time:** 2022-09-22 11:48:06 Pacific Daylight Time  
**Run by:** ServiceNow Admin  
**Table name:** u\_cmd\_12b\_waiver

CMD 12B Waiver

|                                      |                     |                        |                               |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Number:                              | CMD12B0001676       | Request Status:        | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval |
| Requested for:                       | Johanna Gendelman   | State:                 | Work in Progress              |
| Department Head/Delegated authority: | Daniel Kaplan       | Waiver Type:           | 12B Waiver                    |
| Opened:                              | 2022-09-22 08:44:16 | 12B Waiver Type:       | Standard                      |
|                                      |                     | Requesting Department: | HSA                           |
|                                      |                     | Requester Phone:       | +14155575507                  |
|                                      |                     | Awaiting Info from:    |                               |
|                                      |                     | Awaiting Info reason:  |                               |
|                                      |                     | Opened by:             | Johanna Gendelman             |
|                                      |                     | Watch list:            |                               |

Short Description:  
Social work and related skills training to staff. Welfare fraud Detection and Prevention Training to SF HSA staff

|                                                                          |                                                        |                             |              |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Supplier ID:                                                             | 0000009034                                             | Requested Amount:           | \$0.00       |
| Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?: | Modification – Prior Waiver NOT Approved in ServiceNow | Increase Amount:            | \$383,382.00 |
| Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:                                        |                                                        | Previously Approved Amount: | \$575,025.00 |
|                                                                          |                                                        | Total Requested Amount:     | \$958,407.00 |
| Document Type:                                                           | Contract                                               | Enter Contract ID:          | 1000013782   |
| 12B Waiver Justification:                                                | 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)                      | Enter Requisition ID:       |              |
| City Treasurer:                                                          | Jose Cisneros                                          | Enter Purchase Order ID:    |              |
| Admin Code Chapter:                                                      | Chapter 21G Grant Agreements                           | Enter Direct Voucher ID:    |              |
|                                                                          |                                                        | Waiver Start Date:          | 2019-09-01   |
|                                                                          |                                                        | Waiver End Date:            | 2024-06-30   |

|                                                               |       |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Advertising:                                                  | false |
| Commodities, Equipment and Hardware :                         | false |
| Equipment and Vehicle Lease:                                  | false |
| On Premise Software and Support:                              | false |
| Online Content, Reports, Periodicals and Journals:            | false |
| Professional and General Services:                            | false |
| Software as a Service (SaaS) and Cloud Software Applications: | false |
| Vehicles and Trailers:                                        | false |

Detail the purpose of this contract is and what goods and/or services the contra:

a. Univeristy of California, Davis. b. social work and related skills training to staff. Welfare Fraud detection and prevention trainings to HSA staff c. UC Davis is a public entity that operates within a system of employee beneifts and that falls outside of compliance with the City and COuntys SF 12-B ordinance standards. UC Davis falls under the authority of the University of California Regents system and the CA Department of Education, state-level entities that operate outside local ordinances. The contractors legal department has stated that they cannot align their equal benefits system with the San Francisco 12B standards, because their organizational mandate to comply with State-specific regulations.

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

UC Davis was asked to comply with 12B but the contractors legal department has stated that they cannot align their equal benefits system with the San Francisco 12B standards, because their organizational mandate to comply with State-specific regulations.

Cancel Notes:

#### CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:

CMD Analyst Decision:

CMD Analyst Comments:

CMD Director:

Select the reason for this request:

#### CMD Director

CMD Director:

CMD Director Decision:

Reason for Determination:

#### 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Non Property Contracts)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Sole Source – Non Property Contract  
Justification Reason:

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

#### 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Property Contracts)

City Property Status:

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question1:

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question2:

#### 12B.5-1(a)(1)(Property Contracts)

Sole Source – Property Contract  
Justification Reason:

#### 12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency)

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency) Question2:

#### 12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation)

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question1 :

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question2:

#### 12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Non Property)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Public Entity Sole Source – Non  
Property Contract Justification  
Reason:

Explain why this is a Sole Source (Public Entity):

#### 12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Property)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity SS-PC) Question1:

#### 12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity - Substantial)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-SPI)  
Question1:

#### 12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms)

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question1:

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question2:

#### 12B.5-1(e) Investments and Services

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question1:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question2:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question3:

#### 12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk Water, Power and

Bulk Water: false

Bulk Power: false

Bulk Gas: false

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG)  
Question2:

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG) Question1:

#### 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question1:

This service is essential to comply with California Department of Social Services mandate and to protect public funds from welfare fraud and detection.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question2:

The University of California, Davis offers the only training course recommended by CDSS in this focus to become compliant that is within reachable proximity. Through UC Davis' trainings, the Department is able to have up to 800 eligibility workers and fraud investigators meet the CDSS annual compliance mandate. UC Davis was selected for these services with the Department through Request for Proposal #811 issued on January 2, 2019. The University of California, Davis offers the only training course recommended by CDSS in this focus to become compliant that is within reachable proximity. Through UC Davis' trainings, the Department is able to have up to 800 eligibility workers and fraud investigators meet the CDSS annual compliance mandate. UC Davis was selected for these services with the Department through Request for Proposal #811 issued on January 2, 2019.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question3:

Contracts staff did reach out to other training institutions. None were interested.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question4:

It does not defeat the purpose because University of California does offer equal benefits but not in the format that would be accepted by San Francisco 12B codes.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question5:

Not Applicable

#### 12B.5-1(d)(1)(No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question2 :

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question4:

#### 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question5:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question6:

#### 12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity)

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question4:

#### SEC 21.42 (DPH Only)

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

#### SEC 21A GPO (DPH Only)

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

#### Section 8A.102(b) (MTA Only)

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q1:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q2:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q3:



|                       |
|-----------------------|
| 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q4: |
| 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q5: |
| 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q6: |

Activities

Additional comments:

**Related List Title:** Approval List  
**Table name:** sysapproval\_approver  
**Query Condition:** Approval for = CMD12B0001676  
**Sort Order:** Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

| State    | Approver      | Approving                        | Created             | Approval set | Comments |
|----------|---------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|----------|
| Approved | Daniel Kaplan | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001676 | 2022-09-22 08:50:08 |              |          |

**Related List Title:** Metric List  
**Table name:** metric\_instance  
**Query Condition:** Table = u\_cmd\_12b\_waiver AND ID = a9df721a1b465d104cc655392a4bcb2a  
**Sort Order:** None

8 Metrics

| Created             | Definition           | ID                               | Value                         | Start               | End                 | Duration           | Calculation complete |
|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| 2022-09-22 08:50:11 | OCA 12B Metric       | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001676 | Dept. Head approval           | 2022-09-22 08:50:08 | 2022-09-22 08:50:08 | 0 Seconds          | true                 |
| 2022-09-22 08:44:20 | OCA 12B Metric       | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001676 | Draft                         | 2022-09-22 08:44:17 | 2022-09-22 08:50:08 | 5 Minutes          | true                 |
| 2022-09-22 08:50:11 | OCA 12B Metric       | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001676 | Draft                         | 2022-09-22 08:50:08 | 2022-09-22 11:10:25 | 2 Hours 20 Minutes | true                 |
| 2022-09-22 11:10:30 | OCA 12B Metric       | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001676 | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval | 2022-09-22 11:10:25 |                     |                    | false                |
| 2022-09-22 08:44:20 | Assigned to Duration | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001676 | Draft                         | 2022-09-22 08:44:17 | 2022-09-22 08:50:08 | 5 Minutes          | true                 |
| 2022-09-22 11:10:30 | Assigned to Duration | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001676 | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval | 2022-09-22 11:10:25 |                     |                    | false                |
| 2022-09-22 08:50:11 | Assigned to Duration | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001676 | Draft                         | 2022-09-22 08:50:08 | 2022-09-22 11:10:25 | 2 Hours 20 Minutes | true                 |

| Created                | Definition              | ID                               | Value                  | Start                  | End                    | Duration  | Calculation complete |
|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------|----------------------|
| 2022-09-22<br>08:50:11 | Assigned to<br>Duration | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001676 | Dept. Head<br>approval | 2022-09-22<br>08:50:08 | 2022-09-22<br>08:50:08 | 0 Seconds | true                 |

**Report Title:** CMD 12B Waiver Details  
**Run Date and Time:** 2022-09-20 15:50:28 Pacific Daylight Time  
**Run by:** ServiceNow Admin  
**Table name:** u\_cmd\_12b\_waiver

### CMD 12B Waiver

|                                      |                     |                        |                                            |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| Number:                              | CMD12B0001450       | Request Status:        | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval              |
| Requested for:                       | David Agam          | State:                 | Work in Progress                           |
| Department Head/Delegated authority: | Steve Ritchie       | Waiver Type:           | 12B Waiver                                 |
| Opened:                              | 2022-08-24 13:42:10 | 12B Waiver Type:       | Standard                                   |
|                                      |                     | Requesting Department: | PUC                                        |
|                                      |                     | Requester Phone:       |                                            |
|                                      |                     | Awaiting Info from:    |                                            |
|                                      |                     | Awaiting Info reason:  |                                            |
|                                      |                     | Opened by:             | David Agam                                 |
|                                      |                     | Watch list:            | dagam@sflower.org,<br>rgabriel@sflower.org |

#### Short Description:

Contract to procure powder activated carbon (PAC), an additive used in water treatment applications to remove taste and odor to the finished water supply.

|                                                                          |                                                        |                             |                |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Supplier ID:                                                             | 0000038033                                             | Requested Amount:           | \$0.00         |
| Is this a new waiver or are you modifying a previously approved waiver?: | Modification – Prior Waiver NOT Approved in ServiceNow | Increase Amount:            | \$0.00         |
| Last Approved 12B Waiver Request:                                        |                                                        | Previously Approved Amount: | \$2,600,000.00 |
|                                                                          |                                                        | Total Requested Amount:     | \$2,600,000.00 |
| Document Type:                                                           | Contract                                               | Enter Contract ID:          | 1000013249     |
| 12B Waiver Justification:                                                | 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)                      | Enter Requisition ID:       |                |
| City Treasurer:                                                          | Jose Cisneros                                          | Enter Purchase Order ID:    |                |
| Admin Code Chapter:                                                      | Chapter 21 Goods and Services or MTA/DPH Equivalent    | Enter Direct Voucher ID:    |                |
|                                                                          |                                                        | Waiver Start Date:          | 2019-01-15     |
|                                                                          |                                                        | Waiver End Date:            | 2023-12-31     |

|                                                               |       |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Advertising:                                                  | false |
| Commodities, Equipment and Hardware :                         | true  |
| Equipment and Vehicle Lease:                                  | false |
| On Premise Software and Support:                              | false |
| Online Content, Reports, Periodicals and Journals:            | false |
| Professional and General Services:                            | false |
| Software as a Service (SaaS) and Cloud Software Applications: | false |
| Vehicles and Trailers:                                        | false |

Detail the purpose of this contract is and what goods and/or services the contra:

Norit Americas (previously Cabot Norit)

If you have made an effort to have the supplier comply, explain it here. If not,:

OCA is recommending and WSTD is accepting another 1-year extension of the contract. Cabot Norit Americas Inc submitted a 12B Declaration on December 21, 2018. On January 15, 2019, Amber Lewis of the business let the Compliance Officer know that they no longer wished to pursue 12B compliance. Therefore, the file has remained in a pending status. There is no record of any communications with the business since January 2019.

Cancel Notes:

### CMD Analyst

CMD Analyst:

CMD Analyst Decision:

CMD Analyst Comments:

CMD Director:

Select the reason for this request:

### CMD Director

CMD Director:

CMD Director Decision:

Reason for Determination:

### 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Non Property Contracts)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Sole Source – Non Property Contract

Justification Reason:

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

### 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Property Contracts)

City Property Status:

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question1:

CMD 12B.5-1(a)(1) (Sole Source – Property Contracts) Question2:

### 12B.5-1(a)(1)(Property Contracts)

Sole Source – Property Contract

Justification Reason:

### 12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency)

12B.5-1(a)(2) (Declared Emergency) Question2:

### 12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation)

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question1 :

12B.5-1(a)(3) (Specialized Litigation) Question2:

### 12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Non Property)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Public Entity Sole Source – Non  
Property Contract Justification  
Reason:

Explain why this is a Sole Source (Public Entity):

#### 12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-Property)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity SS-PC) Question1:

#### 12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity - Substantial)

12B.5-1(b) (Public Entity-SPI)  
Question1:

#### 12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms)

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question1:

12B.5-1(c) (Conflicting Grant Terms) Question2:

#### 12B.5-1(e) Investments and Services

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question1:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question2:

12B.5-1(e) Investments Question3:

#### 12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk Water, Power and

Bulk Water: false

Bulk Power: false

Bulk Gas: false

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG)  
Question2:

12B.5-1(f) (SFPUC Bulk WPG) Question1:

#### 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question1:

Odor is a secondary drinking water standard parameter set forth by the EPA to give public water systems guidance on removing various contaminants to levels that are below what most people will find to be noticeable. To minimize any potential taste and odor issues pertaining to the City's potable water system, a PAC Feed System was constructed at the Sunol Valley Water Treatment Plant as an additional treatment process to address and control seasonal taste and odor issues that arise from East Bay raw water sources.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question2:

This contract was executed in 2019 with a duration of 3 years. OCA extended the contract for 1 year.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question3:

Cabot Norit Americas Inc submitted a 12B Declaration on December 21, 2018. On January 15, 2019, Amber Lewis of Cabot Norit let the Contract Compliance Officer know that they no longer wished to pursue 12B compliance. On August 24, 2022, David Agam of WSTD asked Amber Lewis whether Norit Americas presently wishes to pursue compliance with 12B, to which she replied that the company will not be able to do so.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question4:

A waiver for this particular contract was granted twice before, with the understanding that this was the only way that PUC could acquire this essential service. This may likely be the final year for this particular contract. Although there is not enough time to rebid this contract in time for its expiration; thereafter, PUC plans to rebid this contract, opening the opportunity to all suppliers.

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Question5:

Not Applicable

#### 12B.5-1(d)(1)(No Vendors Comply)

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question2 :

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply) Limited Question4:

#### 12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing)

Select OCA Solicitation Waiver:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question4:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question5:

12B.5-1(d)(2) (Bulk Purchasing) Question6:

#### 12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity)

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question1:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question2:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question3:

12B.5-1(d)(3) (Sham Entity) Question4:

#### SEC 21.42 (DPH Only)

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

#### SEC 21A GPO (DPH Only)

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

#### Section 8A.102(b) (MTA Only)

Explain why this is a Sole Source:

Detail the nature of this Bulk Purchasing transaction:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q1:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q2:

12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q3:

|                       |
|-----------------------|
| 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q4: |
| 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q5: |
| 12B MTA 8A.102(b) Q6: |

Activities

Additional comments:

**Related List Title:** Approval List  
**Table name:** sysapproval\_approver  
**Query Condition:** Approval for = CMD12B0001450  
**Sort Order:** Order in ascending order

1 Approvals

| State    | Approver      | Approving                        | Created             | Approval set | Comments |
|----------|---------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|----------|
| Approved | Steve Ritchie | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001450 | 2022-09-12 16:13:36 |              |          |

**Related List Title:** Metric List  
**Table name:** metric\_instance  
**Query Condition:** Table = u\_cmd\_12b\_waiver AND ID = 5aede451be999104cc655392a4bcb43  
**Sort Order:** None

8 Metrics

| Created             | Definition           | ID                               | Value                         | Start               | End                 | Duration                   | Calculation complete |
|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| 2022-09-12 16:13:40 | OCA 12B Metric       | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001450 | Draft                         | 2022-09-12 16:13:36 | 2022-09-20 15:27:55 | 7 Days 23 Hours 14 Minutes | true                 |
| 2022-08-24 13:57:25 | OCA 12B Metric       | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001450 | Draft                         | 2022-08-24 13:57:23 | 2022-09-12 16:13:36 | 19 Days 2 Hours 16 Minutes | true                 |
| 2022-09-12 16:13:40 | OCA 12B Metric       | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001450 | Dept. Head approval           | 2022-09-12 16:13:36 | 2022-09-12 16:13:36 | 0 Seconds                  | true                 |
| 2022-09-20 15:28:00 | OCA 12B Metric       | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001450 | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval | 2022-09-20 15:27:55 |                     |                            | false                |
| 2022-09-12 16:13:40 | Assigned to Duration | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001450 | Dept. Head approval           | 2022-09-12 16:13:36 | 2022-09-12 16:13:36 | 0 Seconds                  | true                 |
| 2022-09-20 15:28:00 | Assigned to Duration | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001450 | Awaiting CMD Analyst Approval | 2022-09-20 15:27:55 |                     |                            | false                |
| 2022-09-12 16:13:40 | Assigned to Duration | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001450 | Draft                         | 2022-09-12 16:13:36 | 2022-09-20 15:27:55 | 7 Days 23 Hours 14 Minutes | true                 |

| Created                | Definition              | ID                               | Value | Start                  | End                    | Duration                      | Calculation complete |
|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|-------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|
| 2022-08-24<br>13:57:25 | Assigned to<br>Duration | CMD 12B Waiver:<br>CMD12B0001450 | Draft | 2022-08-24<br>13:57:23 | 2022-09-12<br>16:13:36 | 19 Days 2 Hours<br>16 Minutes | true                 |



**From:** [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: BHC Oversight and Accountability Resolution 9.19.22  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2022 4:16:11 PM  
**Attachments:** [BHC Oversight and Accountability Resolution cvr ltr 9.19.22.docx](#)  
[BHC Oversight and Accountability Resolution FINAL 9.17.22.docx](#)  
[image001.png](#)

---

For C-pages. Thank you.

## Jocelyn Wong

San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
 San Francisco, CA 94102  
 T: 415.554.7702 | F: 415.554.5163  
[jocelyn.wong@sfgov.org](mailto:jocelyn.wong@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*



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:** Grier, Geoffrey (DPH - Contractor) <geoffrey.grier@sfdph.org>

**Sent:** Monday, September 19, 2022 4:09 PM

**To:** Young, Victor (BOS) <victor.young@sfgov.org>; Leger, Cheryl (BOS) <cheryl.leger@sfgov.org>;  
 BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>

**Cc:** Gray, Amber (DPH) <amber.gray@sfdph.org>

**Subject:** BHC Oversight and Accountability Resolution 9.19.22

San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
 City Hall

Re: BHC Oversight and Accountability Resolution  
 Board of Supervisors -

Please accept this notification that the SF Behavioral Health Commission has voted and passed the attached version of the oversight and accountability resolution.

We are including this for your edification and hopes that as a whole endorse this resolution.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions

Geoffrey Grier (himnthem) [What's this?](#)

*Office of Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (JEDI)*

*Mental Health Services Act (MHSA)*

*Behavioral Health Services (BHS)*

*Cultural Liaison*

*San Francisco Department of Public Health*

*1380 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA 94103*

*Work (415) 255-3473*

*Mobile (650) 438-3964*

*cc: Amber Gray*

## SAN FRANCISCO BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMISSION

---



**Mayor  
London N. Breed**

1380 Howard Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
(415) 255-3474 fax: 255-3760  
[mhb@mhbsf.org](mailto:mhb@mhbsf.org)  
[www.mhbsf.org](http://www.mhbsf.org)  
[www.sfgov.org/mental\\_health](http://www.sfgov.org/mental_health)

Balham Javier Vigil, Co-Chair  
Stephen Banuelos, Co-Chair  
Genesis Vasconez, MS, PMHNP-BC, Vice-Chair  
Lisa Williams, Secretary  
Terezia Bohrer, RN, MSW, CLNC  
Judith Klain, MPH  
Carletta Jackson-Lane, JD  
Kescha S. Mason  
Liza Murawski  
Toni Parks  
Harriette Stallworth Stevens, EdD  
Lisa Wynn

**BHC Resolution Notification**  
From the  
**Behavioral Health Commission**

San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
City Hall

Re: BHC Oversight and Accountability Resolution

Board of Supervisors -

Please accept this notification that the SF Behavioral Health Commission has voted and passed the attached version of the oversight and accountability resolution.

We are including this for your edification and hopes that as a whole endorse this resolution.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions

Geoffrey Grier (*himnthem*) [What's this?](#)

*Office of Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (JEDI)*

*Mental Health Services Act (MHSA)*

*Behavioral Health Services (BHS)*

*Cultural Liaison*

*San Francisco Department of Public Health*

*1380 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA 94103*

*Work (415) 255-3473*

*Mobile (650) 438-3964*

**Resolution Urging the San Francisco City and County, Mayor, Board of Supervisors, The Departments of Public Health, and Homelessness and Supportive Housing to Invest Funds to Improve The Standard and Quality of Behavioral Health Services Provided by The City and County of San Francisco to Improve Equitable Access, Services Quality, Transparency, Facility and Staff Standard and Improve Departments Oversight and Quality Control Infrastructure.**

**WHEREAS**, Permanent supportive housing residences provide behavioral health services and case management to vulnerable populations; and

**WHEREAS**, The people residing in these buildings often have behavioral health issues, are very low income and rarely have other housing options; and

**WHEREAS**, Permanent housing buildings require that building owners and operators have contracts with property management services to collect rents and oversee building maintenance and repairs; and

**WHEREAS**, It is contractually necessary for property management services and City and County of San Francisco funded case management and behavioral health services provided in these buildings to maintain a separation of duties; and

**WHEREAS**, It has been reported that supportive service staff are violating the 1996 Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), which protects the privacy of their clients; and

**WHEREAS**, Facilities in San Francisco that provide behavioral health services are in much need of repairs due to constant building malfunctions, proper facility size, and the inequitable distribution of facility resources per district, showing a need for better oversight of the physical infrastructure where services are provided to ensure proper maintenance and health regulation; and

**WHEREAS**, Some of these residences are in varying states of neglect and disrepair with incidents of mold, structural damage, missing or broken fixtures and appliances, vermin infestation, and outdated and potentially hazardous plumbing, electrical, and mechanical systems with rusty pipes and brown water; and

**WHEREAS**, After seeking resolution with case management, some residents have escalated their concerns through the designated channels and still fear retaliation for voicing their concerns around building conditions and property management practices; and

**WHEREAS**, Males significantly outnumber females in the majority of the permanent housing residences, and many female residents have expressed feeling unsafe, and cite incidents of severe bullying and direct threats of harm; and

**WHEREAS**, It has been reported that HSH and DPH are slow to, and often fail, to respond to community and stakeholder requests and information; and

**WHEREAS;** While San Francisco currently has workforce housing programs for vital employees of San Francisco such as teachers and law Enforcement Employees, these programs do not cover employees of Behavioral Health Services and housing providers, which, if extended to those employees, could aid in incentivizing employment in City-funded Behavioral Health Services and housing services, rooted in the communities they live in and serve; and

**WHEREAS,** According to Dr. Marlo Simmons, based on data from 11/12/20 on the total current vacancies for Behavioral Health Services positions, there are a total of 113 Vacancies (90 prioritized and moving through the hiring process, 23 vacant and not yet prioritized), that is 17.38% of BHS Positions Vacant (of the 650 who report to BHS), of which vacant positions, 9 are in the Senior Psychiatric Physician (2242 / 2243) job class, 37 are in the Behavioral Health Clinician (2930) job class, and 6 are in the Senior Behavioral Health Clinician (2932) job class; now, therefore, be it

**RESOLVED,** That the BHCSF of San Francisco thanks the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Department of Public Health (DPH), and Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) of the City and County of San Francisco for their consistent commitment to bringing funds into the fold in the City's struggle for behavioral health services that tackle the problems and issues everyday San Franciscans face in terms of their behavioral health, and key environmental factors impacting their behavioral health such as homelessness and access to housing; and, be it

**FUTHER RESOLVED,** That residents of permanent supportive housing need an entity, agency, or City department where their grievances can be heard and addressed; and, be it

**FURTHER RESOLVED,** That the Behavioral Health Commission of San Francisco urges the City and County of San Francisco, Mayor, Board of Supervisors, DPH, and HSH to find ways to improve their oversight and accountability infrastructure to better oversee and monitor all behavioral health programs offered by the City and County of San Francisco; and, be it

**FURTHER RESOLVED,** That the Behavioral Health Commission of San Francisco (BHCSF) urges the City and County of San Francisco to develop a system of oversight and accountability for buildings providing permanent supportive housing to people with behavioral health challenges; and, be it

**FURTHER RESOLVED,** That even with separate responsibilities and legal requirements between case management services and property management, it is essential that this mutual exclusivity does not result in unsafe or unnecessarily stressful conditions for residents; and, be it

**FURTHER RESOLVED,** That the BHCSF of San Francisco urges the City and County of San Francisco, Mayor, Board of Supervisors, DPH, and HSH to expand the City's workforce housing programs to include Behavioral Health Services providers and other employees working under HSH and DPH to incentivize employees to live in the communities they work for and improve the quality of services provided by HSH and DPH employees; and, be it

**FURTHER RESOLVED**, That the BHCSF urges HSH and DPH to make information accessible to the public around behavioral health and housing services and improve community outreach and advertisement for behavioral health and housing services, and make information accessible to all who request it as seamlessly as possible; and, be it

**FINALLY RESOLVED**, That the BHCSF urges the city and county of San Francisco Mayor, Board of Supervisors, DPH, and HSH to allocate funds to improve staff standards and quality, hire more behavioral health services staff to meet the increasing demand for services, and ensure that those programs are being offered and operated with high-quality standards and quality of life.

**From:** [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: FOR INTRODUCTION: Concrete Building Retrofit City Attorney Request  
**Date:** Thursday, September 22, 2022 12:10:06 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[Mandatory Concrete Retrofits.pdf](#)

---

Hi Ops,

At the below request of Supervisor Safai's office for the attached, please add this for C-pages.

Additionally, this will be a Clerk to Act to be processed for next week's meeting, September 27, 2022. Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you.

### Jocelyn Wong

San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
 San Francisco, CA 94102  
 T: 415.554.7702 | F: 415.554.5163  
[jocelyn.wong@sfgov.org](mailto:jocelyn.wong@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*



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:** Barnes, Bill (BOS) <bill.barnes@sfgov.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 21, 2022 5:37 PM  
**To:** BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Buckley, Jeff (BOS) <jeff.buckley@sfgov.org>;  
 PEARSON, ANNE (CAT) <Anne.Pearson@sfcityatty.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS)  
 <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

<eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>

**Subject:** Re: FOR INTRODUCTION: Concrete Building Retrofit City Attorney Request

Sounds great. Thanks.

Since it was referenced in Roll Call, people may ask about it. Can you also keep it as a communication?

Thanks!

Bill

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** BOS Legislation, (BOS) <[bos.legislation@sfgov.org](mailto:bos.legislation@sfgov.org)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, September 21, 2022 4:07:16 PM

**To:** Barnes, Bill (BOS) <[bill.barnes@sfgov.org](mailto:bill.barnes@sfgov.org)>; BOS Legislation, (BOS) <[bos.legislation@sfgov.org](mailto:bos.legislation@sfgov.org)>

**Cc:** Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <[ahsha.safai@sfgov.org](mailto:ahsha.safai@sfgov.org)>; Buckley, Jeff (BOS) <[jeff.buckley@sfgov.org](mailto:jeff.buckley@sfgov.org)>;

PEARSON, ANNE (CAT) <[Anne.Pearson@sfcityatty.org](mailto:Anne.Pearson@sfcityatty.org)>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS)

<[angela.calvillo@sfgov.org](mailto:angela.calvillo@sfgov.org)>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <[alisa.somera@sfgov.org](mailto:alisa.somera@sfgov.org)>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS)

<[eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org](mailto:eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org)>

**Subject:** RE: FOR INTRODUCTION: Concrete Building Retrofit City Attorney Request

Hi Bill,

The deadline to for the Clerk's office to receive the attached introduction form was yesterday at 5:00 p.m., or at the end of the meeting, whichever is later. We cannot accept the late submittal, but can hold on to it to include it for processing next week.

Best regards,

**Jocelyn Wong**

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

T: 415.554.7702 | F: 415.554.5163

[jocelyn.wong@sfgov.org](mailto:jocelyn.wong@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*



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:** Barnes, Bill (BOS) <[bill.barnes@sfgov.org](mailto:bill.barnes@sfgov.org)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, September 20, 2022 6:10 PM

**To:** BOS Legislation, (BOS) <[bos.legislation@sfgov.org](mailto:bos.legislation@sfgov.org)>

**Cc:** Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <[ahsha.safai@sfgov.org](mailto:ahsha.safai@sfgov.org)>; Buckley, Jeff (BOS) <[jeff.buckley@sfgov.org](mailto:jeff.buckley@sfgov.org)>;

PEARSON, ANNE (CAT) <[Anne.Pearson@sfcityatty.org](mailto:Anne.Pearson@sfcityatty.org)>

**Subject:** FOR INTRODUCTION: Concrete Building Retrofit City Attorney Request

Attached, please find the mandatory concrete retrofits City Attorney request Supervisor Safai referenced in Roll Call for Introductions.

Thanks,

**BILL BARNES** (he/him/his)

Chief of Staff

Supervisor Ahsha Safaí

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

415.554.7896 (direct)

415.554.6975 (main line)

## 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):

Safai

Subject:

Drafting Request - Concrete Building Screening and Retrofit

The text is listed:

Please draft an amendment to the Building Code to create the Concrete Building Safety Program requiring the Department of Building Inspection to implement a mandatory screening and retrofit program for non-ductile concrete buildings, and establish a stakeholder group to monitor program implementation.

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor:

For Clerk's Use Only