

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

RULES COMMITTEE

SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

TO: Supervisor Matt Dorsey, Chair
Rules Committee

FROM: Victor Young, Assistant Clerk *Victor Young*

DATE: February 28, 2023

SUBJECT: **COMMITTEE REPORT, BOARD MEETING**
Tuesday, February 28, 2023

The following file should be presented as a **COMMITTEE REPORT** at the Board Meeting on Tuesday, February 28, 2023. This item was acted upon at the Rules Committee Meeting on Monday, February 27, 2023, at 10:00 a.m., by the votes indicated.

Item No. 30 File No. 221008

[Limiting Teleconferencing and Remote Public Comment at Meetings of the Board of Supervisors and its Committees]

Motion discontinuing remote participation by members of the Board of Supervisors ("Board") at meetings of the Board and its committees for reasons related to COVID-19; and discontinuing remote public comment by members of the public at meetings of the Board and its committees, except as legally required to enable people with disabilities to participate in such meetings.

REFERRED WITHOUTH RECOMMENDATION AS A COMMITTEE REPORT

Vote: Supervisor Ahsha Safai – Aye
Supervisor Shamann Walton – Aye
Supervisor Matt Dorsey - Aye

c: Board of Supervisors
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Alisa Somera, Legislative Deputy Director
Anne Pea/rson, Deputy City Attorney

File No. 221008

Committee Item No. 5

Board Item No. _____

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Rules Committee

Date Feb 27, 2023

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date _____

Cmte Board

- Motion
- Resolution
- Ordinance
- Legislative Digest
- Budget and Legislative Analyst Report
- Youth Commission Report
- Introduction Form
- Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report
- Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
- Grant Information Form
- Grant Budget
- Subcontract Budget
- Contract/Agreement
- Form 126 - Ethics Commission
- Award Letter
- Application
- Form 700
- Information/Vacancies (Boards/Commissions)
- Public Correspondence

OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

Completed by: Victor Young

Date Feb 23, 2023

Completed by: _____

Date _____

1 [Limiting Teleconferencing and Remote Public Comment at Meetings of the Board of
2 Supervisors and its Committees]

3 **Motion discontinuing remote participation by members of the Board of Supervisors**
4 **(“Board”) at meetings of the Board and its committees for reasons related to COVID-19;**
5 **and discontinuing remote public comment by members of the public at meetings of the**
6 **Board and its committees, except as legally required to enable people with disabilities**
7 **to participate in such meetings.**

8
9 WHEREAS, The COVID-19 pandemic has brought about enormous changes in the
10 way that public bodies meet; and

11 WHEREAS, Prior to the pandemic, members of the Board of Supervisors (“Board”) and
12 members of the public were required to participate in meetings of the Board and its
13 committees in person, except where federal or state law required the City to accommodate
14 people with disabilities by providing an opportunity for remote participation in such meetings;
15 and

16 WHEREAS, In March, 2020, the Governor of the State of California proclaimed a state
17 of emergency in California in connection with the COVID-19 pandemic; and

18 WHEREAS, On February 25, 2020, the Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco
19 (the “City”) declared a local emergency, and on March 6, 2020, the City’s Health Officer
20 declared a local health emergency; and

21 WHEREAS, On March 16, 2020, the Health Officer issued a Shelter-in-Place order, to
22 be operational at midnight the following day; and

23 WHEREAS, On March 17, 2020, just hours before the Health Officer’s Shelter-In-Place
24 Order went into effect, the Board unanimously approved a motion to allow remote
25 teleconferencing of future Board meetings and remote public comment; and

1 WHEREAS, At the outset of the COVID-19 emergency, allowing remote participation
2 by Supervisors at Board meetings was made possible by mayoral and gubernatorial
3 emergency orders suspending rules governing the conduct of open meetings; and

4 WHEREAS, The gubernatorial order ended on September 30, 2021, after the Governor
5 signed AB 361, which allows local policy bodies to continue to meet by teleconference during
6 a state of emergency, provided they permit remote public participation and make findings at
7 least once every 30 days that the body has considered the state of emergency, and that
8 public health officials continue to recommend physical distancing, or the state of emergency
9 continues to directly impact the ability of the members to meet safely in person; and

10 WHEREAS, Since September 2021, in light of numerous COVID-19 surges in San
11 Francisco that impacted the ability of individuals to attend crowded public meetings in person,
12 the Board has passed a series of motions making the required findings under AB 361, and
13 has allowed the public to provide remote public comment; and

14 WHEREAS, Maintaining an electronic system that allows every member of the public to
15 participate in Board meetings remotely requires the Clerk's office to staff Board and
16 committee meetings with at least four additional employees, which imposes significant
17 personnel costs on the City, and where Board meetings run long due to remote public
18 participation, meetings need to be double-staffed to ensure coverage for the entire duration of
19 the meeting; and

20 WHEREAS, As of June 15, 2021, the Governor lifted most limitations on indoor
21 gatherings in public settings; and

22 WHEREAS, As of September 7, 2021, the Board and its committees resumed in-
23 person hybrid meetings with remote public participation; and

24 WHEREAS, Effective March 1, 2022, the Health Officer updated the Safer Return
25 Together COVID-19 Order to lift indoor masking requirements for indoor public settings,

1 except for high-risk settings including public transportation, congregant living, and healthcare
2 facilities; and

3 WHEREAS, As of March 7, 2022, the Board and its committees have allowed in-person
4 public participation at public meetings; and

5 WHEREAS, As of March 18, 2022, the City Administrator lifted the indoor masking
6 requirement for City facilities, with the exception of hearing rooms while in session; and

7 WHEREAS, As of April 25, 2022, the City Administrator lifted indoor masking
8 requirements for City hearing rooms while in session; and

9 WHEREAS, The Office of the Clerk of the Board is responsible for facilitating the
10 Board's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and other laws that ensure full
11 access to Board meetings by people with disabilities, and the Clerk of the Board regularly
12 consults with the Mayor's Office on Disability regarding those matters; and

13 WHEREAS, Meetings of the Board and its committees are real-time captioned and
14 cablecast open-captioned on SFGovTV, the Government Channel 26; Board and committee
15 meeting agendas and minutes are available on the Board's website and adhere to web
16 development guidelines based upon the Federal Access Board's Section 508 Guidelines, and
17 members of the public may request sign language interpreters, readers, large print agendas
18 and other accommodations by contacting the Office of the Clerk of the Board; and

19 WHEREAS, The Office of the Clerk of the Board has consulted the Mayor's Office on
20 Disability, and will continue to accommodate requests for reasonable accommodations where
21 necessary to ensure participation by people with disabilities, including requests to participate
22 in Board meetings remotely, provided that the request for accommodation is submitted to the
23 Office of the Clerk of the Board 72 hours in advance of the meeting where the accommodation
24 is sought; and

25

1 WHEREAS, In light of the improved health conditions, the significant costs associated
2 with allowing all members of the public to participate in Board meetings remotely, and the
3 Board's ongoing commitment to provide reasonable accommodations to people with
4 disabilities where their disabilities impair their ability to participate in Board meetings in-
5 person, the Board finds that the public interest is served by restoring the Board's prior practice
6 of limiting remote participation in Board and committee meetings both by Supervisors and by
7 members of the public; now, therefore, be it

8 MOVED, That the Board has considered the state of emergency, and finds that local
9 health orders and guidelines no longer limit indoor gatherings or require masking for indoor
10 public settings and that the state of emergency no longer precludes the ability of members
11 and the public to meet safely in person; and, be it

12 FURTHER MOVED, That the Board hereby rescinds its March 17, 2020 motion
13 allowing remote teleconferencing of Board meetings and remote public comment; and, be it

14 FURTHER MOVED, That effective immediately, members of the Board must
15 participate in Board meetings in person as required by Charter Section 2.104, except to the
16 extent remote participation is authorized by law; and, be it

17 FURTHER MOVED, That effective immediately, members of the public may comment
18 on items before the Board in writing for inclusion in the Board's files or by providing their
19 comment in-person at a meeting of the Board or a committee; and, be it

20 FURTHER MOVED, That the Board will continue to offer opportunities to provide
21 remote public comment to members of the public as necessary to enable the participation of
22 people with disabilities, to the extent required by law.



TERMINATION OF ORDERS ISSUED UNDER PROCLAMATION OF LOCAL EMERGENCY

WHEREAS, On February 25, 2020, the Mayor issued a Proclamation of Local Emergency (“Proclamation”) under California Government Code Sections 8550 et seq., San Francisco Charter Section 3.100(14), and Chapter 7 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, in connection with the imminent spread within the City of a novel (new) coronavirus (“COVID-19”); and

WHEREAS, The Mayor subsequently updated the Proclamation through the issuance of 48 Supplements to the Proclamation, including over 100 individual orders, many of which have been amended and in some cases terminated based on the status of the ongoing emergency and the public health response; and

WHEREAS, On October 17, 2022, the Governor of the State of California announced that the statewide Declaration of Emergency (“Declaration”) due to COVID-19, which originally issued on March 4, 2020, will terminate effective February 28, 2023; and

WHEREAS, While certain of the Mayor’s supplemental orders are still pending and remain necessary at this time, as summarized below, it is also appropriate to prepare for the orderly termination of these remaining orders given the scheduled termination of the Governor’s Declaration, the current state of the pandemic, the status of the City’s pandemic response, the City’s policies regarding vaccination of City employees and employee return-to-work, the vaccination rates in San Francisco, and the current public health indicators; and

WHEREAS, With respect to public meetings, Section 3 of the First Supplement suspended the requirement in the Charter that commissions, boards, and other City policy bodies meet in-person; Sections 6 and 8 of the 5th Supplement suspended various provisions of the Sunshine Ordinance for public meetings during the emergency; and Section 1 of the 45th Supplement allowed for the continuation of remote meetings under certain conditions; and

WHEREAS, With respect to City employment and human resource practices, Section 3 of the 16th Supplement authorized the City to waive the time restrictions that limit how long employees appointed under certain Charter provisions can remain employed by the City; and Section 1 of the 37th Supplement temporarily waived provisions of City law



to expedite the process of filling positions left vacant due to vaccination policy-related suspensions or terminations; and

WHEREAS, With respect to vaccination requirements, Section 1 of the 38th Supplement imposed vaccination requirements on employees of City contractors who work in close proximity with City employees; and Section 2 of the 38th Supplement, as updated by Section 2 of the 41st Supplement, required members of City policy bodies to be fully vaccinated; and

WHEREAS, With respect to facilitating the City's public health response, Section 3 of the 5th Supplement suspended provisions of the Planning Code and other local laws to enable temporary medical and public health facilities on City streets; Section 1 of the 21st Supplement waived provisions of the Planning Code to allow schools to temporarily expand their premises to accommodate physical distancing requirements or increases in enrollment; and Section 1 of the 43rd Supplement authorized the City Administrator to issue fines for violations of the Health Officer's order requiring certain healthcare facilities to offer testing to patients within designated timeframes and to provide reports to the Department of Public Health; and

WHEREAS, With respect to housing, Section 4 of the 5th Supplement suspended provisions of local law to facilitate the use of private hotel rooms for the COVID-19 response effort; Section 1 of the 6th Supplement waived the City's hotel tax on such hotel rooms; Section 1 of the 15th Supplement authorized real property belonging to the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development to be used for temporary emergency housing for homeless, including tent encampments; and Section 2 of the 28th Supplement waived provisions of local law to allow student housing to be used for temporary residential use by non-students; and

WHEREAS, Section 3 of the 2nd Supplement suspended lien proceedings for delinquent water and sewer bills; and

WHEREAS, Section 1 of the 44th Supplement authorized the City to continue funding for nonprofit contractors and grantees that were not performing services due to the emergency; and

WHEREAS, Following the termination of the supplemental orders identified above, the Mayor wishes to delay termination of the Proclamation for a reasonable time, for the limited purposes of enabling the City to seek full reimbursement for eligible costs incurred in the emergency response from federal and state authorities as authorized by



law, and to facilitate an orderly transition with respect to the City's Shared Spaces Program; and

WHEREAS, The remaining orders with respect to "Shared Spaces" programs consist of Section 1 of the 18th Supplement, which authorized the Department of Public Works to implement a program to allow restaurants and retail establishments to temporarily use privately owned open space in front of their premises; Section 3 of the 18th Supplement, as updated by Section 1 of the 23rd Supplement, which authorized the Planning Department to implement such a program; Section 1 of the 26th Supplement, which authorized the Director of Transportation to issue permits to close streets for outdoor dining, retail, and services; and Section 1 of the 27th Supplement, which authorized the Entertainment Commission to permit outdoor entertainment and outdoor amplified sound in connection with certain types of permitted events;

NOW, THEREFORE

I, London N. Breed, Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco, order that all supplemental orders identified herein, with the exception of the Shared Spaces orders, shall terminate effective 11:59 p.m. on February 28, 2023.

DATED: January 25, 2023

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "London Breed".

London N. Breed
Mayor of San Francisco

From: [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: The end of remote public comment
Date: Tuesday, September 20, 2022 12:46:41 PM

From: Evelyn Posamentier <eposamentier@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2022 10:00 AM
To: Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Subject: The end of remote public comment

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,

Evvy Posamentier

Sent from my iPad

Patrick Monette-Shaw

975 Sutter Street, Apt. 6
San Francisco, CA 94109
Phone: (415) 292-6969 • e-
mail: [pmonette-
shaw@earthlink.net](mailto:pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net)

February 6, 2023

San Francisco Board of Supervisors Rules Committee
The Honorable Matt Dorsey, Chair, Rules Committee
The Honorable Shamann Walton, Member, Rules Committee
The Honorable Ahsha Safai, Member, Rules Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: **Agenda Item #5, Board File #221008: Opposition to Discontinuation of Remote Participation in Dial-In Public Comment During Board Meetings**

Dear Chair Dorsey and Rules Committee Members,

As a gay man myself, I am submitting testimony opposing the Motion to discontinue remote dial-in public participation during full Board and Board Committee meetings.

This ill-conceived legislation is an affront to every San Franciscan, as Mr. Mandelman should know, particularly as a gay man representing the LGBTQ+ constituents in his District.

At a time of declining interest in politics and public participation in political processes nationwide, it is alarming Mr. Mandelman has seen fit to attempt restricting public participation in what our elected officials are doing in our names. This is absolutely shameful!

The “universe” of members of the public who call in to make First Amendment Free Speech public comment is miniscule. If they show up in a City Hall meeting where they can make public comment without restriction, enacting this Motion would only slightly reduce the

number of people who call in remotely. Where's the data and the science to show there are a too many people calling in? Show us the data! From my experience with efforts to rescue Laguna Honda Hospital, there are not an inordinate number of people who call in remotely for public comment.

I don't know if this is "The World According to Garp," or "The Weirder Universe According to Mandelman," but it's completely anti-democratic and something befitting of Donald Trump's Republican MAGA aficionado's.

Supervisor Mandelman should come to his senses and simply withdraw this Legislation.

If he doesn't withdraw it, I urge the Rules Committee to Table this Motion completely and do not pass it, or send any recommendation to the full Board of Supervisors.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick Monette-Shaw

Columnist/Reporter

Westside Observer Newspaper

cc: The Honorable Aaron Peskin, Board President
The Honorable Connie Chan, Supervisor, District 1
The Honorable Catherine Stefani, Supervisor, District 2
The Honorable Joel Engardio, Supervisor, District 4
The Honorable Dean Preston, Supervisor, District 5
The Honorable Myrna Melgar, Supervisor, District 7
The Honorable Rafael Mandelman, Supervisor, District 8
The Honorable Hillary Ronen, Supervisor, District 9
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Victor Young, Clerk of the Rules Committee

From: [Tyler Breisacher](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: opposing the change to public comment rules
Date: Friday, February 3, 2023 5:52:48 PM

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

Just wanted to express my opposition to item 221008, "Limiting Teleconferencing and Remote Public Comment at Meetings of the Board of Supervisors and its Committees" before the rules committee meets to discuss it.

Allowing public comment by phone has made a big difference to people being able to participate in the board's discussions, and I really hope they can find a way to keep it, in some form. I didn't realize until reading the legislation that doing so requires four additional people from the clerk's office! Perhaps someone can figure out a way to reduce that to just one or two. Or maybe remote public comment can be set up only for meetings where someone requests it to be set up, so that if a meeting is just routine items where there isn't much public comment anyway, the extra staff wouldn't be needed.

Apart from the specific issue of remote public comment, I would love to see the board come up with ways to engage the public more. Every once in a while I email in my comments if I can't attend the meeting (like I'm doing now) and even if the supervisors took a moment to acknowledge the emails they'd gotten and summarize the points made, I think that would go a long way towards making people feel that their email comments were actually listened to. Maybe for some issues, more "town hall" style meetings can be organized prior to the official committee meetings, which are often at times that are hard for people to attend.

I'm definitely sympathetic to the idea that the current system is unwieldy and can't really work forever, but I hope the committee can come up with some kind of system that encourages more public participation from everyone, not just those who are able to make it to city hall in the middle of the day when a committee meets.

Thanks,

Tyler

From: [regina.sneed](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Rules Committee Item 221008 Teleconferencing and remote public comment at meetings
Date: Saturday, February 4, 2023 1:45:15 PM

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

Dear Rules Committee Members:

I oppose any change in the teleconferencing and remote public comment rules for the Board of Supervisors and its Committees. This ordinance should be tabled until the general public has lots of notice about this change and it is discussed in every Board Committee and Commission meeting.

I only learned about it on Friday from an email from Gray Panthers and today from an email by Senior and Disability Action. If they are just alerting me about it, I'm sure others who attend Board or Committee meetings have not been given adequate notice.

I am a senior citizen whose health no longer allows me to attend meetings at City hall. During covid I have become more active in monitoring and commenting on legislation I believe that increased participation is true for all resident regardless of age.

Yes this access costs more but it saves in other ways.

1. It helps with the cities environmental goals to decrease emissions affecting global warming.
2. It allows parents, the elderly and people who work to efficiently participate without leaving their office or home. No taking leave, no baby sitter expenses etc.
3. The 72 hour request for accommodations under the old system never really worked. In the last 8 months that I have been working on the military equipment issue, there were changes made in draft ordinances that occurred within the 72 hour period. Since the Rules Committee meets at 10 AM Monday, these changes were sometimes not posted with the original notice for the meeting. This kind of accommodation does not comport with the better universal access for everyone standards we should expect with modern communications tools.
4. All city commissions should offer the same public remote access.
5. No one likes long meetings, but as public officials it is your job. It's in the public interest to increase participation in government.

Please keep the current system allowing for remote public comment.

Thank you.

Regina Sneed
District Two resident

Sent from my iPad

From: [Joe A. Kunzler](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fwd: Motion 221008 - the Remote Testimony Resolution
Date: Saturday, February 4, 2023 4:25:50 PM

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

E-mail missive 2 of 2 for the file.

JOE

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

From: **Joe A. Kunzler** <growlernoise@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Feb 3, 2023 at 2:24 PM
Subject: Motion 221008 - the Remote Testimony Resolution
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: <ChanStaff@sfgov.org>, <marstaff@sfgov.org>, <RonenStaff@sfgov.org>, StefaniStaff, (BOS) <stefanistaff@sfgov.org>, <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>, <hknight@schronicle.com>, <ashanks@s Examiner.com>, <Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org>, <Dean.Preston@sfgov.org>, Joe K. <growlernoise@gmail.com>, <Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org>, <Hilary.Ronen@sfgov.org>, <richie@greenbergnation.com>, <hello@togethersf.org>, <contact@growsf.org>, <Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org>

Dear SF Board of Supervisors and Staff;

I'm going to be acute about [this Motion 221008 of yours](#).

For contrast, Washington State is celebrating [almost a year of guaranteed remote testimony from HB 1329](#). Actually works up here as per the above link.

Meanwhile, San Francisco is working to shut down remote testimony.

Supervisor Catherine "Maverick" Stefani is out ill and using remote access.

I just find it incredibly sickening and frankly cruel that the fear of the other in SF of all places has taken hold while the greatest voice for courage is ill.

What Supervisor Catherine Stefani once created in freedom's safest place and the ultimate pwnage of the NRA is now surrounded by fentanyl and fear.

What an impeachable act under the cloak of good intentions to silence all of the public.

I really hope you Supervisors think about what you are doing and why. I thought you wanted to serve the public.

Note the CC line. Check it again. Trust me when I say this: People are going to see your answer.

My doors are open to discuss this, but I have a 3 PM crisis meeting to attend about... YOU.

Like a Stefani, the rest I submit;

Joe A. Kunzler
360-499-4997
growlernoise@gmail.com

From: [Joe A. Kunzler](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: JAK comments 1 of 2 Fwd: Motion 221008
Date: Saturday, February 4, 2023 4:26:42 PM

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

E-mail missive 1 of 2 for the file for ya.

JOE

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

From: **Joe A. Kunzler** <growlernoise@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Feb 3, 2023 at 1:28 PM
Subject: Motion 221008 - the "Sorry You'll Ill Lady Catherine, But I Want to Shut You Down" Motion
To: Catherine Stefani <info@supervisorstefani.com>, <Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org>, <StefaniStaff>, BOS <stefanistaff@sfgov.org>
Cc: <Feinberg>, Giles <Giles.Feinberg@sfgov.org>, <Mandelman>, Rafael <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>

Hi there Supervisor Stefani and esteemed CCs;

Apparently Motion 221008 - the "Sorry You'll Ill Lady Catherine, But I Want to Shut You and Your Superfans Down" Motion is on deck for Rules.

Let's get this over with: Nice going Supervisor Mandleman, nice going. Good intentions but timing couldn't be worse. You can't send tea to your ill colleague and kill this gawdawful resolution? Well I did send *my hero* Constant Comment tea, it's coming Monday. Also, in the interest of class somewhere, somehow: Thank you Supervisor Mandleman for forcing my hand on putting these thoughts below to Gmail.

Now to the main event: Supervisor Stefani, I think you know in that unique way you say you know how I want you to vote and opera sing on this airhead resolution. I think ya do. Rest that opera singer's voice attached to the heart of a Zelensky and give a shout if you need ANYTHING. In case I was not clear: PLEASE GET WELL SOON.

With that, some context: The Washington Coalition for Open Gov't hasn't made this public yet, but we are honoring the heroes on 17 March who bring about protecting remote testimony and the prime sponsor of our HB 1329 is a strong woman in former Rep Emily Wicks. We're also a party to this fight because well, I pulled a few strings to make it so. Something about the Kunzler family's debt of honor to the Stefanis for standing up to gun violence for us gun violence survivors and helping me wake up my folks.

Also I've meant to say this directly but due to SFBOS rules, I've had to dance around being direct: The guilt after each of these mass shootings should be MINE, NOT YOURS SUPERVISOR STEFANI FOR NOT BEING THERE BY YOUR SIDE AND SHANNON WATTS' + MIKE BLOOMBERG'S SIDE FOR THAT MATTER ALL THIS TIME. Every time I step up to "join us" - thank you, I *rock out* to you - in the fight against gun violence, I'm defying my family but I don't consider it family honor or patriotic to sit on the sidelines and cower. Politics in a democracy is a participatory sport and it's a damn shame it's come down to this.

I get the frustration with the overlong meetings and the fact most of the testifiers would cross the street to NOT be seen near a STRONG Supervisor much less wanting to make HER day. But to some of us, me included, feel an obligation to get your back.

Why? Heckfire, back home some call me Maverick. I say you want a Maverick? Go to San Francisco and watch Supervisor Stefani do StefaniStuff. I mean who in the rightful patriotic mind does NOT want to grab 150 guns off the streets during the holidays? Or call the NRA a bunch of terrorists and take the heat like a brave boss? Or get after Congress and their wimpy ways like you do?

That my SF friends is precisely why I'm a Supervisor Stefani Superfan: You care and you show others how to show we care in public life. You are brave and fierce and strong, not just gorgeous. You are the leader yours truly wants to be.

Now again, Supervisor Stefani you please get well soon, drink

some free "Constant Comment" tea coming Monday afternoon to your office and please vote down Tuesday this *well-intended* abomination in Motion 221008. SF needs you and you need your supporters to actually publicly stand with you. You've done an outstanding, exemplary job on fighting gun violence, but SF needs you and your posse. Something about "don't thank us... join us" and Motion 221008 makes the "join us" harder.

Very strategically submitted;

Joe A. Kunzler
360-499-2997
growlernoise@gmail.com

P.S. If you Supervisor Stefani feel up to it and when back in good health, plz share some of the tea with Clerk Angela and Speaker Pelosi. I'm a big fan of Clerk Angela and my mom's a big fan of Speaker Pelosi when she visits 14 Feb - yes, I watch SFGOVTV. Sorry I'm stuck home. Thanks!

From: pmonette-shaw
To: [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Groth, Kelly \(BOS\)](#); [Yu, Angelina \(BOS\)](#); [Burke, Robyn \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Feinberg, Giles \(BOS\)](#); [Del Rosario, Mick \(BOS\)](#); [Logan, Sam \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [Yan, Calvin \(BOS\)](#); [Souza, Sarah \(BOS\)](#); [Hsu, Melody \(BOS\)](#); [Bell, Tita \(BOS\)](#); [Lam, Kit \(BOS\)](#); [Timony, Simon \(BOS\)](#); [Goldberg, Jonathan \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [Kilgore, Preston \(BOS\)](#); [Hernandez, Melissa G \(BOS\)](#); [Boles, Jennifer M. \(BOS\)](#); [Tam, Madison \(BOS\)](#); [Dahl, Bryan \(BOS\)](#); [Leo Alfaro \(BOS\)](#); [Ebadi, Mahanaz \(BOS\)](#); [Fleber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Heiken, Emma \(BOS\)](#); [Carrillo, Lila \(BOS\)](#); [Low, Jen \(BOS\)](#); [Farrah, Michael \(BOS\)](#); [Thornhill, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Prager, Jackie \(BOS\)](#); [Green, Ross \(BOS\)](#); [World, Heather \(BOS\)](#); [Lerma, Santiago \(BOS\)](#); [Saini, Nikita \(BOS\)](#); [Herrera, Ana \(BOS\)](#); [Ferrigno, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Burch, Percy \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Gee, Natalie \(BOS\)](#); [Lopez-Weaver, Lindsey \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Jones, Ernest \(BOS\)](#); [Barnes, Bill \(BOS\)](#); [Buckley, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Agenda Item #5, Board File #221008: Mandelman Forgot Supervisor Tom Ammiano Affirmatively Voted for Resolution 270-96 Passed and Adopted 30 Years Ago for Official City Policy Allo9wing Remote Call-In Testimony
Date: Saturday, February 4, 2023 6:41:00 PM
Attachments: [30-Year Official City Policy — Resolution 270-96 Call-in-Testimony-Resolution.pdf](#)

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

Patrick Monette-Shaw

975 Sutter Street, Apt. 6
San Francisco, CA 94109
Phone: (415) 292-6969 • e-mail: pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net

February 6, 2023

San Francisco Board of Supervisors Rules Committee
The Honorable Matt Dorsey, Chair, Rules Committee
The Honorable Shamann Walton, Member, Rules Committee
The Honorable Ahsha Safai, Member, Rules Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: **Agenda Item #5, Board File #221008: Additional Comment: Don't Forget Board Resolution 270-96
Opposition to Discontinuation of Remote Participation
in Dial-In Public Comment During Board Meetings**

Dear Chair Dorsey and Rules Committee Members,

Mr. Mandelman's limited knowledge of City Policy made him overlook in his 20 "WHEREAS" clauses to his proposed Resolution that for nearly three decades, it has been City policy to permit remote call-in public testimony by telephone.

So let me take a stab at writing WHEREAS and MOVED clauses:

"WHEREAS, Since it has been City Policy for nearly three decades after the Board of Supervisors adopted Board Resolution #270-96 on March 25, 1996 and then Mayor Willie L. Brown signed it into law on March 28, 1996 Resolving that it is the **Policy** of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco that a call-in telephone system be developed to take public comments to increase public participation in City government; and

"WHEREAS, Since Resolution #270-96 was good enough for then-District 8 Supervisor Tom Ammiano's affirmative vote in 1996, it should be good enough for District 8 Supervisor Raphael Mandelman now as **permanent City Policy**; and

"THEREFORE, Be it Resolved that Supervisor Mandelman's anti-democratic efforts to end remote call-in comments during Board meetings and Committee meetings would violate official City Policy enacted 27 years ago in Resolution 270-96; and

"THEREFORE, The Rules Committee, on behalf of the full Board of Supervisors, Moves that no action on Supervisor Mandelman's anti-democratic Motion proposing to end remote public comment will be taken and it will be Tabled; and therefore, let it be,

“RESOLVED, That remote teleconferencing can continue for both members of the Board of Supervisors and members of the public given further advances in technology since 1996.”

Resolution 270-96 is included in this testimony, and attached, for your reference and convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick Monette-Shaw

Columnist/Reporter

Westside Observer Newspaper

cc: The Honorable Aaron Peskin, Board President
The Honorable Connie Chan, Supervisor, District 1
The Honorable Catherine Stefani, Supervisor, District 2
The Honorable Joel Engardio, Supervisor, District 4
The Honorable Dean Preston, Supervisor, District 5
The Honorable Myrna Melgar, Supervisor, District 7
The Honorable Rafael Mandelman, Supervisor, District 8
The Honorable Hillary Ronen, Supervisor, District 9

cc: (Continued)

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Alisa Somera, Legislative Deputy Director to the Clerk of the Board

1 [Call-in telephone system]
2 DECLARING IT TO BE A POLICY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
3 FRANCISCO THAT THE CAPABILITY FOR A CALL-IN TELEPHONE
4 SYSTEM FOR BOARD MEETINGS/BE DEVELOPED AND INSTRUCTING
5 THE CLERK OF THE BOARD TO OVERSEE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A
6 CALL-IN TELEPHONE SYSTEM.

7 WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors has made it a long-standing
8 policy to encourage public participation in the meetings of the Board, through
9 such measures as the passage of the Sunshine Ordinance and by sponsoring
10 and implementing Proposition P, which allows the Board to meet in the
11 neighborhoods of San Francisco; and,

12
13 WHEREAS, Although the Board encourages public participation in
14 Board meetings, there are still many San Franciscans who are unable to
15 attend the meetings in person; and,

16
17 WHEREAS, The Board meetings are broadcast live on radio by KPOO
18 radio and will soon be broadcast with gavel-to-gavel coverage by the San
19 Francisco Community Television Corporation; and,

20
21 WHEREAS, The technology is available to allow those members of the
22 public who cannot attend meetings in person to call in to the meetings by
23 telephone and participate; and,

24
25 SUPERVISOR KEVIN SHELLEY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

1 WHEREAS, Other cities have developed call-in telephone access to
2 government meetings and have implemented inexpensive and simple
3 systems that are very popular and have increased public participation in
4 meetings; and,

5
6 WHEREAS, Interactive telephone access to the Board meetings will
7 provide for greater public access to the workings of local government and
8 increase public participation and awareness; now, therefore be it,

9
10 RESOLVED, That the City and County of Supervisors declares it to be a
11 policy that the capability for call-in telephone system for Board of Supervisors
12 under the Public Commet item
13 meetings/be developed and instructs the Clerk of the Board to oversee the
14 implementation of a call-in telephone system.

Adopted - Board of Supervisors, San Francisco March 25, 1996

Ayes: Supervisors Amiano Bierman Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Leal
Migden Shelley Teng Yaki

Absent: Supervisor Alioto

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution
was adopted by the Board of Supervisors
of the City and County of San Francisco


Clerk

Mayor

File No.
54-96-2

MAR 28 1996

Date Approved

Mayor

Victor Young, Clerk of the Rules Committee

From: [VIVIAN IMPERIALE](#)
To: [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Keep remote meeting access in San Francisco
Date: Sunday, February 5, 2023 12:34:33 PM

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

Honorable Members of the Rules Committee:

Do not accept or forward Supervisor Mandelman's proposal to eliminate the public's ability to call in to meetings to provide their comments. This is a valid and necessary way for people to participate in government affairs and decision-making.

Many people have schedules that preclude a trip to City Hall. Many people have physical limitations that make such a trip undoable.

People have different communication styles: some like to testify in person; some like to write; some like to phone in.

These factors should not eliminate their participation.

Thank you.

Vivian Imperiale

From: [VIVIAN IMPERIALE](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fwd: Keep remote meeting access in San Francisco
Date: Sunday, February 5, 2023 12:36:48 PM

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

Please include my written testimony in the public correspondence folder on-line for Board File #221008.

Thank you.

Vivian Imperiale

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

From: VIVIAN IMPERIALE <zizivaga@comcast.net>
To: Matt Dorsey <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>, "Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org" <Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org>, "Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org" <Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org>
Cc: "Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org" <Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org>, "victor.young@sfgov.org" <victor.young@sfgov.org>
Date: 02/05/2023 12:34 PM
Subject: Keep remote meeting access in San Francisco

Honorable Members of the Rules Committee:

Do not accept or forward Supervisor Mandelman's proposal to eliminate the public's ability to call in to meetings to provide their comments. This is a valid and necessary way for people to participate in government affairs and decision-making.

Many people have schedules that preclude a trip to City Hall. Many people have physical limitations that make such a trip undoable.

People have different communication styles: some like to testify in person; some like to write; some like to phone in.

These factors should not eliminate their participation.

Thank you.

Vivian Imperiale

From: [Shaila Nathu](#)
To: [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Ginny LaRoe](#); [Northern California Society of Professional Journalists Freedom of Information Committee](#); staff@mediaworkers.org
Subject: Opposition to motion discontinuing remote public comment (File #22108)
Date: Monday, February 6, 2023 9:07:28 AM

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

To Members of the Rules Committee of the City and County of San Francisco:

The Freedom of Information Committee of the [Society of Professional Journalists](#), [Northern California Professional Chapter](#), [First Amendment Coalition](#), [Pacific Media Workers Guild \(The NewsGuild-Communications Workers of America Local 39521\)](#), and [Californians Aware](#), nonpartisan organizations that champion government transparency and the rights of the press and public to observe and engage in civic affairs, strongly oppose the rescission of the Board of Supervisors' March 17, 2020 motion allowing remote public comment. As the pandemic era showed, remote public comment broadens and encourages participatory democracy, fostering a more informed and engaged public, and enhances the ability of journalists to gauge public attitudes toward the issues that City policy-makers are tackling. Journalists covering government meetings benefit from hearing from a range of engaged residents and can share that more varied range of public comment with their readers. Unfortunately, members of the public who care deeply about the issues affecting the City are often unable to attend Board or committee meetings in-person for a variety of reasons, including personal health issues and family and/or work obligations.

Rescission of remote public comment, if approved, will preclude many individuals who are immunocompromised but not eligible for protection under the Americans with Disabilities Act or who are living in the same household as someone that is immunocompromised from participating in public meetings. All members of the public should remain able to communicate their concerns, ideas, and advice to the people who shape and execute City policy. San Francisco should lead the way in increasing public participation in civic affairs.

We, therefore, urge the Rules Committee to support continued remote public comment.

Thank you for your consideration of this important issue.

From: [Shaila Nathu](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fwd: Opposition to motion discontinuing remote public comment (File #22108)
Date: Monday, February 6, 2023 9:09:41 AM

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

Hi Clerk Young,

Please post this written testimony into the background file in the Public Correspondence testimony folder on-line for Board File #221008.

Thanks!

Shaila Nathu, Co-Chair of the Freedom of Information Committee, Society of Professional Journalists, Northern California Professional Chapter

Shaila Nathu
805.807.2009 (c)

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

From: **Shaila Nathu** <shailanathu@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Feb 6, 2023 at 9:06 AM
Subject: Opposition to motion discontinuing remote public comment (File #22108)
To: <Matt.Dorsey@sfgov.org>, <Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org>, <Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org>
Cc: <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>, <Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org>, <victor.young@sfgov.org>, Ginny LaRoe <glaroe@firstamendmentcoalition.org>, Northern California Society of Professional Journalists Freedom of Information Committee <spjnorcalfoi@gmail.com>, <staff@mediaworkers.org>

To Members of the Rules Committee of the City and County of San Francisco:

The Freedom of Information Committee of the [Society of Professional Journalists, Northern California Professional Chapter](#), [First Amendment Coalition](#), [Pacific Media Workers Guild \(The NewsGuild-Communications Workers of America Local 39521\)](#), and [Californians Aware](#), nonpartisan organizations that champion government transparency and the rights of the press and public to observe and engage in civic affairs, strongly oppose the rescission of the Board of Supervisors' March 17, 2020 motion allowing remote public comment. As the pandemic era showed, remote public comment broadens and encourages participatory democracy, fostering a more informed and engaged public, and enhances the ability of journalists to gauge public attitudes toward the issues that City policy-makers are tackling. Journalists covering government meetings benefit from hearing from a range of engaged residents and

can share that more varied range of public comment with their readers. Unfortunately, members of the public who care deeply about the issues affecting the City are often unable to attend Board or committee meetings in-person for a variety of reasons, including personal health issues and family and/or work obligations.

Recission of remote public comment, if approved, will preclude many individuals who are immunocompromised but not eligible for protection under the Americans with Disabilities Act or who are living in the same household as someone that is immunocompromised from participating in public meetings. All members of the public should remain able to communicate their concerns, ideas, and advice to the people who shape and execute City policy. San Francisco should lead the way in increasing public participation in civic affairs.

We, therefore, urge the Rules Committee to support continued remote public comment.

Thank you for your consideration of this important issue.

From: [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Strongly OPPOSING Rules Committee Agenda Item #5 [Limiting Teleconferencing and Remote Public Comment at Meetings of the Board of Supervisors and its Committees] File #221008
Date: Monday, February 6, 2023 11:03:52 AM

For the file

From: aeboken <aeboken@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 6, 2023 4:17 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org>
Subject: Strongly OPPOSING Rules Committee Agenda Item #5 [Limiting Teleconferencing and Remote Public Comment at Meetings of the Board of Supervisors and its Committees] File #221008

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

TO: Rules Committee and Board of Supervisors members

I'm strongly opposing this legislation.

On page 4 lines 1 and 2 it states "the significant costs associated with allowing all members of the public to participate in Board meetings remotely".

However, there is no report by the Budget and Legislative Analyst (BLA) stating what those costs actually are.

There also is no analysis on the burdens placed on the public to go to City Hall, wait hours to give two (2) minutes of public comment and then go back from City Hall.

The human costs as well as the financial costs should be taken into consideration.

Eileen Boken,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods*

* For identification purposes only.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: [Hope Kamer](#)
To: [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please Oppose Legislation to Limit Public Comment at BOS Meetings
Date: Monday, February 6, 2023 11:28:02 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)

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

Hello Supervisor Dorsey,

Compass Family Services respectfully requests that today you oppose the legislation to end remote participation at BOS meetings. We believe this is an equity issue- and that the more community members who can participate in our City's democratic process, the stronger the process will be. Parents, educators, and caregivers for young children cannot take a break to come to a meeting but can call in while with children. As the oldest family homelessness nonprofit in SF, we serve housing insecure families with the lived experience and expertise to substantively contribute to decision making at the Supervisor level that will improve San Francisco's public-serving systems. Without remote access, the resource of this expertise will be limited, if not lost completely.

Thank you for your consideration.

In partnership,



Hope Kamer, MSW

She/Her ([Why pronouns?](#))

Director of External Affairs and Policy

Compass Family Services

37 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 | tel 415-644-0504 x 1116

www.compass-sf.org



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 \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Opposition to motion discontinuing remote public comment (File #22108)
Date: Monday, February 6, 2023 12:03:21 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the below communication.

Thank you,

Eileen McHugh
Executive Assistant
Office of the Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-7703 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Shaila Nathu <shailanathu@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 6, 2023 9:07 AM
To: Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Cc: MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Young, Victor (BOS) <victor.young@sfgov.org>; Ginny LaRoe <glaroe@firstamendmentcoalition.org>; Northern California Society of Professional Journalists Freedom of Information Committee <spjnorcalfoi@gmail.com>; staff@mediaworkers.org
Subject: Opposition to motion discontinuing remote public comment (File #22108)

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

To Members of the Rules Committee of the City and County of San Francisco:

The Freedom of Information Committee of the [Society of Professional Journalists](#), [Northern California Professional Chapter](#), [First Amendment Coalition](#), [Pacific Media Workers Guild \(The NewsGuild-Communications Workers of America Local 39521\)](#), and [Californians Aware](#), nonpartisan organizations that champion government transparency and the rights of the press and public to observe and engage in civic affairs, strongly oppose the rescission of the Board of Supervisors' March 17, 2020 motion allowing remote public comment. As the pandemic era showed, remote public

comment broadens and encourages participatory democracy, fostering a more informed and engaged public, and enhances the ability of journalists to gauge public attitudes toward the issues that City policy-makers are tackling. Journalists covering government meetings benefit from hearing from a range of engaged residents and can share that more varied range of public comment with their readers. Unfortunately, members of the public who care deeply about the issues affecting the City are often unable to attend Board or committee meetings in-person for a variety of reasons, including personal health issues and family and/or work obligations.

Recission of remote public comment, if approved, will preclude many individuals who are immunocompromised but not eligible for protection under the Americans with Disabilities Act or who are living in the same household as someone that is immunocompromised from participating in public meetings. All members of the public should remain able to communicate their concerns, ideas, and advice to the people who shape and execute City policy. San Francisco should lead the way in increasing public participation in civic affairs.

We, therefore, urge the Rules Committee to support continued remote public comment.

Thank you for your consideration of this important issue.

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 \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Keep remote meeting access in San Francisco
Date: Monday, February 6, 2023 12:23:33 PM

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the below communication.

Thank you,

Eileen McHugh
Executive Assistant
Office of the Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: VIVIAN IMPERIALE <zizivaga@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, February 5, 2023 12:34 PM
To: Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Young, Victor (BOS) <victor.young@sfgov.org>
Subject: Keep remote meeting access in San Francisco

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

Honorable Members of the Rules Committee:

Do not accept or forward Supervisor Mandelman's proposal to eliminate the public's ability to call in to meetings to provide their comments. This is a valid and necessary way for people to participate in government affairs and decision-making.

Many people have schedules that preclude a trip to City Hall. Many people have physical limitations that make such a trip undoable.

People have different communication styles: some like to testify in person; some like to write; some like to phone in.

These factors should not eliminate their participation.

Thank you.

Vivian Imperiale

From: [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Agenda Item #5, Board File #221008: Mandelman Forgot Supervisor Tom Ammiano Affirmatively Voted for Resolution 270-96 Passed and Adopted 30 Years Ago for Official City Policy Allo9wing Remote Call-In Testimony
Date: Monday, February 6, 2023 2:16:57 PM
Attachments: [30-Year Official City Policy — Resolution 270-96 Call-in-Testimony-Resolution.pdf](#)

For file 221008

Alisa Somera

Legislative Deputy Director
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
415.554.7711 direct | 415.554.5163 fax
alisa.somera@sfgov.org

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

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:** pmonette-shaw <pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net>

**Sent:** Saturday, February 4, 2023 6:40 PM

**To:** Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Young, Victor (BOS) <victor.young@sfgov.org>

**Cc:** Hsieh, Frances (BOS) <frances.hsieh@sfgov.org>; Groth, Kelly (BOS) <kelly.groth@sfgov.org>; Yu, Angelina (BOS) <angelina.yu@sfgov.org>; Burke, Robyn (BOS) <robyn.burke@sfgov.org>; Donovan, Dominica (BOS) <dominica.donovan@sfgov.org>; Feinberg, Giles (BOS) <giles.feinberg@sfgov.org>; Del Rosario, Mick (BOS) <mick.delrosario1@sfgov.org>; Logan, Sam (BOS) <sam.logan@sfgov.org>; Angulo, Sunny (BOS) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>; Yan, Calvin (BOS) <calvin.yan@sfgov.org>; Souza, Sarah (BOS) <sarah.s.souza@sfgov.org>; Hsu, Melody (BOS) <melody.hsu@sfgov.org>; Bell, Tita (BOS) <Tita.Bell@sfgov.org>; Lam, Kit (BOS) <Kit.Lam@sfgov.org>; Timony, Simon (BOS) <Simon.Timony@sfgov.org>; Goldberg, Jonathan (BOS) <jonathan.goldberg@sfgov.org>; Smeallie, Kyle (BOS) <kyle.smeallie@sfgov.org>; Kilgore, Preston (BOS) <preston.kilgore@sfgov.org>; Hernandez, Melissa G (BOS) <melissa.g.hernandez@sfgov.org>; Bolen, Jennifer M. (BOS) <jennifer.m.bolen@sfgov.org>; Tam, Madison (BOS) <madison.r.tam@sfgov.org>; Dahl, Bryan (BOS) <bryan.dahl@sfgov.org>; Leo Alfaro (BOS) <leo.alfaro@sfgov.org>; Ebadi, Mahanaz (BOS) <mahanaz.ebadi@sfgov.org>; Fieber, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.fieber@sfgov.org>; Heiken, Emma (BOS) <emma.heiken@sfgov.org>; Carrillo, Lila (BOS) <lila.carrillo@sfgov.org>; Low, Jen (BOS) <jen.low@sfgov.org>; Farrah, Michael (BOS) <michael.farrah@sfgov.org>; Thornhill, Jackie (BOS) <jackie.thornhill@sfgov.org>; Prager, Jackie (BOS) <jackie.prager@sfgov.org>; Green, Ross (BOS) <ross.green@sfgov.org>; World, Heather (BOS) <heather.world@sfgov.org>; Lerma, Santiago (BOS) <santiago.lerma@sfgov.org>; Saini, Nikita (BOS) <nikita.saini@sfgov.org>; Herrera, Ana (BOS)

<ana.herrera@sfgov.org>; Ferrigno, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.ferrigno@sfgov.org>; Burch, Percy (BOS) <percy.burch@sfgov.org>; Gallardo, Tracy (BOS) <tracy.gallardo@sfgov.org>; Gee, Natalie (BOS) <natalie.gee@sfgov.org>; Lopez-Weaver, Lindsey (BOS) <Lindsey.Lopez@sfgov.org>; Chung, Lauren (BOS) <lauren.l.chung@sfgov.org>; Jones, Ernest (BOS) <ernest.e.jones@sfgov.org>; Barnes, Bill (BOS) <bill.barnes@sfgov.org>; Buckley, Jeff (BOS) <jeff.buckley@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>

**Subject:** Agenda Item #5, Board File #221008: Mandelman Forgot Supervisor Tom Ammiano Affirmatively Voted for Resolution 270-96 Passed and Adopted 30 Years Ago for Official City Policy Allowing Remote Call-In Testimony

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

## Patrick Monette-Shaw

---

975 Sutter Street, Apt. 6  
San Francisco, CA 94109  
Phone: (415) 292-6969 • e-mail: [pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net](mailto:pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net)

February 6, 2023

San Francisco Board of Supervisors Rules Committee  
The Honorable Matt Dorsey, Chair, Rules Committee  
The Honorable Shamann Walton, Member, Rules Committee  
The Honorable Ahsha Safai, Member, Rules Committee  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102

**Re: Agenda Item #5, Board File #221008: Additional Comment: Don't Forget Board Resolution 270-96  
Opposition to Discontinuation of Remote Participation  
in Dial-In Public Comment During Board**

### Meetings

Dear Chair Dorsey and Rules Committee Members,

Mr. Mandelman's limited knowledge of City Policy made him overlook in his 20 "WHEREAS" clauses to his proposed Resolution that for nearly three decades, it has been City policy to permit remote call-in public testimony by telephone.

So let me take a stab at writing WHEREAS and MOVED clauses:

"WHEREAS, Since it has been City Policy for nearly three decades after the Board of Supervisors adopted Board Resolution #270-96 on March 25, 1996 and then Mayor Willie L. Brown signed it into law on March 28, 1996 Resolving that it is the **Policy** of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco that a call-in telephone system be developed to take public comments to increase public participation in City government; and

"WHEREAS, Since Resolution #270-96 was good enough for then-District 8 Supervisor Tom Ammiano's affirmative vote in 1996, it should be good enough for District 8 Supervisor Raphael Mandelman now as **permanent City Policy**; and

"THEREFORE, Be it Resolved that Supervisor Mandelman's anti-democratic efforts to end remote call-in comments during Board meetings and Committee meetings would violate official City Policy enacted 27 years ago in Resolution 270-96; and

"THEREFORE, The Rules Committee, on behalf of the full Board of Supervisors, Moves that no action on

Supervisor Mandelman's anti-democratic Motion proposing to end remote public comment will be taken and it will be Tabled; and therefore, let it be,

“RESOLVED, That remote teleconferencing can continue for both members of the Board of Supervisors and members of the public given further advances in technology since 1996.”

Resolution 270-96 is included in this testimony, and attached, for your reference and convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

**Patrick Monette-Shaw**

*Columnist/Reporter*

*Westside Observer* Newspaper

cc: The Honorable Aaron Peskin, Board President  
The Honorable Connie Chan, Supervisor, District 1  
The Honorable Catherine Stefani, Supervisor, District 2  
The Honorable Joel Engardio, Supervisor, District 4  
The Honorable Dean Preston, Supervisor, District 5  
The Honorable Myrna Melgar, Supervisor, District 7  
The Honorable Rafael Mandelman, Supervisor, District 8  
The Honorable Hillary Ronen, Supervisor, District 9  
cc: (Continued)  
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board  
Alisa Somera, Legislative Deputy Director to the Clerk of the Board  
Victor Young, Clerk of the Rules Committee



**From:** [Joe A. Kunzler](#)  
**To:** [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** Feinberg; [Feinberg, Giles \(BOS\)](#); Calvillo; [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Nightmare scenario you need to consider on 221008  
**Date:** Monday, February 6, 2023 1:59:34 PM

---

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

Supervisor Dorsey and CCs;

Joe Kunzler here. I want to write this so that we have the nightmare scenario I gave in oral comment on the record. Here goes:

1. Limit remote testimony to requiring disability accommodation.
2. Supervisor Stefani does StefaniStuff like introduce another gun violence prevention resolution of national significance.
3. Someone out of SF wants to testify remotely and has a documented disability.
4. The Clerk's Office denies it due a requestor being outside SF.
5. Thanks to the applicant not being able to speak; now you have a civil rights lawsuit.

**How will this nightmare scenario be prevented when you have Supervisor Stefani with her resolutions of *national significance*?** Are you asking the Supervisor who literally snuck out of sickbay to *walk* - I say again, *walk* - with an anti-Asian hate activist in the pouring rain this Saturday and grabbed over 150 guns with a gun buyback and called the NRA a bunch of terrorists to stop those life-saving resolutions out of risk of lawfare? I would pay good money to sit in that discussion. We'll see who's STRONG AND RIGHT on the Board of Supervisors as Supervisor Stefani fumigates so hot, the "Constant Comment" tea could be at drinking temperature in no time!!!

It's also worth noting not one working mother is on the SFBOS Rules Committee. Anyone consult one, just one? Because you didn't hear Supervisor Stefani complain about a meeting that ended before 1 AM on the Tenderloin in what has become a successful failure, but Supervisor Safai got it wrong as 2 AM. You know how I know? I flew three sorties that night as the reply guy who wanted to reopen Alcatraz plus thank some people. I've replayed the epic night a few times. It was the beginning of the end of the far left of SF and their tears as pro-police forces rise up to back the blue make me smile.

=====

With that, now may be a golden time to restructure your meetings from scratch. Put in some rules of civility. Maybe require public comment for only the first 30 minutes of a meeting and the end of a meeting. Maybe look at what other jurisdictions are doing like Washington State that made this work without a fuss instead of responding to a symptom.

**What Would Catherine Stefani Do?**

My door as a mere mortal is open to you to help answer that question. Oh and provide Washington State technical solutions to a plan to rebuild the SFBOS.

On that note, like a Stefani, the rest I submit. Oh and now...

WWCSD;

Joe A. Kunzler  
[growlernoise@gmail.com](mailto:growlernoise@gmail.com)

P.S. Thanks for voting to get Supervisor Stefani on the Golden Gate Transit Committee.  
I've actually rode that transit a few times - slightly overpriced but gets the job done.



**From:** [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW:  
**Date:** Monday, February 6, 2023 9:38:31 AM

---

**Natalie Gee** 朱凱勤, Chief of Staff  
**Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 282  
**Direct:** 415.554.7672 | **Office:** 415.554.7670  
**District 10 Community Events Calendar:** <https://bit.ly/d10communityevents>

---

**From:** Lisa Awbrey <weegreenmea@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 06, 2023 9:37 AM  
**To:** Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:**

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

Dear Supervisor Walton:

First of all, congratulations on your reelection to public office. Secondly, I fully support the continuation of the public's remote access to public hearings going forward. It just so happens that today @11AM, I have a doctor's appointment that's been scheduled for 2 months that I cannot miss. Consequently, I am unable to physically attend today's meeting at the Rules Committee where this critical issue will be heard.

I am temporarily physically disabled with mobility issues; I cannot attend public hearings at City Hall in person. I have attended many past hearings (in person and remotely) on subjects that are near and dear to my heart, things like public transportation, unhoused people, affordable housing, redistricting, public education and policing in San Francisco. San Franciscans like me are the eyes and the ears of San Francisco. We care deeply about our neighborhoods and have mostly good ideas for solutions to our problems. And, as you well know, we are the people who elect our individual district supervisors. We are also the people who adopt storm drains and who are NERT volunteers and who volunteer at our libraries and minister to elders and unhoused people living in our neighborhoods. We have daily experience of these events and therefore have critical insight into these problems. Limiting our access to you at public hearings by requiring that we physically be in the building is a terrible idea and is undemocratic. Please do not create more obstacles and barriers between us, the people and you, our elected leaders. City Hall is the People's House and all San Franciscans must have full and complete access to the important decision making and policy making that happens there. Please support all San Franciscans remote access to meetings and hearings to do with policy making and governance at City Hall.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.  
Very truly yours,  
Lisa Awbrey

**From:** [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Mayor and BOS Need to Prioritize Ending Drug Markets in SF  
**Date:** Monday, February 6, 2023 9:36:02 AM

---

Natalie Gee 朱凱勤, Chief of Staff  
Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 282  
Direct: 415.554.7672 | Office: 415.554.7670  
District 10 Community Events Calendar: <https://bit.ly/d10communityevents>

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

From: Allen Burke <ab94107@icloud.com>  
Sent: Sunday, February 05, 2023 5:39 AM  
To: Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>  
Subject: Mayor and BOS Need to Prioritize Ending Drug Markets in SF

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

Dear Supervisor Walton,

I'm a San Francisco resident who sees a failure by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to address the fentanyl-fueled drug epidemic that is devastating our city. You must make ending open-air drug markets the number one priority of this year's budget cycle. The drug epidemic is linked to all of the problems San Francisco faces, including homelessness, mental health, public safety, and economic vitality. I'm demanding that you take action along the following lines:

**Law Enforcement:** The District Attorney and the Police Department must work together to arrest and prosecute drug dealers in San Francisco, as well as coordinate with state and federal law enforcement to address cartels bringing drugs to the city.

**City-Sponsored Recovery Programs:** Recovery has to be the goal. City departments need to work cross-functionally to make this happen, even if it sometimes means compelling treatment, in order to give users the chance to live healthy lives.

I know that completely eradicating drug use is unrealistic. What I'm demanding is a visible reduction in the open air drug sales and use that is eroding our city. San Francisco should be a place where those who are not involved in drug sales and drug use are not negatively impacted by drug sales and drug use.

Sincerely,  
Your Name  
Allen Burke

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Please do not discontinue remote access and public comments to BOS hearings  
**Date:** Monday, February 6, 2023 9:35:52 AM

---

**Natalie Gee** 朱凱勤, Chief of Staff  
**Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 282  
**Direct:** 415.554.7672 | **Office:** 415.554.7670  
**District 10 Community Events Calendar:** <https://bit.ly/d10communityevents>

---

**From:** Iris Biblowitz <irisbiblowitz@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 05, 2023 8:36 AM  
**To:** Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; RonenOffice (BOS) <ronenoffice@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Please do not discontinue remote access and public comments to BOS hearings

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

Dear Supervisors of the Rules Committee and all Supervisors-

I'm asking you to stand firmly against discontinuing remote access for the public to make watch, listen, and make comments at all Board of Supervisors hearings, Agenda #5, item #221008. I speak as a nurse, a senior, and person with multiple disabilities resulting from my work.

Senior and people with disabilities have often been left out of important narratives and decisions. It's been a constant fight over the years, despite the American with Disabilities Act (that passed in 1990). And despite the fact that about 10% of people in San Francisco report disabilities, and 30% are seniors (often with unreported disabilities).

COVID brought tragedies and suffering to this city and to the world, but one of the rare benefits was that we learned how to create access to many different services online, and to spread that availability throughout the city. Although cases of COVID are going down in most places in the world, including in the Bay Area, the numbers of people with disabilities are not going down.

Please don't exclude people with disabilities from weighing in on important issues. Yes, people can email like I'm doing now, but there's nothing like calling in with updated information, responding thoughtfully to what the Supervisors and everyone else is saying, to have your voice heard. I would have thought this was a no brainer, but evidently not.

Thank you - Iris Biblowitz, RN

**From:** [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Urgent: Opposition to limiting remote participation  
**Date:** Monday, February 6, 2023 9:35:23 AM

---

**Natalie Gee** 朱凱勤, Chief of Staff

**Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10**

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 282

**Direct:** 415.554.7672 | **Office:** 415.554.7670

**District 10 Community Events Calendar:** <https://bit.ly/d10communityevents>

---

**From:** Jessica Lehman <jessica@sdaction.org>

**Sent:** Sunday, February 05, 2023 3:16 PM

**To:** Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>

**Cc:** Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Bohn, Nicole (ADM) <nicole.bohn@sfgov.org>; Dearman, Kelly (HSA) <kelly.dearman@sfgov.org>; Duning, Anna (MYR) <anna.duning@sfgov.org>; Gerull, Linda (TIS) <linda.gerull@sfgov.org>

**Subject:** Re: Urgent: Opposition to limiting remote participation

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

The Department of Technology has created a system to offer secure remote public comment for all meetings that are on sfgovtv, at NO additional expense. They held a demo recently with the SF Mayor's Office on Disability. Details here: [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1tw0wIYHyIb6gzDbEps\\_9Mdqr27WzjblkFTPxpE5zE/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1tw0wIYHyIb6gzDbEps_9Mdqr27WzjblkFTPxpE5zE/edit)

On Fri, Feb 3, 2023, at 4:21 PM, Jessica Lehman wrote:

Dear Supervisors,

In preparation for Monday's Rules Committee meeting, please see this letter signed by more than 100 organizations, urging you to vote NO on legislation that would limit remote public comment in any way.

[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1SWzjNv8d9aOL3gZt9gNTB2\\_XeZETnuoT3lgwaWF4I-k/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1SWzjNv8d9aOL3gZt9gNTB2_XeZETnuoT3lgwaWF4I-k/edit)

Thank you!

Jessica Lehman  
Senior and Disability Action  
cell (510) 427-7535

**From:** [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Rules Committee. Hearing on call-in access to meetings. February 5, 2023, 10:00 AM  
**Date:** Monday, February 6, 2023 9:34:16 AM

---

**Natalie Gee** 朱凱勤, Chief of Staff

**Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10**

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 282

**Direct:** 415.554.7672 | **Office:** 415.554.7670

**District 10 Community Events Calendar:** <https://bit.ly/d10communityevents>

---

**From:** Judi Gorski <judigorski@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Sunday, February 05, 2023 4:16 PM

**To:** Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>

**Cc:** Judi - gmail Gorski <judigorski@gmail.com>

**Subject:** Rules Committee. Hearing on call-in access to meetings. February 5, 2023, 10:00 AM

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

To Supervisor Joel Engardio and all other Supervisors,

I speak for myself and many neighbors, residents and voters of San Francisco in my district, District 4, who want and need to continue to be able to make public comments by phone (and maybe video) for government meetings. The option of calling in, rather than having to come down to City Hall, makes it possible for so many people to share their input and perspectives, including disabled people, parents, working people, seniors, people who live far from City Hall, people who cannot afford to pay for parking or make the time-consuming trip on the limited public transportation available. For myself, the time needed to get back and forth from City Hall is two hours minimum without factoring in the duration of attending the meetings or hearings.

Please do what is necessary to keep remote public comment accessible to your constituents.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,  
Judi Gorski



D4 Resident 40+ years

**From:** [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Comments on Proposed SF Reparations Plan  
**Date:** Monday, February 6, 2023 9:33:56 AM

---

Natalie Gee 朱凱勤, Chief of Staff  
Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 282  
Direct: 415.554.7672 | Office: 415.554.7670  
District 10 Community Events Calendar: <https://bit.ly/d10communityevents>

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

From: Marc Brenman <mbrenman001@comcast.net>  
Sent: Sunday, February 05, 2023 5:28 PM  
To: ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; StefaniStaff, (BOS) <stefanistaff@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; HRC-Reparations <reparations@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Info, HRC (HRC) <hrc.info@sfgov.org>; richie@greenbergnation.com  
Subject: Comments on Proposed SF Reparations Plan

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

Dear San Francisco Supervisors:

I am a long-term San Francisco resident, a taxpayer, and a property owner. I wish to make comments on the draft reparations plan for San Francisco. It's not an entirely bad idea, since many African-American have suffered discrimination in SF. On the other hand, so have members of many other groups. Why should African-Americans be singled out for reparations? California was never a slave state.

Many efforts have been made over the decades to remedy the adverse effects of non-slavery discrimination suffered by African-Americans. These include desegregation, integration, civil rights nondiscrimination laws and their enforcement, disadvantaged business enterprise programs, a City Human Rights Commission, school lunch programs, quotas, preferences, affirmative action, equal employment opportunity, and diversity and inclusion programs.

Any amount of money the City Council decides to give to African-Americans should have the costs and expenditures of these programs deducted from that amount. The only people eligible should be those who have lived in SF their whole lives and who can trace their ancestors back to slavery in the United States. There should also be means testing, so that those who don't need the money don't receive it.

It is incorrect to claim that life in SF has been an unalloyed tragedy for African-Americans. Before World War II, there were very few in the City. Many came to the City to work in war industries in World War II. This was a great opportunity for them, since they escaped poverty in the South. Many lived in housing formerly occupied by Japanese-Americans who were incarcerated in World War II. Should those African-American be punished for taking advantage of the incarcerated Japanese-Americans? They should certainly not be rewarded for it.

A city government as rife with corruption and poor management as SF should not undertake another program with so many opportunities for typical poor decision-making and management. Look at the fiasco of the school renaming commission and the fact that SFUSD is \$125 million in deficit, despite falling enrollment and rising property tax revenues. Look at the horrendous failure of City government in dealing with the homelessness problem. Money keneps getting throw at the problem, to no avail whatsoever. Look at the Van Ness BRT project and the Central Subway project, both of which ran hugely over schedule and budget. The City Council should solve the City's current governance problems first, before undertaking yet another very expensive program.

Thank you for considering these thoughts. Please let me know if you have questions or need more information.

Sincerely,  
Marc Brenman  
2636 Bryant St.  
SF, CA 94110  
Mbrenman001@comcast.net

**From:** [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Please vote NO on motion 221008 [Limiting Teleconferencing and Remote Public Comment at Meetings of the Board of Supervisors and its Committees]  
**Date:** Monday, February 6, 2023 9:33:38 AM

---

**Natalie Gee** 朱凱勤, Chief of Staff  
**Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 282  
**Direct:** 415.554.7672 | **Office:** 415.554.7670  
**District 10 Community Events Calendar:** <https://bit.ly/d10communityevents>

---

**From:** Lea McGeever <lea.mcgeeever@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 05, 2023 6:46 PM  
**To:** Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Raia Small <raia@sdaction.org>  
**Subject:** Please vote NO on motion 221008 [Limiting Teleconferencing and Remote Public Comment at Meetings of the Board of Supervisors and its Committees]

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

Hello Supervisor Walton,

My name is Lea McGeever and I live in D6. I am writing in solidarity with Senior and Disability Action and asking you to **vote NO on motion 221008** during the Rules Committee tomorrow, Monday the 6th. Here are the following reasons you should do so:

- 
- 
- Video conferencing has allowed many
- **disabled people, seniors, poor and working-class people, parents, teachers, child care providers, Black, Indigenous, people of color to participate** in Board of Supervisors hearings, commission meetings, and other public events -- some for the first time
- 
-

- It is vital that the City and County of San
- Francisco commit to continuing a telephone and video option for all public meetings,
- **complete with ASL, captioning, and interpretation.**
- 
- 
- 
- Many working people can't take time off from
- day jobs, when most meetings are held, but can call in and speak for a couple of minutes when their turn comes.
- 
- 
- 
- **Many disabled and immunocompromised people**
- **and their family members and caregivers cannot risk coming in person and getting COVID, or transportation and other barriers prevent in-person attendance.**
- 
- 
- 
- Parents, educators, and caregivers for young
- children cannot take a break to come to a meeting but can call in while with children.
- 
- 
- 
- **Many low-income people and Black, indigenous people of**
- **color live far from City Hall, making it hard to come in person to have their voices heard.**
- 
- 
- 
- Remote participation should be allowed for
- all, rather than only as a “reasonable accommodation.” Requiring people to identify as disabled and ask for an accommodation ahead of time adds a barrier that makes it less likely for people to participate, and nondisabled people also have valid reasons to
- participate remotely.

- 
- 
- **Increased public engagement should be celebrated rather than prevented. There is little to be gained and much to be lost by eliminating remote public comment.**
- 
- 
- 
- The SF Department of Technology has found
- a way to offer remote public comment for all meetings that are on sfgovtv through webex. This will cost the city NO additional funding and allow full access, including a video option for Deaf people using ASL. But if the city goes with the reasonable accommodations
- option through the Clerk's office, it will require staffing and funding.
- 
- 
- 
- **More than 100 community organizations want San Francisco to keep a remote public comment option to ensure that people can share input on housing, transportation, health, racial equity, and other issues.**
- 
- 
- 
- Many cities around the Bay Area and around
- the country are offering remote public comment by phone and video. These include Oakland, San Jose, Walnut Creek, Detroit and Washington, DC.
- **Is San Francisco going to fall behind on civic participation?**
-

**From:** [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Please KEEP Remote Public Comment  
**Date:** Monday, February 6, 2023 9:32:05 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[image005.png](#)  
[image006.png](#)

---

**Natalie Gee** 朱凱勤, Chief of Staff  
**Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 282  
**Direct:** 415.554.7672 | **Office:** 415.554.7670  
**District 10 Community Events Calendar:** <https://bit.ly/d10communityevents>

---

**From:** Curtis Bradford <CBradford@tndc.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 06, 2023 9:30 AM  
**To:** Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Please KEEP Remote Public Comment

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

Hello Supervisor Walton. Today at Rules Committee, you will hear a proposal to end Remote Public Comment.

I urge you to please vote NO. Please KEEP Remote Public Comment for all BOS meetings.

The option of calling in, rather than having to come down to City Hall, makes it possible for so many people to share their input and perspectives, including disabled people, parents, working people, seniors, people who live far from City Hall, and others who are usually less likely to be heard.

I realize that can add to the length of meetings and longer days, but the fact that so many people do call in to have their voice heard is actually evidence that people do care and so many people want and need to be included in the discussions.

I have many folks, seniors and disabled in particular, that I work with who have not been able to participate in our system of government until now because they are unable to get to City Hall for hearings, or sit and wait at City Hall to have their chance to be heard. Remote Comment allows them to participate for the first time. It is empowering and inspiring to them. Please, don't end their chance to continue being a valued partner and voice in this great City.

I thank you for your support in ensuring ALL San Franciscans have the opportunity to be heard.

**Curtis Bradford**  
Community Organizing Manager  
(He/Him/His)  
[cbradford@tndc.org](mailto:cbradford@tndc.org)

c 415-426-8982  
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation  
201 Eddy St.  
San Francisco, CA 94102

[tndc.org](http://tndc.org)



*At TNDc, we believe that everyone deserves to thrive. We support tenants and community members in building transformative communities through Homes, Health, and Voice. Together, we can build a future with economic and racial equity. Join us at [tndc.org](http://tndc.org)!*



**From:** [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Agenda Item #5, Board File #221008 - against  
**Date:** Monday, February 6, 2023 9:30:38 AM

---

**Natalie Gee** 朱凱勤, Chief of Staff  
**Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 282  
**Direct:** 415.554.7672 | **Office:** 415.554.7670  
**District 10 Community Events Calendar:** <https://bit.ly/d10communityevents>

---

**From:** Pam Hofmann <pshofmann@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 05, 2023 9:37 PM  
**To:** Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Re: Agenda Item #5, Board File #221008 - against

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

Please [continue](#) to allow remote dial-in public comment from members of the public during both full Board meetings and during meetings of the Board's various sub-Committees.

Pamela Hofmann

**From:** [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Keep Remote Public Comment  
**Date:** Monday, February 6, 2023 9:30:32 AM

---

**Natalie Gee** 朱凱勤, Chief of Staff  
**Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 282  
**Direct:** 415.554.7672 | **Office:** 415.554.7670  
**District 10 Community Events Calendar:** <https://bit.ly/d10communityevents>

---

**From:** Maria Schulman <maria.schulman@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 05, 2023 9:41 PM  
**To:** Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>;  
Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Keep Remote Public Comment

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

It is vital that the City and County of San Francisco commit to continuing a telephone and video option for all public meetings, complete with ASL, captioning, and interpretation. Many working people can't take time off from day jobs, when most meetings are held, but can call in and speak for a couple of minutes when their turn comes. Many disabled and immuno- compromised people and their family members and caregivers cannot risk coming in person and getting COVID, or transportation and other barriers prevent in-person attendance. Parents, educators, and caregivers for young children cannot take a break to come to a meeting but can call in while with children. Continuing to offer a remote participation option for public meetings will only serve to elevate the diverse voices of our community and create stronger and better decision-making. Dedicated city staff have proven that remote meetings are possible, and we are grateful.

Remote participation should be allowed for all, rather than only as a "reasonable accommodation." Requiring people to identify as disabled adds a barrier that makes it less likely for people to participate, and nondisabled people also have valid reasons to participate remotely. While some meetings have gone extremely long due to callers, there is scant evidence that more than a couple meetings have had callers from outside the Bay Area. Increased public engagement should be celebrated rather than prevented. There is little to be gained and much to be lost by eliminating remote public comment.

San Francisco has always valued rich community discussion. Let's preserve and expand participation from seniors, people with disabilities, working people, parents, and everyone. We know now that remote participation is possible. Every public meeting MUST continue to have an option for members of the public to view and make comments from any location. Please vote no on legislation limiting or ending remote participation options

**From:** [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Preserving Remote Public Comment in San Francisco City Hall meetings.  
**Date:** Monday, February 6, 2023 9:29:45 AM

---

**Natalie Gee** 朱凱勤, Chief of Staff  
**Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 282  
**Direct:** 415.554.7672 | **Office:** 415.554.7670  
**District 10 Community Events Calendar:** <https://bit.ly/d10communityevents>

---

**From:** Julienne Fisher <juliesearching@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 06, 2023 1:27 AM  
**To:** Julie Fisher <juliesearching@yahoo.com>  
**Subject:** Preserving Remote Public Comment in San Francisco City Hall meetings.

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

- Dear Board of Supervisors,
- Today, I hope that each of you will preserve the transparency that remote public comment and remote access offers to all of us. San Francisco City Hall already has technology which had been bringing the voices of our citizens to you. And also allows your voices to be heard by them. Whether they are homebound, unable to travel, caring for elders, children, their clients or if they are ill themselves Remote Public Comment Access connects us together.
- 
- The SF Department of Technology has found a way to offer remote public comment for all meetings that are on sfgovtv through webex. This will cost the city NO additional funding and allow full access, including a video option for Deaf people using ASL.
- 
- More than 100 community organizations want San Francisco to keep a remote public comment option to ensure that people can share input on housing, transportation, health, racial equity, and other issues.

- Cities around the Bay Area and around the country are offering remote public comment by phone and video including Oakland, San Jose, Walnut Creek, Detroit and Washington, DC.

- 

- **There is a lot of talk recently about keeping democracy functioning and preserved as we build better communities.**

**Keeping remote public access**

- **available is part of that practice.**

- 

**Please keep San Francisco moving forward together.**

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Respectfully,

Julienne Fisher  
415 307-1213

**From:** [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 22108 Limiting Teleconferencing and Remote Public Call-In DO NOT SUPPORT  
**Date:** Monday, February 6, 2023 9:25:36 AM

---

**Natalie Gee** 朱凱勤, Chief of Staff  
**Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 282  
**Direct:** 415.554.7672 | **Office:** 415.554.7670  
**District 10 Community Events Calendar:** <https://bit.ly/d10communityevents>

---

**From:** T Flandrich <tflandrich@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 06, 2023 8:50 AM  
**To:** Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** 22108 Limiting Teleconferencing and Remote Public Call-In DO NOT SUPPORT

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

Please continue remote access to not only Board of Supervisors meetings but to ALL City hearings! The single upside of COVID is that all San Franciscans had the opportunity to participate in public discourse, and for many this was the first time that they could publicly voice their concerns, their support.

Thank you for voting to keep the practice of access for all San Franciscans in place!

Theresa Flandrich

**From:** [Elisa Smith](#)  
**To:** [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Joel Engardio](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** remote call-in during Board of Supervisors" meetings  
**Date:** Sunday, February 5, 2023 4:25:03 PM

---

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

Good afternoon Board of Supervisors,

I formally request for remote call-in to be allowed during all Board of Supervisors' meetings where public comment is allowed, because I work Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. with only a one-hour lunch from 12:00 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.; therefore, I am not able to go to City Hall to sit in on meetings to give public comment. Remote call-in for San Francisco citizens is therefore (obviously) vital.

Thank you so much,

Elisa Smith  
D4 Resident

**From:** [Elisa Smith](#)  
**To:** [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Joel Engardio](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** remote call-in during Board of Supervisors" meetings  
**Date:** Sunday, February 5, 2023 4:24:59 PM

---

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

Good afternoon Board of Supervisors,

I formally request for remote call-in to be allowed during all Board of Supervisors' meetings where public comment is allowed, because I work Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. with only a one-hour lunch from 12:00 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.; therefore, I am not able to go to City Hall to sit in on meetings to give public comment. Remote call-in for San Francisco citizens is therefore (obviously) vital.

Thank you so much,

Elisa Smith  
D4 Resident

**From:** [Joe A. Kunzler](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Motion 221008 - the Remote Testimony Resolution  
**Date:** Friday, February 3, 2023 4:04:44 PM

---

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

To ensure the Board gets this message.

JOE SENDS

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

**From:** **Joe A. Kunzler** <[growlernoise@gmail.com](mailto:growlernoise@gmail.com)>  
**Date:** Fri, Feb 3, 2023 at 2:24 PM  
**Subject:** Motion 221008 - the Remote Testimony Resolution  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <[Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
**Cc:** <[ChanStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:ChanStaff@sfgov.org)>, <[marstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:marstaff@sfgov.org)>, <[RonenStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:RonenStaff@sfgov.org)>, StefaniStaff, (BOS) <[stefanistaff@sfgov.org](mailto:stefanistaff@sfgov.org)>, <[EngardioStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:EngardioStaff@sfgov.org)>, <[hknight@sfchronicle.com](mailto:hknight@sfchronicle.com)>, <[ashanks@sfexaminer.com](mailto:ashanks@sfexaminer.com)>, <[Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org](mailto:Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org)>, <[Dean.Preston@sfgov.org](mailto:Dean.Preston@sfgov.org)>, Joe K. <[growlernoise@gmail.com](mailto:growlernoise@gmail.com)>, <[Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org](mailto:Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org)>, <[Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org](mailto:Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org)>, <[richie@greenbergnation.com](mailto:richie@greenbergnation.com)>, <[hello@togethersf.org](mailto:hello@togethersf.org)>, <[contact@growsf.org](mailto:contact@growsf.org)>, <[Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org](mailto:Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org)>

Dear SF Board of Supervisors and Staff;

I'm going to be acute about [this Motion 221008 of yours](#).

For contrast, Washington State is celebrating [almost a year of guaranteed remote testimony from HB 1329](#). Actually works up here as per the above link.

*Meanwhile*, San Francisco is working to shut down remote testimony.

Supervisor Catherine "Maverick" Stefani is out ill and using remote access.

I just find it incredibly sickening and frankly cruel that the fear of the other in SF of all places has taken hold while the greatest voice for courage is ill.

What Supervisor Catherine Stefani once created in freedom's safest place and the ultimate pwnage of the NRA is now surrounded by fentanyl and fear.

What an impeachable act under the cloak of good intentions to silence all of the public.



I really hope you Supervisors think about what you are doing and why. I thought you wanted to serve the public.

Note the CC line. Check it again. Trust me when I say this: People are going to see your answer.

My doors are open to discuss this, but I have a 3 PM crisis meeting to attend about... YOU.

Like a Stefani, the rest I submit;

Joe A. Kunzler  
360-499-4997  
[growlernoise@gmail.com](mailto:growlernoise@gmail.com)

[Call-in telephone system]

1  
2  
25/96  
rt 3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

DECLARING IT TO BE A POLICY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO THAT THE CAPABILITY FOR A CALL-IN TELEPHONE SYSTEM FOR BOARD MEETINGS/BE DEVELOPED AND INSTRUCTING THE CLERK OF THE BOARD TO OVERSEE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A CALL-IN TELEPHONE SYSTEM.

WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors has made it a long-standing policy to encourage public participation in the meetings of the Board, through such measures as the passage of the Sunshine Ordinance and by sponsoring and implementing Proposition P, which allows the Board to meet in the neighborhoods of San Francisco; and,

WHEREAS, Although the Board encourages public participation in Board meetings, there are still many San Franciscans who are unable to attend the meetings in person; and,

WHEREAS, The Board meetings are broadcast live on radio by KPOO radio and will soon be broadcast with gavel-to-gavel coverage by the San Francisco Community Television Corporation; and,

WHEREAS, The technology is available to allow those members of the public who cannot attend meetings in person to call in to the meetings by telephone and participate; and,

SUPERVISOR KEVIN SHELLEY

///  
///  
///

1           WHEREAS, Other cities have developed call-in telephone access to  
2 government meetings and have implemented inexpensive and simple  
3 systems that are very popular and have increased public participation in  
4 meetings; and,

5  
6           WHEREAS, Interactive telephone access to the Board meetings will  
7 provide for greater public access to the workings of local government and  
8 increase public participation and awareness; now, therefore be it,

9  
10           RESOLVED, That the City and County of Supervisors declares it to be a  
11 policy that the capability for call-in telephone system for Board of Supervisors  
12 under the Public Commet item  
13 meetings/be developed and instructs the Clerk of the Board to oversee the  
14 implementation of a call-in telephone system.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

SUPERVISOR KEVIN SHELLEY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

///

///

///

25/96  
rt

Adopted - Board of Supervisors, San Francisco March 25, 1996

Ayes: Supervisors Ammiano Bierman Hsieh Kaufman Kennedy Leal  
Migden Shelley Teng Yaki



Absent: Supervisor Alioto

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution  
was adopted by the Board of Supervisors  
of the City and County of San Francisco

File No.  
54-96-2

**MAR 28 1996**

Date Approved

  
Clerk  


Mayor

**From:** [sanfranfan0-barb@yahoo.com](mailto:sanfranfan0-barb@yahoo.com)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Don't stifle democracy--keep remote public comment  
**Date:** Monday, February 6, 2023 2:13:32 PM

---

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

Dear Supes,

I was shocked to read in 48 Hills that Supervisor Mandelman does not see the value in remote public comment and is "not sure it leads to better decision-making" to hear from seniors, people with disabilities, people who have jobs and/or family responsibilities that might prevent them from attending in-person meetings that can go on for many hours.

Keep remote public comment!

Sincerely,

Barbara Bagot-López

**From:** [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Keep Remote Comments!  
**Date:** Monday, February 6, 2023 9:53:10 AM

---

**From:** Marc Norton <nortonsf@protonmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 05, 2023 3:23 AM  
**To:** Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) <prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; Haneystaff (BOS) <haneystaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** DPH-jessica <jessica@sdaction.org>; Tim Redmond <timredmondsf@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** Keep Remote Comments!

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

I am informed that the Board of Supervisors is considering eliminating remote commentary. That is a fundamental attack on democracy. Eliminating remote comments means making it very, very difficult for working people, for disabled people, for seniors, for people with families and many others to have their say. It sounds like you just do not want to hear from us.

I understand that allowing remote commentary means you have to listen to some crackpots. But eliminating remote commentary in order to solve that problem is truly a case of throwing the baby out with the bath water. Don't do it.

Nobody forced any of you to run for public office. If you don't like the obligations that go with your office, get another job.

-Marc Norton

**From:** [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Limiting Teleconferencing and Remote Public Comment - Please vote NO!  
**Date:** Monday, February 6, 2023 9:52:14 AM

---

**From:** Betty Traynor <btraynor@att.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 05, 2023 6:19 PM  
**To:** Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Limiting Teleconferencing and Remote Public Comment - Please vote NO!

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

Dear Supervisor Walton,

This measure will be before you at Monday's, February 6, Rules Committee meeting.

The option of calling in, rather than having to come down to City Hall, makes it possible for so many people to share their input and perspectives, including disabled people, parents, working people, seniors, people who live far from City Hall, and others who are usually less likely to be heard.

Please vote against this ill-conceived measure.

Thank you very much,

Betty Traynor  
Senior and Disability Action  
Older Women's League

**From:** [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Please vote NO on motion 221008 [Limiting Teleconferencing and Remote Public Comment at Meetings of the Board of Supervisors and its Committees]  
**Date:** Monday, February 6, 2023 9:51:50 AM

---

**Natalie Gee** 朱凱勤, Chief of Staff  
**Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, San Francisco | Room 282  
**Direct:** 415.554.7672 | **Office:** 415.554.7670  
**District 10 Community Events Calendar:** <https://bit.ly/d10communityevents>

---

**From:** Lea McGeever <lea.mcgeeever@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 05, 2023 6:46 PM  
**To:** Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Raia Small <raia@sdaction.org>  
**Subject:** Please vote NO on motion 221008 [Limiting Teleconferencing and Remote Public Comment at Meetings of the Board of Supervisors and its Committees]

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

Hello Supervisor Walton,

My name is Lea McGeever and I live in D6. I am writing in solidarity with Senior and Disability Action and asking you to **vote NO on motion 221008** during the Rules Committee tomorrow, Monday the 6th. Here are the following reasons you should do so:

- 
- 
- Video conferencing has allowed many
- **disabled people, seniors, poor and working-class people, parents, teachers, child care providers, Black, Indigenous, people of color to participate** in Board of Supervisors hearings, commission meetings, and other public events -- some for the first time
- 
-



- It is vital that the City and County of San
- Francisco commit to continuing a telephone and video option for all public meetings,
- **complete with ASL, captioning, and interpretation.**
- 
- 
- 
- Many working people can't take time off from
- day jobs, when most meetings are held, but can call in and speak for a couple of minutes when their turn comes.
- 
- 
- 
- **Many disabled and immunocompromised people**
- **and their family members and caregivers cannot risk coming in person and getting COVID, or transportation and other barriers prevent in-person attendance.**
- 
- 
- 
- Parents, educators, and caregivers for young
- children cannot take a break to come to a meeting but can call in while with children.
- 
- 
- 
- **Many low-income people and Black, indigenous people of**
- **color live far from City Hall, making it hard to come in person to have their voices heard.**
- 
- 
- 
- Remote participation should be allowed for
- all, rather than only as a “reasonable accommodation.” Requiring people to identify as disabled and ask for an accommodation ahead of time adds a barrier that makes it less likely for people to participate, and nondisabled people also have valid reasons to
- participate remotely.

- 
- 
- **Increased public engagement should be celebrated rather than prevented. There is little to be gained and much to be lost by eliminating remote public comment.**
- 
- 
- 
- The SF Department of Technology has found
- a way to offer remote public comment for all meetings that are on sfgovtv through webex. This will cost the city NO additional funding and allow full access, including a video option for Deaf people using ASL. But if the city goes with the reasonable accommodations
- option through the Clerk's office, it will require staffing and funding.
- 
- 
- 
- **More than 100 community organizations want San Francisco to keep a remote public comment option to ensure that people can share input on housing, transportation, health, racial equity, and other issues.**
- 
- 
- 
- Many cities around the Bay Area and around
- the country are offering remote public comment by phone and video. These include Oakland, San Jose, Walnut Creek, Detroit and Washington, DC.
- **Is San Francisco going to fall behind on civic participation?**
-

**From:** [Lisa Awbrey](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Preservation of remote access for all San Franciscans at public hearings  
**Date:** Monday, February 6, 2023 9:44:39 AM

---

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

Dear Supervisors:

I fully support the continuation of the public's remote access to public hearings going forward. It just so happens that today @11AM, I have a doctor's appointment that's been scheduled for 2 months that I cannot miss. Consequently, I am unable to physically attend today's meeting at the Rules Committee where this critical issue will be heard.

I am temporarily physically disabled with mobility issues; I cannot attend public hearings at City Hall in person. I have attended many past hearings (in person and remotely) on subjects that are near and dear to my heart, things like public transportation, unhoused people, affordable housing, redistricting, public education and policing in San Francisco. San Franciscans like me are the eyes and the ears of San Francisco. We care deeply about our neighborhoods and have mostly good ideas for solutions to our problems. And, as you well know, we are the people who elect our individual district supervisors. We are also the people who adopt storm drains and who are NERT volunteers and who volunteer at our libraries and minister to elders and unhoused people living in our neighborhoods. We have daily experience of these events and therefore have critical insight into these problems. Limiting our access to you at public hearings by requiring that we physically be in the building is a terrible idea and is undemocratic. Please do not create more obstacles and barriers between us, the people and you, our elected leaders. City Hall is the People's House and all San Franciscans must have full and complete access to the important decision making and policy making that happens there. Please support all San Franciscans remote access to meetings and hearings to do with policy making and governance at City Hall.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Very truly yours,

Lisa Awbrey

**From:** [Joe A. Kunzler](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** A few thoughts on Rules & remote testimony  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 8, 2023 3:51:52 PM

---

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

Joe Kunzler here.

**First**, I want to object to the draft Rules Committee minutes. I spoke in FAVOR of Supervisor Stefani getting back on the Golden Bridge Highway, Highway & Transportation District. I made clear she's qualified and has been a consistent voice on safe streets.

I also must rise in absolute opposition to the fact that Michael Petrelis gave remarks saying Supervisor Stefani's only qualification is that she can "talk". How damn rude! The same Supervisor who called the NRA terrorists and whose speeches are now adoringly on YouTube. The same Supervisor with a law degree and much life experience. Yet no one but me spoke up for HER against those kinda insults, and that is a bloody demerit on all *bystanders*.

I'm also sure Supervisors NOT named Stefani wish they had hard-working superfans who'd put their speeches on social media. But wait, it gets better...

**Second**, we have a crisis situation created by the cloak of "good intentions". I appreciate I got Supervisor Mandleman's attention on this.

But I want this nightmare scenario considered by all of you:

1. You vote to limit remote testimony to requiring disability accommodation.
2. Supervisor Stefani does StefaniStuff like introducing another gun violence prevention resolution of national significance.
3. Someone out of SF wants to testify remotely on the resolution and has a documented disability.
4. The Clerk's Office denies it due a requestor being outside SF.
5. Thanks to the applicant not being able to speak; now you have a civil rights lawsuit.

I know damn good and well the pro-gun forces are litigious. I also know damn good and well the open gov't community I'm a member of are litigious also.

You can thank Supervisor Catherine "Maverick" Stefani's years of gun responsibility resolutions - normally taken individually without national coordination - for this. Perhaps if more of a national, harmonious approach was taken by the Supervisor, then you wouldn't have so much national attention. Perhaps instead, Moms Demand could use a new CEO, I understand that billet will open end of this year and Supervisor Stefani would be *pitch-perfect* to fill that *warfighting* billet.

But if you want to have the conversation about declawing Supervisor Stefani; let me warn you her face can boil water for "Constant Comment" tea. Not perhaps the best message you want to send right now. I hear COVID-19 didn't stand much of a chance against *her* and she was marching in the Chinese New Year parade within days.

Perhaps this fantasy you can limit or toss remote testimony needs to die. May it die in District 2 at the heels of a modern-day hero and the airpower of her superfans. May 2023 be a continuation of the height of Supervisor Catherine "Maverick" Stefani's power.

**Third**, it's also worth noting not one working mother is on the SFBOS Rules Committee. Someone should fix *that*. I think Supervisor Stefani on Rules would result in very different conversations and possibly different results.

Thank you for hearing me out.

Very strategically;

Joe A. Kunzler  
[growlernoise@gmail.com](mailto:growlernoise@gmail.com)

**From:** [Mullane](#)  
**To:** [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment on Public Comment  
**Date:** Monday, February 6, 2023 6:37:49 PM  
**Attachments:** [public comment.pdf](#)

---

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the attached public comment in support of promoting accessibility and inclusion for all during public comment. Many thanks for your consideration.

Kindly,  
Mullane Ahern  
she / her / ella

 Mullane Ahern (she / her / ella)

 [call me!](#)

 [email me](#)



February 6, 2023

To the Esteemed Board of Supervisors,

My name is Mullane Ahern. I am resident of District 5, a colleague in government, and an advocate of disability justice.

Adapting the ways in which citizens may directly participate in government promotes democracy. Accessibility and inclusion are healthy and consistent with the spirit of open government. Digital accessibility is not only for people with disabilities. Working people; seniors; youth; caregivers; everyone with a stake in policy outcomes deserves to be given equal consideration before policymakers.

At times, I've queued up so far outside chambers in order to make public comment that I had to take the afternoon off before setting foot in the door. I am privileged to exercise my rights. During 2020's uprisings, I was a Disaster Service Worker, the infrastructure lead to set up a field hospital in the Presidio. Onsite at 7am, at night, I often demonstrated at protests, or called into BOS meetings. Sometimes I waited until 1am to give public comment. Thoughtful letters often yield no reply, and thus seem to miss the mark of urgency conveyed in oral comment. In other words: it's hard enough already, but worth it.

My heart breaks when people must leave City Hall after waiting for hours without having their chance to speak during comment. The luxury of time is not available to caregivers, to those representing overburdened organizations with little staff, to people who do not have the privilege of paid time off, or who cannot spend more than 15 minutes on a break. Certainly, those limiting health conditions or funds face access barriers. The system will never be perfect, but it can evolve.

I urge you to creatively increase access to participation in our government. It is in the interest of the people.

Sincerely Yours,

Mullane Ahern

i have only just a minute,  
only sixty seconds in it  
forced upon me, can't refuse it  
didn't seek it, didn't choose it  
but it's up to me to use it.  
i must suffer if i lose it,  
give account if i abuse it  
just a tiny little minute,  
but eternity is in it.

- dr. benjamin e. mays

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Tom Paulino, All City Departments via the Mayor's Office

FROM: Victor Young, Assistant Clerk *Victor Young*

DATE: September 27, 2022

SUBJECT: LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

The Board of Supervisors' Rules Committee received the following proposed legislation:

**File No. 221008**

**Motion discontinuing remote participation by members of the Board of Supervisors ("Board") at meetings of the Board and its committees for reasons related to COVID-19; and discontinuing remote public comment by members of the public at meetings of the Board and its committees, except as legally required to enable people with disabilities to participate in such meetings.**

If you have comments or reports to be included with the file, please forward them to me at the Board of Supervisors, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102 or by email at: [victor.young@sfgov.org](mailto:victor.young@sfgov.org).

cc: Tyra Fennell, Mayor's Office  
Andres Power, Mayor's Office



**From:** [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: The end of remote public comment  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 20, 2022 12:46:41 PM

---

---

**From:** Evelyn Posamentier <eposamentier@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 20, 2022 10:00 AM  
**To:** Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** The end of remote public comment

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,

Evvy Posamentier

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Bintliff, Jacob \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [PEARSON, ANNE \(CAT\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Introduction - motion limiting teleconferencing and remote public comment  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 3:11:36 PM

---

Yes, we will definitely hold on to it for next week.

### *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.*

From: Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, September 14, 2022 2:51 PM
To: Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>
Cc: PEARSON, ANNE (CAT) <Anne.Pearson@sfcityatty.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Introduction - motion limiting teleconferencing and remote public comment

Thanks, Alisa. Sorry, that was my first time missing the deadline and I didn't know if there was

still a possibility of including before LI was published. Would you please hold it to list with LI next week?

Thank you,

Jacob

Jacob Bintliff

Legislative Aide

Office of Supervisor Rafael Mandelman
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 284
San Francisco, California 94102

(415) 554-7753 | jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

From: Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>

Sent: Wednesday, September 14, 2022 2:42 PM

To: Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org>; BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>

Cc: PEARSON, ANNE (CAT) <Anne.Pearson@sfcityatty.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>

Subject: RE: Introduction - motion limiting teleconferencing and remote public comment

Hi Jacob,

As you know, the deadline for introductions going to committee was yesterday at 5:00 p.m. or the end of the meeting, whichever is later. So unfortunately we cannot accept this for introduction this week since those deadlines are non-negotiable. We can hold on to this and include it for introduction next week.

Alisa Somera

Legislative Deputy Director
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

415.554.7711 direct | 415.554.5163 fax
alisa.somera@sfgov.org

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

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

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

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

~~~~~

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

---

**From:** Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <[jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org](mailto:jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 2:19 PM  
**To:** BOS Legislation, (BOS) <[bos.legislation@sfgov.org](mailto:bos.legislation@sfgov.org)>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <[alisa.somera@sfgov.org](mailto:alisa.somera@sfgov.org)>  
**Cc:** PEARSON, ANNE (CAT) <[Anne.Pearson@sfcityatty.org](mailto:Anne.Pearson@sfcityatty.org)>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <[rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org](mailto:rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** Introduction - motion limiting teleconferencing and remote public comment

Hi Alisa et al,

My apologies for failing to send the form and motion that Supervisor Mandelman spoke about at roll call yesterday. Here is the introduction form and motion as drafted by Anne, copied here for confirmation.

Thank you,

Jacob

**Jacob Bintliff**

Legislative Aide

Office of Supervisor Rafael Mandelman  
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 284  
San Francisco, California 94102

(415) 554-7753 | [jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org](mailto:jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org)

*Pronouns: he, him, his*



**MATT DORSEY**


---

**MEMORANDUM**

---

DATE: February 23, 2023

TO: Angela Calvillo  
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Supervisor Matt Dorsey   
Chairperson, Rules Committee

RE: Rules Committee  
COMMITTEE REPORT

---

Pursuant to Board Rule 4.20, as Chair of The Rules Committee, I have deemed the following matters are of an urgent nature and request it be considered by the full Board on Tuesday, February 28, 2023, as a committee report.

**221008      Limiting Teleconferencing and Remote Public Comment at Meetings of the Board of Supervisors and its Committees**

Motion discontinuing remote participation by members of the Board of Supervisors (“Board”) at meetings of the Board and its committees for reasons related to COVID-19; and discontinuing remote public comment by members of the public at meetings of the Board and its committees, except as legally required to enable people with disabilities to participate in such meetings.

230125

**Administrative, Business and Tax Regulations Codes - Homelessness Oversight Commission and Related City Bodies**

Ordinance amending the Administrative Code and Business and Tax Regulations Code as

required by Proposition C, adopted at the November 8, 2022 election, to provide that the Homelessness Oversight Commission (“Commission”) appoint all members of the Local Homeless Coordinating Board (“Coordinating Board”); that the Coordinating Board’s sole duties are to serve as the governing body required to participate in the federal Continuum of Care program and to advise the Commission on issues relating to the Continuum of Care; that the Shelter Monitoring Committee (“Monitoring Committee”) advise the Commission in lieu of the Coordinating Board; that the Our City, Our Home Oversight Committee (“Oversight Committee”) advise and make recommendations to the Commission and the Health Commission; and that the Oversight Committee inform the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing’s strategic planning process; and make further amendments not required by Proposition C to increase the number of seats on the Coordinating Board from nine to eleven; decrease the number of seats on the Monitoring Committee from twelve to thirteen; align the Coordinating Board’s member qualifications with Continuum of Care requirements; prohibit members of the Coordinating Board, the Monitoring Committee, and the Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee (“Grievance Committee”) from serving on other City bodies related to homelessness; provide that the Commission appoint members of the Grievance Committee and the Monitoring Committee; require the Director of the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (“Department”) attend Commission meetings and provide administrative support to the Commission and the Monitoring Committee; remove the Mayor’s sole authority to appoint and remove the Director of the Department; require the Department to report to the Commission in lieu of the Coordinating Board for the Mayor’s Fund for the Homeless and the Navigation Partnerships Fund; and require that the Grievance Committee and the Monitoring Committee provide reports to the Commission.

These matters will be heard at the regularly scheduled Rules Committee Meeting on Monday, February 27, 2023, at 10:00am.



## Patrick Monette-Shaw

---

975 Sutter Street, Apt. 6  
San Francisco, CA 94109  
Phone: (415) 292-6969 • e-mail: [pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net](mailto:pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net)

February 27, 2023

San Francisco Board of Supervisors Rules Committee  
The Honorable Matt Dorsey, Chair, Rules Committee  
The Honorable Shamann Walton, Member, Rules Committee  
The Honorable Ahsha Safai, Member, Rules Committee  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: **Agenda Item #5, Board File #221008: Opposition to Discontinuation of Remote Participation in Dial-In Public Comment During Board Meetings**

Dear Chair Dorsey and Rules Committee Members,

Since whatever the Board of Supervisors does regarding setting policy for remote public comment at your meetings will set a precedent for all other Boards, Commissions, Task Forces, and official Committees throughout City government and the non-profit sector that are subject to the Brown Act and our local Sunshine Ordinance, you should continue taking remote public comment.

That's because Board Resolution #270-96 then-Mayor Willie L. Brown signed it into law 27 years ago on March 28, 1996 resolved that it is the *policy* of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco that a call-in telephone system be developed to take public comments to increase public participation in City government.

It was disturbing hearing during the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System (SFERS) Board of Trustees meeting on February 16 discuss whether to continue accepting remote public comments call-in beginning in March after California's COVID emergency orders expire at the end of February.

Supervisor Safai — who is the Board of Supervisors designee to a seat on SFERS' Board and is current President of SFERS's Board — stated during its meeting on February 16 that the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and SFERS Board, are collaboratively working to end taking remote public comments phoned in a “balancing” act to help the City's economic recovery efforts.

At approximately 4:42:12 and again at 5:30:30 on the audio and videotape of SFERS' meeting archived on SFGOV-TV, Safai stated that the *Downtown and Citywide Economic Recovery Working Group* wants to assist in revitalizing the downtown core and Civic Center Areas, which represents about 70% of the City's GDP and City revenue, by encouraging people to attend City policy body meetings in person. Ostensibly that will help out local retail and neighborhood restaurants from spill-over business.

This is a terrible reason to discontinue continue taking remote public comment. The Mayor has, herself, been recently featured in news segments on local TV broadcasts, and in her State-of-the-City speech, acknowledging that San Francisco's downtown economy is not going to come back to pre-COVID pandemic levels.

Supervisor Mandelman was seen on SFGOV-TV passing out proposed amendments to this legislation on February 6 during the first Rules Committee hearing on this legislation, but those amendments aren't posted as of today on the background file page. What happened to those proposed amendments he introduced? Were they withdrawn?

Also, although the Rules Committee discussed the need to amend the 72-hour period in which to submit reasonable accommodations requests to make remote public comment for people with disabilities who can not attend City Hall meetings in-person, there has been no standardized policy announced for all public bodies to uniformly set a more reasonable 12-hour (or shorter) period in which to submit accommodation requests. That must become a priority goal.

I urge you to recommend to the full Board of Supervisors that remote call-in for all San Franciscans — and not just those who are disabled — *be required*, and permanently set as official City policy for all entities subject to the Brown Act.

February 27, 2023

**Agenda Item #5, Board File #221008: Don't Forget Board Resolution 270-96**

**Opposition to Discontinuation of Remote Participation**

---

Page 2

Respectfully submitted,

**Patrick Monette-Shaw**

*Columnist/Reporter*

*Westside Observer* Newspaper

cc: The Honorable Aaron Peskin, Board President  
The Honorable Connie Chan, Supervisor, District 1  
The Honorable Catherine Stefani, Supervisor, District 2  
The Honorable Joel Engardio, Supervisor, District 4  
The Honorable Dean Preston, Supervisor, District 5  
The Honorable Myrna Melgar, Supervisor, District 7  
The Honorable Rafael Mandelman, Supervisor, District 8  
The Honorable Hillary Ronen, Supervisor, District 9  
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board  
Victor Young, Clerk of the Rules Committee

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Cc:** [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Keep remote public comment option available to all  
**Date:** Thursday, February 23, 2023 12:55:19 PM

---

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

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

---

**From:** anastasia Yovanopoulos <shashacooks@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 13, 2023 4:48 PM  
**To:** Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; joel.engario@sfgov.org  
**Cc:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Keep remote public comment option available to all

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

Dear Members of SF Board of Supervisors,

**Re: Keep remote public comment option available to all**

The legislation currently under consideration to restrict public comment to "in-person public comment" would stifle the voices of members of the public, and is therefore unfair and undemocratic. I am asking you not to limit public comment only to those physically present in the BOS chambers.

I'm a senior SF resident, in my mid-seventies. It is now a hardship for me to come to City Hall to deliver my public comment. I appreciate the ability to "call-in" to the BOS give public comment. There is little to be gained and much to be lost by eliminating remote public comment.

In the spirit of participatory democracy, please vote no on legislation limiting or ending remote participation options.

Let's preserve and expand participation from seniors, people with disabilities, working people, parents, and everyone. We know now that remote participation is possible. Every public meeting MUST continue to have an option for members of the public to view and make comments from any location.

Thank you,  
Sincerely,  
Anastasia Yovanopoulos  
District #8 senior tenant

**From:** [Miguel A. Galarza](#)  
**To:** [oronde.sterling@sterlingframers.com](mailto:oronde.sterling@sterlingframers.com); "[Anne Cervantes, AIA](#)"; [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** "[Nicholas Colina](#)"; "[Tricia Gregory](#)"; [afillon@fillonsolis.com](mailto:afillon@fillonsolis.com); "[Nicole Burgess](#)"; [tana@harrishoisting.com](mailto:tana@harrishoisting.com); "[LaSonia Mansfield](#)"; "[Lamar Heystek](#)"; "[Matthew Ajiake](#)"; [Darolyn Davis](#); "[Alex Chiu](#)"; [Jones, Dwayne](#); "[Mr. Frank S. Fung](#)"; [Heiken, Emma \(BOS\)](#); [Herrera, Ana \(BOS\)](#); [Souza, Sarah \(BOS\)](#); "[Bruce Giron](#)"  
**Subject:** RE: Opposition to Item 6 Elimination  
**Date:** Saturday, February 25, 2023 5:08:03 AM

---

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

Oronde,  
Let talk in the morning.

**Miguel Galarza, President**

Yerba Buena Engineering

**Phone:** 415-822-4400

**Mobile:** 415-7301900

**Web:** [www.yerba-buena.net](http://www.yerba-buena.net)

**Email:** [mgalarza@yerba-buena.net](mailto:mgalarza@yerba-buena.net)

1340 Egbert Ave, San Francisco, CA 94124



---

**From:** [oronde.sterling@sterlingframers.com](mailto:oronde.sterling@sterlingframers.com) <[oronde.sterling@sterlingframers.com](mailto:oronde.sterling@sterlingframers.com)>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 24, 2023 5:54 PM  
**To:** 'Anne Cervantes, AIA' <[cdastudios@aol.com](mailto:cdastudios@aol.com)>; [Victor.Young@sfgov.org](mailto:Victor.Young@sfgov.org)  
**Cc:** Miguel A. Galarza <[mgalarza@yerba-buena.net](mailto:mgalarza@yerba-buena.net)>; 'Nicholas Colina' <[ncolina@ancoiron.com](mailto:ncolina@ancoiron.com)>; 'Tricia Gregory' <[tricia@hvyw8inc.com](mailto:tricia@hvyw8inc.com)>; [afillon@fillonsolis.com](mailto:afillon@fillonsolis.com); 'Nicole Burgess' <[nicole@harrishoisting.com](mailto:nicole@harrishoisting.com)>; [tana@harrishoisting.com](mailto:tana@harrishoisting.com); 'LaSonia Mansfield' <[mansfieldmansfield380@yahoo.com](mailto:mansfieldmansfield380@yahoo.com)>; 'Lamar Heystek' <[president@asianinc.org](mailto:president@asianinc.org)>; 'Matthew Ajiake' <[president@sfaacc.org](mailto:president@sfaacc.org)>; 'Darolyn Davis' <[darolyn@davis-pr.com](mailto:darolyn@davis-pr.com)>; 'Alex Chiu' <[achiu@chiulaw.com](mailto:achiu@chiulaw.com)>; 'Dwayne Jones' <[djones@rdjent.biz](mailto:djones@rdjent.biz)>; 'Mr. Frank S. Fung' <[ffung@ed2intl.com](mailto:ffung@ed2intl.com)>; 'Heiken Emma (MYR)' <[emma.heiken@sfgov.org](mailto:emma.heiken@sfgov.org)>; 'Herrera, Ana (BOS)' <[ana.herrera@sfgov.org](mailto:ana.herrera@sfgov.org)>; 'Souza Sarah (BOS)' <[sarah.s.souza@sfgov.org](mailto:sarah.s.souza@sfgov.org)>; 'Bruce Giron' <[bagiron@gironcms.com](mailto:bagiron@gironcms.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Opposition to Item 6 Elimination

Hello everyone. Reaching out to you all for assistance. With me having very little knowledge about the issues we are having as small businesses, I would like to request from the group, information that can go over and study so I can play my part in advocating for us all. I don't mind speaking nor do I mind somebody writing up my script. However, with me not fully understanding the assignment, I won't be able to do my due diligence in playing my part advocating. If anyone can send links, documents, anything thing that I can go over, I would highly appreciate you. Blessings!!!

Best Regards,  
Oronde Sterling

---

**From:** Anne Cervantes, AIA <[cdastudios@aol.com](mailto:cdastudios@aol.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, February 13, 2023 8:53 AM

**To:** [Victor.Young@sfgov.org](mailto:Victor.Young@sfgov.org)

**Cc:** Miguel A. Galarza <[mgalarza@yerba-buena.net](mailto:mgalarza@yerba-buena.net)>; Nicholas Colina <[ncolina@ancoiron.com](mailto:ncolina@ancoiron.com)>;  
Tricia Gregory <[tricia@hvyw8inc.com](mailto:tricia@hvyw8inc.com)>; Oronde Stelring <[oronde.sterling@sterlingframers.com](mailto:oronde.sterling@sterlingframers.com)>;  
[afillon@fillonsolis.com](mailto:afillon@fillonsolis.com); Nicole Burgess <[nicole@harrishoisting.com](mailto:nicole@harrishoisting.com)>; [tana@harrishoisting.com](mailto:tana@harrishoisting.com);  
LaSonia Mansfield <[mansfieldmansfield380@yahoo.com](mailto:mansfieldmansfield380@yahoo.com)>; Lamar Heystek  
<[president@asianinc.org](mailto:president@asianinc.org)>; Matthew Ajiake <[president@sfaacc.org](mailto:president@sfaacc.org)>; Darolyn Davis <[darolyn@davis-pr.com](mailto:darolyn@davis-pr.com)>;  
Alex Chiu <[achiu@chiulaw.com](mailto:achiu@chiulaw.com)>; Dwayne Jones <[djones@rdjent.biz](mailto:djones@rdjent.biz)>; Mr. Frank S. Fung  
<[ffung@ed2intl.com](mailto:ffung@ed2intl.com)>; Heiken Emma (MYR) <[emma.heiken@sfgov.org](mailto:emma.heiken@sfgov.org)>; Herrera, Ana (BOS)  
<[ana.herrera@sfgov.org](mailto:ana.herrera@sfgov.org)>; Souza Sarah (BOS) <[sarah.s.souza@sfgov.org](mailto:sarah.s.souza@sfgov.org)>; Bruce Giron  
<[bagiron@gironcms.com](mailto:bagiron@gironcms.com)>

**Subject:** Opposition to Item 6 Elimination

See attached letter.

Anne Cervantes, AIA  
Founder and Co-Chair  
San Francisco Latino & Black Builder's Association

**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** This e-mail and any attachments to it may contain confidential communications between a architecture firm and its client. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of any of the information contained in or attached to this e-mail is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify us by reply e-mail or by telephone at (415)695-1751 and destroy this e-mail and any attachments without reading or saving them in any manner. Thank you

**From:** [regina sneed](#)  
**To:** [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Rules Committee Item 221008 Teleconferencing and remote public comment at meetings  
**Date:** Sunday, February 26, 2023 9:47:50 AM

---

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

Dear Supervisors:

I request that the Rules Committee report that the Committee is proposing to forward to the full Board of Supervisors call for maintaining remote access for public comment for all citizens for the reasons listed below in my previous email to the Committee. We are well beyond the time when only persons with disabilities received accommodations.

The policy should be consistent for all the City Commissions as well as for the Board. Some Commissions are just now discussing these issues at their February meetings. From these discussions, I learned that there have been internal discussions with staff, with IT support that will impact what might be provided. For example, a Commissioner on the Commission of Environment indicated that the City IT department will support only one platform for access. That person wanted an easier to use system. So when will the public get to see what options for public access are being proposed and be given the opportunity to help shape the best options.

The City needs to continue remote access for public participation for all.

Regina Sneed  
District two residentv

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** regina sneed <reginasneed@yahoo.com>  
**Date:** February 4, 2023 at 1:44:58 PM PST  
**To:** Victor.Young@sfgov.org, Matt.Dorsey@sfgov.org,  
Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org, Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org  
**Cc:** catherine.stefani@sfgov.org  
**Subject: Rules Committee Item 221008 Teleconferencing and remote public comment at meetings**

Dear Rules Committee Members:

I oppose any change in the teleconferencing and remote public comment rules for

the Board of Supervisors and its Committees. This ordinance should be tabled until the general public has lots of notice about this change and it is discussed in every Board Committee and Commission meeting.

I only learned about it on Friday from an email from Gray Panthers and today from an email by Senior and Disability Action. If they are just alerting me about it, I'm sure others who attend Board or Committee meetings have not been given adequate notice.

I am a senior citizen whose health no longer allows me to attend meetings at City hall. During covid I have become more active in monitoring and commenting on legislation I believe that increased participation is true for all resident regardless of age.

Yes this access costs more but it saves in other ways.

1. It helps with the cities environmental goals to decrease emissions affecting global warming.
2. It allows parents, the elderly and people who work to efficiently participate without leaving their office or home. No taking leave, no baby sitter expenses etc.
3. The 72 hour request for accommodations under the old system never really worked. In the last 8 months that I have been working on the military equipment issue, there were changes made in draft ordinances that occurred within the 72 hour period. Since the Rules Committee meets at 10 AM Monday, these changes were sometimes not posted with the original notice for the meeting. This kind of accommodation does not comport with the better universal access for everyone standards we should expect with modern communications tools.
4. All city commissions should offer the same public remote access.
5. No one likes long meetings, but as public officials it is your job. It's in the public interest to increase participation in government.

Please keep the current system allowing for remote public comment.

Thank you.

Regina Sneed  
District Two resident

Sent from my iPad



**From:** [ALLYSON WASHBURN](#)  
**To:** [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Item 5 on Agenda for 2/27/23 Meeting of the BoS Rules Committee  
**Date:** Friday, February 24, 2023 6:19:45 PM

---

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

Board of Supervisors Rules Committee  
Matt Dorsey, Chair  
Shamann Walton  
Ahsha Safai

Re: Proposal to discontinue remote public comment at meetings of the Board and its committees: **STRONGLY OPPOSE**

San Franciscans for Sunshine, a non-profit organization of citizens advocating for maximizing government transparency and public participation in government, strongly urges the rejection of the above-cited proposal.

Many people who live and/or work in San Francisco have family or job obligations or personal challenges that prevent their in-person attendance at meetings of the city's public bodies. Moreover, medical and epidemiological experts have warned that the COVID-19 pandemic, which has prompted the city to enable remote public comment, is not necessarily over. Democratic principle dictates that this channel remain permanently available.

Sincerely,

Allyson M. Washburn, PhD  
Chair, San Franciscans for Sunshine Steering Committee

## Patrick Monette-Shaw

---

975 Sutter Street, Apt. 6  
San Francisco, CA 94109  
Phone: (415) 292-6969 • e-mail: [pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net](mailto:pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net)

February 27, 2023

San Francisco Board of Supervisors Rules Committee  
The Honorable Matt Dorsey, Chair, Rules Committee  
The Honorable Shamann Walton, Member, Rules Committee  
The Honorable Ahsha Safai, Member, Rules Committee  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: **Agenda Item #5, Board File #221008: Opposition to Discontinuation of Remote Participation in Dial-In Public Comment During Board Meetings**

Dear Chair Dorsey and Rules Committee Members,

Since whatever the Board of Supervisors does regarding setting policy for remote public comment at your meetings will set a precedent for all other Boards, Commissions, Task Forces, and official Committees throughout City government and the non-profit sector that are subject to the Brown Act and our local Sunshine Ordinance, you should continue taking remote public comment.

That's because Board Resolution #270-96 then-Mayor Willie L. Brown signed it into law 27 years ago on March 28, 1996 resolved that it is the *policy* of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco that a call-in telephone system be developed to take public comments to increase public participation in City government.

It was disturbing hearing during the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System (SFERS) Board of Trustees meeting on February 16 discuss whether to continue accepting remote public comments call-in beginning in March after California's COVID emergency orders expire at the end of February.

Supervisor Safai — who is the Board of Supervisors designee to a seat on SFERS' Board and is current President of SFERS's Board — stated during its meeting on February 16 that the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and SFERS Board, are collaboratively working to end taking remote public comments phoned in a “balancing” act to help the City's economic recovery efforts.

At approximately 4:42:12 and again at 5:30:30 on the audio and videotape of SFERS' meeting archived on SFGOV-TV, Safai stated that the *Downtown and Citywide Economic Recovery Working Group* wants to assist in revitalizing the downtown core and Civic Center Areas, which represents about 70% of the City's GDP and City revenue, by encouraging people to attend City policy body meetings in person. Ostensibly that will help out local retail and neighborhood restaurants from spill-over business.

This is a terrible reason to discontinue continue taking remote public comment. The Mayor has, herself, been recently featured in news segments on local TV broadcasts, and in her State-of-the-City speech, acknowledging that San Francisco's downtown economy is not going to come back to pre-COVID pandemic levels.

Supervisor Mandelman was seen on SFGOV-TV passing out proposed amendments to this legislation on February 6 during the first Rules Committee hearing on this legislation, but those amendments aren't posted as of today on the background file page. What happened to those proposed amendments he introduced? Were they withdrawn?

Also, although the Rules Committee discussed the need to amend the 72-hour period in which to submit reasonable accommodations requests to make remote public comment for people with disabilities who can not attend City Hall meetings in-person, there has been no standardized policy announced for all public bodies to uniformly set a more reasonable 12-hour (or shorter) period in which to submit accommodation requests. That must become a priority goal.

I urge you to recommend to the full Board of Supervisors that remote call-in for all San Franciscans — and not just those who are disabled — *be required*, and permanently set as official City policy for all entities subject to the Brown Act.

February 27, 2023

**Agenda Item #5, Board File #221008: Don't Forget Board Resolution 270-96**

**Opposition to Discontinuation of Remote Participation**

---

Page 2

Respectfully submitted,

**Patrick Monette-Shaw**

*Columnist/Reporter*

*Westside Observer* Newspaper

cc: The Honorable Aaron Peskin, Board President  
The Honorable Connie Chan, Supervisor, District 1  
The Honorable Catherine Stefani, Supervisor, District 2  
The Honorable Joel Engardio, Supervisor, District 4  
The Honorable Dean Preston, Supervisor, District 5  
The Honorable Myrna Melgar, Supervisor, District 7  
The Honorable Rafael Mandelman, Supervisor, District 8  
The Honorable Hillary Ronen, Supervisor, District 9  
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board  
Victor Young, Clerk of the Rules Committee

**From:** [T.Flandrich](#)  
**To:** [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Item 5. 221008 Teleconferencing & Remote Public Comment: In opposition, DO NOT LIMIT  
**Date:** Sunday, February 26, 2023 10:59:29 PM

---

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

2/26/2023

Dear Supervisors,

I have copied the letter that Lorraine Petty has sent you, with her permission, as she has said everything in the most eloquent, and soulful manner. I want you to read this again, and again, as you carefully weigh your decision Monday morning and I ask you to vote to continue remote access **for all** San Franciscans.

Most sincerely,  
Theresa Flandrich

"I am opposed to **any** limitation of remote public access to meetings of the Board and its committees, or to any meetings of other San Francisco governmental commissions, committees, etc., including regional bodies the Supervisors may serve on.

The Pandemic brought us suffering, but it also brought us innovation that improved the democratic process. Advancement of technology enabled a better way: remote public access for all to all government public meetings.

To eliminate or limit it now, is to deny progress, and the progression of human rights.

It is to deny the Common Good.

It is to deny the Board's stated Mission to respond to the needs of the people of the City and County of San Francisco.

That Mission requires seeking, encouraging, and listening to as many voices as possible speak their concerns in hearings. It requires Supervisors to not disrespect constituents by dismissing public commentary as irrelevant to decision-making.

The Board's Mission calls for acceptance without complaint that on rare occasions a meeting might run long. It means the capacity to comprehend that a large turnout of public commenters represents an issue of major significance to constituents which must be allowed a full and complete airing in public.

When I myself speak at meetings, it's because I seek assurance of being heard, on the record, in public. I, and many others, write to Supervisors, only to be met with silence: no reply. We are never sure of having been heard. Other San Franciscans are not comfortable or privileged enough or feel adept enough in the majority language, or have enough time amid job and family responsibilities to be able to write to officials. Public comment is their sole path for expressing concerns, and remote access facilitates and ensures this right for the many.

Now--

there is a proposal which purports to make elimination of equal remote public access OK. It is proposed that access be allowed only to certain people-- those who publicly declare disabilities. First of all, to remove the equal access

now enjoyed by all would be unconstitutional. It exists now in a well-developed and widely-utilized form. It would be unlawful, not to mention extremely unwise, to take it away.

Also, to allow access only to a limited group is de-facto segregation –in this case by physical condition, including age. And in addition, for many who might "qualify," it would establish a giant hurdle in an already intimidating process of trying to participate in the systems that govern us.

Remote public access must continue to be equally available to all, without labeling, extra requirements, disability Oaths, or government certification.

Remote public access for all is a fully-operating, established process for many who have come to rely upon it, and for everyone else. There's no going back now. You cannot un-exist it. You cannot de-invent it.

Please reject any attempt to limit remote public access."

Thank you,

Lorraine Petty

Seniors Advocate

District 2

**From:** [Shaila Nathu](#)  
**To:** [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Ginny LaRoe](#); [Northern California Society of Professional Journalists Freedom of Information Committee](#); [staff@mediaworkers.org](mailto:staff@mediaworkers.org)  
**Subject:** Opposition to motion discontinuing remote public comment (File #221008)  
**Date:** Monday, February 27, 2023 8:17:57 AM

---

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

To Members of the Rules Committee of the City and County of San Francisco:

The Freedom of Information Committee of the [Society of Professional Journalists, Northern California Professional Chapter](#), [First Amendment Coalition](#), [Pacific Media Workers Guild \(The NewsGuild-Communications Workers of America Local 39521\)](#), and [Californians Aware](#), nonpartisan organizations that champion government transparency and the rights of the press and public to observe and engage in civic affairs, strongly oppose the rescission of the Board of Supervisors' March 17, 2020 motion allowing remote public comment.

Since the start of the pandemic, the public has been able to engage in San Francisco's government more fully, thanks to the option of remote access to public meetings. Adding dial-in public comment to in person and written options has brought more voices, more "public" to public meetings.

Supervisor Mandelman says this proposal would take San Francisco "back to a better future." The public overwhelmingly disagreed.

Voluminous, vigorous public comment against limiting remote public participation poured in at the Feb. 6 meeting. Individuals shared the reasons why the option is valuable to them, in person and by phone and email. A broad coalition of over 100 organizations submitted a [letter](#) against the proposal. A coalition of journalist and open government groups—the Freedom of Information Committee of the Society of Professional Journalists, Northern California chapter and Californians Aware, both of which I serve, along with the First Amendment Coalition and Pacific Media Workers Guild—also [weighed in](#).

One might speculate that the part-and-parcel framing of the proposal is intended to establish that if public officials must return in person (as required when pandemic-related emergency orders end on Feb. 28), the public should be required to do the same. What's good for the goose is good for the gander, as the saying goes. But that is not how local government, to which the public delegates authority, should think, or

work.

A robust opportunity for public comment at public meetings for our great city and county is vital. As the pandemic era showed, remote public comment broadens and encourages democracy, fostering a more informed and engaged public, and enhances journalists' ability to gauge public attitudes toward the issues that our policymakers are tackling, from how to increase affordable housing to whether to allow our police to deploy killer robots.

Journalists covering government meetings benefit from hearing from a range of engaged residents and workers, and can share that more varied public comment with their readers. Unfortunately, members of the public who care deeply about the issues affecting San Francisco are often unable to attend public meetings in person for a variety of reasons, including personal health and family or work obligations.

Paring down remote public comment will have broad repercussions at the local level. Board of Supervisors President Aaron Peskin noted a desire, which he appears to share with Breed, to create a uniform policy regarding remote public comment that applies not only to the Board and its Committees, but also to all 130+ other boards, commissions, and advisory bodies subject to the [Ralph M. Brown Act](#), our state's main open-meeting law, and San Francisco's [Sunshine Ordinance](#).

And the impact of the decisions made at our local public meetings extend beyond city and county lines. Many of the policies heard, discussed, and approved at these meetings—such as instituting reparations and curbing gun violence—inform state and national policymaking. It would behoove the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors to consider the profound impact of a decision to shrink remote public comment at the local level.

As Peskin pointed out, the technology enabling seamless remote public comment is now commonplace, and it works. Ending remote public comment will only weaken local democracy. The Rules Committee should reject any proposal, including the one before it now, that chills remote public comment at public meetings. Thank you for your consideration of this important issue.

**From:** [Shaila Nathu](#)  
**To:** [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Opposition to motion discontinuing remote public comment (File #221008)  
**Date:** Monday, February 27, 2023 8:21:01 AM

---

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

Hi Clerk Young,

Please post this written testimony into the background file in the Public Correspondence testimony folder on-line for Board File #221008.

Thanks!

Shaila Nathu

Shaila Nathu  
805.807.2009 (c)

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

**From:** **Shaila Nathu** <[shailanathu@gmail.com](mailto:shailanathu@gmail.com)>  
**Date:** Mon, Feb 27, 2023 at 8:17 AM  
**Subject:** Opposition to motion discontinuing remote public comment (File #221008)  
**To:** <[Matt.Dorsey@sfgov.org](mailto:Matt.Dorsey@sfgov.org)>, <[Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org](mailto:Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org)>, <[Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org](mailto:Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org)>  
**Cc:** <[mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org)>, <[Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org](mailto:Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org)>, <[victor.young@sfgov.org](mailto:victor.young@sfgov.org)>, Ginny LaRoe <[glaroe@firstamendmentcoalition.org](mailto:glaroe@firstamendmentcoalition.org)>, Northern California Society of Professional Journalists Freedom of Information Committee <[spjnorcalfoi@gmail.com](mailto:spjnorcalfoi@gmail.com)>, <[staff@mediaworkers.org](mailto:staff@mediaworkers.org)>

To Members of the Rules Committee of the City and County of San Francisco:

The Freedom of Information Committee of the [Society of Professional Journalists, Northern California Professional Chapter](#), [First Amendment Coalition](#), [Pacific Media Workers Guild \(The NewsGuild-Communications Workers of America Local 39521\)](#), and [Californians Aware](#), nonpartisan organizations that champion government transparency and the rights of the press and public to observe and engage in civic affairs, strongly oppose the rescission of the Board of Supervisors' March 17, 2020 motion allowing remote public comment.

Since the start of the pandemic, the public has been able to engage in San Francisco's government more fully, thanks to the option of remote access to public meetings. Adding dial-in public comment to in person and written options has brought more voices, more "public" to public meetings.



Supervisor Mandelman says this proposal would take San Francisco “back to a better future.” The public overwhelmingly disagreed.

Voluminous, vigorous public comment against limiting remote public participation poured in at the Feb. 6 meeting. Individuals shared the reasons why the option is valuable to them, in person and by phone and email. A broad coalition of over 100 organizations submitted a [letter](#) against the proposal. A coalition of journalist and open government groups—the Freedom of Information Committee of the Society of Professional Journalists, Northern California chapter and Californians Aware, both of which I serve, along with the First Amendment Coalition and Pacific Media Workers Guild—also [weighed in](#).

One might speculate that the part-and-parcel framing of the proposal is intended to establish that if public officials must return in person (as required when pandemic-related emergency orders end on Feb. 28), the public should be required to do the same. What’s good for the goose is good for the gander, as the saying goes. But that is not how local government, to which the public delegates authority, should think, or work.

A robust opportunity for public comment at public meetings for our great city and county is vital. As the pandemic era showed, remote public comment broadens and encourages democracy, fostering a more informed and engaged public, and enhances journalists’ ability to gauge public attitudes toward the issues that our policymakers are tackling, from how to increase affordable housing to whether to allow our police to deploy killer robots.

Journalists covering government meetings benefit from hearing from a range of engaged residents and workers, and can share that more varied public comment with their readers. Unfortunately, members of the public who care deeply about the issues affecting San Francisco are often unable to attend public meetings in person for a variety of reasons, including personal health and family or work obligations.

Paring down remote public comment will have broad repercussions at the local level. Board of Supervisors President Aaron Peskin noted a desire, which he appears to share with Breed, to create a uniform policy regarding remote public comment that applies not only to the Board and its Committees, but also to all 130+ other boards, commissions, and advisory bodies subject to the [Ralph M. Brown Act](#), our state’s main open-meeting law, and San Francisco’s [Sunshine Ordinance](#).

And the impact of the decisions made at our local public meetings extend beyond city

and county lines. Many of the policies heard, discussed, and approved at these meetings—such as instituting reparations and curbing gun violence—inform state and national policymaking. It would behoove the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors to consider the profound impact of a decision to shrink remote public comment at the local level.

As Peskin pointed out, the technology enabling seamless remote public comment is now commonplace, and it works. Ending remote public comment will only weaken local democracy. The Rules Committee should reject any proposal, including the one before it now, that chills remote public comment at public meetings. Thank you for your consideration of this important issue.

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Oppose Limits to Remote Public Access -- UPDATED File No. 221008  
**Date:** Monday, February 27, 2023 9:12:45 AM

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see comments below regarding File No. 221008 - Motion discontinuing remote participation by members of the Board of Supervisors (“Board”) at meetings of the Board and its committees for reasons related to COVID-19; and discontinuing remote public comment by members of the public at meetings of the Board and its committees, except as legally required to enable people with disabilities to participate in such meetings.

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:** lgpetty <lgpetty@juno.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 26, 2023 9:21 PM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Oppose Limits to Remote Public Access -- UPDATED

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am opposed to **any** limitation of remote public access to meetings of the Board and its committees, or to any meetings of other San Francisco governmental commissions, committees, etc.

The Pandemic brought us suffering, but it also brought us innovation that improved the democratic process. Advancement of technology enabled a better way: remote public access for all to all government public meetings.

To eliminate or limit it now, is to deny progress, and the progression of human rights.

It is to deny the Common Good.

It is to deny the Board's stated Mission to respond to the needs of the people of the City and County of San Francisco.

That Mission requires seeking, encouraging, and listening to as many voices as possible speak their concerns in hearings. It requires Supervisors to not disrespect constituents by dismissing public commentary as irrelevant to decision-making.

The Board's Mission calls for acceptance without complaint that on rare occasions a meeting might run long. It means the capacity to comprehend that a large turnout of speakers represents an issue of major significance to constituents which must be allowed a full and complete airing in public.

When I myself speak at meetings, it's because I seek assurance of being heard, on the record, in public. I, and many others, write to Supervisors, only to be met with silence: no reply. We are never sure of having been heard. Other San Franciscans are not comfortable or privileged enough or feel adept enough in the majority language, or have enough time amid job and family responsibilities to be able to write to officials. Public comment is their sole path for expressing concerns, and remote access facilitates and ensures this right.

Now--

there is a proposal which purports to make elimination of equal remote public access OK. It is proposed that access be allowed only to certain people-- those who publicly declare disabilities. First of all, to remove the equal access now enjoyed by all would be unconstitutional. It exists now in a well-developed and widely-utilized form. It would be unlawful, not to mention extremely unwise, to undo it.

Also, to allow access only to a limited group is de-facto segregation --in this case by physical condition, including age. And in addition, for many who might "qualify," it would establish a giant hurdle in an already intimidating process of trying to participate in the systems that govern us.

Remote public access must continue to be equally available to all, without labeling, extra requirements, disability Oaths, or government certification.

Remote public access for all is a fully-operating, established process for many who have come to rely upon it, and everyone else. There's no going back now. You cannot un-exist it. You

cannot de-invent it.

Please reject any attempt to limit remote public access.

Thank you,

Lorraine Petty

Seniors Advocate

District 2

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: File #221008: OPPOSE  
**Date:** Monday, February 27, 2023 9:09:02 AM  
**Importance:** High

---

**From:** Richard Knee <rak0408@sonic.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 25, 2023 6:49 PM  
**To:** Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** File #221008: OPPOSE  
**Importance:** High

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

To the Board of Supervisors:  
Aaron Peskin (District 3), President  
Connie Chan (District 1)  
Catherine Stefani (District 2)  
Joel Engardio (District 4)  
Dean Preston (District 5)  
Matt Dorsey (District 6)  
Myrna Melgar (District 7)  
Rafael Mandelman (District 8)  
Hillary Ronen (District 9)  
Shamann Walton (District 10)  
Ahsha Safai (District 11)


Re: File #221008 (Board February 28, 2023, agenda item #30), *motion discontinuing remote participation by members of the Board of Supervisors ("Board") at meetings of the Board and its committees for reasons related to COVID-19; and discontinuing remote public comment by members of the public at meetings of the Board and its committees, except as legally required to enable people with disabilities to participate in such meetings*: STRONGLY OPPOSE.

Many San Francisco residents and workers have family and/or job responsibilities or physical challenges that prevent their attending public-body meetings in person. Furthermore, health authorities have warned that the COVID-19 pandemic is not necessarily over. No wonder, then, that the proposal to discontinue remote public comment

at meetings of the Board and its committees is strongly opposed by organizations such as the Society of Professional Journalists, Northern California Chapter's [Freedom of Information Committee](#); the [First Amendment Coalition](#); [Californians Aware](#); and the [Pacific Media Workers Guild](#) (The NewsGuild-Communications Workers of America Local 39521). They argue correctly that democratic principle demands maximizing government transparency and citizens' participation in government, and the enabling instruments therefor should remain.

Richard A. Knee  
San Francisco 94109

---

 Virus-free [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)

**From:** [sfneighborhoods.net](mailto:sfneighborhoods.net)  
**To:** [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Suggestion for Public Comment Period  
**Date:** Monday, February 27, 2023 9:22:41 AM

---

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

Hello all,

Suggestion:

Before a meeting, allow the public to call in and record public comment for a certain time limit.

Take a sample of that public comment and play it during the meeting.

Take public comment from people at the meeting, as required by the SF Sunshine Ordinance and The Brown Act.

Add all the record public comment as an appendage to the meeting recording either at the end or as a referred to separate recorded file.

sullivan



**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Opposition to motion discontinuing remote public comment (File #221008)  
**Date:** Monday, February 27, 2023 2:24:41 PM

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the below email regarding Item 5 on today's Rules Agenda.

Item No. 5 - File No. 221008 - Limiting Teleconferencing and Remote Public Comment at Meetings of the Board of Supervisors and its Committees

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:** Shaila Nathu <shailanathu@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 27, 2023 8:17 AM  
**To:** Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Young, Victor (BOS) <victor.young@sfgov.org>; Ginny LaRoe <glaroe@firstamendmentcoalition.org>; Northern California Society of Professional Journalists Freedom of Information Committee <spjnorcalfoi@gmail.com>; staff@mediaworkers.org  
**Subject:** Opposition to motion discontinuing remote public comment (File #221008)

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

To Members of the Rules Committee of the City and County of San Francisco:

The Freedom of Information Committee of the [Society of Professional Journalists](#), [Northern California Professional Chapter](#), [First Amendment Coalition](#), [Pacific Media](#)

[Workers Guild \(The NewsGuild-Communications Workers of America Local 39521\)](#), and [Californians Aware](#), nonpartisan organizations that champion government transparency and the rights of the press and public to observe and engage in civic affairs, strongly oppose the rescission of the Board of Supervisors' March 17, 2020 motion allowing remote public comment.

Since the start of the pandemic, the public has been able to engage in San Francisco's government more fully, thanks to the option of remote access to public meetings. Adding dial-in public comment to in person and written options has brought more voices, more "public" to public meetings.

Supervisor Mandelman says this proposal would take San Francisco "back to a better future." The public overwhelmingly disagreed.

Voluminous, vigorous public comment against limiting remote public participation poured in at the Feb. 6 meeting. Individuals shared the reasons why the option is valuable to them, in person and by phone and email. A broad coalition of over 100 organizations submitted a [letter](#) against the proposal. A coalition of journalist and open government groups—the Freedom of Information Committee of the Society of Professional Journalists, Northern California chapter and Californians Aware, both of which I serve, along with the First Amendment Coalition and Pacific Media Workers Guild—also [weighed in](#).

One might speculate that the part-and-parcel framing of the proposal is intended to establish that if public officials must return in person (as required when pandemic-related emergency orders end on Feb. 28), the public should be required to do the same. What's good for the goose is good for the gander, as the saying goes. But that is not how local government, to which the public delegates authority, should think, or work.

A robust opportunity for public comment at public meetings for our great city and county is vital. As the pandemic era showed, remote public comment broadens and encourages democracy, fostering a more informed and engaged public, and enhances journalists' ability to gauge public attitudes toward the issues that our policymakers are tackling, from how to increase affordable housing to whether to allow our police to deploy killer robots.

Journalists covering government meetings benefit from hearing from a range of engaged residents and workers, and can share that more varied public comment with their readers. Unfortunately, members of the public who care deeply about the issues affecting San Francisco are often unable to attend public meetings in person for a

variety of reasons, including personal health and family or work obligations.

Paring down remote public comment will have broad repercussions at the local level. Board of Supervisors President Aaron Peskin noted a desire, which he appears to share with Breed, to create a uniform policy regarding remote public comment that applies not only to the Board and its Committees, but also to all 130+ other boards, commissions, and advisory bodies subject to the [Ralph M. Brown Act](#), our state's main open-meeting law, and San Francisco's [Sunshine Ordinance](#).

And the impact of the decisions made at our local public meetings extend beyond city and county lines. Many of the policies heard, discussed, and approved at these meetings—such as instituting reparations and curbing gun violence—inform state and national policymaking. It would behoove the Rules Committee and the Board of Supervisors to consider the profound impact of a decision to shrink remote public comment at the local level.

As Peskin pointed out, the technology enabling seamless remote public comment is now commonplace, and it works. Ending remote public comment will only weaken local democracy. The Rules Committee should reject any proposal, including the one before it now, that chills remote public comment at public meetings. Thank you for your consideration of this important issue.

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Coalition letter opposed to ANY limits on remote public comment  
**Date:** Monday, February 27, 2023 10:22:30 AM

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the below email regarding Item 5 on today's Rules Agenda.

Item No. 5 - File No. 221008 - Limiting Teleconferencing and Remote Public Comment at Meetings of the Board of Supervisors and its Committees

Thank you,

Eileen McHugh  
Executive Assistant  
Office of the Clerk of the Board  
Board of Supervisors  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689  
Phone: (415) 554-7703 | Fax: (415) 554-5163  
[eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org](mailto:eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

---

**From:** Jessica Lehman <jessica@sdaction.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 27, 2023 7:31 AM  
**To:** Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Elsbernd, Sean (MYR) <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Bohn, Nicole (ADM) <nicole.bohn@sfgov.org>; Dearman, Kelly (HSA) <kelly.dearman@sfgov.org>; Duning, Anna (MYR) <anna.duning@sfgov.org>; Gerull, Linda (TIS) <linda.gerull@sfgov.org>; Hayward, Sophie (ADM) <sophie.hayward@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Coalition letter opposed to ANY limits on remote public comment

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

Dear Supervisors,

There are now more than 100 organizations across San Francisco who oppose ANY limits to remote public comment. [Please see today's letter here.](#)

Best,  
Jessica

-----  
Jessica Lehman (she/her), Executive Director  
Senior & Disability Action \* [www.sdaction.org](http://www.sdaction.org)  
P.O. Box 423388, San Francisco CA 94142

On Fri, Nov 18, 2022, at 2:04 PM, Jessica Lehman wrote:

Dear Supervisors,

[Please see a letter](#) from SF Community Alliance of Disability Advocates (CADA) and more than 15 other organizations representing parents, families, unhoused people, working people, and other marginalized communities. We strongly oppose limiting public comment by phone and video. Thank you for your consideration.

Best,  
Jessica Lehman

November 18, 2022

Dear President Walton and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

We are a coalition of disabled people, seniors, poor and working-class people, parents, teachers, child care providers, Black, Indigenous, people of color, and other people who want to ensure that our communities have a voice in local decision-making. We write to urge you to OPPOSE the ordinance introduced by Supervisor Mandelman to end remote public comment.

Historically, our communities have been missing from the table for government decision-making, due to issues with access, child care, work, racism, and more. During the COVID pandemic, with requirements to shelter in place, the world learned to communicate effectively via the internet and phone. Lack of internet access and digital technologies continues to exclude many people, but video conferencing has allowed many to participate in Board of Supervisors hearings, commission meetings, and other public events -- some for the first time. All city agencies learned how to hold virtual meetings and allow people to listen and share input remotely. As a result, countless seniors, people with disabilities, parents, and others have been able to share their experiences, insights, and knowledge on issues that affect our lives: affordable housing and land use, health care, technology, and much more.

It is vital that the City and County of San Francisco commit to continuing a telephone and video option for all public meetings, complete with ASL, captioning, and interpretation. Many working people can't take time off from day jobs, when most meetings are held, but can call in and speak for a couple of minutes when their turn comes. Many disabled and immuno-compromised people and their family members and caregivers cannot risk coming in person and getting COVID, or transportation and other barriers prevent in-person attendance. Parents, educators, and caregivers for young children cannot take a break to come to a meeting but can call in while with children. Continuing to offer a remote participation option for public meetings will only serve to elevate the diverse voices of our community and create stronger and better decision-making. Dedicated city staff have proven that remote meetings are possible, and we are grateful.

Remote participation should be allowed for all, rather than only as a "reasonable accommodation." Requiring people to identify as disabled adds a barrier that makes it less likely for people to participate, and nondisabled people also have valid reasons to participate remotely. While some meetings have gone extremely long due to callers, there is scant evidence that more than a couple meetings have had callers from outside the Bay Area. Increased public engagement should be celebrated rather than prevented. There is little to be gained and much to be lost by eliminating remote public comment. San Francisco has always valued rich community discussion. Let's preserve and expand participation from seniors, people with disabilities, working people, parents, and everyone. We know now that remote participation is possible. Every public meeting MUST continue to have an option for members of the public to view and make comments from any location. Please vote no on legislation limiting or ending remote participation options.

Thank you.

Sincerely,  
CADA, Community Alliance of Disability Advocates  
Independent Living Resource Center - San Francisco  
Senior and Disability Action

*Supporting organizations:*

AIDS Legal Referral Panel  
Causa Justa :: Just Cause  
Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice  
Community Living Campaign  
Hospitality House  
Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco  
Larkin Street Youth Services  
NEXT Village SF  
San Francisco Human Services Network  
San Francisco Living Wage Coalition  
SF Parents For Equity  
SOMA Pilipinas  
Swords to Plowshares Veterans Rights Organization

Transgender, Gender-Variant, and Intersex Justice Project  
Washington Coalition for Open Government  
Wu Yee Children's Services

cc: Mayor London Breed

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Kelly Dearman, Department of Disability and Aging Services

Nicole Bohn, Mayor's Office on Disability

Linda Gerull, Department of Technology

-----  
Jessica Lehman (she/her), Executive Director  
Senior & Disability Action \* [www.sdaction.org](http://www.sdaction.org)  
P.O. Box 423388, San Francisco CA 94142

**From:** [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Suggestion for Public Comment Period  
**Date:** Monday, February 27, 2023 10:24:30 AM

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see the below email regarding Item 5 on today's Rules Agenda.

Item No. 5 - File No. 221008 - Limiting Teleconferencing and Remote Public Comment at Meetings of the Board of Supervisors and its Committees

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)

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

From: [sfneighborhoods.net](mailto:info@sfneighborhoods.net) <[info@sfneighborhoods.net](mailto:info@sfneighborhoods.net)>  
Sent: Monday, February 27, 2023 9:22 AM  
To: Chan, Connie (BOS) <[connie.chan@sfgov.org](mailto:connie.chan@sfgov.org)>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <[catherine.stefani@sfgov.org](mailto:catherine.stefani@sfgov.org)>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <[aaron.peskin@sfgov.org](mailto:aaron.peskin@sfgov.org)>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <[joel.engardio@sfgov.org](mailto:joel.engardio@sfgov.org)>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <[dean.preston@sfgov.org](mailto:dean.preston@sfgov.org)>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <[matt.dorsey@sfgov.org](mailto:matt.dorsey@sfgov.org)>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <[myrna.melgar@sfgov.org](mailto:myrna.melgar@sfgov.org)>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <[rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org](mailto:rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org)>; Ronen, Hillary <[hillary.ronen@sfgov.org](mailto:hillary.ronen@sfgov.org)>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <[shamann.walton@sfgov.org](mailto:shamann.walton@sfgov.org)>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <[ahsha.safai@sfgov.org](mailto:ahsha.safai@sfgov.org)>  
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <[angela.calvillo@sfgov.org](mailto:angela.calvillo@sfgov.org)>; Young, Victor (BOS) <[victor.young@sfgov.org](mailto:victor.young@sfgov.org)>  
Subject: Suggestion for Public Comment Period

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

Hello all,

Suggestion:

Before a meeting, allow the public to call in and record public comment for a certain time limit.  
Take a sample of that public comment and play it during the meeting.  
Take public comment from people at the meeting, as required by the SF Sunshine Ordinance and The Brown Act.  
Add all the record public comment as an appendage to the meeting recording either at the end or as a referred to separate recorded file.

sullivan





San Franciscans for Sunshine, a non-profit organization of citizens advocating for maximizing government transparency and public participation in government, strongly opposes this move to rescind the March 17, 2020 motion allowing remote public comment at BoS meetings.

Our review of the text of the motion now before you (File No. 221008) found no compelling rationale for discontinuing this practice. The last WHEREAS states that “the significant costs associated with allowing all members of the public to participate in Board meetings remotely” and that “the public interest is served by restoring the Board’s prior practice of limiting remote participation in Board and committee meetings both by Supervisors and by members of the public.” Just how much are these costs—what percentage of the BoS’s budget? And just how would the public interest be better served by limiting participation in public meetings?

So many San Franciscans spoke this morning—Feb. 27, 2023—offering thoughtful and passionate rationales for opposing Supervisor Mandelman’s motion. I’ll just end by saying that democratic principles dictate that this channel remain permanently available. SF4S will continue to advocate for this and for other measures that increase our government’s transparency and support public participation in our government for our common good.

Respectfully,

Dr. Allyson Washburn

Chair, Steering Committee of San Franciscans for Sunshine

Past President, League of Women Voters of San Francisco  
Past member and Chair, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force

## Patrick Monette-Shaw

---

975 Sutter Street, Apt. 6  
San Francisco, CA 94109  
Phone: (415) 292-6969 • e-mail: [pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net](mailto:pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net)

February 27, 2023

San Francisco Board of Supervisors Rules Committee  
The Honorable Matt Dorsey, Chair, Rules Committee  
The Honorable Shamann Walton, Member, Rules Committee  
The Honorable Ahsha Safai, Member, Rules Committee  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: **Agenda Item #5, Board File #221008: Opposition to Discontinuation of Remote Participation in Dial-In Public Comment During Board Meetings**

Dear Chair Dorsey and Rules Committee Members,

Since whatever the Board of Supervisors does regarding setting policy for remote public comment at your meetings will set a precedent for all other Boards, Commissions, Task Forces, and official Committees throughout City government and the non-profit sector that are subject to the Brown Act and our local Sunshine Ordinance, you should continue taking remote public comment.

That's because Board Resolution #270-96 then-Mayor Willie L. Brown signed it into law 27 years ago on March 28, 1996 resolved that it is the *policy* of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco that a call-in telephone system be developed to take public comments to increase public participation in City government.

It was disturbing hearing during the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System (SFERS) Board of Trustees meeting on February 16 discuss whether to continue accepting remote public comments call-in beginning in March after California's COVID emergency orders expire at the end of February.

Supervisor Safai — who is the Board of Supervisors designee to a seat on SFERS' Board and is current President of SFERS's Board — stated during its meeting on February 16 that the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and SFERS Board, are collaboratively working to end taking remote public comments phoned in a “balancing” act to help the City's economic recovery efforts.

At approximately 4:42:12 and again at 5:30:30 on the audio and videotape of SFERS' meeting archived on SFGOV-TV, Safai stated that the *Downtown and Citywide Economic Recovery Working Group* wants to assist in revitalizing the downtown core and Civic Center Areas, which represents about 70% of the City's GDP and City revenue, by encouraging people to attend City policy body meetings in person. Ostensibly that will help out local retail and neighborhood restaurants from spill-over business.

This is a terrible reason to discontinue continue taking remote public comment. The Mayor has, herself, been recently featured in news segments on local TV broadcasts, and in her State-of-the-City speech, acknowledging that San Francisco's downtown economy is not going to come back to pre-COVID pandemic levels.

Supervisor Mandelman was seen on SFGOV-TV passing out proposed amendments to this legislation on February 6 during the first Rules Committee hearing on this legislation, but those amendments aren't posted as of today on the background file page. What happened to those proposed amendments he introduced? Were they withdrawn?

Also, although the Rules Committee discussed the need to amend the 72-hour period in which to submit reasonable accommodations requests to make remote public comment for people with disabilities who can not attend City Hall meetings in-person, there has been no standardized policy announced for all public bodies to uniformly set a more reasonable 12-hour (or shorter) period in which to submit accommodation requests. That must become a priority goal.

I urge you to recommend to the full Board of Supervisors that remote call-in for all San Franciscans — and not just those who are disabled — *be required*, and permanently set as official City policy for all entities subject to the Brown Act.

February 27, 2023

**Agenda Item #5, Board File #221008: Don't Forget Board Resolution 270-96**

**Opposition to Discontinuation of Remote Participation**

---

Page 2

Respectfully submitted,

**Patrick Monette-Shaw**

*Columnist/Reporter*

*Westside Observer* Newspaper

cc: The Honorable Aaron Peskin, Board President  
The Honorable Connie Chan, Supervisor, District 1  
The Honorable Catherine Stefani, Supervisor, District 2  
The Honorable Joel Engardio, Supervisor, District 4  
The Honorable Dean Preston, Supervisor, District 5  
The Honorable Myrna Melgar, Supervisor, District 7  
The Honorable Rafael Mandelman, Supervisor, District 8  
The Honorable Hillary Ronen, Supervisor, District 9  
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board  
Victor Young, Clerk of the Rules Committee



**San Francisco Office of the City Administrator**

**Presentation to the Rules Committee:  
Citywide Guidelines on Remote  
Public Comment for In-Person  
Public Meetings  
beginning March 1<sup>st</sup>**

**Jennifer Johnston – Deputy City Administrator**  
February 27, 2023

# Remote Participation by the Public

---

- Remote attendance/participation must generally be allowed as a reasonable modification for members of the public who are unable to provide public comment in person due to a disability under the ADA.
- The Administrative Code requires that modifications be provided “quickly, easily, and with minimum burden to the person with the disability.”

# Remote Participation by the Public (Not Receiving a Modification)

---

- Policy Bodies are also advised to provide additional time-limited remote public comment for members of the public who are not requesting an accommodation under the ADA.
- The City will re-evaluate the implementation of this guidance, including any staffing or administrative challenges, and make amendments as needed.

---

Questions?



## Patrick Monette-Shaw

---

975 Sutter Street, Apt. 6  
San Francisco, CA 94109  
Phone: (415) 292-6969 • e-mail: [pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net](mailto:pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net)

February 28, 2023

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

The Honorable Aaron Peskin, Board President  
The Honorable Connie Chan, Supervisor, District 1  
The Honorable Catherine Stefani, Supervisor, District 2  
The Honorable Joel Engardio, Supervisor, District 4  
The Honorable Dean Preston, Supervisor, District 5  
The Honorable Matt Dorsey, Supervisor, District 6  
The Honorable Myrna Melgar, Supervisor, District 7  
The Honorable Rafael Mandelman, Supervisor, District 8  
The Honorable Hillary Ronen, Supervisor, District 9  
The Honorable , Supervisor Shamann Walton, District 10  
The Honorable Ahsha Safai, Supervisor, District 11  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Agenda Item #30, Board File 221008: **Limiting Teleconferencing and Remote Public Comment at Meetings of the Board of Supervisors and its Committees**

Dear Board President Peskin, and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

It was good hearing during the Rules Committee meeting on February 27 Committee Chair Matt Dorsey attempt to introduce proposed amendments to Supervisor Mandelman’s Motion at agenda item 30 — “*Limiting Teleconferencing and Remote Public Comment at Meetings of the Board of Supervisors and its Committees.*”

After all, Line 1 on page 4 of Mandelman’s proposed Motion claims there are “*significant costs associated with allowing all members of the public to participate in Board meetings remotely ...*,” but there is no financial analysis posted on-line as a background information to Board File 221008. Moreover, the PowerPoint presentation Deputy City Administrator Jennifer Johnston posted on-line Monday morning — dated on the cover and in the metadata of the PDF file as having been created on February 27, 2023 — contains no financial analysis, which Johnston indicates may need re-evaluation. There doesn’t appear to be a BLA analysis of the associated costs, either.

**I urge the full Board to Table Mandelman’s motion** until such time as detailed, accurate costs of remote participation are obtained and made public.

But it was disturbing hearing Supervisors Walton and Safai indicate they wouldn’t support amendments. They didn’t even display the “collegial” courtesy of allowing Supervisor Dorsey to read or introduce his proposed amendments before they unilaterally shot down amendments they — and members of the public — weren’t even allowed to hear Dorsey read into the record for potential consideration. Why were Walton and Safai unwilling to even have the amendments read into the meeting record, and how could they oppose them if they hadn’t seen them in advance of the Rules Committee hearing on February 27?

I strongly urge Supervisor Dorsey to introduce his amendments at the full Board’s February 28 meeting to potentially consider maintaining the status quo on continuing remote public comment, and potentially, hybrid meetings.

And I urge the full Board of Supervisors to consider passing amendments Supervisor Dorsey may introduce to Mandelman’s motion.

Respectfully submitted,

**Patrick Monette-Shaw**  
*Columnist,*

February 28, 2023

**Limiting Teleconferencing and Remote Public Comment at Meetings of the Board of Supervisors**

Page 2

*Westside Observer* Newspaper

cc: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Alisa Somera, Legislative Deputy Director to the Clerk of the Board

Board of Supervisors

Aaron Peskin (Board President)

Connie Chan

Catherine Stefani

Joel Engardio

Dean Preston

Matt Dorsey

Myrna Melgar

Rafael Mandelman

Hillary Ronen

Shamann Walton

Asha Safai

Re Item #30: Proposal to discontinue remote public comment at meetings of the Board and its committees: **STRONGLY OPPOSE**

San Franciscans for Sunshine, a non-profit organization of citizens advocating for maximizing government transparency and public participation in government, strongly opposes this move to rescind the March 17, 2020 motion allowing remote public comment at BoS meetings.

Our review of the text of the Supervisor Mandelman's motion now before you (File No. 221008) found no compelling rationale for discontinuing this practice. The last WHEREAS states that "the significant costs associated with allowing all members of the public to participate in Board meetings remotely" and that "the public interest is served by restoring the Board's prior practice of limiting remote participation in Board and committee meetings both by Supervisors and by members of the public."

Just how much are these costs—what percentage of the BoS's budget?

And just how would the public interest be better served by limiting participation in public meetings?

Many San Franciscans spoke at this morning's Rules Committee, offering thoughtful and passionate rationales for opposing Supervisor Mandelman's motion. They mentioned, for example, that many people who live and/or work in San Francisco have family or job obligations or personal challenges that prevent their in-person attendance at meetings of the city's public bodies. In addition, they reminded us that medical and epidemiological experts are warning that the COVID-19 pandemic, which prompted the city to enable remote public comment, is not over; one caller shared that she was just diagnosed with her first case of COVID.

Finally, members of the public stressed Monday morning that Democratic principles dictate that this channel remain permanently available. SF4S will continue to advocate for this and for other

measures that increase our government's transparency and support public participation in our government for our common good.

Respectfully,

Dr. Allyson Washburn

Chair, Steering Committee of San Franciscans for Sunshine

Past President, League of Women Voters of San Francisco

Past member and Chair, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force