

FILE NO. 230984

Petitions and Communications received from September 14, 2023, through September 21, 2023, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on September 26, 2023.

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

From the Office of the Mayor, making appointments to the following bodies. Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

Appointment pursuant to Charter, Section 4.113:

- Recreation and Park Commission
- o Breanna Zwart - term ending June 27, 2025
- o Carey Wintroub - term ending June 27, 2026

Appointment pursuant to Charter, Section 4.115:

- Airport Commission
- o Mark Buell - term ending August 31, 2027

Reappointment pursuant to Charter, Sections 3.100(8) and 5.103:

- Arts Commission
- o Seth Brenzel - term ending July 1, 2027

From the Office of the Mayor, submitting a response to a Letter of Inquiry issued by Supervisor Ahsha Safai at the September 5, 2023, Board of Supervisors meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From the Planning Department, regarding the Ocean Beach Climate Change Adaptation Project. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), pursuant to Administrative Code, Chapter 6, Article IV, Section 6.60(d), submitting a Declaration of Emergency for a 16" water main break at the intersection of Fillmore and Green Streets. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From the Department of Public Health (DPH), pursuant to Ordinance No. 11-15, File No. 141122, submitting the Annual Report on Evictions from Subsidized Housing for Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From the Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector (TTX), pursuant to California State Government Code, Section 53646, submitting the Pooled Investment Report for August 2023. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From various departments, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 12B.5-1(d)(1), submitting approved Chapter 12B Waiver Request Forms. 6 Contracts.
Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From the Department of Human Resources (DHR), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 16.82, submitting the Annual Report on Hospitalization and Medical Treatment.
Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From members of the public, regarding a proposed Ordinance amending the Planning Code to encourage housing production. File No. 230446. 16 Letters.
Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From ZK, regarding street conditions near Market and 6th Streets.
Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From K. Miller, regarding California Proposition 47, the Reduced Penalties for Some Crimes Initiative. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From Wynship Hillier, regarding the Behavioral Health Commission.
Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From members of the public, regarding a Hearing of the Board of Supervisors sitting as a Committee of the Whole to hold a public hearing on the Draft San Francisco Reparations Plan and Dream Keeper Initiative updates. File No. 230078. 51 Letters.
Copy: Each Supervisor. (13)

From Remi Tan, regarding various topics. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From Richard Youatt, regarding a proposed Resolution declaring September 21, 2023, as Armenian Independence Day in the City and County of San Francisco and commemorating the 32nd Anniversary of Armenian Independence Day on September 21, 2023. File No. 230979. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From members of the public, regarding a proposed Resolution expressing the Board of Supervisors' concern regarding the development of the United Nations (UN) Activation Plan and displacement of the Heart of the City Farmers' Market from the UN Plaza. File No. 230951. 5 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From Regina Sneed, regarding the sculpture titled Monumental Reckoning by Dana King. Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

From members of the public, regarding a Hearing to discuss the City's comprehensive plan to address car break-ins. 2 Letters. File No. 230826. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From Mike Regan, regarding the Lake Merced Quick-Build Project.
Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From Dr. Teresa Palmer, regarding a Hearing of the Board of Supervisors sitting as a Committee of the Whole to hold a public hearing on Laguna Honda Hospital's Strategy for Recertification and the Submission of a Closure and Patient Transfer and Relocation Plan. File No. 230035. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From Philip Cropp, regarding retail closures. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

From members of the public, regarding San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) Department General Order (DGO) 5.25, Foot Pursuits. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (22)

From members of the public, regarding San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) Department General Order (DGO) 9.07, Curtailing the Use of Pretext Stops. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (23)

From members of the public, regarding Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for the study of drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel. 30 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (24)

From Philip Kuttner, regarding homelessness on Bartlett Street. Copy: Each Supervisor. (25)

From Michael Meiktas, regarding John F. Kennedy Drive. Copy: Each Supervisor. (26)

From Mira Martin-Parker, regarding various topics. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (27)

From Monica D., regarding various topics. 5 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (28)

From members of the public, regarding vehicular turns at red lights. 75 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (29)

From members of the public, regarding a Resolution urging the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) to delay implementing meter hour extension until the completion of an independent economic impact report that specifically analyzes the projected impact to San Francisco small businesses, City revenues, and the City's overall economic recovery and said report is reviewed by the Board of Supervisors and the SFMTA Board. Resolution No. 289-23; File No. 230587. 2 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (30)

From members of the public, regarding the landmarking of Sacred Heart Church. 3 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (31)

From members of the public, regarding the hiring of San Francisco Patrol Special Police (SFPSP) officers. 35 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (32)

From members of the public, regarding street conditions. 3 Letters.
Copy: Each Supervisor. (33)

From members of the public, regarding window replacement standards. 3 Letters.
Copy: Each Supervisor. (34)

From the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 96A, submitting the Quarterly Activity and Data Report (QADR) for Quarter 2, 2023. Copy: Each Supervisor. (35)

From the Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs (OCEIA), submitting recommendations from a San Francisco Immigrant Rights Commission hearing on issues concerning LGBTQIA+ immigrants on May 8, 2023. Copy: Each Supervisor. (36)

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 \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [PEARSON, ANNE \(CAT\)](#); [Paulino, Tom \(MYR\)](#); [Mainardi, Jesse \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: TIME SENSITIVE: Mayoral Reappointment 3.100(18) - Arts Commission
Date: Thursday, September 21, 2023 4:47:58 PM
Attachments: [Clerk's Memo 9.21.23.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)
[2023 Brenzel Reappointment.pdf](#)
[seth brenzel - résumé - September 2023 - final.pdf](#)
[Seth Brenzel Form 700 Submit.PDF](#)

Dear Supervisors,

The Office of the Mayor submitted the attached complete reappointment to the Arts Commission. Please see the memo from the Clerk of the Board for more information and instruction.

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



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

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

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


Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 21, 2023
To: Members, Board of Supervisors
From:  Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Subject: Mayoral Reappointment - Arts Commission

On September 19, 2023, the Office of the Mayor submitted the following complete reappointment package pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18) and 5.103. This reappointment is effective immediately unless rejected by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (October 19, 2023).

Reappointment to the Arts Commission:

- Seth Brenzel - Representative of the Visual Arts - term ending July 1, 2027

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

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

If you wish to hold a hearing on this reappointment, please let me know in writing by Wednesday, September 27, 2023.

c: Matt Dorsey- Rules Committee Chair
Alisa Somera - Legislative Deputy
Victor Young - Rules Clerk
Anne Pearson - Deputy City Attorney
Tom Paulino - Mayor's Legislative Liaison



Notice of Reappointment

September 19, 2023

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

Pursuant to Charter Sections 3.100(18) and 5.103, of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following reappointment:

Seth Brenzel to the Arts Commission as a representative of the visual arts, for the four-year term ending July 1, 2027.

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

Should you have any question about this appointment, please contact my Director of Boards and Commissions, Jesse Mainardi, at 415.554.6588.

Sincerely,

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

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

From: [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [PEARSON, ANNE \(CAT\)](#); [Mainardi, Jesse \(MYR\)](#); [Paulino, Tom \(MYR\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)
Subject: TIME SENSITIVE: Mayoral Appointments 3.100(18) - REC & AIR
Date: Friday, September 15, 2023 2:34:44 PM
Attachments: [COB Memo 09.15.23.pdf](#)
[B Zwart.pdf](#)
[C Wintroub.pdf](#)
[M Bell.pdf](#)

Dear Supervisors,

The Office of the Mayor submitted the attached complete Mayoral Appointments, pursuant to Charter Section 3.100(18). Please see the memo from the Clerk of the Board for more information and instructions.

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.*

**BOARD of SUPERVISORS**




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

---

**MEMORANDUM**

---

Date: September 15, 2023  
To: Members, Board of Supervisors  
From:  Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board  
Subject: Mayoral Appointments - Recreation and Park Commission  
Airport Commission

---

On September 12, 2023, the Office of the Mayor submitted the following complete appointment packages pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18). These appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (October 12, 2023).

**Appointments to Recreation and Park Commission pursuant to Charter, Section 4.113:**

- **Breanna Zwart** - term ending June 27, 2025  
*(Breanna Zwart's Letter of Resignation from the Commission on the Status of Woman has been received.)*
- **Carey Wintroub** - term ending June 27, 2026

**Appointment to the Airport Commission pursuant to Charter, Section 4.115:**

- **Mark Buell** - term ending August 31, 2027  
*(Mark Buell's Letter of Resignation from the Recreation and Park Commission has been received.)*

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

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

If you wish to hold a hearing on any of the above matters, please let me know in writing, by September 20, 2023. Please be advised that the due to Italian American Heritage Day and Indigenous Peoples Day the final Board meeting to hear this matter is October 3, 2023.

c: Matt Dorsey- Rules Committee Chair  
Alisa Somera - Legislative Deputy  
Victor Young - Rules Clerk  
Anne Pearson - Deputy City Attorney  
Tom Paulino - Mayor's Legislative Liaison



**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Letter of Inquiry from Supervisor Safai  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 2:51:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [Response to Letter of Inquiry from Sup Safai\\_09.19.23.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from the Office of the Mayor in response to a Letter of Inquiry issued by Supervisor Safai at the September 5, 2023, Board of Supervisors meeting.

Sincerely,

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

---

**From:** Duning, Anna (MYR) <[anna.duning@sfgov.org](mailto:anna.duning@sfgov.org)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 5:08 PM  
**To:** Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <[ahsha.safai@sfgov.org](mailto:ahsha.safai@sfgov.org)>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <[angela.calvillo@sfgov.org](mailto:angela.calvillo@sfgov.org)>  
**Cc:** Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <[eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org](mailto:eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org)>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <[alisa.somera@sfgov.org](mailto:alisa.somera@sfgov.org)>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <[wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org](mailto:wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org)>; De Asis, Edward (BOS) <[edward.deasis@sfgov.org](mailto:edward.deasis@sfgov.org)>; Hickey, Jacqueline (BOS) <[jacqueline.hickey@sfgov.org](mailto:jacqueline.hickey@sfgov.org)>; Paulino, Tom (MYR) <[tom.paulino@sfgov.org](mailto:tom.paulino@sfgov.org)>; Carrillo, Lila (BOS) <[lila.carrillo@sfgov.org](mailto:lila.carrillo@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** RE: Letter of Inquiry from Supervisor Safai

Please find the response from the Mayor's Office attached.

Thank you,

Anna Duning

**Anna Duning** (she/her)  
 Budget Director  
 Office of Mayor London N. Breed  
[anna.duning@sfgov.org](mailto:anna.duning@sfgov.org) | 415.554.6216 (o)

---

**From:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
**Sent:** Friday, September 8, 2023 4:01 PM  
**To:** Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <[mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org](mailto:mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org)>; Jenkins, Brooke (DAT)

<[brooke.jenkins@sfgov.org](mailto:brooke.jenkins@sfgov.org)>; Scott, William (POL) <[william.scott@sfgov.org](mailto:william.scott@sfgov.org)>; Duning, Anna (MYR) <[anna.duning@sfgov.org](mailto:anna.duning@sfgov.org)>

**Cc:** Carrillo, Lila (BOS) <[lila.carrillo@sfgov.org](mailto:lila.carrillo@sfgov.org)>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <[angela.calvillo@sfgov.org](mailto:angela.calvillo@sfgov.org)>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <[eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org](mailto:eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org)>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <[alisa.somera@sfgov.org](mailto:alisa.somera@sfgov.org)>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <[wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org](mailto:wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org)>; De Asis, Edward (BOS) <[edward.deasis@sfgov.org](mailto:edward.deasis@sfgov.org)>; Hickey, Jacqueline (BOS) <[jacqueline.hickey@sfgov.org](mailto:jacqueline.hickey@sfgov.org)>; BOS-Operations <[bos-operations@sfgov.org](mailto:bos-operations@sfgov.org)>; Paulino, Tom (MYR) <[tom.paulino@sfgov.org](mailto:tom.paulino@sfgov.org)>; Power, Andres (MYR) <[andres.power@sfgov.org](mailto:andres.power@sfgov.org)>; Ortiz, Lisa (POL) <[lisa.ortiz@sfgov.org](mailto:lisa.ortiz@sfgov.org)>; Gamero, Lili (POL) <[lili.gamero@sfgov.org](mailto:lili.gamero@sfgov.org)>; Malouf, Rima (POL) <[rima.malouf@sfgov.org](mailto:rima.malouf@sfgov.org)>; Aroche, Diana (POL) <[diana.arocha@sfgov.org](mailto:diana.arocha@sfgov.org)>; Gonzalez, Ana (DAT) <[ana.gonzalez@sfgov.org](mailto:ana.gonzalez@sfgov.org)>; Clendinen, Eugene (DAT) <[eugene.clendinen@sfgov.org](mailto:eugene.clendinen@sfgov.org)>; McCaffrey, Edward (DAT) <[edward.mccaffrey@sfgov.org](mailto:edward.mccaffrey@sfgov.org)>; Hang, Xang (MYR) <[xang.hang@sfgov.org](mailto:xang.hang@sfgov.org)>

**Subject:** Letter of Inquiry from Supervisor Safai

Dear Mayor Breed, District Attorney Jenkins, Chief Scott, and Director Duning,

Please see the attached memo from the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors regarding a Letter of Inquiry issued by Supervisor Ahsha Safai at the September 5, 2023, Board of Supervisors meeting.

Sincerely,

**Joe Adkins**

**Office of the Clerk of the Board**

**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**

**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**

**San Francisco, CA 94102**

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

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



Tuesday, September 19, 2023

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

**RE: Response to Letter of Inquiry**

*I am requesting that Mayor London Breed and her Budget Director provide an explanation for the denial of the requested Assistant District Attorney position to be dedicated to increased retail theft.*

Dear Supervisor Safaí,

As a member of the Budget and Finance and the Budget Appropriations Committees, you understand the size of the City's deficit projections and the budget instructions the Mayor issued to departments last year.

As part of that process, the Mayor's Office reviewed budget requests by all departments. Ultimately, we had to make General Fund reductions in many, while making some targeted investments in others. The District Attorney's budget was subject to the same review.

In conversation with their office, we decided to prioritize new General Fund for three new positions, dedicated to drug arrests, and ensure the Department had adequate financial resources to remain fully staffed. Additionally, the Department planned to apply for a state grant specifically for retail theft. On September 14, 2023 we learned that the District Attorney was successful with this grant application and will receive state funding as part California Organized Retail Theft Vertical Prosecution Grant Program. These funds will enable the Office to hire a full-time dedicated Assistant District Attorney and a full-time dedicated District Attorney Investigator to prosecute retail theft crimes. You can read more about that program here: <https://www.bscc.ca.gov/organized-retail-theft-vertical-prosecution-grant-program>.

The Board of Supervisors also had an opportunity to amend this budget. After making additional budget cuts, the Board ultimately added over \$40 million in FY 23-24, including 12 new FTE in the Public Defender's Office, 3 new FTE in the Board of Supervisors as well as staff in the Ethics Commission. No additional FTE were added to the District Attorney's Office during the Board's phase of budget deliberations.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Anna Duning".

Anna Duning  
Budget Director  
Office of Mayor London N. Breed

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**  
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO



**OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE BOARD**

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

September 8, 2023

The Honorable London Breed, Mayor  
Office of the Mayor  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 200  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Via Email: [MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org](mailto:MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org)

William Scott, Chief of Police  
San Francisco Police Department  
1245 3rd Street  
San Francisco, CA 94158  
Via Email: [William.Scott@sfgov.org](mailto:William.Scott@sfgov.org)

The Honorable Brooke Jenkins, District Attorney  
Office of the District Attorney  
350 Rhode Island Street  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
Via Email: [Brooke.Jenkins@sfgov.org](mailto:Brooke.Jenkins@sfgov.org)

Anna Duning, Budget Director  
Mayor's Office of Finance  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 288  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Via Email: [Anna.Duning@sfgov.org](mailto:Anna.Duning@sfgov.org)

Dear Mayor Breed, Chief Scott, District Attorney Jenkins, and Director Duning,

At the September 5, 2023, Board of Supervisors meeting, Supervisor Ahsha Safai issued the attached inquiry to Mayor London Breed and the Mayor's Budget Office (MYR), the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), and the District Attorney's Office (DAT). Please review the attached letter of inquiry and introduction form, which provides the Supervisor's request.

The inquiry, in summary, requests data on the current state of retail theft in San Francisco, the structure of law enforcement response, and prevention of retail theft and allocation of resources to stop retail theft, as follows from the respective agencies:

**SFPD:**

1. Number of arrests for commercial retail theft from 2020, 2021, 2022, and 2023
2. Officers and staff member responsible for responding to, reviewing cases, and presenting the case to the District Attorneys and how many average cases they are responsible for
3. How many reports are made versus how many cases are presented to the District Attorney?

**DAT:**

1. Number of cases filed, prosecuted, and convicted for commercial retail theft and comparative analysis for calendar years 2020, 2021, 2022, and 2023
2. Staff responsible for prosecuting these cases and the average case load per attorney and paralegal staff


**MYR:**

1. An explanation for the denial of the requested Assistant District Attorney position to be dedicated to increase retail theft

Please contact Lila Carrillo, [Lila.Carrillo@sfgov.org](mailto:Lila.Carrillo@sfgov.org), Legislative Aide to Supervisor Safai, for any questions related to this request, and copy [BOS@sfgov.org](mailto:BOS@sfgov.org) on all communications to enable my office to track and close out this inquiry. Please provide your response no later than September 22, 2023.

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

Very Truly Yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Angela Calvillo', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Angela Calvillo  
Clerk of the Board  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

WN/JA

Attachments:

- Letter of Inquiry
- Introduction Form

Cc: Tom Paulino, MYR, [Tom.Paulino@sfgov.org](mailto:Tom.Paulino@sfgov.org)  
Andres Power, MYR, [Andres.Power@sfgov.org](mailto:Andres.Power@sfgov.org)  
Lisa Ortiz, SFPD, [Lisa.Ortiz@sfgov.org](mailto:Lisa.Ortiz@sfgov.org)  
Lili Gamero, SFPD, [Lili.Gamero@sfgov.org](mailto:Lili.Gamero@sfgov.org)  
Rima Malouf, SFPD, [Rima.Malouf@sfgov.org](mailto:Rima.Malouf@sfgov.org)  
Diana Oliva-Aroche, SFPD, [Diana.Aroche@sfgov.org](mailto:Diana.Aroche@sfgov.org)  
Ana Gonzalez, DAT, [Ana.Gonzalez@sfgov.org](mailto:Ana.Gonzalez@sfgov.org)  
Eugene Clendinen, DAT, [Eugene.Clendinen@sfgov.org](mailto:Eugene.Clendinen@sfgov.org)  
Edward McCaffrey, DAT, [Edward.McCaffrey@sfgov.org](mailto:Edward.McCaffrey@sfgov.org)  
Xang Hang, MYR, [Xang.Hang@sfgov.org](mailto:Xang.Hang@sfgov.org)



2023 SEP 18 PM 12:52

Item 3

**MEMORANDUM**

*Date:* September 14, 2023  
*Case No.:* **2019-020115ENV**  
*Project Title:* **Ocean Beach Climate Change Adaptation Project**  
*To:* Members of the Planning Commission and Interested Parties  
*From:* Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer  
*Re:* Responses to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Ocean Beach Climate Change Adaptation Project

The San Francisco Planning Department has published the Responses to Comments document the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the above-referenced project on the San Francisco Planning Department's website at [sfplanning.org/sfceqadocs](https://sfplanning.org/sfceqadocs). **This document, along with the Draft EIR, will be before the planning commission for Final EIR certification on September 28, 2023.** The planning commission will receive public testimony on the Final EIR certification at the September 28<sup>th</sup> hearing. Please note that the public review period for the draft EIR ended on January 24, 2022; any comments received after that date, including any comments provided orally or in writing at the final EIR certification hearing, may not be responded to in writing.

The planning commission does not conduct a hearing to receive comments on the responses to comments document, and no such hearing is required by the California Environmental Quality Act. Interested parties, however, may always write to commission members or to the president of the commission at [commissions.secretary@sfgov.org](mailto:commissions.secretary@sfgov.org) (preferred) or 49 South Van Ness Avenue and express an opinion on the responses to comments document, or the commission's decision to certify the completion of the Final EIR for this project.

Please note that the responses to comments document in addition to the draft EIR is the final EIR. If you have any questions concerning the responses to comments document or the environmental review process, please contact Julie Moore at [CPC.OceanBeachEIR@sfgov.org](mailto:CPC.OceanBeachEIR@sfgov.org) or at 628.652.7566.

Thank you for your interest in this project and your consideration of this matter.

**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 \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Declaration of Emergency – Fillmore and Green 16" Water Main Break  
**Date:** Friday, September 15, 2023 1:29:40 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[image005.png](#)  
[9.14.23 Emergency Declaration Fillmore-Green Water Main Break Signed.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached regarding the water main break at Fillmore and Green.

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

Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (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:** Spitz, Jeremy M <JSpitz@sfwater.org>

**Sent:** Friday, September 15, 2023 12:22 PM

**To:** Rosenfield, Ben (CON) <ben.rosenfield@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; English, Jack (MYR) <john.english@sfgov.org>; Paulino, Tom (MYR) <tom.paulino@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>

**Cc:** Herrera, Dennis (PUC) <DJHerrera@sfwater.org>; BREGMAN, SHERYL (CAT) <Sheryl.Bregman@sfcityattly.org>; Hom, Nancy (PUC) <NHom@sfwater.org>; Busch, Laura (PUC) <LBusch@sfwater.org>; Fine, Ivy (PUC) <IFine@sfwater.org>; Lyman, Greg (PUC) <GLyman@sfwater.org>; Sandler, Risa (CON) <risa.sandler@sfgov.org>; Ritchie, Steve (PUC)

<SRitchie@sflower.org>; Ordikhani, Masood (PUC) <MOrdikhani@sflower.org>; Feitelberg, Brittany (PUC) <BFeitelberg@sflower.org>; Rydstrom, Todd (CON) <Todd.Rydstrom@sfgov.org>; Oliveros Reyes, Jennifer (PUC) <JOliverosReyes@sflower.org>; McPartland, Frank (PUC) <fmcpartland@sflower.org>

**Subject:** Declaration of Emergency – Fillmore and Green 16" Water Main Break

Good afternoon,

Please see the attached declaration of emergency pursuant to Section 6.6(d) of the Administrative Code.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

**Jeremy Spitz**

Local and Regional Policy and Government Affairs Manager

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

Cell: 415-214-5296

*Pronouns: he, him, his*

sfpuc.org








## INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

**Date:** September 14, 2023

**To:** Commissioner Newsha Ajami  
President, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

**From:** Dennis J. Herrera   
General Manager

**Subject:** **Declaration of Emergency – Fillmore and Green 16" Water Main Break**

In accordance with Chapter 6, Article IV, Section 6.60(d) of the San Francisco Administrative Code, I am declaring an emergency on behalf of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC).

In the early morning hours of September 11, 2023, a 16" water transmission main installed in 1949 in the intersection of Fillmore and Green Streets failed. The resulting release of water damaged the 8" water distribution main in Fillmore, and subsequent failure of the street base and pavement on Fillmore from the intersection with Green down to the crosswalk of the Union Street intersection. The displacement of sand and mud caused complete collapse of sections of Fillmore with voids of up to 10 feet in depth and failure of the sewer main and sewer laterals from the Fillmore and Green intersection along Fillmore to the Union intersection. The flow of water from the Fillmore and Green intersection buckled sidewalks on Fillmore near Union and inundated a number of resident garages and basements, as well as businesses along Green, Steiner, Fillmore, and Union with displaced sand and mud.

Under Administrative Code section 6.60, an "actual emergency" means a sudden, unforeseeable, and unexpected occurrence involving a clear and imminent danger, demanding immediate action to prevent or mitigate loss of or damage to, life, health, property, or essential public services. The water main break resulted in disruption of water and sewer services as well as interruption of gas service to customers on Fillmore Street. Restoration of Fillmore Street between Green and Union will likely take weeks. In addition, properties downhill from the main break on several other blocks were damaged.

**London N. Breed**  
Mayor

**Newsha K. Ajami**  
President

**Sophie Maxwell**  
Vice President

**Tim Paulson**  
Commissioner

**Anthony Rivera**  
Commissioner

**Kate H. Stacy**  
Commissioner

**Dennis J. Herrera**  
General Manager



This request for an emergency declaration is for contract resources to perform sewer main, water main, and street repairs on Fillmore Street. The work must be completed as soon as possible and is beyond the capabilities of City forces. We currently estimate the cost of the remediation work not-to-exceed \$5,000,000.

I am therefore declaring the existence of an emergency. I trust that this meets with your concurrence and approval.

CONCUR AND APPROVE:

*Newsha Khodatalab Ajami*

---

Newsha Ajami – President  
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

cc: S. Maxwell  
T. Paulson  
T. Rivera  
K. Stacy  
R. Flynn  
S. Ritchie  
S. Robinson  
N. Hom

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Services](#); [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Annual Report on Evictions from Subsidized Housing for Fiscal Year 2022-2023  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 11:37:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [09-14-23 Evictions Data Letter.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see below and attached for the Annual Report on Evictions from Subsidized Housing for Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023, submitted by the Department of Public Health pursuant to Ordinance No. 11-15 (File No. 141122).

Sincerely,

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

---

**From:** Validzic, Ana (DPH) <ana.validzic@sfdph.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 18, 2023 7:45 AM  
**To:** Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Angulo, Sunny (BOS) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>; BOS-Operations <bos-operations@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Patil, Sneha (DPH) <sneha.patil@sfdph.org>; Kunins, Hillary (DPH) <hillary.kunins@sfdph.org>  
**Subject:** Annual Report on Evictions from Subsidized Housing for Fiscal Year 2022-2023

Good morning President Peskin and Sunny -

On behalf of Dr. Kunins, attached is the report required by Article XIV, the Tenant Eviction Annual Reports Ordinance File No. 141122. The report documents evictions from the subsidized housing programs that were funded by the Department of Public Health (DPH) and the Human Services Agency (HSA) for the fiscal year from July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023. Most of these programs have moved into the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing and they will report separately on the sites that they oversee.

Including [@BOS-Operations](#) to track completion.

Best, Ana

\*\*\*\*\*

Ana Validzic (she/her)

Government Affairs Manager

San Francisco Department of Public Health

[ana.validzic@sfdph.org](mailto:ana.validzic@sfdph.org) | 650.503.9536 (cell)

\*\*\*\*\*

**\*\* CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE\*\*** This email message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, use or distribution of the information included in this message and any attachments is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete or otherwise destroy the information.



City and County of San Francisco  
London N. Breed  
Mayor

## San Francisco Department of Public Health



San Francisco Health Network  
Behavioral Health Services

Hillary Kunins, MD, MPH, MS  
Director, Behavioral Health Services and Mental Health SF

1380 Howard Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, San Francisco, CA 94108  
Phone: (415) 255-3400 Fax: (415) 255-3567  
hillary.kunins@sfdph.org

September 14, 2023

Mayor London Breed  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
City Hall  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Annual Report on Evictions from Subsidized Housing for Fiscal Year 2022-2023

Dear Mayor Breed and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Attached is the report required by Article XIV, the Tenant Eviction Annual Reports Ordinance File No. 141122. The report documents evictions from the subsidized housing programs that were funded by the Department of Public Health (DPH) and the Human Services Agency (HSA) for the fiscal year from July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023.

Most of these programs have moved into the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing and they will report separately on the sites that they oversee.

The report is separated by department as required by the legislation and documents the number of written notices of eviction, unlawful detainer filings, and evictions completed within the City's permanent supportive housing portfolio. Below is a basic overview of our findings for FY 22-23.

|               |  | # of Sites | # of Households who lived in the housing facility at any time during this period | # of Households who were issued one or more written Notices of Eviction | # of Unlawful Detainer Filings | Total # of Households Evicted | % of Households Evicted |
|---------------|--|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| DPH           |  | 11         | 401                                                                              | 33                                                                      | 19                             | 7                             | 1.75%                   |
| HSA           |  | 4          | 144                                                                              | 1                                                                       | 1                              | 1                             | 0.69%                   |
|               |  |            |                                                                                  |                                                                         |                                |                               |                         |
| <b>TOTALS</b> |  | 15         | 545                                                                              | 34                                                                      | 20                             | 8                             | 1.47%                   |

Sincerely,

Hillary Kunins, MD, MPH

cc: Angelica Almeida, Director, Adult/Older Adult SOC  
Janis O'Meara, Program Manager, Adult/Older Adult SOC

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** FW: CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for August 2023  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 2:36:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for August 2023.pdf](#)  
[image002.png](#)

---

Hello,

Please see below and attached for the Pooled Investment Report for August 2023, submitted by the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector pursuant to California State Government Code, Section 53646.

Sincerely,

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

---

**From:** Dion, Ichieh (TTX) <[ichieh.dion@sfgov.org](mailto:ichieh.dion@sfgov.org)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:23 PM  
**Subject:** CCSF Monthly Pooled Investment Report for August 2023

All-

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



**Ichieh C. Dion**  
*Investment Settlement Operations/Reporting*  
Investments  
Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector  
Office: 415.554.5433  
San Francisco only, call 311  
[sftreasurer.org](http://sftreasurer.org)

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

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



José Cisneros, Treasurer

Investment Report for the month of August 2023

September 15, 2023

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

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

Colleagues,

In accordance with the provisions of California State Government Code, Section 53646, we forward this report detailing the City's pooled fund portfolio as of August 31, 2023. These investments provide sufficient liquidity to meet expenditure requirements for the next six months and are in compliance with our statement of investment policy and California Code.

This correspondence and its attachments show the investment activity for the month of August 2023 for the portfolios under the Treasurer's management. All pricing and valuation data is obtained from Interactive Data Corporation.

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

| (in \$ million)       | Current Month |             | Prior Month |           |
|-----------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|
|                       | Fiscal YTD    | August 2023 | Fiscal YTD  | July 2023 |
| Average Daily Balance | \$ 15,510     | \$ 15,362   | \$ 15,658   | \$ 15,658 |
| Net Earnings          | 80.39         | 40.31       | 40.07       | 40.07     |
| Earned Income Return  | 3.06%         | 3.10%       | 3.02%       | 3.02%     |

**CCSF Pooled Fund Statistics \***

| (in \$ million)      | % of          | Book               | Market             | Wtd. Avg.    | Wtd. Avg.    |            |
|----------------------|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| Investment Type      | Portfolio     | Value              | Value              | Coupon       | YTM          | WAM        |
| U.S. Treasuries      | 22.18%        | \$ 3,520.1         | \$ 3,292.3         | 0.90%        | 0.99%        | 661        |
| Federal Agencies     | 46.25%        | 7,082.9            | 6,865.0            | 2.52%        | 3.01%        | 600        |
| Public Time Deposits | 0.27%         | 40.0               | 40.0               | 5.47%        | 5.47%        | 118        |
| Negotiable CDs       | 14.34%        | 2,130.0            | 2,128.8            | 5.53%        | 5.53%        | 175        |
| Commercial Paper     | 1.45%         | 215.8              | 215.8              | 0.00%        | 5.70%        | 153        |
| Money Market Funds   | 11.38%        | 1,688.7            | 1,688.7            | 5.25%        | 5.25%        | 1          |
| Supranationals       | 4.13%         | 638.3              | 613.7              | 2.38%        | 2.02%        | 515        |
| <b>Totals</b>        | <b>100.0%</b> | <b>\$ 15,315.8</b> | <b>\$ 14,844.3</b> | <b>2.87%</b> | <b>3.18%</b> | <b>478</b> |

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

Respectfully,

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

**José Cisneros  
Treasurer**

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

# Portfolio Summary

## Pooled Fund

As of August 31, 2023

| <i>(in \$ million)</i>          |                    |                    |                     |                          |                             |                               |                   |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Security Type</b>            | <b>Par Value</b>   | <b>Book Value</b>  | <b>Market Value</b> | <b>Market/Book Price</b> | <b>Current % Allocation</b> | <b>Max. Policy Allocation</b> | <b>Compliant?</b> |
| U.S. Treasuries                 | \$ 3,525.0         | \$ 3,520.1         | \$ 3,292.3          | 93.53                    | 22.98%                      | 100%                          | Yes               |
| Federal Agencies                | 7,088.7            | 7,082.9            | 6,865.0             | 96.92                    | 46.25%                      | 100%                          | Yes               |
| State & Local Government        |                    |                    |                     |                          |                             |                               |                   |
| Agency Obligations              | -                  | -                  | -                   | -                        | 0.00%                       | 20%                           | Yes               |
| Public Time Deposits            | 40.0               | 40.0               | 40.0                | 100.00                   | 0.26%                       | 100%                          | Yes               |
| Negotiable CDs                  | 2,130.0            | 2,130.0            | 2,128.8             | 99.94                    | 13.91%                      | 30%                           | Yes               |
| Bankers Acceptances             | -                  | -                  | -                   | -                        | 0.00%                       | 40%                           | Yes               |
| Commercial Paper                | 221.0              | 215.8              | 215.8               | 100.03                   | 1.41%                       | 25%                           | Yes               |
| Medium Term Notes               | -                  | -                  | -                   | -                        | 0.00%                       | 30%                           | Yes               |
| Repurchase Agreements           | -                  | -                  | -                   | -                        | 0.00%                       | 10%                           | Yes               |
| Reverse Repurchase/             |                    |                    |                     |                          |                             |                               |                   |
| Securities Lending Agreements   | -                  | -                  | -                   | -                        | 0.00%                       | \$75mm                        | Yes               |
| Money Market Funds - Government | 1,688.7            | 1,688.7            | 1,688.7             | 100.00                   | 11.03%                      | 20%                           | Yes               |
| LAIF                            | -                  | -                  | -                   | -                        | 0.00%                       | \$50mm                        | Yes               |
| Supranationals                  | 636.2              | 638.3              | 613.7               | 96.14                    | 4.17%                       | 30%                           | Yes               |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                    | <b>\$ 15,329.6</b> | <b>\$ 15,315.8</b> | <b>\$ 14,844.3</b>  | <b>96.92</b>             | <b>100.00%</b>              | <b>-</b>                      | <b>Yes</b>        |

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

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

Totals may not add due to rounding.




# City and County of San Francisco

## Pooled Fund Portfolio Statistics

For the month ended August 31, 2023

|                           |                  |
|---------------------------|------------------|
| Average Daily Balance     | \$15,362,111,413 |
| Net Earnings              | \$40,314,180     |
| Earned Income Return      | 3.10%            |
| Weighted Average Maturity | 478 days         |

| <b>Investment Type</b> | <b>Par Value</b>    | <b>Book Value</b>  | <b>Market Value</b> |
|------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
|                        | <i>(\$ million)</i> |                    |                     |
| U.S. Treasuries        | \$ 3,525.0          | \$ 3,520.1         | \$ 3,292.3          |
| Federal Agencies       | 7,088.7             | 7,082.9            | 6,865.0             |
| Public Time Deposits   | 40.0                | 40.0               | 40.0                |
| Negotiable CDs         | 2,130.0             | 2,130.0            | 2,128.8             |
| Commercial Paper       | 221.0               | 215.8              | 215.8               |
| Money Market Funds     | 1,688.7             | 1,688.7            | 1,688.7             |
| Supranationals         | 636.2               | 638.3              | 613.7               |
| <b>Total</b>           | <b>\$ 15,329.6</b>  | <b>\$ 15,315.8</b> | <b>\$ 14,844.3</b>  |




**Asset Allocation by Market Value**


# Portfolio Analysis

## Pooled Fund



### Par Value of Investments by Maturity



### Asset Allocation by Market Value



# Yield Curves



# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

As of August 31, 2023

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name        | Maturity    |            |        | Par Value | Original Cost | Amortized  |              |    |            |    |            |
|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------|-----------|---------------|------------|--------------|----|------------|----|------------|
|                    |           |                    | Settle Date | Date       | Coupon |           |               | Book Value | Market Value |    |            |    |            |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAK7 | U.S. Treasury Note | 8/10/2021   | 9/15/2023  | 0.13   | \$        | 50,000,000    | \$         | 49,886,719   | \$ | 49,997,930 | \$ | 49,899,000 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912797HC4 | U.S. Treasury Bill | 6/27/2023   | 10/24/2023 | 0.00   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,137,250   |    | 49,615,750 |    | 49,612,000 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828WE6 | U.S. Treasury Note | 12/17/2019  | 11/15/2023 | 2.75   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 51,960,938   |    | 50,102,918 |    | 49,724,500 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBA8 | U.S. Treasury Note | 3/19/2021   | 12/15/2023 | 0.13   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,767,578   |    | 49,975,620 |    | 49,258,000 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBA8 | U.S. Treasury Note | 12/9/2021   | 12/15/2023 | 0.13   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,402,344   |    | 49,914,737 |    | 49,258,000 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBA8 | U.S. Treasury Note | 12/15/2021  | 12/15/2023 | 0.13   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,443,359   |    | 49,919,935 |    | 49,258,000 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 9128285Z9 | U.S. Treasury Note | 10/4/2021   | 1/31/2024  | 2.50   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 52,511,719   |    | 50,449,683 |    | 49,400,500 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDV0 | U.S. Treasury Note | 2/23/2022   | 1/31/2024  | 0.88   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,390,625   |    | 49,868,989 |    | 49,078,000 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDV0 | U.S. Treasury Note | 4/11/2022   | 1/31/2024  | 0.88   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 48,605,469   |    | 49,678,835 |    | 49,078,000 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828B66 | U.S. Treasury Note | 4/11/2022   | 2/15/2024  | 2.75   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 50,250,000   |    | 50,061,852 |    | 49,386,500 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBR1 | U.S. Treasury Note | 3/8/2022    | 3/15/2024  | 0.25   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 48,708,984   |    | 49,657,129 |    | 48,642,500 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCC3 | U.S. Treasury Note | 7/2/2021    | 5/15/2024  | 0.25   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,718,750   |    | 49,931,029 |    | 48,222,500 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828XT2 | U.S. Treasury Note | 7/6/2021    | 5/31/2024  | 2.00   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 52,263,672   |    | 50,583,002 |    | 48,746,000 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCL3 | U.S. Treasury Note | 8/6/2021    | 7/15/2024  | 0.38   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,998,047   |    | 49,999,422 |    | 47,881,000 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCL3 | U.S. Treasury Note | 8/9/2021    | 7/15/2024  | 0.38   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,960,938   |    | 49,988,402 |    | 47,881,000 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCL3 | U.S. Treasury Note | 4/12/2022   | 7/15/2024  | 0.38   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 47,572,266   |    | 49,064,219 |    | 47,881,000 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828Y87 | U.S. Treasury Note | 3/30/2021   | 7/31/2024  | 1.75   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 52,210,938   |    | 50,605,786 |    | 48,381,000 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCT6 | U.S. Treasury Note | 8/25/2021   | 8/15/2024  | 0.38   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,898,438   |    | 49,967,362 |    | 47,681,500 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828YM6 | U.S. Treasury Note | 4/15/2021   | 10/31/2024 | 1.50   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 51,746,094   |    | 50,574,391 |    | 47,886,500 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828G38 | U.S. Treasury Note | 3/9/2021    | 11/15/2024 | 2.25   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 53,160,156   |    | 51,034,617 |    | 48,238,500 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828G38 | U.S. Treasury Note | 3/12/2021   | 11/15/2024 | 2.25   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 53,228,516   |    | 51,059,357 |    | 48,238,500 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828YY0 | U.S. Treasury Note | 3/15/2021   | 12/31/2024 | 1.75   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 52,226,563   |    | 50,781,785 |    | 47,795,000 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828Z52 | U.S. Treasury Note | 3/30/2021   | 1/31/2025  | 1.38   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 51,515,625   |    | 50,559,582 |    | 47,443,500 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828Z52 | U.S. Treasury Note | 4/15/2021   | 1/31/2025  | 1.38   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 51,507,813   |    | 50,563,120 |    | 47,443,500 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZC7 | U.S. Treasury Note | 3/15/2021   | 2/28/2025  | 1.13   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 51,011,719   |    | 50,382,018 |    | 47,156,500 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZC7 | U.S. Treasury Note | 3/31/2021   | 2/28/2025  | 1.13   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 50,998,047   |    | 50,381,072 |    | 47,156,500 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZF0 | U.S. Treasury Note | 4/15/2021   | 3/31/2025  | 0.50   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,779,297   |    | 49,911,932 |    | 46,564,500 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZF0 | U.S. Treasury Note | 4/19/2021   | 3/31/2025  | 0.50   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,839,844   |    | 49,935,915 |    | 46,564,500 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZL7 | U.S. Treasury Note | 5/18/2021   | 4/30/2025  | 0.38   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,615,234   |    | 49,838,148 |    | 46,324,000 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828XB1 | U.S. Treasury Note | 9/2/2021    | 5/15/2025  | 2.13   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 52,849,609   |    | 51,311,959 |    | 47,660,000 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | U.S. Treasury Note | 3/8/2021    | 6/30/2025  | 0.25   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,140,625   |    | 49,635,516 |    | 45,941,500 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | U.S. Treasury Note | 3/9/2021    | 6/30/2025  | 0.25   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,042,969   |    | 49,593,839 |    | 45,941,500 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | U.S. Treasury Note | 5/12/2021   | 6/30/2025  | 0.25   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,281,250   |    | 49,682,036 |    | 45,941,500 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | U.S. Treasury Note | 5/13/2021   | 6/30/2025  | 0.25   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,183,594   |    | 49,638,596 |    | 45,941,500 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | U.S. Treasury Note | 5/18/2021   | 6/30/2025  | 0.25   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,253,906   |    | 49,668,623 |    | 45,941,500 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | U.S. Treasury Note | 7/12/2021   | 6/30/2025  | 0.25   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,310,547   |    | 49,682,157 |    | 45,941,500 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | U.S. Treasury Note | 8/5/2021    | 6/30/2025  | 0.25   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,500,000   |    | 49,765,614 |    | 45,941,500 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | U.S. Treasury Note | 8/6/2021    | 6/30/2025  | 0.25   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,406,250   |    | 49,721,471 |    | 45,941,500 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | U.S. Treasury Note | 12/7/2021   | 6/30/2025  | 0.25   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 48,628,906   |    | 49,296,010 |    | 45,941,500 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAB7 | U.S. Treasury Note | 8/5/2021    | 7/31/2025  | 0.25   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,458,984   |    | 49,740,268 |    | 45,793,000 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAB7 | U.S. Treasury Note | 8/6/2021    | 7/31/2025  | 0.25   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,363,281   |    | 49,694,112 |    | 45,793,000 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CFK2 | U.S. Treasury Note | 10/7/2022   | 9/15/2025  | 3.50   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 48,968,750   |    | 49,284,654 |    | 48,691,500 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAM3 | U.S. Treasury Note | 5/12/2021   | 9/30/2025  | 0.25   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,109,375   |    | 49,577,481 |    | 45,545,000 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAM3 | U.S. Treasury Note | 7/26/2021   | 9/30/2025  | 0.25   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,281,250   |    | 49,642,272 |    | 45,545,000 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAT8 | U.S. Treasury Note | 2/25/2021   | 10/31/2025 | 0.25   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,298,828   |    | 49,675,467 |    | 45,381,000 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAT8 | U.S. Treasury Note | 3/2/2021    | 10/31/2025 | 0.25   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,078,125   |    | 49,572,064 |    | 45,381,000 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAT8 | U.S. Treasury Note | 3/4/2021    | 10/31/2025 | 0.25   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,048,828   |    | 49,557,945 |    | 45,381,000 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBC4 | U.S. Treasury Note | 2/25/2021   | 12/31/2025 | 0.38   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,455,078   |    | 49,737,699 |    | 45,297,000 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBC4 | U.S. Treasury Note | 2/26/2021   | 12/31/2025 | 0.38   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,271,484   |    | 49,649,126 |    | 45,297,000 |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBW0 | U.S. Treasury Note | 6/28/2021   | 4/30/2026  | 0.75   |           | 50,000,000    |            | 49,662,109   |    | 49,814,131 |    | 45,213,000 |

# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name                     | Settle Date | Maturity   |  | Coupon      | Par Value               | Original Cost           | Amortized               |                         |
|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|-------------|------------|--|-------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
|                    |           |                                 |             | Date       |  |             |                         |                         | Book Value              | Market Value            |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBW0 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 7/2/2021    | 4/30/2026  |  | 0.75        | 50,000,000              | 49,730,469              | 49,851,399              | 45,213,000              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828R36 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 7/23/2021   | 5/15/2026  |  | 1.63        | 50,000,000              | 52,203,125              | 51,237,612              | 46,234,500              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828R36 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 8/27/2021   | 5/15/2026  |  | 1.63        | 50,000,000              | 51,890,625              | 51,083,651              | 46,234,500              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 7/2/2021    | 6/30/2026  |  | 0.88        | 50,000,000              | 49,931,641              | 49,961,286              | 45,193,500              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 7/14/2021   | 6/30/2026  |  | 0.88        | 50,000,000              | 50,070,313              | 50,040,084              | 45,193,500              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 7/22/2021   | 6/30/2026  |  | 0.88        | 50,000,000              | 50,345,703              | 50,197,955              | 45,193,500              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 7/22/2021   | 6/30/2026  |  | 0.88        | 50,000,000              | 50,328,125              | 50,187,890              | 45,193,500              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 8/6/2021    | 6/30/2026  |  | 0.88        | 50,000,000              | 50,406,250              | 50,234,576              | 45,193,500              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 8/10/2021   | 6/30/2026  |  | 0.88        | 50,000,000              | 50,240,234              | 50,139,026              | 45,193,500              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 9/24/2021   | 6/30/2026  |  | 0.88        | 50,000,000              | 49,937,500              | 49,962,895              | 45,193,500              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 10/14/2021  | 6/30/2026  |  | 0.88        | 50,000,000              | 49,593,750              | 49,756,014              | 45,193,500              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 1/4/2022    | 6/30/2026  |  | 0.88        | 50,000,000              | 49,027,344              | 49,386,597              | 45,193,500              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCW9 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 9/28/2021   | 8/31/2026  |  | 0.75        | 50,000,000              | 49,449,219              | 49,664,569              | 44,758,000              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCZ2 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 10/8/2021   | 9/30/2026  |  | 0.88        | 50,000,000              | 49,689,453              | 49,807,830              | 44,861,500              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCZ2 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 10/8/2021   | 9/30/2026  |  | 0.88        | 50,000,000              | 49,671,875              | 49,796,952              | 44,861,500              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCZ2 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 10/19/2021  | 9/30/2026  |  | 0.88        | 50,000,000              | 49,318,359              | 49,575,625              | 44,861,500              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDK4 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 12/3/2021   | 11/30/2026 |  | 1.25        | 50,000,000              | 50,072,266              | 50,047,014              | 45,150,500              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDK4 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 12/7/2021   | 11/30/2026 |  | 1.25        | 50,000,000              | 50,117,188              | 50,076,407              | 45,150,500              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDK4 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 3/29/2022   | 11/30/2026 |  | 1.25        | 50,000,000              | 47,078,125              | 47,969,922              | 45,150,500              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDQ1 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 3/29/2022   | 12/31/2026 |  | 1.25        | 50,000,000              | 47,107,422              | 47,974,530              | 45,086,000              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CEF4 | U.S. Treasury Note              | 4/6/2022    | 3/31/2027  |  | 2.50        | 25,000,000              | 24,757,813              | 24,826,077              | 23,422,750              |
| <b>Subtotals</b>   |           |                                 |             |            |  | <b>0.90</b> | <b>\$ 3,525,000,000</b> | <b>\$ 3,523,877,485</b> | <b>\$ 3,520,123,490</b> | <b>\$ 3,292,257,750</b> |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384LJ6 | Federal Home Loan Bank DN       | 11/7/2022   | 9/6/2023   |  | 0.00        | \$ 50,000,000           | \$ 48,055,750           | \$ 49,967,917           | \$ 49,964,500           |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AJXD6 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 12/14/2021  | 9/8/2023   |  | 0.13        | 20,975,000              | 20,806,361              | 20,973,135              | 20,954,445              |
| Federal Agencies   | 313383YJ4 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 7/27/2022   | 9/8/2023   |  | 3.38        | 25,000,000              | 25,071,750              | 25,001,231              | 24,990,000              |
| Federal Agencies   | 313383YJ4 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 7/27/2022   | 9/8/2023   |  | 3.38        | 25,000,000              | 25,070,000              | 25,001,201              | 24,990,000              |
| Federal Agencies   | 313383YJ4 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 7/28/2022   | 9/8/2023   |  | 3.38        | 40,000,000              | 40,102,000              | 40,001,754              | 39,984,000              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3135G0U43 | Federal National Mortgage Assoc | 12/9/2021   | 9/12/2023  |  | 2.88        | 29,648,000              | 30,793,302              | 29,667,624              | 29,624,578              |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384LR8 | Federal Home Loan Bank DN       | 5/26/2023   | 9/13/2023  |  | 0.00        | 25,000,000              | 24,602,778              | 24,956,667              | 24,957,500              |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384LY3 | Federal Home Loan Bank DN       | 4/21/2023   | 9/20/2023  |  | 0.00        | 50,000,000              | 48,969,778              | 49,871,222              | 49,865,500              |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384MD8 | Federal Home Loan Bank DN       | 4/24/2023   | 9/25/2023  |  | 0.00        | 25,000,000              | 24,475,438              | 24,918,250              | 24,915,000              |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384MD8 | Federal Home Loan Bank DN       | 4/24/2023   | 9/25/2023  |  | 0.00        | 25,000,000              | 24,475,438              | 24,918,250              | 24,915,000              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EM6N7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 9/27/2021   | 9/27/2023  |  | 0.17        | 50,000,000              | 49,950,000              | 49,998,219              | 49,811,500              |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384MH9 | Federal Home Loan Bank DN       | 4/20/2023   | 9/29/2023  |  | 0.00        | 25,000,000              | 24,448,750              | 24,904,722              | 24,900,750              |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384MH9 | Federal Home Loan Bank DN       | 4/20/2023   | 9/29/2023  |  | 0.00        | 25,000,000              | 24,448,750              | 24,904,722              | 24,900,750              |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384MQ9 | Federal Home Loan Bank DN       | 4/24/2023   | 10/6/2023  |  | 0.00        | 30,000,000              | 29,326,250              | 29,857,083              | 29,850,300              |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384MQ9 | Federal Home Loan Bank DN       | 4/24/2023   | 10/6/2023  |  | 0.00        | 36,000,000              | 35,191,500              | 35,828,500              | 35,820,360              |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384MV8 | Federal Home Loan Bank DN       | 5/5/2023    | 10/11/2023 |  | 0.00        | 25,000,000              | 24,456,750              | 24,863,333              | 24,857,500              |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384MV8 | Federal Home Loan Bank DN       | 5/5/2023    | 10/11/2023 |  | 0.00        | 25,000,000              | 24,456,750              | 24,863,333              | 24,857,500              |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384MV8 | Federal Home Loan Bank DN       | 4/12/2023   | 10/11/2023 |  | 0.00        | 40,000,000              | 39,029,333              | 39,786,667              | 39,772,000              |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384MV8 | Federal Home Loan Bank DN       | 4/12/2023   | 10/11/2023 |  | 0.00        | 60,000,000              | 58,544,000              | 59,680,000              | 59,658,000              |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384NE5 | Federal Home Loan Bank DN       | 4/21/2023   | 10/20/2023 |  | 0.00        | 35,000,000              | 34,132,972              | 34,766,569              | 34,755,700              |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384NE5 | Federal Home Loan Bank DN       | 6/6/2023    | 10/20/2023 |  | 0.00        | 40,613,000              | 39,807,509              | 40,322,786              | 40,329,521              |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384NE5 | Federal Home Loan Bank DN       | 4/21/2023   | 10/20/2023 |  | 0.00        | 54,113,000              | 52,772,501              | 53,752,096              | 53,735,291              |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384NK1 | Federal Home Loan Bank DN       | 6/21/2023   | 10/25/2023 |  | 0.00        | 43,944,000              | 43,154,216              | 43,605,521              | 43,606,071              |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384NX3 | Federal Home Loan Bank DN       | 6/20/2023   | 11/6/2023  |  | 0.00        | 50,000,000              | 49,008,660              | 49,529,292              | 49,529,000              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENGf1 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 12/3/2021   | 12/1/2023  |  | 0.50        | 25,000,000              | 24,963,750              | 24,995,469              | 24,685,500              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENGf1 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 12/3/2021   | 12/1/2023  |  | 0.50        | 25,000,000              | 24,963,750              | 24,995,469              | 24,685,500              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENGf1 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 12/3/2021   | 12/1/2023  |  | 0.50        | 75,000,000              | 74,891,250              | 74,986,406              | 74,056,500              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130A3VC5 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 12/10/2021  | 12/8/2023  |  | 2.25        | 10,000,000              | 10,301,000              | 10,040,519              | 9,908,900               |

# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name               | Settle Date | Maturity   | Coupon | Par Value   | Original Cost | Amortized  | Market Value |
|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------|-------------|------------|--------|-------------|---------------|------------|--------------|
|                    |           |                           |             | Date       |        |             |               | Book Value |              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130A3VC5 | Federal Home Loan Bank    | 12/10/2021  | 12/8/2023  | 2.25   | 30,000,000  | 30,903,000    | 30,121,558 | 29,726,700   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENHR4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 12/20/2021  | 12/20/2023 | 0.68   | 25,000,000  | 24,987,600    | 24,998,132 | 24,643,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENHR4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 12/20/2021  | 12/20/2023 | 0.68   | 25,000,000  | 24,988,000    | 24,998,192 | 24,643,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENHR4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 12/20/2021  | 12/20/2023 | 0.68   | 62,000,000  | 61,970,488    | 61,995,553 | 61,114,640   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AU4V3 | Federal Home Loan Bank    | 12/8/2022   | 1/8/2024   | 4.80   | 11,000,000  | 10,998,900    | 10,999,642 | 10,966,340   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AU4V3 | Federal Home Loan Bank    | 12/8/2022   | 1/8/2024   | 4.80   | 25,000,000  | 24,987,500    | 24,995,928 | 24,923,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENLF5 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 3/3/2022    | 1/18/2024  | 0.90   | 11,856,000  | 11,738,815    | 11,832,256 | 11,648,757   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENLF5 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 2/1/2022    | 1/18/2024  | 0.90   | 50,000,000  | 49,701,000    | 49,941,954 | 49,126,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384ST7 | Federal Home Loan Bank DN | 4/21/2023   | 2/6/2024   | 0.00   | 10,650,000  | 10,236,780    | 10,425,640 | 10,409,204   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AFW94 | Federal Home Loan Bank    | 11/12/2021  | 2/13/2024  | 2.50   | 39,010,000  | 40,648,810    | 39,338,559 | 38,483,755   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ELNE0 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 3/18/2020   | 2/14/2024  | 1.43   | 20,495,000  | 20,950,604    | 20,547,962 | 20,134,288   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AUYG3 | Federal Home Loan Bank    | 2/16/2023   | 2/16/2024  | 5.10   | 25,000,000  | 24,996,500    | 24,998,389 | 24,946,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMRZ7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 2/26/2021   | 2/26/2024  | 0.25   | 5,000,000   | 4,998,200     | 4,999,707  | 4,876,650    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMRZ7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 2/26/2021   | 2/26/2024  | 0.25   | 5,000,000   | 4,998,200     | 4,999,707  | 4,876,650    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMRZ7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 2/26/2021   | 2/26/2024  | 0.25   | 100,000,000 | 99,964,000    | 99,994,148 | 97,533,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARHG9 | Federal Home Loan Bank    | 3/25/2022   | 2/28/2024  | 2.13   | 11,000,000  | 10,987,460    | 10,996,798 | 10,826,310   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARHG9 | Federal Home Loan Bank    | 3/25/2022   | 2/28/2024  | 2.13   | 25,000,000  | 24,971,500    | 24,992,723 | 24,605,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATUQ8 | Federal Home Loan Bank    | 11/15/2022  | 3/8/2024   | 4.75   | 10,000,000  | 10,013,300    | 10,005,248 | 9,965,400    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATUQ8 | Federal Home Loan Bank    | 11/18/2022  | 3/8/2024   | 4.75   | 20,000,000  | 20,000,800    | 20,000,318 | 19,930,800   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATUQ8 | Federal Home Loan Bank    | 12/8/2022   | 3/8/2024   | 4.75   | 25,000,000  | 24,982,000    | 24,992,539 | 24,913,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATUQ8 | Federal Home Loan Bank    | 11/18/2022  | 3/8/2024   | 4.75   | 30,000,000  | 30,001,800    | 30,000,715 | 29,896,200   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATUQ8 | Federal Home Loan Bank    | 12/8/2022   | 3/8/2024   | 4.75   | 30,000,000  | 29,978,400    | 29,991,047 | 29,896,200   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMTW2 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 3/18/2021   | 3/18/2024  | 0.30   | 50,000,000  | 49,939,500    | 49,989,015 | 48,657,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMTW2 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 3/18/2021   | 3/18/2024  | 0.30   | 50,000,000  | 49,939,450    | 49,989,006 | 48,657,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMWV0 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 5/4/2021    | 4/22/2024  | 0.35   | 16,545,000  | 16,549,633    | 16,546,000 | 16,023,998   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMWV0 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 5/4/2021    | 4/22/2024  | 0.35   | 29,424,000  | 29,432,239    | 29,425,778 | 28,497,438   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMWV0 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 5/4/2021    | 4/22/2024  | 0.35   | 39,000,000  | 39,010,920    | 39,002,357 | 37,771,890   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENWP1 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 5/16/2022   | 5/16/2024  | 2.63   | 45,000,000  | 44,939,250    | 44,978,559 | 44,174,700   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENWP1 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 5/16/2022   | 5/16/2024  | 2.63   | 50,000,000  | 49,932,500    | 49,976,176 | 49,083,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENYH7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 6/10/2022   | 6/10/2024  | 2.63   | 100,000,000 | 99,871,000    | 99,950,059 | 97,810,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130A1XJ2 | Federal Home Loan Bank    | 5/18/2022   | 6/14/2024  | 2.88   | 15,955,000  | 16,008,449    | 15,975,237 | 15,654,408   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130A1XJ2 | Federal Home Loan Bank    | 5/18/2022   | 6/14/2024  | 2.88   | 17,980,000  | 18,043,829    | 18,004,167 | 17,641,257   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130A1XJ2 | Federal Home Loan Bank    | 5/12/2022   | 6/14/2024  | 2.88   | 25,500,000  | 25,552,530    | 25,519,733 | 25,019,580   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130A1XJ2 | Federal Home Loan Bank    | 5/16/2022   | 6/14/2024  | 2.88   | 50,000,000  | 50,204,000    | 50,077,037 | 49,058,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASHK8 | Federal Home Loan Bank    | 7/22/2022   | 6/14/2024  | 3.13   | 28,000,000  | 27,904,520    | 27,960,458 | 27,515,600   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASHK8 | Federal Home Loan Bank    | 7/22/2022   | 6/14/2024  | 3.13   | 28,210,000  | 28,114,932    | 28,170,629 | 27,721,967   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENYX2 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 6/17/2022   | 6/17/2024  | 3.25   | 25,000,000  | 24,970,500    | 24,988,297 | 24,583,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENYX2 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 6/17/2022   | 6/17/2024  | 3.25   | 25,000,000  | 24,970,750    | 24,988,396 | 24,583,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENYX2 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 6/17/2022   | 6/17/2024  | 3.25   | 50,000,000  | 49,970,000    | 49,988,098 | 49,166,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENZS2 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 6/28/2022   | 6/28/2024  | 3.10   | 25,000,000  | 24,987,500    | 24,994,853 | 24,547,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENZS2 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 6/28/2022   | 6/28/2024  | 3.10   | 25,000,000  | 24,986,500    | 24,994,441 | 24,547,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENZS2 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 6/28/2022   | 6/28/2024  | 3.10   | 50,000,000  | 49,973,000    | 49,988,882 | 49,095,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASME6 | Federal Home Loan Bank    | 7/8/2022    | 7/8/2024   | 3.00   | 10,000,000  | 9,980,600     | 9,991,746  | 9,795,900    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASME6 | Federal Home Loan Bank    | 7/8/2022    | 7/8/2024   | 3.00   | 15,000,000  | 14,970,900    | 14,987,620 | 14,693,850   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASME6 | Federal Home Loan Bank    | 7/8/2022    | 7/8/2024   | 3.00   | 17,500,000  | 17,466,050    | 17,485,556 | 17,142,825   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWFH8 | Federal Home Loan Bank    | 6/13/2023   | 7/12/2024  | 5.51   | 50,000,000  | 50,000,000    | 50,000,000 | 49,842,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMV25 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 8/6/2021    | 7/23/2024  | 0.45   | 50,000,000  | 50,092,000    | 50,027,719 | 47,898,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPBF1 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 2/21/2023   | 8/21/2024  | 4.88   | 10,000,000  | 9,995,700     | 9,997,209  | 9,948,900    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPBF1 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 2/21/2023   | 8/21/2024  | 4.88   | 20,000,000  | 19,992,000    | 19,994,808 | 19,897,800   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPBF1 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 2/21/2023   | 8/21/2024  | 4.88   | 25,000,000  | 24,990,000    | 24,993,510 | 24,872,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENJ84 | Federal Farm Credit Bank  | 8/26/2022   | 8/26/2024  | 3.38   | 50,000,000  | 49,916,500    | 49,958,878 | 49,014,000   |



# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name                     | Settle Date | Maturity   |  | Coupon | Par Value  | Original Cost | Amortized  |              |
|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|-------------|------------|--|--------|------------|---------------|------------|--------------|
|                    |           |                                 |             | Date       |  |        |            |               | Book Value | Market Value |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATVD6 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 11/10/2022  | 9/13/2024  |  | 4.88   | 50,000,000 | 50,062,000    | 50,034,823 | 49,783,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EM5X6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 9/23/2021   | 9/23/2024  |  | 0.43   | 25,000,000 | 24,974,750    | 24,971,061 | 23,759,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EM5X6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 9/23/2021   | 9/23/2024  |  | 0.43   | 50,000,000 | 49,949,500    | 49,982,122 | 47,518,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EM5X6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 9/23/2021   | 9/23/2024  |  | 0.43   | 50,000,000 | 49,949,500    | 49,982,122 | 47,518,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENP79 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 9/26/2022   | 9/26/2024  |  | 4.25   | 50,000,000 | 49,996,000    | 49,997,860 | 49,452,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATT31 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 11/1/2022   | 10/3/2024  |  | 4.50   | 50,000,000 | 49,860,500    | 49,920,910 | 49,554,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3135GAFY2 | Federal National Mortgage Assoc | 4/3/2023    | 10/3/2024  |  | 5.32   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 24,881,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3135GAFY2 | Federal National Mortgage Assoc | 4/3/2023    | 10/3/2024  |  | 5.32   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 24,881,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3135GAFY2 | Federal National Mortgage Assoc | 4/3/2023    | 10/3/2024  |  | 5.32   | 50,000,000 | 50,000,000    | 50,000,000 | 49,763,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPHD0 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 4/28/2023   | 10/28/2024 |  | 4.50   | 20,000,000 | 19,968,400    | 19,975,652 | 19,799,200   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPHD0 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 4/28/2023   | 10/28/2024 |  | 4.50   | 25,000,000 | 24,959,000    | 24,968,410 | 24,749,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENEJ5 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 11/18/2021  | 11/18/2024 |  | 0.88   | 10,000,000 | 9,988,500     | 9,995,341  | 9,485,700    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENEJ5 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 11/18/2021  | 11/18/2024 |  | 0.88   | 10,000,000 | 9,988,500     | 9,995,341  | 9,485,700    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENEJ5 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 11/18/2021  | 11/18/2024 |  | 0.88   | 50,000,000 | 49,942,500    | 49,976,706 | 47,428,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENZ94 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 11/18/2022  | 11/18/2024 |  | 4.50   | 25,000,000 | 24,973,500    | 24,983,904 | 24,799,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ELCP7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 12/3/2019   | 12/3/2024  |  | 1.63   | 25,000,000 | 24,960,000    | 24,989,951 | 23,916,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENGQ7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 12/9/2021   | 12/9/2024  |  | 0.92   | 50,000,000 | 49,985,000    | 49,993,636 | 47,151,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENGQ7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 12/9/2021   | 12/9/2024  |  | 0.92   | 50,000,000 | 49,963,000    | 49,984,302 | 47,151,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN4N7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 12/20/2022  | 12/20/2024 |  | 4.25   | 10,000,000 | 9,982,900     | 9,988,865  | 9,873,700    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN4N7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 12/20/2022  | 12/20/2024 |  | 4.25   | 25,000,000 | 24,954,500    | 24,970,372 | 24,684,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN4N7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 12/20/2022  | 12/20/2024 |  | 4.25   | 25,000,000 | 24,954,500    | 24,970,372 | 24,684,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3135GAG39 | Federal National Mortgage Assoc | 3/30/2023   | 12/30/2024 |  | 5.38   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 24,857,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3135GAG39 | Federal National Mortgage Assoc | 3/30/2023   | 12/30/2024 |  | 5.38   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 24,857,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3135GAG39 | Federal National Mortgage Assoc | 3/30/2023   | 12/30/2024 |  | 5.38   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 24,857,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3135GAG39 | Federal National Mortgage Assoc | 3/30/2023   | 12/30/2024 |  | 5.38   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 24,857,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENKS8 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 1/11/2022   | 1/6/2025   |  | 1.13   | 20,000,000 | 19,955,000    | 19,979,665 | 18,929,400   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENKS8 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 1/11/2022   | 1/6/2025   |  | 1.13   | 25,000,000 | 24,943,750    | 24,974,582 | 23,661,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENKS8 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 1/11/2022   | 1/6/2025   |  | 1.13   | 25,000,000 | 24,943,750    | 24,974,582 | 23,661,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3135G0X24 | Federal National Mortgage Assoc | 4/21/2021   | 1/7/2025   |  | 1.63   | 39,060,000 | 40,632,556    | 39,632,470 | 37,276,520   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENZ37 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 11/10/2022  | 1/10/2025  |  | 4.88   | 10,000,000 | 9,999,400     | 9,999,623  | 9,947,500    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENZ37 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 11/10/2022  | 1/10/2025  |  | 4.88   | 20,000,000 | 19,998,800    | 19,999,247 | 19,895,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENZ37 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 11/10/2022  | 1/10/2025  |  | 4.88   | 20,000,000 | 19,999,580    | 19,999,736 | 19,895,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPAG0 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 2/10/2023   | 2/10/2025  |  | 4.25   | 10,000,000 | 9,947,200     | 9,961,863  | 9,863,100    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPAG0 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 2/10/2023   | 2/10/2025  |  | 4.25   | 29,875,000 | 29,716,065    | 29,760,202 | 29,466,011   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3137EAEP0 | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp | 2/14/2020   | 2/12/2025  |  | 1.50   | 5,000,000  | 4,996,150     | 4,998,882  | 4,747,150    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3137EAEP0 | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp | 2/14/2020   | 2/12/2025  |  | 1.50   | 5,000,000  | 4,996,150     | 4,998,882  | 4,747,150    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3137EAEP0 | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp | 2/14/2020   | 2/12/2025  |  | 1.50   | 5,000,000  | 4,996,150     | 4,998,882  | 4,747,150    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3137EAEP0 | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp | 2/14/2020   | 2/12/2025  |  | 1.50   | 15,000,000 | 14,988,450    | 14,996,646 | 14,241,450   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3137EAEP0 | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp | 2/14/2020   | 2/12/2025  |  | 1.50   | 50,000,000 | 49,961,500    | 49,988,819 | 47,471,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3137EAEP0 | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp | 4/21/2021   | 2/12/2025  |  | 1.50   | 53,532,000 | 55,450,052    | 54,261,768 | 50,824,887   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AUVZ4 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 2/13/2023   | 2/13/2025  |  | 4.50   | 50,000,000 | 49,921,500    | 49,942,977 | 49,542,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AV7L0 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 3/3/2023    | 2/28/2025  |  | 5.00   | 25,000,000 | 24,967,000    | 24,975,250 | 24,990,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AV7L0 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 3/3/2023    | 2/28/2025  |  | 5.00   | 35,000,000 | 34,953,800    | 34,965,350 | 34,986,350   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ELQY3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 3/23/2020   | 3/3/2025   |  | 1.21   | 16,000,000 | 15,990,720    | 15,997,179 | 15,080,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ELQY3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 3/23/2020   | 3/3/2025   |  | 1.21   | 24,000,000 | 23,964,240    | 23,989,129 | 22,620,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMWT5 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 4/21/2021   | 4/21/2025  |  | 0.60   | 50,000,000 | 49,973,500    | 49,989,153 | 46,443,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3135G03U5 | Federal National Mortgage Assoc | 12/8/2021   | 4/22/2025  |  | 0.63   | 37,938,000 | 37,367,792    | 37,660,539 | 35,330,521   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3135G03U5 | Federal National Mortgage Assoc | 7/12/2021   | 4/22/2025  |  | 0.63   | 50,000,000 | 50,108,000    | 50,046,878 | 46,563,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3135G03U5 | Federal National Mortgage Assoc | 12/8/2021   | 4/22/2025  |  | 0.63   | 50,000,000 | 49,243,950    | 49,632,109 | 46,563,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENXE5 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 5/23/2022   | 5/23/2025  |  | 2.85   | 6,000,000  | 5,991,600     | 5,995,172  | 5,776,380    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENXE5 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 5/23/2022   | 5/23/2025  |  | 2.85   | 20,000,000 | 19,972,000    | 19,983,905 | 19,254,600   |

# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name                     | Settle Date | Maturity   |  | Coupon | Par Value  | Original Cost | Amortized  |              |
|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|-------------|------------|--|--------|------------|---------------|------------|--------------|
|                    |           |                                 |             | Date       |  |        |            |               | Book Value | Market Value |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWER7 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 6/12/2023   | 6/6/2025   |  | 4.63   | 10,000,000 | 9,991,700     | 9,992,627  | 9,923,700    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWER7 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 6/12/2023   | 6/6/2025   |  | 4.63   | 15,000,000 | 14,987,550    | 14,988,941 | 14,885,550   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWER7 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 6/12/2023   | 6/6/2025   |  | 4.63   | 25,000,000 | 24,979,250    | 24,981,568 | 24,809,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWER7 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 6/12/2023   | 6/6/2025   |  | 4.63   | 52,000,000 | 51,956,840    | 51,961,662 | 51,603,240   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASG86 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 8/4/2022    | 6/13/2025  |  | 3.38   | 11,940,000 | 12,000,178    | 11,977,525 | 11,601,620   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASG86 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 8/3/2022    | 6/13/2025  |  | 3.38   | 12,700,000 | 12,806,045    | 12,766,062 | 12,340,082   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATST5 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 5/10/2023   | 6/13/2025  |  | 4.38   | 3,000,000  | 3,012,270     | 3,010,442  | 2,965,470    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATST5 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 5/8/2023    | 6/13/2025  |  | 4.38   | 9,915,000  | 9,975,878     | 9,966,671  | 9,800,878    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATST5 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 5/8/2023    | 6/13/2025  |  | 4.38   | 10,000,000 | 10,065,000    | 10,055,169 | 9,884,900    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATST5 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 5/11/2023   | 6/13/2025  |  | 4.38   | 10,000,000 | 10,036,000    | 10,030,675 | 9,884,900    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATST5 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 5/17/2023   | 6/13/2025  |  | 4.38   | 24,000,000 | 24,079,440    | 24,068,226 | 23,723,760   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATST5 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 5/9/2023    | 6/13/2025  |  | 4.38   | 25,500,000 | 25,624,695    | 25,605,974 | 25,206,495   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWLY4 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 7/25/2023   | 6/13/2025  |  | 5.13   | 10,800,000 | 10,818,036    | 10,817,041 | 10,812,636   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWLY4 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 7/25/2023   | 6/13/2025  |  | 5.13   | 48,150,000 | 48,241,967    | 48,236,894 | 48,206,336   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN4B3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 12/13/2022  | 6/13/2025  |  | 4.25   | 15,000,000 | 14,988,383    | 14,991,716 | 14,770,950   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN4B3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 12/13/2022  | 6/13/2025  |  | 4.25   | 15,000,000 | 14,989,800    | 14,992,727 | 14,770,950   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN4B3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 12/13/2022  | 6/13/2025  |  | 4.25   | 15,000,000 | 14,989,050    | 14,992,192 | 14,770,950   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENYQ7 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 6/13/2022   | 6/13/2025  |  | 2.95   | 50,000,000 | 49,975,500    | 49,985,448 | 48,289,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3135G04Z3 | Federal National Mortgage Assoc | 12/8/2021   | 6/17/2025  |  | 0.50   | 4,655,000  | 4,556,640     | 4,604,941  | 4,301,080    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3135G04Z3 | Federal National Mortgage Assoc | 12/8/2021   | 6/17/2025  |  | 0.50   | 10,000,000 | 9,789,600     | 9,892,920  | 9,239,700    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AN4A5 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 7/12/2021   | 6/30/2025  |  | 0.70   | 17,680,000 | 17,734,631    | 17,705,185 | 16,341,624   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPKA2 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 5/18/2023   | 8/18/2025  |  | 4.00   | 25,000,000 | 24,982,000    | 24,984,318 | 24,571,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPKA2 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 5/18/2023   | 8/18/2025  |  | 4.00   | 26,500,000 | 26,483,835    | 26,485,917 | 26,045,260   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPKA2 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 5/18/2023   | 8/18/2025  |  | 4.00   | 30,000,000 | 29,981,700    | 29,984,057 | 29,485,200   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3135G05X7 | Federal National Mortgage Assoc | 3/4/2021    | 8/25/2025  |  | 0.38   | 25,000,000 | 24,684,250    | 24,860,182 | 22,850,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3135G05X7 | Federal National Mortgage Assoc | 2/25/2021   | 8/25/2025  |  | 0.38   | 72,500,000 | 71,862,000    | 72,218,689 | 66,267,175   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130A8ZQ9 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 11/2/2021   | 9/12/2025  |  | 1.75   | 10,295,000 | 10,575,333    | 10,442,523 | 9,662,475    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3137EAEX3 | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp | 3/4/2021    | 9/23/2025  |  | 0.38   | 22,600,000 | 22,295,352    | 22,462,139 | 20,612,330   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPDL6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 3/15/2023   | 10/1/2025  |  | 4.85   | 50,000,000 | 50,000,000    | 50,000,000 | 49,857,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENEG1 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 11/17/2021  | 11/17/2025 |  | 1.05   | 39,675,000 | 39,622,232    | 39,645,817 | 36,489,098   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENEG1 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 11/17/2021  | 11/17/2025 |  | 1.05   | 55,000,000 | 54,923,000    | 54,957,415 | 50,583,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENHM5 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 12/16/2021  | 12/16/2025 |  | 1.17   | 45,000,000 | 44,954,100    | 44,973,704 | 41,468,850   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENHM5 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 12/16/2021  | 12/16/2025 |  | 1.17   | 50,000,000 | 49,949,000    | 49,970,782 | 46,076,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN5E6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 12/29/2022  | 12/29/2025 |  | 4.00   | 15,000,000 | 14,954,700    | 14,964,868 | 14,741,100   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN5E6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 12/29/2022  | 12/29/2025 |  | 4.00   | 20,000,000 | 19,939,600    | 19,953,157 | 19,654,800   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN5E6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 12/29/2022  | 12/29/2025 |  | 4.00   | 25,000,000 | 24,923,750    | 24,940,865 | 24,568,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN6A3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 1/13/2023   | 1/13/2026  |  | 4.00   | 20,000,000 | 19,982,400    | 19,986,109 | 19,653,800   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN6A3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 1/13/2023   | 1/13/2026  |  | 4.00   | 30,000,000 | 29,977,200    | 29,982,005 | 29,480,700   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AUTC8 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 2/9/2023    | 2/6/2026   |  | 4.01   | 21,100,000 | 20,985,427    | 21,006,811 | 20,681,376   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPJX4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 5/17/2023   | 2/17/2026  |  | 3.63   | 25,000,000 | 24,928,500    | 24,936,097 | 24,333,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPJX4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 5/17/2023   | 2/17/2026  |  | 3.63   | 30,000,000 | 29,905,500    | 29,915,541 | 29,199,900   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPBJ3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 2/23/2023   | 2/23/2026  |  | 4.38   | 25,000,000 | 24,953,500    | 24,961,561 | 24,779,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPBJ3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 2/23/2023   | 2/23/2026  |  | 4.38   | 28,000,000 | 27,954,080    | 27,962,041 | 27,753,320   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPBJ3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 2/23/2023   | 2/23/2026  |  | 4.38   | 50,000,000 | 49,918,000    | 49,932,215 | 49,559,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENJ35 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 8/25/2022   | 2/25/2026  |  | 3.32   | 35,000,000 | 34,957,650    | 34,969,958 | 33,789,350   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMZ21 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 8/9/2021    | 4/6/2026   |  | 0.69   | 15,500,000 | 15,458,150    | 15,476,676 | 13,983,015   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENUD0 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 4/8/2022    | 4/8/2026   |  | 2.64   | 20,000,000 | 19,961,200    | 19,974,771 | 18,940,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENUD0 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 4/8/2022    | 4/8/2026   |  | 2.64   | 30,000,000 | 29,941,800    | 29,962,156 | 28,410,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AVWS7 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 5/10/2023   | 6/12/2026  |  | 3.75   | 17,045,000 | 16,991,479    | 16,996,883 | 16,646,317   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AVWS7 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 5/17/2023   | 6/12/2026  |  | 3.75   | 20,000,000 | 19,939,200    | 19,944,998 | 19,532,200   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWAH3 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 6/1/2023    | 6/12/2026  |  | 4.00   | 10,000,000 | 9,934,300     | 9,939,760  | 9,830,800    |



# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name                     | Settle Date | Maturity   |  | Coupon | Par Value  | Original Cost | Amortized  | Market Value |
|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|-------------|------------|--|--------|------------|---------------|------------|--------------|
|                    |           |                                 |             | Date       |  |        |            |               | Book Value |              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWAH3 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 6/1/2023    | 6/12/2026  |  | 4.00   | 15,000,000 | 14,899,350    | 14,907,715 | 14,746,200   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWLZ1 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 7/10/2023   | 6/12/2026  |  | 4.75   | 50,000,000 | 49,856,000    | 49,863,146 | 50,134,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPMU6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 6/15/2023   | 6/15/2026  |  | 4.25   | 20,000,000 | 19,969,200    | 19,971,392 | 19,779,400   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPMU6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 6/15/2023   | 6/15/2026  |  | 4.25   | 24,700,000 | 24,640,226    | 24,644,480 | 24,427,559   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPMU6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 6/15/2023   | 6/15/2026  |  | 4.25   | 30,000,000 | 29,951,400    | 29,954,859 | 29,669,100   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPNG6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 6/23/2023   | 6/23/2026  |  | 4.38   | 25,000,000 | 24,986,750    | 24,987,596 | 24,825,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPNG6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 6/23/2023   | 6/23/2026  |  | 4.38   | 25,000,000 | 24,986,750    | 24,987,596 | 24,825,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPNG6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 6/23/2023   | 6/23/2026  |  | 4.38   | 50,000,000 | 49,973,500    | 49,975,193 | 49,651,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANNM8 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 8/19/2021   | 7/13/2026  |  | 1.05   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,453,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANNM8 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 8/19/2021   | 7/13/2026  |  | 1.05   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,453,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANNM8 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 8/19/2021   | 7/13/2026  |  | 1.05   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,453,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANNM8 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 8/19/2021   | 7/13/2026  |  | 1.05   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,453,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANMP2 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 8/20/2021   | 7/27/2026  |  | 1.07   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,441,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANMP2 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 8/20/2021   | 7/27/2026  |  | 1.07   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,441,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANMP2 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 8/20/2021   | 7/27/2026  |  | 1.07   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,441,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANMP2 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 8/20/2021   | 7/27/2026  |  | 1.07   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,441,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANTG5 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 9/13/2021   | 8/10/2026  |  | 1.05   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,398,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANTG5 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 9/13/2021   | 8/10/2026  |  | 1.05   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,398,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANTG5 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 9/13/2021   | 8/10/2026  |  | 1.05   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,398,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANTG5 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 9/13/2021   | 8/10/2026  |  | 1.05   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,398,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPSW6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 8/14/2023   | 8/14/2026  |  | 4.50   | 50,000,000 | 49,885,000    | 49,886,889 | 49,817,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AP6T7 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 10/1/2021   | 9/3/2026   |  | 1.08   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,370,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AP6T7 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 10/1/2021   | 9/3/2026   |  | 1.08   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,370,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AP6T7 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 10/1/2021   | 9/3/2026   |  | 1.08   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,370,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130APPR0 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 11/18/2021  | 10/19/2026 |  | 1.43   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,565,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130APPR0 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 11/18/2021  | 10/19/2026 |  | 1.43   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,565,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130APPR0 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 11/18/2021  | 10/19/2026 |  | 1.43   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,565,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130APPR0 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 11/18/2021  | 10/19/2026 |  | 1.43   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,565,000   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3134GYRY0 | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp | 5/9/2023    | 11/2/2026  |  | 5.29   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 24,736,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3134GYRY0 | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp | 5/9/2023    | 11/2/2026  |  | 5.29   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 24,736,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3134GYRY0 | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp | 5/9/2023    | 11/2/2026  |  | 5.29   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 24,736,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3134GYRY0 | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp | 5/9/2023    | 11/2/2026  |  | 5.29   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 24,736,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQ7L1 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 12/16/2021  | 11/16/2026 |  | 1.61   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,674,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQ7L1 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 12/16/2021  | 11/16/2026 |  | 1.61   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,674,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQ7L1 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 12/16/2021  | 11/16/2026 |  | 1.61   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,674,750   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQJ95 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 1/14/2022   | 12/14/2026 |  | 1.65   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,661,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQJ95 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 1/14/2022   | 12/14/2026 |  | 1.65   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,661,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQJ95 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 1/14/2022   | 12/14/2026 |  | 1.65   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,661,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQJ95 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 1/14/2022   | 12/14/2026 |  | 1.65   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 22,661,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARB59 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 3/22/2022   | 3/8/2027   |  | 2.35   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 23,013,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARB59 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 3/22/2022   | 3/8/2027   |  | 2.35   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 23,013,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARB59 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 3/22/2022   | 3/8/2027   |  | 2.35   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 23,013,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARB59 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 3/22/2022   | 3/8/2027   |  | 2.35   | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000    | 25,000,000 | 23,013,500   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENRD4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 3/16/2022   | 3/10/2027  |  | 1.68   | 48,573,000 | 47,432,020    | 47,766,791 | 44,019,281   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENTS9 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 4/6/2022    | 4/5/2027   |  | 2.60   | 22,500,000 | 22,392,338    | 22,422,601 | 21,035,925   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENTS9 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 4/6/2022    | 4/5/2027   |  | 2.60   | 24,500,000 | 24,377,010    | 24,411,582 | 22,905,785   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENTS9 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 4/6/2022    | 4/5/2027   |  | 2.60   | 25,000,000 | 24,804,000    | 24,859,095 | 23,373,250   |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN2L3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 11/17/2022  | 5/17/2027  |  | 4.13   | 4,650,000  | 4,646,792     | 4,647,354  | 4,579,739    |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN2L3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 11/17/2022  | 5/17/2027  |  | 4.13   | 5,000,000  | 4,996,550     | 4,997,155  | 4,924,450    |

# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment   | CUSIP     | Issuer Name                     | Settle Date | Maturity   |  | Coupon      | Par Value               | Original Cost           | Amortized               |                         |
|----------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|-------------|------------|--|-------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
|                      |           |                                 |             | Date       |  |             |                         |                         | Book Value              | Market Value            |
| Federal Agencies     | 3133EN2L3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 11/17/2022  | 5/17/2027  |  | 4.13        | 21,000,000              | 20,987,001              | 20,989,281              | 20,682,690              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3133EN2L3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 11/17/2022  | 5/17/2027  |  | 4.13        | 25,000,000              | 24,982,750              | 24,985,776              | 24,622,250              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3130ASGU7 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 7/19/2022   | 6/11/2027  |  | 3.50        | 10,000,000              | 10,141,500              | 10,109,132              | 9,636,400               |
| Federal Agencies     | 3130ASGU7 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 7/19/2022   | 6/11/2027  |  | 3.50        | 12,375,000              | 12,552,829              | 12,512,151              | 11,925,045              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3130ASGU7 | Federal Home Loan Bank          | 7/20/2022   | 6/11/2027  |  | 3.50        | 21,725,000              | 22,016,550              | 21,949,984              | 20,935,079              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3133EPMV4 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 6/15/2023   | 6/15/2027  |  | 4.13        | 28,940,000              | 28,911,928              | 28,913,427              | 28,577,382              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3133ENZK9 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 7/7/2022    | 6/28/2027  |  | 3.24        | 27,865,000              | 28,099,066              | 28,044,833              | 26,585,997              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3134GYUV2 | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp | 6/29/2023   | 6/29/2027  |  | 5.94        | 25,000,000              | 25,000,000              | 25,000,000              | 24,856,250              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3134GYUV2 | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp | 6/29/2023   | 6/29/2027  |  | 5.94        | 25,000,000              | 25,000,000              | 25,000,000              | 24,856,250              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3134GYUV2 | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp | 6/29/2023   | 6/29/2027  |  | 5.94        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,712,500              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3134GYYG1 | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp | 8/16/2023   | 8/16/2027  |  | 6.00        | 25,000,000              | 25,000,000              | 25,000,000              | 24,971,750              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3134GYYG1 | Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp | 8/16/2023   | 8/16/2027  |  | 6.00        | 25,000,000              | 25,000,000              | 25,000,000              | 24,971,750              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3133EPBM6 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 2/23/2023   | 8/23/2027  |  | 4.13        | 10,000,000              | 9,974,000               | 9,977,009               | 9,888,900               |
| Federal Agencies     | 3133EPSK2 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 8/7/2023    | 8/7/2028   |  | 4.25        | 19,500,000              | 19,412,250              | 19,413,451              | 19,407,960              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3133EPUN3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 8/28/2023   | 8/28/2028  |  | 4.50        | 10,000,000              | 9,979,100               | 9,979,146               | 10,071,600              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3133EPUN3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 8/28/2023   | 8/28/2028  |  | 4.50        | 15,000,000              | 14,962,800              | 14,962,881              | 15,107,400              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3133EPUN3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 8/28/2023   | 8/28/2028  |  | 4.50        | 25,000,000              | 24,943,500              | 24,943,624              | 25,179,000              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3133EPUN3 | Federal Farm Credit Bank        | 8/28/2023   | 8/28/2028  |  | 4.50        | 33,000,000              | 32,904,960              | 32,905,168              | 33,236,280              |
| <b>Subtotals</b>     |           |                                 |             |            |  | <b>5.25</b> | <b>\$ 7,088,706,000</b> | <b>\$ 7,073,552,707</b> | <b>\$ 7,082,860,076</b> | <b>\$ 6,864,995,951</b> |
| Public Time Deposits | PPG62B630 | Bank of San Francisco           | 6/5/2023    | 12/4/2023  |  | 5.46        | \$ 10,000,000           | \$ 10,000,000           | \$ 10,000,000           | \$ 10,000,000           |
| Public Time Deposits | PPG42YDZ6 | Bridge Bank NA                  | 6/19/2023   | 12/18/2023 |  | 5.37        | 10,000,000              | 10,000,000              | 10,000,000              | 10,000,000              |
| Public Time Deposits | PPG24NBE1 | Bank of San Francisco           | 7/10/2023   | 1/8/2024   |  | 5.54        | 10,000,000              | 10,000,000              | 10,000,000              | 10,000,000              |
| Public Time Deposits | PPG250Y96 | Bridge Bank NA                  | 7/17/2023   | 1/16/2024  |  | 5.49        | 10,000,000              | 10,000,000              | 10,000,000              | 10,000,000              |
| <b>Subtotals</b>     |           |                                 |             |            |  | <b>5.47</b> | <b>\$ 40,000,000</b>    | <b>\$ 40,000,000</b>    | <b>\$ 40,000,000</b>    | <b>\$ 40,000,000</b>    |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78015JFJ1 | Royal Bank of Canada/NY         | 9/20/2022   | 9/20/2023  |  | 4.75        | \$ 50,000,000           | \$ 50,000,000           | \$ 50,000,000           | \$ 49,978,000           |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CY27 | Bank of Montreal/CHI            | 10/3/2022   | 9/22/2023  |  | 4.80        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,976,000              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78015JHJ9 | Royal Bank of Canada/NY         | 9/30/2022   | 9/22/2023  |  | 4.81        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,978,000              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CXX0 | Bank of Montreal/CHI            | 9/28/2022   | 9/25/2023  |  | 4.82        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,973,000              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78015JH67 | Royal Bank of Canada/NY         | 9/28/2022   | 9/25/2023  |  | 4.76        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,973,000              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367CYA9 | Bank of Montreal/CHI            | 10/6/2022   | 10/6/2023  |  | 4.97        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,966,500              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78015JMJ3 | Royal Bank of Canada/NY         | 11/16/2022  | 10/23/2023 |  | 5.46        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,983,000              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 89115BC73 | Toronto Dominion Bank/NY        | 11/2/2022   | 10/23/2023 |  | 5.57        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,995,000              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367D4E2 | Bank of Montreal/CHI            | 3/1/2023    | 10/24/2023 |  | 5.42        | 100,000,000             | 100,000,000             | 100,000,000             | 99,970,000              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 13606KRZ1 | Canadian Imperial Bank/NY       | 1/10/2023   | 11/6/2023  |  | 5.32        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,977,500              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 89115BJX9 | Toronto Dominion Bank/NY        | 12/2/2022   | 11/20/2023 |  | 5.51        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,975,500              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06417MN84 | Bank of Nova Scotia/HOU         | 12/5/2022   | 11/21/2023 |  | 5.50        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,976,000              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78015JPE1 | Royal Bank of Canada/NY         | 12/19/2022  | 12/18/2023 |  | 5.37        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,931,000              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 78015JRE9 | Royal Bank of Canada/NY         | 1/5/2023    | 12/29/2023 |  | 5.43        | 100,000,000             | 100,000,000             | 100,000,000             | 99,882,000              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 89115BPB0 | Toronto Dominion Bank/NY        | 1/5/2023    | 1/3/2024   |  | 5.43        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,940,000              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 89115BPF1 | Toronto Dominion Bank/NY        | 1/5/2023    | 1/5/2024   |  | 5.43        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,937,500              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 06367D3V5 | Bank of Montreal/CHI            | 1/13/2023   | 1/12/2024  |  | 5.24        | 70,000,000              | 70,000,000              | 70,000,000              | 69,852,300              |
| Negotiable CDs       | 89115BQB9 | Toronto Dominion Bank/NY        | 1/17/2023   | 1/17/2024  |  | 5.24        | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 50,000,000              | 49,889,000              |

# Investment Inventory

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment  | CUSIP     | Issuer Name                              | Settle Date | Maturity  |  | Coupon      | Par Value                | Original Cost            | Amortized                |                          |
|---------------------|-----------|------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|--|-------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|                     |           |                                          |             | Date      |  |             |                          |                          | Book Value               | Market Value             |
| Negotiable CDs      | 89115BST8 | Toronto Dominion Bank/NY                 | 1/30/2023   | 1/29/2024 |  | 5.21        | 100,000,000              | 100,000,000              | 100,000,000              | 99,731,000               |
| Negotiable CDs      | 89115BY79 | Toronto Dominion Bank/NY                 | 3/8/2023    | 1/29/2024 |  | 5.75        | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 49,979,500               |
| Negotiable CDs      | 06417MT47 | Bank of Nova Scotia/HOU                  | 2/10/2023   | 2/9/2024  |  | 5.43        | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 49,904,500               |
| Negotiable CDs      | 89115BWK2 | Toronto Dominion Bank/NY                 | 3/1/2023    | 2/22/2024 |  | 5.58        | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 49,931,500               |
| Negotiable CDs      | 89115BXF2 | Toronto Dominion Bank/NY                 | 3/6/2023    | 3/6/2024  |  | 5.60        | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 49,928,000               |
| Negotiable CDs      | 89115BNG1 | Toronto Dominion Bank/NY                 | 6/27/2023   | 6/5/2024  |  | 5.85        | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 49,965,000               |
| Negotiable CDs      | 06367DBJ3 | Bank of Montreal/CHI                     | 7/17/2023   | 6/7/2024  |  | 5.89        | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 49,994,500               |
| Negotiable CDs      | 06367DAU9 | Bank of Montreal/CHI                     | 6/27/2023   | 6/21/2024 |  | 5.87        | 100,000,000              | 100,000,000              | 100,000,000              | 99,955,000               |
| Negotiable CDs      | 78015JXW2 | Royal Bank of Canada/NY                  | 6/28/2023   | 6/28/2024 |  | 5.89        | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,001,000               |
| Negotiable CDs      | 06367DAX3 | Bank of Montreal/CHI                     | 7/5/2023    | 7/1/2024  |  | 6.00        | 100,000,000              | 100,000,000              | 100,000,000              | 100,062,000              |
| Negotiable CDs      | 06367DBR5 | Bank of Montreal/CHI                     | 7/24/2023   | 7/1/2024  |  | 5.93        | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,010,500               |
| Negotiable CDs      | 13606KZR0 | Canadian Imperial Bank/NY                | 8/7/2023    | 7/1/2024  |  | 5.89        | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,010,500               |
| Negotiable CDs      | 89115BRG7 | Toronto Dominion Bank/NY                 | 7/6/2023    | 7/1/2024  |  | 6.05        | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,043,500               |
| Negotiable CDs      | 89115BS84 | Toronto Dominion Bank/NY                 | 7/17/2023   | 7/1/2024  |  | 5.91        | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 49,992,000               |
| Negotiable CDs      | 89115BSQ4 | Toronto Dominion Bank/NY                 | 7/24/2023   | 7/1/2024  |  | 5.93        | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,002,500               |
| Negotiable CDs      | 89115BV80 | Toronto Dominion Bank/NY                 | 8/2/2023    | 7/3/2024  |  | 5.90        | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 49,994,000               |
| Negotiable CDs      | 06367DBW4 | Bank of Montreal/CHI                     | 8/1/2023    | 7/29/2024 |  | 5.97        | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,030,000               |
| Negotiable CDs      | 13606KZN9 | Canadian Imperial Bank/NY                | 8/2/2023    | 7/29/2024 |  | 5.92        | 60,000,000               | 60,000,000               | 60,000,000               | 60,022,200               |
| Negotiable CDs      | 06367DCF0 | Bank of Montreal/CHI                     | 8/28/2023   | 8/14/2024 |  | 6.01        | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,000,000               | 50,060,000               |
| <b>Subtotals</b>    |           |                                          |             |           |  | <b>5.53</b> | <b>\$ 2,130,000,000</b>  | <b>\$ 2,130,000,000</b>  | <b>\$ 2,130,000,000</b>  | <b>\$ 2,128,770,500</b>  |
| Commercial Paper    | 03785EW59 | Apple                                    | 8/22/2023   | 9/5/2023  |  | 0.00        | \$ 11,000,000            | \$ 10,977,499            | \$ 10,993,571            | \$ 10,991,860            |
| Commercial Paper    | 89233HY65 | Toyota Motor Credit                      | 6/26/2023   | 11/6/2023 |  | 0.00        | 50,000,000               | 48,987,722               | 49,497,667               | 49,500,000               |
| Commercial Paper    | 89233HY81 | Toyota Motor Credit                      | 8/2/2023    | 11/8/2023 |  | 0.00        | 50,000,000               | 49,250,028               | 49,479,611               | 49,485,000               |
| Commercial Paper    | 89233GE36 | Toyota Motor Credit                      | 8/8/2023    | 5/3/2024  |  | 0.00        | 60,000,000               | 57,489,333               | 57,713,333               | 57,748,200               |
| Commercial Paper    | 89233GE69 | Toyota Motor Credit                      | 8/15/2023   | 5/6/2024  |  | 0.00        | 50,000,000               | 47,938,889               | 48,071,111               | 48,100,000               |
| <b>Subtotals</b>    |           |                                          |             |           |  | <b>0.00</b> | <b>\$ 221,000,000</b>    | <b>\$ 214,643,471</b>    | <b>\$ 215,755,293</b>    | <b>\$ 215,825,060</b>    |
| Money Market Funds  | 09248U718 | BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund         | 8/31/2023   | 9/1/2023  |  | 5.24        | \$ 20,639,985            | \$ 20,639,985            | \$ 20,639,985            | \$ 20,639,985            |
| Money Market Funds  | 31607A703 | Fidelity Govt Portfolio                  | 8/31/2023   | 9/1/2023  |  | 5.24        | 538,038,800              | 538,038,800              | 538,038,800              | 538,038,800              |
| Money Market Funds  | 608919718 | Federated Hermes Govt Obligations F      | 8/31/2023   | 9/1/2023  |  | 5.23        | 11,969,130               | 11,969,130               | 11,969,130               | 11,969,130               |
| Money Market Funds  | 262006208 | Dreyfus Government Cash Manageme         | 8/31/2023   | 9/1/2023  |  | 5.22        | 14,960,809               | 14,960,809               | 14,960,809               | 14,960,809               |
| Money Market Funds  | 85749T517 | State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MM  | 8/31/2023   | 9/1/2023  |  | 5.25        | 546,167,400              | 546,167,400              | 546,167,400              | 546,167,400              |
| Money Market Funds  | 61747C319 | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity F | 8/31/2023   | 9/1/2023  |  | 5.25        | 556,939,908              | 556,939,908              | 556,939,908              | 556,939,908              |
| <b>Subtotals</b>    |           |                                          |             |           |  | <b>5.25</b> | <b>\$ 1,688,716,031</b>  | <b>\$ 1,688,716,031</b>  | <b>\$ 1,688,716,031</b>  | <b>\$ 1,688,716,031</b>  |
| Supranationals      | 4581X0CC0 | Inter-American Development Bank          | 12/15/2021  | 10/4/2023 |  | 3.00        | \$ 25,756,000            | \$ 26,837,752            | \$ 25,810,252            | \$ 25,705,003            |
| Supranationals      | 45906M3B5 | Int'l Bank for Recon and Dev             | 3/23/2022   | 6/14/2024 |  | 1.98        | 100,000,000              | 100,000,000              | 100,000,000              | 97,181,000               |
| Supranationals      | 4581X0EE4 | Inter-American Development Bank          | 7/1/2022    | 7/1/2024  |  | 3.25        | 80,000,000               | 79,992,000               | 79,996,673               | 78,519,200               |
| Supranationals      | 459056HV2 | Int'l Bank for Recon and Dev             | 11/2/2021   | 8/28/2024 |  | 1.50        | 50,000,000               | 50,984,250               | 50,345,921               | 48,154,500               |
| Supranationals      | 4581X0DZ8 | Inter-American Development Bank          | 11/4/2021   | 9/23/2024 |  | 0.50        | 50,000,000               | 49,595,500               | 49,851,095               | 47,490,500               |
| Supranationals      | 45950VQG4 | International Finance Corp               | 10/22/2021  | 9/23/2024 |  | 0.44        | 10,000,000               | 9,918,700                | 9,970,436                | 9,455,700                |
| Supranationals      | 4581X0CM8 | Inter-American Development Bank          | 4/26/2021   | 1/15/2025 |  | 2.13        | 100,000,000              | 105,676,000              | 102,095,112              | 95,911,000               |
| Supranationals      | 459058JB0 | Int'l Bank for Recon and Dev             | 7/23/2021   | 4/22/2025 |  | 0.63        | 40,000,000               | 40,086,000               | 40,037,629               | 37,207,200               |
| Supranationals      | 4581X0DN5 | Inter-American Development Bank          | 11/1/2021   | 7/15/2025 |  | 0.63        | 28,900,000               | 28,519,098               | 28,707,577               | 26,679,613               |
| Supranationals      | 45950VRU2 | International Finance Corp               | 1/26/2023   | 1/26/2026 |  | 4.02        | 100,000,000              | 100,000,000              | 100,000,000              | 97,867,000               |
| Supranationals      | 45818WDG8 | Inter-American Development Bank          | 8/25/2021   | 2/27/2026 |  | 0.82        | 19,500,000               | 19,556,907               | 19,531,442               | 17,574,570               |
| Supranationals      | 45906M4C2 | Int'l Bank for Recon and Dev             | 6/15/2023   | 6/15/2026 |  | 5.75        | 32,000,000               | 32,000,000               | 32,000,000               | 31,962,240               |
| <b>Subtotals</b>    |           |                                          |             |           |  | <b>2.38</b> | <b>\$ 636,156,000</b>    | <b>\$ 643,166,207</b>    | <b>\$ 638,346,137</b>    | <b>\$ 613,707,526</b>    |
| <b>Grand Totals</b> |           |                                          |             |           |  | <b>2.87</b> | <b>\$ 15,329,578,031</b> | <b>\$ 15,313,955,901</b> | <b>\$ 15,315,801,028</b> | <b>\$ 14,844,272,818</b> |

# Monthly Investment Earnings

## Pooled Fund

For month ended August 31, 2023

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name        | Par Value     | Accrued<br>Interest Earned | (Amortization) /<br>Accretion | Realized<br>Gain/(Loss) | Total Earnings |
|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828WE6 | T 2.750 11/15/2023 | \$ 50,000,000 | 115,829                    | (42,540)                      |                         | \$ 73,289      |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBC4 | T 0.375 12/31/2025 | 50,000,000    | 15,795                     | 9,544                         |                         | 25,339         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAT8 | T 0.250 10/31/2025 | 50,000,000    | 10,530                     | 12,719                        |                         | 23,249         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBC4 | T 0.375 12/31/2025 | 50,000,000    | 15,795                     | 12,767                        |                         | 28,561         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAT8 | T 0.250 10/31/2025 | 50,000,000    | 10,530                     | 16,771                        |                         | 27,301         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAT8 | T 0.250 10/31/2025 | 50,000,000    | 10,530                     | 17,325                        |                         | 27,854         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | T 0.250 06/30/2025 | 50,000,000    | 10,530                     | 16,915                        |                         | 27,445         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | T 0.250 06/30/2025 | 50,000,000    | 10,530                     | 18,849                        |                         | 29,379         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828G38 | T 2.250 11/15/2024 | 50,000,000    | 94,769                     | (72,728)                      |                         | 22,041         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828G38 | T 2.250 11/15/2024 | 50,000,000    | 94,769                     | (74,467)                      |                         | 20,302         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828YY0 | T 1.750 12/31/2024 | 50,000,000    | 73,709                     | (49,765)                      |                         | 23,945         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZC7 | T 1.125 02/28/2025 | 50,000,000    | 47,401                     | (21,690)                      |                         | 25,712         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBA8 | T 0.125 12/15/2023 | 50,000,000    | 5,294                      | 7,198                         |                         | 12,492         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828Z52 | T 1.375 01/31/2025 | 50,000,000    | 57,914                     | (33,489)                      |                         | 24,426         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828Y87 | T 1.750 07/31/2024 | 50,000,000    | 73,709                     | (56,226)                      |                         | 17,484         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZC7 | T 1.125 02/28/2025 | 50,000,000    | 47,401                     | (21,636)                      |                         | 25,765         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828Z52 | T 1.375 01/31/2025 | 50,000,000    | 57,914                     | (33,700)                      |                         | 24,214         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828YM6 | T 1.500 10/31/2024 | 50,000,000    | 63,179                     | (41,798)                      |                         | 21,381         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZF0 | T 0.500 03/31/2025 | 50,000,000    | 21,175                     | 4,732                         |                         | 25,906         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZF0 | T 0.500 03/31/2025 | 50,000,000    | 21,175                     | 3,443                         |                         | 24,618         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAM3 | T 0.250 09/30/2025 | 50,000,000    | 10,587                     | 17,234                        |                         | 27,822         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | T 0.250 06/30/2025 | 50,000,000    | 10,530                     | 14,756                        |                         | 25,286         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | T 0.250 06/30/2025 | 50,000,000    | 10,530                     | 16,772                        |                         | 27,302         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | T 0.250 06/30/2025 | 50,000,000    | 10,530                     | 15,378                        |                         | 25,908         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZL7 | T 0.375 04/30/2025 | 50,000,000    | 15,795                     | 8,266                         |                         | 24,061         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBW0 | T 0.750 04/30/2026 | 50,000,000    | 31,590                     | 5,928                         |                         | 37,518         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBW0 | T 0.750 04/30/2026 | 50,000,000    | 31,590                     | 4,739                         |                         | 36,329         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | T 0.875 06/30/2026 | 50,000,000    | 36,855                     | 1,162                         |                         | 38,016         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCC3 | T 0.250 05/15/2024 | 50,000,000    | 10,530                     | 8,319                         |                         | 18,849         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828XT2 | T 2.000 05/31/2024 | 50,000,000    | 84,699                     | (66,202)                      |                         | 18,498         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | T 0.250 06/30/2025 | 50,000,000    | 10,530                     | 14,750                        |                         | 25,280         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | T 0.875 06/30/2026 | 50,000,000    | 36,855                     | (1,203)                       |                         | 35,652         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | T 0.875 06/30/2026 | 50,000,000    | 36,855                     | (5,941)                       |                         | 30,914         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | T 0.875 06/30/2026 | 50,000,000    | 36,855                     | (5,639)                       |                         | 31,216         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828R36 | T 1.625 05/15/2026 | 50,000,000    | 68,444                     | (38,871)                      |                         | 29,573         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAM3 | T 0.250 09/30/2025 | 50,000,000    | 10,587                     | 14,592                        |                         | 25,179         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | T 0.250 06/30/2025 | 50,000,000    | 10,530                     | 10,877                        |                         | 21,407         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAB7 | T 0.250 07/31/2025 | 50,000,000    | 10,530                     | 11,519                        |                         | 22,049         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | T 0.250 06/30/2025 | 50,000,000    | 10,530                     | 12,926                        |                         | 23,456         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | T 0.875 06/30/2026 | 50,000,000    | 36,855                     | (7,040)                       |                         | 29,815         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAB7 | T 0.250 07/31/2025 | 50,000,000    | 10,530                     | 13,566                        |                         | 24,096         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCL3 | T 0.375 07/15/2024 | 50,000,000    | 15,795                     | 56                            |                         | 15,851         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCL3 | T 0.375 07/15/2024 | 50,000,000    | 15,795                     | 1,131                         |                         | 16,926         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CAK7 | T 0.125 09/15/2023 | 50,000,000    | 5,265                      | 4,584                         |                         | 9,849          |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | T 0.875 06/30/2026 | 50,000,000    | 36,855                     | (4,172)                       |                         | 32,682         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCT6 | T 0.375 08/15/2024 | 50,000,000    | 15,913                     | 2,899                         |                         | 18,812         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828R36 | T 1.625 05/15/2026 | 50,000,000    | 68,444                     | (34,036)                      |                         | 34,409         |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828XB1 | T 2.125 05/15/2025 | 50,000,000    | 89,504                     | (65,387)                      |                         | 24,117         |

# Monthly Investment Earnings

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name           | Par Value               | Accrued<br>Interest Earned | (Amortization) /<br>Accretion | Realized<br>Gain/(Loss) | Total Earnings      |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | T 0.875 06/30/2026    | 50,000,000              | 36,855                     | 1,114                         |                         | 37,968              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCW9 | T 0.750 08/31/2026    | 50,000,000              | 31,601                     | 9,496                         |                         | 41,097              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 9128285Z9 | T 2.500 01/31/2024    | 50,000,000              | 105,299                    | (91,712)                      |                         | 13,587              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCZ2 | T 0.875 09/30/2026    | 50,000,000              | 37,056                     | 5,295                         |                         | 42,351              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCZ2 | T 0.875 09/30/2026    | 50,000,000              | 37,056                     | 5,595                         |                         | 42,651              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | T 0.875 06/30/2026    | 50,000,000              | 36,855                     | 7,322                         |                         | 44,177              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCZ2 | T 0.875 09/30/2026    | 50,000,000              | 37,056                     | 11,694                        |                         | 48,750              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDK4 | T 1.250 11/30/2026    | 50,000,000              | 52,937                     | (1,229)                       |                         | 51,708              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDK4 | T 1.250 11/30/2026    | 50,000,000              | 52,937                     | (1,997)                       |                         | 50,940              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828ZW3 | T 0.250 06/30/2025    | 50,000,000              | 10,530                     | 32,670                        |                         | 43,200              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBA8 | T 0.125 12/15/2023    | 50,000,000              | 5,294                      | 25,173                        |                         | 30,467              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBA8 | T 0.125 12/15/2023    | 50,000,000              | 5,294                      | 23,638                        |                         | 28,932              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCJ8 | T 0.875 06/30/2026    | 50,000,000              | 36,855                     | 18,408                        |                         | 55,263              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDV0 | T 0.875 01/31/2024    | 50,000,000              | 36,855                     | 26,719                        |                         | 63,574              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CBR1 | T 0.250 03/15/2024    | 50,000,000              | 10,530                     | 54,230                        |                         | 64,760              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDQ1 | T 1.250 12/31/2026    | 50,000,000              | 52,649                     | 51,594                        |                         | 104,243             |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDK4 | T 1.250 11/30/2026    | 50,000,000              | 52,937                     | 53,063                        |                         | 106,000             |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CEF4 | T 2.500 03/31/2027    | 25,000,000              | 52,937                     | 4,125                         |                         | 57,062              |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912828B66 | T 2.750 02/15/2024    | 50,000,000              | 116,696                    | (11,481)                      |                         | 105,214             |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CDV0 | T 0.875 01/31/2024    | 50,000,000              | 36,855                     | 65,501                        |                         | 102,355             |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CCL3 | T 0.375 07/15/2024    | 50,000,000              | 15,795                     | 91,224                        |                         | 107,019             |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 91282CFK2 | T 3.500 09/15/2025    | 50,000,000              | 147,418                    | 29,766                        |                         | 177,185             |
| U.S. Treasuries    | 912797HC4 | B 0.000 10/24/2023    | 50,000,000              |                            | 224,750                       |                         | 224,750             |
| <b>Subtotals</b>   |           |                       | <b>\$ 3,525,000,000</b> | <b>\$ 2,646,680</b>        | <b>\$ 258,146</b>             | <b>\$ -</b>             | <b>\$ 2,904,825</b> |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EM2E1 | FFCB 0.160 08/10/2023 |                         | \$ 2,000                   | \$ 370                        |                         | \$ 2,370            |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EM6N7 | FFCB 0.170 09/27/2023 | 50,000,000              | 7,083                      | 2,123                         |                         | 9,207               |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMRZ7 | FFCB 0.250 02/26/2024 | 5,000,000               | 1,042                      | 51                            |                         | 1,093               |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMRZ7 | FFCB 0.250 02/26/2024 | 5,000,000               | 1,042                      | 51                            |                         | 1,093               |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMRZ7 | FFCB 0.250 02/26/2024 | 100,000,000             | 20,833                     | 1,019                         |                         | 21,853              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMTW2 | FFCB 0.300 03/18/2024 | 50,000,000              | 12,500                     | 1,711                         |                         | 14,211              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMTW2 | FFCB 0.300 03/18/2024 | 50,000,000              | 12,500                     | 1,713                         |                         | 14,213              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMWV0 | FFCB 0.350 04/22/2024 | 39,000,000              | 11,375                     | (312)                         |                         | 11,063              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMWV0 | FFCB 0.350 04/22/2024 | 29,424,000              | 8,582                      | (236)                         |                         | 8,346               |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMWV0 | FFCB 0.350 04/22/2024 | 16,545,000              | 4,826                      | (132)                         |                         | 4,693               |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EM5X6 | FFCB 0.430 09/23/2024 | 25,000,000              | 8,958                      | 714                           |                         | 9,673               |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EM5X6 | FFCB 0.430 09/23/2024 | 50,000,000              | 17,917                     | 1,428                         |                         | 19,345              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EM5X6 | FFCB 0.430 09/23/2024 | 50,000,000              | 17,917                     | 1,428                         |                         | 19,345              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMV25 | FFCB 0.450 07/23/2024 | 50,000,000              | 18,750                     | (2,636)                       |                         | 16,114              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENG1  | FFCB 0.500 12/01/2023 | 25,000,000              | 10,417                     | 1,544                         |                         | 11,960              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENG1  | FFCB 0.500 12/01/2023 | 75,000,000              | 31,250                     | 4,631                         |                         | 35,881              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENG1  | FFCB 0.500 12/01/2023 | 25,000,000              | 10,417                     | 1,544                         |                         | 11,960              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMWT5 | FFCB 0.600 04/21/2025 | 50,000,000              | 25,000                     | 562                           |                         | 25,562              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENHR4 | FFCB 0.680 12/20/2023 | 62,000,000              | 35,133                     | 1,253                         |                         | 36,387              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENHR4 | FFCB 0.680 12/20/2023 | 25,000,000              | 14,167                     | 527                           |                         | 14,693              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENHR4 | FFCB 0.680 12/20/2023 | 25,000,000              | 14,167                     | 510                           |                         | 14,676              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EMZ21 | FFCB 0.690 04/06/2026 | 15,500,000              | 8,913                      | 763                           |                         | 9,675               |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENEJ5 | FFCB 0.875 11/18/2024 | 50,000,000              | 36,458                     | 1,626                         |                         | 38,085              |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENEJ5 | FFCB 0.875 11/18/2024 | 10,000,000              | 7,292                      | 325                           |                         | 7,617               |



# Monthly Investment Earnings

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name           | Par Value   | Accrued<br>Interest Earned | (Amortization) /<br>Accretion | Realized<br>Gain/(Loss) | Total Earnings |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------|-------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENEJ5 | FFCB 0.875 11/18/2024 | 10,000,000  | 7,292                      | 325                           |                         | 7,617          |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENLF5 | FFCB 0.900 01/18/2024 | 50,000,000  | 37,500                     | 12,946                        |                         | 50,446         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENLF5 | FFCB 0.900 01/18/2024 | 11,856,000  | 8,892                      | 5,296                         |                         | 14,188         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENGQ7 | FFCB 0.920 12/09/2024 | 50,000,000  | 38,333                     | 424                           |                         | 38,758         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENGQ7 | FFCB 0.920 12/09/2024 | 50,000,000  | 38,333                     | 1,047                         |                         | 39,380         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENEG1 | FFCB 1.050 11/17/2025 | 55,000,000  | 48,125                     | 1,634                         |                         | 49,759         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENEG1 | FFCB 1.050 11/17/2025 | 39,675,000  | 34,716                     | 1,120                         |                         | 35,835         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENKS8 | FFCB 1.125 01/06/2025 | 20,000,000  | 18,750                     | 1,279                         |                         | 20,029         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENKS8 | FFCB 1.125 01/06/2025 | 25,000,000  | 23,438                     | 1,598                         |                         | 25,036         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENKS8 | FFCB 1.125 01/06/2025 | 25,000,000  | 23,438                     | 1,598                         |                         | 25,036         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENHM5 | FFCB 1.170 12/16/2025 | 45,000,000  | 43,875                     | 974                           |                         | 44,849         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENHM5 | FFCB 1.170 12/16/2025 | 50,000,000  | 48,750                     | 1,082                         |                         | 49,832         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ELQY3 | FFCB 1.210 03/03/2025 | 24,000,000  | 24,200                     | 614                           |                         | 24,814         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ELQY3 | FFCB 1.210 03/03/2025 | 16,000,000  | 16,133                     | 159                           |                         | 16,293         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ELNE0 | FFCB 1.430 02/14/2024 | 20,495,000  | 24,423                     | (9,891)                       |                         | 14,533         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ELCP7 | FFCB 1.625 12/03/2024 | 25,000,000  | 33,854                     | 679                           |                         | 34,533         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENRD4 | FFCB 1.680 03/10/2027 | 48,573,000  | 68,002                     | 19,434                        |                         | 87,436         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENTS9 | FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027 | 24,500,000  | 53,083                     | 2,089                         |                         | 55,172         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENTS9 | FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027 | 22,500,000  | 48,750                     | 1,829                         |                         | 50,579         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENTS9 | FFCB 2.600 04/05/2027 | 25,000,000  | 54,167                     | 3,329                         |                         | 57,496         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENWP1 | FFCB 2.625 05/16/2024 | 45,000,000  | 98,438                     | 2,576                         |                         | 101,014        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENWP1 | FFCB 2.625 05/16/2024 | 50,000,000  | 109,375                    | 2,863                         |                         | 112,238        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENYH7 | FFCB 2.625 06/10/2024 | 100,000,000 | 218,750                    | 5,471                         |                         | 224,221        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENUD0 | FFCB 2.640 04/08/2026 | 20,000,000  | 44,000                     | 823                           |                         | 44,823         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENUD0 | FFCB 2.640 04/08/2026 | 30,000,000  | 66,000                     | 1,235                         |                         | 67,235         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENXE5 | FFCB 2.850 05/23/2025 | 6,000,000   | 14,250                     | 238                           |                         | 14,488         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENXE5 | FFCB 2.850 05/23/2025 | 20,000,000  | 47,500                     | 792                           |                         | 48,292         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENYQ7 | FFCB 2.950 06/13/2025 | 50,000,000  | 122,917                    | 693                           |                         | 123,610        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENZS2 | FFCB 3.100 06/28/2024 | 25,000,000  | 64,583                     | 530                           |                         | 65,113         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENZS2 | FFCB 3.100 06/28/2024 | 50,000,000  | 129,167                    | 1,145                         |                         | 130,312        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENZS2 | FFCB 3.100 06/28/2024 | 25,000,000  | 64,583                     | 573                           |                         | 65,156         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENZK9 | FFCB 3.240 06/28/2027 | 27,865,000  | 75,236                     | (3,993)                       |                         | 71,242         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENYX2 | FFCB 3.250 06/17/2024 | 50,000,000  | 135,417                    | 1,272                         |                         | 136,689        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENYX2 | FFCB 3.250 06/17/2024 | 25,000,000  | 67,708                     | 1,251                         |                         | 68,959         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENYX2 | FFCB 3.250 06/17/2024 | 25,000,000  | 67,708                     | 1,240                         |                         | 68,949         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENJ35 | FFCB 3.320 02/25/2026 | 35,000,000  | 96,833                     | 1,026                         |                         | 97,859         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENJ84 | FFCB 3.375 08/26/2024 | 50,000,000  | 140,625                    | 3,541                         |                         | 144,166        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPJX4 | FFCB 3.625 02/17/2026 | 30,000,000  | 90,625                     | 2,909                         |                         | 93,534         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPJX4 | FFCB 3.625 02/17/2026 | 25,000,000  | 75,521                     | 2,201                         |                         | 77,722         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN6A3 | FFCB 4.000 01/13/2026 | 30,000,000  | 100,000                    | 645                           |                         | 100,645        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN6A3 | FFCB 4.000 01/13/2026 | 20,000,000  | 66,667                     | 498                           |                         | 67,164         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPKA2 | FFCB 4.000 08/18/2025 | 26,500,000  | 88,333                     | 609                           |                         | 88,942         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPKA2 | FFCB 4.000 08/18/2025 | 30,000,000  | 100,000                    | 689                           |                         | 100,689        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPKA2 | FFCB 4.000 08/18/2025 | 25,000,000  | 83,333                     | 678                           |                         | 84,011         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN5E6 | FFCB 4.000 12/29/2025 | 15,000,000  | 50,000                     | 1,281                         |                         | 51,281         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN5E6 | FFCB 4.000 12/29/2025 | 25,000,000  | 83,333                     | 2,157                         |                         | 85,490         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN5E6 | FFCB 4.000 12/29/2025 | 20,000,000  | 66,667                     | 1,708                         |                         | 68,375         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN2L3 | FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027 | 21,000,000  | 72,188                     | 245                           |                         | 72,433         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN2L3 | FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027 | 5,000,000   | 17,188                     | 65                            |                         | 17,253         |

# Monthly Investment Earnings

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name           | Par Value  | Accrued<br>Interest Earned | (Amortization) /<br>Accretion | Realized<br>Gain/(Loss) | Total Earnings |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------|------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN2L3 | FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027 | 4,650,000  | 15,984                     | 61                            |                         | 16,045         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN2L3 | FFCB 4.125 05/17/2027 | 25,000,000 | 85,938                     | 326                           |                         | 86,263         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPMV4 | FFCB 4.125 06/15/2027 | 28,940,000 | 99,481                     | 596                           |                         | 100,077        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPBM6 | FFCB 4.125 08/23/2027 | 10,000,000 | 34,375                     | 491                           |                         | 34,866         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPAG0 | FFCB 4.250 02/10/2025 | 29,875,000 | 105,807                    | 6,740                         |                         | 112,547        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPAG0 | FFCB 4.250 02/10/2025 | 10,000,000 | 35,417                     | 2,239                         |                         | 37,656         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN4B3 | FFCB 4.250 06/13/2025 | 15,000,000 | 53,125                     | 394                           |                         | 53,519         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN4B3 | FFCB 4.250 06/13/2025 | 15,000,000 | 53,125                     | 346                           |                         | 53,471         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN4B3 | FFCB 4.250 06/13/2025 | 15,000,000 | 53,125                     | 372                           |                         | 53,497         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPMU6 | FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026 | 30,000,000 | 106,250                    | 1,375                         |                         | 107,625        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPMU6 | FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026 | 20,000,000 | 70,833                     | 871                           |                         | 71,705         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPMU6 | FFCB 4.250 06/15/2026 | 24,700,000 | 87,479                     | 1,691                         |                         | 89,170         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPSK2 | FFCB 4.250 08/07/2028 | 19,500,000 | 55,250                     | 1,201                         |                         | 56,451         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENP79 | FFCB 4.250 09/26/2024 | 50,000,000 | 177,083                    | 170                           |                         | 177,253        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN4N7 | FFCB 4.250 12/20/2024 | 25,000,000 | 88,542                     | 1,930                         |                         | 90,471         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN4N7 | FFCB 4.250 12/20/2024 | 10,000,000 | 35,417                     | 725                           |                         | 36,142         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EN4N7 | FFCB 4.250 12/20/2024 | 25,000,000 | 88,542                     | 1,930                         |                         | 90,471         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPBJ3 | FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026 | 50,000,000 | 182,292                    | 2,319                         |                         | 184,611        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPBJ3 | FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026 | 25,000,000 | 91,146                     | 1,315                         |                         | 92,461         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPBJ3 | FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026 | 28,000,000 | 102,083                    | 1,299                         |                         | 103,382        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPNG6 | FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026 | 50,000,000 | 182,292                    | 750                           |                         | 183,041        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPNG6 | FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026 | 25,000,000 | 91,146                     | 375                           |                         | 91,521         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPNG6 | FFCB 4.375 06/23/2026 | 25,000,000 | 91,146                     | 375                           |                         | 91,521         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPSW6 | FFCB 4.500 08/14/2026 | 50,000,000 | 106,250                    | 1,889                         |                         | 108,139        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPUN3 | FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028 | 10,000,000 | 3,750                      | 46                            |                         | 3,796          |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPUN3 | FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028 | 25,000,000 | 9,375                      | 124                           |                         | 9,499          |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPUN3 | FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028 | 15,000,000 | 5,625                      | 81                            |                         | 5,706          |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPUN3 | FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028 | 33,000,000 | 12,375                     | 208                           |                         | 12,583         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPHD0 | FFCB 4.875 10/28/2024 | 20,000,000 | 75,000                     | 1,784                         |                         | 76,784         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPHD0 | FFCB 4.500 10/28/2024 | 25,000,000 | 93,750                     | 2,315                         |                         | 96,065         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENZ94 | FFCB 4.500 11/18/2024 | 25,000,000 | 93,750                     | 1,124                         |                         | 94,874         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPDL6 | FFCB 4.850 10/01/2025 | 50,000,000 | 202,083                    |                               |                         | 202,083        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENZ37 | FFCB 4.875 01/10/2025 | 20,000,000 | 81,250                     | 47                            |                         | 81,297         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENZ37 | FFCB 4.875 01/10/2025 | 10,000,000 | 40,625                     | 23                            |                         | 40,648         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133ENZ37 | FFCB 4.875 01/10/2025 | 20,000,000 | 81,250                     | 16                            |                         | 81,266         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPBF1 | FFCB 4.875 08/21/2024 | 10,000,000 | 40,625                     | 244                           |                         | 40,869         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPBF1 | FFCB 4.875 08/21/2024 | 25,000,000 | 101,563                    | 567                           |                         | 102,129        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3133EPBF1 | FFCB 4.875 08/21/2024 | 20,000,000 | 81,250                     | 453                           |                         | 81,703         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384ST7 | FHDN 0.000 02/06/2024 | 10,650,000 |                            | 44,020                        |                         | 44,020         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384KF5 | FHDN 0.000 08/10/2023 |            |                            | 90,375                        |                         | 90,375         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384KP3 | FHDN 0.000 08/18/2023 |            |                            | 35,488                        |                         | 35,488         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384KU2 | FHDN 0.000 08/23/2023 |            |                            | 31,778                        |                         | 31,778         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384LJ6 | FHDN 0.000 09/06/2023 | 50,000,000 |                            | 198,917                       |                         | 198,917        |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384LR8 | FHDN 0.000 09/13/2023 | 25,000,000 |                            | 111,944                       |                         | 111,944        |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384LY3 | FHDN 0.000 09/20/2023 | 50,000,000 |                            | 210,111                       |                         | 210,111        |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384MD8 | FHDN 0.000 09/25/2023 | 25,000,000 |                            | 105,594                       |                         | 105,594        |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384MD8 | FHDN 0.000 09/25/2023 | 25,000,000 |                            | 105,594                       |                         | 105,594        |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384MH9 | FHDN 0.000 09/29/2023 | 25,000,000 |                            | 105,486                       |                         | 105,486        |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384MH9 | FHDN 0.000 09/29/2023 | 25,000,000 |                            | 105,486                       |                         | 105,486        |

# Monthly Investment Earnings

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name           | Par Value  | Accrued<br>Interest Earned | (Amortization) /<br>Accretion | Realized<br>Gain/(Loss) | Total Earnings |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------|------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| Federal Agencies   | 313384MQ9 | FHDN 0.000 10/06/2023 | 30,000,000 |                            | 126,583                       |                         | 126,583        |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384MQ9 | FHDN 0.000 10/06/2023 | 36,000,000 |                            | 151,900                       |                         | 151,900        |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384MV8 | FHDN 0.000 10/11/2023 | 60,000,000 |                            | 248,000                       |                         | 248,000        |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384MV8 | FHDN 0.000 10/11/2023 | 40,000,000 |                            | 165,333                       |                         | 165,333        |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384MV8 | FHDN 0.000 10/11/2023 | 25,000,000 |                            | 105,917                       |                         | 105,917        |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384MV8 | FHDN 0.000 10/11/2023 | 25,000,000 |                            | 105,917                       |                         | 105,917        |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384NE5 | FHDN 0.000 10/20/2023 | 35,000,000 |                            | 147,681                       |                         | 147,681        |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384NE5 | FHDN 0.000 10/20/2023 | 54,113,000 |                            | 228,327                       |                         | 228,327        |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384NE5 | FHDN 0.000 10/20/2023 | 40,613,000 |                            | 183,605                       |                         | 183,605        |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384NK1 | FHDN 0.000 10/25/2023 | 43,944,000 |                            | 194,312                       |                         | 194,312        |
| Federal Agencies   | 313384NX3 | FHDN 0.000 11/06/2023 | 50,000,000 |                            | 221,090                       |                         | 221,090        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AJXD6 | FHLB 0.125 09/08/2023 | 20,975,000 | 2,185                      | 8,259                         |                         | 10,444         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AN4A5 | FHLB 0.700 06/30/2025 | 17,680,000 | 10,313                     | (1,169)                       |                         | 9,145          |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANNM8 | FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026 | 25,000,000 | 21,875                     |                               |                         | 21,875         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANNM8 | FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026 | 25,000,000 | 21,875                     |                               |                         | 21,875         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANNM8 | FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026 | 25,000,000 | 21,875                     |                               |                         | 21,875         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANNM8 | FHLB 1.050 07/13/2026 | 25,000,000 | 21,875                     |                               |                         | 21,875         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANTG5 | FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026 | 25,000,000 | 21,875                     |                               |                         | 21,875         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANTG5 | FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026 | 25,000,000 | 21,875                     |                               |                         | 21,875         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANTG5 | FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026 | 25,000,000 | 21,875                     |                               |                         | 21,875         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANTG5 | FHLB 1.050 08/10/2026 | 25,000,000 | 21,875                     |                               |                         | 21,875         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANMP2 | FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026 | 25,000,000 | 22,292                     |                               |                         | 22,292         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANMP2 | FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026 | 25,000,000 | 22,292                     |                               |                         | 22,292         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANMP2 | FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026 | 25,000,000 | 22,292                     |                               |                         | 22,292         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ANMP2 | FHLB 1.070 07/27/2026 | 25,000,000 | 22,292                     |                               |                         | 22,292         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AP6T7 | FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026 | 25,000,000 | 22,396                     |                               |                         | 22,396         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AP6T7 | FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026 | 25,000,000 | 22,396                     |                               |                         | 22,396         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AP6T7 | FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026 | 25,000,000 | 22,396                     |                               |                         | 22,396         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AP6T7 | FHLB 1.075 09/03/2026 | 25,000,000 | 22,396                     |                               |                         | 22,396         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130APPR0 | FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026 | 25,000,000 | 29,792                     |                               |                         | 29,792         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130APPR0 | FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026 | 25,000,000 | 29,792                     |                               |                         | 29,792         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130APPR0 | FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026 | 25,000,000 | 29,792                     |                               |                         | 29,792         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130APPR0 | FHLB 1.430 10/19/2026 | 25,000,000 | 29,792                     |                               |                         | 29,792         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQ7L1 | FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026 | 25,000,000 | 33,438                     |                               |                         | 33,438         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQ7L1 | FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026 | 25,000,000 | 33,438                     |                               |                         | 33,438         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQ7L1 | FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026 | 25,000,000 | 33,438                     |                               |                         | 33,438         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQ7L1 | FHLB 1.605 11/16/2026 | 25,000,000 | 33,438                     |                               |                         | 33,438         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQJ95 | FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026 | 25,000,000 | 34,271                     |                               |                         | 34,271         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQJ95 | FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026 | 25,000,000 | 34,271                     |                               |                         | 34,271         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQJ95 | FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026 | 25,000,000 | 34,271                     |                               |                         | 34,271         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AQJ95 | FHLB 1.645 12/14/2026 | 25,000,000 | 34,271                     |                               |                         | 34,271         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130A8ZQ9 | FHLB 1.750 09/12/2025 | 10,295,000 | 15,014                     | (6,163)                       |                         | 8,850          |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARHG9 | FHLB 2.125 02/28/2024 | 25,000,000 | 44,271                     | 1,253                         |                         | 45,524         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARHG9 | FHLB 2.125 02/28/2024 | 11,000,000 | 19,479                     | 551                           |                         | 20,031         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130A3VC5 | FHLB 2.250 12/08/2023 | 30,000,000 | 56,250                     | (38,452)                      |                         | 17,798         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130A3VC5 | FHLB 2.250 12/08/2023 | 10,000,000 | 18,750                     | (12,817)                      |                         | 5,933          |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARB59 | FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027 | 25,000,000 | 48,958                     |                               |                         | 48,958         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARB59 | FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027 | 25,000,000 | 48,958                     |                               |                         | 48,958         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARB59 | FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027 | 25,000,000 | 48,958                     |                               |                         | 48,958         |



# Monthly Investment Earnings

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name           | Par Value  | Accrued<br>Interest Earned | (Amortization) /<br>Accretion | Realized<br>Gain/(Loss) | Total Earnings |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------|------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ARB59 | FHLB 2.350 03/08/2027 | 25,000,000 | 48,958                     |                               |                         | 48,958         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AFW94 | FHLB 2.500 02/13/2024 | 39,010,000 | 81,271                     | (61,729)                      |                         | 19,542         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130A1XJ2 | FHLB 2.875 06/14/2024 | 25,500,000 | 61,094                     | (2,131)                       |                         | 58,962         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130A1XJ2 | FHLB 2.875 06/14/2024 | 50,000,000 | 119,792                    | (8,321)                       |                         | 111,471        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130A1XJ2 | FHLB 2.875 06/14/2024 | 17,980,000 | 43,077                     | (2,610)                       |                         | 40,467         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130A1XJ2 | FHLB 2.875 06/14/2024 | 15,955,000 | 38,226                     | (2,186)                       |                         | 36,040         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASME6 | FHLB 3.000 07/08/2024 | 15,000,000 | 37,500                     | 1,234                         |                         | 38,734         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASME6 | FHLB 3.000 07/08/2024 | 17,500,000 | 43,750                     | 1,440                         |                         | 45,190         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASME6 | FHLB 3.000 07/08/2024 | 10,000,000 | 25,000                     | 823                           |                         | 25,823         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASHK8 | FHLB 3.125 06/14/2024 | 28,000,000 | 72,917                     | 4,271                         |                         | 77,188         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASHK8 | FHLB 3.125 06/14/2024 | 28,210,000 | 73,464                     | 4,253                         |                         | 77,716         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASG86 | FHLB 3.375 06/13/2025 | 12,700,000 | 35,719                     | (3,146)                       |                         | 32,573         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASG86 | FHLB 3.375 06/13/2025 | 11,940,000 | 33,581                     | (1,787)                       |                         | 31,794         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313383YJ4 | FHLB 3.375 09/08/2023 | 25,000,000 | 70,313                     | (5,452)                       |                         | 64,861         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313383YJ4 | FHLB 3.375 09/08/2023 | 25,000,000 | 70,313                     | (5,319)                       |                         | 64,994         |
| Federal Agencies   | 313383YJ4 | FHLB 3.375 09/08/2023 | 40,000,000 | 112,500                    | (7,769)                       |                         | 104,731        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASGU7 | FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027 | 12,375,000 | 36,094                     | (3,083)                       |                         | 33,011         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASGU7 | FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027 | 10,000,000 | 29,167                     | (2,453)                       |                         | 26,713         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ASGU7 | FHLB 3.500 06/11/2027 | 21,725,000 | 63,365                     | (5,058)                       |                         | 58,307         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AVWS7 | FHLB 3.750 06/12/2026 | 17,045,000 | 53,266                     | 1,470                         |                         | 54,735         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AVWS7 | FHLB 3.750 06/12/2026 | 20,000,000 | 62,500                     | 1,680                         |                         | 64,180         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWAH3 | FHLB 4.000 06/12/2026 | 15,000,000 | 50,000                     | 2,819                         |                         | 52,819         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWAH3 | FHLB 4.000 06/12/2026 | 10,000,000 | 33,333                     | 1,840                         |                         | 35,173         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AUTC8 | FHLB 4.010 02/06/2026 | 21,100,000 | 70,509                     | 3,250                         |                         | 73,759         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATST5 | FHLB 4.375 06/13/2025 | 10,000,000 | 36,458                     | (2,627)                       |                         | 33,831         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATST5 | FHLB 4.375 06/13/2025 | 9,915,000  | 36,148                     | (2,461)                       |                         | 33,688         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATST5 | FHLB 4.375 06/13/2025 | 25,500,000 | 92,969                     | (5,046)                       |                         | 87,922         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATST5 | FHLB 4.375 06/13/2025 | 3,000,000  | 10,938                     | (497)                         |                         | 10,440         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATST5 | FHLB 4.375 06/13/2025 | 10,000,000 | 36,458                     | (1,461)                       |                         | 34,998         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATST5 | FHLB 4.375 06/13/2025 | 24,000,000 | 87,500                     | (3,249)                       |                         | 84,251         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AUVZ4 | FHLB 4.500 02/13/2025 | 50,000,000 | 187,500                    | 3,329                         |                         | 190,829        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATT31 | FHLB 4.500 10/03/2024 | 50,000,000 | 187,500                    | 6,160                         |                         | 193,660        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWER7 | FHLB 4.625 06/06/2025 | 25,000,000 | 96,354                     | 887                           |                         | 97,241         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWER7 | FHLB 4.625 06/06/2025 | 15,000,000 | 57,813                     | 532                           |                         | 58,345         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWER7 | FHLB 4.625 06/06/2025 | 52,000,000 | 200,417                    | 1,845                         |                         | 202,262        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWER7 | FHLB 4.625 06/06/2025 | 10,000,000 | 38,542                     | 355                           |                         | 38,897         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATUQ8 | FHLB 4.750 03/08/2024 | 10,000,000 | 39,583                     | (861)                         |                         | 38,723         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATUQ8 | FHLB 4.750 03/08/2024 | 20,000,000 | 79,167                     | (52)                          |                         | 79,115         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATUQ8 | FHLB 4.750 03/08/2024 | 30,000,000 | 118,750                    | (117)                         |                         | 118,633        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATUQ8 | FHLB 4.750 03/08/2024 | 30,000,000 | 118,750                    | 1,468                         |                         | 120,218        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATUQ8 | FHLB 4.750 03/08/2024 | 25,000,000 | 98,958                     | 1,224                         |                         | 100,182        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWLZ1 | FHLB 4.750 06/12/2026 | 50,000,000 | 197,917                    | 4,180                         |                         | 202,096        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AU4V3 | FHLB 4.800 01/08/2024 | 11,000,000 | 44,000                     | 86                            |                         | 44,086         |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AU4V3 | FHLB 4.800 01/08/2024 | 25,000,000 | 100,000                    | 979                           |                         | 100,979        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130ATVD6 | FHLB 4.875 09/13/2024 | 50,000,000 | 203,125                    | (2,856)                       |                         | 200,269        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AV7L0 | FHLB 5.000 02/28/2025 | 25,000,000 | 104,167                    | 1,405                         |                         | 105,572        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AV7L0 | FHLB 5.000 02/28/2025 | 35,000,000 | 145,833                    | 1,967                         |                         | 147,801        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AUYG3 | FHLB 5.100 02/16/2024 | 25,000,000 | 106,250                    | 297                           |                         | 106,547        |
| Federal Agencies   | 3130AWLY4 | FHLB 5.125 06/13/2025 | 48,150,000 | 205,641                    | (4,138)                       |                         | 201,503        |

# Monthly Investment Earnings

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment   | CUSIP     | Issuer Name             | Par Value               | Accrued<br>Interest Earned | (Amortization) /<br>Accretion | Realized<br>Gain/(Loss) | Total Earnings       |
|----------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Federal Agencies     | 3130AWLY4 | FHLB 5.125 06/13/2025   | 10,800,000              | 46,125                     | (811)                         |                         | 45,314               |
| Federal Agencies     | 3130AWFH8 | FHLB 5.510 07/12/2024   | 50,000,000              | 229,583                    |                               |                         | 229,583              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3137EAEV7 | FHLMC 0.250 08/24/2023  |                         | 6,513                      | 8,569                         |                         | 15,082               |
| Federal Agencies     | 3137EAEX3 | FHLMC 0.375 09/23/2025  | 22,600,000              | 7,063                      | 5,676                         |                         | 12,738               |
| Federal Agencies     | 3137EAEP0 | FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025  | 15,000,000              | 18,750                     | 196                           |                         | 18,946               |
| Federal Agencies     | 3137EAEP0 | FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025  | 5,000,000               | 6,250                      | 65                            |                         | 6,315                |
| Federal Agencies     | 3137EAEP0 | FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025  | 5,000,000               | 6,250                      | 65                            |                         | 6,315                |
| Federal Agencies     | 3137EAEP0 | FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025  | 5,000,000               | 6,250                      | 65                            |                         | 6,315                |
| Federal Agencies     | 3137EAEP0 | FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025  | 50,000,000              | 62,500                     | 654                           |                         | 63,154               |
| Federal Agencies     | 3137EAEP0 | FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025  | 53,532,000              | 66,915                     | (42,685)                      |                         | 24,230               |
| Federal Agencies     | 3134GYRY0 | FHLMC 5.290 11/02/2026  | 25,000,000              | 110,208                    |                               |                         | 110,208              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3134GYRY0 | FHLMC 5.290 11/02/2026  | 25,000,000              | 110,208                    |                               |                         | 110,208              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3134GYRY0 | FHLMC 5.290 11/02/2026  | 25,000,000              | 110,208                    |                               |                         | 110,208              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3134GYRY0 | FHLMC 5.290 11/02/2026  | 25,000,000              | 110,208                    |                               |                         | 110,208              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3134GYUV2 | FHLMC 5.940 06/29/2027  | 50,000,000              | 247,500                    |                               |                         | 247,500              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3134GYUV2 | FHLMC 5.940 06/29/2027  | 25,000,000              | 123,750                    |                               |                         | 123,750              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3134GYUV2 | FHLMC 5.940 06/29/2027  | 25,000,000              | 123,750                    |                               |                         | 123,750              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3134GYYG1 | FHLMC 6.000 08/16/2027  | 25,000,000              | 62,500                     |                               |                         | 62,500               |
| Federal Agencies     | 3134GYYG1 | FHLMC 6.000 08/16/2027  | 25,000,000              | 62,500                     |                               |                         | 62,500               |
| Federal Agencies     | 3135G05X7 | FNMA 0.375 08/25/2025   | 72,500,000              | 22,656                     | 12,045                        |                         | 34,701               |
| Federal Agencies     | 3135G05X7 | FNMA 0.375 08/25/2025   | 25,000,000              | 7,813                      | 5,987                         |                         | 13,799               |
| Federal Agencies     | 3135G04Z3 | FNMA 0.500 06/17/2025   | 10,000,000              | 4,167                      | 5,068                         |                         | 9,235                |
| Federal Agencies     | 3135G04Z3 | FNMA 0.500 06/17/2025   | 4,655,000               | 1,940                      | 2,369                         |                         | 4,309                |
| Federal Agencies     | 3135G03U5 | FNMA 0.625 04/22/2025   | 50,000,000              | 26,042                     | (2,426)                       |                         | 23,616               |
| Federal Agencies     | 3135G03U5 | FNMA 0.625 04/22/2025   | 37,938,000              | 19,759                     | 14,359                        |                         | 34,119               |
| Federal Agencies     | 3135G03U5 | FNMA 0.625 04/22/2025   | 50,000,000              | 26,042                     | 19,039                        |                         | 45,081               |
| Federal Agencies     | 3135G0X24 | FNMA 1.625 01/07/2025   | 39,060,000              | 52,894                     | (35,924)                      |                         | 16,969               |
| Federal Agencies     | 3135G0U43 | FNMA 2.875 09/12/2023   | 29,648,000              | 71,032                     | (55,303)                      |                         | 15,729               |
| Federal Agencies     | 3135GAFY2 | FNMA 5.320 10/03/2024   | 50,000,000              | 221,667                    |                               |                         | 221,667              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3135GAFY2 | FNMA 5.320 10/03/2024   | 25,000,000              | 110,833                    |                               |                         | 110,833              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3135GAFY2 | FNMA 5.320 10/03/2024   | 25,000,000              | 110,833                    |                               |                         | 110,833              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3135GAG39 | FNMA 5.375 12/30/2024   | 25,000,000              | 111,979                    |                               |                         | 111,979              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3135GAG39 | FNMA 5.375 12/30/2024   | 25,000,000              | 111,979                    |                               |                         | 111,979              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3135GAG39 | FNMA 5.375 12/30/2024   | 25,000,000              | 111,979                    |                               |                         | 111,979              |
| Federal Agencies     | 3135GAG39 | FNMA 5.375 12/30/2024   | 25,000,000              | 111,979                    |                               |                         | 111,979              |
| <b>Subtotals</b>     |           |                         | <b>\$ 7,088,706,000</b> | <b>\$ 14,197,887</b>       | <b>\$ 2,965,225</b>           | <b>\$ -</b>             | <b>\$ 17,163,112</b> |
| Public Time Deposits | PPG62B630 | BKSANF 5.460 12/04/2023 | \$ 10,000,000           | \$ 47,017                  |                               |                         | \$ 47,017            |
| Public Time Deposits | PPG24NBE1 | BKSANF 5.540 01/08/2024 | 10,000,000              | 47,706                     |                               |                         | 47,706               |
| Public Time Deposits | PPG42YDZ6 | BRIDGE 5.370 12/18/2023 | 10,000,000              | 45,608                     |                               |                         | 45,608               |
| Public Time Deposits | PPG250Y96 | BRIDGE 5.490 01/16/2024 | 10,000,000              | 46,627                     |                               |                         | 46,627               |
| <b>Subtotals</b>     |           |                         | <b>\$ 40,000,000</b>    | <b>\$ 186,958</b>          | <b>\$ -</b>                   | <b>\$ -</b>             | <b>\$ 186,958</b>    |

# Monthly Investment Earnings

## Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment | CUSIP     | Issuer Name             | Par Value               | Accrued<br>Interest Earned | (Amortization) /<br>Accretion | Realized<br>Gain/(Loss) | Total Earnings       |
|--------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367CXR3 | BMOCHG 4.230 08/28/2023 |                         | \$ 158,625                 |                               |                         | \$ 158,625           |
| Negotiable CDs     | 78015JFJ1 | RY 4.750 09/20/2023     | 50,000,000              | 204,514                    |                               |                         | 204,514              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367CXX0 | BMOCHG 4.820 09/25/2023 | 50,000,000              | 207,528                    |                               |                         | 207,528              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 78015JH67 | RY 4.760 09/25/2023     | 50,000,000              | 204,944                    |                               |                         | 204,944              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 78015JHJ9 | RY 4.810 09/22/2023     | 50,000,000              | 207,097                    |                               |                         | 207,097              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367CY27 | BMOCHG 4.800 09/22/2023 | 50,000,000              | 206,667                    |                               |                         | 206,667              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367CYA9 | BMOCHG 4.970 10/06/2023 | 50,000,000              | 213,986                    |                               |                         | 213,986              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115BC73 | TDNY 5.570 10/23/2023   | 50,000,000              | 239,819                    |                               |                         | 239,819              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 78015JMJ3 | RY 5.460 10/23/2023     | 50,000,000              | 235,083                    |                               |                         | 235,083              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115BJX9 | TDNY 5.510 11/20/2023   | 50,000,000              | 237,236                    |                               |                         | 237,236              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06417MN84 | BNSHOU 5.500 11/21/2023 | 50,000,000              | 236,806                    |                               |                         | 236,806              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 78015JPE1 | RY 5.370 12/18/2023     | 50,000,000              | 231,208                    |                               |                         | 231,208              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 78015JRE9 | RY 5.430 12/29/2023     | 100,000,000             | 467,583                    |                               |                         | 467,583              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115BPB0 | TDNY 5.430 01/03/2024   | 50,000,000              | 233,792                    |                               |                         | 233,792              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115BPF1 | TDNY 5.430 01/05/2024   | 50,000,000              | 233,792                    |                               |                         | 233,792              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 13606KRZ1 | CIBCNV 5.320 11/06/2023 | 50,000,000              | 229,056                    |                               |                         | 229,056              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367D3V5 | BMOCHG 5.240 01/12/2024 | 70,000,000              | 315,856                    |                               |                         | 315,856              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115BQB9 | TDNY 5.240 01/17/2024   | 50,000,000              | 225,611                    |                               |                         | 225,611              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115BST8 | TDNY 5.210 01/29/2024   | 100,000,000             | 448,639                    |                               |                         | 448,639              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 65602Y7E4 | NORNY 5.050 08/16/2023  |                         | 105,208                    |                               |                         | 105,208              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06417MT47 | BNSHOU 5.430 02/09/2024 | 50,000,000              | 233,792                    |                               |                         | 233,792              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367D4E2 | BMOCHG 5.420 10/24/2023 | 100,000,000             | 466,722                    |                               |                         | 466,722              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115BWK2 | TDNY 5.580 02/22/2024   | 50,000,000              | 240,250                    |                               |                         | 240,250              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115BXF2 | TDNY 5.600 03/06/2024   | 50,000,000              | 241,111                    |                               |                         | 241,111              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115BY79 | TDNY 5.750 01/29/2024   | 50,000,000              | 247,569                    |                               |                         | 247,569              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367DAU9 | BMOCHG 5.870 06/21/2024 | 100,000,000             | 505,472                    |                               |                         | 505,472              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115BNG1 | TDNY 5.850 06/05/2024   | 50,000,000              | 251,875                    |                               |                         | 251,875              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 78015JXW2 | RY 5.890 06/28/2024     | 50,000,000              | 253,597                    |                               |                         | 253,597              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367DAX3 | BMOCHG 6.000 07/01/2024 | 100,000,000             | 516,667                    |                               |                         | 516,667              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115BRG7 | TDNY 6.050 07/01/2024   | 50,000,000              | 260,486                    |                               |                         | 260,486              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115BS84 | TDNY 5.910 07/01/2024   | 50,000,000              | 254,458                    |                               |                         | 254,458              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367DBJ3 | BMOCHG 5.890 06/07/2024 | 50,000,000              | 253,597                    |                               |                         | 253,597              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367DBR5 | BMOCHG 5.930 07/01/2024 | 50,000,000              | 255,319                    |                               |                         | 255,319              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115BSQ4 | TDNY 5.930 07/01/2024   | 50,000,000              | 255,319                    |                               |                         | 255,319              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367DBW4 | BMOCHG 5.970 07/29/2024 | 50,000,000              | 257,042                    |                               |                         | 257,042              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 13606KZN9 | CIBCNV 5.920 07/29/2024 | 60,000,000              | 296,000                    |                               |                         | 296,000              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 89115BV80 | TDNY 5.900 07/03/2024   | 50,000,000              | 245,833                    |                               |                         | 245,833              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 13606KZR0 | CIBCNV 5.890 07/01/2024 | 50,000,000              | 204,514                    |                               |                         | 204,514              |
| Negotiable CDs     | 06367DCF0 | BMOCHI 6.010 08/14/2024 | 50,000,000              | 33,389                     |                               |                         | 33,389               |
| <b>Subtotals</b>   |           |                         | <b>\$ 2,130,000,000</b> | <b>\$ 10,116,064</b>       | <b>\$ -</b>                   | <b>\$ -</b>             | <b>\$ 10,116,064</b> |

## Monthly Investment Earnings

### Pooled Fund

| Type of Investment  | CUSIP     | Issuer Name                                 | Par Value               | Accrued<br>Interest Earned | (Amortization) /<br>Accretion | Realized<br>Gain/(Loss) | Total Earnings       |
|---------------------|-----------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Commercial Paper    | 03785EW59 | APPINC 0.000 09/05/2023                     | \$ 11,000,000           |                            | \$ 16,072                     |                         | \$ 16,072            |
| Commercial Paper    | 62479MV26 | MUFGBK 0.000 08/02/2023                     |                         |                            | 6,903                         |                         | 6,903                |
| Commercial Paper    | 62479MV75 | MUFGBK 0.000 08/07/2023                     |                         |                            | 41,417                        |                         | 41,417               |
| Commercial Paper    | 62479MVE0 | MUFGBK 0.000 08/14/2023                     |                         |                            | 88,833                        |                         | 88,833               |
| Commercial Paper    | 62479MVU4 | MUFGBK 0.000 08/28/2023                     |                         |                            | 186,750                       |                         | 186,750              |
| Commercial Paper    | 89233GE36 | TOYCC 0.000 05/03/2024                      | 60,000,000              |                            | 224,000                       |                         | 224,000              |
| Commercial Paper    | 89233GE69 | TOYCC 0.000 05/06/2024                      | 50,000,000              |                            | 132,222                       |                         | 132,222              |
| Commercial Paper    | 89233HVB7 | TOYCC 0.000 08/11/2023                      |                         |                            | 69,444                        |                         | 69,444               |
| Commercial Paper    | 89233HVV1 | TOYCC 0.000 08/30/2023                      |                         |                            | 201,792                       |                         | 201,792              |
| Commercial Paper    | 89233HY65 | TOYCC 0.000 11/06/2023                      | 50,000,000              |                            | 235,944                       |                         | 235,944              |
| Commercial Paper    | 89233HY81 | TOYCC 0.000 11/08/2023                      | 50,000,000              |                            | 229,583                       |                         | 229,583              |
| <b>Subtotals</b>    |           |                                             | <b>\$ 221,000,000</b>   | <b>\$ -</b>                | <b>\$ 1,432,961</b>           | <b>\$ -</b>             | <b>\$ 1,432,961</b>  |
| Money Market Funds  | 09248U718 | BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund            | \$ 20,639,985           | \$ 91,472                  |                               |                         | \$ 91,472            |
| Money Market Funds  | 31607A703 | Fidelity Govt Portfolio                     | 538,038,800             | 3,003,107                  |                               |                         | 3,003,107            |
| Money Market Funds  | 608919718 | Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund      | 11,969,130              | 52,876                     |                               |                         | 52,876               |
| Money Market Funds  | 262006208 | Dreyfus Government Cash Management          | 14,960,809              | 65,798                     |                               |                         | 65,798               |
| Money Market Funds  | 85749T517 | State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF    | 546,167,400             | 1,465,823                  |                               |                         | 1,465,823            |
| Money Market Funds  | 61747C319 | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund | 556,939,908             | 2,772,871                  |                               |                         | 2,772,871            |
| <b>Subtotals</b>    |           |                                             | <b>\$ 1,688,716,031</b> | <b>\$ 7,451,946</b>        | <b>\$ -</b>                   | <b>\$ -</b>             | <b>\$ 7,451,946</b>  |
| Supranationals      | 4581X0CM8 | IADB 2.125 01/15/2025                       | \$ 100,000,000          | \$ 177,083                 | \$ (129,379)                  |                         | \$ 47,704            |
| Supranationals      | 459058JB0 | IBRD 0.626 04/22/2025                       | 40,000,000              | 20,867                     | (1,947)                       |                         | 18,919               |
| Supranationals      | 45818WDG8 | IADB 0.820 02/27/2026                       | 19,500,000              | 13,325                     | (1,071)                       |                         | 12,254               |
| Supranationals      | 45950VQG4 | IFC 0.440 09/23/2024                        | 10,000,000              | 3,667                      | 2,362                         |                         | 6,029                |
| Supranationals      | 4581X0DN5 | IADB 0.625 07/15/2025                       | 28,900,000              | 15,052                     | 8,734                         |                         | 23,786               |
| Supranationals      | 459056HV2 | IBRD 1.500 08/28/2024                       | 50,000,000              | 62,500                     | (29,623)                      |                         | 32,877               |
| Supranationals      | 4581X0DZ8 | IADB 0.500 09/23/2024                       | 50,000,000              | 20,833                     | 11,897                        |                         | 32,730               |
| Supranationals      | 4581X0CC0 | IADB 3.000 10/04/2023                       | 25,756,000              | 64,390                     | (50,964)                      |                         | 13,426               |
| Supranationals      | 45906M3B5 | IBRD 1.980 06/14/2024                       | 100,000,000             | 165,000                    |                               |                         | 165,000              |
| Supranationals      | 4581X0EE4 | IADB 3.250 07/01/2024                       | 80,000,000              | 216,667                    | 339                           |                         | 217,006              |
| Supranationals      | 45950VRU2 | IFC 4.023 01/26/2026                        | 100,000,000             | 335,250                    |                               |                         | 335,250              |
| Supranationals      | 45906M4C2 | IBRD 5.750 06/15/2026                       | 32,000,000              | 153,333                    |                               |                         | 153,333              |
| <b>Subtotals</b>    |           |                                             | <b>\$ 636,156,000</b>   | <b>\$ 1,247,967</b>        | <b>\$ (189,653)</b>           | <b>\$ -</b>             | <b>\$ 1,058,314</b>  |
| <b>Grand Totals</b> |           |                                             | <b>\$15,329,578,031</b> | <b>\$ 35,847,501</b>       | <b>\$ 4,466,678</b>           | <b>\$ -</b>             | <b>\$ 40,314,180</b> |

# Investment Transactions

## Pooled Fund

For month ended August 31, 2023

| Accounting ID         | Transaction Type | Cusip     | Description             | Price            | Settlement Date | Posted Date | Par Value             | Principal     | Accrued Interest | Total                 |
|-----------------------|------------------|-----------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| 57710                 | Buy              | 06367DBW4 | BMOCHG 5.970 07/29/2024 | \$ 100.00        | 8/1/23          | 8/1/23      | \$ 50,000,000         | \$ 50,000,000 | \$ -             | \$ 50,000,000         |
| 57711                 | Buy              | 89233HY81 | TOYCC 0.000 11/08/2023  | 98.50            | 8/2/23          | 8/2/23      | 50,000,000            | 49,250,028    | -                | 49,250,028            |
| 57713                 | Buy              | 13606KZN9 | CIBCNY 5.920 07/29/2024 | 100.00           | 8/2/23          | 8/2/23      | 60,000,000            | 60,000,000    | -                | 60,000,000            |
| 57714                 | Buy              | 89115BV80 | TDNY 5.900 07/03/2024   | 100.00           | 8/2/23          | 8/2/23      | 50,000,000            | 50,000,000    | -                | 50,000,000            |
| 57712                 | Buy              | 3133EPSK2 | FFCB 4.250 08/07/2028   | 99.55            | 8/7/23          | 8/7/23      | 19,500,000            | 19,412,250    | -                | 19,412,250            |
| 57715                 | Buy              | 13606KZR0 | CIBCNY 5.890 07/01/2024 | 100.00           | 8/7/23          | 8/7/23      | 50,000,000            | 50,000,000    | -                | 50,000,000            |
| 57716                 | Buy              | 89233GE36 | TOYCC 0.000 05/03/2024  | 95.82            | 8/8/23          | 8/8/23      | 60,000,000            | 57,489,333    | -                | 57,489,333            |
| 57717                 | Buy              | 3133EPSW6 | FFCB 4.500 08/14/2026   | 99.77            | 8/14/23         | 8/14/23     | 50,000,000            | 49,885,000    | -                | 49,885,000            |
| 57718                 | Buy              | 89233GE69 | TOYCC 0.000 05/06/2024  | 95.88            | 8/15/23         | 8/15/23     | 50,000,000            | 47,938,889    | -                | 47,938,889            |
| 57719                 | Buy              | 3134GYYG1 | FHLMC 6.000 08/16/2027  | 100.00           | 8/16/23         | 8/16/23     | 25,000,000            | 25,000,000    | -                | 25,000,000            |
| 57720                 | Buy              | 3134GYYG1 | FHLMC 6.000 08/16/2027  | 100.00           | 8/16/23         | 8/16/23     | 25,000,000            | 25,000,000    | -                | 25,000,000            |
| 57721                 | Buy              | 03785EW59 | APPINC 0.000 09/05/2023 | 99.80            | 8/22/23         | 8/22/23     | 11,000,000            | 10,977,499    | -                | 10,977,499            |
| 57729                 | Buy              | 3133EPUN3 | FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028   | 99.79            | 8/28/23         | 8/28/23     | 10,000,000            | 9,979,100     | -                | 9,979,100             |
| 57730                 | Buy              | 3133EPUN3 | FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028   | 99.77            | 8/28/23         | 8/28/23     | 25,000,000            | 24,943,500    | -                | 24,943,500            |
| 57731                 | Buy              | 3133EPUN3 | FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028   | 99.75            | 8/28/23         | 8/28/23     | 15,000,000            | 14,962,800    | -                | 14,962,800            |
| 57732                 | Buy              | 3133EPUN3 | FFCB 4.500 08/28/2028   | 99.71            | 8/28/23         | 8/28/23     | 33,000,000            | 32,904,960    | -                | 32,904,960            |
| 57733                 | Buy              | 06367DCF0 | BMOCHI 6.010 08/14/2024 | 100.00           | 8/28/23         | 8/28/23     | 50,000,000            | 50,000,000    | -                | 50,000,000            |
| <b>Activity Total</b> |                  |           |                         | <b>\$ 99.09</b>  |                 |             | <b>\$ 633,500,000</b> |               | <b>\$ -</b>      | <b>\$ 627,743,359</b> |
| 57579                 | Maturity         | 62479MV26 | MUFGBK 0.000 08/02/2023 | \$ 100.00        | 8/2/23          | 8/2/23      | \$ 50,000,000         | \$ 50,000,000 | \$ -             | \$ 50,000,000         |
| 57580                 | Maturity         | 62479MV75 | MUFGBK 0.000 08/07/2023 | 100.00           | 8/7/23          | 8/7/23      | 50,000,000            | 50,000,000    | -                | 50,000,000            |
| 57617                 | Maturity         | 313384KF5 | FHDN 0.000 08/10/2023   | 100.00           | 8/10/23         | 8/10/23     | 75,000,000            | 75,000,000    | -                | 75,000,000            |
| 47108                 | Maturity         | 3133EM2E1 | FFCB 0.160 08/10/2023   | 100.00           | 8/10/23         | 8/10/23     | 50,000,000            | 50,000,000    | -                | 50,000,000            |
| 57588                 | Maturity         | 89233HVB7 | TOYCC 0.000 08/11/2023  | 100.00           | 8/11/23         | 8/11/23     | 50,000,000            | 50,000,000    | -                | 50,000,000            |
| 57577                 | Maturity         | 62479MVE0 | MUFGBK 0.000 08/14/2023 | 100.00           | 8/14/23         | 8/14/23     | 50,000,000            | 50,000,000    | -                | 50,000,000            |
| 57584                 | Maturity         | 65602Y7E4 | NORNY 5.050 08/16/2023  | 100.00           | 8/16/23         | 8/16/23     | 50,000,000            | 50,000,000    | -                | 50,000,000            |
| 57667                 | Maturity         | 313384KP3 | FHDN 0.000 08/18/2023   | 100.00           | 8/18/23         | 8/18/23     | 15,000,000            | 15,000,000    | -                | 15,000,000            |
| 57669                 | Maturity         | 313384KU2 | FHDN 0.000 08/23/2023   | 100.00           | 8/23/23         | 8/23/23     | 10,000,000            | 10,000,000    | -                | 10,000,000            |
| 47227                 | Maturity         | 3137EAEV7 | FHLMC 0.250 08/24/2023  | 100.00           | 8/24/23         | 8/24/23     | 40,776,000            | 40,776,000    | -                | 40,776,000            |
| 47459                 | Maturity         | 06367CXR3 | BMOCHG 4.230 08/28/2023 | 100.00           | 8/28/23         | 8/28/23     | 50,000,000            | 50,000,000    | -                | 50,000,000            |
| 57574                 | Maturity         | 62479MVU4 | MUFGBK 0.000 08/28/2023 | 100.00           | 8/28/23         | 8/28/23     | 50,000,000            | 50,000,000    | -                | 50,000,000            |
| 57586                 | Maturity         | 89233HVV1 | TOYCC 0.000 08/30/2023  | 100.00           | 8/30/23         | 8/30/23     | 50,000,000            | 50,000,000    | -                | 50,000,000            |
| <b>Activity Total</b> |                  |           |                         | <b>\$ 100.00</b> |                 |             | <b>\$ 590,776,000</b> |               | <b>\$ -</b>      | <b>\$ 590,776,000</b> |

# Interest Received

## Pooled Fund

For month ended August 31, 2023

| <u>Accounting ID</u> | <u>Transaction Type</u> | <u>Cusip</u> | <u>Description</u>      | <u>Date Posted</u> | <u>Interest Received</u> | <u>Purchased Interest Adjustment</u> | <u>Net Interest</u> |
|----------------------|-------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 57583                | Interest Income         | 3130AUTC8    | FHLB 4.010 02/06/2026   | 8/7/2023           | \$ 420,705               | \$ 4,701                             | \$ 416,004          |
| 57581                | Interest Income         | 3133EPAG0    | FFCB 4.250 02/10/2025   | 8/10/2023          | 634,844                  |                                      | 634,844             |
| 57582                | Interest Income         | 3133EPAG0    | FFCB 4.250 02/10/2025   | 8/10/2023          | 212,500                  |                                      | 212,500             |
| 47108                | Interest Income         | 3133EM2E1    | FFCB 0.160 08/10/2023   | 8/10/2023          | 40,000                   |                                      | 40,000              |
| 46426                | Interest Income         | 3137EAEP0    | FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025  | 8/14/2023          | 375,000                  |                                      | 375,000             |
| 46451                | Interest Income         | 3133ELNE0    | FFCB 1.430 02/14/2024   | 8/14/2023          | 146,539                  |                                      | 146,539             |
| 57585                | Interest Income         | 3130AUVZ4    | FHLB 4.500 02/13/2025   | 8/14/2023          | 1,125,000                |                                      | 1,125,000           |
| 47022                | Interest Income         | 3137EAEP0    | FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025  | 8/14/2023          | 401,490                  |                                      | 401,490             |
| 47201                | Interest Income         | 3130AFW94    | FHLB 2.500 02/13/2024   | 8/14/2023          | 487,625                  |                                      | 487,625             |
| 46422                | Interest Income         | 3137EAEP0    | FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025  | 8/14/2023          | 112,500                  |                                      | 112,500             |
| 46423                | Interest Income         | 3137EAEP0    | FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025  | 8/14/2023          | 37,500                   |                                      | 37,500              |
| 46424                | Interest Income         | 3137EAEP0    | FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025  | 8/14/2023          | 37,500                   |                                      | 37,500              |
| 46425                | Interest Income         | 3137EAEP0    | FHLMC 1.500 02/12/2025  | 8/14/2023          | 37,500                   |                                      | 37,500              |
| 47145                | Interest Income         | 91282CCT6    | T 0.375 08/15/2024      | 8/15/2023          | 93,750                   |                                      | 93,750              |
| 47347                | Interest Income         | 912828B66    | T 2.750 02/15/2024      | 8/15/2023          | 687,500                  |                                      | 687,500             |
| 57584                | Interest Income         | 65602Y7E4    | NORNY 5.050 08/16/2023  | 8/16/2023          | 1,325,625                |                                      | 1,325,625           |
| 57593                | Interest Income         | 3130AUYG3    | FHLB 5.100 02/16/2024   | 8/16/2023          | 637,500                  |                                      | 637,500             |
| 57660                | Interest Income         | 3133EPJX4    | FFCB 3.625 02/17/2026   | 8/17/2023          | 271,875                  |                                      | 271,875             |
| 57661                | Interest Income         | 3133EPJX4    | FFCB 3.625 02/17/2026   | 8/17/2023          | 226,563                  |                                      | 226,563             |
| 57662                | Interest Income         | 3133EPKA2    | FFCB 4.000 08/18/2025   | 8/18/2023          | 265,000                  |                                      | 265,000             |
| 57663                | Interest Income         | 3133EPKA2    | FFCB 4.000 08/18/2025   | 8/18/2023          | 300,000                  |                                      | 300,000             |
| 57664                | Interest Income         | 3133EPKA2    | FFCB 4.000 08/18/2025   | 8/18/2023          | 250,000                  |                                      | 250,000             |
| 57589                | Interest Income         | 3133EPBF1    | FFCB 4.875 08/21/2024   | 8/21/2023          | 243,750                  |                                      | 243,750             |
| 57590                | Interest Income         | 3133EPBF1    | FFCB 4.875 08/21/2024   | 8/21/2023          | 609,375                  |                                      | 609,375             |
| 57591                | Interest Income         | 3133EPBF1    | FFCB 4.875 08/21/2024   | 8/21/2023          | 487,500                  |                                      | 487,500             |
| 57594                | Interest Income         | 3133EPBJ3    | FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026   | 8/23/2023          | 1,093,750                |                                      | 1,093,750           |
| 57595                | Interest Income         | 3133EPBJ3    | FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026   | 8/23/2023          | 546,875                  |                                      | 546,875             |
| 57596                | Interest Income         | 3133EPBJ3    | FFCB 4.375 02/23/2026   | 8/23/2023          | 612,500                  |                                      | 612,500             |
| 57597                | Interest Income         | 3133EPBM6    | FFCB 4.125 08/23/2027   | 8/23/2023          | 206,250                  |                                      | 206,250             |
| 47227                | Interest Income         | 3137EAEV7    | FHLMC 0.250 08/24/2023  | 8/24/2023          | 50,970                   |                                      | 50,970              |
| 46937                | Interest Income         | 3135G05X7    | FNMA 0.375 08/25/2025   | 8/25/2023          | 135,938                  |                                      | 135,938             |
| 46955                | Interest Income         | 3135G05X7    | FNMA 0.375 08/25/2025   | 8/25/2023          | 46,875                   |                                      | 46,875              |
| 47433                | Interest Income         | 3133ENJ35    | FFCB 3.320 02/25/2026   | 8/25/2023          | 581,000                  |                                      | 581,000             |
| 57602                | Interest Income         | 3130AV7L0    | FHLB 5.000 02/28/2025   | 8/28/2023          | 607,639                  |                                      | 607,639             |
| 57603                | Interest Income         | 3130AV7L0    | FHLB 5.000 02/28/2025   | 8/28/2023          | 850,694                  |                                      | 850,694             |
| 46934                | Interest Income         | 3133EMRZ7    | FFCB 0.250 02/26/2024   | 8/28/2023          | 6,250                    |                                      | 6,250               |
| 46935                | Interest Income         | 3133EMRZ7    | FFCB 0.250 02/26/2024   | 8/28/2023          | 6,250                    |                                      | 6,250               |
| 46936                | Interest Income         | 3133EMRZ7    | FFCB 0.250 02/26/2024   | 8/28/2023          | 125,000                  |                                      | 125,000             |
| 47194                | Interest Income         | 459056HV2    | IBRD 1.500 08/28/2024   | 8/28/2023          | 375,000                  |                                      | 375,000             |
| 47326                | Interest Income         | 3130ARHG9    | FHLB 2.125 02/28/2024   | 8/28/2023          | 265,625                  |                                      | 265,625             |
| 47327                | Interest Income         | 3130ARHG9    | FHLB 2.125 02/28/2024   | 8/28/2023          | 116,875                  |                                      | 116,875             |
| 47441                | Interest Income         | 3133ENJ84    | FFCB 3.375 08/26/2024   | 8/28/2023          | 843,750                  |                                      | 843,750             |
| 47459                | Interest Income         | 06367CXR3    | BMOCHG 4.230 08/28/2023 | 8/28/2023          | 2,120,875                |                                      | 2,120,875           |
| 47144                | Interest Income         | 45818WDG8    | IADB 0.820 02/27/2026   | 8/29/2023          | 79,950                   |                                      | 79,950              |
| 46977                | Interest Income         | 912828ZC7    | T 1.125 02/28/2025      | 8/31/2023          | 281,250                  |                                      | 281,250             |
| 46994                | Interest Income         | 912828ZC7    | T 1.125 02/28/2025      | 8/31/2023          | 281,250                  |                                      | 281,250             |
| 47166                | Interest Income         | 91282CCW9    | T 0.750 08/31/2026      | 8/31/2023          | 187,500                  |                                      | 187,500             |

## Interest Received Pooled Fund

| <u>Accounting ID</u>  | <u>Transaction Type</u> | <u>Cusip</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Date Posted</u> | <u>Interest Received</u> | <u>Purchased Interest Adjustment</u> | <u>Net Interest</u> |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Activity Total</b> |                         |              |                    |                    | \$ 18,889,206            | \$                                   | 18,884,505          |
|                       |                         |              |                    |                    |                          |                                      |                     |



# Money Market Fund Activity

## Pooled Fund

For month ended August 31, 2023

| <u>Ticker</u>         | <u>Description</u>                          | <u>Activity Date</u> | <u>Transaction Type</u> | <u>Transaction Amount</u> |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| TSTXX                 | BlackRock Liquidity Funds T-Fund            | 8/1/23               | Interest Received       | \$ 114,932                |
| <b>Activity Total</b> |                                             |                      |                         | <b>\$ 114,932</b>         |
| FRGXX                 | Fidelity Govt Portfolio                     | 8/28/23              | Withdrawal              | \$ (95,000,000)           |
| FRGXX                 | Fidelity Govt Portfolio                     | 8/30/23              | Withdrawal              | (60,000,000)              |
| FRGXX                 | Fidelity Govt Portfolio                     | 8/31/23              | Interest Received       | 3,003,107                 |
| <b>Activity Total</b> |                                             |                      |                         | <b>\$ (151,996,893)</b>   |
| GOFXX                 | Federated Hermes Govt Obligations Fund      | 8/31/23              | Interest Received       | \$ 52,876                 |
| <b>Activity Total</b> |                                             |                      |                         | <b>\$ 52,876</b>          |
| DGCXX                 | Dreyfus Government Cash Management          | 8/31/23              | Interest Received       | \$ 65,798                 |
| <b>Activity Total</b> |                                             |                      |                         | <b>\$ 65,798</b>          |
| OPGXX                 | State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF    | 8/1/23               | Withdrawal              | \$ (80,000,000)           |
| OPGXX                 | State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF    | 8/3/23               | Withdrawal              | (11,000,000)              |
| OPGXX                 | State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF    | 8/4/23               | Withdrawal              | (27,000,000)              |
| OPGXX                 | State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF    | 8/7/23               | Withdrawal              | (22,000,000)              |
| OPGXX                 | State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF    | 8/8/23               | Withdrawal              | (62,000,000)              |
| OPGXX                 | State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF    | 8/9/23               | Deposit                 | 10,000,000                |
| OPGXX                 | State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF    | 8/10/23              | Deposit                 | 125,000,000               |
| OPGXX                 | State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF    | 8/11/23              | Deposit                 | 38,000,000                |
| OPGXX                 | State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF    | 8/15/23              | Deposit                 | 15,000,000                |
| OPGXX                 | State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF    | 8/21/23              | Deposit                 | 19,000,000                |
| OPGXX                 | State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF    | 8/22/23              | Deposit                 | 55,000,000                |
| OPGXX                 | State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF    | 8/23/23              | Deposit                 | 17,000,000                |
| OPGXX                 | State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF    | 8/24/23              | Deposit                 | 35,000,000                |
| OPGXX                 | State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF    | 8/25/23              | Deposit                 | 44,000,000                |
| OPGXX                 | State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF    | 8/29/23              | Deposit                 | 40,000,000                |
| OPGXX                 | State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF    | 8/31/23              | Deposit                 | 22,000,000                |
| OPGXX                 | State Street Institutional U.S. Govt MMF    | 8/31/23              | Interest Received       | 1,465,823                 |
| <b>Activity Total</b> |                                             |                      |                         | <b>\$ 219,465,823</b>     |
| IMPXX                 | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund | 8/2/23               | Withdrawal              | \$ (140,000,000)          |
| IMPXX                 | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund | 8/14/23              | Withdrawal              | (74,000,000)              |
| IMPXX                 | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund | 8/16/23              | Withdrawal              | (52,000,000)              |
| IMPXX                 | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund | 8/17/23              | Withdrawal              | (17,000,000)              |
| IMPXX                 | Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund | 8/31/23              | Interest Received       | 2,772,871                 |
| <b>Activity Total</b> |                                             |                      |                         | <b>\$ (280,227,129)</b>   |
|                       |                                             |                      |                         |                           |



**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** 6 Approved Requests to Waive 12B Requirements  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 1:38:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [6 Approved Requested to Waive 12B Requirements.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see attached for 6 approved requests to waive 12B requirements.

Sincerely,

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

**From:** [CCSF IT Service Desk](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** CMD12B0002944 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (DPH) Department Head (Michelle Ruggels)  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 11:49:04 AM  
**Attachments:** [ccsfLogoPic.png](#)

---



## Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0002944 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (DPH) Department Head (Michelle Ruggels).

### Summary of Request

**Requester:** Joanna Li

**Department:** DPH

**Waiver Justification:** 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

**Supplier ID:** 0000039424

**Requested total cost:** \$1,200,000.00

**Short Description:** SFDPH Pharmacy Adjudication Vendor to Bill for Medications Dispensing for Patients in Long Term Care and Ambulatory Settings

[Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request](#)

For additional questions regarding this waiver request please contact [cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org](mailto:cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org)

Thank you.

Ref:TIS4512670\_sEl5k0aZ5qEeYTlls8yk

**From:** [CCSF IT Service Desk](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** CMD12B0002956 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (DPH) Department Head (Michelle Ruggels)  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 4:25:38 PM  
**Attachments:** [ccsfLogoPic.png](#)

---



## Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0002956 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (DPH) Department Head (Michelle Ruggels).

### Summary of Request

**Requester:** Nathaniel Wong

**Department:** DPH

**Waiver Justification:** 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

**Supplier ID:** 0000012358

**Requested total cost:** \$87,031,676.00

**Short Description:** UCSF: Citywide ZSFGH Psychiatry Department services

[Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request](#)

For additional questions regarding this waiver request please contact  
[cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org](mailto:cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org)

Thank you.

Ref:TIS4510731\_PmFGQEQVXXWoTqdEFXw5

**From:** [CCSF IT Service Desk](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** CMD12B0002930 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (HRD) Department Head (Carol Isen)  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 9:50:44 AM  
**Attachments:** [ccsfLogoPic.png](#)

---



## Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0002930 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (HRD) Department Head (Carol Isen).

### Summary of Request

**Requester:** Samaki Banks

**Department:** HRD

**Waiver Justification:** 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

**Supplier ID:** 0000018762

**Requested total cost:** \$11,775.15

**Short Description:** Q-80 Exam Rater Lodging

[Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request](#)

For additional questions regarding this waiver request please contact  
[cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org](mailto:cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org)

Thank you.

Ref:TIS4505510\_TxDhKGVJyPJrfgRZILwO

**From:** [CCSF IT Service Desk](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** CMD12B0002942 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (DPH) Department Head (Michelle Ruggels)  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 1:40:41 PM  
**Attachments:** [ccsfLogoPic.png](#)

---



## Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0002942 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (DPH) Department Head (Michelle Ruggels).

### Summary of Request

**Requester:** Sean Feeney

**Department:** DPH

**Waiver Justification:** 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

**Supplier ID:** 0000012559

**Requested total cost:** \$9,800.00

**Short Description:** Radiation monitoring rings and badges

[Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request](#)

For additional questions regarding this waiver request please contact  
[cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org](mailto:cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org)

Thank you.

Ref:TIS4503455\_lmPk8iTa5o6SqeRLiW2y

**From:** [CCSF IT Service Desk](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** CMD12B0002935 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (LIB) Department Head (Michael Lambert)  
**Date:** Thursday, September 14, 2023 4:25:05 PM  
**Attachments:** [ccsfLogoPic.png](#)

---



## Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0002935 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (LIB) Department Head (Michael Lambert).

### Summary of Request

**Requester:** Feng Ling Jiang

**Department:** LIB

**Waiver Justification:** 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

**Supplier ID:** 0000019169

**Requested total cost:** \$5,500.00

**Short Description:** various music supplies

[Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request](#)

For additional questions regarding this waiver request please contact  
[cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org](mailto:cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org)

Thank you.

Ref:TIS4496744\_PAxEjcffqhoCuVmOIPPQ

**From:** [CCSF IT Service Desk](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** CMD12B0002934 - "Request to Waive 12B Requirements" has been Approved by (LIB) Department Head (Michael Lambert)  
**Date:** Thursday, September 14, 2023 4:25:05 PM  
**Attachments:** [ccsfLogoPic.png](#)

---



## Contract Monitoring Division

SF Board of Supervisors,

This is to inform you that CMD12B0002934 - 'Request to Waive 12B Requirements' has been approved by (LIB) Department Head (Michael Lambert).

### Summary of Request

**Requester:** Feng Ling Jiang

**Department:** LIB

**Waiver Justification:** 12B.5-1(d)(1) (No Vendors Comply)

**Supplier ID:** 0000050671

**Requested total cost:** \$5,000.00

**Short Description:** Art supplies for SFPL youth programs

[Take me to the CMD 12B Waiver Request](#)

For additional questions regarding this waiver request please contact  
[cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org](mailto:cmd.equalbenefits@sfgov.org)

Thank you.

Ref:TIS4496742\_u17ZoALjWmIqtvPGqSKw



**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Annual Report on Hospitalization and Medical Treatment  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 12:30:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[Annual Report to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors on Hospitalization and Medical Treatment - Admin code 16.82 2023 final.pdf](#)

---

**From:** Tugbenyoh, Mawuli (HRD) <mawuli.tugbenyoh@sfgov.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 11:48 AM  
**To:** Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Isen, Carol (HRD) <carol.isen@sfgov.org>; Robinson, Julian (HRD) <julian.e.robinson@sfgov.org>; Buick, Jeanne (HRD) <jeanne.buick@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Annual Report on Hospitalization and Medical Treatment

Dear Madam Clerk –

Pursuant to Admin code 16.82 2023, I am submitting the Annual Report on Hospitalization and Medical Treatment to the Board of Supervisors on behalf of the Human Resources Director, Carol Isen.

Please see the attached and do not hesitate to let us know if you have any questions.

Regards,



**Mawuli Tugbenyoh 杜本樂**

*[He, Him, His]*

**Deputy Director, Policy and External Affairs**

Department of Human Resources

One South Van Ness Ave., 4<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Francisco, CA 94103

Phone: (415) 551-8942


Website: [www.sfdhr.org](http://www.sfdhr.org)



**MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** September 29, 2023

**TO:** Aaron Peskin, President San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
Supervisor Connie Chan  
Supervisor Catherine Stefani  
Supervisor Joel Engardio  
Supervisor Dean Preston  
Supervisor Matt Dorsey  
Supervisor Myrna Melgar  
Supervisor Rafael Mandelman  
Supervisor Hillary Ronen  
Supervisor Shamann Walton  
Supervisor Ahsha Safaí

**FROM:** Carol Isen, Human Resources Director 

**SUBJECT:** Annual Report to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors on Hospitalization and Medical Treatment

---

Section 16.82 of the San Francisco Administrative Code provides authority to the Human Resources Director to administer the City's workers' compensation program and to arrange for hospitalization and medical services necessary and appropriate for those employees who have been injured on the job. This section requires the Human Resources Director to submit an annual report to the Board of Supervisors no later than September 30 of each year to include the costs of hospitals and other medical providers.

**Program Overview**

The Department of Human Resources (DHR) Workers' Compensation Division administers a Medical Provider Network (CCSF MPN) approved by the State Division of Workers' Compensation. The network includes participating hospitals, clinics, and physicians to provide medical treatment to employees who become injured or ill in the course of employment. Medical provider networks are an employer's primary tool for ensuring that medical treatment is consistent with best occupational health practices and that employees are returned to work as quickly as possible after an injury. The DHR Workers' Compensation Division administers the CCSF MPN according to state

requirements. The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency joined the CCSF MPN in 2013, and the San Francisco Community College District (SFCCD) joined the CCSF MPN in 2018.

Hospital and medical service fees are regulated by the State of California's Division of Workers' Compensation. DHR contracts with a bill review company to ensure that billed charges are consistent with the State's Official Medical Fee Schedule by comparing the billable service codes to the maximum allowable fee for those codes. Charges that exceed the fee schedule are repriced accordingly.

Medical treatment is also regulated by, and must conform to, state medical treatment guidelines. Treatment requests are subject to a mandatory review process to ensure that the treatment meets with applicable guidelines, primarily those adopted from the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM). The City contracts with a utilization review company to perform this service. Only a physician can legally deny care as "medically unnecessary".

#### Pharmacy Benefit Program

The City has maintained a Pharmacy Benefit Program since February 2018. Eligible employees receive a pharmacy benefit card that allows for a faster delivery of necessary medications while the City benefits from network discounts and improved oversight of medications as required under the state's formulary.

The following chart contains a breakdown of pharmacy benefit cards issued per Fiscal Year since inception of the Pharmacy Benefit Program. Since launching a pharmacy benefit program with Optum, DHR has enrolled 14,194 CCSF claims, and a further 3,050 SFMTA claims, for a total of 17,244 citywide claims participating in the program and an average penetration rate of 63% of all claims with pharmacy payments. Since launching a pharmacy benefit program with Optum, 71% of total pharmacy spending has been processed under the program, accounting for \$11.48 million of \$16.25 million total spending on prescription drugs between 1/1/2018 and 6/30/23. Penetration declined in 2020 - 2022 due to high incidence of COVID-19 claims which increased volume of claims, however, mostly did not require prescription drug benefits.

**Pharmacy Benefit Cards issued by Year**

| Year               | CCSF         | SFMTA       | Grand Total  | Penetration Rate |
|--------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|------------------|
| 2018               | 5325         | 930         | 6255         | 85%              |
| 2019               | 1802         | 755         | 2557         | 64%              |
| 2020               | 1444         | 354         | 1798         | 47%              |
| 2021               | 1958         | 318         | 2276         | 50%              |
| 2022               | 2473         | 436         | 2909         | 64%              |
| 2023               | 1192         | 257         | 1449         | 51%              |
| <b>Grand Total</b> | <b>14194</b> | <b>3050</b> | <b>17244</b> | <b>63%</b>       |

\*source - Optum

**2023 Hospitalization and Total Medical Costs**

The following chart contains the costs for hospitalization and total medical expenditures (which include hospitalization) for the last five fiscal years. Total medical costs were relatively flat, increasing by 1.2% in FY2022-23 compared to the prior year. However, overall, medical treatment overall increased by 16% over the past 5 years due to inflation and increased costs due to several catastrophic claims over the past few years. It is noted that during the COVID-19 pandemic, particularly in FY2019-20 through FY2021-22, hospitalization slowed due to delays or postponement in non-emergency care. However, such treatment did resume in 2022. The hospitalization numbers below include both in-patient and out-patient hospitalization costs.

**Hospitalization Expense and Total Medical Cost by Year**

| Payment Reserve Transaction Desc | Medical Payments                | 2018-19              | 2019-20              | 2020-21              | 2021-22              | 2022-23              |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
|                                  |                                 | Payment Amount       | Payment Amount       | Payment Amount       | Payment Amount       | Payment Amount       |
| Medical                          | Hospital (Inpatient/Outpatient) | 13,765,966.08        | 10,804,863.60        | 10,556,995.70        | 11,229,004.78        | 12,296,950.98        |
|                                  | Other Med. Payments             | 24,330,893.34        | 24,974,959.31        | 26,217,005.68        | 32,476,602.48        | 31,934,934.85        |
| <b>Totals</b>                    | <b>Totals</b>                   | <b>38,096,859.42</b> | <b>35,779,822.91</b> | <b>36,774,001.38</b> | <b>43,705,607.26</b> | <b>44,231,885.83</b> |

\* Source Claims Enterprise

### 2023 Cost Savings Performance

The Workers' Compensation Division entered into a new contract for bill review and utilization review services with Allied Managed Care (AMC) as of February 28, 2022. Bills are first repriced to the state fee schedule and then further reduced via discount available through detailed review and through Preferred Provider Organization agreements available through AMC. Further savings are achieved through the identification (audited savings) of duplicate billings and bills for unauthorized care. The following table reflects a 70% savings from billed charges produced through the first year of this partnership through June 30, 2023.

#### **Bill Review Statistics FY22-23**

| <b>Bills Reviewed</b> | <b>Total Billed</b> | <b>Fee Schedule Reductions</b> | <b>PPO and Audited Reductions</b> | <b>Total Savings</b> | <b>% of Savings</b> | <b>Total Paid</b> |
|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| 112,093               | \$143,477,330.25    | \$98,499,512.64                | \$2,447,813.13                    | \$100,947,325.77     | 70.36%              | 42,500,004.48     |

### Benchmarked Performance – Annual Medical Costs per Claim in Calendar Year 2022

The City & County of San Francisco submits de-identified workers' compensation claims data to the California Workers' Compensation Institute (CWCI) which allows DHR to benchmark its performance to other workers' compensation claims administrators in California. Benchmarking occurs after claims have matured over a 12-month period. The most recent data available is for 2021 claims valued as of December 31, 2022.

Historically, the City's medical costs per claim were below industry average, but since 2018, the City's medical costs per claim have mostly been above the industry average:

- Average medical costs as of December 31, 2022, for claims filed in 2021 for the City was \$1912 compared to the industry average of \$1760, which represents an 8.6% increase over the industry average.
- The spread becomes more pronounced for prior injury years as medical costs accumulate by injury year, with City costs 18.5% higher than the industry average for the 2019 injury year.

Causes for increases in City medical costs compared to industry benchmarks are multi-faceted and are impacted by multiple factors.

- Beginning in 2020, additional injury presumptions for posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and COVID-19 were passed by the legislature, making it presumed that such injuries are deemed work related. Both injuries are primarily sustained by public personnel such as sworn officers and firefighters, which are usually employed by public agencies like the City.
- The City experienced a series of very severe and catastrophic level injuries over the past few years, as well as an increase in cancer claims requiring substantial treatment, which is often not covered by fee schedule. Such treatment has impacted the City's average medical spend compared with the rest of the industry.

#### Program Improvements in 2022-2023

- The Workers' Compensation Division expanded the "Fast Track" program which has been working since 2015, to add additional participating occupational health clinics in the CCSF Medical Provider Network to preauthorize common medical treatments for the first 180 days of a claim. The program was successful in speeding common treatments to workers and was expanded to add three new clinics recently added to the CCSF MPN as well as add cardiac testing to the list of treatment items approved under Fast Track. This was to further expedite and provide faster access to care for injured City employees.
- A CCSF Medical Provider Network Committee representing DHR, SFMTA, City Attorney, and the contracted workers' compensation third party administrator (Intercare) continues to meet quarterly to review needed changes to the CCSF MPN, including terminating providers for under-performing physicians and the identification and addition of necessary specialists. The committee has terminated several providers from our MPN due to underperformance in terms of return-to work, failure to meet medical treatment guidelines, and consistent billing issues. The committee has also added several providers to our MPN, including a roster of over 30 psyche providers through a nationwide provider Ascensus, in order to provide access to care to injured and ill City employees. The committee further added four additional designated occupational health clinics – three in or near San Francisco and one in Roseville, CA to further expand immediate access to care for injured city employees.
- Expanded the Nurse Triage Hotline, launched in October 2017, to also include injury reporting and nurse advice for incidents and injuries citywide. The Nurse Triage Hotline is a hotline available for injured City employees to report injuries or illnesses, or incidents that do not rise to the level of an injury claim; as well as get real-time medical advice of immediate treatment needed when injured on the job. The

Hotline is available 24 hours/day, 7 days per week, and also specifically tracks COVID-19 claims as well as workplace assaults on City employees when reported through the Hotline.

- Developed and implemented an Alternate Dispute Resolution Program (ADR) between the City and the San Francisco Police and Fire Labor Organizations. The ADR program is an alternative to resolving workers compensation disputes as authorized by Labor Code Section 3201.7, as opposed to resolving disputes through the traditional state-mandated system. The program was launched in July 2019 and is effective for all claims filed on or after July 1, 2019, and is now in its fourth year. As part of this program, injured employees subject to this program may select treating providers as approved under the jurisdiction of the program; expanding access to care outside the parameters of the MPN and more dedicated to First Responders. Also, as part of the ADR program, medical treatment disputes are resolved using Independent evaluators, rather than the Independent Medical Review (IMR) process as it exists in the state system. The goal is to resolve disputes at a faster rate to bring injured members to work, generating cost savings.

#### Goals for 2023-24

1. Reassess the medical treatment authorization protocols for claims adjusters based on an analysis of the utilization review data over the last year.
2. Further expand and market the Nurse Triage Hotline for better Citywide utilization, supporting faster injury reporting and further support of immediate medical services that may be challenging to perform internally.
3. Further expand access to care in the CCSF MPN by accessing gaps in hard to access specialties.
4. Partner with Allied Managed Care to further control medical spend costs in order to better align the City with industry average medical costs going forward.



**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** 6 Letters regarding File No. 230446  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 1:17:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [6 Letters regarding File No. 230446.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see attached for 6 letters regarding File No. 230446, which is Item No. 5 on today's Land Use & Transportation Committee agenda.

**File No. 230446** - Planning Code, Zoning Map - Housing Production (Mayor, Engardio, Dorsey)

Sincerely,

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

**From:** [Karin Payson](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Board File 230446  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 6:57:36 AM  
**Attachments:** [23\\_0918 Housing for All to BOS.pdf](#)

---

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

Attached please find my letter in support of this proposed legislation, to be heard at today's Land Use Committee hearing.

Thank you.

Regards,

Karin Payson, AIA LEED AP  
[www.kpad.com](http://www.kpad.com)

1714 Stockton Street  
San Francisco, CA. 94133  
(o) 415-277-9500  
(m) 415-260-0675



Karin Payson | architecture + design  
1714 Stockton Street Suite 100 | San Francisco, CA 94133  
415-277-9500 | fax: 415-277-9505 | www.kpad.com

September 18, 2023

To the Land Use Committee AND  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
**RE: BOARD FILE 230446**

I am writing to strongly urge the Land-Use Committee to approve this “housing for All” legislation proposed by Mayor Breed and Supervisors Engardio and Dorsey, which will advance housing production in the city through streamlining approvals processes and implementing some land-use changes in the Planning Code.

Under the 2022 Housing Element Update, San Francisco’s first housing plan that is centered on racial and social equity, San Francisco has a state-mandated goal of constructing 82,000 housing units within the next eight years. Meeting this goal will provide a broader array of housing options for all the people that reside in San Francisco, strengthening our communities and improving diversity and affordability overall.

This ‘**Housing for All**’ ordinance is rooted in several policies from the Housing Element that direct the City to remove obstacles hindering housing construction, particularly when such requirements are based on subjective criteria. Critically, the ordinance proposes process improvements, modification of development standards and expansion of incentives for development and construction of housing throughout the city. Implementation of these changes will provide diverse options for housing for all residents of San Francisco, expanding affordability and opportunity for all.

The State of California is putting intense scrutiny on San Francisco, and HCD and the Attorney General are prepared to make an example out of us to set the tone for the rest of the state. If we do not meet the expectations for constraints removal per the Housing Element to the satisfaction of the State, they are seriously threatening to withhold this funding. This would be *disastrous* to our city and to the most vulnerable members of our community.

**OPPOSING THIS LEGISLATION IS EQUIVALENT TO OPPOSING MILLIONS OF DOLLARS OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND TRANSIT FUNDING FROM THE STATE FOR SAN FRANCISCO.**

The ‘Housing for All’ Ordinance will expand housing options for all San Francisco residents, by expanding the availability of housing units of all types. The law of supply and demand is real, and the evidence is clear that the inadequate supply of housing in San Francisco is a major factor in its high cost. Housing in San Francisco, the State and all over the US is built on the private market, with few if any public subsidies. Streamlining the process and allowing housing developers to increase density will reduce the per-unit costs of construction—a cost that is directly passed in full to the renter or homeowner.

Higher density in our neighborhoods will promote stronger communities by having more eyes on the street. Having more residents in our neighborhood commercial districts will do more to stimulate opportunities for local residents to successfully open and operate small retail businesses than any mandated ground-floor retail space could ever do.



Karin Payson | architecture + design  
1714 Stockton Street Suite 100 | San Francisco, CA 94133  
415-277-9500 | fax: 415-277-9505 | [www.kpad.com](http://www.kpad.com)

Expansion of the inventory of housing options in San Francisco will result in greater neighborhood diversity, provide greater opportunities for vulnerable populations to remain housed, and will promote a healthy city culture where all can thrive.

I urge the Land Use Committee, and the Board of Supervisors, to approve the "Housing for All" ordinance without hesitation.

Respectfully submitted,

Karin Payson, AIA LEED AP  
Principal Architect, Karin Payson architecture + design

**From:** [James Hill](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support for the Housing for All Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 11:27:12 AM

---

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

I strongly agree with the AIA's support of the Housing for All Ordinance representing a dedicated effort to move San Francisco forward in providing state-mandated and needed housing.

Please help us with your support.

James Hill  
AIA  
james hill architect  
836 Haight Street  
San Francisco, CA 94117  
phone: 415 864 4408

**From:** [Irving Gonzales](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Constraints Reduction (AKA Housing Production) - Letter of Support  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 11:55:59 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
**Importance:** High

---

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

Re:

**Constraints Reduction (AKA Housing Production) Case Number: 2023-003676PCAMAP Board File No. 230446 By Mayor Breed**

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a 35-year architect currently in practice here in North Beach and an activist in the support of affordable housing and supporting those who may not have a voice in our communities, I am writing to express my strong support for Ordinance 230446 and to encourage you to vote in favor of its passage.

This legislation presents a critical opportunity to remove numerous barriers that have been hindering the construction of new housing in our city where I practice and where I was born and continue to my firm's efforts in making sure that housing is accessible to all. I have also worked with SF DBI and Planning in a workgroup under the Small Firms Committee of AIASF to provide objective recommendations to improve the process by which permits are reviewed and approved to further accelerate housing project approvals in a timely manner.

Under this new legislation, projects that were previously held up for 2-5 years, or more, could be streamlined and completed through over the counter review or a specific review track in a matter of months. This is an imperative change if San Francisco is to meet its goal of 82,000 new units in the next 8 years. San Francisco is facing a severe housing crisis, with an acute shortage of affordable and available homes. This crisis has not helped in the reduction and housing of the unhoused, in some cases created displacement, and has contributed to the diminishing sense of community.

It is essential that we take equally swift and decisive action to address this issue, and Ordinance 230446 finally can begin to move the needle in a meaningful and impactful manner. By streamlining the permitting process and removing unnecessary bureaucracy that we design professionals have endeavored in other forms noted, this ordinance would pave the way for more efficient and timely development of new housing units. I implore you all to carefully consider the positive impacts and potential benefits of Ordinance 230446 and provide your support to its passage. Your vote will not only be a catalyst for positive change but also a testament to your dedication to serving the best interests of our community.

Irving

---

*A community-based architecture firm designing affordable housing that is accessible! Celebrating 35 years in practice and serving our local communities.*



67A Water Street, San Francisco, California 94133  
V: 415.776.8065 Ext 1# | M: 415.254.4717

Irving A. Gonzales—Principal AIA | NOMA  
G7A | Gonzales Architects  
email: [irving@G7Arch.com](mailto:irving@G7Arch.com)  
web: [G7Arch.com](http://G7Arch.com)

2023 | Board of Directors Chair | Mission Housing Development Corp.  
2015 | AIA San Francisco Chapter President

CONFIDENTIALITY: This message may contain privileged and/or confidential information. It is for the exclusive use of the intended recipients. Any review, use, disclosure or distribution by other persons or entities is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you!




**From:** [Eric Brooks](#)  
**To:** [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Groth, Kelly \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Herrera, Ana \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Burch, Percy \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Buckley, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Rosas, Lorenzo \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Goldberg, Jonathan \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Tam, Madison \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** 17 Environmental & Community Orgs Join To Strongly \*OPPOSE\* Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" "Housing" Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 12:36:03 PM  
**Attachments:** [SF CEQA Defenders Sign-On September-18-2023.pdf](#)

---

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

## 17 Environmental, Environmental Justice & Community Organizations Join To Strongly \*OPPOSE\* Engardio-Breed-Dorsey 'Constraints Reduction' 'Housing' Ordinance

*(Also see attached in PDF format)*



***[SPEAK Sunset Parkside Education & Action Committee](#)***

September 18, 2023

To: City and County of San Francisco Decision Makers - 1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Pl, San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: **OPPOSE** Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" ("Housing Production") **File #230446**

Dear San Francisco Decision Makers: The undersigned environmental, housing, economic justice, community, and climate crisis response organizations write to voice our strong opposition to the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" ordinance. It would enact drastic and sweeping exceptions to San Francisco's environmental and community review of real estate projects and would undermine health, environmental, economic and neighborhood protections. The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") contains massive unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making \$150,000 to \$190,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making \$150,000 to \$190,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!
- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.
- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!
- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").
- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please vote DOWN this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Sincerely:

Bayview Hunters Point Mothers & Fathers Committee

California Alliance of Local Electeds Californians for Energy Choice Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Concerned Residents of the Sunset East Mission Improvement Association Extinction Rebellion

SF Bay Area Greenaction for Health & Environmental Justice Mid-Sunset Neighborhood

Association Our City SF Our Neighborhood Voices San Franciscans for Urban Nature San

Francisco Green Party San Francisco Tomorrow Save Our Neighborhoods SF Sunflower Alliance

Sunset Parkside Education & Action Committee



## Bayview Hunters Point Mothers & Fathers Committee



## SPEAK SUNSET PARKSIDE EDUCATION AND ACTION COMMITTEE

September 18, 2023

To: City and County of San Francisco Decision Makers - 1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Pl, San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: **OPPOSE** Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" ("Housing Production") **File #230446**

Dear San Francisco Decision Makers:

The undersigned environmental, housing, economic justice, community, and climate crisis response organizations write to voice our **strong** opposition to the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" ordinance. It would enact drastic and sweeping exceptions to San Francisco's environmental and community review of real estate projects and would undermine health, environmental, economic and neighborhood protections.

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") contains massive unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making \$150,000 to \$190,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is *not* affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making \$150,000 to \$190,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% *oversupply* of housing for those income levels!
- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.

- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!
- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish “Urban Renewal” style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared “cleaned up”).
- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing *more* greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please vote DOWN this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco’s environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Sincerely:

Bayview Hunters Point Mothers & Fathers Committee  
 California Alliance of Local Electeds  
 Californians for Energy Choice  
 Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods  
 Concerned Residents of the Sunset  
 East Mission Improvement Association  
 Extinction Rebellion SF Bay Area  
 Greenaction for Health & Environmental Justice  
 Mid-Sunset Neighborhood Association  
 Our City SF  
 Our Neighborhood Voices  
 San Franciscans for Urban Nature  
 San Francisco Green Party  
 San Francisco Tomorrow  
 Save Our Neighborhoods SF  
 Sunflower Alliance  
 Sunset Parkside Education & Action Committee

**From:** [roisin@sftu.org](mailto:roisin@sftu.org)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** The Tenants Union formally opposes "Constraint Reduction" legislation  
**Date:** Friday, September 15, 2023 6:13:02 PM  
**Attachments:** [Tenants Union Opposes File 230446.pdf](#)

---

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

Dear Clerk of the Board, Angela Calvillo,

The Tenants Union formally opposes File 230446. The "Constraint Reduction" legislation proposed by Mayor Breed and Supervisors Engardio and Dorsey will incentivize the displacement of tenants and demolition of rent-controlled housing, while eliminating recourse for at-risk tenants.

The legislation is being sold as a way to speed up housing production by eliminating planning staff review to make many permits automatic with no public objection allowed. It streamlines demolition of sound rent controlled units as long as the owner declares that either: 1) there have been no records of buyouts or evictions in the last 5 years, and tenants currently do not inhabit the unit; or 2) if tenants currently occupy the unit, displacement will be granted but they have a "right of return" when and if their units are rebuilt. The demolished units must be replaced and increase in number but there is no requirement that the new units are actually rental units – more likely they will become ownership "Tenancy-In-Common" units. This trend is already playing out at the Planning Commission where they still hold hearings and vote on demolition projects for now.

The legislation eliminates hearings where an affected tenant or a neighbor who knows the history of the building could be heard, object, and possibly get a vote of disapproval from the Planning Commission.

Shockingly, the Mayor's legislation eliminates an existing but pathetically short 1-year ownership requirement in order to qualify for streamlining. Eliminating this requirement opens the floodgates for speculators to buy rent controlled buildings and fast-track their demolition with existing tenants barely able to protest their own displacement. New buyers of buildings, in our experience, are the most ruthless although they hide behind the lore of "mom-and-pop" landlords.

Whether tenants currently occupy the units or the units even exist (in the case of unauthorized units) relies on self-attestation by landlords. Unscrupulous landlords have an incentive to lie on their applications, because if they are truthful the replacement units will come with restrictions.

Many vulnerable tenants, especially in unauthorized units, are asked to pay rent in cash so will not be able to prove their occupancy nor understand where to do so.

San Francisco has many, many in-law units that were built without

permits so exist in a gray market outside of planning maps. These units are still covered by rent control and can use the Rent Board services, but tenants are especially vulnerable because both owners and tenants have an incentive to fly under the radar and hide these illegal spaces so the Planning Department doesn't know they exist and would require replacement.

The legislation incentives pressuring tenants to "voluntarily" move out in order to deliver the unit vacant before applying for permits. There are many ways besides buyouts and evictions to convince tenants to leave when profits are at stake.

In our experience, when a tenant is displaced by fire, flooding, or major rehabilitation work, they almost never return despite their right to. Reconstruction is dragged on and the tenants either move on signing long leases elsewhere and typically give up.

Planning Staff (who support this legislation) could not answer simple questions about which department would track these Right of Return tenants and enforce if an owner simply neglected to inform the former tenants reconstruction was over.

A larger threat is that the speculator can simply rebuild and offer the new units for sale separately - "tenancy-in-commons" - so a tenant wishing to assert their right to return would have no unit available to return to. We believe this is the most likely outcome as older rent controlled buildings are typically cheaper to buy so the profit margin to turn them into condo opportunities will be huge. It will result in the loss of rent controlled units from the market.

Tenants will find it hard to fight their displacement as the demolition of their units has been condoned by the Planning Department and sold as good housing policy by developers who could care less about the effects on tenants.

Thank you very much,

San Francisco Tenants Union

# SAN • FRANCISCO TENANTS • UNION

*558 Capp Street • San Francisco CA • 94110 • (415) 282-6543 • [www.sftu.org](http://www.sftu.org)*

Dear Clerk of the Board, Angela Calvillo,

The Tenants Union formally opposes File 230446. The “Constraint Reduction” legislation proposed by Mayor Breed and Supervisors Engardio and Dorsey will incentivize the displacement of tenants and demolition of rent-controlled housing, while eliminating recourse for at-risk tenants.

The legislation is being sold as a way to speed up housing production by eliminating planning staff review to make many permits automatic with no public objection allowed. It streamlines demolition of sound rent controlled units as long as the owner declares that either: 1) there have been no records of buyouts or evictions in the last 5 years, and tenants currently do not inhabit the unit; or 2) if tenants currently occupy the unit, displacement will be granted but they have a “right of return” when and if their units are rebuilt. The demolished units must be replaced and increase in number but there is no requirement that the new units are actually rental units – more likely they will become ownership “Tenancy-In-Common” units. This trend is already playing out at the Planning Commission where they still hold hearings and vote on demolition projects for now.

The legislation eliminates hearings where an affected tenant or a neighbor who knows the history of the building could be heard, object, and possibly get a vote of disapproval from the Planning Commission.

Shockingly, the Mayor’s legislation eliminates an existing but pathetically short 1-year ownership requirement in order to qualify for streamlining. Eliminating this requirement opens the floodgates for speculators to buy rent controlled buildings and fast-track their demolition with existing tenants barely able to protest their own displacement. New buyers of buildings, in our experience, are the most ruthless although they hide behind the lore of “mom-and-pop” landlords.

Whether tenants currently occupy the units or the units even exist (in the case of unauthorized units) relies on self-attestation by landlords. Unscrupulous landlords have an incentive to lie on their applications, because if they are truthful the replacement units will come with restrictions. Many vulnerable tenants, especially in unauthorized units, are asked to pay rent in cash so will not be able to prove their occupancy nor understand where to do so.

San Francisco has many, many in-law units that were built without permits so exist in a gray market outside of planning maps. These units are still covered by rent control and can use the Rent Board services, but tenants are especially vulnerable because both owners and tenants have an incentive to fly



under the radar and hide these illegal spaces so the Planning Department doesn't know they exist and would require replacement.

The legislation incentives pressuring tenants to "voluntarily" move out in order to deliver the unit vacant before applying for permits. There are many ways besides buyouts and evictions to convince tenants to leave when profits are at stake.

In our experience, when a tenant is displaced by fire, flooding, or major rehabilitation work, they almost never return despite their right to. Reconstruction is dragged on and the tenants either move on signing long leases elsewhere and typically give up.

Planning Staff (who support this legislation) could not answer simple questions about which department would track these Right of Return tenants and enforce if an owner simply neglected to inform the former tenants reconstruction was over.

A larger threat is that the speculator can simply rebuild and offer the new units for sale separately - "tenancy-in-commons" - so a tenant wishing to assert their right to return would have no unit available to return to. We believe this is the most likely outcome as older rent controlled buildings are typically cheaper to buy so the profit margin to turn them into condo opportunities will be huge. It will result in the loss of rent controlled units from the market.

Tenants will find it hard to fight their displacement as the demolition of their units has been condoned by the Planning Department and sold as good housing policy by developers who could care less about the effects on tenants.

Thank you very much,

**San Francisco Tenants Union**

**From:** [Dawn Ma](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Letter of \*SUPPORT\* for the Housing Legislation Ord. #230446  
**Date:** Sunday, September 17, 2023 6:35:48 PM

---

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to urge you to **SUPPORT** the Housing for All legislation, specifically the Constraint Reduction, and join the [AIASF Housing for All Ordinance Support](#)

It is rare for a national professional organization such as the AIASF to rally their members and practitioners to support a city legislation, unless it is detrimental to the welfare of the community. We are at the frontline of the housing crisis, having to deliver the horrific facts of time and costs it takes to permit their projects. We already lost all credibility as professionals to advise the public to navigate the permit system in San Francisco. The process is getting less transparent, and yet the permit fee is increasing.

Our clients come from all walks of life. Most just want to improve their decades old deferred maintenance in their buildings. It is our American right to improve our living space. We should not be burdened by a system that holds no accountability of their delivery, charges us thousands of dollars of fees, and subjects us to endless debates with random public on whether our code-compliant project meets their interpretation of neighborhood characters.

The inequality of getting a simple building permit directly contributes to substandard and illegal construction, life-threatening living conditions and unsustainable use of resources. So no, the way it is doesn't support the diversity we all claim San Francisco to be, and it is apparent to all of us who choose to continue living here.

As small firm owners, we cannot afford hiring designers within our own city. I have lost good candidates but with no experience to larger firms offering them a \$70k salary. We have to resort to outsourcing our staff to other countries, or face constant turnover of inexperienced staff. If you support local businesses, you need to support housing reform.

This past Friday the city experienced a joyous event that galvanized 800k of San Francisco - the Sunset Night Market. It is successful because the event was well-planned, and didn't try to appease everyone (there were many nay-sayers on Nextdoor.com from Supervisor Engerdio's original post). The content of this legislation will not satisfy everyone, but the overall importance of cleaning up the existing process of urban development is an important step. We as architects, engineers and builders will always work w/ the city to get things done. Be brave and trust the professionals to stand side by side with you on this.

Dawn Ma, PE, AAIA  
principal  
[Q-Architecture](#)  
[Certified Green Business since 2014](#)

p +1 415-695-2700

This email, along with any attachments, is intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. Do Not Forward this Email. If the reader and/or recipient of this email is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this email to the intended recipient, you are notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify us by phone, fax or return email as listed herein. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

To: Erica Major

305-11

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO

September 14, 2023

2023 SEP 14 PM 12:28

BY HAND

President Aaron Peskin  
Supervisor Myrna Melgar  
Supervisor Dean Preston  
Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee  
City Hall

Re: Mayor Breed's Constraint Reduction Ordinance Board File No. 230446

Dear Chair Melgar, President Peskin and Supervisor Preston:

The Mayor's Ordinance will be heard at the LUT sometime soon. (September 18th?)

The Committee should not recommend it to the full Board.

This Ordinance is not needed due to the fact of other legislation, both local and from Sacramento. For example:

The Board has passed Chair Melgar's Ordinance to expand housing with the "Family Housing Opportunity SUD".

There is SB 9. And there is the local Four-Plex Program.

The Rezoning under the Housing Element is underway and will be finalized in early 2024.

SB 35 has been extended and expanded via SB 423.

Construction on Treasure Island is underway.

Recent ADU legislation from Sacramento allows them to be sold as condos.

All the other housing bills from the Sacramento....too many to cite!

There are tons of units in the San Francisco pipeline: Stonestown, Park Merced, Schlage Lock, numerous projects around the HUB, etc, etc, etc)

Plenty of existing vacant units. (i.e. One Oak, 603 Tennessee Street, etc, etc, etc)

*Let's see what happens with all of this before reducing constraints even more.*

*Georgia Schuttish*

Georgia Schuttish

Copy to Erica Major, Clerk for LUT/ One Copy to each LUT Staff

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** 9 Letters regarding File No. 230446  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 1:53:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [9 Letters regarding File No. 230446.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see attached for 9 letters regarding File No. 230446.

**File No. 230446** - Planning Code, Zoning Map - Housing Production (Mayor, Engardio, Dorsey)

Sincerely,

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

**From:** [R L](#)  
**To:** [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Groth, Kelly \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Herrera, Ana \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Burch, Percy \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Buckley, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Rosas, Lorenzo \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Goldberg, Jonathan \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Tam, Madison \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Barnes, Bill \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Carrillo, Lila \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Subject: Public Comment: Strongly OPPOSE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" "Housing" Ordinance File #230446  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 8:04:58 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisors,

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") contains massive, unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making \$150,000 to \$190,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high-priced housing that is not "affordable." It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making \$150,000 to \$190,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels! There is nothing "affordable" about this type of ordinance but a subsidized program that only benefits owners, developers, real estate interests or speculators etc. and not those most in need.
- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more working class (low/middle income) San Franciscans either out of the City, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.
- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction; we need to make our existing housing space affordable!
- **NO Housing Crisis** – Lets use simple math & logic, since 2022 the population of San Francisco has declined by over 65,000 which certainly has increased for 2023. There are approximately 143,000 units that are vacant, have been built, are currently being built, that are coming soon and are in the pipeline for building, so, why would we need 82,000 more units? Reason - we do NOT have a housing

crisis but a crisis where HCD (RHNA) over-inflated the figures for housing needs & their veiled threats that if cities don't build these numbers, funding will not be given to cities such as San Francisco.

- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to build unhealthy housing even more easily on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up"), as well as 2550 Irving and thousands of other sites in the City with similar issues. CEQA and other agencies of this nature were established to protect the Communities & to enforce doing the right thing like doing the proper testing, remediate a site properly, not build on toxic sites or not cut corners for the sake of making money. Removing these protections will harm the Community and all those you profess to care about.
- **Urban Renewal 2.0** – Ordinances of these nature are & will follow the same trajectory as the past like Geneva Towers.\* They will be built, not be occupied only to sit vacant (e.g. The Westerly on Sloat), become mismanaged\*, not benefit the people's needs and a blight on the Neighborhoods.
- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators.

Please vote DOWN this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and Community integrity!

Thank you,

<!--[if !supportLineBreakNewLine]-->

<!--[endif]-->

Renee Lazear

D4 Resident - 94116

SON-SF ~ Save Our Neighborhoods SF

*Preserve the Nature & Character of Our Neighborhoods*





**From:** [Robert Hall](#)  
**To:** [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Groth, Kelly \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Herrera, Ana \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Burch, Percy \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Buckley, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Rosas, Lorenzo \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Goldberg, Jonathan \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Tam, Madison \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Barnes, Bill \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Carrillo, Lila \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment: Strongly OPPOSE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" "Housing" Ordinance File #230446  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 7:27:19 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisors:

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") contains massive unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making \$150,000 to \$190,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making \$150,000 to \$190,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!
- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.
- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!
- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style

redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").

- 

**The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please vote DOWN this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Thank you,

Robert Hall  
94117

**From:** [Brian Luenow](#)  
**To:** [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Groth, Kelly \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Herrera, Ana \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Burch, Percy \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Buckley, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Rosas, Lorenzo \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Goldberg, Jonathan \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Tam, Madison \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Barnes, Bill \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Carrillo, Lila \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment: Strongly OPPOSE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" "Housing" Ordinance File #230446  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 5:25:31 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisors,

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") contains massive unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making \$150,000 to \$190,000 per year!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making \$150,000 to \$190,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!
- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.
- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!
- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").
- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other

building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please vote DOWN this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Thank you,

Brian

94116

**From:** [A. Colichidas](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Subject: Public Comment: File #230446 Strongly OPPOSE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" "Housing" Ordinance File #230446  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 3:32:24 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisors,

Do I have to enumerate all the things wrong with the "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance")?

As a lifelong renter, I join San Francisco renters and allies in strongly opposing this legislation.

It is a license to \_\_\_\_\_!(you fill in the blank), will gut SF rent protections and worsen the very problems the Board and the Administration are desperate to solve, such as:

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making \$150,000 to \$190,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!
- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.

I trust you will do the right thing here and vote NO. You have been sitting in those chairs long enough to know that the human misery on our streets will only be exacerbated and many lives cut short of their potential if this is allowed to proceed.

Sincerely,

\*Ann Colichidas, San Francisco  
Member: San Francisco Gray Panthers  
Member: Our Mission, No Eviction

\*The opinions expressed are my own.

**From:** [Christine Hanson](#)  
**To:** [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Groth, Kelly \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Herrera, Ana \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Burch, Percy \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Buckley, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Rosas, Lorenzo \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Goldberg, Jonathan \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Tam, Madison \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Barnes, Bill \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Carrillo, Lila \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment: Strongly OPPOSE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" "Housing" Ordinance File #230446  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 3:18:01 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisors,

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") contains massive unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making \$150,000 to \$190,000 per year! This excludes your teachers, your nurses, and likely many of your own aides!

This ordinance would worsen:

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls • housing built mostly for families making \$150,000 to \$190,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels! *If you truly want the City to create more units of affordable housing, please do not vote for anything g that minimizes public input!*

**The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.

- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need MORE MARKET OR PROHIBITIVELY EXPENSIVE housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!
- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up"). For these reasons, in addition to gross speculation on real estate, the wait time between property purchase and development cannot be less than 10 years.
- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

- This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. *As it exists, the currently proposed legislation will pave the way for this!*

Please vote **DOWN** this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Thank You!

Christine Hanson

Resident of the Excelsior

--

Perfectionism is the voice of the oppressor.

*Annie Lamott*



**From:** [Magick Altman](#)  
**To:** [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** The iso-called "Family HOusing  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 2:36:27 PM

---

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

This will be a travesty for working people, elders, physically challenged, and families with young children. Please stop catering to developers who are not helping with real for the people housing.

This is wrong, and is a giveaway to the developers. UGH!

Yours I truth,

Magick

94107

**From:** [Kathleen Kelley](#)  
**To:** [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Groth, Kelly \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Herrera, Ana \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Burch, Percy \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Buckley, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Rosas, Lorenzo \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Goldberg, Jonathan \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Tam, Madison \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Barnes, Bill \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Carrillo, Lila \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment: Strongly OPPOSE Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction" "Housing" Ordinance File #230446  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 2:33:35 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisors,

The proposed ordinance by Engardio-Breed is going in the wrong direction.

Taking away public and community input results in toxic sites like 2550 Irving from being cleaned up. The developer, the DTSC, the Mayor, MOHCD all turned their backs on the Sunset community as we raised over two years of legitimate concerns about proven toxin levels, joining in a chorus falsely describing neighbors as NIMBY's, and wasting time and money. And causing heartache.

Why isn't the 2550 Irving site being given the same "apples to apples" testing as requested by the Board of Appeals and the neighbors toxin experts? **Why didn't our Supervisor Engardio follow up on his quote from the Mission Local article**

<https://missionlocal.org/2023/08/affordable-housing-sunset-san-francisco-2550-irving-toxic/>

*"Separate and apart from the science here, this is confusing, even for neighborhood residents and city officials staunchly in favor of this project. "You would think that the tests they did on two sites, on two different sides of the street, would be the same, so they'd have a true comparison," said Engardio. Toxic Substances Control "is claiming it did all the testing, and everything is fine. But it does not match up to what the neighborhood asked for, or what a layperson might see as apples to apples."*

Engardio stresses that "it's not my role to second-guess a state agency that's in charge of keeping people safe." But, if only to check off a box, "it is baffling to me they would not have done apples to apples tests just to take this argument off the table."

Supervisor Engardio left it at that. It was more convenient for him, the Mayor, MOHCD and

others to sit back, call the neighbors NIMBY's, check the box on state funding and steamroll over the real toxin issue. You said we "were crying wolf". Our leadership has failed the Sunset. You have failed the Sunset by not taking community input seriously, as it was SO much easier to blindly accept the convoluted flawed science of DTSC methodology and check the "housing numbers box" without caring that you do this project right. Clean it up, then build it up. No one in the Sunset said they did not want the housing. It was just convenient for you, our so-called leadership, to take that stance and join the chorus. Look in the mirror. You have failed us.

And 2550 is a real affordable housing site! TNDC and DTSC never involved the community with authentic communication. TNDC and DTSC could have done the testing months ago when requested, saving time and money. The Mar Resolution supposedly "unanimously approved by the BOS" was ignored. Supervisor Engardio, you could have come to your community's aid. But you did not, you were told by the Mayor that we were crying wolf and you bought into that untruth.

Commissioner Trasvina quote from <https://missionlocal.org/2023/08/2550-irving-street-affordable-housing-soil-toxins-pce-board-of-appeals/> "I'm ready to grant the appeal, based on an overreliance on, and misplaced deference to, DTSC," said Trasviña, referring to the Department of Toxic Substance Control. He contended that the agency did not meet and communicate enough with residents, and said he was disappointed it did not complete the additional soil vapor tests the Mid-Sunset Neighborhood Association requested. "If we really believe in affordable housing, if we really believe in the public health of the people of San Francisco, and future people in San Francisco, then we have to do this right," he said.

Commissioner Lemberg also supported the appeal: "There are several things that smell here, for me," they said, most notably that the Department of Toxic Substances Control did not complete the tests asked for by the appellants.

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") contains massive unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making \$150,000 to \$190,000 per year!

This ordinance will also worsen:

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making \$150,000 to \$190,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!
- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.
- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!
- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").
- **The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance will build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators.

Please vote **DOWN** this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Thank you,

Kathleen Kelley

San Francisco Resident who is Very Discouraged in our Leadership

**From:** [Gregory Stevens](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)  
**Subject:** We oppose Engardio-Breed-Dorsey Attack on Environment & Affordable Housing  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 2:09:12 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisors,

**Representing over 50 congregations in San Francisco, we at California Interfaith Power and Light, stand in opposition to the Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") because it contains massive unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making \$150,000 to \$190,000 per year!**

This ordinance would worsen:

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making \$150,000 to \$190,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!
- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.
- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!
- **The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").

- 

**The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please vote DOWN this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Thank you,

---

Gregory Stevens (they/them)  
[California Interfaith Power & Light](#)  
Northern California Director  
(650) 313-3998

Schedule a meeting [here](#).

**From:** [KyleD](#)  
**To:** [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Groth, Kelly \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Thongsavat, Adam \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Herrera, Ana \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Burch, Percy \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Buckley, Jeff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Rosas, Lorenzo \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [Goldberg, Jonathan \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Tam, Madison \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Barnes, Bill \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Carrillo, Lila \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please Reject the "Constraints Reduction" "Housing Legislation File #230446"  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 2:03:08 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisors,

The Engardio-Breed-Dorsey "Constraints Reduction Ordinance" (aka "Housing Production Ordinance") contains massive unprecedented waivers of local environmental, community and demolition review that are absolutely unacceptable, all in the name of producing housing called "affordable" when most of that housing would be for families making \$150,000 to \$190,000 per year!

My primary concerns are that:

There are insufficient provisions to verify Landlords honor the 'right of return', and insufficient penalties when they fail to do so.

Condo Conversion works around tenant rights and needs to be restricted.

Most of the units that would be effected are below market rate, which are why they are being done, and goes against the premise of the City of San Francisco that more below market rate units are needed.

This ordinance would worsen:

- **The Unaffordable Housing Crisis** - This ordinance promotes building new high priced housing that is not affordable. It is ridiculous that the ordinance calls housing built mostly for families making \$150,000 to \$190,000 dollars per year "affordable". We already have a 50% oversupply of housing for those income levels!
- **The Homelessness Crisis** - The gentrification spurred by this ordinance would push most rents citywide even higher, driving more middle, working and lower class San Franciscans either out of the city, or onto our streets where they will face unacceptable dangers of declining health, street crime, and underemployment.
- **The Vacant Housing Crisis** - San Francisco has at least 60,000 vacant housing units, most of them *far* overpriced. We also have empty office space that can be converted

into thousands more apartments. We do not need more housing construction, we need to make our existing housing space affordable!

- 

**The Environmental Justice & Equity Crisis** - This ordinance would gut environmental and community review protections and would establish "Urban Renewal" style redevelopment zones, setting precedents that would allow corporate real estate giants to even more easily build unhealthy housing on toxic and radioactive waste sites like those in Bayview Hunters Point and on Treasure Island (which local, state and federal agencies have falsely declared "cleaned up").

- 

**The Climate Crisis** - This ordinance is bad for the environment. Allowing sweeping demolitions and expansions of existing homes and apartments, to replace them with luxury condo and rental towers, will use massive amounts of new cement and other building materials releasing more greenhouse gases, not less.

This ordinance would build housing for the wealthy, create more homelessness, and is an environmentally destructive giveaway to rapacious Wall Street and corporate real estate speculators. Please vote DOWN this unacceptable corporate attack on San Francisco's environmental, economic, cultural, and community integrity!

Thank you,

Kyle DeWolfe

SF CA 94109



**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** FW: More disaster to come on Market Street  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 2:00:00 PM

---

Hello,

Please see below for communication from ZK regarding street conditions near Market Steet and 6<sup>th</sup> Street.

Sincerely,

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

---

**From:** Zawadi Zawadi <kahawa@juno.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, September 15, 2023 11:19 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Re: More disaster to come on Market Street

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

HomeRise will "manage" the SRO. If you can brave it, look how the SRO are "managed" on Leavenworth. Stop dumping creating drug addicted, mentally ill ghettos!

On Fri, Sep 15, 2023, 11:14 AM Zawadi Zawadi <[kahawa@juno.com](mailto:kahawa@juno.com)> wrote:

Correction:

The city along with Newsom approved funding for Homesite to have a reconstructed SRO at 6th and Market Street. Also, Breed wants a mental health care and navigation center a few feet away.

Look at all the SRO and city clinics and you know the area will get worse!

ZK

On Fri, Sep 15, 2023, 11:10 AM Zawadi Zawadi <[kahawa@juno.com](mailto:kahawa@juno.com)> wrote:

Mayor Breed does not get it. Adding more mentally ill, marginally housed and drug addicted people to 5, 6, 7 and 8 make the situation worse.

We just found out that the construction at 6th and Market a few feet from Ikea is for an SRO hotel for homeless, drug addicted and mentally ill people.

Isn't the area flooded with this group which drug dealers feed off? Breed also wants to open a mentally ill navigation center a few feet away too.

This does not allow the area to revise and recover. Also, her plans of lip stick on pigs vs. actually addressing the problems on Market or the tenderloin is all she has.

Dorsey, Dean and the President Preston is to blame for the building recklessness. Why are they not allowing the area to recover. Adding more mentally ill, drug addicted and homeless to the area is not progress.

It's bogus and bias. Like dreamforce..Ikea side of the street is suspiciously clear compared to the garbage around them.

People will continue to move away leaving it like the horrid place it is now.

ZK

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Time to change prop 47 in SF  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 2:04:00 PM

---

Hello,

Please see below for communication from K. Miller regarding California Proposition 47, the Reduced Penalties for Some Crimes Initiative (2014).

Sincerely,

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

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

From: k miller <[kevmill@yahoo.com](mailto:kevmill@yahoo.com)>  
 Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2023 11:30 AM  
 To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <[mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org](mailto:mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org)>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>; Bolen, Jennifer M.(BOS) <[jennifer.m.bolen@sfgov.org](mailto:jennifer.m.bolen@sfgov.org)>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <[dean.preston@sfgov.org](mailto:dean.preston@sfgov.org)>  
 Subject: Time to change prop 47 in SF

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

Hi

I write to request the city take action and pass legislation that brings back the policies and laws that prop47 has removed .

Prop 47 removed the policy infrastructure to require mandatory substance abuse treatment.

Beyond being harmful it is plan stupid .

Drug overdoses have skyrocketed.

Shoplifting without consequences is another result of this .

Serial shoplifting is no longer a felony .

The evidence of this failed prop are evident .

The city should act locally and restore these laws as evidence shows those that commit these crimes obviously need consequences to stop their selfish and unacceptable behaviors .

Babysitting and rewarding criminals is not ok ,

Please start to correct prop 47 failures locally .

In good faith ,

K Miller

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Communication  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 2:06:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [Murawski and Parks.pdf](#)  
[BHC Grievance Portal email.pdf](#)  
[Strategic Plan FY 23-24 draft.pdf](#)  
[print of June 2023 Impl Com mtg page.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from Wynship Hillier regarding the Behavioral Health Commission.

Sincerely,

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

---

**From:** Wynship Hillier <wynship@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 18, 2023 11:15 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Toni Parks <tonerinsf@me.com>  
**Subject:** Communication

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

Dear Madam, Mx., or Sir:

Please forward this email to the Board of Supervisors and include in the communications packet for the next available meeting of the Board.

Very truly yours,  
 Wynship Hillier

**Wynship W. Hillier, M.S.**  
3562 20<sup>th</sup> Street, Apartment 22  
San Francisco, California 94110  
(415) 505-3856  
wynship@hotmail.com

September 17, 2023

Aaron Peskin, Chair  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
City Hall  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, California 94102

*Sent via email to [bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org)*

**RE: LIZA MURAWSKI AND TONI PARKS SHOULD BE DISMISSED FROM THE  
BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMISSION FOR OFFICIAL MISCONDUCT.**

Honorable Chair Peskin:

Liza Murawski and Toni Parks should be dismissed from the Behavioral Health Commission for official misconduct. Ms. Murawski chaired a meeting of the Site Visit Committee of the Commission and Ms. Parks attended this meeting as well as a meeting of the Implementation Committee on June 13 of this year, at both of which meetings multiple violations of open meetings laws occurred.

OFFICIAL MISCONDUCT. Official misconduct means any wrongful behavior by a public officer in relation to the duties of his or her office, willful in its character, including any failure, refusal or neglect of an officer to perform any duty enjoined on him or her by law . . . When any City law provides that a violation of the law constitutes or is deemed official misconduct, the conduct is covered by this definition and may subject the person to discipline and/or removal from office.

*S.F. Charter* § 15.105(e). “Willfully” is defined by *Cal. Penal Code* § 7(1) (second para.) as follows:

The following words have in this code the signification attached to them in this section, unless otherwise apparent from the context:

(1) The word “willfully,” when applied to the intent with which an act is done or omitted, implies simply a purpose or willingness to commit the act, or

make the omission referred to. It does not require any intent to violate law, or to injure another, or to acquire any advantage.

Although this definition does not strictly apply to *S.F. Charter*, § 15.105(e) of the latter represents a purely remedial measure, rather than punishment. Consequently, this section of the *Charter* should be construed more liberally than the *Penal Code*, rather than less. I.e., it should include what counts as willful behavior at least according to the *Penal Code*, if not more. Furthermore, the Site Visit Committee was a “legislative body” under the Brown Act because it was a standing committee with the power to act on behalf of the Commission by advising the Director of Behavioral Health Services. It was created by the Commission on May 18, 2022, through passage of its bylaws, and the Commission is a legislative body because it was created by ordinance of the Board of Supervisors, which is a legislative body because it is the governing body of the City and County of San Francisco, which is a local agency. *Cal. Gov’t Code* §§ 54951 and 54952(a) and (b), *S.F. Admin. Code* § 15.12(a) (creating the Commission). The Implementation Committee is a “legislative body” because it is a standing advisory committee consisting entirely of less than a majority of the Commission created by the Commission on May 18, 2022, also through the passage of bylaws. Both committees were also “policy bodies” because they were both standing committees of the Commission, which is a policy body because it was created by the Board of Supervisors. *Id.* §§ 15.12(a) (creating the Commission) and 67.3(d)(3) and (d)(5). These factors will become important in the argument below.

When a violation of open meetings laws occurs, every member of the legislative body or policy body present at the meeting shares in the responsibility therefor. This is because the chair has the power to rule items on the agenda out of order for violation of state or local procedural law. RONR (12<sup>th</sup> ed.) 4:17 and 10:26(1). Upon failure of the chair to do so, other members of the policy body then have the ability to immediately force the issue by raising a point of order, *id.* 23:5, requiring an immediate ruling by the chair, before discussion or consideration of the violative item may begin. This is evident from criminal penalty for violations of the Brown Act, which apply not just to the chair, but to every member of the legislative body present at the meeting where action is taken in violation of the Brown Act who knows or should know the facts that make the violation:

*Each member of a legislative body who attends a meeting of that legislative body where action is taken in violation of any provision of this chapter, and where the member intends to deprive the public of information to which the member knows or has reason to know the public is entitled under this chapter, is guilty of a misdemeanor.*

*Cal. Gov’t Code* § 54959 (in full) (emph. added). This occurred at the meetings of more than one body on June 13.

## MEETING OF THE “SITE VISIT COMMITTEE” OF THE BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMISSION ON JUNE 13

At appx. 2:37 p.m. on June 13, subsequent to a technical delay, Ms. Murawski, also a member of the Committee, chaired a meeting of the “Site Visit Committee” of the Behavioral Health Commission in Room 416 at City Hall which Ms. Parks and one other member also attended. According to the agenda for the meeting, the Site Visit Committee has only three members, so a majority of the members were in attendance. Therefore, a “meeting” of the Site Visit Committee occurred on June 13, 2023, as defined by *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.3(b)(1). However, none of the items on the agenda for the meeting, available here: [https://sf.gov/sites/default/files/2023-06/BHC%20Site%20Visit%20Cmte%20Agenda%206.13.23%20ag 0.pdf](https://sf.gov/sites/default/files/2023-06/BHC%20Site%20Visit%20Cmte%20Agenda%206.13.23%20ag%200.pdf), that were within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee were actually discussed or considered during the meeting. Consequently, a “meeting” of the Site Visit Committee as defined by *Cal. Gov’t Code* § 54952.2(a) did not occur on June 13, 2023.

### **1. Ms. Murawski Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Rule All of the Items on the Agenda or Off of It Out of Order, and Ms. Parks by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Conduct of the Meeting when Ms. Murawski Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Each of Them Respectively by *Cal. Gov’t Code* § 54954(a).**

*Cal. Gov’t Code* § 54954(a) provided as follows:

Each legislative body of a local agency, except for advisory committees or standing committees, shall provide, by ordinance, resolution, bylaws, or by whatever other rule is required for the conduct of business by that body, the time and place for holding regular meetings. Meetings of advisory committees or standing committees, for which an agenda is posted at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 54954.2, shall be considered for purposes of this chapter to be regular meetings of the legislative body.

The “Site Visit Committee” (actually the Program Evaluation Site Visit Committee) was a standing committee. 2:00 p.m. on June 13 was a regular meeting of the Site Visit Committee because meetings of this Committee were also noticed for 2:00 p.m. on the Tuesday of the week before the third Wednesday in both April and May, i.e. within a quarterly time interval. Consequently, the agenda for the June 13 meeting was posted at least 72 hours in advance pursuant to *Cal. Gov’t Code* § 54954.2(a)(1) (which only applies to regular meetings).

However, *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.6(a) provided as follows: “Each policy body, except for advisory bodies, shall establish by resolution or motion the time and place for holding regular meetings.” The Site Visit Committee was a policy body with decision-making power (i.e., not



advisory). Consequently, these two rules directly contradicted one another in this specific instance. Which one applied?

Although the meeting on June 13 was not a “meeting” pursuant to the Brown Act, it was a “meeting” of a policy body under the *Sunshine Ordinance*, and meetings of policy bodies were subject to the Brown Act through the first sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.5 (“All meetings of any policy body shall . . . governed by the provisions of the Ralph M. Brown Act (Government Code Section 54950 et seq.) and this Article. . .”). The two rules directly contradicted one another as to what body was to provide the time and place for regular meetings, and whether such provision was mandatory or discretionary, with respect to standing committees with decision-making power (i.e., not advisory). The second sentence of *id.* gave instruction as to how to resolve such conflicts: “In case of inconsistent requirements under the Brown Act and this Article, the requirement which would result in greater or more expedited public access shall apply.” In this case, this gave little guidance, because there was a question as to which rule provided greater public access.

*Neither Rule Clearly Provided Greater Public Access.*

The Brown Act rule requiring that a decision have been made at the level of the creating body as to whether a committee thereof should meet regularly, and, if so, where and when, could have resulted in more public access because it would have resulted in a more stable judgment. It would have required that a larger body vote on the matter, and to revise such a vote under the most popular system of parliamentary rules would require a 2/3 majority. RONR (12<sup>th</sup> ed.) pp. xlix-1 and para. 6:25(c). A 2/3 vote in a large body might have been difficult to muster, especially given local laws in some cities such as San Francisco, i.e., *S.F. Charter* § 4.104(b), requiring that such a vote of the Commission obtain the assent of 2/3 of its members, rather than the members present. A 2/3 majority vote at the level of the committee might have been much easier to obtain, especially if the aforementioned rule did not generally apply to committees, as was the case in San Francisco. (This situation was exacerbated by the Commission’s bylaws, which, following the *Good Government Guide*, used “members” to mean the number of seats on the Commission, such that a 2/3 vote of the Commission would be 12 “yes” votes, currently impossible to obtain because the Commission had no more than 10 members currently appointed to it.) More stability meant more predictability, which translated into more openness. If meeting dates were more difficult to change, they would have changed less often. If they had changed less often, members of the public would have been better able to arrange their lives to attend the meetings.

The Brown Act rule might also have resulted more directly in greater public access. If the decision had been made by the larger body, then members of the larger body who were not members of the committee would have been able to contribute to it. This would have resulted in greater public access because it would have been more likely that a time and place would have been chosen for regular meetings of the committee that members of the larger body who were not members of the committee (who would have been members of the public with respect to the

committee) would have been able to attend. Furthermore, meetings of the larger body would have been more likely to be attended by members the public (with respect to the Commission). Thus, more members of the public with respect to the Commission would also have been able to contribute to the decision and be able to attend the meetings of the committee.

However, it could be argued that some members of the public would have been more interested in the proceedings of the committee than that of the larger body, and more likely to attend the former than the latter. This might especially have been the case with committees with decision-making power, such as this one, because such a committee would have needed no approval from the larger body to take action on its behalf. With advisory committees, which cannot take action on behalf of the creating body, any interest in their proceedings would have extended to interest in the creating body, which alone would have had the power to act on behalf of the advice of the committee. Thus, the decision as to the time and place for regular meetings being made at the committee level for a committee with decision-making power might have been conducive to public access, because it might have attracted more members of the public, who would have had more interest in the activities of the committee alone. The second sentence of sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.5 did not give unequivocal guidance therefor.

*A Functionalist Argument Supported the Brown Act Rule.*

Because of the nature of these provisions, the previous dispute did not need to be resolved. Unlike nearly all other provisions in either law, these provisions had effects which extended over more than a single meeting. Thus, although the meeting on June 13 was not a “meeting” under the Brown Act, if it had been so, the Brown Act might have preempted the *Sunshine Ordinance* wherever the two were in conflict, regardless of the second sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.5, which only applied when the Brown Act was applicable solely through the first sentence. It seems reasonable to presume that, at some point, the Site Visit Committee would have held a regular meeting at which it would have transacted or discussed a matter within its subject-matter jurisdiction, wither on the agenda for that meeting or not. If and when it did, the Brown Act would apply *per se* and possibly with preemptive force. Such a meeting would be illegal unless the Commission had passed a resolution providing a time and place for regular meetings of the Site Visit Committee, and the Committee was in fact meeting at that place and time provided, if it was a regular meeting. The Brown Act rule alone must be assumed to apply, then, and to preempt the conflicting *Sunshine Ordinance* rule, in order that a single rule would apply in all regular meetings, whether matters within the subject-matter jurisdiction of the committee were discussed or not. The Brown Act rule must have applied even when the Brown Act itself only applied through the first sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.5, as it did on June 13.

It could not have been any other way. If the *Sunshine Ordinance* rule applied to meetings that were not meetings under the Brown Act *per se* and the Brown Act applied (with preemptive force) to the other ones, then there would have to be two provisions: One by the Commission providing a time and place for regular meetings of the Site Visit Committee, to which the Brown Act applied *per se* and with preemptive force (implicitly allowing them), and another by the Site

Visit Committee for its own regular meetings, to which the Brown Act applied only through the *Sunshine Ordinance*, assuming that the Sunshine Ordinance rule provided greater public access. There would have been no way to require that the two provisions provide the same time and place for regular meetings of the committee, nor that the Commission provide either a regular time or place. If the two bodies made different provisions, then it would be impossible to notice a regular meeting, because which provision were to apply to it would depend entirely upon whether any business would transacted or discussed within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Site Visit Committee at the meeting. This would not be known until the meeting actually took place, regardless of what was on the agenda, because of the provisions for discussing matters without notice on the agenda, the Commission's practice of filling their agendas with many "dead" items under which no discussion or consideration actually occurred at the meeting, items not reached for lack of time, and the possibility that the chair might rule an item on the agenda out of order before discussion or consideration of it could begin.

*The Functionalist Argument Required That the Brown Act Rule Preempt the Sunshine Ordinance Rule When the Two per se Were in Conflict, and It Did in Fact.*

As mentioned, the above argument assumed that the Brown Act preempted the Sunshine Ordinance whenever the two *per se* were in conflict. This was not necessarily so on the facts recounted so far. San Francisco had adopted a home-rule provision, *S.F. Charter* § 1.101, which allowed an ordinance of the Board of Supervisors to prevail over state law, if it could be shown that the two were in conflict and that the state law was overbroad, such that a conflicting provision was not reasonably related to a statewide concern, and thus unduly constrained local legislatures having home-rule power. *See, Cal. Const. Art. XI, § 5* (limiting home rule power to "municipal affairs").

Such an argument could not be sustained regarding *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54954(a). Even though it was equivocal which rule would have provided *greater* public access, the Brown Act rule was reasonably related to public access insofar as it extended to standing committees with power. This allowed it to preempt the Sunshine Ordinance, even given the home rule provision in the *Charter*.

The Brown Act rule was reasonably related to public access, even with respect to standing committees with decision-making power such as the "Site Visit Committee." We have just related how the fact of decision-making power held by the Site Visit Committee suggested that the Sunshine Ordinance rule might have been conducive to greater public access. Against this argument, a standing committee might have had decision-making power limited to a very small area, as was the case with the Site Visit Committee. Most of its work might well be advisory. Such a committee would be considered to have decision-making power because of the small area in which it did. To have required it to make its own decisions about regular meetings (per the Sunshine Ordinance rule) because of the narrow area would have been conducive to less public access, because the factors that applied to advisory committees would have predominated. It would also have led boards and commissions to create standing committees with "token"

decision-making power, solely in order that the committees could have decided on times and places for their own regular meetings with less public access. This was probably why the Brown Act rule gave only ad hoc committees with decision-making power the ability to decide on times and places for their own regular meetings (and required them to have regular meetings). Ad hoc committees were created to do only one thing. If that one thing was action taken on behalf of the creating body, then these committees would have had no advisory capacity whatsoever, and so nothing would have been lost by requiring them to hold regular meetings and to determine for themselves the times and places for them.

With respect to the distinction between the creating body determining *whether* a standing committee with decision-making power would meet regularly at all, as required by the Brown Act, and simply requiring that it do so, per the Sunshine Ordinance, the following ought to be considered. Whatever advantages with respect to openness would be achieved by requiring standing committees with decision-making power to meet regularly (per the Sunshine Ordinance) would be mitigated in part by the advantages of having the decision made by the creating body (per the Brown Act) for the reasons stated above. Recall that, with respect to the committee, many of the members of the creating body are likely to be members of the public. If the public had an interest in the committee meeting regularly, this would be reflected in a provision by the creating body to this effect. Furthermore, it is an adage that power tends to be used. If the creating body has the power to provide the time and place for regular meetings, it will tend to provide that the committee meet regularly at them. Furthermore, openness is not aided by requiring that a committee also meet regularly if the nature of its business requires that it do all its work at special meetings. On the whole, the advantages with respect to openness of the creating body providing the place and time for regular meetings, if any, of its standing committee with decision-making power will outweigh the disadvantage of the creating body sometimes not providing that the committee meet regularly. This would be all that would be required for state law to prevail, i.e., a reasonable relationship between the provision in question and the goal of openness.

This argument assumed that the Brown Act regulated a matter of predominantly statewide concern. After an early opinion of the State Attorney General took this view, 27 *Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen.* 123, 130-31 (3-2-56), binding precedent made it into law: *San Diego Union v. City Council*, 146 Cal. App. 3d 947, \*958 (1983) (Justice Work) (unanimous). It had also been said that, generally, whether statewide concerns or municipal affairs predominated in an area of conflicting state and local provisions depended upon historical circumstance. *California Fed. Savings & Loan Assn. v. City of Los Angeles*, 54 Cal. 3d 1, \*18 (1991) (Justice Arabian) (unanimous in the judgment). If historical circumstance had relevantly changed since 1983, the correct course would not have been, as occurred here, to ignore *San Diego Union* and apply the Sunshine Ordinance rule. Society would cease to function if everyone took the law into their own hands whenever they conceived of an argument of why the law might be wrong. Stability instead required that one had proven one's argument by having brought a lawsuit that had overturned *San Diego Union*. Until this had been accomplished, *San Diego Union* was ruling

case law and was required to have been followed. (If, on the other hand, Ms. Murawski and Ms. Parks had merely wished to commit civil disobedience without calling the law otherwise into question, they must necessarily have consented to the punishment—or, in this case, the purely remedial measure—that could be predicted to follow therefrom.)

The Brown Act rule for regular meetings of committees was reasonably related to the objective of public access such that San Francisco’s home rule provision, supporting its *Sunshine Ordinance* in cases in which the two were in conflict, was held in abeyance, and the Brown Act rule applied. The mere prospect of discussion or consideration of a matter within the subject-matter jurisdiction of the committee at a meeting required the use of a single rule for all meetings of the committee. The case for application of the Brown Act rule to the meeting of the “Site Visit Committee” on June 13 was thus complete.

*Therefore, Ms. Murawski and Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct at the Meeting of the “Site Visit Committee” on June 13.*

For these reasons, the Brown Act rule unequivocally applied to the June 13 meeting. Neither the Commission nor its Executive Committee ever provided Room 416 at City Hall for regular meetings of the Site Visit Committee. Neither provided 2:00 p.m. on the Tuesday of the week before the third Wednesday, either. The Commission had provided a time for regular meetings of this Committee on Dec. 17, 2022, but the time provided was 3:00 p.m. on the Tuesday of the week before the third Wednesday of the month for April, May, and June of 2023, i.e., an hour later than the time for which this meeting was noticed. See p. 10 of the agenda here: <https://sf.gov/sites/default/files/2022-12/BHC%20Retreat%20Agenda%2012.17.22%20.pdf>. (These times for regular meetings were approved during Item No. 5.0 a. on the agenda.)

Consequently, the meeting of this Committee was regular with the Commission having provided neither the time nor the place for it. *Cal. Gov’t Code* § 54954(a) imposed this duty upon the Commission which the Commission failed, refused, or neglected to perform. Knowing (or should having known) that the Commission had omitted to perform this duty enjoined upon it by law, Ms. Murawski and Ms. Parks then enrolled themselves in and completed the Commission’s failure, refusal, or neglect through their own failure, refusal, or neglect to bring what was a regular meeting of this standing committee of the Commission to an halt before entering into discussion or consideration of the first item on the agenda, by either Ms. Murawski ruling all of the items on the agenda out of order and adjourning the meeting for lack of further business before discussion or consideration began on the first item on the agenda or off of it, or, immediately upon Ms. Murawski’s failure to do so, Ms. Parks raising a point of order against the conduct of any business at the meeting because of the aforementioned omission, and the third member present also failing to do as was required of Ms. Parks. Thus, discussion or consideration proceeded on the first item on the agenda for the regular meeting, the violation of *id.* was completed, and committee members Murawski and Parks should be dismissed from the Commission for official misconduct.

**2. Ms. Murawski Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Rule “AGENDA CHANGES” on the Agenda Out of Order, and Ms. Parks by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of “AGENDA CHANGES” when Ms. Murawski Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Each of Them Respectively by the Brief, General Description Requirement of *Cal. Gov’t Code* § 54954.2(a)(1).**

“AGENDA CHANGES” on the agenda for the meeting of the Site Visit Committee on June 13 was as follows: “BHC should open the meeting with a motion to disclose the physical place, time, and location of the meeting under Item 1.1”. Item no. 1.1 stated as follows:

**1.1** The Co-Chairs will call for a motion to disclose the physical place, time, and location of the meetings going forward and BHC Staff call attention to California Government Code Section 54953(e) also known as AB 361 for the hybrid participants which empowers local policy bodies to convene by teleconferencing technology for those physically unable to attend –  
**[action item]**

This confused message describes two items: The “motion to disclose the physical place”, etc., and the “BHC Staff call attention to . . .” The second of these was out of date; it only applied during Governor Newsom’s Emergency Order, which he rescinded effective Mar. 1.

The first notice did not provide enough detail to advise someone whose interests would be affected by the item of whether to attend the meeting, which is the standard for compliance with *Cal. Gov’t Code* § 54954.2(a)(1). *Olson v. Hornbrook Community Services Dist.*, 33 Cal. App. 5<sup>th</sup> 502, \*520 (2019) (Justice Robie) (unanimous):

Those interested in the payment had notice that it was going to be discussed and acted upon at the District’s August meeting and could attend the meeting and participate in the Board’s action . . . plaintiffs’ allegations lead us to conclude the essential nature of the Board’s action was communicated and did not prevent public participation that would have otherwise occurred . . .

*Id.* at \*521 (“[T]hose interested in the District’s expenses would know from the agenda description that they needed to attend the meeting to participate in that discussion and action . . .”) (“Those interested in payments not listed would not know to attend the September 2016 meeting so they could comment on the subject.”). The notice above informed the public that a decision of whether to disclose information to the public about times and places for regular meetings of the Site Visit Committee that had been provided elsewhere and was otherwise privy to the Site Visit Committee. It did not entail the actual disclosure, only a decision of whether any disclosure would be made at a time and in a manner perhaps also to be decided at the meeting. This was not at all what was transacted under “AGENDA CHANGES”. What was transacted under “AGENDA CHANGES” was what time and place to provide for regular

meetings of the Committee, not whether to disclose a time and place that had already been provided elsewhere and how and when to do so. Consequently, someone whose interests would have been affected by the time and place to be provided for regular meetings of the Committee but was unconcerned by the decision of whether to disclose them or when and how to do so would not have known to attend the meeting on June 13.

Provision by the agenda of a brief, general description of the item to be transacted thereunder was a duty enjoined by law upon the Committee. Knowing that the description of this item was inadequate for what had been moved under it, Ms. Murawski should have ruled the motion out of order when it was introduced. Upon her failure to do so, Ms. Parks should have immediately raised a point of order against the consideration of the motion on the same basis before discussion, debate, or voting began on the item. By both of them failing to do so and the third member also failing to do what Ms. Parks should have done, all three members enrolled themselves in and completed the failure, refusal, or neglect to perform an act enjoined upon them by law, and thus committed official misconduct, and should be dismissed from the Commission therefor.

**3. Ms. Murawski Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Rule Item “AGENDA CHANGES” on the Agenda Out of Order, and Ms. Parks by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of “AGENDA CHANGES” when Ms. Murawski Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Each of Them Respectively by the Meaningful Description Requirement of the First Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).**

The requirement of the previous number is substantially repeated by the first sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a), which requires “an agenda containing a meaningful description of each item of business to be transacted or discussed at the meeting. . . .” “[A] meaningful description” is defined by *id.* § 67.7(b), expressly stating a standard similar to that for *Cal. Gov’t Code* § 54954.2(a)(1), as follows: “A description is meaningful if it is sufficiently clear and specific to alert a person of average intelligence and education whose interests are affected by the item that he or she may have reason to attend the meeting or seek more information about the item. . . .” Consequently, Ms. Murawski should have ruled this item out of order for violation of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a) as well as *Cal. Gov’t Code* §§ 54954(a) and 54954.2(a)(1), and, failing this, Ms. Parks or the other member present should have raised a point of order against the discussion or consideration of “AGENDA CHANGES” before discussion or consideration of it began at the meeting. By all three failing, refusing, or neglecting to perform these duties, all three enrolled themselves in this failure, refusal, or neglect to perform a duty enjoined on them by law, and Ms. Parks and Ms. Murawski should be dismissed from the Behavioral Health Commission for official misconduct.

**4. Ms. Murawski Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Rule Item “AGENDA CHANGES” on the Agenda Out of Order, and Ms. Parks by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of “AGENDA CHANGES” when Ms. Murawski Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Each of Them Respectively by the Second Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).**

The second sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a) reads as follows: “Agendas shall specify for each item of business the proposed action or a statement that the item is for discussion only.” When this item was called up, a motion was made and carried “That the Site Visit Committee be held on Tuesday according to the schedule attached to the Behavioral Health Commission meeting in Room 416 at 2:00 p.m.” The agenda, to the contrary, read as specified under item no. 2, above, which contained none of this information. It contained neither the proposed action that was taken at the meeting nor a statement that the item was for discussion only. Consequently, this item violated the second sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a). Ms. Murawski should have ruled it out of order when calling it up. When she failed, refused, or neglected to do so, Ms. Parks or the other member present should have raised a point of order against the consideration of the item. When neither of them did so, all three enrolled themselves in the failure, refusal, or neglect to perform the duty enjoined by the second sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a). Ms. Parks and Ms. Murawski should be dismissed from the Commission for official misconduct therefor.

**5. Ms. Murawski Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Rule Item “AGENDA CHANGES” on the Agenda Out of Order, and Ms. Parks by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of “AGENDA CHANGES” when Ms. Murawski Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Each of Them Respectively by *Cal. Gov’t Code* § 54954.3(a).**

*Cal. Gov’t Code* § 54955.3(a) requires that the agenda provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the committee on each item of interest to the public before or during the discussion or consideration of the item. The agenda provided no opportunity to address the committee regarding “AGENDA CHANGES” at all. Although “AGENDA CHANGES” referenced item no. 1.1 on the agenda, the agenda neither provided an opportunity for the public to address the committee regarding item no. 1.1 before or during the consideration of the item. The fact that Ms. Murawski asked for public comment on this item at the meeting did not cure the defect in the agenda. Consequently, she should have ruled “AGENDA CHANGES” out of order as soon as she called it up. Failing this, Ms. Parks or the other member should have raised a point of order before consideration of this item began, and Ms. Murawski should have ruled the point of order to be well taken. When none of the members did so, all of them committed official misconduct by willfully enrolling themselves in the failure,



refusal, or neglect to include the required information on the agenda. Ms. Murawski and Ms. Parks should be dismissed from the Commission therefor.

**6. Ms. Murawski Committed Official Misconduct by Amending the Action in Item No. 1.3 on the Agenda beyond Its Original Scope, by Assigning Commissioners Jackson-Lane, Mason, Wynn, and Parks to Visit Jordan Arms and McAllister Apartments, and by Amending the Action in Item No. 1.3 on the Agenda beyond Its Original Scope by Ordering Staff to Send Correspondence to These Sites Within 24 Hours Requiring That The Sites Respond Within 15 Days as to When They Would Host the Site Visit at Least 30 Days Thereafter, and Ms. Parks by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against These Amendments when Ms. Murawski Made Them, Which Forbearances and Duties Were Enjoined on Each of Them Respectively by the Second Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).**

The second sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a) reads as follows: “Agendas shall specify for each item of business the proposed action or a statement that the item is for discussion only.” Item No. 1.3 on the agenda for the meeting of the Site Visit Committee on June 13, 2023, read as follows:

**1.3** Discuss strategic planning around future presentations by programs that have been recently evaluated. It was suggested that the BHC do site visits on the Jordan Apartments and the McAllister Apartments. **[action item]**

Taking the second sentence to be the proposed action, it did not include many of the things that Ms. Murawski added. While the second sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a) allows amendments at the meeting that reduce the scope of the proposed action below that which was proposed on the agenda, it does not allow amendments at the meeting that increase the scope beyond what was proposed on the agenda. The agenda not including these aspects of the action was failure, refusal, or neglect to perform a duty enjoined on the Site Visit Committee by law and thus official misconduct. Ms. Murawski endorsed this official misconduct by proposing these amendments and Ms. Parks by not objecting thereto. Although no vote was taken, this was a “collective decision” and thus “action taken” as defined by *Cal. Gov’t Code* § 54952.6.

**7. Ms. Murawski Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Corral Discussion on Item No. 2.5 to within the Confines of a List of Assignments of Commissioners to Sites, and Ms. Parks by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against These Excesses when Ms. Murawski Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Each of Them Respectively by *Cal. Gov’t Code* § 54954.2(a)(1).**

This legal requirement is discussed under Item No. 2 of this complaint.

Item No. 2.5 on the agenda for the meeting read as follows:

**2.5** Update on scheduling of new Site Visits; to engage the commissioners in the site visit process, it was determined that Chair Murawski would begin a list to present to the Commissioners; vote to accept. **[action item]**

Under this item, Chair Murawski moved “that the committee get clarification on mental health services provided by Behavioral Health Services under their contract with Homelessness and Supportive Housing.” Someone whose interests would be affected by this would not know from the notice on the agenda whether they should attend the meeting. Consequently, the notice was inadequate and there was a failure, refusal, or neglect to perform a duty enjoined on someone by law, namely the provision of adequate notice on the agenda. Mr. Murawski endorsed this failure, refusal, or neglect, by making this motion, and Ms. Parks enrolled herself therein by not raising a point of order against this motion before consideration of it began.

**8. Ms. Murawski Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Corral Discussion on Item No. 2.5 to within the Confines of a List of Assignments of Commissioners to Sites, and Ms. Parks by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against These Excesses when Ms. Murawski Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Each of Them Respectively by the First Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).**

The legal requirement of this sentence is discussed under Item No. 3 of this complaint. The factual situation is discussed under Item No. 7 of this complaint. The inability of a person whose interests would be affected by what was moved under this item to know whether to attend the meeting from the notice that appeared on the agenda was also a violation of this sentence.

**9. Ms. Murawski Committed Official Misconduct by Making a Main Motion That Did Not Appear on the Agenda under Item No. 2.5, and Ms. Parks by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against Its Consideration when Ms. Murawski So Acted, Which Forbearance and Duty Were Enjoined on Each of Them Respectively by the Second Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).**

The legal requirement of this sentence is discussed under Item Nos. 4 and 6 of this complaint. The factual situation is described under Item No. 7 of this complaint. The proposed action that appeared on the agenda did not encompass in any way the motion that was made at the meeting.

#### **MEETING OF THE IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE OF THE BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMISSION ON JUNE 13**

At appx. 3:00 p.m. on June 13, a meeting of the Implementation Committee of the Behavioral Health Commission was held in Room 416 at City Hall which Ms. Parks and two other members also attended, agenda available here:

<https://sf.gov/sites/default/files/2023-06/BHC%20Implementation%20Cmte%20Agenda%206.13.23%20ag.pdf> .

According to the agenda for the meeting, the Implementation Committee had only four members,

so a majority of the members were in attendance. Therefore, a “meeting” of the Implementation Committee occurred on June 13, 2023, as defined by *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.3(b)(1). Thus, the meeting was subject to the Brown Act through the first sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.5. Furthermore, a matter within the subject-matter jurisdiction of the Implementation Committee was discussed during this meeting. Therefore, it was also a “meeting” as defined by the Brown Act, *Cal. Gov’t Code* § 54952.2(a), and the Brown Act also applied to it *per se*.

**1. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Conduct of the Entire Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by *Cal. Gov’t Code* § 54954(a).**

Please see the discussion of the law in question under Item No. 1 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. The Implementation Committee being an advisory committee, however, the section of the *Sunshine Ordinance* that conflicts with the Brown Act is different, and it conflicts differently. The section that conflicts is *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.6(f). It begins as follows: “Special meetings of any policy body, *including advisory bodies that choose to establish regular meeting times . . .*” (emph. added). This clause conflicts only on the issue of which body decides whether the committee is to meet regularly (the committee or its parent) and the place and time of the regular meetings. It does not conflict as to whether regular meetings are mandatory or discretionary.

This meeting was regular because an agenda had been posted for the same Committee at the same time, 3:00 p.m., on the Tuesday of the week prior to the third Wednesday of the month two months earlier, in April.

The Commission had never provided for the Implementation Committee to meet regularly at this time and place. In fact, it had provided for it to meet regularly one hour later, at 4:00 p.m., on this date, the provision having been made on Dec. 17, 2022. It had never provided for this Committee to meet in Room 416 of City Hall. Therefore, this meeting violated *Cal. Gov’t Code* § 54954(a) two different ways. The chair should have ruled the entire meeting out of order before discussion or consideration could begin on the first item on the agenda. That they did not enrolled every member present, including Ms. Parks, in the violation, because neither Ms. Parks nor the other member present raised a point of order against the conduct of the meeting before discussion or consideration began of the first item on the agenda. If they had done so, the point of order should have been well taken, the meeting should have been adjourned for lack of further business, and the committee would not have failed, refused, or neglected to perform a duty enjoined upon them by law.

**2. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of “AGENDA CHANGES” when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Brief, General Description Requirement of *Cal. Gov’t Code* § 54954.2(a)(1).**

Please see the discussion of the law in question under Item No. 2 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. The agenda item in question was the same for the Implementation Committee and the Site Visit Committee. It had the same defects, and the same requirements and penalties applied. As with the Site Visit Committee, a motion was made and passed to determine the time and place for regular meetings of the Implementation Committee, rather than what was described on the agenda for this item. This violated the section in question. The committee chair failed, refused, or neglected to rule the motion out of order therefor. Given this state of affairs, Ms. Parks or the other member of the committee should have raised a point of order against the consideration of the question, which point of order should have been well taken. By failing, refusing, or neglecting to raise a point of order, Ms. Parks endorsed the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to perform the task enjoined upon them by law, and should be removed from the Commission for official misconduct.

**3. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of “AGENDA CHANGES” when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Meaningful Description Requirement of the First Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).**

Again, please see the discussion of the law and the facts under Item No. 3 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. The agenda item in question was the same for both committees. It had the same defects, and the same requirements and penalties applied. As with the Site Visit Committee, a motion was made and passed to determine the time and place for regular meetings of the Implementation Committee, rather than what was described on the agenda for this item. This violated the section in question. The committee chair failed, refused, or neglected to rule the motion out of order therefor. Ms. Parks or the other member should have raised a point of order against the consideration of the question, and the point of order should have been well-taken. By her failure, refusal, or neglect, Ms. Parks endorsed the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to perform a task enjoined upon them by law and should be removed from the Commission for official misconduct.

**4. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of “AGENDA CHANGES” when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Second Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).**

Please see the discussion of the law and the facts under Item No. 4 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. The agenda item in question was the same for both committees. It had the same defects, and the same requirements and penalties applied. As with the meeting of the Site Visit Committee, a motion was made and passed “to meet on the Second Tuesday at 3 p.m. in hearing room 416 in City Hall at 1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place”, which action did not appear on the agenda for the meeting. This violated the section in question. When the committee chair failed, refused, or neglected to rule the motion out of order therefor, Ms. Parks or the other member should have raised a point of order against the consideration of the question, and the point of order should have been well taken. By failing even to raise it, Ms. Parks endorsed the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to perform a duty enjoined on them by law, and should be removed from the Commission for official misconduct.

**5. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of “AGENDA CHANGES” when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by *Cal. Gov’t Code* § 54954.3(a).**

Please see the discussion of the law and the facts under Item No. 5 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. The agenda item in question was the same for both committees. It had the same defects, and the same requirements and penalties applied. This violated the section in question. When calling up the item the committee chair failed, refused, or neglected to rule the motion out of order therefor. Ms. Parks or the other member should have raised a point of order against the consideration of the question as soon as it was stated by the committee chair, and the point of order should have been well taken. Consequently, consideration was allowed to begin on the question. Ms. Parks thus endorsed the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to perform a task enjoined on them by law, which was to provide an opportunity for member of the public to address the committee on the agenda before or during the consideration of the item. Ms. Parks should be removed from the Commission for official misconduct therefor.

**6. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.1 on the Agenda when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Second Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).**

Please see the discussion of the law under Item Nos. 4 and 6 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. Item No. 2.1 on the agenda stated as follows:

**2.1 Follow up on Grievance Procedures:** update on BHC strategy to improve Grievance Procedures; vote to adopt Commissioner Wynn’s portal to be installed on the BHC website. Commissioners need to create and submit sample items for the portal. **[action item]**

What was actually approved under this item on June 13 was a motion “that BHS have online complaint process active by 12/31/23.” While the notice on the agenda might have been enough to inform someone whose interests were affected of whether they should attend the meeting, the motion that was passed was not strictly within the scope of the motion that appeared on the agenda. The motion was changed from an instruction to staff to put a complaint portal on the BHC website which was to be further specified into an advice to BHS that they must put an online complaint portal on their website by a certain date. Consequently, the motion that was passed violated the second sentence of *S.F. Admin.. Code* § 67.7(a). The committee chair failing to rule the motion out of order, Ms. Parks or the remaining other member should have raised a point of order against the motion as soon as the committee chair stated it. By both remaining members neglecting, refusing, or failing to raise a point of order, Ms. Parks endorsed the neglect, refusal, or failure of the committee to perform a duty enjoined by law, which was to put the proposed action on the agenda for the meeting, required by *id.* Thus, she committed official misconduct and should be dismissed from the Commission therefor.

**7. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.1 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by *Cal. Gov’t Code* § 54954.3(a).**

Please see Item No. 5 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above, for a discussion of this law. The agenda did not provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the Implementation Committee on Item No. 2.1 on the agenda for the meeting before or during the consideration of the item. That public comment was actually called during the consideration of this item, and that there was no public comment, did not cure this defect. The chair should have ruled this item out of order before discussion or consideration of it began. When the chair failed to do so, Ms. Parks or the remaining other member should have raised a point of order against any consideration of this item on this basis, and the point of order should have been well taken. By neither of them doing so, Ms. Parks endorsed the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to perform an act enjoined upon them by law, which was for them to provide the required opportunity *on the agenda* for the meeting. This was official misconduct, for which Ms. Parks should be dismissed from the Commission.

**8. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.1 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Reference Clause of the Third Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(b).**

The third sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(b) states as follows:

[The meaningful description of each item of business on the agenda for the meeting] shall refer to any explanatory documents that have been provided to the policy body in connection with the item, such as correspondence or reports, and such documents shall be posted adjacent to the agenda, or, if such documents are of more than one page in length, made available for public inspection and copying at a location indicated on the agenda during normal office hours.

(square brackets added.) Please see the description of the agenda item in Item No. 6 regarding the meeting of the Implementation Committee in this document. This description clearly references no documents. However, a multiple-page email I sent to the Commission on April 20, 2023, a copy of which I am attaching, was provided to the Commission in reference to this item. This was “correspondence” and should have been referenced in the item description. The agenda item failed to reference it. This email having been sent to all members of the Commission, when calling up this item, the committee chair should have ruled it out of order therefor. When he failed, refused or neglected to do so, Ms. Parks or the other member of the committee should have raised a point of order against the consideration of the item on the basis of the violation of a procedural rule prescribed by applicable local law, and the point of order should have been well taken. Because neither of them did so, all three members of the committee present endorsed and enrolled themselves in the failure of the committee to perform a duty enjoined upon them by law, which was to print the reference to the explanatory documents on the agenda. Ms. Parks should be dismissed from the Commission for official misconduct therefor.

**9. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.1 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Second Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.9(a).**

Please see the description of the agenda item in Item No. 6 of this complaint. As mentioned in Item No. 8, above, the description referenced no documents, and yet Ms. Parks and the other members of the Implementation Committee were aware that an email document existed that was associated to this item. Therefore, they should have inferred from this lack of reference on the agenda and exclusion from their agenda packet that this document had neither been posted on the Commission’s website. As the attached printout shows, the email regarding the proposed web portal was never posted on the Commission’s internet site for the meeting.

Agendas of meetings and any other documents on file with the clerk of a policy body, when intended for distribution to all, or a majority of all, of the members of a policy body in connection with a matter anticipated for discussion or consideration at a public meeting shall be made available to the public. To the extent possible, such documents shall also be made available through the policy body's Internet site. However, this disclosure need not include any material exempt from disclosure under this ordinance.

*S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.9(a) (in full). Therefore, the committee chair should have ruled Item No. 2.1 on the agenda out of order as soon as he called it up. Failing to do so, either Ms. Parks or the other member of the committee should have raised a point of order against the consideration of the item, and the point of order should have been well taken. That Ms. Parks did not do so when her colleague also failed to do so endorsed and enrolled her in the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to perform a duty enjoined on them by law, namely, to publish documents associated with items on the agenda for a meeting on their website. Thus, Ms. Parks committed official misconduct and should be dismissed from the Commission therefor.

**10. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.2 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Reference Clause of the Third Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(b).**

Please see Item No. 8 for a description of the law. Agenda item no. 2.2 read as follows:

**2.2 Strategic Plan: Continue revision process begun in BHC Retreat of 12/17/22:** This is an ongoing item on the Implementation Committee agenda and will allow the committee/BHC to have an ongoing sense of our progress on meeting goals (discuss outcomes that came out of the retreat and who will take the lead post Commissioner Bohrer's resignation) **[action item]**

(sq. brackets, emphases in orig.). This description clearly references no document. However, a strategic plan document, more than one page in length, existed in the possession of BHC and is attached to this correspondence. It had been attached to the agendas of other meetings of the committee, and so all members of the committee knew of its existence. Agenda Item 2.2 failed to reference it. When item no. 2.2 was called up therefor, the committee chair should have ruled it out of order. When he failed, refused, or neglected to do so, one of the other members of the committee should have raised a point of order against the consideration of the item before its consideration began, and the point of order should have been well taken. By failing, refusing, or neglecting to do so under these circumstances when no other member did, all of the members of the committee endorsed and enrolled themselves in the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to perform a duty enjoined upon them by the section cited, which was to reference the



explanatory document in the item on the agenda. Thus, Ms. Parks committed official misconduct and should be dismissed from the Commission therefor.

**11. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.2 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Reference Clause of the Third Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(b).**

Please see Item No. 5 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above, for a discussion of this law. The agenda did not provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the Implementation Committee on Item No. 2.2 on the agenda for the meeting before or during the consideration of the item. That public comment was actually called during the consideration of this item, and that there was no public comment, did not cure this defect. The chair should have ruled this item out of order before discussion or consideration of it began. When the chair failed to do so, Ms. Parks or the remaining other member should have raised a point of order against any consideration of this item on this basis, and the point of order should have been well taken. By neither of them doing so, Ms. Parks endorsed the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to perform an act enjoined upon them by law, which was for them to provide the required opportunity *on the agenda* for the meeting. This was official misconduct, for which Ms. Parks should be dismissed from the Commission.

**12. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.2 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Second Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).**

Please see Item No. 4 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above, for a discussion of this law and Item No. 10 for a description of this item on the agenda for the meeting.

No motion was made during this item, nor was any collective decision reached without the introduction of a motion. The committee chair only made a short announcement that he would do something related to this item. Therefore, this item was for discussion only, and the agenda was required to include a statement to this effect. Because there was neither a proposed action on the agenda for this item, nor a statement that it was or discussion only, the committee chair should have ruled it out of order, rather than making his announcement. Upon his failure to do so, Ms. Parks or the other member of the committee should have raised a point of order against the discussion or consideration of the item before the chair made his announcement. Her and her colleague's failure, refusal, or neglect to do so enrolled each member of the committee in the failure of the committee to perform an act enjoined upon it by law, which was to provide either a proposed action or a statement that the item was for discussion only for every item thereon. Consequently, Ms. Parks committed official misconduct and should be dismissed from the Commission therefor.

**13. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.2 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule Them out of Order, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Second Sentence of S.F. Admin. Code § 67.9(a).**

Please see Item No. 9 for a description of this law, and Item No. 10 for a description of item no. 2.2 on the agenda for the meeting, as well as the document associated therewith. As the associated printout of the web page for the meeting shows, the strategic plan document was not included with the documents for the meeting, and the members of the committee should have inferred from this that it had not been posted on the website. The committee chair should have ruled this item out of order therefor. The committee chair failing to do so, it fell to the members of the committee to raise a point of order against the consideration of the item. When neither Ms. Parks nor her colleague did so, Ms. Parks enrolled herself in and subscribed to the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to perform a task enjoined on them by law, which was to post the plan document associated with this item on their web page. This was official misconduct, and Ms. Parks should be dismissed from the Commission therefor.

**14. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item Nos. 2.1 and 2.2 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule Them out of Order, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Location Clause of the Third Sentence of S.F. Admin. Code § 67.7(b).**

Please see Item No. 8 for a description of the law, Item Nos. 6 and 10 for descriptions of Item Nos. 1.2 and 2.2 on the agenda for the meeting, and Item Nos. 8 and 10 for a description of the explanatory documents related to these items.

The agenda failed to indicate a physical location where the documents associated with these items would be made available for inspection and copying during normal office hours. The address on the letterhead, “1380 Howard St., 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor” was not specific enough. The second floor of 1380 Howard St. is a big maze of cubicles and hallways with no reception desk. A member of the public would not be able to find anyone on the basis of this information. Furthermore, nothing on the agenda said that this or any other location were where documents referenced on the agenda may be inspected and copied during normal business hours.

Because of the lack of a provision of a physical location for the examination and photocopying of related documents, the committee chair should have ruled the items on the agenda that had associated documents, Item Nos. 2.1 and 2.2, out of order for violation of this procedural rule prescribed by local law. When they failed to do so, it became beholden upon the other members of the committee to raise points of order against the consideration of these items on this basis, and the points of order should have been well taken. The members’ failure, refusal, or neglect to do so endorsed and enrolled them in the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to perform

an act enjoined upon it by law, which was to provide such a physical location on the agenda for the meeting. Ms. Parks, by her participation therein, incurred official misconduct and should be dismissed from the Commission therefor.

**15. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.3 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule It out of Order, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by Brief, General Description Requirement of *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54954.2(a)(1).**

Please see the discussion of the law in question under Item No. 2 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. Agenda item no. 2.3 on the agenda for the meeting read as follows: “**2.3 Annual Public Hearing:** Discussion continued regarding public hearings [discussion only]”. This item did not specify by whom the annual public hearing was to be held, nor whether the hearing was proposed or past. Consistent with the subject-matter jurisdiction of this committee, the referenced hearing might have been held by Behavioral Health Services as part of their engagement of the community in the planning process. Or it might have been held by DPH, or the Health Commission, or the Board of Supervisors, or Homelessness and Supportive Housing, or the Commission, or by a local or state nonprofit, or by the state legislature or administrative organ, *et al.* References to past discussions mean nothing to a member of the public who might be considering attending a meeting for the first time. Therefore, this item did not contain enough detail for someone whose interests would be affected by the item to know whether to attend the meeting. It did not meet the minimum notice requirement of the section cited, and the committee chair should have ruled it out of order as soon as he called it up. Once he failed to do so, one of the other members of the committee should have raised a point of order against any discussion of the item before the discussion began, and this point of order should have been well taken. By allowing the discussion to continue when the committee chair failed, refused, or neglected to rule and her colleague failed, refused, or neglected to raise a point of order against the discussion of the item, Ms. Parks endorsed and enrolled herself in the discussion of the item, and thus cooperated in the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to provide a brief, general, description of the item on the agenda, a duty enjoined upon them by law, which has been specified as to its requirement by the California Court of Appeal. Thus, Ms. Parks committed official misconduct and should be dismissed from the Commission therefor.

**16. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.3 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule It out of Order, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Meaningful Description Requirement of the First Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).**

Please see the discussion of the law in question under Item No. 3 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. Please see Item No. 15 for a description of the agenda item. The legal

standard of this section is the same as that for Item No. 15 with respect to the facts at issue, and the argument is consequently exactly the same.

**17. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.4 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule It out of Order, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Brief, General Description Requirement of *Cal. Gov't Code* § 54954.2(a)(1).**

Please see the discussion of the law in question under Item No. 2 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. Agenda item no. 2.4 on the agenda for the meeting read as follows, in full: **“2.4 How to Address Housing & Behavioral Health: Discussion on process”**. This description might have been adequate if it had been as general as it sounded and also accurate. However, the discussion that took place under it had nothing to do with process in general, and spanned far less than the entirety of the problem of housing and behavioral health. In fact, the discussion did not even touch upon this topic. As was revealed when the item was called up, what the proponent of the item actually wanted to propose under its broad and global rubric was that someone from the committee attend meetings of the newly-formed Homelessness and Supportive Housing Commission, a very concrete and specific proposal, far from a wide-ranging and freewheeling discussion of all of the ins and outs of housing and behavioral health. They should have put the actual topic on the agenda, and not hide under vague, elusive, and cosmic-sounding generalities such as “How to Address Housing & Behavioral Health,” when something much more specific was in mind. Given that they had failed in this, the committee chair (who was the proponent of the item) should have ruled it out of order when he called it up, as the description on the agenda was far too vague to alert someone whose interests would be affected by what would be discussed under the actual item to know whether they should attend the meeting. Given that the committee chair failed to rule the item out of order, the other members of the committee should have raised a point of order as soon as the committee chair revealed that the description of this item on the agenda was merely a subterfuge hiding a specific proposal, without waiting to obtain the floor, on the basis that a vague generality had been placed on the agenda to disguise a specific proposal, in violation of the cited section. The committee chair should have found the point of order to be well-taken. When Ms. Parks did not do this, given that her colleague also failed, refused, or neglected to do so, she then endorsed the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to perform a task enjoined upon them by law, namely putting a description of the item on the agenda with enough specificity as to alert someone whose interests may be affected by the item of whether they should attend the meeting. Thus, she committed official misconduct and should be dismissed from the Commission.

**18. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.4 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule It out of Order, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Meaningful Description Requirement of the First Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).**

Please see the discussion of the law in question under Item No. 3 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. Please see Item No. 17 for a description of the agenda item. The legal standard of this section is the same as that for Item No. 17 with respect to the facts at issue, and the argument is consequently exactly the same.

**19. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 2.4 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule It out of Order, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Second Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).**

Please see the discussion of the law in question under Item No. 4 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. Please see Item No. 17 of this complaint for a description of the agenda item. Item No. 2.4 on the agenda included neither a proposed action nor a statement that the item was for discussion only, as required by the cited sentence, and violated the cited section on its face. The committee chair should have ruled it out of order therefor. When they failed, refused, or neglected to do so, a member of the committee should have raised a point of order against any discussion of the item, and the point of order should have been well taken. When neither Ms. Parks nor her colleague did so, Ms. Parks endorsed the failure, refusal, or neglect of the committee to perform a duty enjoined upon them by law, which was to publish a proposed action or a statement that the item was for discussion only for each item of business on the agenda. Thus, Ms. Parks committed official misconduct and should be dismissed from the Commission therefor.

**20. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 3.0 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule It out of Order, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Meaningful Description Requirement of the First Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).**

Please see the discussion of the law in question under Item No. 3 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. The description of Item No. 3.0 on the agenda was as follows, in full: “**COMMITTEE MEMBERS** [sic] **REPORTS** – For discussion and possible action.” (sq. brackets added, emph. in orig.). Under this item was discussed the Mayor’s proposal to cut mental health services in the City and County. In fact, Ms. Parks herself made this announcement. The committee chair should have ruled this item out of order as soon as he called it up, for the description is obviously so general as to contain almost anything, and

provides no help whatsoever to a member of the public who would be trying to make an intelligent decision about whether to attend the meeting on the basis of what would actually be transacted or discussed there, rather than just showing up and seeing what would happen. It is to be noted that, while “a brief announcement” is exempt from the notice requirement of the Brown Act, *Cal. Gov’t Code* § 54954.2(a)(3), the Board of Supervisors filled in this exemption with the similar requirement of the *Sunshine Ordinance*, cited above, which contains no analogous exemption. Brief announcements without special notice on the agenda thus violate local law. When the committee chair failed, refused, or neglected to rule this item out of order for this reason, either Ms. Parks or her colleague should have raised a point of order against any discussion or action under this item, and their point of order should have been well taken. Ms. Parks’s failure, refusal, or neglect to do so, in this context, was an endorsement of the committee’s failure, refusal, or neglect to perform a duty enjoined upon them by law, which was to provide a meaningful description of each item on the agenda, with a few very, very narrow exceptions not containing what was done here. Thus, Ms. Parks committed official misconduct and should be dismissed from the Commission.

**21. Ms. Parks Committed Official Misconduct by Failing, Refusing, or Neglecting to Raise a Point of Order against the Consideration of Item No. 3.0 on the Agenda for the Meeting when the Chair Failed, Refused, or Neglected to Rule It out of Order, Which Duties Were Enjoined on Both of Them by the Second Sentence of *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(a).**

Please see the discussion of the law in question under Item No. 4 for the Meeting of the Site Visit Committee, above. Please see Item No. 20 of this complaint for a description of the item on the agenda. The description of this item on the agenda was required to contain either a proposed action or a statement that it was for discussion only. The committee chair, therefore, should have ruled this item out of order as soon as he called it up. When he failed, refused, or neglect to do so, either of the other two members of the committee should have raised a point of order against the discussion or consideration of the item, which point of order should have been well taken. They were able to do this right away, because it was apparent from the description of this item that, no matter what transpired under it, the notice was inadequate. By Ms. Parks failing, refusing, or neglecting to raise a point of order when her colleague did the same was official misconduct. By doing so, Ms. Parks enrolled herself in the committee’s failure, refusal, or neglect to perform a duty enjoined on them by law, which was to provide either a proposed action or a statement that the item was for discussion only for each item on the agenda. Consequently, she should be dismissed from the Commission for official misconduct.

Chair Peskin  
September 17, 2023  
Page 26

Very Truly Yours,

/s/

Wynship Hillier

cc: Toni Parks

## Proposed BHC grievance portal

wynship@hotmail.com

Thu 4/20/2023 4:15 PM

To:DPH-San Francisco Behavioral Health Commission <sfbhc@sfdph.org>

Cc:wynship@hotmail.com <wynship@hotmail.com>

Bcc:LIZA murawski <[REDACTED]>;Stephen Banuelos <[REDACTED]>;Toni Parks <[REDACTED]>;Lisa Wynn <[REDACTED]>

(sent via bcc to Commissioners Murawski, Parks, Banuelos, and Wynn)

Please forward to all Commissioners and reference in all further agenda items regarding this matter, *S.F. Admin. Code* § 67.7(b), and post on the Commission's website, *id.* § 67.9(a), if this matter is ever agendized again.

Parts of the *San Francisco Mental Health Plan* ("Plan"), which I previously sent to you on Nov. 22, 2022, are directly relevant to this issue. See, in particular, Attachment 12 to Exhibit A, "BENEFICIARY PROBLEM RESOLUTION", pp. 71-93 of the PDF.

This section cites the Federal Code of Regulations, which it tracks very closely. Furthermore, upon following the citations (this is essential to understanding the Plan, and never be afraid of reading the CFR, which is uniformly clearly written), I find that what Mr. Banuelos said in committees last week is not true, and precisely the *opposite* of what he said is true; "grievance", as the term is used in the Plan and applicable federal regulations, does not apply to adverse benefit determinations (which are subject to appeals, not grievances) and is not otherwise significantly limited. It is defined as follows in 42 CFR § 438.400(b), which applies to all of Subpart F of Part 438:

*Grievance* means an expression of dissatisfaction about any matter other than an adverse benefit determination. Grievances may include, but are not limited to, the quality of care or services provided, and aspects of interpersonal relationships such as rudeness of a provider or employee, or failure to respect an enrollee's rights regardless of whether remedial action is requested. Grievance includes an enrollee's right to dispute an extension of time proposed by the MCI, PIHP, or PAHP to make an authorization decision.

There are some carve-outs from subpart F as a whole in 42 CFR § 438.402(a), but they are so narrow that it would seem better to call them "slice-outs". This being the case, any protected health information or other confidential information, such as information that would or could be used to identify the patient, including contact information, would have to be redacted from every grievance before BHC could look at it. *Plan* para. 1.B.10, citing 9 CCR § 1850.205(c)(6). I find that *Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code* § 5328 would also be applicable to any Personally Identifying Information in a grievance to a provider of specialty mental health services, because it would disclose the fact that the complainant was receiving treatment for a mental disorder covered by this section. BHS would have to do the redaction. The information entered into the portal would have to go straight to BHS therefore. Thus, there would be no point on housing the portal on the BHC website unless patients are more likely to look for it there. No evidence whatsoever has been offered that patients are more likely to look for it on the BHC web page, and it seems that the real purpose of this proposal might be to drive more traffic to the BHC web page. Furthermore, to the extent that BHC has an interest in any of this information under its first power and duty, to "Review and evaluate the City and County's mental health needs, services, facilities, and special problems," *S.F. Admin. Code* § 15.14(a)(1), an individual



Commissioner could obtain this information through public records requests. A motion to *Rescind* the motion passed in February to put such a portal on the BHC website, requiring a vote of 2/3 of the members present to pass, will not only be in order at the May meeting (assuming that this meeting is legally held and draws a quorum), but BHC's integrity requires it.

As for BHC subcontractor noncompliance with the *Plan* and associated state and federal regulations, i.e., requirements applicable to grievances, it is without BHC's powers and duties to refer matters to federal, state, or local offices with enforcement power over the *Plan*, subcontractor agreements, or associated state and federal regulations. Commissioners or Consumers may approach these authorities as individuals. However, the *Plan*, Exhibit A -- Attachment 13 ("PROGRAM INTEGRITY") § 3, ¶ B(1)-(3), as well as 42 CFR § 438.608(a)(1)(i)-(iii) both require the following:

**Administrative and management arrangements or procedures to detect and prevent fraud, waste, and abuse.** The State, through its contract with the MCO, PIHP, or PAHP, must require that the MCO, PIHP, or PAHP, or subcontractor to the extent that the subcontractor is delegated responsibility under the MCO, PIHP, or PAHP for coverage of services and payment of claims under the contract between the MCO, PIHP, or PAHP, implement and maintain procedures that are designed to detect and prevent fraud, waste, and abuse. The arrangements or procedures must include the following:

(1) A compliance program that includes, at a minimum, all of the following elements:

(i) written policies, procedures, and standards of conduct that articulate the organization's commitment to comply with all applicable requirements and standards under the contract, and all applicable federal and state requirements.

(ii) The designation of a compliance officer who is responsible for developing and implementing policies, procedures and practices designed to ensure compliance with the contract and who reports directly to the Chief Executive Officer and the board of directors.

(iii) The establishment of a Regulatory Compliance Committee on the Board of Directors and at the senior management level charged with overseeing the organization's compliance program and its compliance with the requirements under the contract.

....  
....  
....  
....

42 CFR § 438.608(a)(1) (ellipses added). There is no question in my mind but that the Behavioral Health Commission is this Board of Directors, and that it is required to establish this Regulatory Compliance Committee. This should be placed on the agenda for the May meeting, along with the motion to *Rescind* the February resolution establishing the web portal:

*Resolved*, That the Behavioral Health Commission create a Regulatory Compliance Committee with jurisdiction over the compliance program of Behavioral Health Services and Behavioral Health Service's compliance with the San Francisco Mental Health Plan, to consist of four members to be appointed by the Co-Chair Committee, including, as an *ex officio* nonvoting member, the Compliance Officer of Behavioral Health Services, to meet at 3:00 p.m. at City Hall in Room 408 on the first Friday of every month.

This is essential to addressing the issues raised by the BHC recently, as well as required by the *Plan*. The "requirements under the contract" includes the following:

[BHS] and/or [DHCS] shall verify through an on-site review that:

....

....

- 3) The physical plant of any site owned, leased, or operated by the provider and used for services or staff is clean, sanitary, and in good repair.
- 4) The organizational provider establishes and implements maintenance policies for any site owned, leased, or operated by the provider and used for services or staff to ensure the safety and well-being of beneficiaries and staff.

*Plan*, Exhibit A, Attachment 8 ("PROVIDER NETWORK"), § 8, ¶ G.3-4.

With respect to grievances, it requires that reasonable assistance be provided to the consumer in filing a grievance. *Plan*, Exhibit A -- Attachment 12 ("BENEFICIARY PROBLEM RESOLUTION") § 1, ¶ B(1) (d). Consumers are to receive a written acknowledgement of grievances within five days of their filing them. *Id.* § 3, ¶ B. Each grievance is due to be resolved within 90 days after filing. *Id.* ¶ C. The consumer is due a written notice of the resolution. *Id.* ¶ E. All of this information was to be included in the beneficiary handbook and posted on the provider's physical site, as well as forms and self-addressed envelopes be made available without the consumer having to make a request to anyone. *Id.* § 1, ¶ B(1)(a)-(c). *See, also*, 42 CFR §§ 438.406(a) and (b)(1) and 438.408(b)(1).

All of these provisions apply to BHS subcontractors, as well. *Plan*, Exhibit A, Attachment 8 ("PROVIDER NETWORK"), § 10, ¶ A, requires that BHS notify subcontractors of the grievance program requirements, and *id.*, Exhibit D(F) ("**Special Terms and Conditions**"), § 5 ("**Subcontractor Requirements**"), ¶ f ("The Contractor is responsible for all performance requirements under this Agreement, even though performance may be carried out through a subcontract.").

Consequently, an appropriate response to the problems raised in recent years is to establish the required Regulatory Compliance Committee, not put up a web form. If BHC wants compliance with provisions of the *Plan* applicable to the problems of which it is aware, it must itself comply with the *Plan* and take on its share of the burden of regulatory compliance. BHC cannot insist on BHS's compliance and also shirk such compliance itself. If it does not create the required committee and include the Compliance Officer as a nonvoting member, it cannot insist on BHS's adherence to the terms of the *Plan* that apply to BHS and, through BHS, its contractors.

Very truly yours,  
Wynship Hillier



Part of Behavioral Health Commission

# BHC Implementation Committee - June

Tuesday, June 13, 2023

## Agenda

### 1 BHC Implementation Agenda

[BHC Implementation Agenda - June](#)

### 2 BHC Implementation Minutes

[BHC Implementation Minutes - June](#)

## Date & Time

Tuesday, June 13, 2023

3:00 pm to 4:00 pm

## Behavioral Health Commission Meetings


BHC Committee Meetings

San Francisco City Hall

1 Carlton B Goodlett Place

Room 416

San Francisco, CA 94102



[Get directions](#)

## Online

BHC Implementation Committee

[Join Zoom Meeting](#)

*Last updated June 9, 2023*

Was this page helpful?

**Yes**

**No**

[Report something wrong with this page](#)

**[Jobs with the City](#)**

**[Contact us](#)**

**[About this website](#)**

[Disclaimer](#)

[Privacy policy](#)

City and County  
of San Francisco

## STRATEGIC PLAN: FY 2023-24 BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMISSION OF SAN FRANCISCO

| GOAL 1. Review and evaluate the behavioral health needs, services, facilities, and special problems.                                                                                                                                                         | RESPONSIBLE PARTIES                                                                                    | OUTCOME MEASURES                                                                                                                                                                   | COMPLETION DATE                                                 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| a. Review monthly reports submitted by the Behavioral Health Director. Request presentation of specific data pertaining to priority issues.                                                                                                                  | Behavioral Health Director and Commissioners                                                           | Reports reviewed at each meeting and included with minutes. Questions and comments made.                                                                                           | Monthly meeting                                                 |
| b. Evaluate services via conducting a minimum of xx Program Review Site Visits annually and via MHSA and other provider presentations at Commission meetings. Each Commissioner will be requested to conduct a minimum of xx Program Evaluation site visits. | Establish Program Review Site Visit Committee; Invite presenters; Commissioners with staff assistance. | Number of completed visits; written reports prepared by Commissioners submitted to Behavioral Health Svs. Director. Attend Provider presentations; offer comments/recommendations. | A minimum of xx site visits conducted monthly. Monthly meetings |
| c. Hold one (1) public hearing annually. Consider holding monthly Commission meetings at different Community sites.                                                                                                                                          | (Ad hoc Public Hearing Committee ??) Staff and Commissioners                                           | Public Hearing held. Follow up actions, if any, completed.                                                                                                                         | Public Hearing ? DATE                                           |
| d. Participate in selection of the Behavioral Health Director.                                                                                                                                                                                               | Commissioner(s)                                                                                        | Full participation in selection process.                                                                                                                                           | When necessary.                                                 |
| e. Advise Board of Supervisors and Mayor and Behavioral Health Director as to any aspect of the local mental health program.                                                                                                                                 | Commissioners                                                                                          | Testify at BOS meetings, Annual Report completed; resolutions presented; and letters/memos as needed.                                                                              | Annual Report – Testify, Resolutions/Letters – as needed.       |
| f. Complete Data Notebook distributed by the California Mental Health Planning Council.                                                                                                                                                                      | Commissioners (Ad Hoc Committee)                                                                       | Timely submission to request from Planning Council.                                                                                                                                | Due date?                                                       |

## STRATEGIC PLAN: FY 2023-24 BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMISSION OF SAN FRANCISCO

|                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| g. Review and comment on MHSA multi-year plan. Hold Public Hearing on Plan. Divide report into sections; assign Commissioners to review and report back prior to Public Hearing      | Commissioners<br><b>Ad hoc MHSA Review Committee</b> ; staff<br>schedule Hearing date | Comments provided within time frame. Time allocated for Public Hearing.                                                                                              | <b>DATE- July ?</b>                                                                 |
| <b>GOAL 2. Review any agreements entered into by the Behavioral Health Services. Review realignment.</b>                                                                             | <b>RESPONSIBLE PARTIES</b>                                                            | <b>OUTCOME MEASURES</b>                                                                                                                                              | <b>COMPLETION DATE</b>                                                              |
| <b>Request information from the Director of Behavioral Health Services. Review contract(s) and reports.</b>                                                                          | Executive Committee and Staff                                                         | Contracts reviewed; comments submitted to Board and BHS Director                                                                                                     | Monthly                                                                             |
| <b>GOAL 3. Establish committees to address special needs, projects, and issues, e.g., Executive Committee, Legislation, Bylaws, Program, Site Visits, Public Hearing and Awards.</b> | <b>RESPONSIBLE PARTIES</b>                                                            | <b>OUTCOME MEASURES</b>                                                                                                                                              | <b>COMPLETION DATE</b>                                                              |
| a. Update Commission By-laws; review every five years.                                                                                                                               | Ad hoc Subcommittee, Executive Comm. & staff                                          | Bylaws completed.                                                                                                                                                    | Draft: December 2022<br>Final: <b>? 2023</b> Review 2028.                           |
| b. Convene Annual Board retreat in December to set priorities for the next year.                                                                                                     | Commissioners & staff<br><b>Ad hoc retreat planning committee</b>                     | Retreat planned and held.                                                                                                                                            | December 2023 & 2024                                                                |
| c. Set Annual priorities via Strategic Plan.                                                                                                                                         | Commissioners;<br>Committee Chairs/ staff                                             | <b>Priorities set at December retreat.</b> Strategic Plan reviewed bi-monthly to note progress. Status reported at monthly BHC meetings. Recorded in meeting minutes | FY 23-24 Plan – Bi-monthly review –<br>November/January/March/May<br>July/September |

## STRATEGIC PLAN: FY 2023-24 BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMISSION OF SAN FRANCISCO

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>d. Establish Committees to address priorities (e.g., special needs, projects, and issues). FY 23:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Executive Committee</li> <li>2. Site Visit Committee</li> <li>3. Implementation Committee</li> <li>4. Ad hoc Committees/Tasks               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A) MHSA Review/Public Hearing</li> <li>B) Bylaw Revisions</li> <li>C) Annual Report</li> <li>D) Nominating</li> <li>E) State Planning Data Report</li> <li>F) Monitor MH/SF</li> <li>G) Outreach - members</li> </ol> </li> </ol> | <p>Commissioners &amp; staff</p> | <p>Committees established. Each Committee reports its progress and status monthly. Over a two-year period, Identify, analyze, and publicize gaps pertaining to each issue; produce written reports; testify at BOS hearings and meetings; share information with California Association of Local Behavioral Health Boards/Commissions, SF Health Commission, SFDPH BHS &amp; MHSF Director. Outreach to recommend new people for Commissioner appointments.</p> | <p>Committee meetings held; develop objectives and work plan for the year. List DATE</p> <p>Issue interim reports at DATE meeting.</p> <p>Complete tasks by DATE.</p> <p>4.C Due June</p> <p>4D. November every even year.</p> <p>4E. Usually due in February</p> <p>4F. Monthly meetings held</p> <p>4G. all year</p> |
| <p>e. Priority Issues For 2023-2024: [INCLUDE SHORT AND LONG-TERM PROJECT GOALS]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Improve communication with BOS</li> <li>2.Develop Position Papers/Interim reports</li> <li>3.Housing Issues</li> <li>4.?</li> </ol>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | <p>Commissioners</p>             | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.BOS Contacts reported and increased contact over time;</li> <li>2. Issue papers completed and presented to BOS and Mayor;</li> <li>3. Implementation Comm.</li> <li>4</li> </ol>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | <p>? DATE</p> <p>? DATE</p> <p>? DATE</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |



**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation. \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** 23 Letters regarding File No. 230078  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:09:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [23 Letters regarding File No. 230078.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see attached for 23 letters regarding File No. 230078, which is Item No. 10 on today's agenda.

**File No. 230078** - Hearing - Committee of the Whole - Draft San Francisco Reparations Plan and Dream Keeper Initiative Updates - September 19, 2023, at 3:00 p.m.

Sincerely,

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

**From:** [Daniel B. Landry](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** The SF African American Reparations Final Plan - PETITION ATTACHED!  
**Date:** Friday, September 15, 2023 8:49:45 PM  
**Attachments:** [petition\\_signatures\\_jobs\\_37146925\\_20230916031929 \(1\) - petition\\_signatures\\_jobs\\_37146925\\_20230916031929 \(1\).pdf](#)

---

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

Hi, Angela Calvillo:

Attached below is the official petition in support of the SF African American Reparations Final Plan from [change.org](#). Please distribute to all Board of Supervisors prior to our scheduled hearing next Tuesday, September 19, 2023.

If you have please feel free to contact me at 1.415.902.1009.

Thank you.

DANIEL B. LANDRY, AARAC  
Policy Subcommittee

| Name              | City             | State | Postal Code | Country | Signed On  |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|-------------|---------|------------|
| Daniel Landry     | San Francisco    | CA    |             | US      | 2023-08-14 |
| Gloria Berry      | San Jose         | CA    | 95112       | US      | 2023-08-14 |
| Yolanda Harris    | San Francisco    | CA    | 94124       | US      | 2023-08-14 |
| MaKaylah Samp     | Canton           |       | 44709       | US      | 2023-08-14 |
| Lori Ruffin       | Fayetteville     |       | 28304       | US      | 2023-08-14 |
| Eric Brown        | Oakland          | CA    | 94606       | US      | 2023-08-14 |
| Andersa Brumair   | Orlando          |       | 32818       | US      | 2023-08-15 |
| elizabeth Macha   | Port Orange      |       | 32129       | US      | 2023-08-15 |
| Jullian Mero      | Kissimmee        |       | 34759       | US      | 2023-08-15 |
| Andre Parks       | Redford          |       | 48240       | US      | 2023-08-15 |
| Sonic Son         | Oroville         |       | 95966       | US      | 2023-08-15 |
| Savannah Price    | Port Orange      |       | 32127       | US      | 2023-08-15 |
| makayla michauc   | DeLand           |       | 32763       | US      | 2023-08-15 |
| Sophia Pulgar     | Davenport        |       | 33837       | US      | 2023-08-15 |
| Eheh Bbsbb        | Orlando          |       | 32822       | US      | 2023-08-15 |
| Isabel Quinones   | Sanford          |       | 32773       | US      | 2023-08-15 |
| Gedamene Edoa     | Tamarac          |       | 33321       | US      | 2023-08-15 |
| Elsa Hailemarian  | Springfield      |       | 22153       | US      | 2023-08-15 |
| Brayden Surprise  | Highland         |       | 12528       | US      | 2023-08-15 |
| Amanda Jackson    | Birmingham       | AL    | 35205       | US      | 2023-08-15 |
| Journey Avery     | Dallas           |       | 75270       | US      | 2023-08-15 |
| Joanna Caballero  | San Francisco    |       | 94142       | US      | 2023-08-15 |
| ariella bowen     | Miami            |       | 33132       | US      | 2023-08-15 |
| Isabella Rodrigue | Naples           |       | 34102       | US      | 2023-08-15 |
| Edward Szewczy    | Peru             |       | 61354       | US      | 2023-08-15 |
| rachael Glogovsk  | Lake Geneva      |       | 53147       | US      | 2023-08-15 |
| Nina Pierre       | Orlando          |       | 32811       | US      | 2023-08-15 |
| Phoenix Griffin   | West Valley City |       | 84119       | US      | 2023-08-15 |
| Jaslynn Melecio   | Prairieville     |       | 70769       | US      | 2023-08-15 |
| M Peter           | Sebring          |       | 33870       | US      | 2023-08-15 |
| Brittany Madley   |                  |       |             | US      | 2023-08-15 |

|                     |               |    |            |    |            |
|---------------------|---------------|----|------------|----|------------|
| Jayla Lopes         | Middleburg    |    | 32068      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| leilany luna        | Van Nuys      |    | 91406      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| jade santos         | Merchantville |    | 8109       | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Adam wells Wells    | Bettendorf    |    | 52722      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Omorede Hamilton    | San Francisco | CA | 94124      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Shonda jones        | San Jose      | CA | 95110      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Sade Saheli         | San Francisco | CA | 94114      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Meka Jones          | Oakland       | CA | 94621      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Bivett Brackett     | San Francisco | CA | 94134      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Preston Updegraff   | Hartford      |    | 6123       | US | 2023-08-15 |
| ixamara kalary      | riverside     |    | 90262      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Ashkan Alavi nezami | New York      |    | 10013      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| j p                 | Port Orchard  |    | 98367      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Mariah Rodriguez    | Austin        |    | 78741      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Reese Wilkins       | Fort Wayne    |    | 46765      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Jason Martinez      | Tacoma        | WA | 98408      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Mia Jackson         | San Francisco | CA | 94105      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Robert A Smith      | San Francisco | CA | 94142      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| David Ligon         | Salinas       |    | 93907      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Leona Walker        | San Francisco | CA | 94124-2932 | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Dontae Hill         | Roseville     | CA | 95628      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Brenda Weaver       | Sacramento    | CA | 95823      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Latrice Washington  | San Francisco | CA | 94109      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| JanNise Booker      | San Francisco | CA | 94116      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Mark Cappetta       | Rancho Mirage |    | 92270-5622 | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Linda Ross          | San Francisco | CA | 94102      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Isabelle Benaon     | Racine        |    | 53402      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Emily Hosseini      | Bristow       |    | 20136      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Lauryn F            | Baldwinsville |    | 13027      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Olivia Reinke       | Ashton        |    | 51232      | US | 2023-08-15 |
| mohammed pate       | Kissimmee     |    | 34741      | US | 2023-08-15 |

|                  |                     |    |         |    |            |
|------------------|---------------------|----|---------|----|------------|
| Rob Kaminski     | berkeley            |    | 8741    | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Katherine Hutchi | Phoenix             |    | 85050   | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Jamie Dufault    | Los Angeles         |    | 90006   | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Keira Que        | Las Vegas           |    | 89111   | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Hana Saloum      | Egg Harbor Township |    | 8234    | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Logan Hogeland   | Portland            |    | 97204   | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Hunter Hendricks | Mt carmel           |    | 37645   | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Christopher Bean |                     |    |         | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Ray Washington   | San Francisco       | CA | 94142   | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Linda Jordan     | San Francisco       | CA | 94124   | US | 2023-08-15 |
| A decent lady    | Unknown             |    | Unknown | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Mary Apanowicz   | Carroll             |    | 3575    | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Jayme Spencer    | Milwaukee           |    | 53208   | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Aaron Blair      | Corydon             |    | 47112   | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Bill McDonnell   | Providence          |    | 2908    | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Silvio Carron    | Miami               |    | 33136   | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Traicia Constant | Pompano Beach       |    | 33064   | US | 2023-08-15 |
| zaharra lawrence | Cape Coral          |    | 33990   | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Walker Whiten    | Pace                |    | 32571   | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Sammie Broadna   | San Francisco       | CA | 94115   | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Adam Kaluba      | Burleson            | TX | 76028   | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Linda Parker Per | San Francisco       | CA | 94127   | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Steven Gaines    | San                 | TX | 76111   | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Marquis Muhamr   | San Francisco       | CA | 94142   | US | 2023-08-15 |
| Ander A          | San Francisco       | CA | 94142   | US | 2023-08-16 |
| Johnathan Willis | Dallas              | TX | 75241   | US | 2023-08-16 |
| Brian Mitchell   | San Jose            | CA | 95111   | US | 2023-08-16 |
| Gwendolyn Hubb   | San Francisco       | CA | 94116   | US | 2023-08-16 |
| elliot helman    | San Francisco       | CA | 94103   | US | 2023-08-16 |
| Emily Morris     | San Mateo           | CA | 94402   | US | 2023-08-16 |
| Dee Seligman     | San Francisco       | CA | 94117   | US | 2023-08-16 |

|                  |               |    |       |          |            |
|------------------|---------------|----|-------|----------|------------|
| Jennifer Raviv   | San Francisco | CA | 94110 | US       | 2023-08-16 |
| Maya Pollak      | San Francisco | CA | 94114 | US       | 2023-08-17 |
| Aya Harel        | Berkeley      | CA | 94704 | US       | 2023-08-17 |
| Marcus Landry    | San Francisco | CA | 94115 | US       | 2023-08-17 |
| Nekia Wright     |               |    |       | Zimbabwe | 2023-08-17 |
| Shaka Jackson    | San Francisco | CA | 94102 | US       | 2023-08-17 |
| martina roland   | San Francisco | CA | 94115 | US       | 2023-08-17 |
| Tyrone Anderson  | Oakland       | CA | 94606 | US       | 2023-08-17 |
| Elly Simmons. S  | San Francisco | CA | 94133 | US       | 2023-08-18 |
| Gwendolyn White  | Sacramento    |    | 95841 | US       | 2023-08-18 |
| Jennifer Kellar  | Caliente      |    | 89008 | US       | 2023-08-18 |
| Axel Santos Ran  | Elizabeth     |    | 7202  | US       | 2023-08-18 |
| Mikel Norman     | Chicago       |    | 60637 | US       | 2023-08-18 |
| Micaiah Adames   | Tucson        |    | 85713 | US       | 2023-08-18 |
| Nela Anni        | Puyallup      |    | 98374 | US       | 2023-08-18 |
| Ny D             | Ladera Ranch  |    | 92694 | US       | 2023-08-18 |
| Karl Myers       | Seattle       |    | 98168 | US       | 2023-08-18 |
| Jada Wales       |               |    |       | US       | 2023-08-19 |
| Charli Kearse    | Denver        |    | 80204 | US       | 2023-08-19 |
| Majeid Crawford  | San Francisco | CA | 94115 | US       | 2023-08-19 |
| Cum InMyAss      | Canton        |    | 69420 | US       | 2023-08-22 |
| Theresa corrales | Lake Elsinore |    | 92530 | US       | 2023-08-22 |
| Sasha Medina     |               |    |       | US       | 2023-08-22 |
| Patricia Pineda  | Plainfield    |    | 7060  | US       | 2023-08-22 |
| Hansol Hwang     | Hamden        |    | 90017 | US       | 2023-08-22 |
| Gordon Poston    | Kingstree     |    | 29556 | US       | 2023-08-22 |
| Gavin Stephens   | Louisiana     |    | 71115 | US       | 2023-08-22 |
| Eileen Gallagher | Jersey City   |    | 7302  | US       | 2023-08-22 |
| Kyla Gannon      | Tyler         |    | 75701 | US       | 2023-08-22 |
| hoang lukas cock | nope          |    | nope  | US       | 2023-08-22 |
| Ediverto Galvez  | Panorama City |    | 91402 | US       | 2023-08-22 |

|                  |               |    |            |    |            |
|------------------|---------------|----|------------|----|------------|
| Jason Akers      | Tacoma        |    | 98446      | US | 2023-08-22 |
| Joshua Curphey   | Peterborough  |    | PE7        | US | 2023-08-22 |
| Nova Van Ness    | Flagstaff     |    | 86004      | US | 2023-08-23 |
| aliyah Simet     | Howell        |    | 48843      | US | 2023-08-23 |
| Jo Lubin         | Watchung      |    | 7069       | US | 2023-08-23 |
| Anja Bircher     | San Francisco | CA | 94110      | US | 2023-08-23 |
| Matthew visconti | New Rochelle  |    | 10801      | US | 2023-08-23 |
| Natassia Lample  | Atlanta       |    | 30340      | US | 2023-08-23 |
| Eileen Dawson    | Philadelphia  | PA | 19147      | US | 2023-08-23 |
| Izzy Cunningham  | Austin        |    | 78745      | US | 2023-08-23 |
| Brianna Crawford | Portland8     |    | 97070      | US | 2023-08-23 |
| Makenzie Lafond  | Kankakee      |    | 60901      | US | 2023-08-23 |
| ishwar vijayakum | Frisco        |    | 75035      | US | 2023-08-23 |
| Michael Hughes   | Pekin         |    | 61554      | US | 2023-08-24 |
| Selam Habte      | Alexandria    |    | 22314      | US | 2023-08-24 |
| Thea Baker       | Monson        |    | 1057       | US | 2023-08-24 |
| Chris Bethel     |               |    |            | US | 2023-08-24 |
| Heather Shoup    | Butler        |    | 16001      | US | 2023-08-24 |
| Mikaela Bodek    | Fort Lee      |    | 7024       | US | 2023-08-24 |
| Kathylene Steven | Louisville    |    | 40210      | US | 2023-08-24 |
| Mildred Johnson  | Lancaster     |    | 29721      | US | 2023-08-24 |
| Jameel Patterson | Sanfrancisco  | CA | 94124      | US | 2023-08-24 |
| Deandra Bryant   | Secaucus      | NJ | 7094       | US | 2023-08-24 |
| richale Babbs    | Merced        | CA | 95348      | US | 2023-08-24 |
| Dawn Gray        | San Francisco | CA | 94110      | US | 2023-08-24 |
| Carl Norde       | San Francisco | CA | 94142      | US | 2023-08-24 |
| Ashir Rayikanti  | San Francisco | CA | 94109      | US | 2023-08-24 |
| Aisha Gilmore    | San Francisco | CA | 94103      | US | 2023-08-24 |
| RYAN JACKSON     | San Leandro   | CA | 94577      | US | 2023-08-24 |
| Dante Dimario    | Los Angeles   |    | 90026-4227 | US | 2023-08-24 |
| Rahman McCrea    | San Francisco | CA | 94110      | US | 2023-08-24 |

|                    |                 |    |       |    |            |
|--------------------|-----------------|----|-------|----|------------|
| Vanessa Jackson    | San Francisco   | CA | 94132 | US | 2023-08-25 |
| Alise Vincent      | San Francisco   | CA | 94124 | US | 2023-08-25 |
| tami Bryant        | San Francisco   | CA | 94115 | US | 2023-08-25 |
| Larry Martin       | San Francisco   | CA | 94109 | US | 2023-08-26 |
| Marcia Peterzell   | San Francisco   | CA | 94115 | US | 2023-08-26 |
| james GLOVER       | San Francisco   | CA | 94123 | US | 2023-08-26 |
| Franzo King        | San Francisco   | CA | 94124 | US | 2023-08-27 |
| Aleena White       | Bemidji         |    | 56601 | US | 2023-08-27 |
| Emily Flores       | Artesia         |    | 88210 | US | 2023-08-27 |
| Tiffany Whitaker   | DeSoto          |    | 75115 | US | 2023-08-27 |
| Melany Arbolaes    | Hialeah         |    | 33012 | US | 2023-08-27 |
| Reyna Sanchez      | Albuquerque     |    | 87112 | US | 2023-08-27 |
| Sabrina Uribe      | San Francisco   | CA | 94142 | US | 2023-08-27 |
| Shamari Wooten     | Tracy           | CA | 95376 | US | 2023-08-29 |
| Kevin Epps         | San Francisco   | CA | 94142 | US | 2023-08-29 |
| Katrina Nelson     | San Francisco   | CA | 94110 | US | 2023-08-30 |
| Cassandra Ester    | San Francisco   | CA | 94142 | US | 2023-08-30 |
| Joshua Spector     | Cortland        |    | 13045 | US | 2023-09-04 |
| joe ward           | San francisco   | CA | 94115 | US | 2023-09-04 |
| Wendy Williams     | San Francisco   | CA | 94110 | US | 2023-09-06 |
| Nicolle Foland     | San Francisco   | CA | 94122 | US | 2023-09-06 |
| Kylan Southern     | Claremore       |    | 74019 | US | 2023-09-06 |
| Eva Freedman       | Deerfield Beach |    | 33441 | US | 2023-09-06 |
| Erin Stuart        | San Francisco   | CA | 94110 | US | 2023-09-06 |
| Christopher Willis | Sanford         |    | 27330 | US | 2023-09-06 |
| Donovan Casper     | Pensacola       |    | 32503 | US | 2023-09-06 |
| Téa McCoy          | Winnsboro       |    | 75494 | US | 2023-09-06 |
| M.S. Wise LCSW     | San Jose        | CA | 95122 | US | 2023-09-06 |
| Brandee Marckm     | San Francisco   | IA | 94118 | US | 2023-09-06 |
| Jonathan Weinst    | San Francisco   | CA | 94117 | US | 2023-09-07 |
| lea mcgeeever      | San Francisco   | CA | 94121 | US | 2023-09-07 |



|                  |               |    |       |    |            |
|------------------|---------------|----|-------|----|------------|
| Julie Pitta      | San Francisco | CA | 94121 | US | 2023-09-08 |
| Rose Brennan     | Valley Stream |    | 11580 | US | 2023-09-08 |
| G. Diane Matthe  | Carson        |    | 90746 | US | 2023-09-08 |
| Tyler Walker     | San Antonio   |    | 78254 | US | 2023-09-08 |
| Emma Thomas      | Ithaca        |    | 14850 | US | 2023-09-08 |
| Joseph De Feo    | Yonkers       |    | 10704 | US | 2023-09-08 |
| Dev Alwine       | Chicago       |    | 60014 | US | 2023-09-08 |
| Walid Shokoori   | Baldwin Park  |    | 91706 | US | 2023-09-08 |
| Emily Cook       | Fresno        |    | 93737 | US | 2023-09-08 |
| Graham Isom      | San Francisco | CA | 94112 | US | 2023-09-09 |
| Aaron Baggs      | Richmond      | CA | 94801 | US | 2023-09-11 |
| Schaeffer Nelson | San Francisco | CA | 94112 | US | 2023-09-11 |
| Rosemary Hanne   | Berkeley      | CA | 94708 | US | 2023-09-11 |
| Emily Barrett    | San Francisco | CA | 94110 | US | 2023-09-12 |

**From:** [Bruce Neuburger](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee  
**Date:** Friday, September 15, 2023 9:52:14 AM

---

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

Both my parents had to flee the country of their birth and suffered great losses to their families as a result of racial prejudice. It took 10 years from the end of World War II for them to begin to receive reparations for the damage inflicted. Only a small part of the stolen wealth was compensated for (of course there could be no compensation for the stolen lives), but at least there was an effort. It has now been hundreds of years since the damage inflicted by racism against the African American community began and yet it continues. There is much to be done to end this. Monetary reparations to the African American is a very small step in the right direction, but a necessary one.

Bruce Neuburger  
bruceneu@gmail.com  
25 Ellington Avenue  
San Francisco, California 94112



**From:** [Christina Gomez](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee  
**Date:** Friday, September 15, 2023 6:15:30 AM

---

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. As an ally to San Francisco's Black community, with urgency, I ask that you now continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

Reparations for Black San Franciscans, the most disenfranchised group of SF residents, is the first step in the direction of shrinking our terrible wealth gap. Based on other opportunities for residents in other cities who've had access to additional resources (that look similar to reparations) including cash payments, parents paid bills, were able to access basic supplies that made day to day living easier and were able to invest in their kids well-being through tutoring and after school activities, essentially increasing the livelihood of their family.

Reparations can be all these things for Black San Franciscans. We know reparations means the opportunity to increase family and individual well-being, break generational cycles of poverty and build generational wealth. Which will increase the likelihood of Black San Franciscans STAYING in San Francisco and contributing to their communities in the most positive ways. It means having the ability to participate in the economic rebuilding of San Francisco and to revitalize parts of Black San Francisco that have needed attention and care for some time.

Again, I urge you to make reparations for Black San Franciscans a reality. Don't let their contributions, past and present, to our City go without an acknowledgment that those contributions are major to this City's cultural and historic landscape.

In Community,

Christina "Krea" Gomez

Christina Gomez  
kreagomez@gmail.com  
607 Peralta Ave

San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** [Chaney, Bilal \(DPH\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Subject:** Support for Reparations for Black San Franciscans  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:44:52 AM

---

Dear Supervisors,

I urge you and the Board of Supervisors to vote in favor of the reparations plan. Reparations are a vital step towards healing the wounds of the past and building a more equitable and inclusive future for all residents of San Francisco.

Furthermore, I hope and pray that no one on the BOS believes in their own perception that they are race neutral and have nothing to do personally with the legacy of slavery. We as the descendants of enslaved people must implore you to do the right thing. This has gone on far too long

Regards,

Bilal

**Bilal Chaney, BS**  
Program Coordinator  
Radiology, Internships & Volunteers  
DEI Lead  
Department of Radiology & Biomedical Imaging  
**ZUCKERBERG SAN FRANCISCO GENERAL**  
**HOSPITAL AND TRAUMA CENTER**  
1001 Potrero Avenue Room 1x26

San Francisco, CA 94110  
Phone: (628) 206 - 3805  
Fax: (628) 206 - 8946  
[ZuckerbergSanFranciscoGeneral.org](https://ZuckerbergSanFranciscoGeneral.org)  
[Follow us on Facebook](#)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The contents of this email message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information and may be legally protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient of this message or their agent, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, please immediately alert the sender by reply email and then delete this message and any attachments. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, copying, or storage of this message or its attachments is strictly prohibited.

**From:** [Julien DeFrance](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Info, HRC \(HRC\)](#); [HRC-Reparations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Souza, Sarah \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Julien, Reparations Hearing TODAY. Call in!  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:31:08 AM

---

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

**NO TO THIS RACIST, ILLEGAL, UNCONSTITUTIONAL REPARATIONS PLAN!**

**WE ALL HAD ENOUGH OF YOUR BULLSHIT RADICAL-LEFT AGENDA.**


**STOP WASTING OUR HARD-EARNED TAXPAYERS DOLLARS.**

**STOP THIS NON-SENSE AND DISSOLVE THE REPARATIONS COMMITTEE IMMEDIATELY.**

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

From: **Richie Greenberg Press Office** <[comments@richiegreenberg.org](mailto:comments@richiegreenberg.org)>

Subject: Julien, Reparations Hearing TODAY. Call in!



**REPARATIONS ON AGENDA**

SF Board will hold hearing 3:00pm today,  
CALL IN to the meeting, voice your concerns.

TUESDAY, Sept 19, 2023

*Message from Richie Greenberg:*

***LAST MINUTE URGENT ALERT. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors will hold a hearing at 3:00pm today, Tuesday, to discuss the Reparations Plan.***

The Reparations Plan has already been shown by analysts and commentators to be unconstitutional, yet the SF Supervisors are discussing the plan regardless.

**CALL THE BOARD DURING THE MEETING:**

Call 415.655.0001 Meeting ID 2664 385 6418 ##

Press \*3 to enter the Speaker's line

*There are several federal and state constitutional violations, civil rights act violations and court decisions making the SF Reparations Plan unlawful, You may mention any or all of these when you call, but you are limited to 2 minutes to speak:*

**California Prop 209** - also known as the California Civil Rights Initiative or CCRI approved November 1996, amended the state constitution to prohibit state governmental institutions from considering race, sex, or ethnicity or national origin specifically in the areas of public employment, public contracting, and public education, preventing the government from discriminating against or granting preferential treatment. Proposition 209 banned the use of affirmative action involving race-based or sex-based preferences in California.

**California Article 1 Section 7** - California state constitution provides a person may not be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or denied equal protection of the laws.

**California Article XI, Section 10(a)** CA state Constitution provides a local



government body ... may not pay a claim under an agreement made without authority of law.

**California Article 34** - California state constitution requires voter approval before developing, constructing, or acquiring in any manner public housing (low-rent housing project) in a community.

**Federal Title VI of Civil Rights Act** - Was enacted as part of the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964. It prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, and national origin in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance such as grants and student loans as well as racial segregation in schools and public accommodations, and employment discrimination.

**Federal Title VII of Civil Rights Act** – Also from the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is a federal employment law that prohibits employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, and national origin.

**Federal 14th Amendment to US Constitution** – Guarantees all citizens equal protection under law; a state shall not violate a citizen's privileges; shall not deprive any person of property without due process of law; Regarding Segregation: In 1954 (Brown v. Board of Education) the Supreme Court unanimously held that separate schools for blacks and whites violated the Equal Protection Clause.

You may also email your opinion to the Board Clerk, which adds your comments to public record: [Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org)

You may wish to email the Human Rights Commission, they are the city agency administering the SF Reparations Plan: [hrc.info@sfgov.org](mailto:hrc.info@sfgov.org)

The African American Reparations Advisory Committee can be contacted as well: [reparations@sfgov.org](mailto:reparations@sfgov.org)

***If you choose to make your opinion on the Reparations Plan known to these agencies, please be cordial and respectful. Consider informing them of the RejectThePlan.com website which outlines all the violations of law which their plan runs afoul of. Remind them the Mayor, the City Attorney, The Reparations Committee itself were all served with Cease***

***& Desist demands to stop their work, stop the waste of taxpayers' money on unlawful legislation.***

Richie

Try email marketing for free today!

**From:** [Eleana Binder](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support Reparations by Implementing the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee's Recommendations  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:16:51 AM

---

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan. The San Francisco Reparations Plan offers a framework for defining the scope of the policy-based harms that have contributed to inequitable outcomes in Black communities over time, and outlines comprehensive, systemic remedies to address them, through policy and programmatic action. By supporting the recommendations, you will be supporting community-centered solutions to address the injustices of the past and present and try to move us towards a more just future.

Eleana Binder  
[ebinder@glide.org](mailto:ebinder@glide.org)  
330 Ellis St  
San Francisco, California 94102-2710



**From:** [beaubarlotte](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Info, HRC \(HRC\); HRC-Reparations](#)  
**Subject:** NO to the Reparations Plan  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:09:15 AM

---

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

Dear All,

The Reparations Plan is unconstitutional and an egregious attempt to deplete vast amounts of money out of San Francisco's public coffers. Those who wrote this plan claim victimhood for an entire group, many of whom do not agree with their perspective. Also, a vast majority of San Francisco's taxpayers had nothing to do with historic wrongs against black Americans. It is unfair and unconstitutional to use our taxed money to create entitlements for a specified racial group. Taxpayer money is intended for the benefit of the entire community.

This plan is arrogant, divisive, fraught with unfairness and emotionally extortive. Indubitably anyone who opposes the plan will be metaphorically slapped with the epithet of "RACIST!" We San Franciscans are no longer willing to condone this manipulative bullying.

You can never 'right' a wrong with another wrong. This plan is wrong. Cancel it.

Cordially,

C. W.

Truth and freedom matter more

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.

**From:** [Delia Fitzpatrick](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Subject: Support for Reparations for Black San Franciscans  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:03:05 AM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors Clerk

I am writing to express my support for the SF Reparations Plan. It's crucial that we acknowledge and address the historical injustices and systemic discrimination that have disproportionately affected African Americans in our city, and this plan does exactly that.

The recent report detailing the harm inflicted by public policies paints a disturbing picture of the hardships faced by many Black San Franciscans. The disparities around the access for child care, resources support for specialists to support the educational, emotional and overall health of our children are undeniable. It is our moral obligation to take concrete steps towards rectifying these injustices.

I urge the Board of Supervisors to vote in favor of the reparations plan. Reparations are a vital step towards healing the wounds of the past and building a more equitable and inclusive future for all residents of San Francisco.

Furthermore, I would like to request that the Board of Supervisors ensures transparency and accountability in the allocation and distribution of reparations funds. This will help build trust and confidence within the community and ensure that the intended goals are met.

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter. Please consider my support for reparations as you make your decision, and I hope that you will choose to stand on the right side of history by supporting this important initiative.

Sincerely,

Delia Fitzpatrick

--

Delia Fitzpatrick

**From:** [John E. Jones](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [HRC-Reparations](#); [Info, HRC \(HRC\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)  
**Subject:** Comment for Public Record: REPARATIONS NO  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:26:20 AM

---

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

May I state my firm opposition to the Reparations Plan to be considered by the Board today.

I have considered the State and local reparations plans, and the arguments presented in support, but remain convinced that the parlous state of the black community is mostly self-inflicted.

One lasting effect of this reparations debate will be to embitter race relations for generations.

/s/ John E. Jones  
(Sine / Cosine)

**From:** [Greenberg Nation](#)  
**To:** [Meyer, Catherine \(HRC\)](#)  
**Cc:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [myr\\_alldepartmentheads](#); [waynem](#)  
**Subject:** Reparations Unconstitutional - Cease & Desist in force  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 9:57:36 AM

---

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

Good Day,

Over the past months, once the SF Reparations Plan came to light, a deep analysis and expose on the plan's unconstitutionality and unlawfulness became the impetus for RejectThePlan.com . The site provides great detail of which state and federal laws, civil rights act(s) and court rulings the SF Reparations plan could run afoul of. In a nutshell, SF Reparations is unlawful, and pursuing the plan regardless of this fact is a clear and purposeful wasting of the city's taxpayers' money, which has legal precedent to sue under, under CA Constitution.

Three separate Cease & Desist demands were served: On Mayor London Breed, on the Board of Supervisors, and on chairman of the African-American Reparations Advisory Committee. Copies had been provided to City Attorney Chiu.

These C&D demands have not been rescinded.

**Kindly,**

**Richie Greenberg,**  
San Francisco  
[richie@greenbergnation.com](mailto:richie@greenbergnation.com)



**From:** [Chaney, Bilal \(DPH\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Subject:** San Francisco Reparations  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 9:55:36 AM

---

Dear BOS-Supervisors,

I implore you to adopt and formalize the African American Reparations Plan. My hope and prayer is that the esteemed BOS-Supervisors are willing, able, and capable to hear and accept feedback from people who share my heritage and who share a history of Black Lives not mattering.

Throughout this country and the world, people will be watching, whether or not, the fundamental humanity that was brutally taken from an entire race of people, will finally take responsibility and pay reparations for the harm that was done to them.

Regards,

Bilal

**Bilal Chaney, BS**

**Program Coordinator**

**Radiology, Internships & Volunteers**

**DEI Lead**

**Department of Radiology & Biomedical Imaging**

**ZUCKERBERG SAN FRANCISCO GENERAL**

**HOSPITAL AND TRAUMA CENTER**

1001 Potrero Avenue Room 1x26

San Francisco, CA 94110

Phone: (628) 206 - 3805

Fax: (628) 206 - 8946

[ZuckerbergSanFranciscoGeneral.org](https://ZuckerbergSanFranciscoGeneral.org)

[Follow us on Facebook](#)

---

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The contents of this email message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information and may be legally protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient of this message or their agent, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, please immediately alert the sender by reply email and then delete this message and any attachments. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, copying, or storage of this message or its attachments is strictly prohibited.

**From:** [Arnold Cohn](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Stop Reparations  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 9:10:43 AM

---

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

**California Prop 209** - also known as the California Civil Rights Initiative or CCRI approved November 1996, amended the state constitution to prohibit state governmental institutions from considering race, sex, or ethnicity or national origin specifically in the areas of public employment, public contracting, and public education, preventing the government from discriminating against or granting preferential treatment. Proposition 209 banned the use of affirmative action involving race-based or sex-based preferences in California.

**California Article 1 Section 7** - California state constitution provides a person may not be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or denied equal protection of the laws.

**California Article XI, Section 10(a)** CA state Constitution provides a local government body ... may not pay a claim under an agreement made without authority of law.

**California Article 34** - California state constitution requires voter approval before developing, constructing, or acquiring in any manner public housing (low-rent housing project) in a community.

**Federal Title VI of Civil Rights Act** - Was enacted as part of the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964. It prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, and national origin in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance such as grants and student loans as well as racial segregation in schools and public accommodations, and employment discrimination.

**Federal Title VII of Civil Rights Act** – Also from the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is a federal employment law that prohibits employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, and national origin.

**Federal 14th Amendment to US Constitution** – Guarantees all citizens equal protection under law; a state shall not violate a citizen's privileges; shall not deprive any person of property without due process of law; Regarding Segregation: In 1954 (Brown v. Board of Education) the Supreme Court unanimously held that separate schools for blacks and whites violated the Equal Protection Clause.

Arnold Cohn

**From:** [phnnextant2.0@yahoo.com](mailto:phnnextant2.0@yahoo.com)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** REPARATIONS PLAN  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 8:34:58 AM

---

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

Objections to what is likely to be a huge waste of taxpayers money:

- (1) Pre and post Civil War, California was not a slave owner state.
- (2) If reparations money is to be paid, it should come from those states which pre-civil war had slave owner ship in their history.

Please consider the objections raised by the website: [Reject the Plan.Com](#)

Thank you.

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

**From:** [Marc Rabideau](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reparations Benefits  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 8:33:43 AM

---

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

I want to go on the record as opposing the planned Reparations Act.  
I have read the materials and the "Reject The Plan" outline. I agree that these actions would be unconstitutional and unfair in their face. Thanks for allowing me to express my opposition to Reparations benefits for one class of citizens.

Respectfully submitted,

Marc Joseph Rabideau, PT  
Physical Therapy of San Francisco  
2410-18th Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94116  
415.681.9287 clinic phone  
415.681.6329 clinic fax

**From:** [Emily Morris](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support reparations by implementing all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 7:42:28 PM

---

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. I am writing to urge you to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

Thank you for your time,  
Emily

Emily Morris  
emilys.morris21@gmail.com  
128 N Humboldt St,  
San Mateo, California 94401



**From:** [john nelson](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 6:45:45 PM

---

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

john nelson  
johnnelson540@gmail.com  
445 O'farrell ST  
San Francisco, California 94102





**From:** [Nicholas Endres](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 6:33:55 PM

---

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

Nicholas Endres  
nickendres@gmail.com  
1225 Channing Way  
Berkeley, California 94702



**From:** [Frederick Martin](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 12:05:18 PM

---

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

Frederick Martin  
heirwitjes@gmail.com  
1510 Eddy St, 1201  
San Francisco, California 94115



**From:** [Cyrone Byrd](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [MYR-ALL Department Heads](#); [alidafisher@sfusd.edu](#); [kevineboggess@sfusd.edu](#); [jennylam@sfusd.edu](#); [lisaweissman-ward@sfusd.edu](#); [MattAlexander@sfusd.edu](#); [lainiemotamedi@sfusd.edu](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [waynem@sfusd.edu](#)  
**Subject:** San Francisco Office of Reparations  
**Date:** Sunday, September 17, 2023 11:32:29 PM

---

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

>

> Hello, my name is Cyrone Byrd. I believe it's absolutely essential to create an office of reparations for African American. Reparations a long over due for African Americans, & Here are a few reasons that it's important:

> 1. Historical context: African Americans have faced centuries of systematic oppression, including slavery, segregation, discriminatory policies, and economic disadvantages. Reparations acknowledge this historical context and aim to address the long-lasting effects of these injustices.

> 2. Economic Inequality: African Americans in the United States and particularly in San Francisco, have consistently experienced lower levels of wealth, income, and educational opportunities compared to our white counterparts. Reparations can help bridge the economic gap by providing financial resources, educational support, and business opportunities.

> 3. Redress for Past Injustices: Reparations seek to provide redress for the injustices suffered by African Americans, such as forced labor and exploitation endured during slavery and subsequent racial discrimination. Establishing an Office of Reparations signifies a commitment to rectifying these past wrongs.

> 4. Generational Wealth Transfer: Due to historical disadvantages and discriminatory practices, African Americans have been unable to accumulate wealth at the same rate as white Americans. Reparations can help address this wealth gap by providing resources and opportunities that enable the transfer of generational wealth.

> 5. Symbolic and Moral Responsibility: Creating an Office of Reparations demonstrates a recognition of the systemic racism and injustices faced by African Americans. It sends a powerful message that society acknowledges the need to address these inequalities and works towards racial justice and equality.

> 6. Truth and Reconciliation: Reparations can contribute to the healing process by fostering a sense of truth and reconciliation. By acknowledging past wrongs and providing reparative measures, it opens the door for dialogue, understanding, and healing between the communities.

> 7. Leading by Example: By establishing an Office of Reparations, San Francisco can serve as a model for other cities and jurisdictions, inspiring them to undertake similar initiatives. It can be a catalyst for broader discussion and actions surrounding reparations at the national level.

> Lastly I would like to mention that African Americans have received some of the worst racism, and endured it for the longest amount of time. Yet we the only ethnicity that hasn't received any reparations or compensation after being promised 40 acres and a mule. Also there are many African Americans who have passed away before receiving their proper reparations. Please Let us begin the process of long overdue reparations for our African American community.

>

> Cyrone Byrd

**From:** [Gowan Mclin](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee  
**Date:** Saturday, September 16, 2023 11:07:27 PM

---

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

Gowan Mclin  
gowanmclin@gmail.com  
20 Towerside Ave  
San Francisco , California 94134



**From:** [Eneshal Miller](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee  
**Date:** Saturday, September 16, 2023 5:38:19 PM

---

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

Eneshal Miller  
eneshalmiller371@gmail.com  
8560 Second Ave  
Silver Spring , Maryland 20910





**From:** [Cassandra Pierce](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee  
**Date:** Friday, September 15, 2023 10:20:28 PM

---

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

Cassandra Pierce  
cece4me2@yahoo.com  
639 Lakeview  
San Francisco , California 94112



**From:** [Angela](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support for Reparations for Black San Franciscans  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:05:56 PM

---

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

Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my support for the SF Reparations Plan. It's crucial that we acknowledge and address the historical injustices and systemic discrimination that have disproportionately affected African Americans in our city, and this plan does exactly that.

The recent report detailing the harm inflicted by public policies paints a disturbing picture of the hardships faced by many Black San Franciscans. The disparities [\_\_\_\_\_] (fill in with specific harm: ie: ***in housing, exposure to environmental racism, educational opportunities, etc.***)] are undeniable. It is our moral obligation to take concrete steps towards rectifying these injustices.

I urge the Board of Supervisors to vote in favor of the reparations plan. Reparations are a vital step towards healing the wounds of the past and building a more equitable and inclusive future for all residents of San Francisco.

Furthermore, I would like to request that the Board of Supervisors ensures transparency and accountability in the allocation and distribution of reparations funds. This will help build trust and confidence within the community and ensure that the intended goals are met.

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter. Please consider my support for reparations as you make your decision, and I hope that you will choose to stand on the right side of history by supporting this important initiative.

Sincerely,

Angela R. Y. Jenkins

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO

2023 SEP 19 AM 10:08

BY JIS

September 16, 2023

**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**

1 Carlton B Goodlett Plaza, Suite 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

Attn: Aaron Peskin and members of the Board of Supervisors of San Francisco City and County

I am a supporter of the African American Reparations Advisory Committee, and attend their monthly meetings in City Hall. I'm writing to you today to express support for legislation of findings of the AARAC, and to ask that you make clear that threats to undermine these actions will not be tolerated.

I would also like to take a moment to describe my reasons for supporting diverse, quality legal representation that reflects the history and needs of the African American, Black community and all BIPOC communities in the San Francisco Bay Area.

At the age of 35, I became the subject of a U.S. Executive ordered torture, psy-op and enhanced interrogation *without a formal charge* by a former U.S. Executive. Prior to this event I had no knowledge that I had come into contact with intelligence, or how federal intelligence functioned. In January of 2017, I began a legal search for lawyers qualified to represent an individual where classified legal content was relevant to representation. I began this search while having no knowledge of who might help me, and while being the subject of severe harassment by the torture-counterintelligence employed by the former Executive.

Within a period of six years -between January of 2017 and January of 2023- I contacted at least thirty legal forums that included faculty of Ivy League Law Schools and Law Firms, the Attorney General's office, the Office of U.S. Attorney in San Francisco, and three offices of the Department of Justice. I spent six years, without a car visiting the federal buildings, requesting any information related to who could help me with submitting information of classified torture assault and where to obtain proper legal representation. I did this while the Executive's torture-counterintelligence were permitted to enter my home, threaten my family and disrupt emails and phone calls. In September of 2018, I travelled to the UNHCR in Geneva, Switzerland to request a diplomatic intervention based on horrific classified torture, obstructions to representation, and identified involuntary displacement. When I returned home, I was sent a notice that I had not exhausted all domestic resources and that my submissions were not in the proper legal format. I was never able to reach a UNHCR Special Rapporteur for assistance from the U.S., and found that noone within the U.S. could direct me to an individual who was familiar with the UNHCR treaty or assisting individuals with completing their complaints for submission.


Between January of 2017 and January of 2023, **not one** federal agency that I contacted was able to direct me to the U.S. Court of Federal Claims, or to the U.S. Foreign Intelligence Surveillance court as the correct locations for submitting classified interrogation evidence. Noone referred to these courts, or knew where to request representation and a protective order for classified torture. I received referrals to community legal clinics that could not assist me, or to law firms that were only familiar with torture related to immigration.

Non-classified information from my enhanced review demonstrated that I had been the subject of torture based solely on the use of censored physical eugenics practices, permitted by the former Executive. Supportive intelligence discovered that I have an immunity to malaria and naturally inherited African American gene expression that promoted healthy teeth, skin, hair growth, and high integrity nervous tissue repair; considered lighter and more desirable by the Executive's torture. Unfortunately, the Executive's torture were permitted to censor this information by attempting to thin the sides of my hair, and experiment with skin lightening, hair removal across the rest of my body, and tooth filing as an adult. I would not have this information if supportive intelligence from the U.K., Europe, the former Soviet Union, Africa, and China had not been present to investigate these activities when I was a small child. Sadly, this has had no impact on my ability to acquire legal information at a County or Federal level while being the subject of violent torture. I have yet to meet a lawyer who is familiar with representing an individual who has been the subject of classified eugenics, or who is knowledgeable about the Black intelligence experience. I've only found that modern eugenics have been unlawfully forced into classified censorship in this county, following World War II. Comparatively, I have met individuals who have shared being the subject of domestic torture, and they have never received help or an acknowledgement for their suffering. They are all persons of color.

I am writing to advocate for quality legal support for the African American community and for persons of color who have lived through decades of decline in legal care, where the pool of knowledgeable legal representation has become invisible. I would like to see support for County Police Force and District Attorney education, and the establishment of responsive Victim Witness programs that will support and not turn away individuals who have similar experiences to my own. I also welcome an Incident Drop Box, where citizens can file a complaint on carbon paper in designated precinct offices, without the need for an officer present, that can then be reviewed at a later time with an officer and social worker.

The meetings that the AARAC have provided for the public have been instrumental in offering a place of safety for individuals like myself whose voices have been silenced. I greatly appreciate your review of my letter and please Legislate the Financial Action.

Most Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Rebecca L. Bradshaw". The ink is dark and the signature is fluid.

Rebecca L. Bradshaw

22 South Park, Unit 220  
San Francisco, California 94107  
Email: rbbradshaw@yahoo.com

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** 27 Letters regarding File No. 230078  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 1:46:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [27 Letters regarding File No. 230078.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see attached for 27 letters regarding File No. 230078.

**File No. 230078** - Hearing - Committee of the Whole - Draft San Francisco Reparations Plan and Dream Keeper Initiative Updates - September 19, 2023, at 3:00 p.m.

Sincerely,

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

**From:** [Angela A](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Angela A](#)  
**Subject:** To add to 9/19/23 REPARATIONS Minutes  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 8:56:49 PM  
**Attachments:** [Angela Alexandra \\_Reparations Comment to BOS\\_091923.pdf](#)

---

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

If you prefer a WORD DOC kindly TEXT ME and I'll send you one:  
415-570-3690



## To add to the Minutes of the September 19, 2023 Board of Supervisors Meeting

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I called in and made a curtailed public comment, simply because allotting one minute for each public comment is insufficient for some, (though understandable), which was the case for me. I was however told that I can send in my recommendation comment as well as the ideas I gave to Aaron Peskin back in March. And these would be added to today's meeting minutes.

My "1-minute comment was to be fully this:

*"My name is Angela Alexandra*

*Back in March, members of The Board, appeared to express a desire for Reparations, which leaves the QUESTION OF HOW? As a constituent of Supervisor Peskin, back in March, I gave Aaron several suggestions that could be considered towards FUNDING REPARATIONS—POTENTIALLY **WITHOUT BURDENING SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS**, which means, holding accountable entities who profited from actions directed toward African-Americans, WHO CONTINUE PROSPERING EVEN TODAY; WEALTH BUILT OFF OF blacks!! And, one of my suggestions included The City BRINGING LAWSUITS ON BEHALF OF THE AFRICAN-AMERICAN RESIDENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO aimed at institutions/entities, funding that can be used for restitution. I also want to point out ANOTHER MAJOR IMPACT from the reduction in population of the black community over these decades is the impact to OUR POLITICAL POWER; as someone mentioned earlier during public comment, OUR POWER LIES IN OUR POWER TO NEGOTIATE yet how do we do that without sufficient political power and/or without our allies? Lastly, I want to also express that **PRIORITY MUST BE GIVEN TO SENIORS PERSONS STARTING AT AGE 62/65 AND OLDER and DONE SO QUICKLY BEFORE WE DIE!** Dr. Davis during her presentation, mentioned seniors, indicating age 70 or 80 – NO!! **It has to be earlier than that!!!** Lastly, there has already been acknowledgement of SFARRC committee members, well-deserved, AND acknowledgement needs to be given to the members of the public who have been involved FOR MONTH, many, many months of subcommittee meetings, group discussions, suggestions culled and there were those such as myself, behind the scenes, conducting research projects, without stipend, to aid towards development of the report. Thank you to EVERYONE WHO HELPED!!"*

.....  
Here is what I had given to Aaron Peskin back in March:

**" I have heard so many be concerned about the cost.** In consideration of that and surely the slew of pushback that will arise related to costs, an idea came to my mind where **I wondered if the City of San Francisco could recoup the funds paid out for the Reparations??**

Any black residents who meet the residency requirement and who also is a descendant of Chattel Slavery should be made a plaintiff against those who profited. We cannot expect the Federal Government to bring redress for harms the done to the black community but, the City of San Francisco can.

**Recoup how?** By suing, on behalf of the black residents of San Francisco, specific businesses, organizations, **(including entities outside of the US)**, as well as countries—YES COUNTRIES – (even African countries), involved in **the slave trade or involved in any activity** that brought

harm or who profited from blacks. This approach is not only fair and justified but could make it a win-win all around—black residents benefit, and the city doesn't lose! **However, I hope we don't have to wait until any case is settled in order to receive such compensation!**  
**PAY US REPARATIONS FIRST AND THEN WORK ON RE-COUPING THE FUNDS.**

Here is a law firm I had found named **Hagens Berman**; seems highly competent; their main page is this: <https://www.hbsslaw.com> (btw, Looks like their most recent case is the train derailment in East Palestine.) **Hagens Berman's** cases have involved not only individuals, but companies, (foreign and domestic), cities, states and countries!! I came across a mention of Hagens Berman in a report titled: **European Class Action Report 2021**

The report mentions Hagens Berman as having opened an office in the UK, which might be handy given that a significant portion of the slave trade was from the British and Portugal!!) <https://cms.law/en/media/international/files/publications/publications/cms-european-class-actions-report-2021?v=2>

This is the link of many cases they have been involved with; you'll see some very high caliber clients, and get an idea of the quality and breadth of their cases; cases of immense importance such magnitude: <https://www.hbsslaw.com/cases>

You can also filter by area. Here are cases involving governmental representation: <https://www.hbsslaw.com/practices/governmental-representation>

They have/are apparently doing/are doing work for the City of San Francisco. I saw this one in which the defendants are: Chevron Corp., Exxon Mobil Corp., Royal Dutch Shell PLC and ConocoPhillips  
here: <https://www.hbsslaw.com/cases/climate-change-san-francisco-oakland>

And there is this case: <https://www.hbsslaw.com/press/mckesson-corp/hbss-co-counsels-with-san-francisco-city-attorney-in-case-against-mckesson>

Btw...I'm not a lawyer, but didn't Citizens United declare that corporations are. People? Don't let them use a corporation status to try to get out of paying!)

**Can a country be sued?** Well, I recently saw this example of a US citizen suing a country: Washington Post journalist Jason Rezaian sues Iran over 'torture'  
"The lawsuit says Mr Rezaian suffered "irreparable harm" due to "torture and other cruel treatment".

<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-37552607>

Isn't "irreparable harm" due to "torture and other cruel treatment" familiar to what was done to black folks here in this country?

There is also this article—again I am not a lawyer and wondered if this can be employed:  
“... since the enactment of the [Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act](#)(FSIA) in 1976, foreign sovereigns have become subject to a number of statutory exceptions to immunity in U.S. courts. **The most significant exception is for when the foreign nation conducts “commercial activity” with a U.S. nexus...**”  
<https://www.justsecurity.org/71263/suing-foreign-states-in-us-courts/>

**Wasn't slavery a commercial activity??!!**

**We must move toward healing...**

I believe reparations is not ONLY ABOUT MONETARY COMPENSATION. There has to be acknowledgments and apologies made; **forgiveness asked for and forgiveness given**. There needs to be redress and healing. A comprehensive Reparations plan that considers several factors that may contribute to one's healing. Personally **FREE genealogy research/resources** with just as importantly **FREE DNA MATCHING** should be added to the plan. Our ancestors were taken from tribes, slave owners raped our women, (and men and children too!) within my blood runs the DNA of who? Growing up in foster care, not knowing my own direct roots, plays into a large void of not knowing my identity. Many Americans can celebrate with family reunions or know their European roots. Knowing where you come from is not only powerful but brings a sense of belonging and connection, helps in the healing process. That is why genealogy and DNA MATCHING matters.

**I would request that you keep in mind my story and my requests when you are conferring with other members of the Board. I must also stress this is my story. I do not know the hardships and/or tragedies others may have endured; surely some worse than mine but the common denominator I feel is the suffering we've experienced due to a system that has not valued, nurtured nor supported black people since the inception of this country. And to make it even more difficult is when there is a need to have these discussions, yet some folks would find it easier to talk about sex than face truths and talk about race.**

.....  
**Schedule of payouts:**

I notice so much attention and discussion is given on youth support and development yet much less attention is given on the two population groups of greatest needs: **seniors and persons with disabilities**.

Priority of payments should **first go to seniors, age 65 and up!!!!** Afterall it is the OLDER GENERATION WHO HAS BEEN MOST IMPACTED BY RACISM; particularly those born **before or during the Civil Rights era** (1954-1968).

Then priority (or at the same time that seniors are paid), to **persons with disabilities who are NOT working!!!**

Also...

**DO NOT pay out seniors in installments.** I am 66 years old. I want a lump sum—TAX FREE or at a greatly discounted tax rate. **I hope I live long enough to see an actual payment** providing a means for me to live my remaining years with some level of enjoyment, which I have not really had in most of my life and I am sure there are plenty others such as myself.

Do however make installment payouts, if proposed, to the younger folks, between a determined age bracket. In fact, I feel younger folks should get less compensation relative to older folks as today's generation has a slew of support services available and they have experienced FAR LESS racism given their shorter existence and given the strides our country has made in race relations, despite continued challenges. This is not the case for older folks nor was it EVER the case when I was growing up. I wish some of the resources, services and free benefits, available to young people today were available when I was growing up --my life would have unfolded differently.

**From:** [Toni Hines](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reparations for African Americans  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 8:10:29 PM

---

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

Dear San Francisco Supervisors

Please accept the recommendations of the Reparations Committee. African Americans are harmed by many San Francisco Departments. Please protect this group of your constituents.

Thanks you

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

**From:** [justin williams](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 6:42:02 PM

---

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

justin williams  
jgouda32@gmail.com  
4227 lincoln way  
sf , California 94122



**From:** [veronica pittman](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 6:40:05 PM

---

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

veronica pittman  
veronicapittman11@yahoo.com  
4227 lincoln way  
san francisco , California 94122





**From:** [Maya Pollak](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** SF Reparations  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 6:38:22 PM

---

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

Hi there,

I'm a Noe Valley resident and am emailing to voice my strong support for SF Reparations. I hope you'll take action on the critical recommendations outlined in the SF Reparations Plan.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Maya Pollak

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [McWilliams Joseph](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Subject:** Reparations  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 5:36:43 PM

---

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

I Joseph Williams 30 resident of SF and  
City Employee  
I'm present at the last city hall meeting 9/18/23

The Crime that was inflicted upon my people  
has caused the outburst of Crime in the Community and around the world

The key to this message is Safety  
Ones you Pay reparations this will clearly reduce crime nearly 50/% (Safety first)

Pay up  
Thank you

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

**From:** [Austin Stack](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 4:51:29 PM

---

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

Austin Stack  
sfrocker@comcast.net  
155 Bronte Street  
San Francisco, California 94110



**From:** [Joyce Nakamura](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [aynem@sfusd.edu](mailto:aynem@sfusd.edu)  
**Subject:** Support for Final African American Reparations Plan  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 4:38:15 PM

---

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

I am a 3rd generation Japanese American who has lived most of my life in San Francisco since 1972. I now reside in District 3.

I agree with the Final African American Reparations Plan that focuses on the City of San Francisco harms of redevelopment. I witnessed the last legs of the redevelopment destruction of the Black community in the Fillmore District in the 1970's. Formally known as the "Harlem of the West," redevelopment destroyed not only the residential community, but the Black middle class, further harnessing any hope of generating generational wealth, along with the City's policies and practice of over criminalization of the Black community, educational restrictions and workplace discrimination.

Reparations is long overdue to address the harms inflicted on the Black community in San Francisco. I urge the adoption of the Final African American Reparations Plan to begin the process of rectifying these harms for current and future generations of Black San Franciscans.

Joyce Nakamura  
resident of District 3

**From:** [Jennifer Kozicki](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 4:27:50 PM

---

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

Jennifer Kozicki  
[jkozicki@glide.org](mailto:jkozicki@glide.org)  
330 Ellis  
San Francisco , California 94102





**From:** [Mrs. Nikcole Cunningham](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [MYR-ALL Department Heads](#); [alidafisher@sfusd.edu](#); [kevineboggess@sfusd.edu](#); [jennylam@sfusd.edu](#); [lisaweissman-ward@sfusd.edu](#); [MattAlexander@sfusd.edu](#); [lainiemotamedi@sfusd.edu](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [waynem@sfusd.edu](#)  
**Cc:** [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [asha.safai@sfgov.org](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary; Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Public comment for 9/19/2023  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 3:23:22 PM

---

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

Hello Mayor Breed, Superintendent, Board of Supervisors and staff,

I apologize that I cannot be physically present in today's meeting with you due to being ill. I'd like to take this time to thank you all for showing up as your best selves to hear our plea to your humanity about our humanity as Black people in San Francisco.

I have the following asks of you:

- 1) Please do not bring any Reparations recommendations to the San Francisco residents to vote on, they do not want Black people to have reparations.
- 2) Please sign our recommendations into LAW directly in a way that they must be enforced where consequences and repercussions will be bestowed on if not enforced. We (Black people) are human beings and deserve to be treated as such.
- 3) Please personally review all of our over 140 recommendations and personally commit to overseeing 8-10 recommendations each. With your personal commitment, we can reach nearly all recommendations. These recommendations are simple humanity needs, not gifts, not something "special," it's an attempt to make Black people whole again in a way no one else has ever attempted to do so.
- 4) Please vote for the Office of Reparations and fully fund this office in a manner that it will thrive for the next 400 years.
- 5) Please hire someone outside of the City and County of San Francisco to lead and head the Office of Reparations. We need someone who is not tied to the City and County of San Francisco in any capacity. You've seen the systemic corruption exposed in the past few years within several City departments; we cannot allow this very important office to become corrupt or neglected by anyone already involved with harming Black people in San Francisco. Anti-blackness and racism runs rapidly throughout all offices in the City and County of San Francisco.
- 6) Please allow the San Francisco African American Reparations Advisory Committee, Mayor Breed, Supervisor Walton, and Dr. Sheryl Davis to be part of the interviewing process for the leadership of the Office of Reparations. We cannot afford to others to hire someone who will continue the harm, we all should be directly involved with hiring the best person to head this department.

Side note: All Black folk are not kin folk meaning...just because someone is Black, it does not mean they will do right by Black people.

In conclusion, until Black people can walk in any state in this country and feel SAFE and PROTECTED like any white woman can, we are not equal! Do what you can to put YOUR vote towards real enforceable policies to attempt to protect Black people at all costs!

Thank you for your time and support to make restitution to Black people harmed by the policies and racist acts in San Francisco.

Nikcole Cunningham

Member of the San Francisco African American Reparations Advisory Committee (seat 6)

Racist status: Not-Racist, You?

Preferred Pronouns: She/Her I support LGBTQA+

"You have to find the blessings within the hell you're in!" Nikcole

**From:** [Mrs. Nikcole Cunningham](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [MYR-ALL Department Heads](#); [alidafisher@sfusd.edu](#); [kevineboggess@sfusd.edu](#); [jennylam@sfusd.edu](#); [lisa weissman-ward@sfusd.edu](#); [MattAlexander@sfusd.edu](#); [lainiemotamedi@sfusd.edu](#); [MarkSanchez@sfusd.edu](#); [waynem@sfusd.edu](#)  
**Cc:** [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [asha.safai@sfgov.org](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary; Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Public comment for 9/19/2023  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 3:23:19 PM

---

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

Hello Mayor Breed, Superintendent, Board of Supervisors and staff,

I apologize that I cannot be physically present in today's meeting with you due to being ill. I'd like to take this time to thank you all for showing up as your best selves to hear our plea to your humanity about our humanity as Black people in San Francisco.

I have the following asks of you:

- 1) Please do not bring any Reparations recommendations to the San Francisco residents to vote on, they do not want Black people to have reparations.
  - 2) Please sign our recommendations into LAW directly in a way that they must be enforced where consequences and repercussions will be bestowed on if not enforced. We (Black people) are human beings and deserve to be treated as such.
  - 3) Please personally review all of our over 140 recommendations and personally commit to overseeing 8-10 recommendations each. With your personal commitment, we can reach nearly all recommendations. These recommendations are simple humanity needs, not gifts, not something "special," it's an attempt to make Black people whole again in a way no one else has ever attempted to do so.
  - 4) Please vote for the Office of Reparations and fully fund this office in a manner that it will thrive for the next 400 years.
  - 5) Please hire someone outside of the City and County of San Francisco to lead and head the Office of Reparations. We need someone who is not tied to the City and County of San Francisco in any capacity. You've seen the systemic corruption exposed in the past few years within several City departments; we cannot allow this very important office to become corrupt or neglected by anyone already involved with harming Black people in San Francisco. Anti-blackness and racism runs rapidly throughout all offices in the City and County of San Francisco.
  - 6) Please allow the San Francisco African American Reparations Advisory Committee, Mayor Breed, Supervisor Walton, and Dr. Sheryl Davis to be part of the interviewing process for the leadership of the Office of Reparations. We cannot afford to others to hire someone who will continue the harm, we all should be directly involved with hiring the best person to head this department.
- Side note: All Black folk are not kin folk meaning...just because someone is Black, it does not

mean they will do right by Black people.

In conclusion, until Black people can walk in any state in this country and feel SAFE and PROTECTED like any white woman can, we are not equal! Do what you can to put YOUR vote towards real enforceable policies to attempt to protect Black people at all costs!

Thank you for your time and support to make restitution to Black people harmed by the policies and racist acts in San Francisco.

Nikcole Cunningham

Member of the San Francisco African American Reparations Advisory Committee (seat 6)

Racist status: Not-Racist, You?

Preferred Pronouns: She/Her I support LGBTQA+

"You have to find the blessings within the hell you're in!" Nikcole

**From:** [Jennifer Waggoner](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support implementation of SF African American Reparations Committee recommendations  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 2:17:25 PM

---

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,


Please continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan. Delays or no action is unacceptable.

Jennifer Waggoner  
jenny-AN@consume.org  
912 Cole St, Suite 326  
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94117




From: [Phyllis Bowie, W.E. Enterprises LLC](#)  
To: Board of Supervisors (BOSS)  
Subject: Happening Now: San Francisco Reparations Rally Followed by 2 p.m. Board of Supervisors Meeting, The City's Office of Economic and Workforce Development Transition, BIRGOK's Mental Health Symposium  
Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2023 1:20:48 PM

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




**Wright Enterprises-Community Spotlight**  
(Greatest Message of All Time) September 19, 2023


**HAVE YOU SIGNED UP FOR W.E. ENEWS YET?**



Videos and Information from the Office of Phyllis Bowie- [Click Here for more details](#)



Supervisor Shamann Walton



ERIC MCDONNELL, CHAIRMAN  
SAN FRANCISCO REPARATIONS COMMITTEE

IT'S NOT REPARATIONS IN ONE PLACE. IT'S REPARATIONS IN EVERY PLACE. THANK YOU FROM THE BOTTOM OF MY HEART...IT DOESN'T STOP HERE...IT'S JUST THE BEGINNING...

Anietie Ekanem  
Member SF Reparations Committee

All Free to Call in the City or Outside.

Remote Participation: Watch SF Cable Channel 26, 28, 78, or 99 (depending on your provider) Watch [www.sfgov.org](http://www.sfgov.org)  
Public Comment Phone Number 1 (415) 655-0001  
Meeting ID: 2664 385 6418 # # (Press \*3 to enter the speaker line)

MORE SAN FRANCISCO CITY NEWS...

September 19, 2023

Dear Esteemed Community Partners and Colleagues,

It has been an honor and a privilege to work closely with you all as San Francisco's Director of Workforce Development these past 5+ years. It has been a joy to help support your programs and to develop so many new initiatives with you on behalf of the communities we serve. Together we have established new policies, practices, and frameworks that I have been excited to share, often side by side with so many of you, with other workforce development boards around the state and country.

At last week's workforce board meeting, I shared that I'm transitioning out of my role as Director of Workforce Development at the end of the month and I invite you all to join us at the **"Working Together 2023"** event on **Wednesday September 27 from 5-7 PM** (7 PM or beyond!) at Bissap Baobab, located at 2243 Mission Street, for what I hope will become a new annual tradition at the workforce shop after I'm gone.

"Working Together" celebrates National Workforce Development Month, our community and labor partners, and outgoing workforce leaders. This year's inaugural event highlights the work that we collectively do in workforce development to recruit, train and support job seekers and workers on behalf of the community and society. We will also recognize those who have transitioned onto their next chapters as part of the continuum of leadership development in this work, including longtime workforce folks like Jeff Mori, David Taylor and myself.

I am grateful to Mayor London Breed for her faith in appointing me to this role in the summer of 2018, and it's been a pleasure and inspiration to spend 5+ years working alongside our amazing OEWD team and all of our community, labor Union, business, education, and government partners.

I hope to see you all on the 27<sup>th</sup> and please RSVP if you can to Armina Brown at [ladirobinson@gmail.com](mailto:ladirobinson@gmail.com).

Lastly, please let us all never forget to, as Human Rights Commission Director Dr. Sheryl Davis says, "Celebrate Community" each and every day.

Thank you all,


Josh

**Joshua Arce, Director of Workforce Development**  
Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD), Workforce Division  
City and County of San Francisco


1 South Van Ness, 5th Fl., San Francisco, CA 94103  
415.701.4861 (DIRECT) 415.701.4848 (MAIN) 415.701.4894 (FAX)  
[Joshua.Arce@sfgov.org](mailto:Joshua.Arce@sfgov.org)  
[OEWD/Workforce](#) | [Job Centers](#) | [Training Orientations](#)  
[#LocalHire](#) [#WorkforceSF](#)



OTHER NEWS...





Kelly Armstrong, host of podcast "Straight Talking with Kelly" lauds KTVU's Claudine Wong's interview of The Oakland International Film Festival Co-founder and Executive Director, David Roach. [Click image to see the interview.](#)



Related Article

**The Oakland International Film Festival by Zaire Saunders**  
<https://sfbayview.com/2023/09/the-oakland-international-film-festival-starts-sept-14/>


**"SURVIVAL"**  
**COMING SOON ON STREAMING PLATFORMS 9/25/23**  
READ ABOUT IT-CLICK THE IMAGE  
[READ ABOUT DAMON JAMAL, CO-WRITER & DIRECTOR, AN ALUM OF SAN FRANCISCO BLACK FILM FESTIVAL](#)  
**KRON TV'S OLIVIA HORTON SPEAKS DAMON JAMAL**






[WATCH THE "SURVIVAL" TRAILER](#)

**LISTEN OUT FOR THE UPCOMING INTERVIEW**  
**STREAMING WITH DAMON JAMAL ON**  
**ABC7'S MORNINGS @ 7**

IN OTHER NEWS...



[CLICK IMAGE FOR DETAILS](#)



#### [WRIGHT ENTERPRISES COMMUNITY SPOTLIGHT COMMUNITY NEWS](#)

##### [SIGN UP FOR W.E. COMMUNITY SPOTLIGHT NEWSLETTER!](#)

Wright Enterprises Community Spotlight Recent Editions:

"Rediscover Oakland & The World Through Film" 21st Oakland International Film Festival, Barbara Lee & Elihu Harris Lecture, BWOPA Mental Health Symposium & More

<https://conta.cc/469CWEz>

Remembering 9-11, Lest We Forget...W.E. Salute

<https://conta.cc/4684fBA>

Hope Your Labor Day Weekend Was Great--Thanks to Labor Keeping the Country and World Going...Artistically and Financially The Arts Contribute to Local, National, and Economies Worldwide

<https://conta.cc/45TailZ>

Remember August 28, 1963...Remember Jacksonville...Remember "Love Thy Neighbor" Honorary Mayor Beyoncé in The Bay In Dos Dias

<https://url.avanan.click/v2/> <https://conta.cc/3pkTIQ> [YXAzOnNmZHOyOmE6bzoyODdlMTY3OGU4NDlnN2FjNTA1NDJlMzYkYzY0ZDkzZDQ3ZTQ6NWJpZWM0YjRmNjU0YjE0TRmZBjZlZkZkOTRjNGE2ZTp0OQ](#)

DFW-LL COOL "The F.O.R.C.E. Tour 50 Years of Hip Hop" Hits the Heart of One Half A Century Admirer in Dallas Metroplex

Plus Questlove and the Roots, Rakim, M.C. Lyte, Ceelo Green and Goodie Mob, Raekwon from the Wu-Tang Clan, Juvenile, Bone Thugs and Harmony and Big Boi Making Some Noise

<https://url.avanan.click/v2/> <https://conta.cc/3KX33qe> [YXAzOnNmZHOyOmE6bzoyODdlMTY3OGU4NDlnN2FjNTA1NDJlMzYkYzY0ZDkzZDQ3ZTQ6NWJpZWM0YjRmNjU0YjE0TRmZBjZlZkZkOTRjNGE2ZTp0OQ](#)

SAN FRANCISCO-NOW-6 P.M. FREE ! HOWARD HEWITT; DIGITAL UNDERGROUND; CASE, PLUS MORGAN FREEMAN'S DOC ON WWII 761st BATTALION & More

<https://url.avanan.click/v2/> <https://conta.cc/3RZ7kAV> [YXAzOnNmZHOyOmE6bzoyODdlMTY3OGU4NDlnN2FjNTA1NDJlMzYkYzY0ZDkzZDQ3ZTQ6NWJpZWM0YjRmNjU0YjE0TRmZBjZlZkZkOTRjNGE2ZTp0OQ](#)

[4NmZkZDc-cZTMyYmRlZDl5ZExMjcWZkd0YzhNDk0OTg0YTQ5MzQzOTp0OIQ](#)

Oakland, CA - Join Black Women Organized for Political Action/Training Institute for Leadership Enrichment (BWOPA/TILE) for its final presentation for Cohort 7 of the Dezie Woods Jones Policy Fellowship Program, Wednesday, August 16th, via ZOOM, 6:00-8:30 p.m.

[https://url.avanan.click/v2/\\_\\_\\_\\_https://conta.cc/475jq7l\\_\\_\\_\\_YXAzQnNmZHQyOmE6bzoyODdlMTY3OGUANDImN2FjNTAINDlMzVhYzY0ZDc3ZDp3Zjhm3YlU6bjkNTlZyTFMTEwYzE3OTRlYmUsMkVhZDQyN2RlZjcwMkxwMGZlZjU3OTg3MWFmMGYwMTg3ZWJmNDY1MDNiZjp0OIQ](https://url.avanan.click/v2/____https://conta.cc/475jq7l____YXAzQnNmZHQyOmE6bzoyODdlMTY3OGUANDImN2FjNTAINDlMzVhYzY0ZDc3ZDp3Zjhm3YlU6bjkNTlZyTFMTEwYzE3OTRlYmUsMkVhZDQyN2RlZjcwMkxwMGZlZjU3OTg3MWFmMGYwMTg3ZWJmNDY1MDNiZjp0OIQ)

Jackie Wright,  
President of Wright Enterprises  
Contact: [jackiewright@wrightnow.biz](mailto:jackiewright@wrightnow.biz)  
415 525 0410

BE INSPIRED WITH  
30 MINUTES TO SUCCESS  
INSPIRATIONAL TUESDAY TALKS  
[ON TUESDAY TALKS INSPIRE  
YOUTUBE CHANNEL](#)

Share This Email

Share This Email

Share This Email

**From:** [Stacia Fink](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reparations  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:36:45 PM

---

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

An outrage

**From:** [Dean Schaffer](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** SF Reparations Plan and Hearing  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:34:51 PM

---

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

Hi,

I'm writing to show my support for the [San Francisco Reparations Plan](#), which I know is being considered in today's hearing. San Francisco must redress the discriminatory actions taken to violently displace, limit the political participation of, invisibilize, restrict the physical and financial mobility of, and otherwise harm Black people across San Francisco. It's critical that we be accountable for actions that subjugated Black people in San Francisco, the vestiges of which uphold the intent and legacy of chattel slavery and continue to have impacts today.

I'm a San Francisco resident in District 7 (Kirkham @ 8th Ave).

Thanks,

Dean Schaffer

**From:** [Karen](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reparations  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:11:46 PM

---

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

Very slippery slope here, “ we” have also taken land from American Indigenous peoples, incarcerated the Japanese, and perpetrated many other harmful acts, against many ethnic groups.

I urge you to stop this “ reparations “ discrimination ( it is explicitly discriminatory) before San Francisco has to defend itself in another lawsuit.

Thanks in advance,  
K. R. Schwartz  
D8 resident and voter

**From:** [Marvin Fulton](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:08:27 PM

---

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

Marvin Fulton  
marvin69692004@yahoo.com  
351 Turk st #612  
San Francisco, 94102





**From:** [Lucey Bowen](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Subject:** Reparations  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 11:10:11 AM

---

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

I am a property tax payer in San Francisco. Please procede with long overdue reparations for those who were robbed by SF's destructive demolitions.--  
Sent from Gmail Mobile

**From:** [Maryanne Razzo](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** SF Reparations Plan  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 5:51:22 PM

---

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

Dear Honorable San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing with concern about the approval of the SF Reparations Plan and feel the disposition of those monies could endanger the solvency of San Francisco.

Additionally, there are several federal and state constitutional violations, civil rights act violations and court decisions making the SF Reparations Plan unlawful,

California Prop 209 - also known as the California Civil Rights Initiative or CCRI approved November 1996, amended the state constitution to prohibit state governmental institutions from considering race, sex, or ethnicity or national origin specifically in the areas of public employment, public contracting, and public education, preventing the government from discriminating against or granting preferential treatment. Proposition 209 banned the use of affirmative action involving race-based or sex-based preferences in California.

California Article 1 Section 7 - California state constitution provides a person may not be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or denied equal protection of the laws.

California Article XI, Section 10(a) CA state Constitution provides a local government body ... may not pay a claim under an agreement made without authority of law.

California Article 34 - California state constitution requires voter approval before developing, constructing, or acquiring in any manner public housing (low-rent housing project) in a community.

Federal Title VI of Civil Rights Act - Was enacted as part of the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964. It prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, and national origin in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance such as grants and student loans as well as racial segregation in schools and public accommodations, and employment discrimination.

Federal Title VII of Civil Rights Act – Also from the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is a federal employment law that prohibits employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, and national origin.

Federal 14th Amendment to US Constitution – Guarantees all citizens equal protection under law; a state shall not violate a citizen's privileges; shall not deprive any person of property without due process of law; Regarding Segregation: In 1954 (Brown v. Board of Education) the Supreme Court unanimously held that separate schools for blacks and whites violated the Equal Protection Clause.

With great respect,

Maryanne Razzo  
1118 Brussels Street  
San Francisco, CA 94134

**From:** [Julien DeFrance](#)  
**Cc:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Info, HRC \(HRC\)](#); [HRC-Reparations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Souza, Sarah \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: NO TO THE REPARATIONS PLAN!  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 12:02:18 PM

---

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

You are all LUNATICS.

“SAN FRANCISCO — Payments of \$5 million to every eligible Black adult, the elimination of personal debt and tax burdens, guaranteed annual incomes of at least \$97,000 for 250 years and homes in San Francisco for just \$1 a family.”

What is gonna be the cost of this non-sense for everyone else?

STUPIDITY and ARROGANCE have no limits with you all CORRUPT DEMOC'RATS!



San Francisco board open to reparations with \$5M payouts  
nbcnews.com

On Sep 20, 2023, at 09:38, Julien DeFrance <[julien.defrance@gmail.com](mailto:julien.defrance@gmail.com)> wrote:

NONE OF THIS IS ECONOMICALLY VIABLE, EITHER.

ALL OF YOU'RE GOING TO DO IS TO BANKRUPT THIS CITY.

SHAME ON YOU.  
THIS IS NOT DEMOCRACY.

On Tue, Sep 19, 2023 at 4:32 PM Julien DeFrance <[julien.defrance@gmail.com](mailto:julien.defrance@gmail.com)>

wrote:

**NO ONE IS ENTITLED ANY SUCH THING AS REPARATIONS**

**NO ONE LIVING IN SAN FRANCISCO TODAY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR WHAT  
HAPPENED OVER US HISTORY OR IN ANCIENT ROME OR WHENEVER**

**WE ALL HAD ENOUGH OF YOUR BULLSHIT RADICAL-LEFT AGENDA,  
LISTENING TO ALL OF THOSE SOCIALIST LUNATICS**

**STOP WASTING OUR HARD-EARNED TAXPAYERS DOLLARS.**

**STOP THIS NON-SENSE AND DISSOLVE THE REPARATIONS COMMITTEE  
IMMEDIATELY.**

**SAN FRANCISCO ISN'T A STOLEN LAND EITHER. IT MIGHT BE TIME YOU TAKE  
THIS LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT BULLSHIT OUT OF THE ROLL CALL AND  
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE OF THIS MEETING AND INSTEAD FOCUS ON THE  
ACTUAL GOAL OF THIS MEETING**

**From:** [Virginia Marshall](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Support reparations by implementation of all the recommendations presented by the San Francisco African American Reparations Committee  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 11:41:04 AM

---

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

Board of Supervisors Public Comment,

For Black San Franciscans, life has been indelibly shaped by residential displacement, persistent disparities in socioeconomic outcomes, and untold broken promises.

You took the first step of acknowledging the City's need to formally document these harms by unanimously voting to form the San Francisco Reparations Advisory Committee. Now you need to continue on the path towards justice for Black San Franciscans by supporting all of the recommendations in the San Francisco Reparations Plan.

Virginia Marshall  
vmarshall999@yahoo.com  
7A Gonzalez Dr  
San Francisco, California 94132



**From:** [ALICE XAVER](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Engardio, Joel \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Oppose reparations  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 8:43:02 AM

---

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

Dear Supervisors,

We are opposed to reparations to the black community, as suggested by the non elected Human Rights Commission and discussed by the Board of Supervisors.

The Chinese had no involvement in slavery or redlining. In fact, the Chinese were redlined and discriminated against. The Chinese Exclusion Act is a prime example of the US government allowing such discrimination.

The Chinese are still singled out and beaten, often by members of the Black community, yet no one dares to speak openly about this. Why? When the civil rights of the Chinese are violated, no one really cares. We are even asked to accept being pushed off a bus platform as an accident. Case closed!

Cheryl Davis, Director of the non elected Human Rights Commission, was once asked to address the beatings of the Chinese community at a Zoom meeting I attended. She said "to forgive". Well, we do not accept that response!

The Chinese people were offered an apology by the City and no reparations. The Black community should be given the same apology. Cash payments should not be part of the discussion unless it's reparations for all who were discriminated against.

Thank you for your time. I realize this is a very difficult discussion.

Alice & Chris Xavier  
D7



**From:** [Marc Brenman](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Info. HRC \(HRC\)](#); [HRC-Reparations](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Krista.Pfefferkorn@sen.ca.gov](#); [Jeff.Sparks@sen.ca.gov](#); [assemblymember.haney@assembly.ca.gov](#); [Staffabigail.rivamontemesa@asm.ca.gov](#)  
**Cc:** [richie@greenbergnation.com](#)  
**Subject:** Comments on Reparations Proposals  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 7:46:34 AM

---

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

Dear Colleagues;

I understand the position of advocates on reparations for African-Americans, but there are many other disadvantaged populations in the City and State with a history of discrimination, including Asian-Americans, Hispanics, indigenous people, and people with disabilities.

Any set of benefits provided to African-Americans should be subject to means testing, so that wealthy and well-educated Blacks do not receive undue benefits.

In addition, benefits already received, such as subsidized housing, fair housing laws, passage and enforcement of civil rights nondiscrimination laws, investigation and resolution of civil rights complaints and grievances, the dollar amount of court ordered settlements, law enforcement efforts against hate crimes, disadvantaged business enterprise programs, preferences, quotas, affirmative action, aid to Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Black studies programs, school lunch programs, Earned Income Tax Credit, LIHEAP, Section 8 vouchers, TANF, WIC, War on Poverty, etc. should be deducted from the reparations amounts granted.

Finally, anyone receiving the reparations benefits should be required to sign a binding legal document that they waive and forgo any past, present, and future claims to discrimination.

The City and State will also need to prepare for inevitable legal challenges based on Constitutional equal protection claims due to provision of benefits to a single racial group. The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled against much affirmative action. Provision of benefits based on race will be subject to a strict scrutiny analysis under the U.S. Constitution and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

It will be very difficult to determine who is eligible. Certain myths need to be disposed of, such as the assertion that California was once a slave state. There is no American legal concept that the sins of the father are visited unto the son unto the seventh generation. Will benefits be distributed based on the percent of ancestors who lived in slavery? Would this be a perpetuation of the one-drop rule?

Where will the money come from? Will this money deprive other worthy programs of funding? How will individuals who receive the money spend it? Will there be any controls on how it is spent by individuals? Will the benefits be taxable?

All other reparations programs internationally have included the necessity to show direct connection within a single generation to the harm. This includes the Japanese-American reparations, which only went to those who were actually incarcerated, and the German Holocaust reparations, which required the direct connection within a single generation.

All in all, unless your approach takes these matters into serious consideration, you're

making a mistake. There are so many present problems and failures in the City and the State that need to be dealt with; this issue detracts from solving them, to the detriment of all other San Franciscans and Californians. It's time to think more broadly, of the City and State as a whole, and not concentrate so much on one relatively small population with only a tenuous or no connection to slavery.

Sincerely,

Marc Brenman

2636 Bryant St.

SF, CA 94110

Mbrenman001@comcast.net

**From:** [Lisa King](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Comment about African American Reparations in San Francisco  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:12:09 PM

---

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

Dear Office of the Clerk of the Board, and Board of Supervisors,

From some of my earliest memories in grade school, the issue of racial injustice has plagued my heart, mind, and consciousness, though I never experienced racial discrimination myself. I'm writing you today to say: May today's session actually move to its historic promise.

As a white woman who has been active in the struggle for Black Liberation since Trump was elected in 2017 and has lived in San Francisco for over 30 years. It took me far too long to see the depth of racial injustice and become active in the pursuit for change. I only became more aware by volunteering with Wealth & Disparities in the Black Community of the stats of inequities and injustices in San Francisco, which are shameful in all categories including how surprised nearly all the Supervisors we met with were about the stats of the disparities.

The trappings of greed are the American way, and so has racism been the dark foundation of this nation. I understand that most of what is being asked for is repair for harm done, and I couldn't be more pleased that we could be on the precipice of making this a reality. We must repair the harm and build a foundation forward for equality for all Black San Franciscans.

Supervisors will be encouraged to negotiate, limit, and may even be tempted to back-pedal on your gracious statements today. I urge you not to, and advance BOLD policy with speed. There is no more time to waste. This city, country and world desperately needs a racial reparations reckoning.

Yours,  
Lisa King

PS. For a topic this important, 1 minute is NOT long enough for public comment. 2 minutes must become the minimum amount of time for any topic.

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Motor homes on Winston and SFSU  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 2:33:00 PM

---

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Remi Tan regarding proposed locations for RVs.

Sincerely,

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

---

**From:** Remi Tan <remitan@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:32 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <[mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org](mailto:mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** Motor homes on Winston and SFSU

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

Dear BOS and Mayor Breed. Heard about the city trying to move the motorhomes around SFSU and Winston. The City should consider pier 32 as that area is usually vacant and is near services

Thank you and Best Regards,

**Remi Tan**, AIA, LEED AP BD+C  
*Architecture, Green/Sustainability Consulting, and Real Estate Investment*

650-291-3097

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Dean Preston's comment on empty shelter beds and the unhoused  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 2:39:00 PM

---

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Remi Tan regarding vacant shelter spaces.

Sincerely,

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

---

**From:** Remi Tan <remitan@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:28 PM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <[mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org](mailto:mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** Dean Preston's comment on empty shelter beds and the unhoused

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

Dear Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed -

Heard on the news that Dean Preston is urging filling the 10% of available shelter spaces that is vacant. This is a great idea - the city should not have any vacant shelter spaces with the high amount of unhoused on our streets - and the board and mayor should put aside all political differences to make this happen. vacant beds is a waste of city resources that were spent to create and maintain them.

However, 10% vacancies out of the 1200 total shelter beds is only a drop in the bucket with only 120 available beds to house the purportedly 5000 homeless persons on the street out of total of 8000 homeless persons.

There has been anecdotal evidence that many of the unhoused are from out of area/state. The city should expand the homeward bound program to help return out of area/state unhoused to their original homes - many are missing persons that desperate families are trying to find. Only if the unhoused person was abused by family/spouse/partner, should the city consider placing the person in foster care(for youth) or shelter for battered persons. All others should be sent home. This should help reduce a large part of the unhoused population who are not from the city.

The majority of the unhoused are addicted to drugs. The city needs to be seeking money from the opioid settlements with Perdue, Sacklers and other pharma, pharmacy companies to help with the drug rehab programs and building more rehab beds which is the only real solution to the crisis.

Thank you and Best Regards,

**Remi Tan**, AIA, LEED AP BD+C  
*Architecture, Green/Sustainability Consulting, and Real Estate Investment*

650-291-3097

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [BOS Legislation \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: De Jure Recognition of Artsakh  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 2:43:00 PM

---

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Richard Youatt regarding File No. 230979.

**File No. 230979** - Resolution declaring September 21, 2023, as Armenian Independence Day in the City and County of San Francisco and commemorating the 32nd Anniversary of Armenian Independence Day on September 21, 2023. (Melgar, Peskin, Safai, Mandelman, Stefani, Dorsey)

Sincerely,

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

---

**From:** Richard Youatt <[richardyouatt@gmail.com](mailto:richardyouatt@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 1:44 PM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** De Jure Recognition of Artsakh

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

I urge you to work with all levels of Government, especially the Federal level, to establish de jure recognition of the Republic of Artsakh, its right to self-determination and freedom from wars of aggression by the government of Azerbaijan.

At the local level, I urge full public disclosure of the outcome of the investigation into the acts of arson committed against the offices of the St. Gregory's Armenian church on Commonwealth Avenue.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [BOS Legislation \(BOS\)](#); [Cabrera, Stephanie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** 4 Letters Regarding File No. 230951  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 2:45:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [4 Letters Regarding File No. 230951.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see attached for 4 letters regarding File No. 230951.

**File No. 230951** - Urging the Recreation and Park Department to Publicly Share Information Regarding Pilot Activation of UN Plaza and Take Steps to Mitigate Any Impact on the Farmers' Market. (Preston, Peskin)

Sincerely,

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



**From:** [Friedland](#)  
**To:** [Cabrera, Stephanie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment re Civic Center Farmers Market/Skate Park plan.  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:06:40 PM

---

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

Dear Government Audit and Oversight Committee,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the shift of the Farmers' Market from UN Plaza to Fulton Street for the sake of installing a skate park and other recreational equipment.

I'm not a resident of the Tenderloin, but I'm an employee of the City and County of San Francisco, and I work in the Tenderloin.

Rec & Park's plan for UN Plaza is mean-spirited and unproductive:

1) The farmers worked very hard throughout the pandemic to bring food to the heart of the city, especially to marginalized and poor folk who depend on this market for their produce needs.

This is how the City rewards them? By making farmers' jobs more difficult? Why take away their ease of parking? Why not prioritize their needs? **The shift has already impacted their livelihood. According to one farmer, due to the parking squeeze and the reduction of tent space with the relocation, each farmer is losing between \$1,000 and \$2,000 per week during their peak produce season.**

It's already very tough to be a small-scale farmer in the U.S. Let's give them the respect and ease-of-operation that they deserve.

2) **A skate park will not succeed in UN Plaza, and it doesn't meet the real needs of the Tenderloin community.**

**Is this installation actually for the purpose of making the UN Plaza safer and more citizen friendly? Or, is it for burnishing Mayor's Breed's terrible image nationwide with respect to drug-dealing in that area?** The skaters and drug dealers will co-exist just as Urban Alchemy staff and drug dealers are co-existing. The installation of ping pong tables will not cause the dealing to stop. **The dealing would only, temporarily, shift to Market Street and further into the streets of the Tenderloin.**

Parents will still not want to bring their kids to the UN Plaza to play if they have any other option.

If the Mayor and the City would like to make the Tenderloin District more "family friendly," they should instead come up with initiatives to improve the lives of the families that actually *live* in the Tenderloin, first, by close listening to the businesses and families of the neighborhood to learn what their unmet needs are.

**Minimally, some honest assessment of the success of this skatepark in serving the Tenderloin community should be made after its first six months of operation** if Rec & Park decides to move forward on this ill-conceived plan.

Thanks for considering my opinion as a worker who frequents UN Plaza many days a week and as a City of San Francisco employee and resident.

L Friedland  
friedlandstaying@yahoo.com

**From:** [Susan Keyte](#)  
**To:** [Cabrera, Stephanie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I'm Against Replacing Heart of the City Farmer's Market With a Skate Park!!!  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 8:34:08 AM

---

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

I've just read the following SF Chronicle article and am horrified at this development.

## **‘It’s going to be a nightmare’: SF displaces farmers market to make room for skate area**

I own a condo in Opera Plaza & am surrounded by drug users, drug dealers & homeless enablers. Your idea of opening a skate area, etc. a few blocks away will be a huge magnet for more of what we're already experiencing.

In addition, you'll be ruining any chance for the new IKEA store to survive. It appears you have no idea of the disastrous consequences of this insane idea to Market Street, the tenderloin AND our beautiful Farmer's Market. You're going to bring more of the same lowlife teenagers & 20 somethings we're already dealing w/ 24/7.

Quote from SF Chronicle article:

"A message sent to the Recreation and Park Department was not returned before publication. However, Phil Ginsburg, general manager of San Francisco Recreation and Park, told the farmers market's Board of Directors that the recreation area is an experiment and that the vendors will be allowed to return if the project does not improve the public health issues in U.N. Plaza"

STOP. LEAVE US ALONE. DON'T DO THIS!!!!!!! DECENT PEOPLE LIVE HERE, WE DON'T NEED OR WANT THIS KIND OF EXPERIMENT!!!!!!! YOU BOTH KNOW DISTRICT 2 & I WONDER WHERE YOU LIVE THAT YOU WOULD COME UP W/ THIS HAIRBRAINED IDEA AS A REMEDY.

PLEASE RECONSIDER. Thank you.

Susan Keyte

Opera Plaza Condo Owner  
[601 Van Ness Ave., #741](#)  
[San Francisco, CA. 94102](#)  
415-605-6903

**From:** [Tara Cahn](#)  
**To:** [Cabrera, Stephanie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** United Nations Plaza Heart of the City Farmer"s Market Heritage Site  
**Date:** Sunday, September 17, 2023 3:18:07 PM  
**Attachments:** [United Nations Plaza Heart of the City Farmer"s Market Heritage Site.One of the hidden Jewels of SF.Final.docx](#)

---

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

Clerk Stephanie Cabrera:  
Re: Government Audit & Oversight Committee Meeting this week. Public comment submission.

Please see attached letter.

Thank you,  
T.Cahn

Tara Cahn Architecture  
Former Fulbright Scholar

**From:** [Jan Michaels](#)  
**To:** [Cabrera, Stephanie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Farmer's Market Location Change  
**Date:** Sunday, September 17, 2023 1:15:50 PM

---

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

Please put me down in the record as a SF resident who opposed the location change of the Farmer's Market at Civic Center Plaza. The market needs the extra space to thrive. A skateboard park at UN Plaza is not a good idea. It will not improve anything. Thank you, Jan Michaels

1580 Jackson St #11  
San Francisco CA 94109

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#); [Cabrera, Stephanie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Public comment for September 20, 2023 BOS Government Audit & Oversight Committee  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 9:38:00 AM

---

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Adele Framer regarding File No. 230951, which is Item No. 2 on today's Government Audit and Oversight Committee agenda.

**File No. 230951** - Urging the Recreation and Park Department to Publicly Share Information Regarding Pilot Activation of UN Plaza and Take Steps to Mitigate Any Impact on the Farmers' Market (Preston, Peskin)

Sincerely,

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

---

**From:** Adele Framer <adeleframer@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 11:39 PM  
**To:** Cabrera, Stephanie (BOS) <stephanie.cabrera@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Public comment for September 20, 2023 BOS Government Audit & Oversight Committee

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

**Comment on 2. 230951 [Urging the Recreation and Park Department to Publicly Share Information Regarding Pilot Activation of UN Plaza and Take Steps to Mitigate Any Impact on the Farmers' Market]**

My name is Adele Framer. I live in current District 8. I've enjoyed shopping at the farmers' market on UN Plaza for more than 20 years, like thousands of other San Francisco voters.

I urge all supervisors to support this resolution.

I am very concerned about the health of the farmers' market. There are signs that the relocation to Fulton Plaza has been very rough for them. The new location is out of the way, too small, and logistically difficult. The farmers cannot afford much in the way of financial losses.

Everyone agrees that the farmers' market has been a shining asset to the city for 41 years. The crowds attracted by the farmers's market transformed UN Plaza every market day. It was established with a state grant to remedy a food desert. Without the market, the area is still a food desert.

The farmers' market is a small business and its members are mostly people of color who have worked hard to feed a poor neighborhood as well as thousands of other San Franciscans. If the farmers' market fails, I urge the committee to consider how this will affect food equity in the heart of San Francisco. How will this make our city look?

Overall, the UN Plaza project is poorly planned. Other than a paragraph describing skate ramp construction for Rec & Park's Planning application, I can find no formal plans, studies, or projected demographics or usage patterns for the skate park project. It never went before the Rec and Park board. The Planning department was told it was a temporary installation. Exactly how temporary is this slipshod pilot project?

This is not an obscure corner of the city. UN Plaza is a historic landmark and the gateway to our Civic Center. The Civic Center of the city of San Francisco belongs to all San Franciscans.

Why a skate park? Will that bring in the same kind of foot traffic as the farmers' market? I want to know why the Recreation and Park board did not explore other alternatives that would keep the farmers' market in place on UN Plaza. The night market organized by Supervisor Joel Engardio was a raging success. People come out for food. Why not have food in UN Plaza 7 days a week?

Sincerely,

Adele Framer



**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Acquisition of the Dana King sculpture titled Monumental Reckoning currently on display  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 2:54:00 PM

---

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Regina Sneed regarding the artwork *Monumental Reckoning* by artists Dana King.

Sincerely,

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

---

**From:** regina sneed <reginasneed@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 9:58 PM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Acquisition of the Dana King sculpture titled Monumental Reckoning currently on display

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



["It Makes One Speechless": 350 Sculptures](#)  
[Invoke First Enslaved Africans](#)  
[hyperallergic.com](http://hyperallergic.com)

Dear Board Members:

To mark today in San Francisco history at the Board of Supervisors, the permanent display in Golden Gate Park and purchase of this great work of art would let the world know that San Francisco has recognized its history and plans to address its past and present in reparation and healing.

Please request the Arts Commission to purchase this work.

Thank you for considering my request.

Regina Sneed  
District Two resident

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#); [Cabrera, Stephanie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** 1 Letter Regarding File No. 230826  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 2:57:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [1 Letter Regarding File No. 203826.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see attached for communication from Denny Garbuio regarding File No. 230826.

**File No. 230826** - Hearing - City's Efforts to Address Car Break-Ins (Preston)

Sincerely,

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

**From:** [John Fluevog Haight St San Francisco](#)  
**To:** [Cabrera, Stephanie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Thursday 10am/ Hearing on Car Break Ins--Urgent Action Needed: Addressing the Alarming Rise in Car Break-Ins  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 10:59:31 AM

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

Dear Government Heads of San Francisco,

I write to you today as a concerned business manager on Haight Street, a street celebrated for its vibrant culture and welcoming atmosphere, but that has now become synonymous with the rampant car break-ins that plague our beloved city. I must admit that it is increasingly difficult to find anything positive in a city that is suffering from a seemingly unending epidemic of car break-ins and increased crime.

It deeply saddens me to report that San Francisco has reached a point where tourists, who should be captivated by the beauty and charm of our city, are instead leaving with harrowing tales of their vehicles being broken into, leaving them not just inconvenienced, but emotionally scarred by the loss of their belongings and personal security.

Recently, I had two friends visit San Francisco, both of whom had their vehicles broken into. It is not an exaggeration to say that the impression this left on them was nothing short of terrible. They, like many others, took to social media to share their unfortunate experiences, and I fear the damage this does to our reputation as a tourist destination.

The situation is dire, and it is utterly perplexing that we find ourselves here despite the extensive surveillance infrastructure throughout the city. We can see where these criminals live, we can track them, and we can follow their actions. Yet, car break-ins continue to plague Alamo Square, Twin Peaks lookout, Haight Street, Fisherman's Wharf, and countless other areas. It is disheartening to witness the decline of this once-great city into a hotbed of criminal activity.

The devastating sight of shattered glass in our neighborhoods is now an all too familiar one. We are tired, and yes, we are angry. We have been voicing our concerns for years, yet the problem persists. Why are these criminals not being held accountable for their actions? It is time to put an end to this cycle of leniency and slap-on-the-wrist justice.

As residents and business owners in a city with one of the highest costs of living, we deserve more than empty promises. It is time for action. We implore you to take decisive steps to incarcerate these criminals, protect our streets, and restore San Francisco's reputation as a safe and welcoming destination.

We understand that addressing this issue is complex, but the longer we delay, the more damage is done to our city's reputation and, consequently, our economy. We urge you to work tirelessly to find a solution that ensures the safety of our residents and visitors alike.

Let us not allow San Francisco's legacy to be defined by crime and open air drug abuse. We have the potential to turn the tide, but it will require a collective effort and unwavering determination. We stand ready to support any measures that will bring back the San Francisco we once knew and loved.

Sincerely,

Denny Garbuio  
John Fluevog Shoes  
1697 Haight St  
San Francisco, CA  
94117

--

**JOHN FLUEVOG SHOES, HAIGHT STREET**

P: [415-436-9784](tel:415-436-9784) E: [sanfrancisco@fluevog.com](mailto:sanfrancisco@fluevog.com)  
W: [www.fluevog.com](http://www.fluevog.com)  
1697 Haight St. San Francisco CA. 94117 USA  
Mon-Sat 11-7 Sun 12-6

**UNIQUE SOLES FOR UNIQUE SOULS: SINCE 1970**

T: [www.fluevog.com/twitter](http://www.fluevog.com/twitter) FB: [www.facebook.com/fluevog](http://www.facebook.com/fluevog)

VancouverSeattleBostonTorontoNewYorkSanFranciscoChicagoLosAngelesMontrealPortlandCalgaryDenverOttawaNewOrleansEdmontonVictoriaAmsterdamMelbourneDallas

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Cabrera, Stephanie \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Addressing Car Break-Ins  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 9:50:00 AM

---

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Ted Getten regarding File No. 230826, which is Item No. 1 on today's Government Audit and Oversight Committee agenda.

**File No. 230826** - Hearing - City's Efforts to Address Car Break-Ins (Preston)

Sincerely,

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

---

**From:** Ted Getten <ted.getten@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 9:48 AM  
**To:** Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Cabrera, Stephanie (BOS) <stephanie.cabrera@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Addressing Car Break-Ins

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

Supervisors,

On today's Government Audit and Oversight Committee agenda, Supervisor Preston is leading an item on car break-ins. I read the Supervisor's letter about the approach he believes the city should take to car break-ins, and I am left wholly disappointed. Where else is the strategy, "departments should talk more, and people shouldn't leave stuff in their cars"? How is this a practical approach to solving a significant issue that impacts the quality of life for all residents and visitors, especially those who are poor?

Where is the focus on actual deterrence? Where is the focus on solving the problem itself? Where is

the focus on the consequences for those who are smashing windows and those who are buying the stolen goods?

Our city streets are littered with car window glass. Is this the best our Board of Supervisors has to solve an issue plaguing us and worsening? I hope today's hearing contains far more nuance than Supervisor Preston's proposal, which reads more like a last-minute brainstorm and less like a well-thought-out policy presentation that can turn the tide on break-ins.

Let's come together and truly solve these issues!

Thank you,  
Ted

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Lake Merced Quick Build  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 9:32:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [LMB QB.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see below and attached for communication from Mike Regan regarding the Lake Merced Quick-Build Project.

Sincerely,

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

---

**From:** Mike Regan <myoldgoat@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 5:33 PM  
**To:** MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; mtaboard@sfmta.com; senator@boxer.senate.gov; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; northcoast@coastal.ca.gov; Leng, Thalia (MTA) <Thalia.Leng@sfmta.com>; metro@sfchronicle.com; elindqwister@sfstandard.com; Editor@RichmondSunsetNews.com; Govenor <governor@governor.ca.gov>; Ethics Commission, (ETH) <ethics.commission@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Lake Merced Quick Build

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

Hello, the attached pdf answers the questions Supervisor Melgar asked me.

It is too long to put into an email, but then most of you won't read it anyway.

Thanks

Mike Regan  
 D7

I think that your party's belief is that you can effect a modal change in transportation by forcing residents out of their cars. I would like to address some of the things in your email.

**Just a couple of items to look at:**

**1. Let's look at these intersections crosswalks and see what is going on.**

- Brotherhood way and Winston don't intersect (I know some of the maps show LMB as Brotherhood way) but we both know that's wrong.)
- There is a controlled intersection *with* crosswalks at Lake Merced Blvd and Brotherhood way.
- There is a controlled intersection *with* crosswalks at Higuera and LMB
- There is a controlled intersection *with* crosswalks at Font and LMB
- There is a controlled intersection without a crosswalk at State and LMB (could use one)
- There is a controlled intersection *with* a crosswalk at Winston and LMB
- There is a controlled intersection *with* a crosswalk at Middlefield and MLB
- There is an uncontrolled turn out without a crosswalk at Clearfield and MLB.
- There is no crosswalk where LMB turns into Sunset Blvd.
- Even the controlled intersection of LMB and John Muir has a crosswalk

**So out of 10 intersections all but two have crosswalks and are controlled intersections but those two aren't really intersections.** All the major intersections that pedestrians use have crosswalks and are controlled. Could some of these existing crosswalks be improved? Certainly and they should be but that isn't really what is going on here.

**2. Let's look at these accidents by intersection:** (The information is from the TransBase at SFGOV.ORG from 2017 to 2022 (there is some 2023 data here 7 years of data)

- John Muir and LMB 8 accidents zero fatalities, one cyclist involved accident.
- Lake Merced Hill and LMB 1 accident zero fatalities controlled intersection with crosswalk.
- Brotherhood way and LMB 16 accidents zero fatalities, one pedestrians injury and that person was crossing outside of the crosswalk. (the problem here is the right turn from Brotherhood to LMB has no yield sign, there should be a right turn light at this intersection and the slip lane could be eliminated)
- Higuera and LMB 3 accidents one fatality in 2021 by a drunk driver. (Sorry don't think any of the precautions or changes that are being implemented will stop this from happening). In fact one of the injury accidents here was a cyclist who ran over a pedestrian and was cited for unsafe speed for prevailing conditions
- Font and LMB 2 accidents no pedestrians and this is an intersection that is very well controlled.
- Middlefield and LMB 3 accidents no peds
- Clearfield and LMB 5 accidents no pedestrians.
- Sunset and LMB 5 accidents no pedestrians

The two fatalities that occurred during your tenure only one was on the stretch of road that this quick build addresses. The other was on John Muir drive at Lakewood



apartments. Tragically, a 14 year old lost her life here. Strangely enough she was in an SFMTA recommended raised crosswalk and was struck by a 91 year old woman in daylight.

From 2017 to 2021 there were 1.4 fatalities; from 2018 to 2023 there were also 1.4 fatalities. While I agree any fatalities need to be investigated and if remedial actions are necessary they should be done, but this quick build is spitting into the wind if they think that any of their solutions are going to be effective. 1.4 in 5 years and 1.4 in 6 years seems to me that there are far more dangerous places that need to be addressed. Like maybe 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. or even some of those really dangerous intersections downtown that SFMTA created. One section of Market St. had over 3,500 incidents in that time frame **3,500** and we are going to spend how much this quick build?


3. **Lets talk about the bike route from Lowell/LakeShore.** Google maps show Euclid to 20<sup>th</sup> to Stonestown as the best/safest bike route. Euclid has highly visible crosswalks and is a fairly quiet street. Could also use Ocean since we have already put in bike lanes there or maybe Sloat where a traffic lane was eliminated to make room for a bike lane. If a cycling route is wanted or needed there are better and less complicated ways and places to do this. There is a lot of space on LMB and everything that this “quick build” wants to do can be done without “repurposing parking” or taking out lanes or reducing lane size. You just have to be willing to look at other alternatives that don’t eliminate motor vehicles or make driving more difficult.
4. **Let’s talk about parking.** This quick build is slated to “repurpose” 350 parking spots. What this really means is they want to eliminate 350 places where people need to and have been parking. You say there is plenty of space in Park Merced but that is only because of remote learning and let’s not forget that there are additional large towers that will be built there. I remember Holloway at State and you couldn’t find a space at all. You mention all the new residents that will be “living” at Stonestown. Well that project is going to take out parking as well.

I hope you realize that the reason we have permit parking in our area is because of the students who drive going to State so please let’s not pretend that parking isn’t an issue especially with all the new buildings not requiring adequate parking for residents.

5. **Let’s talk about the Great Highway:** While this road isn’t in your area many of your constituents use the highway to get across the park and other people outside of SF need that road as well. Over 20,000 people per day used that road but that doesn’t matter since a few cyclists want to take it over for their pleasure rides. (Do we really think anyone is using the Great Highway to commute to work on a bike?)
  - **Southern Extension:** All of these “environmentalists” and cyclists want to shut down this road because they claim climate change and sea level rise will allow the sea to reclaim this area. Well the sea has been trying to take this area back since I was a kid and we as a “people” worked to maintain it. NOAA data shows that this whole area is in no danger from rising seas. However downtown, Marina, SOMA and other areas in the bay may have a problem. They always show the worst scenario, so this is with a

12' sea level rise and a 100 year storm surge. Funny, if you're talking managed retreat I think the Bay is where the problem is, not the Great Highway.

**FIGURE 4-24**  
**TEMPORARY COASTAL FLOODING IN SEA LEVEL RISE VULNERABILITY ZONE**




- When you read the plan it's strange that we really aren't managed retreating from this area at all, in fact I would say we are doing just the opposite. We are building a giant **SEAWALL** to protect the sewer plant and the tunnel. In addition the sand replenishment is going to continue with sand from the shipping channel dredging and from the area north (Kelly's Cove) near the Cliff House. I was told keeping the road would cost 11 million dollars and people baulked at that number, but this project is

going to cost well over 200 million and close the road.

They want to put in a new bathroom, the new pumping station is being built, updates to the old pumping station are being completed, and we are putting in a water recycling plant there so, how in anyone's world does this even resemble managed retreat? The misinformation that is coming out of city hall and its agencies these days is breaking records. **Hence NO TRUST!** Forcing people to drive more/longer is doing more damage to the climate. Bunch of hypocrites!

All of you talk about safety; well the two roads that you want to close are safer than the majority of roads in the city. I count **TWO** accidents on the GH extension (or the Southern Extension) from 4/1/2018 to 3/31/2023. You want to close this safe road and push that traffic onto a road that has had more incidents? Does that make sense to anyone?



The majority of us don't have a problem "improving" the area. In fact it would be great to have a new restroom built and a walking trail, but you **DON'T NEED TO SHUT THE ROAD DOWN TO CARS TO ACCOMPLISH THAT.**

- **Central Extension:** The pilot program to shut this road down for 3 years (a leftover from our friend G. Mar) is just a ploy to attempt to get public acceptance of this closing and to encourage more usage to pump the numbers. The bicycle lobby is pushing this along with other "nonprofits" to finish their bay-to-beach unobstructed route at the expense of thousands of motorists.

Closing this road at noon on Friday was and is a slap in the face to all of those

people who need the road to do their normal daily activities. Closing the road on weekends creates more problems than it solves and pits communities against each other.

The data that the city (Park & Rec) collected is tainted and full of misrepresentations, omitted data, manipulated data and flat out lies.

When the city allowed the cycling activists (safe street rebels) to slow ride this section, it was a slap in the face to all motorists and law abiding citizens. The PD was told hands off and even provided a buffer for them. (Now they have moved to shutting down the bridges because they want a bike lane).

The chaos and money that closing this road cost us was ridiculous. The over \$500,000 that was spent to mitigate the diverted traffic was a waste. I attribute the accidents that occurred on 45<sup>th</sup> Ave to the closing. Putting in bollards to stop people from making a left at 47<sup>th</sup> (a much safer place to turn) pushing them up to 45<sup>th</sup> created more problems than it solved. Putting in bollards to stop people from making a right from Lincoln onto any of the avenues from La Playa to 41<sup>st</sup> Ave created more problems. I think the fatality on Lincoln could be attributed to this change.

- **Northern Extension:** I haven't seen any real plans that address this area, guess it's too historic to shut down. One of our Cities tourist attractions was the 49 mile scenic route. Guess historic San Francisco doesn't have any appeal anymore. But at the same time we are trying to get tourism back. I understand that the Cliff House, Sutro's and Louie's are with GGNRA but have you seen what is out there now? **NOTHING!** Between the city ignoring the smash and grab thefts and GGNRA mis-management the area is now a ghost town. Plenty of parking available here.

## 6. Let's talk about public trust:

- We have attended many public meetings between BOS, CTA etc and what we have found is that none of you even bother to listen to the public comments. You're all on PC's or laptops or your phone and are not paying one iota of attention to comments. In fact one of the BOS members thinks that public comment should be eliminated since none of you listen or take heed to what is being said. I think he said it was a waste of time.
- I have witnessed firsthand how Rec & Park has lied and manipulated data to fit their agenda. At one point they said that the counters on the Great Highway stopped working due to being covered by sand and that was why usage numbers

on the GH were down. However when we looked at cell phone data the same low numbers of users was recorded. **Why lie about it?**


- We now have 6 members of city government that have been arrested, jailed or have been forced to resign. How far does this corruption go?
- We have non profits that are funding elected officials to convince them to support their projects. The Park Alliance was a part of why the head of DPW ended up in jail.
- The SFBC wanted a seat at the table and they have taken over the table. How many motorists have been appointed to a seat at any of these commissions? I'd guess **NONE**. I think it was SF Walk that got in trouble for donating and lobbying city hall illegally and had to take back the donation. Oh that was just a mistake. Well it's a mistake that an awful lot of them are making these days. All these non profits are really just lobbying groups trying to buy political support. They need to go.

7. **Now shall we talk about how screwed up the city is** because of all these progressive positions.

- A bowling alley at Nordstrom's, really. A skate park in Civic Center. More new parks being created. These remind me of Rome when the politicians built entertainment arenas for the populist to keep them sedated.
- Closing Market St. to cars really helped the area, did it really? I don't think so.
- The intersections of Market/Octavia and Market/Gough have had 43 and 41 incidents. Much more than any other intersection in the city and both of them were gone over by SFMTA and made worse by their changes.
- Market/7<sup>th</sup> st. 15 of the 23 accidents at this location involved cyclist
- Going through this data base sure tells me that the city has many more problems in the East side of town and maybe the emphasis should be placed there. I know this isn't your area but I think a wider view for supervisors is a good thing considering all the emphasis being put on safety and reducing fatalities. There is already a push going on that wants to have city wide supervisors.
- Finally I see that some politicians are getting on board with cleaning up all the Fentanyl and other drug usage and getting the mentally unstable off the streets and into programs that will actually help. We need to prosecute these thieves going into the stores and robbing them along with the car break-ins.
- The removal of any and all safe consumption sites needs to happen. Safe consumption is enabling. How many times does an addict get to overdose, how many times can we administer naloxone (Narcan) to drug addicts? I think there are a lot of people who are feed up with the city enabling all of these problems.
- There is no balance in our city government. It's really one progressive after another. Do you think a centralist or someone on the right could get elected in SF?

**NO WAY.** But people are getting feed up with the progressive politics and balance needs to be restored to city hall.

Here is a screenshot of the SF TransBASE Dashboard of all traffic incidents from 4/1/2018 to 3/31/23. If you're worried about safety then this screen shot clearly shows where your emphasis should be and where it shouldn't.



We need to stop wasting our tax dollars to appease these zealots who have infiltrated our government. Cyclist represent less than 3% of the residence in SF, currently contribute zero to the tax base and yet we are expected to spend billions on meeting their demands.

Thanks and sorry this got so long but it barely covers the problems.



**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Laguna Honda must not be jeopardized again-File No. 230035 - Hearing - Committee of the Whole -  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 9:34:00 AM

---

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Teresa Palmer regarding File No. 230035.

**File No. 230035** - Hearing - Committee of the Whole - Laguna Honda Hospital's Strategy for Recertification and the Submission of a Closure and Patient Transfer and Relocation Plan - September 26, 2023, at 3:00 p.m.

Sincerely,

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

---

**From:** Teresa Palmer <teresapalmer2014@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 8:45 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>  
**Cc:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Laguna Honda must not be jeopardized again-File No. 230035 - Hearing - Committee of the Whole -

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

## Our Public Nursing Home Must Not Be Jeopardized Again

To: Board of Supervisors

Copy to: Clerk of the Board-please place in meeting file: [Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org)

[File No. 230035](#) - Hearing - Committee of the Whole - Laguna Honda Hospital's Strategy for Recertification and the Submission of a Closure and Patient Transfer and Relocation Plan - September 26, 2023, at 3:00 p.m.

Given the dire shortage of nursing home beds in San Francisco, the people of our city must be certain that all beds at Laguna Honda will be there for their use.

Given the sickness and death, and the horrible stress and expense that the situation at LHH has engendered since 2021 and even before, we ask the Board of Supervisors these questions:

1. How to create a system of oversight for LHH so that repeated profound mismanagement does not persist or recur? The Health Commission was not up to this. We would like to hear a plan. There will be ongoing budgetary incentives to cut corners.
2. Shouldn't any nursing home eligible San Francisco resident who has had to leave the county for care have priority for care in SF? Why can't they get priority at LHH?
3. Will admission of acutely behaviorally unstable residents to LHH from ZSFG resume? ("The flow project.") **The only reason to jeopardize LHH's continued existence with these inappropriate admissions is to jettison hard to place people from our county hospital.** This is inhumane to all involved. Better services must be developed, and not at the expense of LHH or of these most vulnerable persons that need treatment and shelter.
4. Has CDPH/State of California clarified how ongoing failure to keep up with LHH problems will be rectified? State of California/CDPH's inability to offer timely feedback about problems at LHH contributed to this mess!
5. Can the Board of Supervisors closely monitor the submission of a waiver to prevent the 120 bed loss; San Franciscans cannot afford to lose these beds!

Thankyou.

Teresa Palmer M.D. - Former Laguna Honda Physician  
Family Medicine/Geriatrics  
1845 Hayes St.  
San Francisco, California 94117



**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [McHugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** FW: CVS  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 11:58:00 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Philip Cropp regarding retail closures.

Sincerely,


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

**From:** Philip Cropp <prcropp@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 9:56 AM  
**To:** Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** SFPD, Chief (POL) <sfpdchief@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** CVS

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

Congratulations...

<https://www.sfgate.com/local/article/downtown-san-francisco-cvs-closure-18378866.php>



**LOCAL**

# Downtown San Francisco CVS to close next month

By **Sam Mauhay-Moore**


Sep 20, 2023

---



CVS' location at 601 Mission St. will close by Oct. 23, a spokesperson for the company confirmed.

Screen shot via Google Maps



**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** 2 Letters regarding SFPD DGO 5.25  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 1:57:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [2 Letters regarding SFPD DGO 5.25.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see attached for 2 letters regarding SFPD DGO 5.25, Foot Pursuits.

Sincerely,

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

**From:** [Ali Mandvi](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 6:16:20 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      Ali Mandvi  
Email                              samali48@yahoo.com  
I live in District              District 6

### **I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.**

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

---

**From:** [Douglas Lambert](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 5:00:49 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission and Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      Douglas Lambert

Email      douglasl02@gmail.com

I live in District      District 2

### **I oppose advancing DGO 5.25.**

Message:

Dear Police Commissioners,

I strongly oppose advancing DGO 5.25. It is unnecessary and to claim this is for “officer safety” is disingenuous and unsupported by empirical data.

Additionally, Order 5.25 is vague and confusing. For example, it is unclear what exactly constitutes a foot pursuit...walking quickly, running, jogging? Does pursuit with a bicycle fall under this Order? How will foot pursuit be defined, and how will an officer know if they are in violation?

Although obvious, this Commission must be reminded that everything law enforcement does is, by definition, dangerous, and our highly trained SFPD knows how to intelligently pursue criminals while keeping themselves and the public safe. It’s the very nature of their job. Chief Scott, his officers, and our legislators can and should be the ones to establish the threshold of risk for police officers and how to mitigate it. San Francisco does not need this untrained Commission sitting comfortably at their desks to create a theoretical policy to replace our officers’ personal judgment in real-time about whether they should run after a suspect. The very suggestion that this Commission is better positioned to spell out what should happen in a foot pursuit would be comical if it were not such a threat to public

safety.

DGO 5.25 begs a very dangerous question...what will prevent this anti-law enforcement Commission from using "officer safety" as grounds to stop the police department from enforcing all laws? Is your plan to policy the SFPD out of existence on the basis of "officer safety?" By using "concern for officer safety" as a justification for barring our SFPD from pursuing criminal suspects in any manner, you are effectively laying the groundwork for the excuse of "officer safety" to create future policies prohibiting the SFPD from performing any and every task they are legally allowed and required to perform. Yesterday, it was car pursuits. Today, it is foot pursuits. What will it be tomorrow? The Police Commission is not authorized to decide if and what laws get enforced, and you are not imbued with the authority to effectively nullify our police department.

Disguising this ill-conceived, legally unsound policy under the false narrative of "officer safety," with not a shred of empirical data related to officer safety during foot pursuits, is an offensive and brazenly arrogant dereliction of duty by this Police Commission. DGO 5.05 already hampers the ability of our officers to pursue and detain suspects. 5.25, coupled with DGO 5.05, now makes ALL pursuit and subsequent arrests nearly impossible, allowing for criminals to flee and avoid apprehension. DGO 5.25 is unnecessary, baseless, dangerous, and lacks common sense. This is the very definition of Commission overreach and the very opposite of ensuring public safety, and I urge you to abandon further action on this Order.

---

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** 2 Letters regarding SFPD DGO 9.07  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 2:05:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [2 Letters regarding SFPD DGO 9.07.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see attached for 2 letters regarding SFPD Department General Order 9.07, Curtailing the Use of Pretext Stops.

Sincerely,

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



**From:** [Alison Goh](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#); [CMS, SFDPA \(DPA\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [LWVSF Advocacy](#)  
**Subject:** Police Commission, Department General Order 9.07 - Meet & Confer Delays Are Unacceptable  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 1:09:08 PM

---

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

Dear Mayor, Chief of Police, Department of Police Accountability, and Board of Supervisors,

In January 2023, the San Francisco Police Commission voted to prohibit racially-biased traffic stops. Over 7 months later, the policy has yet to be implemented and the Police Commission has not brought the policy back for its second and final vote. Instead, it's been allowed to languish in negotiations between the Commission and the Police Officer's Association. San Francisco over-polices communities of color via pretextual stops, which involve racial profiling scenarios such as stopping someone for something like an air freshener hanging from a rearview mirror as a pretext to question and search the person.

Why is DGO 9.07 still in meet and confer seven months later?

Since 2018, SFPD has stopped Black people at least six times the rate of white people, searched Black people at least 10 times the rate of white people, and were at least 12 times more likely to use force on Black people than white people. Each time the Police Commission meets and does not bring the policy back for final approval, it allows harm against communities of color to continue.

There has been plenty of time to reach agreement and move forward. That is why I am asking you to use your influence to ask for DGO 9.07 to be brought back for a final vote and implementation at the next Police Commission meeting.

I am also sending a message to the Police Commission.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Alison

---

Alison Goh  
President  
[president@lwvsf.org](mailto:president@lwvsf.org)  
*pronouns: she/her*

**League of Women Voters of San Francisco**  
582 Market Street, Suite 615, San Francisco, CA 94104  
415-989-8683 • [Facebook](#) • [Twitter](#)  
**Empowering voters. Defending democracy.** Learn more at [lwvsf.org](https://lwvsf.org).

**From:** [Jennifer Waggoner](#)  
**To:** [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [CMS, SFDPA \(DPA\)](#)  
**Subject:** Police Commission, Department General Order 9.07 - Meet & Confer Delays Are Unacceptable  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 11:24:16 AM

---

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

Dear Mayor, Chief & Board of Supervisors,

Why is DGO 9.07 still in meet and confer seven months later?

In January 2023, the San Francisco Police Commission voted to prohibit racially-biased traffic stops. Today, over 7 months later, the policy still has not been implemented. The Police Commission never brought the policy back for its second and final vote. Instead, it's been allowed to languish in negotiations between the Commission and the Police Officer's Association. San Francisco over-polices communities of color via pretextual stops, which involve racial profiling scenarios such as stopping someone for something like an air freshener hanging from a rearview mirror as a pretext to question and search the person.

Since 2018, SFPD has stopped Black people at least six times the rate of white people, searched Black people at least 10 times the rate of white people, and were at least 12 times more likely to use force on Black people than white people. Each time the Police Commission meets and does not bring the policy back for final approval, it allows harm against communities of color to continue.

There has been plenty of time to reach agreement and move forward. **That is why I am asking you to use your influence to ask for DGO 9.07 to be brought back for a final vote and implementation at the next Police Commission meeting.**

I am also sending a message to the Police Commission.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

-JDub

Jennifer "JDub" Waggoner ([she/her or they/them](#))  
LWV San Francisco member interested in [policing practices](#)  
[jdublww@gmail.com](mailto:jdublww@gmail.com)  
Skype jwaggo or +1-415-644-5094

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** 30 Letters regarding Supervisor Dorsey"s request concerning taxpayer-funded legal council  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 2:24:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [30 Letters regarding Supervisor Dorsey"s request concerning taxpayer-funded legal council.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see attached for 30 letters regarding Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for the study of drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.

Sincerely,

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

**From:** [Thomas Henderson](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 11:12:24 AM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      Thomas Henderson  
Email                              t.stephen.henderson@gmail.com  
I live in District              District 1

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [Susan McDonough](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 10:35:04 AM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      Susan McDonough  
Email                              susan@mcdfaa.com  
I live in District              District 1

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [Peter Anderson](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 9:22:41 AM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      Peter Anderson

Email      [findflowform@gmail.com](mailto:findflowform@gmail.com)

I live in District      [District 1](#)

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."



Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [LAUREN PIERIK](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 4:51:58 AM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      **LAUREN PIERIK**

Email                              [laurenpierik@yahoo.com](mailto:laurenpierik@yahoo.com)

I live in District              **District 8**

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [Gnarity Burke](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 10:50:37 PM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      Gnarity Burke

Email      urban42n81@gmail.com

I live in District      District 5

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [Ann Poletti](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 10:20:48 PM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      Ann Poletti  
Email                              annpoletti@gmail.com  
I live in District              District 1

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [Jennifer Kriz](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 10:14:33 PM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      Jennifer Kriz

Email      [jenniferkriz@sbcglobal.net](mailto:jenniferkriz@sbcglobal.net)

I live in District      [District 1](#)

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."



Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [Solange Levy](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 8:25:49 PM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      Solange Levy

Email      [solange94121@hotmail.com](mailto:solange94121@hotmail.com)

I live in District      [District 1](#)

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [Tamara Greenberg](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 8:13:31 PM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      Tamara Greenberg  
Email      tamaragreenberg@gmail.com  
I live in District      [District 2](#)

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [Ron Lee](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:22:33 PM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      **Ron Lee**

Email                              [rlee288@aol.com](mailto:rlee288@aol.com)

I live in District              [District 8](#)

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [JeNeal Granieri](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 8:04:59 PM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      JeNeal Granieri

Email                              jenealann@att.net

I live in District              District 7

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."



Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [Donna Crowder](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 7:19:54 PM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      Donna Crowder  
Email                              dona@donacrowder.com  
I live in District              [District 8](#)

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [Ali Mandvi](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 6:13:58 PM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      Ali Mandvi  
Email                              samali48@yahoo.com  
I live in District              District 6

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [Diane Sargent](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 3:39:15 PM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      Diane Sargent

Email      [diane.sargent@gmail.com](mailto:diane.sargent@gmail.com)

I live in District      [District 1](#)

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Sincerely,  
Diane Sargent  
District 1 resident and engaged voter

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

---

**From:** [Michael Anders](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 2:42:27 PM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      Michael Anders

Email                              mja712@gmail.com

I live in District              District 5

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."



Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [Donna Hurowitz](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 1:21:11 PM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      Donna Hurowitz

Email      donnabhurowitz@comcast.net

I live in District      District 4

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [Linda Showaihat](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:40:58 PM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent Linda Showaihat

Email [linda@lsdds.com](mailto:linda@lsdds.com)

I live in District [District 7](#)

**I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message: Dear Supervisors,

PLEASE STOP THE MADNESS AND SAVE OUR CITY. I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office. As we have seen in the past under Jeff Adachi, we know something is amiss in that department.

Remember he died on a Friday with alcohol, cocaine, edibles and two "friends"! Was that a present for the free legal representation he was giving!

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to

legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our “Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects).”

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties’ standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst’s report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender’s office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [Arjun Banker](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:53:20 AM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      Arjun Banker

Email      [arjunbanker@gmail.com](mailto:arjunbanker@gmail.com)

I live in District      [District 8](#)

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [Ari Kanter](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:34:17 AM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      Ari Kanter  
Email                              arikanter@gmail.com  
I live in District              District 1

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."



Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [Donna Brown](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:31:06 AM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      Donna Brown

Email      donna.brown05@gmail.com

I live in District      [District 7](#)

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [Sunita Giri](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:26:30 AM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      Sunita Giri

Email      [sunita.pradhan.giri@gmail.com](mailto:sunita.pradhan.giri@gmail.com)

I live in District      [District 1](#)

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [William Muits](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:20:55 AM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent William Muits  
Email [billmuits@gmail.com](mailto:billmuits@gmail.com)  
I live in District [District 4](#)

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [Karen Schwartz](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:20:55 AM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      Karen Schwartz

Email      [kielygomes@yahoo.com](mailto:kielygomes@yahoo.com)

I live in District      [District 8](#)

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."



Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [david bancroft](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:10:39 AM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      david bancroft

Email      [sfdavidbancroft@gmail.com](mailto:sfdavidbancroft@gmail.com)

I live in District      [District 2](#)

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [Barbara Seegal](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:01:04 AM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      Barbara Seegal  
Email                              barsee28@gmail.com  
I live in District              [District 2](#)

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [samuel manzano](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:55:53 AM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      **samuel manzano**

Email      [sman94121@gmail.com](mailto:sman94121@gmail.com)

I live in District      **District 7**

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [Christina Tucker](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:55:49 AM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      Christina Tucker

Email                              ctucker.0306@gmail.com

I live in District              District 5

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."



Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [Sebastiano Scarampi](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:55:41 AM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      Sebastiano Scarampi

Email      [scarampi@gmail.com](mailto:scarampi@gmail.com)

I live in District      [District 2](#)

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [Arnold Cohn](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:50:09 AM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      Arnold Cohn  
Email                              sfamc2@gmail.com  
I live in District              District 2

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

In addition, San Francisco's policy of not deporting any non U.S. citizen convicted of drug dealing totally wrong. This policy results in more deaths of U.S. citizens because of their drug usage.

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

---

**From:** [Shea English](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:43:20 AM

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors

From your constituent      Shea English

Email                              shea@sheaenglish.com

I live in District              [District 3](#)

### **I support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel.**

Message:

Dear Supervisors,

I write to support Supervisor Matt Dorsey's request for an investigation of wealthy drug dealing defendants' eligibility for taxpayer-funded legal counsel from the S.F. Public Defender's Office.

Some current and former drug dealers recently told the San Francisco Chronicle that "they can make as much as \$350,000 a year – or even more if they help run a local operation." And it's tax-free.

Supervisor Dorsey is seeking information on policies and processes in our city's judiciary and criminal justice system to determine whether criminal defendants are eligible for free legal counsel funded by San Francisco taxpayers.

While criminal suspects have a constitutional right to legal counsel, there is no legal right to a publicly funded attorney for suspects who can afford to pay.

In fact, Section 6.104 of the San Francisco Charter explicitly states only that our "Public Defender shall, upon the request of an accused who is financially unable to employ counsel, or upon order of the Court ... defend criminal (suspects)."

Drug dealing is a plague on our city, and every legal tool available must be employed to fight the scourge of fentanyl and other deadly drugs, which are on pace to kill a record number of people in San Francisco.

I urge you to support this investigation and public hearings into how eligibility for free legal assistance is determined in San Francisco, including the study of other California counties' standards and implementation approaches.

Would you also let me know whether you support such public hearings and investigations? And if the results of the Budget Analyst's report turn out to confirm the fact that rich drug dealers are likely being represented by the Public Defender's office, would you support legislation to reduce or end this misuse of taxpayer funds?

Cc: District Attorney Brooke Jenkins  
Mayor London Breed

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** FW: People living on my sidewalk  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 2:35:00 PM

---

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Philip Kuttner regarding homelessness on Bartlett Street.

Sincerely,

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

---

**From:** Philip Kuttner <philkuttner@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 16, 2023 9:09 PM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** People living on my sidewalk

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

Dear Board of Supervisors:

Four people have been living with piles of junk on the sidewalk at 321 Bartlett Street for a week. I saw some outreach people talking to them a few days ago but they are still here. Please take steps to remove them as soon as possible. Thank you for your cooperation.

Philip Kuttner  
363 Bartlett St #5







Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** FW: JFK Drive  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 2:37:00 PM

---

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Michael Meiktas regarding John F. Kennedy Drive.

Sincerely,

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

---

**From:** Michael Meiktas <Michael.Meiktas.497171867@p2a.co>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 18, 2023 6:47 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** JFK Drive

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The current closure of JFK Drive severely impacts people with disabilities, seniors, and communities not directly neighboring Golden Gate Park.

As we emerge from COVID, it's time to reopen JFK Drive. Golden Gate Park belongs to the people of San Francisco, not just a few.

I strongly encourage you to support JFK Drive returning to the conditions pre-COVID, with all roadways open to vehicle traffic and street closures on Sundays, holidays and Saturdays, 6 months of the year.

Regards,  
Michael Meiktas

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** 2 Letters from Mira Martin-Parker  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 2:42:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [2 Letters from Mira Martin-Parker.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see attached for 2 letters from Mira Martin-Parker regarding various topics.

Sincerely,

**Joe Adkins**

**Office of the Clerk of the Board**

**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**

**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**

**San Francisco, CA 94102**

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

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

**From:** [Mira Martin-Parker](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Three rubles  
**Date:** Saturday, September 16, 2023 9:29:30 AM

---

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

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

**From:** **Mira Martin-Parker** <[tartarthistle@gmail.com](mailto:tartarthistle@gmail.com)>  
**Date:** Sat, Sep 16, 2023 at 9:21 AM  
**Subject:** Three rubles  
**To:** <[gkelly@sfstandard.com](mailto:gkelly@sfstandard.com)>  
**Cc:** tips <[tips@missionlocal.com](mailto:tips@missionlocal.com)>, [tips@missionlocal.com](mailto:tips@missionlocal.com) <[cgraf@sfexaminer.com](mailto:cgraf@sfexaminer.com)>, <[tips@sfstandard.com](mailto:tips@sfstandard.com)>, <[tips@sfist.com](mailto:tips@sfist.com)>, Tim Redmond <[tim@48hills.org](mailto:tim@48hills.org)>, <[blogger@nakedcapitalism.com](mailto:blogger@nakedcapitalism.com)>, editor <[editor@sfbayview.com](mailto:editor@sfbayview.com)>, Michael Durand <[Editor@richmondsunsetnews.com](mailto:Editor@richmondsunsetnews.com)>, letters <[letters@nytimes.com](mailto:letters@nytimes.com)>, letters <[letters@sfexaminer.com](mailto:letters@sfexaminer.com)>

Tell this poor student the next time this happens, give the officer at the front desk three rubles. He'll spring to life like a Jack-in-the box and have the goods returned to his doorstep the same afternoon.

Has he never dealt with American Cossacks before?

## San Francisco Filmmaker Blasts Cops After Tracking \$24K of Stolen Gear to Alleged Fencing Operation

Written by [George Kelly](#) Published Sep. 15, 2023 • 12:19pm

“When I said [an address on] Leavenworth [in the Tenderloin], he said, ‘Oh, yeah, that’s a known major fencing operation,’ and my head exploded,” Schuck said.



**From:** [Mira Martin-Parker](#)  
**To:** [Tim Redmond](#); [info](#); [tips@sfstandard.com](mailto:tips@sfstandard.com); [michaelshellenberger@proton.me](mailto:michaelshellenberger@proton.me); [Michael Durand](#); [mickey@projectcensored.org](mailto:mickey@projectcensored.org); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [tips@missionlocal.com](mailto:tips@missionlocal.com); [tips@sfist.com](mailto:tips@sfist.com); [letters](#); [letters@kpfa.org](mailto:letters@kpfa.org)  
**Subject:** Is there even a left left in San Francisco?  
**Date:** Saturday, September 9, 2023 11:56:14 AM

---

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

So these right wing forces Tim refers to below must be within the Democratic Party (i.e. Gary Tan, Michael Moritz, etc). Are you ever going to write about that, Tim Redmond? Who is the right wing in San Francisco? And what is this "radical left" that people constantly claim is governing the city? There's only poor lone Dean Preston, and no offense to Dean, but I personally would describe his politics as moderate (I mean, REALLY moderate). The right wing you refer to is mainly in the Democratic Party. Is there even a meaningful left existing in San Francisco anymore? I mean actual RADICALS. Seems to me, there's just a handful of older activists barely hanging on, in rent-controlled apartments. There are young socialists, but these "socialists" are not even anti war and haven't too much to say about the radical income inequality existing in the City. This is primarily a radical right wing city. And it's the Democratic Party that governs it. Former Governor Moonbeam is right wing now. He simply IS. Pretty much all of the old left has morphed into war mongers, property owners, and bizarre libertarian tech cult fanatics. Will you write about this? Will anyone?

Are we allowed to psychologically acknowledge this glaring truth, or does the Party forbid that? Thought crime?

This is flaccid. Pathetic. Unworthy of even being considered politics. It's sheer force. Brutality. It's not politics.

## **The right-wing forces can't blame their DA or their mayor, so they are attacking judges**

Ousting Chesa Boudin and creating a new War on Drugs isn't working, so now they are seeking someone else to blame



By [Tim Redmond](#)  
September 7, 2023

**From:** [Monica D](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#); [District Attorney, \(DAT\)](#); [senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [gavin.newsom@gov.ca.gov](#); [assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov](#)  
**Subject:** Ferris wheel  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 12:30:16 AM

---

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

No one wants to go to Fisherman's Wharf if your car is going to get broken into and your things are going to be stolen! So save taxpayers money on this stupid move! Duh!



San Francisco Wants To Move Golden Gate Park's Ferris Wheel  
[sfstandard.com](#)

**2024**, here we come!

~ livid SF taxpayer/voter  
(TRANSpartying)

**From:** [Monica D](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#); [District Attorney \(DAT\)](#); [senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [gavin.newsom@gov.ca.gov](#); [assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov](#)  
**Subject:** Safety first  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 9:29:16 AM

---

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

I have a grand slam idea! MAKE SAN FRANCISCO SAFE AGAIN FIRST! Nobody is going to go out there if they expect to get mugged, robbed, or killed by your criminals! It's that SIMPLE!



Empty Downtown San Francisco Space Becomes Art Oasis  
[sfstandard.com](#)

**2024**, here we come!

~ livid SF taxpayer/voter  
(TRANSpartying)



**From:** [Monica D](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#); [District Attorney, \(DAT\)](#); [senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [gavin.newsom@gov.ca.gov](#); [assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov](#)  
**Subject:** Gavin Newsom & retail theft  
**Date:** Friday, September 15, 2023 7:58:09 PM

---

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

Newsom announced a new \$267 million investment to combat crime!!! That's \$267 M of our tax money, peeps! Newsom shouldn't have signed all these pro-criminal bills into law, then he wouldn't have to be throwing \$267 M of our tax \$ to solve this problem that he created! Oh and he does this right before the election, trying to pretend to work? LOL.



San Francisco awarded more than \$17M to help fight organized retail crime  
[abc7news.com](#)

**2024**, here we come!

~ livid SF taxpayer/voter  
(TRANSpartying)

**From:** [Monica D](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#); [District Attorney, \(DAT\)](#); [senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [gavin.newsom@gov.ca.gov](#); [assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov](#)  
**Subject:** Sharon Lai  
**Date:** Friday, September 15, 2023 7:46:34 PM

---

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

We are NOT voting for another woke board of supe, Sharon Lai. Having someone like “F\*ck the Police” Sandra Fewer, and just as woke as Commie Connie Chan and Myrna Melgar behind her says it all— all were in support of fraudster Chesa Boudin. Asians nowadays are NOT voting for her just coz she’s Asian— get that in your thick heads.



Former SF Transit Official Runs for Downtown District Supervisor  
[sfstandard.com](http://sfstandard.com)

**2024**, here we come!

~ livid SF taxpayer/voter  
(TRANSpartying)

**From:** [Monica D](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [SFPD, Chief \(POL\)](#); [District Attorney, \(DAT\)](#); [senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov](#); [Elias, Cindy \(POL\)](#); [Carter-Oberstone, Max \(POL\)](#); [Yee, Larry \(POL\)](#); [Byrne, Jim \(POL\)](#); [Yanez, Jesus \(POL\)](#); [Benedicto, Kevin \(POL\)](#); [Walker, Debra \(POL\)](#); [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#); [gavin.newsom@gov.ca.gov](#); [assemblymember.ting@assembly.ca.gov](#)  
**Subject:** Retail theft  
**Date:** Friday, September 15, 2023 5:14:56 PM  
**Attachments:** [Screenshot-2023-09-15-at-1.14.18-PM.png](#)

---

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

Well, TGIF!



Vehicle Smashes Through San Francisco CVS in Brazen Robbery Attempt  
[sfstandard.com](#)

**2024**, here we come!

~ livid SF taxpayer/voter  
(TRANSpartying)

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** 75 Letters regarding Vehicular Turns at Red Lights  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 2:48:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [75 Letters regarding turns on red lights.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see attached for 75 letters regarding vehicular turns at red lights.

Sincerely,

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

**From:** [Ariana Austin](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 11:58:48 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Ariana Austin  
ariana.austin@gmail.com  
377 Noe Street  
San Francisco, California 94114



**From:** [James Rhoads](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 11:44:55 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

James Rhoads  
jr1945j@aol.com  
83 DOWNEY STREET  
San Francisco, California 94117





**From:** [Michael Hawley](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 11:38:35 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco.

Although I no longer live in San Francisco, I did live there for 43 years (1975 to 2018). During that time I was struck by cars twice as a pedestrian. Both times it was because drivers making a right hand turn were so focused on oncoming traffic from the left, they neglected to look right to see if anyone was in the crosswalk crossing the street. Both times I had the green light/walk sign.

Thank you,

Michael Hawley  
michaelhawley53@gmail.com  
7132 W Butte Ln  
Boise City, Idaho 83704



**From:** [Terry Holtz](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 11:31:07 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Terry Holtz  
terry.holtz@gmail.com  
361 Duncan St  
San Francisco, California 94131



**From:** [Matthew Ringard](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 11:07:09 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Matthew Ringard  
District 8 Resident, San Francisco

Matthew Ringard  
[matt.ringard@gmail.com](mailto:matt.ringard@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94114



**From:** [MAHDI SALMANI RAHIMI](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 11:02:12 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

MAHDI SALMANI RAHIMI  
m.s.rahimi@gmail.com  
521 ELLSWORTH ST  
San Francisco, California 94110





**From:** [Nathan Spindel](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 10:56:41 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Nathan Spindel  
nathans@gmail.com  
10 Grossland Way  
Petaluma, California 94952



**From:** [Natasha Avery](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 9:13:45 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Natasha Avery  
natashagavery@gmail.com  
520 Eugenia Ave  
San Francisco, California 94110



**From:** [Michael Christensen](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 9:06:20 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Michael Christensen  
machristensen23@outlook.com  
193 Hartford Street  
San Francisco, California 94114-2554



**From:** [Shaw Yu](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 8:48:17 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Shaw Yu  
shaw.yu@gmail.com  
3500 Market St #303  
San Francisco, California 94131





**From:** [Roderick Lemaire](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 7:57:49 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Roderick Lemaire  
james.roderick.lemaire@gmail.com  
3685 17th St #12  
San Francisco, California 94114



**From:** [Aaron Baucom](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 7:43:24 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Aaron Baucom  
aaronbaucom@gmail.com  
1434 28th Ave  
San Francisco, California 94122



**From:** [Brian Tobin](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 7:40:14 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Brian Tobin  
coffee5012@gmail.com  
406 Buchanan  
San Francisco, California 94102



**From:** [Agnieszka Krajewska](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 7:39:15 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco.

In addition to all the good reasons laid out below, this one is personal for me. I've had many close calls crossing the street when I had the light and right turning drivers, focused on the car cross traffic didn't see me and nearly hit me, in neighborhoods where I've lived and worked in San Francisco over the last 22 years, but especially downtown and in the Mission. I've witnessed it happen to even more people. And I've seen a bicyclist with the right of way struck by a turning car on Valencia and 24th, an upsetting memory I'm unlikely to ever forget.

No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Agnieszka Krajewska

rubrics-crasser.09@icloud.com

55 28th Street

San Francisco, California 94110



**From:** [Andrea Steele](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 7:30:09 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Andrea Steele  
adsteele2020@gmail.com  
746 Portola Street, A  
San Francisco, California 94129



**From:** [Ben Durbin](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 7:29:35 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Ben Durbin  
bpdurbin@gmail.com  
2944 Judah Street  
San Francisco, California 94122



**From:** [Gregory Bodin](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 7:27:38 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Gregory Bodin  
gregbodin@gmail.com  
3685 17th St Apt 12  
San Francisco, California 94114



**From:** [Alexandra Ulmer](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 7:14:44 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Alexandra Ulmer  
alexandra.ulmer@gmail.com  
11 Divisadero Street  
San Francisco, California 94117





**From:** [Sarah Maloney](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 6:18:30 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Sarah Maloney  
[forgottenfootprints@gmail.com](mailto:forgottenfootprints@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94107



**From:** [Christopher Romp](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 11:13:25 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,  
Chris Romp

Christopher Romp  
[chrisromp@gmail.com](mailto:chrisromp@gmail.com)  
718 15th Ave  
San Francisco, California 94118



**From:** [Patricia Toy](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 5:42:15 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Patricia Toy  
patriciatoy@yahoo.com  
570 Beale Street  
San Francisco, California 94105



**From:** [Jonathan Dirrenberger](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 5:40:27 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Jonathan Dirrenberger  
[jonathan.dirrenberger@gmail.com](mailto:jonathan.dirrenberger@gmail.com)  
3528 22nd St  
San Francisco, California 94114





**From:** [Tommaso Boggia](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 5:08:54 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

Hi!

I live in Oakland so you don't owe me anything as a constituent, but I love San Francisco and would visit a lot more often if:

- A. I could get there and back without panicking about BART times either because BART runs longer hours or because you finally build a Bay Bridge bike lane.
- B. Getting around while in the city wasn't the most dangerous urban riding I ever do.

Stopping cars from turning on red would be a game-changer in forcing drivist to wait a second and pay attention to the intersection they are in. It's rare these days to see a drivist who isn't looking at their phone while driving these days which, combined with larger and larger vehicles, means you have a lot of squishy humans under needlessly large tanks driven by people who just have to send that text message.

But I digress, please start caring about people walking around and enjoying your city and stop focusing every single decision through the lens of VROOOM VROOOM BEEP BEEP.

Tommaso Boggia  
tboggia@gmail.com  
248 Third Street #616  
Oakland, California 94607



**From:** [Anthony Perry](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 4:31:37 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Anthony Perry  
perryanthonyj@gmail.com  
1669 Motta Street  
Woodland, California 95776



**From:** [allison arieff](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 4:30:44 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Allison Arieff

allison arieff  
aja@modernhouse.com  
2 Roanoke Street  
san francisco , California 94131



**From:** [David Miller](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 4:29:07 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

David Miller  
[dwarnermiller@gmail.com](mailto:dwarnermiller@gmail.com)  
215 1/2 Fair Oaks Street  
San Francisco, California 94110





**From:** [Jason Dewees](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 4:26:50 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am a daily driver writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Jason Dewees  
[jjuania@yahoo.com](mailto:jjuania@yahoo.com)  
1326 - 6th Avenue  
San Francisco, California 94122



**From:** [Patrick Linehan](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 4:12:37 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,  
Patrick

Patrick Linehan  
[plinehan@plinehan.com](mailto:plinehan@plinehan.com)  
251 Foerster St  
San Francisco, California 94112



**From:** [Karolina Zatz](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 4:07:28 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Karolina Zatz  
karolinazatz@gmail.com  
28 Alma St  
San Francisco, California 94117



**From:** [Donald Robertson](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 3:32:57 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Donald Robertson  
DonaldFR@DonaldFRobertson.com  
255A Henry Street  
San Francisco, California 94114-1231





**From:** [Tyler Moselle](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 1:58:54 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,  
Tyler

Tyler Moselle  
[tyleranneliese@gmail.com](mailto:tyleranneliese@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94103



**From:** [John Kim](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 1:51:37 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

John Kim  
[jfk3va@gmail.com](mailto:jfk3va@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94158



**From:** [Will Ashley](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 1:46:54 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Will Ashley  
willashley23@gmail.com  
3470 20th St, #2  
San Francisco, California 94110



**From:** [Amy O'Hair](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 12:08:15 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,  
Amy O'Hair

Amy O'Hair  
[amyohair@ohair-sherman.com](mailto:amyohair@ohair-sherman.com)  
432 Flood Avenue  
San Francisco, California 94112-1335





**From:** [Ryan James](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 11:35:50 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,  
Ryan James

Ryan James  
[ryanwilsonjames@gmail.com](mailto:ryanwilsonjames@gmail.com)  
4118 Montgomery St  
Oakland, California 94611



**From:** [Kay Hoskins](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 11:33:06 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Kay Hoskins  
kayhoskins66@gmail.com  
353 Church Street  
San Francisco, California 94114



**From:** [Adrian Daub](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 9:44:52 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Adrian Daub  
adrian.daub@gmail.com  
3887 17th Street  
San Francisco, California 94114



**From:** [Jackie Bona](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:24:20 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Jackie Bona  
jackiebona@gmail.com  
1732 fell st  
San Francisco, California 94117





**From:** [Mariana Prutton](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 6:30:45 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Mariana Prutton  
marprutton@gmail.com  
98 Stoneman St  
San Francisco, California 94110



**From:** [Daniel Rechtschaffen](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 4:06:56 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Daniel Rechtschaffen  
[drechtsc@gmail.com](mailto:drechtsc@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94118



**From:** [Amanda Lopez](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 3:40:46 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Amanda Lopez  
amandaklopez117@gmail.com  
2297 E Cromwell Ave  
Fresno, California 93720



**From:** [Tyler Goodman](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:34:26 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Personally, i've had cars creep up on my ankles as they try to make a turn on a red. This makes me feel incredibly unsafe, especially when i'm walking my dog - which many cars in SF have come close to hitting as they try to make the turn as fast as they can.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Tyler Goodman  
tygoodman@protonmail.com  
793 S Van Ness Ave, Apt 307  
San Francisco, California 94110





**From:** [Leslie Ernst](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:16:58 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Leslie Ernst  
leslieernst@gmail.com  
119 Germania st  
San Francisco, California 94117



**From:** [Simranjit Chadha](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:54:32 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Simranjit Chadha  
simranjit06@gmail.com  
410 Scott St  
San Francisco, California 94117



**From:** [L.A. Nelson](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:43:25 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

L.A. Nelson  
intomykitchen@yahoo.com  
1501 Lincoln Way  
San Francisco, California 94122



**From:** [L.A. Nelson](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 11:37:18 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

L.A. Nelson  
intomykitchen@yahoo.com  
1501 Lincoln Way  
San Francisco, California 94122





**From:** [Philip Meserve Platt](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:40:32 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Philip Meserve Platt  
meservep@gmail.com  
1271 Church Street  
San Francisco, California 94114



**From:** [Rita Devlin](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:37:02 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Rita Devlin & family

Rita Devlin  
[rita.devlin.marier@gmail.com](mailto:rita.devlin.marier@gmail.com)  
84 webster, san francisco  
San Francisco, California 94117



**From:** [Megha Mehrotra](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:05:48 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Megha Mehrotra  
[mlmehrotra@gmail.com](mailto:mlmehrotra@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94117



**From:** [Matthew Garza](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 9:40:58 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

As an avid runner and cyclist here in San Francisco, I love being able to enjoy our beautiful city each and every day. When we implemented Slow Streets during the COVID-19 pandemic, I feel like for the first time in my life, I saw just how incredible pedestrian-focused initiatives could be at building community, making our city safer, and encouraging people to get outside and get moving. No Turn On Red could be our next step to making more of this a permanent reality for this amazing city we all get to call home.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,  
Matthew

Matthew Garza  
[matthewgarza98@gmail.com](mailto:matthewgarza98@gmail.com)

973 Haight St., Apt 6  
San Francisco, California 94117



**From:** [Maxwell Gara](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 8:37:08 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Maxwell Gara  
maxwell.gara@gmail.com  
638 Kains Ave  
Albany, California 94706



**From:** [Elizabeth Strand](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 8:28:05 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Elizabeth Strand  
sfragazza@me.com  
221 24th Ave Apt 202  
San Francisco, California 94121



**From:** [Jonathan Gaul](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 8:06:32 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Jonathan Gaul  
jonbeesh@gmail.com  
117a Bartlett st  
San Francisco, California 94110



**From:** [Sameer Manek](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 9:15:04 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Sameer Manek  
sameer.manek@gmail.com  
1714 Bryant St  
San Francisco, California 94110





**From:** [Eugene Gregor](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 9:02:54 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I write to support no turn on red signs implementation throughout SF as soon as practicable.

I also note for you that the compromise 6/30/24 implementation date for ab43 speed limit reductions by right is fast approaching.

Fulton street along the park should be posted as 25 mph immediately on July 1, 2024. What are the city authorities doing now to make this happen?

Just this afternoon there was a collision at 11th avenue and Fulton intersection that would have been ameliorated or avoided if traffic on Fulton was not regularly exceeding 40 mph.

Best regards.

ECG

Eugene Gregor  
eugene.gregor650@gmail.com  
771 11th avenue  
San Francisco, California 94118



**From:** [Akshaya Natarajan](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 8:50:46 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Akshaya Natarajan  
akshaya.natarajan495@gmail.com  
923 Fulton  
San Francisco, California 94117



**From:** [Joey Kotfica](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 7:46:39 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Joey Kotfica  
[j\\_kotfica@yahoo.com](mailto:j_kotfica@yahoo.com)

San Francisco, California 94117



**From:** [Lizzie Siegle](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 6:07:22 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Lizzie Siegle  
[lizzie.siegle@gmail.com](mailto:lizzie.siegle@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94108





**From:** [Peter Robinett](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 4:39:04 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Peter Robinett  
[peter@robinett.us](mailto:peter@robinett.us)  
888 Haight St  
San Francisco, California 94117



**From:** [Felix Sargent](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 4:36:47 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Felix Sargent  
felix.sargent@gmail.com  
6 Ramona Ave  
San Francisco, California 94103-2215



**From:** [Jonathan Tyburski](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 4:33:10 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Jonathan Tyburski  
[jtyburski@gmail.com](mailto:jtyburski@gmail.com)  
1849 Page Street  
San Francisco, California 94117



**From:** [Bradley Golden](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 4:21:02 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,  
Bradley

Bradley Golden  
[bradleyrgolden@gmail.com](mailto:bradleyrgolden@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94117





**From:** [Kunaal Mithal](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 4:16:24 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Kunaal Mithal  
kmithal14@gmail.com  
100 Van ness avenue  
San Francisco, California 94102



**From:** [Rangaraj Tirumalai](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 3:42:16 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Rangaraj Tirumalai  
rangaraj.t@gmail.com  
333 Haight St  
San Francisco, California 94102



**From:** [corbin muraro](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 3:07:51 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

corbin muraro  
corbinmuraro@gmail.com  
503 waller  
, California 94117



**From:** [kaylebarnes@gmail.com](mailto:kaylebarnes@gmail.com)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 2:35:42 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

kaylebarnes@gmail.com  
1855 Turk Street #9  
San Francisco, California 94115





**From:** [Stephanie Kuyper](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 2:35:30 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Stephanie Kuyper  
Skuyper11@gmail.com  
1514 Pershing St  
San Francisco, California 94129



**From:** [Evan Goldin](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 2:34:36 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Evan Goldin  
evan.goldin@gmail.com  
41 Federal St  
San Francisco, California 94107



**From:** [Susan Latham](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 10:30:00 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to STRONGLY urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Susan Latham  
[sdlatham@yahoo.com](mailto:sdlatham@yahoo.com)  
1965 PAGE STREET #301  
San Francisco, California 94117



**From:** [Kaly Trezos](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Sunday, September 17, 2023 10:54:14 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Kaly Trezos  
ktrezos@gmail.com  
27 Starview  
San Francisco, California 94131





**From:** [Aidan Mc Guire](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Saturday, September 16, 2023 6:58:29 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. I am born and raised in San Francisco but my family and I moved to Germany years ago. On my trip back to San Francisco to meet family and friends I have noticed how uncomfortable I felt with cars carelessly driving on the part of the road that I want to cross on, despite me having a green "Ampelmännchen" and them having a red light. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Aidan Mc Guire  
16aidanmcguire@gmail.com  
Mariposa  
Westerngrund, Bayern 63825



**From:** [Marc Haumann](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Saturday, September 16, 2023 10:26:21 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,  
Marc Haumann

Marc Haumann  
[marchaumann@gmail.com](mailto:marchaumann@gmail.com)  
439 Dolores St  
San Francisco, California 94110



**From:** [Eric Straw](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Friday, September 15, 2023 11:00:32 AM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Eric Straw  
eric.straw459@gmail.com  
4368 23rd St.  
San Francisco, California 94114



**From:** [Lauren Murdock](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street...  
**Date:** Thursday, September 14, 2023 11:24:33 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. No Turn On Red has been proven to increase safety — especially for families, seniors, and people living with disabilities — including where it's been implemented in San Francisco, notably throughout the Tenderloin. No Turn On Red also makes driving safer and more predictable for people who need to drive. Now is the time to approve and implement No Turn On Red citywide.

Our city faces a roadway safety crisis and our planet faces a climate crisis, both of which require making it safer to get around without a car and encouraging people to use public transportation and active transportation (e.g. walking, biking, scooting, skateboarding, mobility device, etc.). Implementing No Turn On Red citywide will help more people shift trips to walking, public transportation, and active transportation, and make the city safer for the people who get around those ways. We need your leadership to make this improvement.

I urge you to support and approve No Turn On Red citywide to increase safety and make it easier and less stressful to cross the street in San Francisco. Please do everything within your power to ensure No Turn On Red is implemented citywide as soon as possible.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,

Lauren Murdock  
murdock\_ls@hotmail.com  
3940 Via Lucero, Apt #16  
Santa Barbara, California 93110-1669





**From:** [Enja Titova](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please support and approve No Turn On Red citywide  
**Date:** Thursday, September 14, 2023 3:44:25 PM

---

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

The Board of Supervisors,

I've struggled for a very long time to write this email.

What do you say to convince someone that a 4-year old child dying in the middle of a city intersection is unacceptable? Why do you even have to convince someone in a position of making change?

It's time to mandate a No Turn on Red citywide policy in San Francisco.

I know each of you counts yourself a progressive. At the national level, we often point fingers at the other side when refuse to take action on gun safety, an issue that similarly harms and kills children. We tell them time and again: "when you didn't act after Sandy Hook, when you didn't act after 6-year olds were gunned down in their classroom, you showed us where your priorities lie."

What are you telling the residents of San Francisco when you allow a child to die and do nothing?

No Turn on Red is a policy that works other places. If it works in a place as busy as New York City, it can work in San Francisco on a citywide level.

Individual "no right on red" signs don't work. Drivers don't expect them and so they ignore them. I've sat at intersections like that. Drivers either ignore/don't see the sign and make the turn anyway. Or when the car in front of them observes it, they honk because they don't understand why someone is blocking the turn, creating immense peer pressure to violate the signal.

It's time to send a unified message: in San Francisco, you can't turn right on red.

To our city officials, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors: I urge you to vote on this issue immediately.

Supervisor Melgar, I look forward to hearing from your office directly.

For those of you in state-level office, please work on legislation to allow San Francisco to implement No Turn On Red without installing signs at every intersection, which would enable the City to implement No Turn On Red citywide faster at a significantly lower cost (in terms of both taxpayer dollars and staff time).

Thank you,  
Enia Titova  
San Francisco, District 7 resident

Enia Titova  
enia.titova@gmail.com  
821 Taraval St  
San Francisco, California 94116

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** 2 Letters regarding File No. 230986  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 2:53:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [2 Letters regarding File No. 230587.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see attached for 2 letters regarding File No. 230587.

Sincerely,

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

**From:** [My Huynh](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [sneighborhoodgroup@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** I oppose the plan to extend parking meter hours!  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 8:34:36 AM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA

From your constituent      My Huynh

Email      maycheung7@gmail.com

I live in District

### **I oppose the plan to extend parking meter hours!**

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor Breed, Mr. Tumlin and SFMTA Board Members,

I write to oppose the plan to extend parking meter hours and to support the Board of Supervisors' resolution 230587. Extending meter hours will negatively impact local businesses, discourage out-of-town visitors and add financial stress to local residents who already feel the instability and impact of an impending recession.

San Franciscans and tourists visit neighborhood business districts in the evenings to relax, unwind, and share a meal with their loved ones. Expanded parking meter hours will burden potential customers (especially seniors, the disabled, and families) with an additional cost, detracting from their overall enjoyment and inhibiting them from such activities.

Meter hours until 10pm will materially impact restaurant and retail workers who will be feeding meters and spending 2 to 3 times more on parking. Many service employees live outside San Francisco, and public transportation is frequently not an option.

If we want to boost our local economy and revitalize restaurants and tourist areas, we need to incentivize evening and Sunday customers, take care of workers, and not pile on additional costs at a time

when rents and the price of food and necessary items are already so high.

I sincerely hope the Board of Supervisors votes to reject this plan. Please consider the needs of our local businesses and residents, as well as the overall interests of San Francisco. Thank you for your careful consideration of this matter.

---

**From:** [Wen Lee](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [sneighborhoodgroup@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** I oppose the plan to extend parking meter hours!  
**Date:** Thursday, September 14, 2023 8:55:28 PM

---

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

## Message to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor and SFMTA

From your constituent      Wen Lee

Email      jello\_sabor@hotmail.com

I live in District

### **I oppose the plan to extend parking meter hours!**

Message:

Dear Supervisors, Mayor Breed, Mr. Tumlin and SFMTA Board Members,

I write to oppose the plan to extend parking meter hours and to support the Board of Supervisors' resolution 230587. Extending meter hours will negatively impact local businesses, discourage out-of-town visitors and add financial stress to local residents who already feel the instability and impact of an impending recession.

San Franciscans and tourists visit neighborhood business districts in the evenings to relax, unwind, and share a meal with their loved ones. Expanded parking meter hours will burden potential customers (especially seniors, the disabled, and families) with an additional cost, detracting from their overall enjoyment and inhibiting them from such activities.

Meter hours until 10pm will materially impact restaurant and retail workers who will be feeding meters and spending 2 to 3 times more on parking. Many service employees live outside San Francisco, and public transportation is frequently not an option.

If we want to boost our local economy and revitalize restaurants and tourist areas, we need to incentivize evening and Sunday customers, take care of workers, and not pile on additional costs at a time

when rents and the price of food and necessary items are already so high.

I sincerely hope the Board of Supervisors votes to reject this plan. Please consider the needs of our local businesses and residents, as well as the overall interests of San Francisco. Thank you for your careful consideration of this matter.

---

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** 3 Letters regarding the Landmarking of Sacred Heart Church  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 3:24:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [3 Letters regarding the Landmarking of Sacred Heart Church.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see attached for 3 letters regarding the landmarking of Sacred Heart Church.

Sincerely,

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



**From:** [Arthur Levy](#)  
**To:** [Matsuda, Diane \(CPC\)](#); [Nageswaran, Ruchira \(CPC\)](#); [Foley, Chris \(CPC\)](#); [Vergara, Robert \(CPC\)](#); [Wright, Jason \(CPC\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Ferguson, Shannon \(CPC\)](#); [San, William \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Francine Sosa-Lewis; ropritchard@gmail.com](#); [J T Elderkin](#); [merle easton](#); [Bertha Canty](#); [Sandra Finegan](#); [Bobby Fischer](#); [Patricia Welsh](#); [Julie Welsh](#); [Kendall Goh](#)  
**Subject:** Landmark Sacred Heart Church! 2015-005890DES, Hearing Sept. 20, 2023  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 7:58:59 AM

---

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

Dear Commissioners,

St. Peter and Paul Church in North Beach embodies the spirit and soul of Italian Catholic San Francisco.

Sacred Heart Church embodies the spirit and soul of Irish Catholic San Francisco.

Sacred Heart evokes a neighborhood, a community, a time and place in the City's history that is more than worthy of commemoration and celebration. Landmarking this architectural masterpiece falls short in that mission, but it is nevertheless a critical recognition of a community of San Franciscans who lived, worked, and prayed in the Western Addition.

Once landmarked, the spire of Sacred Heart will announce to the world that San Francisco has not forgotten them.

Respectfully,

Arthur Levy

Arthur D. Levy  
3950 Broadway  
Suite 200  
Oakland, California 94611  
Telephone: (415) 702-4551  
Facsimile: (415) 814-4080

**From:** [merle easton](#)  
**To:** [Ferguson, Shannon \(CPC\)](#); [San, William \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Francine Sosa-Lewis](#); [Robert O. Pritchard](#); [Arthur Levy](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Support the Designation of Sacred Heart Parish Complex as a Landmark  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 4:54:10 PM

---

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

September 19, 2023

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall  
San Francisco, CA

Re: Support the Designation of Sacred Heart Parish Complex as a Landmark

We have been waiting a long time and are thrilled that this designation will come before before your Board tomorrow.

I have been involved with the Sacred Heart Church professionally as an architect since 2004 and also, personally before and since as a community member. I live in the Western Addition neighborhood District 5.

In 2004-05 I recruited structural engineers to voluntarily tour the church building with me and be available to advise and assess the cost of a structural retrofit. Four engineers responded and we inspected it from basement and crawl space to the attic and top of campanile. It is an amazing building with a rich cultural and architectural history.

When the Church was closed in 2005 a group of us formed "Save Our Sacred Heart" advocacy group to keep the community informed and to seek Historic Preservation for the building and it's treasures. City Landmark Designation was one of our primary goals. We attended many meetings of the HPC which recommended it to your Board for adoption in 2018.

In 2010 Christopher Ver Planck wrote the nomination for The Register of National Landmark Status, which went to Sacramento in front of the State Historical Resources Commission. It was designated Eligible for National Register for Historic Places. Your approval will protect this complex for the City and Nation. Thank you!!

I strongly urge you to support this designation of the Sacred Heart Complex as a City Landmark!

Merle Lynn Easton, AIA, Architect  
1132 Broderick St.

San Francisco, CA 94115

**From:** [Francine Sosa-Lewis](#)  
**To:** [Ferguson, Shannon \(CPC\)](#); [San, William \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Designation of Sacred Heart Parish Complex as a Landmark  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 2:21:15 PM  
**Attachments:** [Sacred Heart Last Mass \(1\).mov](#)

---

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

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors and Historic Preservation Commission,

I am writing to passionately recommend the designation of the Sacred Heart Parish Complex, particularly the Sacred Heart Church, as an individual landmark within our beloved community. The Sacred Heart Church holds a profound significance in the history and development of the Western Addition, and it stands as a symbol of the civil rights movements of the late 1960s and early 1970s.

My personal connection to this historic site runs deep, I have been a Parishioner since birth and all my family baptism, communions, wedding and funeral have been held at that sacred building.

One cannot overstate the architectural and cultural significance of the Sacred Heart Church's (bell tower), Campanile. It stands tall as a beacon for all, visible from miles around and an integral part of the iconic skyline of Hayes Valley. Its presence serves as a constant reminder of the rich heritage and vibrant history of our community.

By designating the Sacred Heart Parish Complex, especially the Sacred Heart Church, as an individual landmark, we not only honor its historical importance but also ensure that future generations can appreciate and learn from the pivotal role it played in the civil rights movement and the growth of our neighborhood.

Preserving the Sacred Heart Church as an individual landmark is an investment in our community's heritage and a testament to our commitment to preserving the values and stories that have shaped us. I urge you, members of the Board of Supervisors, to consider this recommendation with the utmost care and dedication.

Thank you for your consideration on this important matter, and I look forward to seeing the Sacred Heart Parish Complex recognized and protected for generations to come. See the attached movie of the last mass at our beloved church.

Sincerely,

Francine Sosa-Lewis  
originally born at,  
527 Fillmore Street  
San Francisco, CA

Thank you, Francine Sosa-Lewis 510-528-8182

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** 35 Letters regarding the Hiring of Patrol Special Officers  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 3:30:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [35 Letters regarding the hiring of Patrol Special Officers.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see attached for 35 letters regarding the hiring of Patrol Special Officers.

Sincerely,

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

**From:** [Amy Chau](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 10:11:34 AM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 6

From your constituent

Amy Chau

Email

amy4evacute@yahoo.com

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---



**From:** [Gianluca billante](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 5:25:37 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 2

From your constituent

Gianluca billante

Email

[gcb75@cornell.edu](mailto:gcb75@cornell.edu)

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---

**From:** [elizabeth.billante](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 4:48:00 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 2

From your constituent

elizabeth billante

Email

ecbillante@yahoo.com

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---

**From:** [frank billante](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 4:46:22 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 2

From your constituent

frank billante

Email

francob7@aol.com

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---

**From:** [Maria Cruz](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 7:43:04 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 6

From your constituent

Maria Cruz

Email

mdc94106@gmail.com

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---



**From:** [Peter Elden](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 2:23:04 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 2

From your constituent

Peter Elden

Email

[peterelden@sbcglobal.net](mailto:peterelden@sbcglobal.net)

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---

**From:** [Dorothy Chan](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:10:52 AM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 2

From your constituent

Dorothy Chan

Email

dorothywaichan@aol.com

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---

**From:** [Robert Chan](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 10:07:10 AM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 2

From your constituent

Robert Chan

Email

robertychan@aol.com

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---

**From:** [Rodney Leong](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 9:50:25 AM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 1

From your constituent

Rodney Leong

Email

[rleong@rocketmail.com](mailto:rleong@rocketmail.com)

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856 and predates the SFPD by two years. With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special

Officers are an excellent resource and our City needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---



**From:** [Kathy Kelly](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 9:21:28 AM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 4

From your constituent

Kathy Kelly

Email

kathykelly44@yahoo.com

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---

**From:** [Susan OHara](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 8:17:27 AM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 5

From your constituent

Susan OHara

Email

[sj\\_ohara@yahoo.com](mailto:sj_ohara@yahoo.com)

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,  
Susan O'Hara

---

**From:** [Ed Wang](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 2:21:05 AM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 4

From your constituent

Ed Wang

Email

lined065@yahoo.com

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---

**From:** [Leanna Dawydiak](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:37:43 AM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 1

From your constituent

Leanna Dawydiak

Email

LDawydiak@gmail.com

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---



**From:** [Gnarity Burke](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 12:06:15 AM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 5

From your constituent

Gnarity Burke

Email

urban42n81@gmail.com

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---

**From:** [Diana Ruiz](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 10:23:58 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 4

From your constituent

Diana Ruiz

Email

druizassoc@vom.com

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---

**From:** [JEFFREY RICKER](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 10:10:34 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 2

From your constituent

JEFFREY RICKER

Email

THE\_DREADNOUGHT@YAHOO.COM

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---

**From:** [Sherry Bijan](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 8:59:28 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 1

From your constituent

Sherry Bijan

Email

Sherrybijan@gmail.com

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---



**From:** [Oren Yunger](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 8:00:58 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 2

From your constituent

Oren Yunger

Email

orenyunger@gmail.com

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---

**From:** [Kaaren alvarado](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 7:25:36 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 4

From your constituent

Kaaren alvarado

Email

kaaren25@att.net

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---

**From:** [Kaaren alvarado](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 7:25:29 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 4

From your constituent

Kaaren alvarado

Email

kaaren25@att.net

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---

**From:** [Kaaren alvarado](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 7:22:37 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 4

From your constituent

Kaaren alvarado

Email

kaaren25@att.net

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---



**From:** [Daniel O'Donnell](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 7:07:58 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 2

From your constituent

Daniel O'Donnell

Email

dodonnell88@hotmail.com

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---

**From:** [Ding Ma](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 6:45:31 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 4

From your constituent

Ding Ma

Email

dingm0942@gmail.com

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---

**From:** [Purvi Sahu](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 6:26:24 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 2

From your constituent

Purvi Sahu

Email

purvisahu@icloud.com

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---

**From:** [Andrew Lipsett](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 6:09:56 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 4

From your constituent

Andrew Lipsett

Email

duh86@yahoo.com

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---



**From:** [Michael Goodwin](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 6:05:38 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 3

From your constituent

Michael Goodwin

Email

[mgoodwin@gmx.com](mailto:mgoodwin@gmx.com)

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---

**From:** [SG Quinn](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 5:29:30 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 7

From your constituent

SG Quinn

Email

sgq133@msn.com

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---

**From:** [Erin OGrady](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 5:11:09 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 7

From your constituent

Erin OGrady

Email

[erogrady@pacbell.net](mailto:erogrady@pacbell.net)

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---

**From:** [Helen Timen](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 5:11:04 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 3

From your constituent

Helen Timen

Email

helentimen@hotmail.com

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---



**From:** [Leanna Louie](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 5:00:51 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 11

From your constituent

Leanna Louie

Email

leannalouie28@yahoo.com

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---

**From:** [Joe Greene](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 4:42:39 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 8

From your constituent

Joe Greene

Email

joebengreene@yahoo.com

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---

**From:** [Angela Tickler](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 4:20:40 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 1

From your constituent

Angela Tickler

Email

[angela.tickler@yahoo.com](mailto:angela.tickler@yahoo.com)

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---

**From:** [Louella Fung](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 4:15:04 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 7

From your constituent

Louella Fung

Email

[loufung628@icloud.com](mailto:loufung628@icloud.com)

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---



**From:** [Nancy Yarmak](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 3:06:03 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 1

From your constituent

Nancy Yarmak

Email

nancy94121@gmail.com

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---

**From:** [Ron Lee](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program  
**Date:** Monday, September 18, 2023 2:30:48 PM

---

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

## Message to the Police Commission, Police Chief, and Board of Supervisors

I live in District

District 8

From your constituent

Ron Lee

Email

rlee288@ail.com

### **I support the SF PATROL SPECIAL POLICE - save and expand this much needed community policing program**

Message:

Dear Commissioners, Chief Scott, Mayor Breed, and Supervisors,

With most residents feeling unsafe, and identifying public safety as their top priority, it is hardly the time to terminate the SF Patrol Special Police, which has been recognized in the City Charter since 1856.

With a shortage of over 500 SFPD officers and more slated to retire, the City should be looking to employ every available option to put qualified Patrol Officers in our communities and on our streets.

These Patrols are now considered to represent the first community policing efforts, because of their focused attention to honoring the culture and personality of each distinct neighborhood. This is exactly the type of policing this Commission says it wants. Every district in the City should be able to enjoy the benefits of added community patrols and if this Commission blocks more officers from being hired, the Patrol located in the Marina will represent the end of the program. These Patrol Special Officers are an excellent resource and our City

needs them now more than ever.

We are asking the Police Commission to take immediate action to approve the 3 qualified candidates identified by the Marina Patrol and save this program! Failure to do so will jeopardize the program, and would be a clear failure of your responsibility to promote community policing efforts as well as to our general public safety. Recruitment of more officers takes time...time that we do not have as crime increases while SFPD faces challenges filling new recruitment classes and officer retirements.

The Marina Patrol has identified and recruited 3 candidates who have passed all qualifications for the job. We are asking you to uphold your stated belief in community policing and approve the appointment of these 3 qualified candidates. Every San Franciscan in every district in the city deserves the multitude of benefits from this neighborhood-minded program. Please approve these candidates before September 1st, 2023. Do not let this vital program expire!

Sincerely,

---

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** 3 Letters regarding Street Conditions  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 3:33:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [3 Letters regarding Street Conditions.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see attached for 3 letters regarding street conditions.

Sincerely,

**Joe Adkins**

**Office of the Clerk of the Board**

**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**

**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**

**San Francisco, CA 94102**

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

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

**From:** [Philip Kuttner](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: People living on my sidewalk  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 6:40:58 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors:

You should know that notwithstanding the Court's temporary injunction against clearing encampments on the sidewalks of San Francisco, **with 72 hours notice the city can clear streets for access, whether that's for fire and police personnel in the event of an emergency or for ADA compliance, meaning enough space is left on the sidewalk for a wheelchair to pass, for example.**

This is clearly the case for the encampment on my block shown above.

I await your timely response.

Philip Kuttner  
363 Bartlett St #5  
San Francisco CA 94110

On Sat, Sep 16, 2023 at 9:08 PM Philip Kuttner <[philkuttner@gmail.com](mailto:philkuttner@gmail.com)> wrote:

Dear Board of Supervisors:

Four people have been living with piles of junk on the sidewalk at 321 Bartlett Street for a week. I saw some outreach people talking to them a few days ago but they are still here. Please take steps to remove them as soon as possible. Thank you for your cooperation.

Philip Kuttner  
363 Bartlett St #5

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Julien DeFrance](#)  
**To:** [lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com](mailto:lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com)  
**Cc:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Sawyer, Jason \(POL\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Souza, Sarah \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Bring your pup to new Larkin/ Myrtle Alley Barklet!!!!  
**Date:** Sunday, September 17, 2023 6:48:36 PM

---

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

How safe is this though?  
With all the encampments/crackheads around!


All encampments neighborhood and city wide need to be removed immediately.

Make it happen.

On Sep 17, 2023, at 18:42, Lower Polk Neighbors <[lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com](mailto:lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com)> wrote:

September 21st, 2023 Myrtle Bark!let

[View this email in your browser](#)



Hello Neighbors–  
Who let the dogs IN?  
Who who who who who?

We did! Bring your pup to new Larkin/ Myrtle Alley Bark!et!!!!

Soft Opening:  
Thursday, September 21st @12pm  
Come by for treats, meets, greets  
and celebrate with the PoCo (Polk Corridor) Community!

Sponsored by:  
[INTERSTICE Architects](#)  
[Lower Polk Community Benefit District – LPCBD](#)

Polk Neighbors  
[lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com](mailto:lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com)

Follow us on [Facebook](#)

---



If you have any questions please contact us-  
[lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com](mailto:lowerpolkneighbors@gmail.com)

---



---

*Copyright © 2021 Lower Polk Neighbors, All rights reserved.*

Want to change how you receive these emails?  
You can [update your preferences](#) or [unsubscribe from this list](#)

---

This email was sent to [julien.defrance@gmail.com](mailto:julien.defrance@gmail.com)  
[why did I get this?](#) [unsubscribe from this list](#) [update subscription preferences](#)  
Lower Polk Neighbors · PO Box 642428 · San Francisco, CA 94164-2428 · USA



**From:** [Richard B. Allen](#)  
**To:** [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Joel Engardio](#)  
**Subject:** Quote of the week.....  
**Date:** Saturday, September 16, 2023 12:06:07 PM

---

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

"Still, Benioff questioned why "the city cannot be this clean and safe every single day."  
Mayor London Breed quickly  
responded that the city is making progress,....."  
Mayor Breed, please give the City residents a timeline, measurable goals, who is  
in charge, and consequences if goals are not met.

Dick Allen, San Francisco

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#)  
**Subject:** 3 Letters regarding Window Replacement Standards  
**Date:** Thursday, September 21, 2023 3:37:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [3 Letters regarding Window Replacement Standards.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

Please see attached for 3 letters regarding window replacement standards.

Sincerely,

**Joe Adkins**

**Office of the Clerk of the Board**

**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**

**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**

**San Francisco, CA 94102**

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

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

**From:** [Nick Panagopoulos](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reform SF Window Replacement Standards to Improve Health, Climate, Comfort, and Lower Cost  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 11:19:55 AM

---

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

Board of Supervisors ,

I urge you to reform San Francisco's Window Replacement Standards.

Every San Francisco resident deserves windows that aren't leaky, are insulated to reduce heating bills, noise, and condensation, and reduce fossil fuel heating needs – at an affordable price.

But San Francisco's Window Replacement Standards unnecessarily raise the price to replace street facing windows in many San Francisco homes. Exorbitant costs mean less window upgrades, meaning homeowners and renters are stuck with old, leaky windows that harm health, comfort, and the climate. All for barely-noticeable aesthetics in the name of “neighborhood character”.

**\*\*Costlier for Homeowners:** The standards increase the cost of replacing street-facing windows by 50-100%. 70% of San Francisco's occupied 350,000 homes were built in the 1960s or before.

**\*\*Costlier for Renters:** Costlier window replacements are passed on in the form of higher rent. More likely, exorbitant costs means tenants are stuck with draftier interiors, and higher heating bills and carbon emissions. Over half of San Francisco's renters live in housing units built before 1970 in SF.

**\*\*Bad for the Climate:** Residents burn more fossil fuels to heat their homes as older windows are more likely to be poorly sealed, leaky, and uninsulated single pane glass. 56% of occupied homes in San Francisco are heated with fossil fuels, mostly with natural gas.

**\*\*Bad for Health:** Older single-pane windows are more likely to condense, leading to indoor mold. They're also more likely to leak, allowing heat or air-conditioned air to escape, and polluting particulates from nearby highways inside.

**\*\*Bad for Comfort:** In addition to leaking air in-and out, older windows block less noise. This is increasingly important as San Francisco accommodates more housing.

Thank you,

Nick Panagopoulos  
[npanagopoulos@gmail.com](mailto:npanagopoulos@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94108

**From:** [evan.goldin@gmail.com](mailto:evan.goldin@gmail.com)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please update SF's window replacement standards  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 12:01:04 PM

---

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

Board of Supervisors ,

Hey folks,

I strongly urge you to reform San Francisco's Window Replacement Standards.

Especially with bad air outside today and my son at a daycare with crappy, old windows, it's a good reminder that these rules need to change. It's absolutely absurd we make it so difficult to modernize our windows — for health and for comfort.

Please fix these rules, and allow people to use modern windows with ease! It's more important than strange old rules designed to protect the "look and feel" of SF.

Thank you,

Evan

D6

[evan.goldin@gmail.com](mailto:evan.goldin@gmail.com)

,



**From:** [Natalie Farren](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reform SF Window Replacement Standards to Improve Health, Climate, Comfort, and Lower Cost  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2023 2:22:51 PM

---

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

Board of Supervisors ,

I urge you to reform San Francisco's Window Replacement Standards.

Every San Francisco resident deserves windows that aren't leaky, are insulated to reduce heating bills, noise, and condensation, and reduce fossil fuel heating needs – at an affordable price.

But San Francisco's Window Replacement Standards unnecessarily raise the price to replace street facing windows in many San Francisco homes. Exorbitant costs mean less window upgrades, meaning homeowners and renters are stuck with old, leaky windows that harm health, comfort, and the climate. All for barely-noticeable aesthetics in the name of “neighborhood character”.

**\*\*Costlier for Homeowners:** The standards increase the cost of replacing street-facing windows by 50-100%. 70% of San Francisco's occupied 350,000 homes were built in the 1960s or before.

**\*\*Costlier for Renters:** Costlier window replacements are passed on in the form of higher rent. More likely, exorbitant costs means tenants are stuck with draftier interiors, and higher heating bills and carbon emissions. Over half of San Francisco's renters live in housing units built before 1970 in SF.

**\*\*Bad for the Climate:** Residents burn more fossil fuels to heat their homes as older windows are more likely to be poorly sealed, leaky, and uninsulated single pane glass. 56% of occupied homes in San Francisco are heated with fossil fuels, mostly with natural gas.

**\*\*Bad for Health:** Older single-pane windows are more likely to condense, leading to indoor mold. They're also more likely to leak, allowing heat or air-conditioned air to escape, and polluting particulates from nearby highways inside.

**\*\*Bad for Comfort:** In addition to leaking air in-and out, older windows block less noise. This is increasingly important as San Francisco accommodates more housing.

Thank you,

Natalie Farren  
[natalie.r.raps@gmail.com](mailto:natalie.r.raps@gmail.com)



San Francisco, California 94115

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [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 \(BOS\)](#); [PEARSON, ANNE \(CAT\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: SFPD Required Report - Chapter 96a, Law Enforcement Reporting  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 3:46:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [OADR Q2 2023 Finalv3.pdf](#)  
[Victim Demographics Q2 2023.pdf](#)  
[SFPD\\_2023\\_Q2\\_Coverletter\\_Signed.pdf](#)

---

**From:** Cunningham, Jason (POL) <jason.cunningham@sfgov.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 18, 2023 8:58 PM  
**To:** Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; StefaniStaff, (BOS) <stefanistaff@sfgov.org>; PeskinStaff (BOS) <peskinstaff@sfgov.org>; EngardioStaff (BOS) <EngardioStaff@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) <prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; DorseyStaff (BOS) <DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; RonenStaff (BOS) <ronenstaff@sfgov.org>; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; SafaiStaff (BOS) <safaistaff@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** SFPD Required Report - Chapter 96a, Law Enforcement Reporting

Good evening, Madam Clerk,

On behalf of Chief William Scott, the attached reports for Quarter 2 2023 are being submitted pursuant to Admin Code Chapter 96A, Law Enforcement Reporting,

It is respectfully requested these documents be shared with the President of the Board as well as the other Supervisors.

Thank you for your assistance.

v/r

Jason Cunningham  
 Program Manager  
 Professional Standards & Principled Policing Bureau  
 San Francisco Police Department

[jason.cunningham@sfgov.org](mailto:jason.cunningham@sfgov.org)

(415) 889-0024 (C)



**LONDON N. BREED**  
MAYOR

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
**POLICE DEPARTMENT**  
HEADQUARTERS  
1245 3<sup>RD</sup> Street  
San Francisco, California, 94158



**WILLIAM SCOTT**  
CHIEF OF POLICE

September 11, 2023

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

The Honorable Aaron Peskin  
President, Board of Supervisors  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102

The Honorable Cindy Elias  
President, Police Commission  
1245 3rd Street  
San Francisco, CA 94158

Director Sheryl Davis  
Executive Director, Human Rights Commission  
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 800  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mayor Breed, Supervisor Peskin, Commissioner Elias, and Executive Director Davis,

**RE: Second Quarter 2023 Report per Chapter 96A, Law Enforcement Reporting Requirements – Stops Data, Use of Force, Crime Victim, and Domestic Violence**

As required by Administrative Code Chapter 96A, the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) is submitting the attached Quarterly Activity and Data Report (QADR). The report is being submitted past the required date (1st Tuesday in August) due to the increased complexity of the reporting requirements.

This report includes expanded use of force data points (transitioning to the new Use of Force standard adopted by the police commission and in effect for the first full quarter) required under the updated Department General Order, Use of Force Policy and Proper Control of a Person. As such, the analysis required additional time and review as the changed reporting standards resulted in a need to recalculate previously used methodologies.

The 96A quarterly information and comparisons provide an opportunity to analyze the progress of reforms indirectly correlated with policing engagements. In 2016, the Board of Supervisors voted unanimously to pass local legislation supporting police reforms and specified law enforcement reporting requirements pertaining to stops, searches, arrests, uses of force, and alleged bias-related complaints.

We appreciate the commitment the Mayor and Board of Supervisors has expressed toward the reform initiatives being implemented by the SFPD. We believe these efforts are in alignment with the values of our department and create a closer step to re-envisioning policing to better serve all our communities.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me or my staff, Director of Policy and Public Affairs, Diana Oliva-Aroche at [diana.oliva-arocha@sfgov.org](mailto:diana.oliva-arocha@sfgov.org). These documents will be posted online at [www.sanfranciscopolice.org](http://www.sanfranciscopolice.org).

Sincerely,

**DAVID LAZAR**  
Assistant Chief, SFPD

# SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT

## Quarterly Activity and Data Report Quarter 2 2023



*Safety with Respect*  
**William Scott,**  
**Chief of Police**  
**San Francisco**  
**Police Department**

# Table of Contents

|                                                                     |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Quarterly Activity and Data Report .....                            | 3  |
| Q2 Overview .....                                                   | 4  |
| Use of Force Data Methodology Update .....                          | 5  |
| Suspects.....                                                       | 9  |
| Suspects.....                                                       | 10 |
| 2018-2022 Total Stops.....                                          | 14 |
| Stops and Searches .....                                            | 14 |
| Searches By Level of Discretion .....                               | 19 |
| Search Yield Rates .....                                            | 25 |
| Use of Force.....                                                   | 29 |
| Use of Force – Current Use of Force Policy .....                    | 30 |
| Types Of Force Used .....                                           | 32 |
| Total Arrests by Quarter – 2019-2023 .....                          | 35 |
| Arrests .....                                                       | 35 |
| Arrests By District .....                                           | 37 |
| Bias-Related Complaints .....                                       | 38 |
| Q2 Quantitative Analysis   Per Capita Population Benchmark .....    | 40 |
| Annual Per Capita Interactions by Race .....                        | 44 |
| Q2 Quantitative Analysis.....                                       | 48 |
| Per Capita Population Benchmark .....                               | 48 |
| Domestic Violence Reporting - Admin Code Sec. 96D.2b.....           | 55 |
| SFPD Quarterly Activity & Data Report – Additional Data Tables..... | 57 |
| Stops, by Self-Initiated vs Dispatched .....                        | 58 |
| Stop Data Q2 2023 .....                                             | 58 |
| Stops and Searches by Perceived Race/Ethnicity .....                | 60 |
| Searches, by Self- Initiated vs Dispatched .....                    | 63 |
| Stops and Searches by District.....                                 | 67 |

|                                          |     |
|------------------------------------------|-----|
| Basis of Searches.....                   | 68  |
| Search Yield Rate .....                  | 71  |
| Reasons for Stops.....                   | 75  |
| Calls for Service, Q2 2023.....          | 80  |
| Suspects, Q2 2023 .....                  | 82  |
| Use of Force, Q2 2023 .....              | 84  |
| Overview by Subject Race/Ethnicity ..... | 86  |
| Total Uses of Force-by-Force Type .....  | 89  |
| Officers Assaulted by Quarter .....      | 92  |
| Uses of Force by Reason .....            | 96  |
| Arrests, Q2 2023.....                    | 101 |
| By District Data.....                    | 103 |
| Total Uses of Force, by District .....   | 105 |
| Total Arrests by District .....          | 106 |
| Central District .....                   | 107 |
| Southern District .....                  | 110 |
| Bayview District .....                   | 113 |
| Mission District .....                   | 116 |
| Northern District .....                  | 119 |
| Park District.....                       | 122 |
| Richmond District.....                   | 125 |
| Ingleside District .....                 | 128 |
| Taraval District .....                   | 131 |
| Tenderloin District .....                | 134 |
| Airport.....                             | 137 |
| Outside of SF/Unknown.....               | 140 |
| Glossary .....                           | 144 |

# Quarterly Activity and Data Report

## Quarter 2, 2023




**SFPD stands for safety with respect for all.**

**We will:**

- Engage in just, transparent, unbiased, and responsive policing.
- Do so in the spirit of dignity and in collaboration with the community.
- Maintain and build trust and respect as the guardian of constitutional and human rights.



## Q2 Overview



Data collected during the pandemic and recovery period reflect the unique circumstances of the time. Users should take care when comparing data trends across pandemic and non-pandemic response timeframes.



# Data Exploration

## Use of Force Data Methodology Update

Data collected under SFPD's Use of Force Policy has changed two times over the past 18 months, resulting in three different criteria for data collection. This exploration seeks to provide context to the changing landscape of use of force data collection, and its implications to reporting and analysis.

### Policy Changes Drive Changes to Data Collection

On December 21, 2016, the San Francisco Police Commission passed a significant overhaul of SFPD's Use of Force policy, which went into effect the same day. This policy remained in place until April 12, 2022.

On January 12, 2022, the San Francisco Police Commission passed a revised policy for the use of force, called "[Use of Force & Proper Control of a Person](#)." Ninety days later, on April 12, 2022, SFPD transitioned to this new use of force standard. The April 2022 use of force policy changed multiple definitions within the policy, in most cases broadening definitions and reducing thresholds for reportable uses of force. The 2022 policy also added new categories of force, and associated definitions for collection.

On November 2, 2022, the San Francisco Police Commission [passed additional revisions to the policy](#), in most cases narrowing definitions and increasing thresholds for reportable uses of force. This revised general order went into effect on December 8, 2022.

# Data Exploration

## What Policy Changes Were Made?

As noted in DN 22-111 and DGO 5.01, Use of Force and Proper Control of a Person (12/8/22), the following policies changed:

- Revised Threshold for Reportable Force - The threshold for reportable force has been changed so that some common types of low-level physical interactions with a person are not reportable force.
- Revisions to Drawing and Exhibiting vs. Pointing a Firearm - The definitions have been revised to provide clearer guidance on whether the presentation of a firearm is considered a circumstance of Drawing and Exhibiting or Pointing a Firearm. Under the revised definitions, the Low Ready position is reclassified as Drawing and Exhibiting, rather than a circumstance of Pointing a Firearm, and is reported, albeit not as a use of force.
- Revisions to Safeguarding Dignity - This section has revised guidance for when and how officers may direct a subject involuntarily to the ground, and how to follow-up and document the circumstance.
- Supervisory Evaluations and Review of Video -The procedures for the Supervisory Evaluation of circumstances of Use of Force and Drawing and Exhibiting have been modified to reduce administrative burdens on members.

The full text of the current version of DGO 5.01 can be found [on the SFPD website](#).

## Technical Notes

The April 2022 policy, continuing through the December 2022 policy, allowed the department to transition to an electronic entry system for use of force data, as opposed to paper forms that were filled out and routed for entry into an electronic system. This new functionality in a department-wide system is part of continual improvement that builds on the 2016 USDOJ Recommendation 4.1, which notes “...the department needs to create an electronic use of force reporting system so that data can be captured in real time.”

The use-of-force data system is an extension of SFPD’s crime data warehouse, which is the department’s incident report system of record. The Airport Bureau uses the San Mateo County’s incident report system. In the coming two years, SFPD will transition to a new records management system and use-of-force reporting system, and the Airport Bureau will use that system as well.

# Data Exploration

## Dataset Handling and Adjustments

The QADR 2022 Q4 report consisted of a new UoF dataset, a new structure, and all new uses, that required the data be assessed for duplication, and whether there was a need for restructure of the data for analysis. Where technical corrections to the collection interface or structure were necessary, they were provided to the SFPD Technology applications team for remediation. The following adjustments were necessary after this review.

| Field(s)                                          | Application or Caveat                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| UoF Subject                                       | Fields unpopulated: Records entered with no UoF Subject were manually reviewed to ensure accuracy. There was only 1 incident without Subject info where a subject was associated with a use of force. This incident was included in the report.                                                                                                                                                               |
| Reason for Drawing/Exhibiting firearm description | Double counting correction: In certain instances, records will contain multiple “Officer Reason for Drawing Firearm Description” fields, which can lead to duplicated uses of force in situations where both a drawn/exhibited entry AND a UoF entry are generated by a single officer on a single subject. Only one of each type of UoF per reason for drawing firearm, per officer, per subject is counted. |
| Airport Data                                      | Airport Bureau Supervisory Use of Force Evaluation forms require a paper form submitted centrally and entered manually. As of publication, data from the Airport has not been integrated into the rest of the department’s use of force data. Reporting will be provided in the quarter it becomes available and is analyzed.                                                                                 |

## Qualitative Notes

As with any major change to a reporting system, data collected immediately after a significant change to definitions, policy or process should be considered carefully as individuals who enter the data adjust to new requirements.

# Data Exploration

## Reporting and Historical Data

With a new use-of-force standard in effect, this report will;

- Continue to present historical use-of-force data, and
- Trend data and comparisons across years will use only the same Use of Force data standard. This means that this report and all future reports will conform to the following when comparing across time periods:
  - the 2016 use-of-force standard would only be compared to previous data
  - the April 2022-December 8, 2022, standard would be compared to itself
  - all data collected after December 8, 2022, would be compared to subsequent time periods.

## Future Analysis

With a settled use-of-force standard and a more robust data set, this report may provide more in-depth analyses, as additional use-of-force data becomes available.

# Suspects

## Suspects Observed or Reported


The suspect information provided includes descriptions provided by members of the public or observed by department members and documented in police incident reports.

| Suspects by Race/Ethnicity |       |       |       | April 1, 2023 - June 30, 2023 |                                |
|----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| DESCRIPTION                | Apr   | May   | June  | Q2 2023<br>Suspects           | % of Total Suspects<br>Q2 2023 |
| Asian/ Pacific Islander    | 107   | 115   | 101   | 323                           | 4.2%                           |
| Black/ African American    | 944   | 979   | 1023  | 2946                          | 37.9%                          |
| Hispanic/ Latino           | 444   | 480   | 409   | 1333                          | 17.2%                          |
| Native American            | 7     | 6     | 1     | 14                            | 0.2%                           |
| White                      | 476   | 542   | 531   | 1549                          | 19.9%                          |
| Others                     | 507   | 468   | 631   | 1606                          | 20.7%                          |
| Total                      | 2,485 | 2,590 | 2,696 | 7,771                         | 100.00%                        |

Total suspects observed and reported in Q2 2023 (7,771) decreased by almost 3% from Q2 2022 (7,992). Black/African Americans accounted for approximately 38% of all suspects observed and reported in Q2-2023. Unknown suspects and suspects with unknown race or ethnicity are not included. Review of suspect data indicates 4,864, or 38%, of all suspects (12,635) are either unknown suspect, or race/ethnicity unknown.


# Suspects

SUSPECTS BY RACE/ETHNICITY, last 6 quarters




**Note:** Subject data is extracted from incident reports via the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = “Suspect.” Records with Unknown Race/Ethnicity data are not included.

# Suspects




**Note:** Subject data is extracted from incident reports via the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Suspect." Records with Unknown Race/Ethnicity data are not included.

# Suspects




In Quarter 2 of 2023, there were 69 Black/African American individuals listed as suspects per 1000 Black/African American residents of San Francisco, as compared to 4 White suspects per 1000 White residents.



Citywide suspect data over the past 6 quarters shows suspects are listed as Black/African American individuals 13.8-15.6 times more often than white individuals, when comparing to the population per 1000 residents of each.



# Suspects




Citywide suspect data shows that from Q1 2022 through Q2 2023, Suspects are listed as Black/African American individuals 68.5-73.6 times more often than white individuals, when comparing to the population per 1000 residents of each

# Stops and Searches

## 2018-2022 Total Stops

Starting in 2019, there is a consistent yearly decrease in stops for all individuals across perceived race/ethnicities. Specifically, when comparing the data for 2022 to 2021, there was an overall decrease of 45% across all perceived race/ethnicities.




*\*2018 stats only account for Q3 and Q4 2018. AB953, the legislation requiring data collection, went into effect for SFPD on July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2018.*

# Stops and Searches

## Q2 2023 Total Stops:


In Quarter 2 of 2023, April 1 – June 28 1159hrs, 4,754 stops were conducted. Of those stops, 970 resulted in searches (23.6%). White individuals accounted for 32% of all stops and 27% of all searches. Black individuals accounted for 23% of stops and 37% of searches.

**SFPD STOPS BY PERCEIVED RACE  
(TRAILING 6 QUARTERS)**



*Due to a data system cutover in late Q2, 2023, all stops data in this report includes data from April 1 thru June 28<sup>th</sup> at 1159hrs. Data not included in this report will be rolled into the next QADR report when available.*


# Stops and Searches




*\*Due to Stop Data transitioning to a different reporting platform, Q2 2022 and Q2 2023 data contain the stats for the period of April 1 through June 28, 1159hrs.*

Compared to Quarter 2 of 2022, the percentage of total stops in Q2 of 2023 increased by 28.2% for Black/African American individuals and increased by 32% for White individuals.

# Stops and Searches




Citywide stops data shows in Quarter 2 of 2023, 23.8 Black individuals, per 1000 Black/African American residents of San Francisco may be stopped, as compared to 4 White individuals per every 1000 White residents



Citywide vehicle and pedestrian stop data shows that since Quarter 1 of 2022, Black/African American individuals are stopped 5 to 6 times more often than White individuals.

# Stops and Searches



Citywide vehicle and pedestrian stop data show that from Quarter 1 2022 through Quarter 2 2023, on average Black/African American individuals may be stopped 22.0 times per 1000 Black/African American residents.

# Stops and Searches

## Searches By Level of Discretion

The department classifies the various types of searches into three categories:

1. **Discretionary searches,**
2. **Administrative searches, and**
3. **Other searches.**

Discretionary searches require an officer to ask and receive consent to search. In such cases, officers have the most flexibility in determining who to search and include only those occurrences where consent is the only basis provided. Administrative searches include those that occur because of a search warrant, arrest, or vehicle inventory. Other searches have a variable range of discretion and include reasons such as officer safety, suspected weapons, visible contraband, evidence of crime, etc.

| Discretionary Searches | Administrative Searches | Other Searches                                               |
|------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| *Consent Given         | *Incident to Arrest     | *Officer Safety/ Safety of Others                            |
|                        | *Search Warrant         | *Suspected Weapons                                           |
|                        | *Vehicle Inventory      | *Visible Contraband                                          |
|                        |                         | *Odor of Contraband                                          |
|                        |                         | *Canine Detection                                            |
|                        |                         | *Evidence of Crime                                           |
|                        |                         | *Emergency                                                   |
|                        |                         | *Suspected Violation of School Policy                        |
|                        |                         | *Condition of Parole/ Probation/ PRCS/ Mandatory Supervision |

## Current Quarter vs 1 year ago, % Change by Race/Ethnicity

|                            | STOPS                |                      |                 | SEARCHES           |                      |                 |
|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| Perceived Race / Ethnicity | Q2-2022<br>(n=3,128) | Q2-2023<br>(n=4,754) | %Δ from Q2-2022 | Q2-2022<br>(n=963) | Q2-2023<br>(n=1,085) | %Δ from Q2-2022 |
| Asian                      | 13%                  | 11%                  | -1.3%           | 7%                 | 6%                   | -1%             |
| Black/ African American    | 25%                  | 21%                  | -4.0%           | 32%                | 32%                  | 0%              |
| Hispanic/ Latino           | 23%                  | 28%                  | 4.6%            | 28%                | 28%                  | -1%             |
| White                      | 31%                  | 28%                  | -2.9%           | 28%                | 25%                  | -3%             |
| Other                      | 8%                   | 11%                  | 3.6%            | 4%                 | 9%                   | 5%              |

**Note:** “Perceived” identifiers are used to categorize demographic information specific to Stop Data Collection System

# Stops and Searches

The 1,085 total searches conducted in Q2-2023 were categorized into 3 search categories listed below. When multiple bases for search are present during a stop, officers are able to select multiple bases for search. In these cases, one search is counted in each basis. . As a result, a stop may appear in two or all three search categories listed below. From 1,085 total searches, there were 1,598 bases for search selected, which fell into 3 search categories, Discretionary, Administrative, and Other Searches.


| Total Basis of Search                                    | Total        | % Total |
|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------|---------|
| Consent given                                            | 59           | 4%      |
| Officer safety/safety of others                          | 276          | 17%     |
| Search warrant                                           | 52           | 3%      |
| Condition of parole/probation/PRCS/mandatory supervision | 90           | 6%      |
| Suspected weapons                                        | 88           | 6%      |
| Visible contraband                                       | 67           | 4%      |
| Odor of contraband                                       | 9            | 1%      |
| Canine Detection                                         | 3            | 0%      |
| Evidence of crime                                        | 163          | 10%     |
| Incident to arrest                                       | 729          | 46%     |
| Exigent circumstances/emergency                          | 9            | 1%      |
| Vehicle inventory                                        | 53           | 3%      |
| Suspected violation of school policy                     | 0            | 0%      |
| <b>*Distinct Count of Searches</b>                       | <b>1,085</b> |         |
| <b>Total Count of Basis for Search</b>                   | <b>1,598</b> |         |

\*There may be more than one basis for search

| Type of Search                         | Distinct Count | % Total     |
|----------------------------------------|----------------|-------------|
| Discretionary (Consent Given) Searches | 59             | 4.27%       |
| Administrative Searches                | 816            | 59.09%      |
| Other Searches                         | 506            | 36.64%      |
| <b>*Distinct Count of Searches</b>     | <b>1,381</b>   | <b>100%</b> |




# Stops and Searches



*\*Due to Stop Data transitioning to a different reporting platform, Q2 2022 and Q2 2023 data contain the stats for the period of April 1 through June 28, 1159hrs.*

Compared to Q2-2022, Administrative Searches for individuals of "Other" race in Q2 of 2023 have increased by 96% and Black/African American individuals by 22%. There was also an increase by 25% of Administrative Searches for White individuals.


# Stops and Searches



*\*Due to Stop Data transitioning to a different reporting platform, Q2 2022 and Q2 2023 data contain the stats for the period of April 1 through June 28, 1159hrs.*

Compared to Q2-2022, Discretionary Searches for all individuals decreased in Q2-2023, where Asian individuals saw a 29% decrease, Black/African American individuals saw a 32% decrease, Hispanic/Latino individuals saw a 66% decrease, White individuals saw a 33% decrease, and Other individuals saw a 40% decrease.


# Stops and Searches



*\*Due to Stop Data transitioning to a different reporting platform, Q2 2022 and Q2 2023 data contain the stats for the period of April 1 through June 28, 1159hrs.*

Compared to Q2-2022, Asian individuals saw a 10% decrease, Black/African American individuals saw a 7% increase, Hispanic/Latino individuals saw a 16% decrease, White individuals saw a 15% decrease, and Other individuals saw a 174% increase.

# Stops and Searches




Search yield rates have increased year over year since mid-2018, suggesting an increase in the use of objective factors. Objective factors are clearly defined and articulable behaviors an officer can observe to inform the decision to conduct a search. Including objective factors in training and/or policies is reflective of one of SFPD's proposed solutions for reducing the influence of bias in decision-making surrounding stops and searches.

# Stops and Searches

## Search Yield Rates

The average yield rate for all searches was 57% in Quarter 2 of 2023. The yield rate was 47% for Discretionary (Consent only) searches, 61% for Administrative (Supervision) searches, and 64% for Other searches.



As noted in the Phase III SFPD Collaborative Reform Initiative report:


**“The assumption among researchers is that if the rate of discovering contraband during searches of a particular identity group is low, then those people are “objectively less suspicious and may be searched, at least in part, because of their perceived identity.”**

<https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/ripa/ripa-board-report-2021.pdf> AT PAGE 48.

**In turn, if the hit/yield rate for a particular identity group increases, that means that officers are using more objective factors – and not a person’s perceived identity – to make the decision to search a person. In short, higher hit/yield rates suggest that officers are less likely making a biased decision to search, but are rather using objective factors to inform their decision-making.<sup>1</sup>”**

<sup>1</sup> SFPD Collaborative Reform Initiative Phase III – Final Assessment Report, Hillard Heintze, 2022, p 6, footnote 11.


# Stops and Searches




\*Due to Stop Data transitioning to a different reporting platform, Q2 2022 and Q2 2023 data contain the stats for the period of April 1 through June 28, 1159hrs.

As compared to Q2 2022, the yield rate for all searches increased in Quarter 2 of 2023 for Black/African American and White demographic groups. This yield rate increased by 39% for Other and increased by 22% for Hispanic/Latino, while staying the same for the Asian.

# Stops and Searches




Citywide search data shows in Quarter 2 of 2023, per 1000 Black/African American residents of San Francisco, roughly eight searches of Black/African American individuals may occur. For every 1000 White residents, less than 1 search of a white individual per 1000 white residents occurs.



Citywide search data shows that from Q1 2022 through Q2 2023, Black/African American individuals on average may be searched 8 times per 1000 Black/African American residents.

# Stops and Searches




Since Quarter 1 of 2022, individuals searched are listed as Black/African American individuals 8.3-11.0 times more often than white individuals, when comparing to the population per 1000 residents of each



## Use of Force

## Use Of Force – Historical




Unless otherwise noted, the term “total uses of force” refers to the number of times force is applied by an officer against an individual to compel compliance. Per the April 2022 Use of Force Policy, during Q4-2022, and including the October 1 through December 7, 2022, period, there were 504 incidents where force was used 1,408 times by 615 officers against 579 individuals.

*Changes to the Use of Force Department General Order and associated data collection is discussed in the data exploration section of this report and should be kept in mind when interpreting these data.*

# Use of Force


## Use of Force – Current Use of Force Policy



During Quarter 2 of 2023, the department responded to 146,297 total calls for service. Department officers were assaulted 57 times and force was used in 251 incidents which represented 0.017% of all calls for service. Of those 251 incidents, force was used 600 times by 322 officers against 305 individuals.

**There were two Officer Involved Shooting incidents during Quarter 2 of 2023 resulting in injury or death.**

# Use of Force



## Race/Ethnicity of Individuals Subject to a Use of Force, Q2 2023

| Race/Ethnicity         | Apr-23 | May-23 | Jun-23 |
|------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Asian                  | 17.1%  | 3.8%   | 12.0%  |
| Black/African American | 43.8%  | 36.1%  | 50.9%  |
| Hispanic/Latino        | 20.3%  | 38.0%  | 22.9%  |
| White                  | 15.2%  | 20.2%  | 12.6%  |
| Other                  | 3.7%   | 1.9%   | 1.7%   |

Per the most recent 2022 December Use of Force policy, during Q2 of 2023, White individuals represented 16% of total number of individuals subject to uses of force. This rate is 43% for Black/African American individuals, 27% for Hispanic/Latino individuals, and 11% for Asian individuals.


# Use of Force

## Types Of Force Used


Under the December 2022 use of force policy, Physical Control Hold/Take Down and Firearm Pointing were the top two types of force used and accounted for 85% of total Uses of Force during Q2 2023.

| <b>Use of Force by Type of Force Description<br/>December 2022 UoF Policy Standard</b> |                |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| <b>Type of Force Description</b>                                                       | <b>Q2 2023</b> |
| Chemical Agent                                                                         | 17             |
| ERIW                                                                                   | 5              |
| ERIW 40mm                                                                              | 2              |
| Firearm Pointing                                                                       | 260            |
| Impact Weapon                                                                          | 4              |
| Other                                                                                  | 19             |
| Physical Control Hold/Take Down                                                        | 251            |
| Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist                                             | 27             |
| Vehicle Intervention                                                                   | 13             |
| Firearm OIS                                                                            | 2              |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                                                                     | <b>600</b>     |

# Use of Force



Citywide Use of Force data shows in Quarter 2 of 2023, 6.1 Black individuals per 1000 Black/African American residents of San Francisco may be subject to a use of force, as compared to .29 per 1000 White residents.



Under the current Use of Force policy, in Q2, 2023, individuals receiving force are listed as Black/African American individuals 21.2 times more often than white individuals, when comparing to the population per 1000 residents of each.



## USE OF FORCE RESULTING IN DEATH

**There were two Use of Force incidents that resulted in death during Quarter 2 of 2023.**

***First Incident - SAN FRANCISCO (May 19, 2023):***

At approximately 2:20 pm SFPD officers responded to the 100 block of Bosworth St. regarding a person armed with a firearm who entered a residence. The person who discovered the suspect was able to exit the residence and contacted the police. Officers arrived on scene and made contact with the armed suspect who had refused to comply with officers for approximately 3 and a half hours. Additional SFPD resources and SFFD medics were on scene to assist with the incident. As officers were attempting to negotiate with the subject, an officer involved shooting occurred. The subject was transported to the hospital. Despite the life-saving efforts of the emergency responders and medical staff, the subject succumbed to his injuries and was declared deceased.


***Second Incident - SAN FRANCISCO (JUNE 22, 2023):***

On Thursday, June 22, 2023, at approximately 2:39 a.m., SFPD officers from Richmond Station were dispatched to a residence on the 700 block of 31st Avenue for a report of an aggravated assault in progress. An officer arrived on scene and made contact with an 84-year-old male victim in the doorway of the home. During the interaction, the 37-year-old subject, who was armed with a knife, advanced toward the officer and the victim from inside the home and an officer involved shooting occurred. Additional officers arrived on scene and began rendering aid to the subject and summoned medical personnel to the scene.


The victim told officers that the subject had assaulted a 76-year-old female victim inside the home. Officers entered the home and discovered the female victim deceased. A dog was also found deceased inside the home. Medics transported the subject to a local hospital where he was later pronounced deceased. The male victim was transported to a local hospital and treated for non-life-threatening injuries.

# Arrests

## Total Arrests by Quarter – 2019-2023



There were 3,416 arrests during Quarter 2 of 2023, a 15% increase from Q2-2022 (2,982). Black/African American individuals and Hispanic individuals accounted for 64% of all arrests.<sup>2</sup>




<sup>2</sup> Arrests made by Department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported in San Mateo County data and are not included in these data.

# Arrests

| Percentage of Total Arrests |                      |                      |                 |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| Race/ Ethnicity             | Q2-2022<br>(n=2,982) | Q2-2023<br>(n=3,416) | %Δ from<br>2022 |
| Asian                       | 7%                   | 6%                   | -1%             |
| Black/ African American     | 34%                  | 32%                  | -2%             |
| Hispanic/Latino             | 30%                  | 32%                  | 2%              |
| White                       | 26%                  | 27%                  | 1%              |
| Unknown                     | 4%                   | 4%                   | 0%              |

Overall arrests of Hispanic/Latino individuals increased by approximately 2% in Quarter 2 of 2023 compared to Quarter 2 of 2022.

*\*Detailed data regarding age groups and gender can be found later in this report.*



Citywide arrest data shows that from Quarter 1 of 2022 through Quarter 2 of 2023, 25.5 Black/African American individuals may be stopped per 1000 Black/African American residents.



# Arrests

## Arrests By District

It is important to note that arrests made by department members at San Francisco International Airport are investigated by and reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City's totals.

The "Outside SF/Other" category includes arrests made by department members outside of the City and County of San Francisco by SFPD as well as some arrests made inside the City and County of San Francisco by agencies other than SFPD that are captured by our Incident Reporting system.

Arrests made by department members within the City and County of San Francisco jurisdiction increased in Quarter 2 of 2023 compared to Quarter 2 of 2022 by 15%.

| Arrests By District, Q2 2022 vs Q2 2023 |              |              |            |
|-----------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| District                                | Q2 2022      | Q2 2023      | % change   |
| Co. A - Central                         | 363          | 420          | 16%        |
| Co. B - Southern                        | 431          | 544          | 26%        |
| Co. C - Bayview                         | 271          | 250          | -8%        |
| Co. D - Mission                         | 454          | 536          | 18%        |
| Co. E - Northern                        | 272          | 372          | 37%        |
| Co. F - Park                            | 98           | 78           | -20%       |
| Co. G - Richmond                        | 110          | 126          | 15%        |
| Co. H - Ingleside                       | 181          | 230          | 27%        |
| Co. I - Taraval                         | 155          | 146          | -6%        |
| Co. J - Tenderloin                      | 590          | 685          | 16%        |
| Outside SF                              | 57           | 29           | -49%       |
| <b>Total</b>                            | <b>2,982</b> | <b>3,416</b> | <b>15%</b> |

# Bias-Related Complaints

## DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

The department is required to obtain information from the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) regarding the total number of complaints received during the reporting period that it characterizes as allegations of bias based on race or ethnicity, gender, or gender identity. The department also is required to include in its report the total number of complaints DPA closed during the reporting period that were characterized as allegations of bias based on race or ethnicity, gender, or gender identity, as well as the total number of each type of disposition for such complaints.

### Cases Received in Q2-2023

| Type of Case Received       | # of Cases |
|-----------------------------|------------|
| Racial Bias                 | 1          |
| Gender Bias                 | 0          |
| Transphobic Bias            | 0          |
| Both Racial and Gender Bias | 0          |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                | <b>1</b>   |

DPA received 188 total cases for the quarter.

2 Officer(s) were named for allegations of racial or gender bias.

Total Cases received in 2023 involving Racial or Gender Bias: 2 Case(s)

During Quarter 2 of 2023, DPA completed 6 complaint investigation cases in which there was an allegation of racial or gender bias. There were no sustained allegations of racial or gender bias in Quarter 2 of 2023.

### Q2-2023 Case Closures & Dispositions

| Type of Case                    | Sustained | Withdrawn | Unfounded | No Finding | Insufficient Evidence | Proper Conduct | Referral | TOTAL    |
|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------------------|----------------|----------|----------|
| Racial Bias                     | 0         | 0         | 2         | 0          | 2                     | 0              | 1        | 5        |
| Homophobic Bias                 | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0          | 0                     | 0              | 0        | 0        |
| Gender Bias                     | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0          | 1                     | 0              | 0        | 1        |
| Transphobic Bias                | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0          | 0                     | 0              | 0        | 0        |
| Racial, Homophobic, Gender Bias | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0          | 0                     | 0              | 0        | 0        |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                    | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>  | <b>2</b>  | <b>0</b>   | <b>3</b>              | <b>0</b>       | <b>1</b> | <b>6</b> |

\*Source: Department of Police Accountability

DPA closed a total of 178 cases for the quarter, including above.

DPA closed a total of 359 cases for the year, including above

# Bias-Related Complaints

## BIAS-RELATED COMPLAINTS RECEIVED BY SFPD, AND INVESTIGATED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

As part of the department's commitment to transparency, the department also reports on all bias-related complaints received internally from members of the department and forwarded to the Department of Human Resources (DHR) for investigation. Closed cases may include complaints received in previous quarters. Bias-related complaints are referred to as Employment Equal Opportunity (EEO) cases by DHR.

### Q2-2023 Bias Cases Received

| EEO Cases Received                              | Q2-2023  |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------|
| Age / Race / Religion and Gender Discrimination | 0        |
| Disability Discrimination                       | 0        |
| Hostile Work Environment                        | 1        |
| Medical Discrimination                          | 0        |
| Gender Discrimination                           | 0        |
| Race Discrimination                             | 2        |
| Retaliation                                     | 0        |
| Sexual Harassment                               | 0        |
| Sexual Orientation                              | 0        |
| Harassment/Non-EEO                              | 0        |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                    | <b>3</b> |

**Complainants:** 3 Department Members; 0 Outside Civilians

**Respondents (Named):** 1 SFPD (named in 1 complaint); 1 Sworn Officer; 1 Civilian

**Total Respondents:** 1 SFPD Named; 1 Sworn Officer; 1 Civilian

| Type of Case                                    | Administrative Closures |          | Insufficient Evidence | Sustained | TOTAL    |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------|-----------------------|-----------|----------|
|                                                 | Respondent Counseled    | Rejected |                       |           |          |
| Age / Race / Religion and Gender Discrimination | 0                       | 0        | 6                     | 0         | 6        |
| Gender Discrimination                           | 0                       | 0        | 0                     | 0         | 0        |
| Gender Identity                                 | 0                       | 0        | 0                     | 0         | 0        |
| Hostile Work Environment                        | 0                       | 0        | 1                     | 1         | 2        |
| Marital/Parental Discrimination                 | 0                       | 0        | 0                     | 0         | 0        |
| Medical Discrimination                          | 0                       | 0        | 0                     | 0         | 0        |
| Race Discrimination                             | 0                       | 0        | 0                     | 0         | 0        |
| Race / Sex Discrimination                       | 0                       | 0        | 0                     | 0         | 0        |
| Retaliation                                     | 0                       | 0        | 0                     | 0         | 0        |
| Sexual Harassment                               | 0                       | 0        | 0                     | 1         | 1        |
| Sexual Orientation                              | 0                       | 0        | 0                     | 0         | 0        |
| Slurs/Inappropriate Comment                     | 0                       | 0        | 0                     | 0         | 0        |
| Weight Discrimination                           | 0                       | 0        | 0                     | 0         | 0        |
| Harassment/ Non-EEO                             | 0                       | 0        | 0                     | 0         | 0        |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                    | <b>0</b>                | <b>0</b> | <b>7</b>              | <b>2</b>  | <b>9</b> |

Source: SFPD Risk Management EEO Quarterly Report

## Population Benchmark Analysis, Per Capita Race/Ethnicity

The San Francisco Police Department received requests from various key community stakeholders to present a per capita population benchmark analysis. This analysis captures a particular race or ethnicity, as compared to their representation in a similar population of 1000 individuals. We adjust for population in our analysis by the race/ethnic demographic groups in our data. This analysis compares this report's quarter and all quarters with data available. A disparity analysis- the contrast between different race/ethnicity groups against each other- is also considered to generate a numerical comparison. This analysis may surface potential racial disparities when comparing policing activities with the various demographic groups. In all cases, a population benchmark analysis that presents per capita results will have challenges, as noted below.

### *What is a benchmark?*

A benchmark is a common frame of reference, created by comparing at least two sets of data to each other, to consider trends and context presented in the data. In this analysis, we compare citywide population demographics against pre and post stop activities by SFPD, and then convert those contact ratios into a Per Capita (or by 1000) number.

### *Population Benchmark Weaknesses*

As noted by the California Department of Justice in their RIPA 2021 report, "An assumption of this type of comparison is that the distribution of who is stopped would be similar to who resides within a comparable geographic region. However, this is not always the case, as people may travel a considerable distance from where they live for several reasons (e.g., to go to work, visit family).<sup>3</sup>" The supposition that the comparison of police data should reflect the residential population makeup makes several assumptions that are not addressed in this analysis, and may result in inaccurate results of the comparative disparities noted in the analysis.

Comparing against residential population does not account for individuals who travel outside their home residential district or zip code in the residential population count, potentially causing over or under representation in the data<sup>4</sup>.

It should be noted that SFPD categorizes residential population demographics differently than other agencies. For instance, the Census American Community Survey (ACS) and

---

<sup>3</sup> [2021 RIPA Board Report - Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory \(RIPA\) Board \(ca.gov\)](#) Pp46

<sup>4</sup> <https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/ripa/ripa-board-report-2020.pdf> pp26-27

## Q2 Quantitative Analysis

### Per Capita Population Benchmark

Racial and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA) have different data standards. When the RIPA board data is used, it is perceived demographic data being compared to self-reported demographics in the residential population data.

Further, “Population counts generally overestimate bias in stop decisions, as differences in poverty, education, and labor market opportunities vary across identity groups in the U.S. Because education and employment affect criminal behavior, disparities along these dimensions will lead to disparities in who commits crime. In this way, pre-existing social disparities will tend to make the fraction of Black or Latinx people in the population smaller than the fraction of Black or Latinx people who are potentially subject to being stopped, overestimating any bias in a stop decision.”<sup>5</sup>

Despite these known limitations in working with population data within a benchmark, it does not mean analysis using a population benchmark is invalid. These limitations should, however, be kept in mind when interpreting results of any population benchmark. Results of population benchmarks can inform future analysis’ and provide insight into potential disparities, trends, and differences between geographic areas, such as SFPD districts.

#### *Population Benchmark Strengths*

A key benefit in using a population data benchmark is the intuitive ease of understanding as compared to other benchmarks. Other benchmarking techniques can utilize univariate or multivariate statistical analysis that can be hard to explain succinctly and can quickly become overwhelming.

#### *What did SFPD do?*

SFPD took a citywide demographic dataset from the 2016-2021 American Community Survey (ACS), administered by the US Census Bureau. Starting in the first quarter of 2023, all datasets are calculated against corresponding population demographics, which are based on 5-year ACS estimates (2016 ACS for 2016 dataset, 2017 ACS for 2017 dataset, etc.), except for 2020 dataset which is based on 2020 Census. 2021 data onward uses 2021 ACS population data. 2022 ACS will be released in December 2023.

Race/Ethnicity groupings are then consolidated to match current department systems, with Asian and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander groups combined into the Asian group, and two or more races, some other race alone and American Indian/Alaska Native

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.capolicylab.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/RIPA-in-the-LAPD-Summary-Report.pdf> pp12-13

## Q2 Quantitative Analysis

### Per Capita Population Benchmark

combined into the Other grouping. The demographic representation in various data and generated per capita (per 1000 residents) along with a table and graph for each datapoint. Data used for comparison to the population benchmark and per capita calculation was gathered during the covered period of this report.

All available data was used for the historical per capita analysis, reaching back to either 2016 or the second half of 2018, depending on the availability of data. All available prior year data was compared with overall trends per capita against types of SFPD activity, by demographic group. In cases where policy standards have changed over time (namely with Use of Force policy), comparisons are done within policy spaces. That is, use of force data from one policy is only compared against itself. Finally, we conducted a disparity analysis by comparing per capita demographic data for certain groups against each other to determine if disparate treatment may be occurring.

#### *Specific Methodology Notes*

In addition to the general challenges of a population benchmark, noted above, SFPD would like to highlight the additional methodological notes for clarity and context.

- Census<sup>6</sup>/ACS data considers “Hispanic” as an ethnicity, while the suspect, stops, searches, uses of force, and arrest data considers “Hispanic” as a race.
- Suspects per District: Crime Data Warehouse was searched for persons categorized as “Suspects” on police incident reports. Suspect demographic information may be developed from calls for service, or it may be developed at a subsequent point during investigation of an incident. All police incident reports (initial or supplemental) having a data value are included. Suspects with unknown race values are not included. While some suspects are subsequently arrested, and also listed as “booked” or “cited” on police incident reports, this category is not intended to include arrestees.
- Stops information provided reflects entries into the Stop Data Collection System (SDCS), a data collection tool provided by the California Department of Justice to assist departments in complying with AB953 and the RIPA Board’s data collection requirements.

---

<sup>6</sup> SFPD discovered a calculation error in Q4, 2021 when tabulating census data. The error and corrected tables are included in the Q4, 2021 QADR.

## **Q2 Quantitative Analysis**

### **Per Capita Population Benchmark**

- Searches information provided reflects entries into the SDCS, with the same caveats as above.
- Uses of Force information provided reflects entries into the department use-of-force Database and account for a distinct count of uses of force broken down by District and race of subject force was used against.
- Arrests count persons “booked” and “cited” where an incident report (initial or supplemental) had a date value.

#### **Historical Per Capita Interactions**

Using the previously mentioned methodologies, the following trends are noted. Per capita interactions for the current and more recent quarters can be found in the type of interactions’ section within the QADR.


Per capita analysis for Use of Force data is presented per use of force standard to allow for an apples-to-apples comparison within each standard.

## Q2 Quantitative Analysis

### Per Capita Population Benchmark

#### Annual Per Capita Interactions by Race

Analysis was conducted using the above methodology across all quarters from which we have useful data. In this case, starting in Q1, 2016 for Arrests, Uses of Force and Suspect data, and 2018 for Stops and Searches. We found the following trends. Note: Data labels and trend lines for the most impacted group(s) are included for context and clarity.



Citywide suspect data since 2016 shows that Black/African American individuals have been reported as suspects of crimes significantly higher than other demographic categories. On average, however, there has been a decline over time of the per capita inclusion of Black/African American residents within suspect reporting.


A linear trendline is produced for the most impacted group. Slopes for all trendlines are included in the above table to allow for comparison. Slope represents the average change, per demographic group, per quarter. In this case the number of Black/African American individuals included in suspect data goes down 5.268, per 1000 Black/African American residents, per year, on average, over time.

| Rate of Decrease, Suspects Per Capita |        |
|---------------------------------------|--------|
| Race                                  | Slope  |
| Black                                 | -5.268 |
| Asian                                 | -0.101 |
| Hispanic                              | -0.243 |
| White                                 | -0.076 |
| Other                                 | -5.810 |



## Q2 Quantitative Analysis

### Per Capita Population Benchmark



Citywide stops data since 2018 shows that Black/African American individuals have been stopped by SFPD at significantly higher rates per capita than other demographic categories. There has been a significant decline over time, on average, of the per capita number of Black/African American stopped in a vehicle or pedestrian stop since mid-2018.


A linear trendline is produced for the most impacted group. Slopes for all trendlines shown in the above table to allow for comparison. Slope represents the average change, per demographic group, per quarter. In this case the number of Black/African American individuals included in tops data goes down 38.90, per 1000 Black/African American residents, per year, on average, over time.

#### Rate of Decrease, Stops Per Capita

| Race     | Slope   |
|----------|---------|
| Black    | -38.901 |
| Asian    | -2.724  |
| Hispanic | -9.280  |
| White    | -6.667  |
| Other    | -14.436 |

# Q2 Quantitative Analysis

## Per Capita Population Benchmark




Citywide search data since 2018 shows that Black/African American individuals have been searched in connection with an interaction with SFPD at rates higher than other demographic categories. There has been a significant decline over time, on average, of the per capita number of Black/African Americans searched since mid-2018.

A linear trendline is produced for the most impacted group. Slopes for all trendlines shown in the above table to allow for comparison. Slope represents the average change, per demographic group, per quarter. In this case the number of Black/African American individuals included in search data goes down 10.446, per 1000 Black/African American residents, per year, on average, over time.

| Rate of Decrease, Searches Per Capita |         |
|---------------------------------------|---------|
| Race                                  | Slope   |
| Black                                 | -10.446 |
| Asian                                 | -0.236  |
| Hispanic                              | -1.776  |
| White                                 | -0.852  |
| Other                                 | -0.870  |

## Q2 Quantitative Analysis

### Per Capita Population Benchmark



Citywide use of force data since 2016 shows that Black/African American individuals have been subject to a use of force at significantly higher rates as compared to other demographic categories. There has been a decline over time, on average, of the per capita number of Black/African Americans upon whom use of force has been used since 2016.

| Rate of Decrease, UoF Per Capita |        |
|----------------------------------|--------|
| Race                             | Slope  |
| Black                            | -1.281 |
| Asian                            | -0.036 |
| Hispanic                         | -0.210 |
| White                            | -0.068 |
| Other                            | -0.076 |


A linear trendline is produced for the most impacted group.

Slopes for all trendlines shown in the above table to allow for comparison. Slope represents the average change, per demographic group, per quarter. In this case the number of Black/African American individuals included in UoF is at -1.281, per 1000 Black/African American residents, per year, on average, over time.

## Q2 Quantitative Analysis

### Per Capita Population Benchmark


*Due to the changes in the Use of Force policy, the 2016 UoF policy data is used to provide context over time, above. A separate calculation for per capita use of force is included using only the April 2022 UoF policy standard, below.*



Data collected under the April 2022 Use of Force policy shows that Black/African American individuals may be subject to a use of force 16.5 times per 1000 Black/African American residents.

## Q2 Quantitative Analysis

### Per Capita Population Benchmark



Citywide arrest data since 2016 shows that Black/African American individuals have arrested at higher rates as compared to other demographic categories. There has been a modest decline over time, on average, of the per capita number of Black/African Americans arrested since 2016.

A linear trendline is produced for the most impacted group. Slopes for all trendlines shown in the above table to allow for comparison. Slope represents the average change, per demographic group, per quarter. In this case the number of Black/African American individuals included in Arrest data goes down 5.18, per 1000 Black/African American residents, per year, on average, over time.


| Rate of Decrease, Arrests Per Capita |        |
|--------------------------------------|--------|
| Race                                 | Slope  |
| Black                                | -5.181 |
| Asian                                | -0.123 |
| Hispanic                             | -0.502 |
| White                                | -0.484 |
| Other                                | -0.127 |

## Q2 Quantitative Analysis

### Per Capita Population Benchmark

#### Yearly Per Capita Disparity Analysis


We further conduct a disparity analysis by baselining the three most represented demographics against each other to find a numerical representation of the disparity between groups, per SFPD interaction, per year. As with the other per capita analysis, Black/African American residents of San Francisco have higher rates of disparity in the data as compared to the White and Hispanic demographic groups. Please note that due to the changes in the Use of Force policy, the 2016 Use of Force policy data is used to provide context over time.




Citywide suspect data since 2016 shows that suspects are listed as Black/African American individuals 13.9-19.0 times more often than white individuals, when comparing to the population per 1000 residents of each.

## Q2 Quantitative Analysis

### Per Capita Population Benchmark




Citywide vehicle and pedestrian stop data from 2018 through 2022 shows that individuals stopped are listed as Black/African American individuals 5.6-5.9 times more often than white individuals, when comparing to the population per 1000 residents of each.




Citywide search data shows that from 2018 through 2022 individuals searched are listed as Black/African American individuals 9.2 to 11.6 times more often than white individuals, when comparing to the population per 1000 residents of each.

## Q2 Quantitative Analysis

### Per Capita Population Benchmark



Citywide Use of Force data shows that from 2016 - Q4 2022 (through Dec 7), under the 2016 Policy, individuals receiving force are listed as Black/African American individuals 9-25 times more often than white individuals, when comparing to the population per 1000 residents of each.




Citywide Use of Force data shows that from Q4 2022 (beginning Dec 8) – Q2 2023, under the December 2022 Policy, individuals receiving force are listed as Black/African American individuals 18-21 times more often than white individuals, when comparing to the population per 1000 residents of each.



## Q2 Quantitative Analysis

### Per Capita Population Benchmark



Citywide arrest data shows that from 2016 through 2022, arrested individuals are listed as Black/African American individuals 9.4-10.7 times more often than white individuals, when comparing to the population per 1000 residents of each.

## Q2 Quantitative Analysis

### Per Capita Population Benchmark

#### *What did we find?*

We found that Black/African American individuals are more often involved in various SFPD interactions than their representation in the population, especially when compared to White residents. In some forms of contact between the department and individuals, this involvement has been decreasing over time. These findings provide context around who is involved with SFPD at various points of engagement but do not answer the question of ‘why’ this is the case.

It is possible that some or all factors discussed in the benchmark description section above are affecting the data in some way. The context provided gives us a common frame for conversation, mutual understanding, and a starting point from which additional analysis may occur.

#### *What's next?*

The Department looks forward to continuing the analysis of data on a quarterly basis. However, it should be noted that SFPD will need to build out analytical capacity to carry out some of this work, and timeline expectations will be shared and updated with the publishing of each quarterly report.

SFPD has also partnered with multiple academic entities to assist in academic level analyses of SFPD data, including:

- The California Policy Lab at UC Berkeley and UC Los Angeles,
- Stanford's SPARQ center,
- Palo Alto University, and
- The Center for Policing Equity
- New York University

# Domestic Violence Reporting

- Admin Code Sec. 96D.2b

## Domestic Violence Reporting - Background

In November 2021, the Board of Supervisors approved, and Mayor Breed signed, legislation amending the San Francisco Administrative Code to require certain data involving Domestic Violence be reported on a quarterly basis starting in the first quarter of 2022. The report is to be submitted on a quarterly basis to the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, Office of Racial Equity, the Human Rights Commission, the Department on the Status of Women, and the Police Commission.

### Domestic Violence Calls for Service and Investigations

Domestic Violence, also known as Intimate Partner Violence, is abbreviated as DV for brevity in this report. For the purposes of this report, Admin Code 96D defines Domestic Violence as: *"Domestic Violence" means the crime defined in Section 273.5 and the crimes punishable under Section 243 (e){1}, of the California Penal Code.*

SFPD responds to calls for service (CFS) received by the Department of Emergency Management (DEM) whether as a 911 emergency or through the non-emergency line. After gathering information from the caller, DEM staff has the responsibility of determining the appropriate code for the call, based on the information provided, and to dispatch units to the location as either a Priority A (highest), Priority B, or Priority C.

Upon arrival, SFPD officers conduct a thorough investigation into the allegations of domestic violence. Per SFPD policy, calls for service are coded with a final disposition of domestic violence (DV) in cases in which DV is evident during an officer's investigation.

In some cases, a report may be taken without a call to 911 (self-reporting at a police station, for example.) In these cases, a call for service number is generated during the report writing process.

This is a quarterly data report from 1 April 2023 through 30 June 2023.

# Domestic Violence Reporting

## - Admin Code Sec. 96D.2b

### Admin Code Sec. 96D.2b Reporting Components

1(A) The number of calls for service for domestic violence that the Police Department received from the Department of Emergency Management for the period of April 1 to June 30, 2023.

| Calls for Service, Final Call Code Includes "DV"<br>April 1 - June 30, 2023 |      |     |     |       |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-----|-----|-------|
|                                                                             | 2023 |     |     |       |
|                                                                             | Apr  | May | Jun | Total |
| DV Calls for Service                                                        | 442  | 479 | 416 | 1337  |

1(B) The number of domestic violence cases that the Police Department presented to the District Attorney for investigation and/or prosecution in the prior quarter, and of those cases, the number in which a child or children were present and/or a firearm or firearms were present.

| DV INCIDENTS SUBMITTED TO THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE             |      |     |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-----|-----|
|                                                                      | 2023 |     |     |
|                                                                      | Apr  | May | Jun |
| Number of DV Cases Presented to the District Attorney's Office       | 77   | 96  | 65  |
| Number of DV cases referred to the DA in which a child was present   | 5    | 14  | 4   |
| Number of DV cases referred to the DA in which a firearm was present | 0    | 3   | 0   |

**Confiscation of Weapons:** Pursuant to Penal Code § 18250 and Department policy, officers are mandated to confiscate any firearms or other deadly weapons discovered at the scene of a domestic violence incident. The weapon is booked into the Department's Property Room as evidence. As federal and state laws prohibit individuals convicted of a domestic violence charge from owning or acquiring a weapon, the Property Room follows DOJ protocols, including a criminal records' checks, to determine if the individual is eligible for release of the weapon.

**Presence of Children:** SFPD Department General Order 6.09 also outlines the procedures to follow if children are present during a domestic violence incident. DGO 7.04, Children of Arrested Parents, provides guidance to minimize the negative impact and harmful stressors on children when a parent/guardian is arrested whether in their presence or not. This policy is considered a national model, highlighting law enforcement's responsibility to ensure a safe environment for children following a traumatic experience such as the arrest of one's parent.




## **SFPD Quarterly Activity & Data Report – Additional Data Tables**

# Stop Data Q2 2023

## Stops, by Self-Initiated vs Dispatched

In Quarter 2 of 2023, there were a total of 4754 stops, a 52% increase from Quarter 2 of 2022. Of those stops, 1,116 (23%) stops were made in response to dispatched calls for service, and 3,638 (77%) stops were made in response to self-initiated calls.




| Stops by Perceived Race-Dispatched |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
|                                    | 2022 |      |      |      | 2023 |      |
| Perceived Race                     | Q1   | Q2*  | Q3   | Q4   | Q1   | Q2*  |
| Self-Initiated                     | 2364 | 1292 | 2910 | 2857 | 2941 | 3638 |
| Dispatched                         | 1405 | 1836 | 1315 | 1142 | 1152 | 1116 |
| Total                              | 3769 | 3128 | 4225 | 3999 | 4093 | 4754 |

\*Due to Stop Data transitioning to a different reporting platform, Q2 2022 and Q2 2023 data contain the stats for the period of April 1 through June 28, 1159hrs.

# Stop Data Q2 2023

During Q2 2023, April 1 through June 28 1159hrs, from 4754 total stops 1,085 (23%) resulted in searches. Of those searches, 542 (49.9%) were made in response to Self-Initiated Calls, and 543 (50%) were in response to Dispatched Calls for Service.



| SFPD Total Searches, Self-Initiated vs Dispatched |      |     |      |     |      |      |
|---------------------------------------------------|------|-----|------|-----|------|------|
|                                                   | 2022 |     |      |     | 2023 |      |
| Perceived Race                                    | Q1   | Q2* | Q3   | Q4  | Q1   | Q2*  |
| Self-Initiated                                    | 385  | 603 | 399  | 382 | 456  | 542  |
| Dispatched                                        | 668  | 360 | 621  | 533 | 514  | 543  |
| Total                                             | 1053 | 963 | 1020 | 915 | 970  | 1085 |

\*Due to Stop Data transitioning to a different reporting platform, Q2 2022 and Q2 2023 data contain the stats for the period of April 1 through June 28, 1159hrs.

The Department utilizes the SDCS program definitions under AB953; a 'stop' is defined as **1)** any detention, as defined in regulations, by a peace officer of a person or **2)** any peace officer interaction with a person in which the officer conducts a search as defined in regulation.<sup>7</sup> Stops include Traffic Stops and Pedestrian Detentions. Stops may be Self-Initiated or Dispatched.

<sup>7</sup>

[https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Browse/Home/California/CaliforniaCodeofRegulations?guid=I93C41A693CA74BA595E5E5C58A213F79&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=Default&contextData=\(sc.Default\)](https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Browse/Home/California/CaliforniaCodeofRegulations?guid=I93C41A693CA74BA595E5E5C58A213F79&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=Default&contextData=(sc.Default))

# Stop Data Q2 2023

## Stops and Searches by Perceived Race/Ethnicity


White individuals accounted for 28% of all stops and 25% of all searches. Black/African American individuals accounted for 21% of total stops and 32% of total searches.

| Total Stops by Perceived Race / Ethnicity<br>Apr 1 - June 28, 2023 1159hrs |       |       |       |          |            |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|----------|------------|
| Perceived Race / Ethnicity                                                 | Apr   | May   | June  | Q2 Total | % of Stops |
| Asian                                                                      | 176   | 180   | 122   | 478      | 10%        |
| Black/African American                                                     | 333   | 375   | 309   | 1,017    | 21%        |
| Hispanic/Latino                                                            | 434   | 566   | 312   | 1,312    | 28%        |
| Middle Eastern or South                                                    | 92    | 124   | 90    | 306      | 6%         |
| Native American                                                            | 4     | 2     | 4     | 10       | 0%         |
| Pacific Islander                                                           | 24    | 23    | 19    | 66       | 1%         |
| White                                                                      | 472   | 543   | 335   | 1,350    | 28%        |
| Other                                                                      | 72    | 82    | 61    | 215      | 5%         |
| Total                                                                      | 1,607 | 1,895 | 1,252 | 4,754    | 100%       |

| Total Searches by Perceived Race / Ethnicity<br>Apr 1 - June 28, 2023 1159hrs |     |     |      |          |               |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|------|----------|---------------|
| Perceived Race / Ethnicity                                                    | Apr | May | June | Q2 Total | % of Searches |
| Asian                                                                         | 20  | 15  | 14   | 49       | 5%            |
| Black/African American                                                        | 105 | 135 | 110  | 350      | 32%           |
| Hispanic/Latino                                                               | 95  | 129 | 75   | 299      | 28%           |
| Middle Eastern or South                                                       | 7   | 4   | 7    | 18       | 2%            |
| Native American                                                               | 1   | 0   | 4    | 5        | 0%            |
| Pacific Islander                                                              | 7   | 4   | 7    | 18       | 2%            |
| White                                                                         | 90  | 96  | 88   | 274      | 25%           |
| Other                                                                         | 28  | 23  | 21   | 72       | 7%            |
| Total                                                                         | 353 | 406 | 326  | 1,085    | 100%          |




# Stop Data Q2 2023




## Stops and Searches by Perceived Race/Ethnicity, By Self-Initiated (On-View) and Dispatched Calls for Service

In Q2 2023, 3,638 out of Stops made in response to Self-Initiated Calls, White individuals accounted for (27%) stops followed by Hispanic/Latino Individuals 1,076 (30%). Black/African American Individuals accounted for 678 (19%) stops.



# Stop Data Q2 2023


In Q2 2023, out of 1,152 Stops made in response to Dispatched Calls for Service, White Individuals accounted for 399 (35%) stops and Black/African American individuals accounted for 362 (31%) stops. Hispanic/Latino individuals accounted for 224 (19%) stops.




*\*Due to Stop Data transitioning to a different reporting platform, Q2 2022 and Q2 2023 data contain the stats for the period of April 1 through June 28, 1159hrs.*

## Searches, by Self- Initiated vs Dispatched

In Q2 2023, out of 543 Searches made in response to Self-Initiated Stops, Black/African American individuals accounted for 179 (33%) searches followed by Hispanic/Latino individuals 181 (33%), and White individuals accounted for 97 (18%) searches.



In Q2 2023, out of 542 Searches made in response to Dispatched Calls for Service, Black/African American accounted for 171 (32%) searches followed by White individuals 177 (33%), and Hispanic/Latino individuals accounted for 118 (22%) searches.



\*Due to Stop Data transitioning to a different reporting platform, Q2 2022 and Q2 2023 data contain the stats for the period of April 1 through June 28, 1159hrs.


# Stop Data Q2 2023

## Stops and Searches by Perceived Age

Individuals within the age group of 30-39 accounted for the most stops (33%) and the most searches (36%).

| Total Stops by Perceived Age Category<br>Apr 1 - June 28, 2023 1159hrs |       |       |       |          |            |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|----------|------------|
| Perceived Age Category                                                 | Apr   | May   | June  | Q2 Total | % of Stops |
| Under 18                                                               | 41    | 55    | 43    | 139      | 3%         |
| 18 - 29                                                                | 399   | 437   | 309   | 1,145    | 24%        |
| 30 - 39                                                                | 540   | 635   | 400   | 1,575    | 33%        |
| 40 - 49                                                                | 322   | 379   | 275   | 976      | 21%        |
| 50 - 59                                                                | 200   | 262   | 141   | 603      | 13%        |
| 60 or over                                                             | 103   | 117   | 80    | 300      | 6%         |
| Unknown                                                                | 2     | 10    | 4     | 16       | 0%         |
| Total                                                                  | 1,607 | 1,895 | 1,252 | 4,754    | 100%       |

| Total Searches by Perceived Age Category<br>Apr 1 - June 28, 2023 1159hrs |     |     |      |          |               |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|------|----------|---------------|
| Perceived Age Category                                                    | Apr | May | June | Q2 Total | % of Searches |
| Under 18                                                                  | 18  | 23  | 26   | 67       | 6%            |
| 18 - 29                                                                   | 95  | 106 | 85   | 286      | 26%           |
| 30 - 39                                                                   | 136 | 138 | 114  | 388      | 36%           |
| 40 - 49                                                                   | 61  | 82  | 65   | 208      | 19%           |
| 50 - 59                                                                   | 28  | 43  | 29   | 100      | 9%            |
| 60 or over                                                                | 15  | 14  | 7    | 36       | 3%            |
| Total                                                                     | 353 | 406 | 326  | 1,085    | 100%          |




# Stop Data Q2 2023

## Stops and Searches by Perceived Gender

Male individuals accounted for 78% of all stops and 82% of all searches.

| Total Stops by Perceived Gender<br>Apr 1 - June 28, 2023 1159hrs |       |       |       |          |            |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|----------|------------|
| Perceived Gender                                                 | Apr   | May   | June  | Q2 Total | % of Stops |
| Female                                                           | 331   | 427   | 226   | 984      | 21%        |
| Male                                                             | 1,262 | 1,450 | 1,015 | 3,727    | 78%        |
| Transgender man/boy                                              | 2     | 0     | 1     | 3        | 0%         |
| Transgender woman/girl                                           | 6     | 7     | 6     | 19       | 0%         |
| Unknown                                                          | 6     | 11    | 4     | 21       | 0%         |
| Total                                                            | 1,607 | 1,895 | 1,252 | 4,754    | 100%       |

| Total Searches by Perceived Gender<br>Apr 1 - June 28, 2023 1159hrs |     |     |      |          |               |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|------|----------|---------------|
| Perceived Gender                                                    | Apr | May | June | Q2 Total | % of Searches |
| Female                                                              | 57  | 81  | 41   | 179      | 16%           |
| Male                                                                | 292 | 320 | 282  | 894      | 82%           |
| Transgender man/boy                                                 | 1   | 0   | 1    | 2        | 0%            |
| Transgender woman/girl                                              | 1   | 4   | 2    | 7        | 1%            |
| Unknown                                                             | 2   | 1   | 0    | 3        | 0%            |
| Total                                                               | 353 | 406 | 326  | 1,085    | 100%          |



# Stop Data Q2 2023

## Stops and Searches by District

Mission Station accounted for the most stops (14.1%) and Tenderloin Station conducted the most searches (15.9%).

| Total Stops by District<br>Apr 1 - June 28, 2023 1159hrs |              |              |              |              |             |
|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| District                                                 | Jan          | Feb          | Mar          | Total        | % Total     |
| Central                                                  | 119          | 117          | 74           | 310          | 7.6%        |
| Southern                                                 | 127          | 83           | 145          | 355          | 8.7%        |
| Bayview                                                  | 36           | 36           | 86           | 158          | 3.9%        |
| Mission                                                  | 123          | 195          | 259          | 577          | 14.1%       |
| Northern                                                 | 109          | 131          | 110          | 350          | 8.6%        |
| Park                                                     | 61           | 38           | 86           | 185          | 4.5%        |
| Richmond                                                 | 93           | 75           | 71           | 239          | 5.8%        |
| Ingleside                                                | 76           | 86           | 79           | 241          | 5.9%        |
| Taraval                                                  | 31           | 43           | 89           | 163          | 4.0%        |
| Tenderloin                                               | 79           | 131          | 133          | 343          | 8.4%        |
| Airport                                                  | 114          | 107          | 150          | 371          | 9.1%        |
| Unknown                                                  | 247          | 228          | 326          | 801          | 19.6%       |
| <b>Total</b>                                             | <b>1,215</b> | <b>1,270</b> | <b>1,608</b> | <b>4,093</b> | <b>100%</b> |

| Total Searches by District<br>Apr 1 - June 28, 2023 1159hrs |            |            |            |            |             |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| District                                                    | Jan        | Feb        | Mar        | Total      | % Total     |
| Central                                                     | 38         | 47         | 20         | 105        | 10.8%       |
| Southern                                                    | 32         | 31         | 41         | 104        | 10.7%       |
| Bayview                                                     | 15         | 19         | 24         | 58         | 6.0%        |
| Mission                                                     | 30         | 35         | 43         | 108        | 11.1%       |
| Northern                                                    | 37         | 29         | 28         | 94         | 9.7%        |
| Park                                                        | 9          | 8          | 6          | 23         | 2.4%        |
| Richmond                                                    | 2          | 4          | 8          | 14         | 1.4%        |
| Ingleside                                                   | 16         | 22         | 25         | 63         | 6.5%        |
| Taraval                                                     | 12         | 9          | 11         | 32         | 3.3%        |
| Tenderloin                                                  | 40         | 53         | 61         | 154        | 15.9%       |
| Airport                                                     | 17         | 16         | 29         | 62         | 6.4%        |
| Unknown                                                     | 68         | 47         | 38         | 153        | 15.8%       |
| <b>Total</b>                                                | <b>316</b> | <b>320</b> | <b>334</b> | <b>970</b> | <b>100%</b> |

**Note:** Location information in the Stop Data Collection System is in free text format. "Unknown" indicates stop records that could not be geocoded.


# Stop Data Q2 2023

## Basis of Searches

The two reasons that accounted for 63% of total searches were Incident to Arrest (46%) and Officer Safety/Safety of Others (17%).

| Total Basis of Search                                    | Total        | % Total |
|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------|---------|
| Consent given                                            | 59           | 4%      |
| Officer safety/safety of others                          | 276          | 17%     |
| Search warrant                                           | 52           | 3%      |
| Condition of parole/probation/PRCS/mandatory supervision | 90           | 6%      |
| Suspected weapons                                        | 88           | 6%      |
| Visible contraband                                       | 67           | 4%      |
| Odor of contraband                                       | 9            | 1%      |
| Canine Detection                                         | 3            | 0%      |
| Evidence of crime                                        | 163          | 10%     |
| Incident to arrest                                       | 729          | 46%     |
| Exigent circumstances/emergency                          | 9            | 1%      |
| Vehicle inventory                                        | 53           | 3%      |
| Suspected violation of school policy                     | 0            | 0%      |
| <b>*Distinct Count of Searches</b>                       | <b>1,085</b> |         |
| <b>Total Count of Basis for Search</b>                   | <b>1,598</b> |         |

\*There may be more than one basis for search





# Stop Data Q2 2023

## Basis of Search by Race, Age, and Gender – Quarter 2 of 2023

| Basis of Search                                              | Asian     | Black/<br>African<br>American | Hispanic/<br>Latino | Middle<br>Eastern/<br>South<br>Asian | Native<br>American | Pacific<br>Islander | White      | Other     | Total        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------|-----------|--------------|
| Consent given                                                | 4         | 21                            | 10                  | 1                                    | 2                  | 1                   | 16         | 4         | 59           |
| Officer safety/safety of others                              | 20        | 88                            | 61                  | 6                                    | 2                  | 4                   | 69         | 26        | 276          |
| Search warrant                                               | 2         | 23                            | 22                  | 0                                    | 0                  | 1                   | 1          | 3         | 52           |
| Condition of parole/probation/<br>PRCS/mandatory supervision | 1         | 34                            | 20                  | 2                                    | 0                  | 3                   | 15         | 15        | 90           |
| Suspected weapons                                            | 3         | 34                            | 17                  | 3                                    | 0                  | 2                   | 26         | 3         | 88           |
| Visible contraband                                           | 0         | 17                            | 18                  | 2                                    | 1                  | 0                   | 24         | 5         | 67           |
| Odor of contraband                                           | 1         | 3                             | 4                   | 0                                    | 0                  | 0                   | 0          | 1         | 9            |
| Canine Detection                                             | 0         | 0                             | 3                   | 0                                    | 0                  | 0                   | 0          | 0         | 3            |
| Evidence of crime                                            | 4         | 55                            | 54                  | 1                                    | 0                  | 1                   | 41         | 7         | 163          |
| Incident to arrest                                           | 31        | 235                           | 216                 | 11                                   | 2                  | 10                  | 188        | 36        | 729          |
| Exigent circumstances/emergency                              | 0         | 3                             | 1                   | 0                                    | 0                  | 0                   | 5          | 0         | 9            |
| Vehicle inventory                                            | 2         | 22                            | 12                  | 1                                    | 0                  | 1                   | 12         | 3         | 53           |
| Suspected violation of school policy                         | 0         | 0                             | 0                   | 0                                    | 0                  | 0                   | 0          | 0         | 0            |
| <b>Distinct Count of Searches</b>                            | <b>49</b> | <b>350</b>                    | <b>299</b>          | <b>18</b>                            | <b>5</b>           | <b>18</b>           | <b>274</b> | <b>72</b> | <b>1,085</b> |
| <b>% of Total Searches</b>                                   | <b>5%</b> | <b>32%</b>                    | <b>28%</b>          | <b>2%</b>                            | <b>0%</b>          | <b>2%</b>           | <b>25%</b> | <b>7%</b> | <b>100%</b>  |

| Basis of Search                                              | Under 18  | 18-29      | 30-39      | 40-49      | 50-59      | 60+       | Total        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|--------------|
| Consent given                                                | 1         | 17         | 20         | 13         | 4          | 4         | 59           |
| Officer safety/safety of others                              | 25        | 79         | 85         | 49         | 26         | 12        | 276          |
| Search warrant                                               | 5         | 16         | 12         | 12         | 5          | 2         | 52           |
| Condition of parole/probation/<br>PRCS/mandatory supervision | 0         | 22         | 39         | 20         | 6          | 3         | 90           |
| Suspected weapons                                            | 5         | 19         | 32         | 16         | 13         | 3         | 88           |
| Visible contraband                                           | 1         | 26         | 24         | 11         | 4          | 1         | 67           |
| Odor of contraband                                           | 1         | 4          | 4          | 0          | 0          | 0         | 9            |
| Canine Detection                                             | 0         | 3          | 0          | 0          |            | 0         | 3            |
| Evidence of crime                                            | 12        | 53         | 56         | 28         | 9          | 5         | 163          |
| Incident to arrest                                           | 43        | 195        | 267        | 130        | 72         | 22        | 729          |
| Exigent circumstances/emergency                              | 2         | 2          | 3          | 0          | 2          | 0         | 9            |
| Vehicle inventory                                            | 2         | 13         | 16         | 14         | 7          | 1         | 53           |
| Suspected violation of school policy                         | 0         | 0          | 0          | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0            |
| <b>Distinct Count of Searches</b>                            | <b>67</b> | <b>286</b> | <b>388</b> | <b>208</b> | <b>100</b> | <b>36</b> | <b>1,085</b> |
| <b>% of Total Searches</b>                                   | <b>6%</b> | <b>26%</b> | <b>36%</b> | <b>19%</b> | <b>9%</b>  | <b>3%</b> | <b>100%</b>  |


# Stop Data Q2 2023

| Basis of Search                                          | Female     | Male       | Transgender man/boy | Transgender woman/girl | Unknown   | Total        |
|----------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------|--------------|
| Consent given                                            | 11         | 47         | 0                   | 1                      | 0         | 59           |
| Officer safety/safety of others                          | 45         | 227        | 2                   | 1                      | 1         | 276          |
| Search warrant                                           | 14         | 38         | 0                   | 0                      | 0         | 52           |
| Condition of parole/probation/PRCS/mandatory supervision | 6          | 84         | 0                   | 0                      | 0         | 90           |
| Suspected weapons                                        | 7          | 80         | 0                   | 1                      | 0         | 88           |
| Visible contraband                                       | 7          | 60         | 0                   | 0                      | 0         | 67           |
| Odor of contraband                                       | 4          | 5          | 0                   | 0                      | 0         | 9            |
| Canine Detection                                         | 1          | 2          | 0                   | 0                      | 0         | 3            |
| Evidence of crime                                        | 25         | 136        | 0                   | 2                      | 0         | 163          |
| Incident to arrest                                       | 125        | 597        | 1                   | 4                      | 2         | 729          |
| Exigent circumstances/emergency                          | 2          | 7          | 0                   | 0                      | 0         | 9            |
| Vehicle inventory                                        | 7          | 46         | 0                   | 0                      | 0         | 53           |
| Suspected violation of school policy                     | 0          | 0          | 0                   | 0                      | 0         | 0            |
| <b>Distinct Count of Searches</b>                        | <b>179</b> | <b>894</b> | <b>2</b>            | <b>7</b>               | <b>3</b>  | <b>1,085</b> |
| <b>% of Total Searches</b>                               | <b>16%</b> | <b>82%</b> | <b>0%</b>           | <b>1%</b>              | <b>0%</b> | <b>100%</b>  |

# Stop Data Q2 2023

## Search Yield Rate


There were 1085 distinct searches in Quarter 2 of 2023. Total yield rate for all searches was 57%.



\*Due to Stop Data transitioning to a different reporting platform, Q2 2022 and Q2 2023 data contain the stats for the period of April 1 through June 28, 1159hrs.

Yield rate was 58% for Other, 53% for Black/African Americans, 69% for Hispanics/Latinos, 36% for Asian and 54% for White individuals in Quarter 2 of 2023.


# Stop Data Q2 2023



Search yield rates have increased year over year since mid-2018, suggesting an increase in the use of objective factors and decrease in the use of bias in decisions to search individuals.

# Stop Data Q2 2023

## Results of Searches 2023 QUARTER 2



| Results of Searches                 | Total        | % Total     |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| None                                | 469          | 31%         |
| Firearm(s)                          | 77           | 5%          |
| Ammunition                          | 66           | 4%          |
| Weapon(s) other than a firearm      | 71           | 5%          |
| Drugs/Narcotics                     | 247          | 16%         |
| Alcohol                             | 26           | 2%          |
| Money                               | 119          | 8%          |
| Drug Paraphernalia                  | 152          | 10%         |
| Suspected stolen property           | 98           | 6%          |
| Cell phone(s) or electronic devices | 76           | 5%          |
| Other Contraband or evidence        | 134          | 9%          |
| Unknown                             | 0            | 0%          |
| <b>Distinct Count of Search</b>     | <b>1,085</b> | <b>100%</b> |

\*A single search may have multiple results

# Stop Data Q2 2023

## Results of Searches 2023 QUARTER 2

| Results of Searches                 | Asian     | Black/<br>African<br>American | Hispanic/<br>Latino | Middle<br>Eastern/ South<br>Asian | Native<br>American | Pacific<br>Islander | White      | Other     | Total        |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------|-----------|--------------|
| None                                | 32        | 166                           | 95                  | 15                                | 3                  | 11                  | 125        | 22        | 469          |
| Firearm(s)                          | 3         | 34                            | 16                  | 2                                 | 1                  | 1                   | 12         | 8         | 77           |
| Ammunition                          | 2         | 26                            | 13                  | 2                                 | 1                  | 0                   | 11         | 11        | 66           |
| Weapon(s) other than a firearm      | 4         | 17                            | 18                  | 1                                 | 1                  | 2                   | 24         | 4         | 71           |
| Drugs/Narcotics                     | 6         | 45                            | 126                 | 2                                 | 0                  | 1                   | 43         | 24        | 247          |
| Alcohol                             | 1         | 3                             | 13                  | 0                                 | 0                  | 0                   | 3          | 6         | 26           |
| Money                               | 0         | 15                            | 80                  | 2                                 | 0                  | 0                   | 7          | 15        | 119          |
| Drug Paraphernalia                  | 3         | 44                            | 37                  | 0                                 | 0                  | 2                   | 62         | 4         | 152          |
| Suspected stolen property           | 2         | 50                            | 21                  | 0                                 | 0                  | 0                   | 22         | 3         | 98           |
| Cell phone(s) or electronic devices | 2         | 32                            | 30                  | 1                                 | 0                  | 1                   | 8          | 2         | 76           |
| Other Contraband or evidence        | 4         | 52                            | 29                  | 0                                 | 0                  | 2                   | 42         | 5         | 134          |
| Unknown                             |           |                               |                     |                                   |                    |                     |            |           | 0            |
| <b>Distinct Count of Search</b>     | <b>49</b> | <b>350</b>                    | <b>299</b>          | <b>18</b>                         | <b>5</b>           | <b>18</b>           | <b>274</b> | <b>72</b> | <b>1,085</b> |

| Results of Searches                 | Under 18  | 18-29      | 30-39      | 40-49      | 50-59      | 60+       | Unknown  | Total        |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|----------|--------------|
| None                                | 31        | 110        | 163        | 107        | 43         | 15        | 0        | 469          |
| Firearm(s)                          | 7         | 33         | 27         | 5          | 4          | 1         | 0        | 77           |
| Ammunition                          | 6         | 26         | 20         | 7          | 5          | 2         | 0        | 66           |
| Weapon(s) other than a firearm      | 5         | 10         | 27         | 18         | 10         | 1         | 0        | 71           |
| Drugs/Narcotics                     | 14        | 92         | 89         | 29         | 19         | 4         | 0        | 247          |
| Alcohol                             | 0         | 10         | 7          | 4          | 3          | 2         | 0        | 26           |
| Money                               | 10        | 67         | 31         | 10         | 1          | 0         | 0        | 119          |
| Drug Paraphernalia                  | 0         | 21         | 80         | 29         | 17         | 5         | 0        | 152          |
| Suspected stolen property           | 10        | 28         | 32         | 17         | 7          | 4         | 0        | 98           |
| Cell phone(s) or electronic devices | 6         | 33         | 20         | 11         | 3          | 3         | 0        | 76           |
| Other Contraband or evidence        | 11        | 25         | 49         | 29         | 14         | 6         | 0        | 134          |
| Unknown                             | 0         | 0          | 0          | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0        | 0            |
| <b>Distinct Count of Search</b>     | <b>67</b> | <b>286</b> | <b>388</b> | <b>208</b> | <b>100</b> | <b>36</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>1,085</b> |


| Results of Searches                 | Female     | Male       | Transgender<br>man/boy | Transgender<br>woman/girl | Unknown  | Total        |
|-------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------------------|---------------------------|----------|--------------|
| None                                | 97         | 366        | 1                      | 4                         | 1        | 469          |
| Firearm(s)                          | 7          | 69         | 0                      | 1                         | 0        | 77           |
| Ammunition                          | 6          | 57         | 1                      | 0                         | 2        | 66           |
| Weapon(s) other than a firearm      | 13         | 57         | 0                      | 1                         | 0        | 71           |
| Drugs/Narcotics                     | 33         | 213        | 0                      | 1                         | 0        | 247          |
| Alcohol                             | 2          | 24         | 0                      | 0                         | 0        | 26           |
| Money                               | 13         | 106        | 0                      | 0                         | 0        | 119          |
| Drug Paraphernalia                  | 20         | 132        | 0                      | 0                         | 0        | 152          |
| Suspected stolen property           | 18         | 80         | 0                      | 0                         | 0        | 98           |
| Cell phone(s) or electronic devices | 16         | 60         | 0                      | 0                         | 0        | 76           |
| Other Contraband or evidence        | 21         | 112        | 0                      | 1                         | 0        | 134          |
| Unknown                             | 0          | 0          | 0                      | 0                         | 0        | 0            |
| <b>Distinct Count of Search</b>     | <b>179</b> | <b>894</b> | <b>2</b>               | <b>7</b>                  | <b>3</b> | <b>1,085</b> |

# Stop Data Q2 2023

## Reasons for Stops

In Quarter 2 of 2023, traffic violations and reasonable suspicion accounted for 95% of reasons for stop. Traffic violations accounted for 60% and reasonable suspicion accounted for 35%.

| Reason for Stops                                                       | Total        | % Total     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Consensual encounter resulting in search                               | 18           | 0%          |
| Investigation to determine if person is truant                         | 22           | 0%          |
| Knowledge of outstanding arrest warrant/wanted person                  | 158          | 3%          |
| Known to be on parole/probation/PRCS/ mandatory supervision            | 14           | 0%          |
| Reasonable suspicion that this person was engaged in criminal activity | 1,680        | 35%         |
| Traffic violation                                                      | 2,838        | 60%         |
| Unknown                                                                | 24           | 1%          |
| <b>Distinct Count of Stops</b>                                         | <b>4,754</b> | <b>100%</b> |



# Stop Data Q2 2023

## Reasons for Stops by Race, Age, Gender

| Reasons for Stops                                                      | Asian      | Black/<br>African<br>American | Hispanic/ Latino | Middle Eastern/<br>South Asian | Native<br>American | Pacific<br>Islander | White        | Other      | Total        |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------|------------|--------------|
| Consensual encounter resulting in search                               | 2          | 6                             | 2                | 0                              | 0                  | 0                   | 8            | 0          | 18           |
| Investigation to determine if person is truant                         | 0          | 3                             | 9                | 1                              | 0                  | 1                   | 8            | 0          | 22           |
| Knowledge of outstanding arrest warrant/wanted person                  | 10         | 64                            | 35               | 6                              | 0                  | 1                   | 38           | 4          | 158          |
| Known to be on parole/probation/PRCS/mandatory supervision             | 0          | 5                             | 4                | 0                              | 0                  | 1                   | 2            | 2          | 14           |
| Reasonable suspicion that this person was engaged in criminal activity | 93         | 492                           | 488              | 36                             | 7                  | 26                  | 477          | 61         | 1,680        |
| Traffic violation                                                      | 372        | 447                           | 769              | 263                            | 3                  | 37                  | 815          | 132        | 2,838        |
| Unknown                                                                | 1          | 0                             | 5                | 0                              | 0                  | 0                   | 2            | 16         | 24           |
| <b>Distinct Count of Stops</b>                                         | <b>478</b> | <b>1,017</b>                  | <b>1,312</b>     | <b>306</b>                     | <b>10</b>          | <b>66</b>           | <b>1,350</b> | <b>215</b> | <b>4,754</b> |
| <b>% of Stops</b>                                                      | <b>10%</b> | <b>21%</b>                    | <b>28%</b>       | <b>6%</b>                      | <b>0%</b>          | <b>1%</b>           | <b>28%</b>   | <b>5%</b>  | <b>100%</b>  |

| Reasons for Stops                                                      | Under 18   | 18-29        | 30-39        | 40-49      | 50-59      | 60+        | Unknown   | Total        |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|--------------|
| Consensual encounter resulting in search                               | 0          | 9            | 3            | 3          | 0          | 3          | 0         | 18           |
| Investigation to determine if person is truant                         | 2          | 8            | 5            | 4          | 1          | 2          | 0         | 22           |
| Knowledge of outstanding arrest warrant/wanted person                  | 8          | 36           | 45           | 37         | 24         | 8          | 0         | 158          |
| Known to be on parole/probation/PRCS/mandatory supervision             | 0          | 5            | 6            | 3          | 0          | 0          | 0         | 14           |
| Reasonable suspicion that this person was engaged in criminal activity | 112        | 386          | 588          | 322        | 185        | 87         | 0         | 1,680        |
| Traffic violation                                                      | 17         | 700          | 925          | 603        | 393        | 200        | 0         | 2,838        |
| Unknown                                                                | 0          | 1            | 3            | 4          | 0          | 0          | 16        | 24           |
| <b>Distinct Count of Stops</b>                                         | <b>139</b> | <b>1,145</b> | <b>1,575</b> | <b>976</b> | <b>603</b> | <b>300</b> | <b>16</b> | <b>4,754</b> |
| <b>% of Stops</b>                                                      | <b>3%</b>  | <b>24%</b>   | <b>33%</b>   | <b>21%</b> | <b>13%</b> | <b>6%</b>  | <b>0%</b> | <b>100%</b>  |

| Reasons for Stops                                                      | Female     | Male         | Transgender<br>man/boy | Transgender<br>woman/girl | Unknown   | Total        |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|--------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|--------------|
| Consensual encounter resulting in search                               | 4          | 14           | 0                      | 0                         | 0         | 18           |
| Investigation to determine if person is truant                         | 6          | 16           | 0                      | 0                         | 0         | 22           |
| Knowledge of outstanding arrest warrant/wanted person                  | 22         | 134          | 1                      | 1                         | 0         | 158          |
| Known to be on parole/probation/PRCS/mandatory supervision             | 1          | 13           | 0                      | 0                         | 0         | 14           |
| Reasonable suspicion that this person was engaged in criminal activity | 349        | 1,317        | 0                      | 13                        | 1         | 1,680        |
| Traffic violation                                                      | 600        | 2,227        | 2                      | 5                         | 4         | 2,838        |
| Unknown                                                                | 2          | 6            | 0                      | 0                         | 16        | 24           |
| <b>Distinct Count of Stops</b>                                         | <b>984</b> | <b>3,727</b> | <b>3</b>               | <b>19</b>                 | <b>21</b> | <b>4,754</b> |
| <b>% of Stops</b>                                                      | <b>21%</b> | <b>78%</b>   | <b>0%</b>              | <b>0%</b>                 | <b>0%</b> | <b>100%</b>  |




# Stop Data Q2 2023

## Results of Stops

Of the 4,754 stops, a citation for infraction was issued for 29% of the stops; a warning was issued for 27%, and custodial arrest without warrant occurred for 14% of the stops.

| Results of Stops                                                                                           | Total        | % Total     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| No action                                                                                                  | 426          | 9%          |
| Warning (verbal or written)                                                                                | 1,341        | 27%         |
| Citation for infraction (use for local ordinances only)                                                    | 1,430        | 29%         |
| In-field cite and release                                                                                  | 542          | 11%         |
| Custodial arrest pursuant to outstanding warrant                                                           | 321          | 6%          |
| Custodial arrest without warrant                                                                           | 685          | 14%         |
| Field interview card completed                                                                             | 49           | 1%          |
| Non-criminal transport or caretaking transport (including transport by officer, ambulance or other agency) | 32           | 1%          |
| Contacted parent/legal guardian or other person responsible for the minor                                  | 45           | 1%          |
| Psychiatric hold (W&I Code 5150 or 5585.20)                                                                | 121          | 2%          |
| Contacted U.S. Department of Homeland Security (e.g., ICE or CBP)                                          | 3            | 0%          |
| Referral to school administrator or other support staff                                                    | 0            | 0%          |
| Unknown                                                                                                    | 0            | 0%          |
| <b>Distinct Count of Stops</b>                                                                             | <b>4,754</b> | <b>100%</b> |

\*A single stop may have multiple results



# Stop Data Q2 2023

## Results of Stops by Race, Age, and Gender

| Results of Stops                                                                                           | Asian      | Black/<br>African<br>American | Hispanic/<br>Latino(a) | Middle<br>Eastern/<br>South Asian | Native<br>American | Pacific<br>Islander | White        | Other      | Total        |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------|------------|--------------|
| No action                                                                                                  | 19         | 130                           | 114                    | 9                                 | 5                  | 6                   | 114          | 29         | 426          |
| Warning (verbal or written)                                                                                | 147        | 290                           | 338                    | 121                               | 2                  | 14                  | 362          | 67         | 1,341        |
| Citation for infraction (use for local ordinances only)                                                    | 213        | 150                           | 391                    | 133                               | 0                  | 24                  | 461          | 58         | 1,430        |
| In-field cite and release                                                                                  | 52         | 121                           | 182                    | 35                                | 0                  | 6                   | 127          | 19         | 542          |
| Custodial arrest pursuant to outstanding warrant                                                           | 13         | 109                           | 68                     | 7                                 | 0                  | 5                   | 110          | 9          | 321          |
| Custodial arrest without warrant                                                                           | 29         | 211                           | 230                    | 7                                 | 2                  | 11                  | 160          | 35         | 685          |
| Field interview card completed                                                                             | 2          | 14                            | 15                     | 1                                 | 0                  | 1                   | 15           | 1          | 49           |
| Non-criminal transport or caretaking transport (including transport by officer, ambulance or other agency) | 0          | 11                            | 5                      | 2                                 | 0                  | 0                   | 14           | 0          | 32           |
| Contacted parent/legal guardian or other person responsible for the minor                                  | 2          | 19                            | 10                     | 2                                 | 1                  | 0                   | 6            | 5          | 45           |
| Psychiatric hold (W&I Code 5150 or 5585.20)                                                                | 18         | 29                            | 15                     | 3                                 | 0                  | 2                   | 52           | 2          | 121          |
| Contacted U.S. Department of Homeland Security (e.g., ICE or CBP)                                          | 1          | 1                             | 0                      | 0                                 | 0                  | 0                   | 1            | 0          | 3            |
| Referral to school administrator or other support staff                                                    | 0          | 0                             | 0                      | 0                                 | 0                  | 0                   | 0            | 0          | 0            |
| Unknown                                                                                                    | 0          | 0                             | 0                      | 0                                 | 0                  | 0                   | 0            | 0          | 0            |
| <b>Distinct Count of Stops</b>                                                                             | <b>478</b> | <b>1,017</b>                  | <b>1,312</b>           | <b>306</b>                        | <b>10</b>          | <b>66</b>           | <b>1,350</b> | <b>215</b> | <b>4,754</b> |

| Results of Stops                                                                                           | Under 18   | 18-29        | 30-39        | 40-49      | 50-59      | 60+        | Unknown   | Total        |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|--------------|
| No action                                                                                                  | 15         | 113          | 133          | 89         | 47         | 13         | 16        | 426          |
| Warning (verbal or written)                                                                                | 13         | 295          | 440          | 310        | 191        | 92         | 0         | 1,341        |
| Citation for infraction (use for local ordinances only)                                                    | 10         | 320          | 460          | 305        | 215        | 120        | 0         | 1,430        |
| In-field cite and release                                                                                  | 30         | 142          | 176          | 97         | 60         | 37         | 0         | 542          |
| Custodial arrest pursuant to outstanding warrant                                                           | 7          | 46           | 133          | 86         | 35         | 14         | 0         | 321          |
| Custodial arrest without warrant                                                                           | 33         | 214          | 250          | 113        | 59         | 16         | 0         | 685          |
| Field interview card completed                                                                             | 3          | 16           | 16           | 7          | 6          | 1          | 0         | 49           |
| Non-criminal transport or caretaking transport (including transport by officer, ambulance or other agency) | 5          | 10           | 9            | 5          | 3          | 0          | 0         | 32           |
| Contacted parent/legal guardian or other person responsible for the minor                                  | 41         | 4            | 0            | 0          | 0          | 0          | 0         | 45           |
| Psychiatric hold (W&I Code 5150 or 5585.20)                                                                | 5          | 28           | 48           | 14         | 10         | 16         | 0         | 121          |
| Contacted U.S. Department of Homeland Security (e.g., ICE or CBP)                                          | 0          | 1            | 1            | 1          | 0          | 0          | 0         | 3            |
| Referral to school administrator or other support staff                                                    | 0          | 0            | 0            | 0          | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0            |
| Unknown                                                                                                    | 0          | 0            | 0            | 0          | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0            |
| <b>Distinct Count of Stops</b>                                                                             | <b>139</b> | <b>1,145</b> | <b>1,575</b> | <b>976</b> | <b>603</b> | <b>300</b> | <b>16</b> | <b>4,754</b> |

| Results of Stops                                                                                           | Female     | Male         | Transgender<br>man/boy | Transgender<br>woman/girl | Unknown   | Total        |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|--------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|--------------|
| No action                                                                                                  | 106        | 303          | 0                      | 1                         | 16        | 426          |
| Warning (verbal or written)                                                                                | 299        | 1,037        | 0                      | 5                         | 0         | 1,341        |
| Citation for infraction (use for local ordinances only)                                                    | 283        | 1,140        | 2                      | 1                         | 4         | 1,430        |
| In-field cite and release                                                                                  | 106        | 430          | 0                      | 5                         | 1         | 542          |
| Custodial arrest pursuant to outstanding warrant                                                           | 45         | 275          | 0                      | 0                         | 1         | 321          |
| Custodial arrest without warrant                                                                           | 121        | 558          | 1                      | 5                         | 0         | 685          |
| Field interview card completed                                                                             | 10         | 38           | 0                      | 0                         | 1         | 49           |
| Non-criminal transport or caretaking transport (including transport by officer, ambulance or other agency) | 9          | 23           | 0                      | 0                         | 0         | 32           |
| Contacted parent/legal guardian or other person responsible for the minor                                  | 10         | 35           | 0                      | 0                         | 0         | 45           |
| Psychiatric hold (W&I Code 5150 or 5585.20)                                                                | 43         | 75           | 0                      | 3                         | 0         | 121          |
| Contacted U.S. Department of Homeland Security (e.g., ICE or CBP)                                          | 0          | 3            | 0                      | 0                         | 0         | 3            |
| Referral to school administrator or other support staff                                                    | 0          | 0            | 0                      | 0                         | 0         | 0            |
| Unknown                                                                                                    | 0          | 0            | 0                      | 0                         | 0         | 0            |
| <b>Distinct Count of Stops</b>                                                                             | <b>984</b> | <b>3,727</b> | <b>3</b>               | <b>19</b>                 | <b>21</b> | <b>4,754</b> |

\*Three stops during Quarter 2 of 2023 resulted in contact with the Department of Homeland Security or its sub-divisions. One incident occurred at Central District and the other two incidents occurred at the San Francisco International Airport where Department of Homeland Security/TSA was notified and responded as follows:

- On 4/1/23 after completion of a traffic stop in Central Police District which resulted in a citation of the driver, SF Dispatch requested the citing Officer contact DHS. DHS Agent advised the Officer that the cited driver was

## Stop Data Q2 2023

*a human trafficking suspect and it was believed that the passenger in the vehicle was a victim of human trafficking. DHS Agent requested the Officer confirm the suspect via photo shared by the agent. The Officer positively identified the suspect.*


- *On 5/26/23 (case #23-14658), a USA citizen was detained for going through a secured door after he got lost coming off of a flight. The DHS/TSA was notified as is the policy.*
- *On 6/23/23 (case # 23-17454), a USA citizen was intoxicated and unruly on a domestic flight. She was detained upon arrival. The DHS/TSA was notified as is the policy.*

*There was no violation of DGO 5.15, Enforcement of Immigration Laws.*


# Calls for Service, Q2 2023

## Calls for Service

The Department responded to 146,297 total calls for service during April 1 through June 30, 2023. Call volume slightly decreased from the month of May to the month of June during the Quarter 2 2023.



## Calls for Service, Q2 2023



911 Calls assigned to SFPD have declined year over year since 2019.

**Data Source:** San Francisco Police Department Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD). Calls for Service data represent calls to the Department of Emergency Management (DEM) via the 911 system and assigned to SFPD.


# Suspects, Q2 2023

## SUSPECTS OBSERVED AND/OR REPORTED TO SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT

Suspect information/description is either provided by a member of the public, reported directly to the police or through dispatch, or is observed by a department member during a self-initiated call for service in which there is reasonable suspicion or probable cause for an officer to conduct a stop. The suspect information is documented in a police incident report that is generated from the call for service.

The following table summarizes suspect descriptions gathered from incident reports through the means stated above. Data captured shows that approximately 38% of the individuals observed and/or reported are Black/African American.


| Suspects by Race/Ethnicity April 1, 2023 - June 30, 2023 |       |       |       |                  |                             |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| DESCRIPTION                                              | Apr   | May   | June  | Q2 2023 Suspects | % of Total Suspects Q2 2023 |
| Asian/ Pacific Islander                                  | 107   | 115   | 101   | 323              | 4.2%                        |
| Black/ African American                                  | 944   | 979   | 1023  | 2946             | 37.9%                       |
| Hispanic/ Latino                                         | 444   | 480   | 409   | 1333             | 17.2%                       |
| Native American                                          | 7     | 6     | 1     | 14               | 0.2%                        |
| White                                                    | 476   | 542   | 531   | 1549             | 19.9%                       |
| Others                                                   | 507   | 468   | 631   | 1606             | 20.7%                       |
| Total                                                    | 2,485 | 2,590 | 2,696 | 7,771            | 100.00%                     |



**Note:** Suspect data is extracted from incident reports via the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Suspect." Records with Unknown Race/Ethnicity data are not included.

# Suspects, Q2 2023


Black/African American individuals have been the highest demographic of Suspects observed and/or reported for the last 6 quarters (Q1 2022 – Q2 2023). However, data captured in Q2 2023 shows a decline by almost 3% of Suspects observed and/or reported as Black/African American when compared to Q2 2022.



**Note:** Suspect data is extracted from incident reports via the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = “Suspect.” Records with Unknown Race/Ethnicity data are not included.

# Use of Force, Q2 2023

## Total Use of Force Overview January 1, 2016, through December 7, 2022




*Changes to the Use of Force Department General Order and associated data collection is discussed in the data exploration section of this report and should be kept in mind when interpreting these data.*

*Where possible this report provides data for December 8, 2022 through December 31, 2022 and complete Q1 2023 data to account for December 2022 UoF policy change and allow for historical context and tracking of data not provided in QADR Report for Q4 2022.*



# Use of Force, Q2 2023




During Quarter 2 of 2023, the department responded to 146,297 total calls for service. Department officers were assaulted **57** times and force was used in 251 incidents which represented 0.017% of all calls for service. Of those 251 incidents, force was used 600 times by 322 officers against 305 individuals.

# Use of Force, Q2 2023

## Overview by Subject Race/Ethnicity

During Quarter 2 of 2023, April 1 through June 30, 2023, 16% of the total Uses of Force were against White individuals, 43% were against Black/African American individual, 27% were against Hispanic/Latino individuals, and 11% were against Asians.


|                           | COUNT OF FORCE -<br>December 2022 Policy |            |            |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------|------------|
|                           | 2022                                     | 2023       |            |
| INDIVIDUAL RACE           | Dec 8-31                                 | Q1         | Q2         |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 4                                        | 14         | 66         |
| Black                     | 53                                       | 243        | 259        |
| Hispanic                  | 43                                       | 148        | 163        |
| White                     | 23                                       | 126        | 97         |
| Unknown                   | 7                                        | 20         | 15         |
| <b>Grand Total</b>        | <b>130</b>                               | <b>551</b> | <b>600</b> |



# Use of Force, Q2 2023

Under the December 2022 Use of Force policy, from April 1<sup>st</sup> through June 30<sup>th</sup>, Quarter 2 of 2023, the total count of use of force received by Black/African American individuals accounted for (43%, 259), while Hispanic individuals accounted for (27%, 163), and White individuals accounted for (16%, 97).

| Total % Use of Force, Q2 2023 by Race/Ethnicity |         |      |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------|------|
| Subject Race                                    | Q2 2023 |      |
| Asian or Pacific Islander                       | 66      | 11%  |
| Black                                           | 259     | 43%  |
| Hispanic                                        | 163     | 27%  |
| White                                           | 97      | 16%  |
| Oth/Unk Race & Gender                           | 15      | 3%   |
| Grand Total                                     | 600     | 100% |




# Use of Force, Q2 2023

## Total Use of Force Overview by Individual Age

Under the 2022 Use of Force policy, during April 1 through June 30, 2023, of Q2-2023, 39% of the total Uses of Force were against 18-29 years old individuals, and 13% were against 40-49 years old individuals, and 28% were against 30-39 years old individuals.

|                    | COUNT OF FORCE -<br>December 2022 Policy |            |            |
|--------------------|------------------------------------------|------------|------------|
|                    | 2022                                     | 2023       |            |
| INDIVIDUAL AGE     | Dec 8-31                                 | Q1         | Q2         |
| Under 18           | 12                                       | 36         | 50         |
| 18-29              | 40                                       | 214        | 233        |
| 30-39              | 43                                       | 163        | 169        |
| 40-49              | 24                                       | 78         | 77         |
| 50-59              | 4                                        | 31         | 38         |
| 60+                | 1                                        | 6          | 12         |
| Unknown            | 6                                        | 23         | 21         |
| <b>Grand Total</b> | <b>130</b>                               | <b>551</b> | <b>600</b> |




# Use of Force, Q2 2023

## Total Use of Force

### Overview by Individual Gender

Using the 2022 use of force policy, 85% of the total Uses of Force were against male individuals, and 14% were against female individuals during Quarter 2 of 2023.

| INDIVIDUAL GENDER  | COUNT OF FORCE -<br>December 2022 Policy |            |            |
|--------------------|------------------------------------------|------------|------------|
|                    | 2022                                     | 2023       |            |
|                    | Dec 8-31                                 | Q1         | Q2         |
| Female             | 17                                       | 87         | 86         |
| Male               | 111                                      | 460        | 511        |
| Unkown/Nonbinary   | 2                                        | 4          | 3          |
| <b>Grand Total</b> | <b>130</b>                               | <b>551</b> | <b>600</b> |




# Use of Force, Q2 2023

## Total Uses of Force-by-Force Type

Q2 2023

During Quarter 2 of 2023, under the December 2022 use of force policy, Physical Control and Firearm Pointing were the top two types of force used and accounted for 85% of total Uses of Force.



| Use of Force by Type of Force Description<br>December 2022 UoF Policy Standard |            |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Type of Force Description                                                      | Q2 2023    |
| Chemical Agent                                                                 | 17         |
| ERIW                                                                           | 5          |
| ERIW 40mm                                                                      | 2          |
| Firearm Pointing                                                               | 260        |
| Impact Weapon                                                                  | 4          |
| Other                                                                          | 19         |
| Physical Control Hold/Take Down                                                | 251        |
| Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist                                     | 27         |
| Vehicle Intervention                                                           | 13         |
| Firearm OIS                                                                    | 2          |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                                                             | <b>600</b> |

A review of all reported uses of force during Quarter 2 of 2023 found no instances of officers discharging firearms at a moving vehicle, nor any instances where the carotid restraint was employed.

## USE OF FORCE RESULTING IN DEATH

**There were two Use of Force incidents resulting in death in Quarter 2 of 2023.**

**SAN FRANCISCO (May 19, 2023)** — At approximately 2:20 p.m. SFPD officers responded to the 100 block of Bosworth St. regarding a person armed with a firearm who entered a residence. The person who discovered the suspect was able to exit the residence and contacted the police. Officers arrived on scene and made contact with the armed suspect who had refused to comply with officers for approximately 3 and a half hours. Additional SFPD resources and SFFD medics were on scene to assist with the incident. As officers were attempting to negotiate with the suspect, an officer involved shooting occurred. The suspect was transported to the hospital. Despite the life-saving efforts of the emergency responders and medical staff the suspect succumbed to his injuries and was declared deceased.


**SAN FRANCISCO (JUNE 22, 2023)** – On Thursday, June 22, 2023, at approximately 2:39 a.m., San Francisco police officers from Richmond Station were dispatched to a residence on the 700 block of 31<sup>st</sup> Avenue for a report of an aggravated assault in progress. An officer arrived on scene and made contact with an 84-year-old male victim in the doorway of the home. During the interaction, the 37-year-old suspect, who was armed with a knife, advanced toward the officer and the victim from inside the home and an officer involved shooting occurred. Additional officers arrived on scene and began rendering aid to the suspect and summoned medical personnel to the scene.

The victim told officers that the suspect had assaulted a 76-year-old female victim inside the home. Officers entered the home and discovered the female victim deceased. A dog was also found deceased inside the home. Medics transported the suspect to a local hospital where he was later pronounced deceased. The male victim was transported to a local hospital and treated for non-life-threatening injuries.

# Officers Assaulted, Q2 2023

## Officers Assaulted by Quarter

In Quarter 2 of 2023, there were a total of 57 officers assaulted.





# Use of Force, Q2 2023

## Types of Force by Race/Ethnicity and Gender of Subject April 1 – June 30, 2023

During Quarter 2 of 2023, under the new December 2022 Use of Force Policy, Uses of Force used against Hispanic Male individuals accounted for 25%, 13% against White Male individuals, and 35% against Black Male individuals.

| Type of Force by Individual Race and Gender<br>April 1 - June 30, 2023 |                |          |          |                  |               |           |                                 |                                            |                      |             |             |             |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------|----------|------------------|---------------|-----------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Individual Race and Gender                                             | Chemical Agent | ERW      | ERW 40mm | Firearm Pointing | Impact Weapon | Other     | Physical Control Hold/Take Down | Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/fist | Vehicle Intervention | Firearm OIS | Grand Total | % of Calls  |
| A - Asian or Pacific Islander F                                        | 0              | 0        | 0        | 1                | 0             | 0         | 2                               | 0                                          | 0                    | 0           | 3           | 1%          |
| A - Asian or Pacific Islander M                                        | 0              | 0        | 0        | 39               | 0             | 3         | 19                              | 1                                          | 0                    | 1           | 63          | 11%         |
| B - Black F                                                            | 0              | 0        | 0        | 11               | 0             | 2         | 30                              | 4                                          | 0                    | 0           | 47          | 8%          |
| B - Black M                                                            | 10             | 1        | 0        | 91               | 2             | 12        | 78                              | 11                                         | 7                    | 0           | 212         | 35%         |
| H - Hispanic or Latin F                                                | 0              | 0        | 0        | 1                | 0             | 0         | 10                              | 1                                          | 0                    | 0           | 12          | 2%          |
| H - Hispanic or Latin M                                                | 5              | 2        | 2        | 81               | 0             | 2         | 50                              | 5                                          | 3                    | 1           | 151         | 25%         |
| W - White F                                                            | 1              | 0        | 0        | 4                | 0             | 0         | 11                              | 1                                          | 3                    | 0           | 20          | 3%          |
| W - White M                                                            | 1              | 1        | 0        | 25               | 2             | 0         | 46                              | 2                                          | 0                    | 0           | 77          | 13%         |
| Z - Other/Unkn M                                                       | 0              | 1        | 0        | 4                | 0             | 0         | 2                               | 1                                          | 0                    | 0           | 8           | 1%          |
| Z - Other/Unkn F                                                       | 0              | 0        | 0        | 2                | 0             | 0         | 2                               | 0                                          | 0                    | 0           | 4           | 1%          |
| Z - Other/Unkn Race and Gender                                         | 0              | 0        | 0        | 1                | 0             | 0         | 1                               | 1                                          | 0                    | 0           | 3           | 1%          |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                                                     | <b>17</b>      | <b>5</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>260</b>       | <b>4</b>      | <b>19</b> | <b>251</b>                      | <b>27</b>                                  | <b>13</b>            | <b>2</b>    | <b>600</b>  | <b>100%</b> |

# Use of Force, Q2 2023

## Types of Force by Age of Subject April 1 – June 30, 2023

During Quarter 2 of 2023, per December 2022 use-of-force standard, use of force used against the individuals in the age group of 18-29 accounted for 39% of Uses of Force, the age group of 30-39 accounted for 28%, and the age group of 40-49 accounted for 13%.

| Type of Force by Individual Age Category<br>April 1 - June 30, 2023 |                |      |           |                  |               |       |                                 |                                            |                      |             |             |            |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|------|-----------|------------------|---------------|-------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|
|                                                                     | Chemical Agent | ERIW | ERIW 40mm | Firearm Pointing | Impact Weapon | Other | Physical Control Hold/Take Down | Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist | Vehicle Intervention | Firearm OIS | Grand Total | % of calls |
| Individual Age Category                                             |                |      |           |                  |               |       |                                 |                                            |                      |             |             |            |
| Under 18                                                            | 0              | 0    | 0         | 29               | 0             | 0     | 17                              | 0                                          | 4                    | 0           | 50          | 8%         |
| 18-29                                                               | 6              | 1    | 0         | 112              | 1             | 9     | 90                              | 9                                          | 5                    | 0           | 233         | 39%        |
| 30-39                                                               | 6              | 2    | 0         | 68               | 2             | 5     | 75                              | 10                                         | 0                    | 1           | 169         | 28%        |
| 40-49                                                               | 3              | 1    | 2         | 29               | 0             | 1     | 36                              | 4                                          | 0                    | 1           | 77          | 13%        |
| 50-59                                                               | 1              | 1    | 0         | 10               | 0             | 4     | 20                              | 2                                          | 0                    | 0           | 38          | 6%         |
| 60+                                                                 | 0              | 0    | 0         | 1                | 1             | 0     | 9                               | 1                                          | 0                    | 0           | 12          | 2%         |
| Unknown                                                             | 1              | 0    | 0         | 11               | 0             | 0     | 4                               | 1                                          | 4                    | 0           | 21          | 4%         |
| Grand Total                                                         | 17             | 5    | 2         | 260              | 4             | 19    | 251                             | 27                                         | 13                   | 2           | 600         | 100%       |

Unknown indicates information was not documented in the report for various reasons (i.e. suspect fled and demographic information was not known).

Due to rounding, percentage totals may not add up to exactly 100%

# Use of Force, Q2 2023

## Types of Force by Call Type, 2022 Use of Force Policy April 1 – June 30, 2023

Per December 2022 Use-of-Force Standard, Part I Violent was the top call type and accounted for 32% of total Uses of Force during Quarter 2 of 2023.

| Use of Force by Types of Call and Force Type Description<br>April 1 - June 30, 2023 |                |          |          |             |                  |               |           |                                 |                                            |                      |             |             |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------|----------|-------------|------------------|---------------|-----------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Types of Call                                                                       | Chemical Agent | ERW      | ERW 40mm | Firearm OIS | Firearm Pointing | Impact Weapon | Other     | Physical Control Hold/Take Down | Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist | Vehicle Intervention | Grand Total | % of Calls  |
| Part I Violent                                                                      | 10             | 0        | 0        | 1           | 90               | 1             | 3         | 77                              | 7                                          | 0                    | 189         | 32%         |
| 1030                                                                                | 0              | 0        | 0        | 0           | 35               | 0             | 1         | 12                              | 3                                          | 1                    | 52          | 9%          |
| Suspicious Person (311/811/601/602/603/646/916/917)                                 | 2              | 0        | 0        | 0           | 7                | 0             | 0         | 38                              | 2                                          | 0                    | 49          | 8%          |
| Part I Property                                                                     | 1              | 1        | 0        | 0           | 28               | 0             | 0         | 10                              | 1                                          | 6                    | 47          | 8%          |
| Person with a gun (221)                                                             | 0              | 1        | 2        | 1           | 36               | 0             | 1         | 3                               | 0                                          | 0                    | 44          | 7%          |
| Misc                                                                                | 0              | 0        | 0        | 0           | 14               | 0             | 2         | 14                              | 3                                          | 3                    | 36          | 6%          |
| Mental Health Related (5150/800/801/806)                                            | 0              | 1        | 0        | 0           | 1                | 1             | 0         | 24                              | 3                                          | 0                    | 30          | 5%          |
| Vandalism (594/595/911)                                                             | 1              | 2        | 0        | 0           | 2                | 2             | 0         | 19                              | 3                                          | 0                    | 29          | 5%          |
| 7A                                                                                  | 0              | 0        | 0        | 0           | 20               | 0             | 7         | 1                               | 0                                          | 0                    | 28          | 5%          |
| Traffic-Related                                                                     | 0              | 0        | 0        | 0           | 14               | 0             | 1         | 9                               | 0                                          | 3                    | 27          | 5%          |
| All Other Types of Call                                                             | 3              | 0        | 0        | 0           | 13               | 0             | 4         | 44                              | 5                                          | 0                    | 69          | 12%         |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                                                                  | <b>17</b>      | <b>5</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>2</b>    | <b>260</b>       | <b>4</b>      | <b>19</b> | <b>251</b>                      | <b>27</b>                                  | <b>13</b>            | <b>600</b>  | <b>100%</b> |

The table above reflects the top 10 Types of Call. "All Other Types of Call" include the sum of remaining call type categories.

# Use of Force, Q2 2023

## Uses of Force by Reason

**April 1 – June 30, 2023**

Per December 2022 Use of Force Standard, “To Effect a Lawful Arrest, Detention, or Search” was the most common reason for Use of Force in Quarter 2 of 2023.

| UoF Reason of Force Description<br>April 1 - June 30, 2023                                                                                                                |                     |                       |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| UoF Reason of Force                                                                                                                                                       | Total UoF Incidents | Total Count of Reason |
| Reason is to effect a lawful arrest, detention or search                                                                                                                  | 244                 | 1467                  |
| Reason is to overcome resistance or to prevent escape                                                                                                                     | 191                 | 1205                  |
| Reason is to prevent a person from injuring himself/herself, when the person also poses an imminent danger of death or serious bodily injury to another person or officer | 14                  | 112                   |
| Reason is to prevent the commission of a public offense                                                                                                                   | 74                  | 444                   |
| Reason of others or in self-defense                                                                                                                                       | 111                 | 641                   |
| Reason to gain compliance with a lawful order                                                                                                                             | 207                 | 1202                  |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                                                                                                                                                        | <b>251</b>          | <b>5071</b>           |

As noted in the data exploration section, the reason for use of force has gone from a single selection to a multiple select field. This can lead to more reasons for uses of force in data collected in Quarter 2 of 2022 onward than actual uses of force, as seen above.

# Use of Force, Q2 2023

## Uses of Force by Race/Ethnicity, Gender, and Age of Officer Q2-2023, April 1 – June 30, 2023

During Quarter 2 of 2023, using the December 2022 Use of Force policy, White male officers accounted for 290 (48%) of Uses of Force used, and Asian male officers accounted for 105 (18%) of Uses of Force used, and Hispanic male officers accounted for 105 (18%) as well.

| Officers Using Force by Race and Gender<br>April 1 - June 30, 2023 |                     |                      |                        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| Officer Race and Gender                                            | Total Uses of Force | Officers Using Force | Department Demographic |
| A - Asian or Pacific Islander F                                    | 5                   | 5                    | 43                     |
| A - Asian or Pacific Islander M                                    | 105                 | 64                   | 411                    |
| B - Black F                                                        | 14                  | 6                    | 34                     |
| B - Black M                                                        | 45                  | 22                   | 127                    |
| H - Hispanic F                                                     | 8                   | 7                    | 74                     |
| H - Hispanic M                                                     | 105                 | 57                   | 289                    |
| W - White F                                                        | 14                  | 8                    | 119                    |
| W - White M                                                        | 290                 | 146                  | 734                    |
| Z - Other F                                                        | 0                   | 0                    | 7                      |
| Z - Other M                                                        | 14                  | 7                    | 31                     |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                                                 | <b>600</b>          | <b>322</b>           | <b>1869</b>            |

Per December 2022 Use of Force Policy, Officers in the age group of 30-39 accounted for 328 (55%) of Uses of Force applied against individuals.

| Officers Using Force by Age Category<br>April 1 - June 30, 2023 |                     |                      |                        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| Officer Age Category                                            | Total Uses of Force | Officers Using Force | Department Demographic |
| 21-29                                                           | 132                 | 74                   | 190                    |
| 30-39                                                           | 328                 | 165                  | 646                    |
| 40-49                                                           | 95                  | 60                   | 577                    |
| 50-59                                                           | 40                  | 21                   | 418                    |
| 60+                                                             | 5                   | 3                    | 38                     |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                                              | <b>600</b>          | <b>322</b>           | <b>1869</b>            |

\*Asian includes Asian and Pacific Islander

\*\*Other indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions

# Use of Force, Q2 2023

## Uses of Force by Race/Ethnicity, Gender, and Age of Individual Q2-2023, April 1 – June 30, 2023

During Quarter 2 of 2023, per December 2022 use-of-force standard, Black male individuals accounted for 212 (35%), Hispanic male individuals accounted for 151 (25%) of Uses of Force used against, and White male individuals accounted for 77 (13%) of Uses of Force used against.

| Individuals by Race and Gender<br>April 1 - June 30, 2023 |                     |                       |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Individual Race and Gender                                | Total Uses of Force | Number of Individuals |
| A - Asian or Pacific Islander F                           | 3                   | 2                     |
| A - Asian or Pacific Islander M                           | 63                  | 21                    |
| B - Black F                                               | 47                  | 23                    |
| B - Black M                                               | 212                 | 100                   |
| H - Hispanic or Latin F                                   | 12                  | 9                     |
| H - Hispanic or Latin M                                   | 151                 | 72                    |
| W - White F                                               | 20                  | 15                    |
| W - White M                                               | 77                  | 51                    |
| Z - Other/Unkn F                                          | 4                   | 3                     |
| Z - Other/Unkn M                                          | 8                   | 7                     |
| Z - Other/Unkn Race and Gender                            | 3                   | 2                     |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                                        | <b>600</b>          | <b>305</b>            |

Individuals in the age group of 18-29 accounted for 233 (39%) of Total Use of Force used against, and age group of 30-39 accounted for 169 (28%) of Total Use of Force.

| Individuals by Age Category<br>April 1 - June 30, 2023 |                     |                       |
|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Individual Age Category                                | Total Uses of Force | Number of Individuals |
| Under 18                                               | 50                  | 22                    |
| 18-29                                                  | 233                 | 107                   |
| 30-39                                                  | 169                 | 87                    |
| 40-49                                                  | 77                  | 42                    |
| 50-59                                                  | 38                  | 21                    |
| 60+                                                    | 12                  | 6                     |
| Unknown                                                | 21                  | 20                    |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                                     | <b>600</b>          | <b>305</b>            |


*\*Unknown indicates data not provided in incident report*

# Use of Force, Q2 2023

## Uses of Force Incidents by Number of Officers Involved April 1 – June 30, 2023

Per the December 2022 Use of Force standard, of 251 total Use of Force incidents, most of the incidents involved 1 officer (137, 54%).

| Number of Officers Involved<br>April 1 - June 30, 2023 |                        |
|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Number of<br>Officers                                  | Number of<br>Incidents |
| 1                                                      | 137                    |
| 2                                                      | 62                     |
| 3                                                      | 24                     |
| 4                                                      | 9                      |
| 5                                                      | 10                     |
| 6                                                      | 4                      |
| 7                                                      | 3                      |
| 8                                                      | 1                      |
| 11                                                     | 1                      |
| Grand Total                                            | 251                    |




# Use of Force, Q2 2023

## Uses of Force Incidents by Number of Individuals Involved April 1 – June 30, 2023

Under the December 2022 Use of Force policy, of 251 total Use of Force incidents, most of the incidents involved 1 subject (216, 86%).

| Number of Individuals Involved<br>April 1 - June 30, 2023 |                        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Number of<br>Individuals                                  | Number of<br>Incidents |
| 1                                                         | 216                    |
| 2                                                         | 23                     |
| 3                                                         | 8                      |
| 4                                                         | 2                      |
| 5                                                         | 1                      |
| 6                                                         | 1                      |
| Grand Total                                               | 251                    |






# Arrests, Q2 2023

## Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender Q2-2022 vs. Q2-2023

Overall arrests increased in Quarter 2 of 2023 (3,416) by 15% compared to Quarter 2 of 2022 (2,982).

| Race and Gender       | Q2 2022      | Q2 2023      | % change   |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| Asian Female          | 42           | 41           | -2%        |
| Asian Male            | 156          | 164          | 5%         |
| Asian Unknown         | 0            | 0            | not cal    |
| Black Female          | 192          | 260          | 35%        |
| Black Male            | 822          | 820          | 0%         |
| Black Unknown         | 1            | 7            | 600%       |
| Hispanic Female       | 97           | 157          | 62%        |
| Hispanic Male         | 781          | 935          | 20%        |
| Hispanic Unknown      | 3            | 1            | -67%       |
| White Female          | 157          | 143          | -9%        |
| White Male            | 615          | 761          | 24%        |
| White Unknown         | 2            | 4            | 100%       |
| Unknown Female        | 22           | 19           | -14%       |
| Unknown Male          | 79           | 88           | 11%        |
| Unknown Race & Gender | 13           | 16           | 23%        |
| <b>Total</b>          | <b>2,982</b> | <b>3,416</b> | <b>15%</b> |



Arrests made by department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in these data.

Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type is listed as “Booked” or “Cited.” Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports in which data was not provided.


# Arrests Q2, 2023

## Arrests by Age

### Q2-2022 vs. Q2-2023

The overall arrests of individuals under age 18 increased by 123% in Quarter 2 of 2023 (178) when compared to arrests in Quarter 2 of 2022 (80). The arrest of individuals aged 30-39 increased by 20% in Quarter 2 of 2023 (1,137) when compared to Quarter 2 of 2022 (943).

| Arrests By Age Q2 2022 vs Q2 2023 |         |         |          |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|----------|
| Age                               | Q2 2022 | Q2 2023 | % change |
| Under 18                          | 80      | 178     | 123%     |
| 18-29                             | 943     | 1,019   | 8%       |
| 30-39                             | 948     | 1,137   | 20%      |
| 40-49                             | 554     | 605     | 9%       |
| 50-59                             | 285     | 324     | 14%      |
| 60+                               | 172     | 153     | -11%     |
| Unknown                           | 0       | 0       | 0%       |
| Total                             | 2,982   | 3,416   | 15%      |



Arrests made by department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City's totals.


Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided.

## By District Data

### Use of Force Incidents, by District Q1 – 2023, December 2022 Reporting Standard

During Quarter 2 of 2023, per December 2022 use-of-force standard, the Mission District accounted for 46 Use of Force incidents comprising 18% of all districts use-of-force incidents.

| Use of Force Incidents by District<br>April 1 - June 30, 2023 |           |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Districts                                                     | Incidents |
| A - Central                                                   | 27        |
| B - Southern                                                  | 30        |
| C - Bayview                                                   | 25        |
| D - Mission                                                   | 46        |
| E - Northern                                                  | 26        |
| F - Park                                                      | 5         |
| G - Richmond                                                  | 12        |
| H - Ingleside                                                 | 30        |
| I - Taraval                                                   | 6         |
| J - Tenderloin                                                | 39        |
| L - Outside SF                                                | 5         |
| Grand Total                                                   | 251       |




## By District Data

### Number of Individuals on Whom Force Was Used, by District Q1 – 2023, December 2022 Reporting Standard

Per December 2022 Use of Force Reporting Standard, during Quarter 2 of 2023, Mission and Tenderloin districts accounted for 33% of all districts by the number of individuals on whom force was used.


| Number of Individuals on Whom Force was Used by District<br>April 1 - June 30, 2023 |                       |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| District                                                                            | Number of Individuals |
| Bayview                                                                             | 35                    |
| Central                                                                             | 35                    |
| Ingleside                                                                           | 33                    |
| Mission                                                                             | 57                    |
| Northern                                                                            | 29                    |
| Out of SF                                                                           | 6                     |
| Park                                                                                | 5                     |
| Richmond                                                                            | 18                    |
| Southern                                                                            | 33                    |
| Taraval                                                                             | 10                    |
| Tenderloin                                                                          | 44                    |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                                                                  | <b>305</b>            |



## By District Data

### Total Uses of Force, by District

| Uses of Force by District<br>April 1 - June 30, 2023 |            |
|------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Districts                                            | of Force   |
| A - Central                                          | 62         |
| B - Southern                                         | 55         |
| C - Bayview                                          | 57         |
| D - Mission                                          | 121        |
| E - Northern                                         | 51         |
| F - Park                                             | 10         |
| G - Richmond                                         | 42         |
| H - Ingleside                                        | 76         |
| I - Taraval                                          | 15         |
| J - Tenderloin                                       | 91         |
| L - Outside SF                                       | 20         |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                                   | <b>600</b> |




During Quarter 2 of 2023, April 1 through June 30, 2023, Mission District (121 uses of force incidents), Tenderloin District (91 uses of force incidents) and Ingleside District (76 uses of force incidents) accounted for 48% of all districts Uses of Force incidents.

# By District Data

## Total Arrests by District Q2 – 2022 vs. 2023

In Quarter 2 of 2023, there was an overall increase in arrests of 15% as compared to Quarter 2, 2022. However, Northern station arrests (372) increased by 37% when compared to Q2-2022 (272).

| District           | Q2 2022      | Q2 2023      | % change   |
|--------------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| Co. A - Central    | 363          | 420          | 16%        |
| Co. B - Southern   | 431          | 544          | 26%        |
| Co. C - Bayview    | 271          | 250          | -8%        |
| Co. D - Mission    | 454          | 536          | 18%        |
| Co. E - Northern   | 272          | 372          | 37%        |
| Co. F - Park       | 98           | 78           | -20%       |
| Co. G - Richmond   | 110          | 126          | 15%        |
| Co. H - Ingleside  | 181          | 230          | 27%        |
| Co. I - Taraval    | 155          | 146          | -6%        |
| Co. J - Tenderloin | 590          | 685          | 16%        |
| Outside SF         | 57           | 29           | -49%       |
| <b>Total</b>       | <b>2,982</b> | <b>3,416</b> | <b>15%</b> |



Arrests made by department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City's totals. Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited." Arrests totals do not include arrests at the Airport.

# By District Data

## Central District

### (Company A)

#### Use of Force

April 1 – June 30, 2023

There were 62 total Uses of Force in the Central District. Physical Control Hold/Take Down (28) accounted for 45% of the type of force used. The peak time for incidents (39, 63%) was between 1600-1959hrs.

| Use of Force                               | Total     |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Chemical Agent                             | 1         |
| ERIW                                       | 1         |
| ERIW 40mm                                  | 0         |
| Firearm OIS                                | 0         |
| Firearm Pointing                           | 18        |
| Impact Weapon                              | 0         |
| Other                                      | 2         |
| Physical Control Hold/Take Down            | 28        |
| Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist | 3         |
| Vehicle Intervention                       | 9         |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                         | <b>62</b> |


| Time of Day/Day of Week |          |           |          |           |          |           |          |           |
|-------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| A-Central               | SUN      | MON       | TUES     | WED       | THURS    | FRI       | SAT      | Total     |
| 0000-0359               | 0        | 0         | 0        | 1         | 0        | 1         | 0        | 2         |
| 0400-0759               | 0        | 2         | 0        | 0         | 0        | 2         | 0        | 4         |
| 0800-1159               | 0        | 0         | 0        | 4         | 1        | 0         | 3        | 8         |
| 1200-1559               | 0        | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0        | 0         |
| 1600-1959               | 6        | 8         | 0        | 10        | 3        | 8         | 4        | 39        |
| 2000-2359               | 2        | 2         | 2        | 1         | 0        | 0         | 2        | 9         |
| <b>Total</b>            | <b>8</b> | <b>12</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>16</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>9</b> | <b>62</b> |
| Percentage              | 13%      | 19%       | 3%       | 26%       | 6%       | 18%       | 15%      | 100%      |

## By District Data

### Central District (Company A) Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender April – June 2023

Black males (28%), and White males (27%) accounted for approximately 55% of arrests made by Central Station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

| Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender |                 | Company A   |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Race and Gender                      | Q2 2023 Arrests | % of Total  |
| Asian Female                         | 8               | 2%          |
| Asian Male                           | 22              | 5%          |
| Asian Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Black Female                         | 29              | 7%          |
| Black Male                           | 118             | 28%         |
| Black Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Hispanic Female                      | 14              | 3%          |
| Hispanic Male                        | 68              | 16%         |
| Hispanic Unknown                     | 0               | 0%          |
| White Female                         | 24              | 6%          |
| White Male                           | 115             | 27%         |
| White Unknown                        | 2               | 0%          |
| Unknown Female                       | 5               | 1%          |
| Unknown Male                         | 12              | 3%          |
| Unknown Race & Gender                | 3               | 1%          |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>420</b>      | <b>100%</b> |



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = “Booked” or “Cited.” Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn’t provided.




## By District Data

### Central District (Company A) Arrests by Age April – June 2023

Individuals aged 18-29 (26%) and 30-39 (29%) accounted for 55% of arrests made by Central Station, while individuals aged 60 and over accounted for 5%.

| Arrest By Age |                 | Company A  |
|---------------|-----------------|------------|
| Age           | Q2 2023 Arrests | % of Total |
| Under 18      | 47              | 11%        |
| 18-29         | 111             | 26%        |
| 30-39         | 121             | 29%        |
| 40-49         | 76              | 18%        |
| 50-59         | 46              | 11%        |
| 60+           | 19              | 5%         |
| Unknown Age   | 0               | 0%         |
| Total         | 420             | 100%       |



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = “Booked” or “Cited.”

# By District Data

## Southern District (Company B) Use of Force April 1 – June 30, 2023

There were 55 total Uses of Force in the Southern District. Physical Control Hold/Take Down (25) accounted for 45% of Type of Force used. The peak times for incidents (19, 35%) were at 0000-0359hr and 2000-2359hr.

| Use of Force                               | Total     |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Chemical Agent                             | 0         |
| ERIW                                       | 0         |
| ERIW 40mm                                  | 0         |
| Firearm OIS                                | 0         |
| Firearm Pointing                           | 24        |
| Impact Weapon                              | 1         |
| Other                                      | 5         |
| Physical Control Hold/Take Down            | 25        |
| Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist | 0         |
| Vehicle Intervention                       | 0         |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                         | <b>55</b> |


| Time of Day/Day of Week |          |           |          |          |           |           |           |             |
|-------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| B-Southern              | SUN      | MON       | TUES     | WED      | THURS     | FRI       | SAT       | Total       |
| 0000-0359               | 0        | 1         | 0        | 0        | 4         | 4         | 10        | <b>19</b>   |
| 0400-0759               | 0        | 1         | 0        | 0        | 2         | 0         | 0         | <b>3</b>    |
| 0800-1159               | 0        | 0         | 1        | 1        | 0         | 1         | 0         | <b>3</b>    |
| 1200-1559               | 0        | 0         | 0        | 0        | 0         | 0         | 0         | <b>0</b>    |
| 1600-1959               | 0        | 1         | 2        | 0        | 2         | 1         | 5         | <b>11</b>   |
| 2000-2359               | 0        | 9         | 1        | 1        | 3         | 4         | 1         | <b>19</b>   |
| <b>Total</b>            | <b>0</b> | <b>12</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>10</b> | <b>16</b> | <b>55</b>   |
| Percentage              | 0%       | 22%       | 7%       | 4%       | 20%       | 18%       | 29%       | <b>100%</b> |

# By District Data

## Southern District (Company B) Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender April – June 2023

Black males (31%) and White males (27%) accounted for approximately 58% of arrests made by Southern Station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

| Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender |                 | Company B   |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Race and Gender                      | Q2 2023 Arrests | % of Total  |
| Asian Female                         | 8               | 1%          |
| Asian Male                           | 15              | 3%          |
| Asian Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Black Female                         | 38              | 7%          |
| Black Male                           | 168             | 31%         |
| Black Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Hispanic Female                      | 20              | 4%          |
| Hispanic Male                        | 116             | 21%         |
| Hispanic Unknown                     | 0               | 0%          |
| White Female                         | 18              | 3%          |
| White Male                           | 145             | 27%         |
| White Unknown                        | 1               | 0%          |
| Unknown Female                       | 1               | 0%          |
| Unknown Male                         | 9               | 2%          |
| Unknown Race & Gender                | 5               | 1%          |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>544</b>      | <b>100%</b> |



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = “Booked” or “Cited.” Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn’t provided.

## By District Data


### Southern District (Company B)

#### Arrests by Age

April – June 2023

Individuals aged 18-29 (31%) and individuals 30-39 (33%) accounted for approximately 64% of arrests made by Southern Station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

| Arrest By Age |                 | Company B   |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Age           | Q2 2023 Arrests | % of Total  |
| Under 18      | 14              | 3%          |
| 18-29         | 170             | 31%         |
| 30-39         | 180             | 33%         |
| 40-49         | 114             | 21%         |
| 50-59         | 44              | 8%          |
| 60+           | 22              | 4%          |
| Unknown Age   | 0               | 0%          |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>544</b>      | <b>100%</b> |



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = “Booked” or “Cited.”

# By District Data

## Bayview District (Company C) Use of Force April 1 – June 30, 2023

There were 57 total Uses of Force in the Bayview district. Firearm Pointing (26) accounted for 46% of Type of Force used. The peak time for incidents (32, 56%) was between 1600-1959hrs.

| Use of Force                               | Total     |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Chemical Agent                             | 0         |
| ERIW                                       | 1         |
| ERIW 40mm                                  | 0         |
| Firearm OIS                                | 0         |
| Firearm Pointing                           | 26        |
| Impact Weapon                              | 0         |
| Other                                      | 3         |
| Physical Control Hold/Take Down            | 22        |
| Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist | 4         |
| Vehicle Intervention                       | 1         |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                         | <b>57</b> |


| Time of Day/Day of Week |     |     |      |     |       |     |     |       |      |
|-------------------------|-----|-----|------|-----|-------|-----|-----|-------|------|
| C-Bayview               | SUN | MON | TUES | WED | THURS | FRI | SAT | Total |      |
| 0000-0359               | 0   | 8   | 0    | 0   | 0     | 0   | 0   | 8     | 14%  |
| 0400-0759               | 0   | 0   | 0    | 0   | 8     | 0   | 0   | 8     | 14%  |
| 0800-1159               | 0   | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0     | 0   | 2   | 2     | 4%   |
| 1200-1559               | 0   | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0     | 0   | 0   | 0     | 0%   |
| 1600-1959               | 0   | 10  | 3    | 11  | 1     | 1   | 6   | 32    | 56%  |
| 2000-2359               | 0   | 1   | 2    | 1   | 2     | 0   | 1   | 7     | 12%  |
| Total                   | 0   | 19  | 5    | 12  | 11    | 1   | 9   | 57    | 100% |
| Percentage              | 0%  | 33% | 9%   | 21% | 19%   | 2%  | 16% | 100%  |      |

# By District Data

## Bayview District (Company C) Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender April –June 2023

Black males (38%) and Hispanic males (22%) accounted for 60% of arrests made by Bayview Station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

| Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender |                 | Company C   |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Race and Gender                      | Q2 2023 Arrests | % of Total  |
| Asian Female                         | 2               | 1%          |
| Asian Male                           | 13              | 5%          |
| Asian Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Black Female                         | 32              | 13%         |
| Black Male                           | 94              | 38%         |
| Black Unknown                        | 3               | 1%          |
| Hispanic Female                      | 19              | 8%          |
| Hispanic Male                        | 56              | 22%         |
| Hispanic Unknown                     | 0               | 0%          |
| White Female                         | 7               | 3%          |
| White Male                           | 17              | 7%          |
| White Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Unknown Female                       | 0               | 0%          |
| Unknown Male                         | 7               | 3%          |
| Unknown Race & Gender                | 0               | 0%          |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>250</b>      | <b>100%</b> |



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = “Booked” or “Cited.” Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn’t provided.

## By District Data


### Bayview District (Company C)

#### Arrests by Age

April – June 2023

Individuals ages 18-29 (27%) and individuals ages 30-39 (30%) accounted for 57% of the arrests made by Bayview station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

| Arrest By Age |                 | Company C  |
|---------------|-----------------|------------|
| Age           | Q2 2023 Arrests | % of Total |
| Under 18      | 11              | 4%         |
| 18-29         | 68              | 27%        |
| 30-39         | 74              | 30%        |
| 40-49         | 44              | 18%        |
| 50-59         | 34              | 14%        |
| 60+           | 19              | 8%         |
| Unknown Age   | 0               | 0%         |
| Total         | 250             | 100%       |



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

# By District Data

## Mission District

### (Company D)

### Use of Force

April 1 – June 30, 2023

There were 121 total Uses of Force in the Mission district. Physical Control Hold/Take Down (53) accounted for 44% of Type of Force used. The peak time for incidents (40, 33%) was between 2000-2359hrs.

| Use of Force                               | Total      |
|--------------------------------------------|------------|
| Chemical Agent                             | 6          |
| ERIW                                       | 1          |
| ERIW 40mm                                  | 0          |
| Firearm OIS                                | 0          |
| Firearm Pointing                           | 50         |
| Impact Weapon                              | 1          |
| Other                                      | 1          |
| Physical Control Hold/Take Down            | 53         |
| Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist | 9          |
| Vehicle Intervention                       | 0          |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                         | <b>121</b> |

| Time of Day/Day of Week |          |           |          |          |           |           |           |            |
|-------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| D-Mission               | SUN      | MON       | TUES     | WED      | THURS     | FRI       | SAT       | Total      |
| 0000-0359               | 3        | 1         | 0        | 1        | 1         | 8         | 1         | 15         |
| 0400-0759               | 0        | 1         | 0        | 0        | 3         | 4         | 2         | 10         |
| 0800-1159               | 4        | 8         | 1        | 3        | 0         | 17        | 1         | 34         |
| 1200-1559               | 0        | 0         | 0        | 0        | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0          |
| 1600-1959               | 2        | 5         | 1        | 2        | 4         | 2         | 6         | 22         |
| 2000-2359               | 0        | 2         | 5        | 2        | 10        | 1         | 20        | 40         |
| <b>Total</b>            | <b>9</b> | <b>17</b> | <b>7</b> | <b>8</b> | <b>18</b> | <b>32</b> | <b>30</b> | <b>121</b> |
| Percentage              | 7%       | 14%       | 6%       | 7%       | 15%       | 26%       | 25%       | 100%       |




# By District Data

## Mission District (Company D) Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender April – June 2023

Hispanic males accounted for 46% of all arrests made by Mission station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

| Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender |                 | Company D   |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Race and Gender                      | Q2 2023 Arrests | % of Total  |
| Asian Female                         | 3               | 1%          |
| Asian Male                           | 17              | 3%          |
| Asian Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Black Female                         | 32              | 6%          |
| Black Male                           | 92              | 17%         |
| Black Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Hispanic Female                      | 30              | 6%          |
| Hispanic Male                        | 246             | 46%         |
| Hispanic Unknown                     | 0               | 0%          |
| White Female                         | 14              | 3%          |
| White Male                           | 87              | 16%         |
| White Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Unknown Female                       | 3               | 1%          |
| Unknown Male                         | 11              | 2%          |
| Unknown Race & Gender                | 1               | 0%          |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>536</b>      | <b>100%</b> |



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = “Booked” or “Cited.” Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn’t provided.

## By District Data


### Mission District (Company D)

#### Arrests by Age

April –June 2023

Individuals ages 18-29 (35%) and individuals ages 30-39 (30%) accounted for 65% of the arrest made by Mission station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

| Arrest By Age |                 | Company D  |
|---------------|-----------------|------------|
| Age           | Q2 2023 Arrests | % of Total |
| Under 18      | 20              | 4%         |
| 18-29         | 188             | 35%        |
| 30-39         | 162             | 30%        |
| 40-49         | 99              | 18%        |
| 50-59         | 45              | 8%         |
| 60+           | 22              | 4%         |
| Unknown Age   | 0               | 0%         |
| Total         | 536             | 100%       |



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = “Booked” or “Cited.”

## By District Data

### Northern District (Company E) Use of Force April 1 – June 30, 2023

There were 51 total Uses of Force in the Northern district. Physical Control (32) accounted for 63% of Type of Force used. The peak time for incidents (23, 45%) was between 1600-1959hrs.

| Use of Force                               | Total     |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Chemical Agent                             | 3         |
| ERIW                                       | 1         |
| ERIW 40mm                                  | 0         |
| Firearm OIS                                | 0         |
| Firearm Pointing                           | 10        |
| Impact Weapon                              | 2         |
| Other                                      | 2         |
| Physical Control Hold/Take                 | 32        |
| Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist | 1         |
| Vehicle Intervention                       | 0         |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                         | <b>51</b> |

| Time of Day/Day of Week | SUN      | MON      | TUES     | WED       | THURS    | FRI       | SAT       | Total       |             |
|-------------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| E-Northern              |          |          |          |           |          |           |           |             |             |
| 0000-0359               | 0        | 2        | 0        | 0         | 0        | 7         | 0         | <b>9</b>    | 18%         |
| 0400-0759               | 1        | 0        | 0        | 1         | 2        | 0         | 3         | <b>7</b>    | 14%         |
| 0800-1159               | 2        | 1        | 0        | 2         | 0        | 0         | 1         | <b>6</b>    | 12%         |
| 1200-1559               | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0         | <b>0</b>    | 0%          |
| 1600-1959               | 0        | 3        | 0        | 9         | 1        | 4         | 6         | <b>23</b>   | 45%         |
| 2000-2359               | 1        | 0        | 2        | 0         | 0        | 0         | 3         | <b>6</b>    | 12%         |
| <b>Total</b>            | <b>4</b> | <b>6</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>12</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>13</b> | <b>51</b>   | <b>100%</b> |
| Percentage              | 8%       | 12%      | 4%       | 24%       | 6%       | 22%       | 25%       | <b>100%</b> |             |

# By District Data


## Northern District (Company E)

### Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender

April – June 2023

Hispanic males (23%) and White males (28%) accounted for 51% of all arrests made by Northern Station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

| Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender |                 | Company E   |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Race and Gender                      | Q2 2023 Arrests | % of Total  |
| Asian Female                         | 3               | 1%          |
| Asian Male                           | 16              | 4%          |
| Asian Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Black Female                         | 21              | 6%          |
| Black Male                           | 83              | 22%         |
| Black Unknown                        | 1               | 0%          |
| Hispanic Female                      | 23              | 6%          |
| Hispanic Male                        | 87              | 23%         |
| Hispanic Unknown                     | 1               | 0%          |
| White Female                         | 23              | 6%          |
| White Male                           | 105             | 28%         |
| White Unknown                        | 1               | 0%          |
| Unknown Female                       | 1               | 0%          |
| Unknown Male                         | 6               | 2%          |
| Unknown Race & Gender                | 1               | 0%          |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>372</b>      | <b>100%</b> |



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = “Booked” or “Cited.” Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn’t provided.

## By District Data


### Northern District (Company E)

#### Arrests by Age

April – June 2023

Individuals ages 18-29 (31%) and individuals ages 30-39 (38%) accounted for 69% of arrests made by Northern station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

| Arrest By Age |                 | Company E  |
|---------------|-----------------|------------|
| Age           | Q2 2023 Arrests | % of Total |
| Under 18      | 10              | 3%         |
| 18-29         | 115             | 31%        |
| 30-39         | 142             | 38%        |
| 40-49         | 63              | 17%        |
| 50-59         | 27              | 7%         |
| 60+           | 15              | 4%         |
| Unknown Age   | 0               | 0%         |
| Total         | 372             | 100%       |



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

# By District Data

## Park District

### (Company F)

### Use of Force

April 1 – June 30, 2023

There were 10 total Uses of Force in the Park district. Physical Control/Take Down (9) accounted for 90% of Type of Force used. The peak times for incidents (4, 40%) were at 0400-0759hrs and 1600-1959hrs.

| Use of Force                               | Total     |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Chemical Agent                             | 0         |
| ERIW                                       | 1         |
| ERIW 40mm                                  | 0         |
| Firearm OIS                                | 0         |
| Firearm Pointing                           | 0         |
| Impact Weapon                              | 0         |
| Other                                      | 0         |
| Physical Control Hold/Take Down            | 9         |
| Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist | 0         |
| Vehicle Intervention                       | 0         |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                         | <b>10</b> |


| Time of Day/Day of Week |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |           |
|-------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| F-Park                  | SUN      | MON      | TUES     | WED      | THURS    | FRI      | SAT      | Total     |
| 0000-0359               | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0         |
| 0400-0759               | 0        | 0        | 0        | 4        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 4         |
| 0800-1159               | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 2        | 0        | 2         |
| 1200-1559               | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0         |
| 1600-1959               | 1        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 3        | 0        | 0        | 4         |
| 2000-2359               | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0         |
| <b>Total</b>            | <b>1</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>10</b> |
| Percentage              | 10%      | 0%       | 0%       | 40%      | 30%      | 20%      | 0%       | 100%      |

# By District Data

## Park District (Company F) Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender April – June 2023

Hispanic males (18%) and White males (36%) accounted for 54% of all arrests made by Park Station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

| Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender |                 | Company F   |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Race and Gender                      | Q2 2023 Arrests | % of Total  |
| Asian Female                         | 1               | 1%          |
| Asian Male                           | 5               | 6%          |
| Asian Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Black Female                         | 2               | 3%          |
| Black Male                           | 11              | 14%         |
| Black Unknown                        | 1               | 1%          |
| Hispanic Female                      | 3               | 4%          |
| Hispanic Male                        | 14              | 18%         |
| Hispanic Unknown                     | 0               | 0%          |
| White Female                         | 8               | 10%         |
| White Male                           | 28              | 36%         |
| White Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Unknown Female                       | 0               | 0%          |
| Unknown Male                         | 5               | 6%          |
| Unknown Race & Gender                | 0               | 0%          |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>78</b>       | <b>100%</b> |



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = “Booked” or “Cited.” Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn’t provided.

## By District Data


### Park District (Company F)

#### Arrests by Age

April – June 2023

Individuals ages 30-39 accounted for 44% of the arrests made by Park station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

| Arrest By Age |                 | Company F  |
|---------------|-----------------|------------|
| Age           | Q2 2023 Arrests | % of Total |
| Under 18      | 1               | 1%         |
| 18-29         | 18              | 23%        |
| 30-39         | 34              | 44%        |
| 40-49         | 18              | 23%        |
| 50-59         | 3               | 4%         |
| 60+           | 4               | 5%         |
| Unknown Age   | 0               | 0%         |
| Total         | 78              | 100%       |



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."



# By District Data

## Richmond District

### (Company G)

#### Use of Force

**April 1 – June 30, 2023**

There were 42 total Uses of Force in the Richmond district. Firearm Pointing (24) accounted for 57% of Type of Force used. The peak time for incidents (16, 38%) was between 1600-1959hrs.

| Use of Force                               | Total     |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Chemical Agent                             | 2         |
| ERIW                                       | 0         |
| ERIW 40mm                                  | 0         |
| Firearm OIS                                | 1         |
| Firearm Pointing                           | 24        |
| Impact Weapon                              | 0         |
| Other                                      | 0         |
| Physical Control Hold/Take                 | 12        |
| Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist | 3         |
| Vehicle Intervention                       | 0         |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                         | <b>42</b> |


| Time of Day/Day of Week | SUN      | MON       | TUES     | WED       | THURS    | FRI      | SAT      | Total       |             |
|-------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-------------|-------------|
| G-Richmond              |          |           |          |           |          |          |          |             |             |
| 0000-0359               | 0        | 0         | 0        | 0         | 3        | 2        | 4        | <b>9</b>    | 21%         |
| 0400-0759               | 0        | 0         | 0        | 4         | 0        | 0        | 0        | <b>4</b>    | 10%         |
| 0800-1159               | 0        | 0         | 0        | 0         | 1        | 0        | 0        | <b>1</b>    | 2%          |
| 1200-1559               | 0        | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0        | 0        | 0        | <b>0</b>    | 0%          |
| 1600-1959               | 0        | 0         | 2        | 9         | 4        | 1        | 0        | <b>16</b>   | 38%         |
| 2000-2359               | 0        | 12        | 0        | 0         | 0        | 0        | 0        | <b>12</b>   | 29%         |
| <b>Total</b>            | <b>0</b> | <b>12</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>13</b> | <b>8</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>42</b>   | <b>100%</b> |
| Percentage              | 0%       | 29%       | 5%       | 31%       | 19%      | 7%       | 10%      | <b>100%</b> |             |

# By District Data

## Richmond District (Company G) Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender April – June 2023

White males (29%) and Hispanic males (25%) accounted for 54% of all arrests made by Richmond station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

| Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender |                 | Company G   |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Race and Gender                      | Q2 2023 Arrests | % of Total  |
| Asian Female                         | 5               | 4%          |
| Asian Male                           | 11              | 9%          |
| Asian Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Black Female                         | 5               | 4%          |
| Black Male                           | 22              | 17%         |
| Black Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Hispanic Female                      | 2               | 2%          |
| Hispanic Male                        | 31              | 25%         |
| Hispanic Unknown                     | 0               | 0%          |
| White Female                         | 9               | 7%          |
| White Male                           | 37              | 29%         |
| White Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Unknown Female                       | 0               | 0%          |
| Unknown Male                         | 4               | 3%          |
| Unknown Race & Gender                | 0               | 0%          |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>126</b>      | <b>100%</b> |



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = “Booked” or “Cited.” Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn’t provided.

## By District Data


### Richmond District (Company G)

#### Arrests by Age

April – June 2023

Individuals age 18-29 (25%) and individuals age 30-39 (36%) accounted for approximately 61% of the arrests made by Richmond station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

| Arrest By Age |                 | Company G  |
|---------------|-----------------|------------|
| Age           | Q2 2023 Arrests | % of Total |
| Under 18      | 14              | 11%        |
| 18-29         | 31              | 25%        |
| 30-39         | 45              | 36%        |
| 40-49         | 18              | 14%        |
| 50-59         | 13              | 10%        |
| 60+           | 5               | 4%         |
| Unknown Age   | 0               | 0%         |
| Total         | 126             | 100%       |



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

## By District Data

### Ingleside District (Company H) Use of Force April 1 – June 30, 2023

There were 76 total Uses of Force in the Ingleside district. Firearm Pointing (39) accounted for 51% of Type of Force used. The peak time for incidents was (36, 47%) between 1600-1959hrs.

| Use of Force                               | Total     |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Chemical Agent                             | 4         |
| ERIW                                       | 0         |
| ERIW 40mm                                  | 2         |
| Firearm OIS                                | 1         |
| Firearm Pointing                           | 39        |
| Impact Weapon                              | 0         |
| Other                                      | 2         |
| Physical Control Hold/Take                 | 25        |
| Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist | 3         |
| Vehicle Intervention                       | 0         |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                         | <b>76</b> |


| Time of Day/Day of Week | SUN      | MON      | TUES     | WED      | THURS     | FRI       | SAT       | Total       |             |
|-------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| H-Ingleside             |          |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |             |
| 0000-0359               | 0        | 1        | 0        | 0        | 2         | 1         | 3         | <b>7</b>    | 9%          |
| 0400-0759               | 0        | 0        | 0        | 1        | 0         | 3         | 0         | <b>4</b>    | 5%          |
| 0800-1159               | 2        | 0        | 0        | 1        | 3         | 6         | 2         | <b>14</b>   | 18%         |
| 1200-1559               | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0         | 0         | 0         | <b>0</b>    | 0%          |
| 1600-1959               | 4        | 3        | 0        | 6        | 4         | 14        | 5         | <b>36</b>   | 47%         |
| 2000-2359               | 2        | 2        | 2        | 0        | 9         | 0         | 0         | <b>15</b>   | 20%         |
| <b>Total</b>            | <b>8</b> | <b>6</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>8</b> | <b>18</b> | <b>24</b> | <b>10</b> | <b>76</b>   | <b>100%</b> |
| Percentage              | 11%      | 8%       | 3%       | 11%      | 24%       | 32%       | 13%       | <b>100%</b> |             |

## By District Data

### Ingleside District (Company H) Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender April – June 2023

Hispanic males (31%) and Black males (20%) accounted for approximately 51% of all arrests made by Ingleside station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

| Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender |                 | Company H   |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Race and Gender                      | Q2 2023 Arrests | % of Total  |
| Asian Female                         | 5               | 2%          |
| Asian Male                           | 19              | 8%          |
| Asian Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Black Female                         | 28              | 12%         |
| Black Male                           | 46              | 20%         |
| Black Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Hispanic Female                      | 10              | 4%          |
| Hispanic Male                        | 71              | 31%         |
| Hispanic Unknown                     | 0               | 0%          |
| White Female                         | 8               | 3%          |
| White Male                           | 31              | 13%         |
| White Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Unknown Female                       | 2               | 1%          |
| Unknown Male                         | 9               | 4%          |
| Unknown Race & Gender                | 1               | 0%          |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>230</b>      | <b>100%</b> |



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = “Booked” or “Cited.” Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn’t provided.

## By District Data


### Ingleside District (Company H)

#### Arrests by Age

April – June 2023

Individuals ages 18-29 (27%) and individuals ages 30-39 (34%) accounted for 61% of arrests made by the Ingleside station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

| Arrest By Age |                 | Company H  |
|---------------|-----------------|------------|
| Age           | Q2 2023 Arrests | % of Total |
| Under 18      | 14              | 6%         |
| 18-29         | 62              | 27%        |
| 30-39         | 79              | 34%        |
| 40-49         | 33              | 14%        |
| 50-59         | 32              | 14%        |
| 60+           | 10              | 4%         |
| Unknown Age   | 0               | 0%         |
| Total         | 230             | 100%       |



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = “Booked” or “Cited.”

## By District Data

### Taraval District (Company I) Use of Force April 1 – June 30, 2023

There were total of 15 Uses of Force in the Taraval district. Physical Control Hold/Take Down (7) accounted for 46% of Type of Force used. The peak time for incidents (8, 53%) was between 1600-1959hrs.

| Use of Force                               | Total     |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Chemical Agent                             | 0         |
| ERIW                                       | 0         |
| ERIW 40mm                                  | 0         |
| Firearm OIS                                | 0         |
| Firearm Pointing                           | 5         |
| Impact Weapon                              | 0         |
| Other                                      | 0         |
| Physical Control Hold/Take                 | 7         |
| Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist | 0         |
| Vehicle Intervention                       | 3         |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                         | <b>15</b> |


| Time of Day/Day of Week | SUN      | MON      | TUES     | WED      | THURS    | FRI      | SAT      | Total       |             |
|-------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------------|-------------|
| I-Taraval               |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |             |             |
| 0000-0359               | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 2        | 0        | <b>2</b>    | 13%         |
| 0400-0759               | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 1        | <b>1</b>    | 7%          |
| 0800-1159               | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | <b>0</b>    | 0%          |
| 1200-1559               | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | <b>0</b>    | 0%          |
| 1600-1959               | 0        | 0        | 2        | 0        | 3        | 3        | 0        | <b>8</b>    | 53%         |
| 2000-2359               | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 4        | <b>4</b>    | 27%         |
| <b>Total</b>            | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>15</b>   | <b>100%</b> |
| Percentage              | 0%       | 0%       | 13%      | 0%       | 20%      | 33%      | 33%      | <b>100%</b> |             |

# By District Data

## Taraval District (Company I) Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender April – June 2023

Black males (21%) and White males (22%) accounted for 43% of all arrests made by Taraval station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

| Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender |                 | Company I   |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Race and Gender                      | Q2 2023 Arrests | % of Total  |
| Asian Female                         | 5               | 3%          |
| Asian Male                           | 25              | 17%         |
| Asian Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Black Female                         | 8               | 5%          |
| Black Male                           | 31              | 21%         |
| Black Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Hispanic Female                      | 6               | 4%          |
| Hispanic Male                        | 27              | 18%         |
| Hispanic Unknown                     | 0               | 0%          |
| White Female                         | 7               | 5%          |
| White Male                           | 32              | 22%         |
| White Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Unknown Female                       | 0               | 0%          |
| Unknown Male                         | 4               | 3%          |
| Unknown Race & Gender                | 1               | 1%          |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>146</b>      | <b>100%</b> |



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = “Booked” or “Cited.” Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn’t provided.



## By District Data


### Taraval District (Company I)

#### Arrests by Age

April – June 2023

Individuals ages 30-39 accounted for 32% of arrests made by Taraval station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

| Arrest By Age |                 | Company I  |
|---------------|-----------------|------------|
| Age           | Q2 2023 Arrests | % of Total |
| Under 18      | 9               | 6%         |
| 18-29         | 41              | 28%        |
| 30-39         | 46              | 32%        |
| 40-49         | 28              | 19%        |
| 50-59         | 15              | 10%        |
| 60+           | 7               | 5%         |
| Unknown Age   | 0               | 0%         |
| Total         | 146             | 100%       |



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = "Booked" or "Cited."

## By District Data

### Tenderloin District (Company J) Use of Force April 1 – June 30, 2023

There were 91 total Uses of Force in the Tenderloin district. Firearm pointing (51) accounted for 56% of Type of Force used. The peak time for incidents (41, 45%) was between 2000-2359hrs.

| Use of Force                               | Total     |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Chemical Agent                             | 1         |
| ERIW                                       | 0         |
| ERIW 40mm                                  | 0         |
| Firearm OIS                                | 0         |
| Firearm Pointing                           | 51        |
| Impact Weapon                              | 0         |
| Other                                      | 0         |
| Physical Control Hold/Take                 | 35        |
| Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist | 4         |
| Vehicle Intervention                       | 0         |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                         | <b>91</b> |


| Time of Day/Day of Week | SUN      | MON       | TUES      | WED      | THURS    | FRI      | SAT       | Total       |             |
|-------------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| J-Tenderloin            |          |           |           |          |          |          |           |             |             |
| 0000-0359               | 1        | 6         | 0         | 0        | 0        | 0        | 1         | <b>8</b>    | 9%          |
| 0400-0759               | 0        | 0         | 0         | 1        | 1        | 0        | 4         | <b>6</b>    | 7%          |
| 0800-1159               | 2        | 6         | 4         | 0        | 0        | 1        | 6         | <b>19</b>   | 21%         |
| 1200-1559               | 0        | 0         | 0         | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0         | <b>0</b>    | 0%          |
| 1600-1959               | 2        | 1         | 5         | 3        | 1        | 3        | 2         | <b>17</b>   | 19%         |
| 2000-2359               | 0        | 32        | 1         | 2        | 2        | 0        | 4         | <b>41</b>   | 45%         |
| <b>Total</b>            | <b>5</b> | <b>45</b> | <b>10</b> | <b>6</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>17</b> | <b>91</b>   | <b>100%</b> |
| Percentage              | 5%       | 49%       | 11%       | 7%       | 4%       | 4%       | 19%       | <b>100%</b> |             |

## By District Data

### Tenderloin District (Company J) Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender April – June 2023

Hispanic males (31%) and White males (23%) accounted for 54% of all arrests made by Tenderloin Station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

| Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender |                 | Company J   |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Race and Gender                      | Q2 2023 Arrests | % of Total  |
| Asian Female                         | 1               | 0%          |
| Asian Male                           | 19              | 3%          |
| Asian Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Black Female                         | 63              | 9%          |
| Black Male                           | 143             | 21%         |
| Black Unknown                        | 2               | 0%          |
| Hispanic Female                      | 30              | 4%          |
| Hispanic Male                        | 211             | 31%         |
| Hispanic Unknown                     | 0               | 0%          |
| White Female                         | 25              | 4%          |
| White Male                           | 159             | 23%         |
| White Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Unknown Female                       | 7               | 1%          |
| Unknown Male                         | 21              | 3%          |
| Unknown Race & Gender                | 4               | 1%          |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>685</b>      | <b>100%</b> |



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = “Booked” or “Cited.” Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn’t provided.

## By District Data


### Tenderloin District (Company J)

#### Arrests Age

April – June 2023

Individuals ages 18-29 (30%) and individuals ages 30-39 (35%) accounted for 65% of arrests made by Tenderloin station in Quarter 2 of 2023.

| Arrest By Age |                 | Company J  |
|---------------|-----------------|------------|
| Age           | Q2 2023 Arrests | % of Total |
| Under 18      | 38              | 6%         |
| 18-29         | 204             | 30%        |
| 30-39         | 238             | 35%        |
| 40-49         | 112             | 16%        |
| 50-59         | 64              | 9%         |
| 60+           | 29              | 4%         |
| Unknown Age   | 0               | 0%         |
| Total         | 685             | 100%       |



Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = “Booked” or “Cited.”

## By District Data

### Airport

#### Use of Force

**April 1 – June 30, 2023**


Airport Use of Force data per December 2022 Use of Force Policy standard was unavailable at time of report.

## By District Data

### Airport Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender April – June 2023

Black males (18%) and White males (25%) accounted for 43% of total Airport arrests in Quarter 2 of 2023.

| Race & Gender    | Q2-2023 Arrests | % of Total  |
|------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Asian Female     | 5               | 4%          |
| Asian Male       | 12              | 10%         |
| Asian Unknown    | 0               | 0%          |
| Black Female     | 6               | 5%          |
| Black Male       | 22              | 18%         |
| Black Unknown    | 0               | 0%          |
| Hispanic Female  | 5               | 4%          |
| Hispanic Male    | 13              | 11%         |
| Hispanic Unknown | 0               | 0%          |
| White Female     | 6               | 5%          |
| White Male       | 30              | 25%         |
| White Unknown    | 0               | 0%          |
| Unknown Female   | 4               | 3%          |
| Unknown Male     | 19              | 16%         |
| <b>Total</b>     | <b>122</b>      | <b>100%</b> |




**Note:** Airport arrest data is obtained from the San Francisco Police Department's Airport Bureau. Airport data includes every individual arrest (booked or cited) that occurs within 24-hour periods in the 3-month quarterly time period. An individual arrested within different 24-hour periods are counted as separate arrests. Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided. Arrests made by department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City's totals.

## By District Data

### Airport Arrests by Age April – June 2023

Individuals ages 30-39 (31%) and Individuals ages 40-49 (27%) accounted for 58% of all Airport arrests in Quarter 2 of 2023.

| Airport Arrests by Age |                 |            |
|------------------------|-----------------|------------|
| Group                  | Q2-2023 Arrests | % of Total |
| 18-29                  | 24              | 20%        |
| 30-39                  | 38              | 31%        |
| 40-49                  | 33              | 27%        |
| 50-59                  | 14              | 11%        |
| 60+                    | 13              | 11%        |
| Total                  | 122             | 100%       |



**Note:** Airport arrest data is obtained from the San Francisco Police Department's Airport Bureau. Airport data includes every individual arrest (booked or cited) that occurs within 24-hour periods in the 3-month quarterly time period. An individual arrested within different 24-hour periods are counted as separate arrests. Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn't provided. Arrests made by department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City's totals.

## By District Data

### Outside of SF/Unknown

#### Use of Force

April 1 – June 30, 2023

There were 20 total Uses of Force Outside of SF/Unknown. Firearm Pointing (13) accounted for 65% of Type of Force used. The peak time for incidents (16, 80%) was between 1600-1959hr.

| Use of Force                               | Total     |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Chemical Agent                             | 0         |
| ERIW                                       | 0         |
| ERIW 40mm                                  | 0         |
| Firearm OIS                                | 0         |
| Firearm Pointing                           | 13        |
| Impact Weapon                              | 0         |
| Other                                      | 4         |
| Physical Control Hold/Take Down            | 3         |
| Strike by Obj. (personal body weapon)/Fist | 0         |
| Vehicle Intervention                       | 0         |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                         | <b>20</b> |

| Time of Day/Day of Week |          |          |          |          |           |          |          |           |
|-------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| L-Outside SF            | SUN      | MON      | TUES     | WED      | THURS     | FRI      | SAT      | Total     |
| 0000-0359               | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0         | 0        | 2        | 2         |
| 0400-0759               | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 2         | 0        | 0        | 2         |
| 0800-1159               | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0         | 0        | 0        | 0         |
| 1200-1559               | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0         | 0        | 0        | 0         |
| 1600-1959               | 0        | 0        | 0        | 7        | 9         | 0        | 0        | 16        |
| 2000-2359               | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0         | 0        | 0        | 0         |
| <b>Total</b>            | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>7</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>20</b> |
| Percentage              | 0%       | 0%       | 0%       | 35%      | 55%       | 0%       | 10%      | 100%      |




# By District Data

## Outside SF/Unknown Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender April – June 2023

Black males (41%) and Hispanic males (28%) accounted for 69% of all Outside SF arrests.

| Arrests by Race/Ethnicity and Gender |                 | Outside SF  |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Race and Gender                      | Q2 2023 Arrests | % of Total  |
| Asian Female                         | 0               | 0%          |
| Asian Male                           | 2               | 7%          |
| Asian Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Black Female                         | 2               | 7%          |
| Black Male                           | 12              | 41%         |
| Black Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Hispanic Female                      | 0               | 0%          |
| Hispanic Male                        | 8               | 28%         |
| Hispanic Unknown                     | 0               | 0%          |
| White Female                         | 0               | 0%          |
| White Male                           | 5               | 17%         |
| White Unknown                        | 0               | 0%          |
| Unknown Female                       | 0               | 0%          |
| Unknown Male                         | 0               | 0%          |
| Unknown Race & Gender                | 0               | 0%          |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>29</b>       | <b>100%</b> |




**Note:** Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which Person Type = “Booked” or “Cited.” Unknown indicates ethnicities outside DOJ definitions, Native American, and incident reports where data wasn’t provided. Arrests made by department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City’s totals.

## By District Data

### Outside SF/Unknown Arrests by Age April – June 2023

Individuals age 30-99 accounted for 55% of all Outside SF arrests.

| Arrests by Age |                 | Outside SF  |
|----------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Age            | Q2-2023 Arrests | % of Total  |
| Under 18       | 0               | 0%          |
| 18-29          | 11              | 38%         |
| 30-39          | 16              | 55%         |
| 40-49          | 0               | 0%          |
| 50-59          | 1               | 3%          |
| 60+            | 1               | 3%          |
| Unknown Age    | 0               | 0%          |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>29</b>       | <b>100%</b> |



**Note:** Arrest statistics are extracted from the Person Schema of Crime Data Warehouse via Business Intelligence tools. Search criteria includes results in which “Person Type” = “Booked” or “Cited.” Arrests made by department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City’s totals.

# By District Data


## Outside SF/Unknown

### Arrests by Location

April - June 2023

Contra Costa County, CA (4), Oakland, CA (4) and Walnut Creek (3) accounted for 11 of 29 arrests outside of the city limits.

| Arrests Outside of SF by Location |                 |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|
| Location                          | Q2 2023 Arrests |
| Alameda, CA                       | 1               |
| Baton Rouge, LA                   | 1               |
| Concord, CA                       | 1               |
| Confidential                      | 2               |
| Contra Costa County               | 4               |
| Hayward, CA                       | 2               |
| Hercules, CA                      | 1               |
| Jonesboro, GA                     | 1               |
| Mill Valley, CA                   | 1               |
| Oakland, CA                       | 4               |
| Pinole, CA                        | 1               |
| Redwood City, CA                  | 1               |
| Richmond, CA                      | 1               |
| San Rafael, CA                    | 1               |
| Santa Clara County                | 1               |
| SF County (Non-SFPD Jurisdiction) | 1               |
| Stockton, CA                      | 1               |
| Suisun City, CA                   | 1               |
| Walnut Creek, CA                  | 3               |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                | <b>29</b>       |



**Note:** Arrests made by department members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are not included in the City's totals.

# Glossary

|                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|-------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>AB 953</b>     | Assembly Bill 953, also known as the Racial and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA) of 2015; requires CA law enforcement agencies to collect and report demographic data to the California Department of Justice |
| <b>ACS</b>        | American Community Survey                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| <b>CDW</b>        | Crime Data Warehouse                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| <b>City</b>       | City and County of San Francisco                                                                                                                                                                           |
| <b>Department</b> | San Francisco Police Department                                                                                                                                                                            |
| <b>DGO</b>        | Department General Order                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| <b>DHR</b>        | San Francisco Department of Human Resources                                                                                                                                                                |
| <b>DHS</b>        | U.S. Department of Homeland Security                                                                                                                                                                       |
| <b>DOJ</b>        | U.S. Department of Justice                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| <b>DPA</b>        | Department of Police Accountability                                                                                                                                                                        |
| <b>EEO</b>        | Equal Employment Opportunity                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <b>PRCS</b>       | Post Release Community Supervision; used to classify probation and parole searches                                                                                                                         |
| <b>RIPA Board</b> | California's Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board; produces an annual report on the past and current status of racial identity profiling and provides recommendations to law enforcement agencies  |
| <b>SDCS</b>       | Stop Data Collection System, the tool used to collect stops and search data in compliance with AB953                                                                                                       |
| <b>SFPD</b>       | San Francisco Police Department                                                                                                                                                                            |
| <b>TSA</b>        | Transportation Security Administration                                                                                                                                                                     |
| <b>UoF</b>        | Use of Force                                                                                                                                                                                               |



## *Safety with Respect*

Prepared by San Francisco Police Department

Professional Standards and Principled Policing Unit

August 2023

**Data Sources:** San Francisco Police Department's Crime Data Warehouse, accessed via Business Intelligence Tools; San Francisco Police Department Early Intervention Systems Administrative Investigative Management Database, accessed via Business Intelligence Tools; San Francisco Police Department Airport Bureau, San Francisco Police Department Human Resources; San Francisco Police Department Internal Affairs; San Francisco Department of Emergency Management; San Francisco Department of Police Accountability; California Department of Justice Stop Data Collection System

Q2 2023 Use of Force data was queried on July 18, 2023

Q2 2023 Arrest Data was queried on July 26, 2023



*Safety with Respect*

## **APPENDIX A**

### **SFPD Quarterly Activity & Data Report**

### **2023 Quarter 2 Report**

### **Crime Victim Data Reporting**

**WILLIAM SCOTT**  
Chief of Police

On April 12, 2020, Ordinance 40-20 went into effect, amending San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 96 to include section 96A.5, “Quarterly Crime Victim Data Reporting.” The ordinance mandated that the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) provide quarterly reports regarding victim demographics across a host of data points, further specifying that the quarterly reports would be due on the first Tuesday in February, May, August and November.

As part of our commitment to the community we serve, SFPD’s Professional Standards and Principled Policing Unit worked diligently and in close coordination with relevant SFPD bureaus to compile the crime victim information required for this report. It bears mentioning here, however, that as noted by the Board of Supervisors’ Budget and Legislative Analyst, SFPD...

...would need to modify the current UCR [Uniform Crime Reports] system if the proposed ordinance required tracking and reporting of the additional crime data at an earlier date than the estimated NIBRS [National Incident-Based Reporting System] implementation date of March 2022. Based on a minimum of two full-time equivalent (FTE) consultants, the Department estimates the minimum cost would be approximately \$960,000. The estimated cost could be higher, based on the actual scope of work needed to modify the current UCR system. (Source: Budget and Legislative Analyst Memo for the February 6, 2020 Government Audit and Oversight Committee Meeting, Feb. 3, 2020, <https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=8048232&GUID=24920980-EBBA-4951-95B0-79C2FB993568>)

As no additional funding was allocated to allow for the extraction of this data from our primary records management system, Crime Data Warehouse (CDW), staff worked within the constraints of the current resources to aggregate the needed data from CDW as it stands. As a result, readers must be aware that SFPD data is not structured for this reporting method.

As background, all law enforcement agencies must report the most severe crime under the Uniform Crime Reporting requirements, as stated by the FBI Summary Reporting System manual:

*“In cases where more than one offense occurs in an incident, only the highest ranking Part I offense is counted.”*

## VICTIM DEMOGRAPHIC DATA REPORT

Q2 2023

This “hierarchy rule” has led to the development of a system (born many decades ago), and migrated to the current state, structured for the purpose of counting the “highest ranking” offense. As such, the number of victims of certain crimes is not mandated for reporting by UCR nor is the age, ethnicity, gender or location for any crime. Therefore, detailed demographic and location information for victims is not prepared for capture in this type of report.

For example:

1. An individual can be a victim of multiple crime types in a single reported incident – that person may be counted in each crime type.
2. In a single incident with multiple crimes *and* multiple victims, SFPD summary reporting cannot provide how many people were victim to any individual crime. All victims in the incident show up in each crime.

**Prepared by:** San Francisco Police Department Professional Standards and Principled Policing Unit

**Data Sources:** San Francisco Police Department's Crime Data Warehouse (CDW); San Francisco Police Department Homicide Unit; San Francisco Police Department Special Investigations Division

VICTIM DEMOGRAPHIC DATA REPORT  
Q2 2023

**APPENDIX A – SFPD Quarterly Activity & Data Report - Victim Demographic Summary Findings**

**Aggravated Assault**

The number of victims associated with Aggravated Assault incident reports is down 11.1 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023, and down 7.2 percent when comparing Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q2 through Q2 2023. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Aggravated Assault in Q2 2023 and Q1-Q2 2023 are Hispanic, male, ages 18-29.

**Battery/Other Assault**

The number of victims associated with Battery/Other Assault incident reports is down 0.6 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023, and up 9 percent when comparing Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q1 through Q2 2023. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Battery/Other Assault in Q2 2023 are Hispanic, male, ages 18-29. White, male, ages 30-39 is the highest demographic for Q1 through Q2 2023.

**Robbery**

The number of victims associated with Robbery incident reports is up 2.2 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023, and up 12.1 percent when comparing Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q1 through Q2 2023. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Robbery in Q2 2023 are Hispanic, male, ages 18-29. The same victim demographic characteristics are highest for Q1 through Q2 2023.

**Burglary**

The number of victims associated with Burglary incident reports is down 4 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023, and down 3.4 percent when comparing Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q1 through Q2 2023. Burglary victim data includes commercial establishments, which are typically entered in the “other” and “unknown” demographic categories. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Burglary in Q2 2023, excluding others and unknown, are White, male, ages 30-39. The same victim demographic characteristics are highest for Q1 through Q2 2023.

**Larceny Theft**

The number of victims associated with Larceny incident reports is down 4.3 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023, and down 1 percent when comparing Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q1 through Q2 2023. Larceny victim data includes commercial establishments, which are typically entered in the “other” and “unknown” demographic categories. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Larceny in Q2 2023 are other/unknown, followed by White, male, ages 30-39. The same victim demographic characteristics are highest for Q1 through Q2 2023.

**Motor Vehicle Theft**

The number of victims associated with Motor Vehicle Theft incident reports is up 19.3 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023, and up 2.6 percent when comparing Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q1 through Q2 2023. Motor Vehicle Theft victim data includes commercial establishments, which are typically entered in the “other” and “unknown” demographic categories. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Motor Vehicle Theft in Q2 2023 are others, followed by white, male, ages 30-39. The same victim demographic characteristics are highest for Q1 through Q2 2023.



## VICTIM DEMOGRAPHIC DATA REPORT

Q2 2023

### **Sexual Assault**

The number of victims associated with Sexual Assault incident reports is down 17.6 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023, and down 10.2 percent when comparing Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q1 through Q2 2023. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Sexual Assault in Q2 2023 are Hispanic, female, under 18. Hispanic, female, 18-29, are the highest demographic characteristics for Q1 through Q2 2023.

### **Vandalism**

The number of victims associated with Vandalism incident reports is down 11.8 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023, and down 7.3 percent when comparing Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q1 through Q2 2023. Vandalism victim data includes commercial establishments, which are typically entered in the “other” and “unknown” demographic categories. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Vandalism in Q2 2023 are others, followed by White, male, ages 30-39. The same victim demographic characteristics are highest for Q1 through Q2 2023.

### **Domestic Violence**

The number of victims associated with Domestic Violence incident reports is down 11.3 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023, and down 7.4 percent when comparing Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q1 through Q2 2023. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Domestic Violence in Q2 2023 are Hispanic, female, ages 30-39. The same victim demographic characteristics are highest for Q1 through Q2 2023.

### **Elder Abuse**

The number of victims associated with Elder Abuse incident reports is up 19.9 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023, and up 13.5 percent when comparing Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q1 through Q2 2023. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Elder Abuse in Q3 2022 are White, male, ages 65 or older. The same victim demographic characteristics are highest for Q1 through Q2 2023.

### **Child Abuse**

The number of victims associated with Child Abuse incident reports is down 1.9 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023, and down 1.1 percent when comparing Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q1 through Q2 2023. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Child Abuse in Q2 2023 are Hispanic, female, under 18 years old. The same victim demographic characteristics are highest for Q1 through Q2 2023.

### **Homicide**

The number of Homicide victims is down 6.7 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023 and up 4.2 percent when comparing Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q1 through Q2 2023. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Homicide in Q2 2023 are Black, male, ages 18-29. The same victim demographic characteristics are highest for Q1 through Q2 2023.

### **Hate Crime**

The number of victims associated with Hate Crime incident reports is up 27.3 percent from Q2 2022 to Q2 2023, and up 76.2 percent from Q1 through Q2 2022 to Q1 through Q2 2023. The most common victim demographic characteristics for Hate Crime in Q2 2023 are Hispanic, male, ages 18-29. For Q1 through Q2 2023, the most common demographic characteristics are Asian/Asian Indian/Other Asian and Hispanic, female, ages 18-29. The most prevalent bias motivation during Q2 2023 was anti-Transgender and Q1 through Q2 2023 was anti-Asian.

**AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE**

| AGGRAVATED ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |        |                   |        |         |        | PERSON COUNT |
|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------|-------------------|--------|---------|--------|--------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black  | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White  |              |
| A                  | Central              |                                   | 11.00                     | 23.00  | 20.00             | 6.00   | 4.00    | 31.00  | 95.00        |
| B                  | Southern             |                                   | 7.00                      | 38.00  | 33.00             | 14.00  | 3.00    | 31.00  | 126.00       |
| C                  | Bayview              |                                   | 10.00                     | 48.00  | 48.00             | 12.00  | 1.00    | 11.00  | 130.00       |
| D                  | Mission              |                                   | 4.00                      | 19.00  | 97.00             | 13.00  | 7.00    | 39.00  | 179.00       |
| E                  | Northern             | 2.00                              | 18.00                     | 21.00  | 27.00             | 21.00  | 9.00    | 36.00  | 134.00       |
| F                  | Park                 |                                   | 3.00                      | 1.00   | 5.00              | 3.00   | 3.00    | 19.00  | 34.00        |
| G                  | Richmond             |                                   | 4.00                      | 1.00   | 4.00              | 3.00   | 1.00    | 10.00  | 23.00        |
| H                  | Ingleside            | 2.00                              | 29.00                     | 8.00   | 49.00             | 9.00   | 4.00    | 17.00  | 118.00       |
| I                  | Taraval              | 1.00                              | 15.00                     | 8.00   | 11.00             | 1.00   | 1.00    | 9.00   | 46.00        |
| J                  | Tenderloin           |                                   | 19.00                     | 46.00  | 27.00             | 13.00  | 10.00   | 53.00  | 168.00       |
| X                  | Out of SF            |                                   |                           |        |                   | 1.00   |         |        | 1.00         |
| Grand Total        |                      | 5.00                              | 120.00                    | 213.00 | 321.00            | 96.00  | 43.00   | 256.00 | 1054.00      |

**AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE**

| AGGRAVATED ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| A                  | Central              |                                   | 1.0%                      | 2.2%  | 1.9%              | 0.6%   | 0.4%    | 2.9%  | 9.0%         |
| B                  | Southern             |                                   | 0.7%                      | 3.6%  | 3.1%              | 1.3%   | 0.3%    | 2.9%  | 12.0%        |
| C                  | Bayview              |                                   | 0.9%                      | 4.6%  | 4.6%              | 1.1%   | 0.1%    | 1.0%  | 12.3%        |
| D                  | Mission              |                                   | 0.4%                      | 1.8%  | 9.2%              | 1.2%   | 0.7%    | 3.7%  | 17.0%        |
| E                  | Northern             | 0.2%                              | 1.7%                      | 2.0%  | 2.6%              | 2.0%   | 0.9%    | 3.4%  | 12.7%        |
| F                  | Park                 |                                   | 0.3%                      | 0.1%  | 0.5%              | 0.3%   | 0.3%    | 1.8%  | 3.2%         |
| G                  | Richmond             |                                   | 0.4%                      | 0.1%  | 0.4%              | 0.3%   | 0.1%    | 0.9%  | 2.2%         |
| H                  | Ingleside            | 0.2%                              | 2.8%                      | 0.8%  | 4.6%              | 0.9%   | 0.4%    | 1.6%  | 11.2%        |
| I                  | Taraval              | 0.1%                              | 1.4%                      | 0.8%  | 1.0%              | 0.1%   | 0.1%    | 0.9%  | 4.4%         |
| J                  | Tenderloin           |                                   | 1.8%                      | 4.4%  | 2.6%              | 1.2%   | 0.9%    | 5.0%  | 15.9%        |
| X                  | Out of SF            |                                   |                           |       |                   | 0.1%   |         |       | 0.1%         |
| Grand Total        |                      | 0.5%                              | 11.4%                     | 20.2% | 30.5%             | 9.1%   | 4.1%    | 24.3% | 100.0%       |

**AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE**

| AGGRAVATED ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT |        |        |        |        |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|--------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29  | 30-39  | 40-49  | 50-59  | 60+    | Unknown |              |
| A                  | Central              | 2.00         | 22.00  | 26.00  | 14.00  | 13.00  | 7.00   | 11.00   | 95.00        |
| B                  | Southern             | 3.00         | 33.00  | 34.00  | 16.00  | 21.00  | 4.00   | 15.00   | 126.00       |
| C                  | Bayview              | 14.00        | 28.00  | 25.00  | 19.00  | 16.00  | 14.00  | 14.00   | 130.00       |
| D                  | Mission              | 11.00        | 52.00  | 31.00  | 31.00  | 19.00  | 18.00  | 17.00   | 179.00       |
| E                  | Northern             | 15.00        | 25.00  | 27.00  | 19.00  | 11.00  | 12.00  | 25.00   | 134.00       |
| F                  | Park                 | 4.00         | 8.00   | 6.00   | 5.00   | 2.00   | 6.00   | 3.00    | 34.00        |
| G                  | Richmond             | 5.00         | 4.00   | 2.00   | 2.00   | 3.00   | 5.00   | 2.00    | 23.00        |
| H                  | Ingleside            | 17.00        | 24.00  | 21.00  | 22.00  | 8.00   | 21.00  | 5.00    | 118.00       |
| I                  | Taraval              | 7.00         | 14.00  | 7.00   | 6.00   | 6.00   | 4.00   | 2.00    | 46.00        |
| J                  | Tenderloin           | 6.00         | 23.00  | 32.00  | 25.00  | 41.00  | 18.00  | 23.00   | 168.00       |
| X                  | Out of SF            |              |        |        |        |        |        | 1.00    | 1.00         |
| Grand Total        |                      | 84.00        | 233.00 | 211.00 | 159.00 | 140.00 | 109.00 | 118.00  | 1054.00      |

**AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE**

| AGGRAVATED ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |       |       |         | PERSON COUNT |
|--------------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+   | Unknown |              |
| A                  | Central              | 0.2%         | 2.1%  | 2.5%  | 1.3%  | 1.2%  | 0.7%  | 1.0%    | 9.0%         |
| B                  | Southern             | 0.3%         | 3.1%  | 3.2%  | 1.5%  | 2.0%  | 0.4%  | 1.4%    | 12.0%        |
| C                  | Bayview              | 1.3%         | 2.7%  | 2.4%  | 1.8%  | 1.5%  | 1.3%  | 1.3%    | 12.3%        |
| D                  | Mission              | 1.0%         | 4.9%  | 2.9%  | 2.9%  | 1.8%  | 1.7%  | 1.6%    | 17.0%        |
| E                  | Northern             | 1.4%         | 2.4%  | 2.6%  | 1.8%  | 1.0%  | 1.1%  | 2.4%    | 12.7%        |
| F                  | Park                 | 0.4%         | 0.8%  | 0.6%  | 0.5%  | 0.2%  | 0.6%  | 0.3%    | 3.2%         |
| G                  | Richmond             | 0.5%         | 0.4%  | 0.2%  | 0.2%  | 0.3%  | 0.5%  | 0.2%    | 2.2%         |
| H                  | Ingleside            | 1.6%         | 2.3%  | 2.0%  | 2.1%  | 0.8%  | 2.0%  | 0.5%    | 11.2%        |
| I                  | Taraval              | 0.7%         | 1.3%  | 0.7%  | 0.6%  | 0.6%  | 0.4%  | 0.2%    | 4.4%         |
| J                  | Tenderloin           | 0.6%         | 2.2%  | 3.0%  | 2.4%  | 3.9%  | 1.7%  | 2.2%    | 15.9%        |
| X                  | Out of SF            |              |       |       |       |       |       | 0.1%    | 0.1%         |
| Grand Total        |                      | 8.0%         | 22.1% | 20.0% | 15.1% | 13.3% | 10.3% | 11.2%   | 100.0%       |

**AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER**

| AGGRAVATED ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT |        |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|--------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male   | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A                  | Central              | 27.00        | 62.00  |           | 6.00   |         | 95.00        |
| B                  | Southern             | 35.00        | 77.00  | 1.00      | 13.00  |         | 126.00       |
| C                  | Bayview              | 54.00        | 66.00  |           | 9.00   | 1.00    | 130.00       |
| D                  | Mission              | 52.00        | 114.00 |           | 12.00  | 1.00    | 179.00       |
| E                  | Northern             | 52.00        | 65.00  |           | 17.00  |         | 134.00       |
| F                  | Park                 | 13.00        | 20.00  |           | 1.00   |         | 34.00        |
| G                  | Richmond             | 9.00         | 12.00  |           | 2.00   |         | 23.00        |
| H                  | Ingleside            | 46.00        | 62.00  | 1.00      | 9.00   |         | 118.00       |
| I                  | Taraval              | 14.00        | 31.00  |           | 1.00   |         | 46.00        |
| J                  | Tenderloin           | 46.00        | 102.00 |           | 13.00  | 7.00    | 168.00       |
| X                  | Out of SF            |              | 1.00   |           |        |         | 1.00         |
| Grand Total        |                      | 348.00       | 612.00 | 2.00      | 83.00  | 9.00    | 1054.00      |

**AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER**

| AGGRAVATED ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|--------------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A                  | Central              | 2.6%         | 5.9%  |           | 0.6%   |         | 9.0%         |
| B                  | Southern             | 3.3%         | 7.3%  | 0.1%      | 1.2%   |         | 12.0%        |
| C                  | Bayview              | 5.1%         | 6.3%  |           | 0.9%   | 0.1%    | 12.3%        |
| D                  | Mission              | 4.9%         | 10.8% |           | 1.1%   | 0.1%    | 17.0%        |
| E                  | Northern             | 4.9%         | 6.2%  |           | 1.6%   |         | 12.7%        |
| F                  | Park                 | 1.2%         | 1.9%  |           | 0.1%   |         | 3.2%         |
| G                  | Richmond             | 0.9%         | 1.1%  |           | 0.2%   |         | 2.2%         |
| H                  | Ingleside            | 4.4%         | 5.9%  | 0.1%      | 0.9%   |         | 11.2%        |
| I                  | Taraval              | 1.3%         | 2.9%  |           | 0.1%   |         | 4.4%         |
| J                  | Tenderloin           | 4.4%         | 9.7%  |           | 1.2%   | 0.7%    | 15.9%        |
| X                  | Out of SF            |              | 0.1%  |           |        |         | 0.1%         |
| Grand Total        |                      | 33.0%        | 58.1% | 0.2%      | 7.9%   | 0.9%    | 100.0%       |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q2 2023

**AGGRAVATED ASSAULT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE**

| AGGRAVATED<br>ASSAULT<br>DISTRICT | PERSON COUNT                         |                              |        |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT  |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|---------------|
|                                   | American Indian or<br>Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific<br>Islander | Black  | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |               |
| Q2 2022                           | 4                                    | 128                          | 280    | 354               | 107    | 41      | 272   | <b>1,186</b>  |
| Q2 2023                           | 5                                    | 120                          | 213    | 321               | 96     | 43      | 256   | <b>1,054</b>  |
| Difference                        | 1                                    | -8                           | -67    | -33               | -11    | 2       | -16   | <b>-132</b>   |
| % Change                          | 25.0%                                | -6.3%                        | -23.9% | -9.3%             | -10.3% | 4.9%    | -5.9% | <b>-11.1%</b> |

**AGGRAVATED ASSAULT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE**

| AGGRAVATED<br>ASSAULT | PERSON COUNT |       |        |        |       |       |         | PERSON COUNT  |
|-----------------------|--------------|-------|--------|--------|-------|-------|---------|---------------|
|                       | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39  | 40-49  | 50-59 | 60+   | Unknown |               |
| Q2 2022               | 81           | 257   | 270    | 200    | 124   | 117   | 137     | <b>1,186</b>  |
| Q2 2023               | 84           | 233   | 211    | 159    | 140   | 109   | 118     | <b>1,054</b>  |
| Difference            | 3            | -24   | -59    | -41    | 16    | -8    | -19     | <b>-132</b>   |
| % Change              | 3.7%         | -9.3% | -21.9% | -20.5% | 12.9% | -6.8% | -13.9%  | <b>-11.1%</b> |

**AGGRAVATED ASSAULT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER**

| AGGRAVATED<br>ASSAULT | PERSON COUNT |        |           |        |         | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------|-----------|--------|---------|-----------------|
|                       | Female       | Male   | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |                 |
| Q2 2022               | 383          | 699    | 2         | 99     | 3       | <b>1,186</b>    |
| Q2 2023               | 348          | 612    | 2         | 83     | 9       | <b>1,054</b>    |
| Difference            | -35          | -87    | 0         | -16    | 6       | <b>-132</b>     |
| % Change              | -9.1%        | -12.4% | 0.0%      | -16.2% | 200.0%  | <b>-11.1%</b>   |

#### BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

| BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |        |                   |        |         |        | PERSON COUNT |
|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------|-------------------|--------|---------|--------|--------------|
| DISTRICT              | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black  | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White  |              |
| A                     | Central              |                                   | 26.00                     | 28.00  | 47.00             | 23.00  | 12.00   | 68.00  | 204.00       |
| B                     | Southern             | 5.00                              | 24.00                     | 47.00  | 61.00             | 9.00   | 10.00   | 56.00  | 212.00       |
| C                     | Bayview              |                                   | 21.00                     | 45.00  | 43.00             | 3.00   | 4.00    | 18.00  | 134.00       |
| D                     | Mission              |                                   | 26.00                     | 38.00  | 134.00            | 15.00  | 16.00   | 79.00  | 308.00       |
| E                     | Northern             | 2.00                              | 21.00                     | 31.00  | 43.00             | 9.00   | 9.00    | 55.00  | 170.00       |
| F                     | Park                 |                                   | 8.00                      | 7.00   | 7.00              | 3.00   | 1.00    | 22.00  | 48.00        |
| G                     | Richmond             |                                   | 13.00                     | 3.00   | 6.00              | 3.00   | 12.00   | 24.00  | 61.00        |
| H                     | Ingleside            |                                   | 17.00                     | 19.00  | 56.00             | 6.00   | 3.00    | 26.00  | 127.00       |
| I                     | Taraval              |                                   | 26.00                     | 15.00  | 23.00             | 4.00   | 3.00    | 34.00  | 105.00       |
| J                     | Tenderloin           | 2.00                              | 32.00                     | 51.00  | 45.00             | 14.00  | 14.00   | 83.00  | 241.00       |
| X                     | Out of SF            |                                   | 1.00                      | 6.00   | 3.00              |        | 1.00    |        | 11.00        |
| Grand Total           |                      | 9.00                              | 215.00                    | 290.00 | 468.00            | 89.00  | 85.00   | 465.00 | 1621.00      |

#### BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

| BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
| DISTRICT              | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| A                     | Central              |                                   | 1.6%                      | 1.7%  | 2.9%              | 1.4%   | 0.7%    | 4.2%  | 12.6%        |
| B                     | Southern             | 0.3%                              | 1.5%                      | 2.9%  | 3.8%              | 0.6%   | 0.6%    | 3.5%  | 13.1%        |
| C                     | Bayview              |                                   | 1.3%                      | 2.8%  | 2.7%              | 0.2%   | 0.2%    | 1.1%  | 8.3%         |
| D                     | Mission              |                                   | 1.6%                      | 2.3%  | 8.3%              | 0.9%   | 1.0%    | 4.9%  | 19.0%        |
| E                     | Northern             | 0.1%                              | 1.3%                      | 1.9%  | 2.7%              | 0.6%   | 0.6%    | 3.4%  | 10.5%        |
| F                     | Park                 |                                   | 0.5%                      | 0.4%  | 0.4%              | 0.2%   | 0.1%    | 1.4%  | 3.0%         |
| G                     | Richmond             |                                   | 0.8%                      | 0.2%  | 0.4%              | 0.2%   | 0.7%    | 1.5%  | 3.8%         |
| H                     | Ingleside            |                                   | 1.0%                      | 1.2%  | 3.5%              | 0.4%   | 0.2%    | 1.6%  | 7.8%         |
| I                     | Taraval              |                                   | 1.6%                      | 0.9%  | 1.4%              | 0.2%   | 0.2%    | 2.1%  | 6.5%         |
| J                     | Tenderloin           | 0.1%                              | 2.0%                      | 3.1%  | 2.8%              | 0.9%   | 0.9%    | 5.1%  | 14.9%        |
| X                     | Out of SF            |                                   | 0.1%                      | 0.4%  | 0.2%              |        | 0.1%    |       | 0.7%         |
| Grand Total           |                      | 0.6%                              | 13.3%                     | 17.9% | 28.9%             | 5.5%   | 5.2%    | 28.7% | 100.0%       |

#### BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

| BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT |        |        |        |        |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT              | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29  | 30-39  | 40-49  | 50-59  | 60+    | Unknown |              |
| A                     | Central              | 6.00         | 46.00  | 49.00  | 35.00  | 26.00  | 18.00  | 24.00   | 204.00       |
| B                     | Southern             | 13.00        | 56.00  | 51.00  | 32.00  | 26.00  | 21.00  | 13.00   | 212.00       |
| C                     | Bayview              | 19.00        | 27.00  | 32.00  | 12.00  | 19.00  | 21.00  | 4.00    | 134.00       |
| D                     | Mission              | 29.00        | 89.00  | 59.00  | 53.00  | 29.00  | 25.00  | 24.00   | 308.00       |
| E                     | Northern             | 17.00        | 34.00  | 47.00  | 24.00  | 26.00  | 11.00  | 11.00   | 170.00       |
| F                     | Park                 | 5.00         | 13.00  | 10.00  | 6.00   | 7.00   | 6.00   | 1.00    | 48.00        |
| G                     | Richmond             | 8.00         | 5.00   | 11.00  | 10.00  | 9.00   | 12.00  | 6.00    | 61.00        |
| H                     | Ingleside            | 15.00        | 25.00  | 21.00  | 17.00  | 22.00  | 21.00  | 6.00    | 127.00       |
| I                     | Taraval              | 16.00        | 18.00  | 14.00  | 21.00  | 13.00  | 18.00  | 5.00    | 105.00       |
| J                     | Tenderloin           | 5.00         | 42.00  | 60.00  | 49.00  | 30.00  | 36.00  | 19.00   | 241.00       |
| X                     | Out of SF            | 4.00         | 3.00   | 2.00   |        | 1.00   | 1.00   |         | 11.00        |
| Grand Total           |                      | 137.00       | 358.00 | 356.00 | 259.00 | 208.00 | 190.00 | 113.00  | 1621.00      |

**BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE**

| BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |       |       |         |  | PERSON COUNT |
|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|--|--------------|
| DISTRICT              | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+   | Unknown |  |              |
| A                     | Central              | 0.4%         | 2.8%  | 3.0%  | 2.2%  | 1.6%  | 1.1%  | 1.5%    |  | 12.6%        |
| B                     | Southern             | 0.8%         | 3.5%  | 3.1%  | 2.0%  | 1.6%  | 1.3%  | 0.8%    |  | 13.1%        |
| C                     | Bayview              | 1.2%         | 1.7%  | 2.0%  | 0.7%  | 1.2%  | 1.3%  | 0.2%    |  | 8.3%         |
| D                     | Mission              | 1.8%         | 5.5%  | 3.6%  | 3.3%  | 1.8%  | 1.5%  | 1.5%    |  | 19.0%        |
| E                     | Northern             | 1.0%         | 2.1%  | 2.9%  | 1.5%  | 1.6%  | 0.7%  | 0.7%    |  | 10.5%        |
| F                     | Park                 | 0.3%         | 0.8%  | 0.6%  | 0.4%  | 0.4%  | 0.4%  | 0.1%    |  | 3.0%         |
| G                     | Richmond             | 0.5%         | 0.3%  | 0.7%  | 0.6%  | 0.6%  | 0.7%  | 0.4%    |  | 3.8%         |
| H                     | Ingleside            | 0.9%         | 1.5%  | 1.3%  | 1.0%  | 1.4%  | 1.3%  | 0.4%    |  | 7.8%         |
| I                     | Taraval              | 1.0%         | 1.1%  | 0.9%  | 1.3%  | 0.8%  | 1.1%  | 0.3%    |  | 6.5%         |
| J                     | Tenderloin           | 0.3%         | 2.6%  | 3.7%  | 3.0%  | 1.9%  | 2.2%  | 1.2%    |  | 14.9%        |
| X                     | Out of SF            | 0.2%         | 0.2%  | 0.1%  |       | 0.1%  | 0.1%  |         |  | 0.7%         |
| Grand Total           |                      | 8.5%         | 22.1% | 22.0% | 16.0% | 12.8% | 11.7% | 7.0%    |  | 100.0%       |

**BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER**

| BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT |        |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT              | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male   | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A                     | Central              | 76.00        | 106.00 |           | 20.00  | 2.00    | 204.00       |
| B                     | Southern             | 93.00        | 108.00 | 1.00      | 9.00   | 1.00    | 212.00       |
| C                     | Bayview              | 72.00        | 59.00  |           | 3.00   |         | 134.00       |
| D                     | Mission              | 120.00       | 176.00 | 1.00      | 11.00  |         | 308.00       |
| E                     | Northern             | 71.00        | 88.00  |           | 8.00   | 3.00    | 170.00       |
| F                     | Park                 | 15.00        | 30.00  | 1.00      | 2.00   |         | 48.00        |
| G                     | Richmond             | 25.00        | 31.00  |           | 3.00   | 2.00    | 61.00        |
| H                     | Ingleside            | 61.00        | 59.00  | 1.00      | 6.00   |         | 127.00       |
| I                     | Taraval              | 47.00        | 53.00  | 1.00      | 4.00   |         | 105.00       |
| J                     | Tenderloin           | 85.00        | 140.00 | 1.00      | 15.00  |         | 241.00       |
| X                     | Out of SF            | 7.00         | 4.00   |           |        |         | 11.00        |
| Grand Total           |                      | 672.00       | 854.00 | 6.00      | 81.00  | 8.00    | 1621.00      |

**BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER**

| BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT              | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A                     | Central              | 4.7%         | 6.5%  |           | 1.2%   | 0.1%    | 12.6%        |
| B                     | Southern             | 5.7%         | 6.7%  | 0.1%      | 0.6%   | 0.1%    | 13.1%        |
| C                     | Bayview              | 4.4%         | 3.6%  |           | 0.2%   |         | 8.3%         |
| D                     | Mission              | 7.4%         | 10.9% | 0.1%      | 0.7%   |         | 19.0%        |
| E                     | Northern             | 4.4%         | 5.4%  |           | 0.5%   | 0.2%    | 10.5%        |
| F                     | Park                 | 0.9%         | 1.9%  | 0.1%      | 0.1%   |         | 3.0%         |
| G                     | Richmond             | 1.5%         | 1.9%  |           | 0.2%   | 0.1%    | 3.8%         |
| H                     | Ingleside            | 3.8%         | 3.6%  | 0.1%      | 0.4%   |         | 7.8%         |
| I                     | Taraval              | 2.9%         | 3.3%  | 0.1%      | 0.2%   |         | 6.5%         |
| J                     | Tenderloin           | 5.2%         | 8.6%  | 0.1%      | 0.9%   |         | 14.9%        |
| X                     | Out of SF            | 0.4%         | 0.2%  |           |        |         | 0.7%         |
| Grand Total           |                      | 41.5%        | 52.7% | 0.4%      | 5.0%   | 0.5%    | 100.0%       |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q2 2023

**BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE**

| BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT DISTRICT | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
|                                | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| Q2 2022                        | 7                                 | 237                       | 306   | 398               | 104    | 95      | 484   | 1,631        |
| Q2 2023                        | 9                                 | 215                       | 290   | 468               | 89     | 85      | 465   | 1,621        |
| Difference                     | 2                                 | -22                       | -16   | 70                | -15    | -10     | -19   | -10          |
| % Change                       | 28.6%                             | -9.3%                     | -5.2% | 17.6%             | -14.4% | -10.5%  | -3.9% | -0.6%        |

**BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE**

| BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT | PERSON COUNT |       |       |        |       |       |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-----------------------|--------------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|---------|--------------|
|                       | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49  | 50-59 | 60+   | Unknown |              |
| Q2 2022               | 104          | 348   | 359   | 314    | 177   | 195   | 134     | 1,631        |
| Q2 2023               | 137          | 358   | 356   | 259    | 208   | 190   | 113     | 1,621        |
| Difference            | 33           | 10    | -3    | -55    | 31    | -5    | -21     | -10          |
| % Change              | 31.7%        | 2.9%  | -0.8% | -17.5% | 17.5% | -2.6% | -15.7%  | -0.6%        |

**BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER**

| BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT | PERSON COUNT |      |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-----------------------|--------------|------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
|                       | Female       | Male | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| Q2 2022               | 718          | 803  | 2         | 98     | 10      | 1,631        |
| Q2 2023               | 672          | 854  | 6         | 81     | 8       | 1,621        |
| Difference            | -46          | 51   | 4         | -17    | -2      | -10          |
| % Change              | -6.4%        | 6.4% | 200.0%    | -17.3% | -20.0%  | -0.6%        |

#### ROBBERY VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

| ROBBERY     |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |        | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|--------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White  |              |
| A           | Central              |                                   | 18.00                     | 18.00 | 20.00             | 34.00  | 7.00    | 30.00  | 127.00       |
| B           | Southern             |                                   | 18.00                     | 13.00 | 46.00             | 16.00  | 7.00    | 27.00  | 127.00       |
| C           | Bayview              |                                   | 10.00                     | 13.00 | 52.00             | 21.00  | 1.00    | 5.00   | 102.00       |
| D           | Mission              |                                   | 7.00                      | 4.00  | 62.00             | 2.00   | 3.00    | 25.00  | 103.00       |
| E           | Northern             |                                   | 14.00                     | 3.00  | 24.00             | 16.00  | 2.00    | 39.00  | 98.00        |
| F           | Park                 |                                   | 9.00                      |       | 1.00              | 6.00   | 1.00    | 8.00   | 25.00        |
| G           | Richmond             |                                   | 13.00                     | 2.00  | 7.00              | 17.00  | 4.00    | 18.00  | 61.00        |
| H           | Ingleside            | 1.00                              | 23.00                     | 13.00 | 51.00             | 14.00  | 1.00    | 14.00  | 117.00       |
| I           | Taraval              |                                   | 27.00                     | 1.00  | 10.00             | 12.00  | 1.00    | 8.00   | 59.00        |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 1.00                              | 19.00                     | 29.00 | 30.00             | 28.00  | 5.00    | 40.00  | 152.00       |
| Grand Total |                      | 2.00                              | 158.00                    | 96.00 | 303.00            | 166.00 | 32.00   | 214.00 | 971.00       |

#### ROBBERY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

| ROBBERY     |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| A           | Central              |                                   | 1.9%                      | 1.9%  | 2.1%              | 3.5%   | 0.7%    | 3.1%  | 13.1%        |
| B           | Southern             |                                   | 1.9%                      | 1.3%  | 4.7%              | 1.6%   | 0.7%    | 2.8%  | 13.1%        |
| C           | Bayview              |                                   | 1.0%                      | 1.3%  | 5.4%              | 2.2%   | 0.1%    | 0.5%  | 10.5%        |
| D           | Mission              |                                   | 0.7%                      | 0.4%  | 6.4%              | 0.2%   | 0.3%    | 2.6%  | 10.6%        |
| E           | Northern             |                                   | 1.4%                      | 0.3%  | 2.5%              | 1.6%   | 0.2%    | 4.0%  | 10.1%        |
| F           | Park                 |                                   | 0.9%                      |       | 0.1%              | 0.6%   | 0.1%    | 0.8%  | 2.6%         |
| G           | Richmond             |                                   | 1.3%                      | 0.2%  | 0.7%              | 1.8%   | 0.4%    | 1.9%  | 6.3%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 0.1%                              | 2.4%                      | 1.3%  | 5.3%              | 1.4%   | 0.1%    | 1.4%  | 12.0%        |
| I           | Taraval              |                                   | 2.8%                      | 0.1%  | 1.0%              | 1.2%   | 0.1%    | 0.8%  | 6.1%         |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 0.1%                              | 2.0%                      | 3.0%  | 3.1%              | 2.9%   | 0.5%    | 4.1%  | 15.7%        |
| Grand Total |                      | 0.2%                              | 16.3%                     | 9.9%  | 31.2%             | 17.1%  | 3.3%    | 22.0% | 100.0%       |

#### ROBBERY VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

| ROBBERY     |                      | PERSON COUNT |        |        |        |        |       |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29  | 30-39  | 40-49  | 50-59  | 60+   | Unknown |              |
| A           | Central              | 1.00         | 33.00  | 14.00  | 15.00  | 9.00   | 18.00 | 37.00   | 127.00       |
| B           | Southern             | 2.00         | 44.00  | 28.00  | 11.00  | 17.00  | 10.00 | 15.00   | 127.00       |
| C           | Bayview              | 8.00         | 27.00  | 9.00   | 23.00  | 13.00  | 4.00  | 18.00   | 102.00       |
| D           | Mission              | 12.00        | 30.00  | 30.00  | 13.00  | 7.00   | 7.00  | 4.00    | 103.00       |
| E           | Northern             | 16.00        | 20.00  | 25.00  | 6.00   | 11.00  | 4.00  | 16.00   | 98.00        |
| F           | Park                 | 4.00         | 3.00   | 4.00   | 1.00   | 3.00   | 3.00  | 7.00    | 25.00        |
| G           | Richmond             | 11.00        | 11.00  | 7.00   | 5.00   | 5.00   | 6.00  | 16.00   | 61.00        |
| H           | Ingleside            | 26.00        | 26.00  | 18.00  | 18.00  | 9.00   | 8.00  | 12.00   | 117.00       |
| I           | Taraval              | 11.00        | 10.00  | 8.00   | 4.00   | 7.00   | 5.00  | 14.00   | 59.00        |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 4.00         | 36.00  | 30.00  | 23.00  | 23.00  | 7.00  | 29.00   | 152.00       |
| Grand Total |                      | 95.00        | 240.00 | 173.00 | 119.00 | 104.00 | 72.00 | 168.00  | 971.00       |



#### ROBBERY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

| ROBBERY     |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |       |      |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+  | Unknown |              |
| A           | Central              | 0.1%         | 3.4%  | 1.4%  | 1.5%  | 0.9%  | 1.9% | 3.8%    | 13.1%        |
| B           | Southern             | 0.2%         | 4.5%  | 2.9%  | 1.1%  | 1.8%  | 1.0% | 1.5%    | 13.1%        |
| C           | Bayview              | 0.8%         | 2.8%  | 0.9%  | 2.4%  | 1.3%  | 0.4% | 1.9%    | 10.5%        |
| D           | Mission              | 1.2%         | 3.1%  | 3.1%  | 1.3%  | 0.7%  | 0.7% | 0.4%    | 10.6%        |
| E           | Northern             | 1.6%         | 2.1%  | 2.6%  | 0.6%  | 1.1%  | 0.4% | 1.6%    | 10.1%        |
| F           | Park                 | 0.4%         | 0.3%  | 0.4%  | 0.1%  | 0.3%  | 0.3% | 0.7%    | 2.6%         |
| G           | Richmond             | 1.1%         | 1.1%  | 0.7%  | 0.5%  | 0.5%  | 0.6% | 1.6%    | 6.3%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 2.7%         | 2.7%  | 1.9%  | 1.9%  | 0.9%  | 0.8% | 1.2%    | 12.0%        |
| I           | Taraval              | 1.1%         | 1.0%  | 0.8%  | 0.4%  | 0.7%  | 0.5% | 1.4%    | 6.1%         |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 0.4%         | 3.7%  | 3.1%  | 2.4%  | 2.4%  | 0.7% | 3.0%    | 15.7%        |
| Grand Total |                      | 9.8%         | 24.7% | 17.8% | 12.3% | 10.7% | 7.4% | 17.3%   | 100.0%       |

#### ROBBERY VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

| ROBBERY     |                      | PERSON COUNT |        |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male   | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A           | Central              | 33.00        | 60.00  |           | 34.00  |         | 127.00       |
| B           | Southern             | 36.00        | 76.00  |           | 15.00  |         | 127.00       |
| C           | Bayview              | 27.00        | 55.00  |           | 20.00  |         | 102.00       |
| D           | Mission              | 43.00        | 57.00  | 1.00      | 2.00   |         | 103.00       |
| E           | Northern             | 31.00        | 49.00  | 2.00      | 16.00  |         | 98.00        |
| F           | Park                 | 8.00         | 11.00  |           | 6.00   |         | 25.00        |
| G           | Richmond             | 18.00        | 26.00  |           | 17.00  |         | 61.00        |
| H           | Ingleside            | 44.00        | 59.00  |           | 14.00  |         | 117.00       |
| I           | Taraval              | 16.00        | 31.00  |           | 12.00  |         | 59.00        |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 40.00        | 83.00  | 1.00      | 27.00  | 1.00    | 152.00       |
| Grand Total |                      | 296.00       | 507.00 | 4.00      | 163.00 | 1.00    | 971.00       |

#### ROBBERY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

| ROBBERY     |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A           | Central              | 3.4%         | 6.2%  |           | 3.5%   |         | 13.1%        |
| B           | Southern             | 3.7%         | 7.8%  |           | 1.5%   |         | 13.1%        |
| C           | Bayview              | 2.8%         | 5.7%  |           | 2.1%   |         | 10.5%        |
| D           | Mission              | 4.4%         | 5.9%  | 0.1%      | 0.2%   |         | 10.6%        |
| E           | Northern             | 3.2%         | 5.0%  | 0.2%      | 1.6%   |         | 10.1%        |
| F           | Park                 | 0.8%         | 1.1%  |           | 0.6%   |         | 2.6%         |
| G           | Richmond             | 1.9%         | 2.7%  |           | 1.8%   |         | 6.3%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 4.5%         | 6.1%  |           | 1.4%   |         | 12.0%        |
| I           | Taraval              | 1.6%         | 3.2%  |           | 1.2%   |         | 6.1%         |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 4.1%         | 8.5%  | 0.1%      | 2.8%   | 0.1%    | 15.7%        |
| Grand Total |                      | 30.5%        | 52.2% | 0.4%      | 16.8%  | 0.1%    | 100.0%       |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q2 2023

**ROBBERY - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE**

| ROBBERY    | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
| DISTRICT   | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| Q2 2022    | 6                                 | 154                       | 94    | 240               | 181    | 46      | 229   | 950          |
| Q2 2023    | 2                                 | 158                       | 96    | 303               | 166    | 32      | 214   | 971          |
| Difference | -4                                | 4                         | 2     | 63                | -15    | -14     | -15   | 21           |
| % Change   | -66.7%                            | 2.6%                      | 2.1%  | 26.3%             | -8.3%  | -30.4%  | -6.6% | 2.2%         |

**ROBBERY - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE**

| ROBBERY    | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |       |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|---------|--------------|
|            | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+    | Unknown |              |
| Q2 2022    | 40           | 253   | 174   | 128   | 93    | 103    | 159     | 950          |
| Q2 2023    | 95           | 240   | 173   | 119   | 104   | 72     | 168     | 971          |
| Difference | 55           | -13   | -1    | -9    | 11    | -31    | 9       | 21           |
| % Change   | 137.5%       | -5.1% | -0.6% | -7.0% | 11.8% | -30.1% | 5.7%    | 2.2%         |

**ROBBERY - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER**

| ROBBERY    | PERSON COUNT |      |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|--------------|------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
|            | Female       | Male | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| Q2 2022    | 273          | 491  | 1         | 180    | 5       | 950          |
| Q2 2023    | 296          | 507  | 4         | 163    | 1       | 971          |
| Difference | 23           | 16   | 3         | -17    | -4      | 21           |
| % Change   | 8.4%         | 3.3% | 300.0%    | -9.4%  | -80.0%  | 2.2%         |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q2 2023

**BURGLARY VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE**

| BURGLARY    |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |        | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|--------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White  |              |
| A           | Central              | 1.00                              | 42.00                     | 11.00 | 10.00             | 120.00 | 36.00   | 63.00  | 283.00       |
| B           | Southern             | 5.00                              | 22.00                     | 12.00 | 16.00             | 122.00 | 23.00   | 46.00  | 246.00       |
| C           | Bayview              |                                   | 18.00                     | 14.00 | 26.00             | 61.00  | 4.00    | 29.00  | 152.00       |
| D           | Mission              | 4.00                              | 27.00                     | 9.00  | 24.00             | 90.00  | 15.00   | 71.00  | 240.00       |
| E           | Northern             | 1.00                              | 35.00                     | 11.00 | 12.00             | 154.00 | 30.00   | 111.00 | 354.00       |
| F           | Park                 | 1.00                              | 22.00                     | 3.00  | 6.00              | 30.00  | 15.00   | 73.00  | 150.00       |
| G           | Richmond             |                                   | 18.00                     | 11.00 | 6.00              | 47.00  | 7.00    | 57.00  | 146.00       |
| H           | Ingleside            | 4.00                              | 44.00                     | 7.00  | 16.00             | 36.00  | 13.00   | 93.00  | 213.00       |
| I           | Taraval              | 2.00                              | 72.00                     | 8.00  | 11.00             | 57.00  | 8.00    | 68.00  | 226.00       |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 1.00                              | 6.00                      | 10.00 | 7.00              | 44.00  | 7.00    | 14.00  | 89.00        |
| X           | Out of SF            |                                   |                           |       |                   |        |         | 1.00   | 1.00         |
| Grand Total |                      | 19.00                             | 306.00                    | 96.00 | 134.00            | 761.00 | 158.00  | 626.00 | 2100.00      |

**BURGLARY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE**

| BURGLARY    |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| A           | Central              | 0.0%                              | 2.0%                      | 0.5%  | 0.5%              | 5.7%   | 1.7%    | 3.0%  | 13.5%        |
| B           | Southern             | 0.2%                              | 1.0%                      | 0.6%  | 0.8%              | 5.8%   | 1.1%    | 2.2%  | 11.7%        |
| C           | Bayview              |                                   | 0.9%                      | 0.7%  | 1.2%              | 2.9%   | 0.2%    | 1.4%  | 7.2%         |
| D           | Mission              | 0.2%                              | 1.3%                      | 0.4%  | 1.1%              | 4.3%   | 0.7%    | 3.4%  | 11.4%        |
| E           | Northern             | 0.0%                              | 1.7%                      | 0.5%  | 0.6%              | 7.3%   | 1.4%    | 5.3%  | 16.9%        |
| F           | Park                 | 0.0%                              | 1.0%                      | 0.1%  | 0.3%              | 1.4%   | 0.7%    | 3.5%  | 7.1%         |
| G           | Richmond             |                                   | 0.9%                      | 0.5%  | 0.3%              | 2.2%   | 0.3%    | 2.7%  | 7.0%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 0.2%                              | 2.1%                      | 0.3%  | 0.8%              | 1.7%   | 0.6%    | 4.4%  | 10.1%        |
| I           | Taraval              | 0.1%                              | 3.4%                      | 0.4%  | 0.5%              | 2.7%   | 0.4%    | 3.2%  | 10.8%        |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 0.0%                              | 0.3%                      | 0.5%  | 0.3%              | 2.1%   | 0.3%    | 0.7%  | 4.2%         |
| X           | Out of SF            |                                   |                           |       |                   |        |         | 0.0%  | 0.0%         |
| Grand Total |                      | 0.9%                              | 14.6%                     | 4.6%  | 6.4%              | 36.2%  | 7.5%    | 29.8% | 100.0%       |

**BURGLARY VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE**

| BURGLARY    |                      | PERSON COUNT |        |        |        |        |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29  | 30-39  | 40-49  | 50-59  | 60+    | Unknown |              |
| A           | Central              | 2.00         | 43.00  | 24.00  | 20.00  | 23.00  | 34.00  | 137.00  | 283.00       |
| B           | Southern             |              | 20.00  | 35.00  | 27.00  | 19.00  | 10.00  | 135.00  | 246.00       |
| C           | Bayview              | 3.00         | 10.00  | 23.00  | 17.00  | 16.00  | 23.00  | 60.00   | 152.00       |
| D           | Mission              |              | 16.00  | 47.00  | 39.00  | 20.00  | 29.00  | 89.00   | 240.00       |
| E           | Northern             | 5.00         | 38.00  | 56.00  | 40.00  | 21.00  | 42.00  | 152.00  | 354.00       |
| F           | Park                 | 2.00         | 23.00  | 42.00  | 25.00  | 14.00  | 18.00  | 26.00   | 150.00       |
| G           | Richmond             |              | 14.00  | 29.00  | 20.00  | 16.00  | 25.00  | 42.00   | 146.00       |
| H           | Ingleside            | 6.00         | 19.00  | 48.00  | 39.00  | 26.00  | 47.00  | 28.00   | 213.00       |
| I           | Taraval              | 4.00         | 19.00  | 40.00  | 37.00  | 30.00  | 40.00  | 56.00   | 226.00       |
| J           | Tenderloin           |              | 6.00   | 11.00  | 9.00   | 13.00  | 6.00   | 44.00   | 89.00        |
| X           | Out of SF            |              |        | 1.00   |        |        |        |         | 1.00         |
| Grand Total |                      | 22.00        | 208.00 | 356.00 | 273.00 | 198.00 | 274.00 | 769.00  | 2100.00      |

**BURGLARY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE**

| BURGLARY    |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |       |       |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+   | Unknown |              |
| A           | Central              | 0.1%         | 2.0%  | 1.1%  | 1.0%  | 1.1%  | 1.6%  | 6.5%    | 13.5%        |
| B           | Southern             |              | 1.0%  | 1.7%  | 1.3%  | 0.9%  | 0.5%  | 6.4%    | 11.7%        |
| C           | Bayview              | 0.1%         | 0.5%  | 1.1%  | 0.8%  | 0.8%  | 1.1%  | 2.9%    | 7.2%         |
| D           | Mission              |              | 0.8%  | 2.2%  | 1.9%  | 1.0%  | 1.4%  | 4.2%    | 11.4%        |
| E           | Northern             | 0.2%         | 1.8%  | 2.7%  | 1.9%  | 1.0%  | 2.0%  | 7.2%    | 16.9%        |
| F           | Park                 | 0.1%         | 1.1%  | 2.0%  | 1.2%  | 0.7%  | 0.9%  | 1.2%    | 7.1%         |
| G           | Richmond             |              | 0.7%  | 1.4%  | 1.0%  | 0.8%  | 1.2%  | 2.0%    | 7.0%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 0.3%         | 0.9%  | 2.3%  | 1.9%  | 1.2%  | 2.2%  | 1.3%    | 10.1%        |
| I           | Taraval              | 0.2%         | 0.9%  | 1.9%  | 1.8%  | 1.4%  | 1.9%  | 2.7%    | 10.8%        |
| J           | Tenderloin           |              | 0.3%  | 0.5%  | 0.4%  | 0.6%  | 0.3%  | 2.1%    | 4.2%         |
| X           | Out of SF            |              |       | 0.0%  |       |       |       |         | 0.0%         |
| Grand Total |                      | 1.0%         | 9.9%  | 17.0% | 13.0% | 9.4%  | 13.0% | 36.6%   | 100.0%       |

**BURGLARY VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER**

| BURGLARY    |                      | PERSON COUNT |        |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male   | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A           | Central              | 53.00        | 89.00  |           | 118.00 | 23.00   | 283.00       |
| B           | Southern             | 31.00        | 80.00  |           | 121.00 | 14.00   | 246.00       |
| C           | Bayview              | 30.00        | 61.00  |           | 59.00  | 2.00    | 152.00       |
| D           | Mission              | 50.00        | 104.00 |           | 84.00  | 2.00    | 240.00       |
| E           | Northern             | 79.00        | 120.00 |           | 150.00 | 5.00    | 354.00       |
| F           | Park                 | 43.00        | 81.00  |           | 26.00  |         | 150.00       |
| G           | Richmond             | 40.00        | 65.00  |           | 41.00  |         | 146.00       |
| H           | Ingleside            | 72.00        | 108.00 | 1.00      | 29.00  | 3.00    | 213.00       |
| I           | Taraval              | 73.00        | 98.00  |           | 54.00  | 1.00    | 226.00       |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 15.00        | 27.00  | 2.00      | 44.00  | 1.00    | 89.00        |
| X           | Out of SF            | 1.00         |        |           |        |         | 1.00         |
| Grand Total |                      | 487.00       | 833.00 | 3.00      | 726.00 | 51.00   | 2100.00      |

**BURGLARY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER**

| BURGLARY    |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A           | Central              | 2.5%         | 4.2%  |           | 5.6%   | 1.1%    | 13.5%        |
| B           | Southern             | 1.5%         | 3.8%  |           | 5.8%   | 0.7%    | 11.7%        |
| C           | Bayview              | 1.4%         | 2.9%  |           | 2.8%   | 0.1%    | 7.2%         |
| D           | Mission              | 2.4%         | 5.0%  |           | 4.0%   | 0.1%    | 11.4%        |
| E           | Northern             | 3.8%         | 5.7%  |           | 7.1%   | 0.2%    | 16.9%        |
| F           | Park                 | 2.0%         | 3.9%  |           | 1.2%   |         | 7.1%         |
| G           | Richmond             | 1.9%         | 3.1%  |           | 2.0%   |         | 7.0%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 3.4%         | 5.1%  | 0.0%      | 1.4%   | 0.1%    | 10.1%        |
| I           | Taraval              | 3.5%         | 4.7%  |           | 2.6%   | 0.0%    | 10.8%        |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 0.7%         | 1.3%  | 0.1%      | 2.1%   | 0.0%    | 4.2%         |
| X           | Out of SF            | 0.0%         |       |           |        |         | 0.0%         |
| Grand Total |                      | 23.2%        | 39.7% | 0.1%      | 34.6%  | 2.4%    | 100.0%       |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q2 2023

**BURGLARY - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE**

| BURGLARY   | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |        | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|--------|--------------|
|            | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White  |              |
| Q2 2022    | 11                                | 325                       | 94    | 158               | 663    | 170     | 766    | 2,187        |
| Q2 2023    | 19                                | 306                       | 96    | 134               | 761    | 158     | 626    | 2,100        |
| Difference | 8                                 | -19                       | 2     | -24               | 98     | -12     | -140   | -87          |
| % Change   | 72.7%                             | -5.8%                     | 2.1%  | -15.2%            | 14.8%  | -7.1%   | -18.3% | -4.0%        |

**BURGLARY - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE**

| BURGLARY   | PERSON COUNT |       |       |        |        |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|--------------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------------|
|            | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49  | 50-59  | 60+    | Unknown |              |
| Q2 2022    | 16           | 210   | 363   | 335    | 261    | 320    | 682     | 2,187        |
| Q2 2023    | 22           | 208   | 356   | 273    | 198    | 274    | 769     | 2,100        |
| Difference | 6            | -2    | -7    | -62    | -63    | -46    | 87      | -87          |
| % Change   | 37.5%        | -1.0% | -1.9% | -18.5% | -24.1% | -14.4% | 12.8%   | -4.0%        |

**BURGLARY - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER**

| BURGLARY   | PERSON COUNT |        |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|--------------|--------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
|            | Female       | Male   | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| Q2 2022    | 553          | 978    | 2         | 610    | 44      | 2,187        |
| Q2 2023    | 487          | 833    | 3         | 726    | 51      | 2,100        |
| Difference | -66          | -145   | 1         | 116    | 7       | -87          |
| % Change   | -11.9%       | -14.8% | 50.0%     | 19.0%  | 15.9%   | -4.0%        |

**LARCENY THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE**

| LARCENY THEFT |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |        |                   |         |         |         |  | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------|-------------------|---------|---------|---------|--|--------------|
| DISTRICT      | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black  | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS  | Unknown | White   |  |              |
| A             | Central              | 12.00                             | 441.00                    | 75.00  | 210.00            | 1179.00 | 116.00  | 887.00  |  | 2920.00      |
| B             | Southern             | 12.00                             | 163.00                    | 52.00  | 82.00             | 317.00  | 48.00   | 224.00  |  | 898.00       |
| C             | Bayview              | 3.00                              | 101.00                    | 54.00  | 86.00             | 155.00  | 30.00   | 83.00   |  | 512.00       |
| D             | Mission              | 4.00                              | 91.00                     | 38.00  | 127.00            | 273.00  | 44.00   | 225.00  |  | 802.00       |
| E             | Northern             | 7.00                              | 333.00                    | 69.00  | 139.00            | 776.00  | 79.00   | 656.00  |  | 2059.00      |
| F             | Park                 | 1.00                              | 89.00                     | 10.00  | 36.00             | 249.00  | 48.00   | 242.00  |  | 675.00       |
| G             | Richmond             | 4.00                              | 207.00                    | 19.00  | 74.00             | 584.00  | 42.00   | 424.00  |  | 1354.00      |
| H             | Ingleside            | 5.00                              | 123.00                    | 32.00  | 99.00             | 223.00  | 25.00   | 142.00  |  | 649.00       |
| I             | Taraval              | 4.00                              | 200.00                    | 32.00  | 54.00             | 313.00  | 34.00   | 190.00  |  | 827.00       |
| J             | Tenderloin           |                                   | 60.00                     | 39.00  | 36.00             | 175.00  | 16.00   | 121.00  |  | 447.00       |
| X             | Out of SF            |                                   | 29.00                     | 9.00   | 7.00              | 55.00   | 6.00    | 63.00   |  | 169.00       |
| Grand Total   |                      | 52.00                             | 1837.00                   | 429.00 | 950.00            | 4299.00 | 488.00  | 3257.00 |  | 11312.00     |

**LARCENY THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE**

| LARCENY THEFT |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       |  | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--|--------------|
| DISTRICT      | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |  |              |
| A             | Central              | 0.1%                              | 3.9%                      | 0.7%  | 1.9%              | 10.4%  | 1.0%    | 7.8%  |  | 25.8%        |
| B             | Southern             | 0.1%                              | 1.4%                      | 0.5%  | 0.7%              | 2.8%   | 0.4%    | 2.0%  |  | 7.9%         |
| C             | Bayview              | 0.0%                              | 0.9%                      | 0.5%  | 0.8%              | 1.4%   | 0.3%    | 0.7%  |  | 4.5%         |
| D             | Mission              | 0.0%                              | 0.8%                      | 0.3%  | 1.1%              | 2.4%   | 0.4%    | 2.0%  |  | 7.1%         |
| E             | Northern             | 0.1%                              | 2.9%                      | 0.6%  | 1.2%              | 6.9%   | 0.7%    | 5.8%  |  | 18.2%        |
| F             | Park                 | 0.0%                              | 0.8%                      | 0.1%  | 0.3%              | 2.2%   | 0.4%    | 2.1%  |  | 6.0%         |
| G             | Richmond             | 0.0%                              | 1.8%                      | 0.2%  | 0.7%              | 5.2%   | 0.4%    | 3.7%  |  | 12.0%        |
| H             | Ingleside            | 0.0%                              | 1.1%                      | 0.3%  | 0.9%              | 2.0%   | 0.2%    | 1.3%  |  | 5.7%         |
| I             | Taraval              | 0.0%                              | 1.8%                      | 0.3%  | 0.5%              | 2.8%   | 0.3%    | 1.7%  |  | 7.3%         |
| J             | Tenderloin           |                                   | 0.5%                      | 0.3%  | 0.3%              | 1.5%   | 0.1%    | 1.1%  |  | 4.0%         |
| X             | Out of SF            |                                   | 0.3%                      | 0.1%  | 0.1%              | 0.5%   | 0.1%    | 0.6%  |  | 1.5%         |
| Grand Total   |                      | 0.5%                              | 16.2%                     | 3.8%  | 8.4%              | 38.0%  | 4.3%    | 28.8% |  | 100.0%       |

**LARCENY THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE**

| LARCENY THEFT |                      | PERSON COUNT |         |         |         |         |         |         |  | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------|----------------------|--------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--|--------------|
| DISTRICT      | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29   | 30-39   | 40-49   | 50-59   | 60+     | Unknown |  |              |
| A             | Central              | 95.00        | 476.00  | 534.00  | 453.00  | 337.00  | 232.00  | 793.00  |  | 2920.00      |
| B             | Southern             | 12.00        | 232.00  | 222.00  | 149.00  | 98.00   | 63.00   | 122.00  |  | 898.00       |
| C             | Bayview              | 12.00        | 99.00   | 116.00  | 77.00   | 73.00   | 70.00   | 65.00   |  | 512.00       |
| D             | Mission              | 7.00         | 186.00  | 235.00  | 119.00  | 87.00   | 64.00   | 104.00  |  | 802.00       |
| E             | Northern             | 34.00        | 470.00  | 418.00  | 296.00  | 225.00  | 152.00  | 464.00  |  | 2059.00      |
| F             | Park                 | 20.00        | 154.00  | 145.00  | 102.00  | 63.00   | 67.00   | 124.00  |  | 675.00       |
| G             | Richmond             | 38.00        | 227.00  | 229.00  | 187.00  | 163.00  | 137.00  | 373.00  |  | 1354.00      |
| H             | Ingleside            | 6.00         | 104.00  | 149.00  | 112.00  | 87.00   | 95.00   | 96.00   |  | 649.00       |
| I             | Taraval              | 5.00         | 132.00  | 166.00  | 142.00  | 91.00   | 141.00  | 150.00  |  | 827.00       |
| J             | Tenderloin           | 5.00         | 101.00  | 89.00   | 51.00   | 39.00   | 47.00   | 115.00  |  | 447.00       |
| X             | Out of SF            | 2.00         | 35.00   | 46.00   | 28.00   | 22.00   | 23.00   | 13.00   |  | 169.00       |
| Grand Total   |                      | 236.00       | 2216.00 | 2349.00 | 1716.00 | 1285.00 | 1091.00 | 2419.00 |  | 11312.00     |

**LARCENY THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE**

| LARCENY THEFT |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |       |      |         | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT      | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+  | Unknown |              |
| A             | Central              | 0.8%         | 4.2%  | 4.7%  | 4.0%  | 3.0%  | 2.1% | 7.0%    | 25.8%        |
| B             | Southern             | 0.1%         | 2.1%  | 2.0%  | 1.3%  | 0.9%  | 0.6% | 1.1%    | 7.9%         |
| C             | Bayview              | 0.1%         | 0.9%  | 1.0%  | 0.7%  | 0.6%  | 0.6% | 0.6%    | 4.5%         |
| D             | Mission              | 0.1%         | 1.6%  | 2.1%  | 1.1%  | 0.8%  | 0.6% | 0.9%    | 7.1%         |
| E             | Northern             | 0.3%         | 4.2%  | 3.7%  | 2.6%  | 2.0%  | 1.3% | 4.1%    | 18.2%        |
| F             | Park                 | 0.2%         | 1.4%  | 1.3%  | 0.9%  | 0.6%  | 0.6% | 1.1%    | 6.0%         |
| G             | Richmond             | 0.3%         | 2.0%  | 2.0%  | 1.7%  | 1.4%  | 1.2% | 3.3%    | 12.0%        |
| H             | Ingleside            | 0.1%         | 0.9%  | 1.3%  | 1.0%  | 0.8%  | 0.8% | 0.8%    | 5.7%         |
| I             | Taraval              | 0.0%         | 1.2%  | 1.5%  | 1.3%  | 0.8%  | 1.2% | 1.3%    | 7.3%         |
| J             | Tenderloin           | 0.0%         | 0.9%  | 0.8%  | 0.5%  | 0.3%  | 0.4% | 1.0%    | 4.0%         |
| X             | Out of SF            | 0.0%         | 0.3%  | 0.4%  | 0.2%  | 0.2%  | 0.2% | 0.1%    | 1.5%         |
| Grand Total   |                      | 2.1%         | 19.6% | 20.8% | 15.2% | 11.4% | 9.6% | 21.4%   | 100.0%       |

**LARCENY THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER**

| LARCENY THEFT |                      | PERSON COUNT |         |           |         |         | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------|----------------------|--------------|---------|-----------|---------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT      | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male    | Nonbinary | OTHERS  | Unknown |              |
| A             | Central              | 879.00       | 1247.00 | 1.00      | 779.00  | 14.00   | 2920.00      |
| B             | Southern             | 304.00       | 469.00  | 1.00      | 120.00  | 4.00    | 898.00       |
| C             | Bayview              | 202.00       | 250.00  |           | 58.00   | 2.00    | 512.00       |
| D             | Mission              | 257.00       | 435.00  |           | 96.00   | 14.00   | 802.00       |
| E             | Northern             | 714.00       | 881.00  |           | 453.00  | 11.00   | 2059.00      |
| F             | Park                 | 223.00       | 327.00  |           | 121.00  | 4.00    | 675.00       |
| G             | Richmond             | 391.00       | 584.00  |           | 376.00  | 3.00    | 1354.00      |
| H             | Ingleside            | 230.00       | 317.00  |           | 96.00   | 6.00    | 649.00       |
| I             | Taraval              | 279.00       | 393.00  | 1.00      | 148.00  | 6.00    | 827.00       |
| J             | Tenderloin           | 135.00       | 182.00  |           | 129.00  | 1.00    | 447.00       |
| X             | Out of SF            | 84.00        | 72.00   |           | 13.00   |         | 169.00       |
| Grand Total   |                      | 3698.00      | 5157.00 | 3.00      | 2389.00 | 65.00   | 11312.00     |

**LARCENY THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER**

| LARCENY THEFT |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT      | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A             | Central              | 7.8%         | 11.0% | 0.0%      | 6.9%   | 0.1%    | 25.8%        |
| B             | Southern             | 2.7%         | 4.1%  | 0.0%      | 1.1%   | 0.0%    | 7.9%         |
| C             | Bayview              | 1.8%         | 2.2%  |           | 0.5%   | 0.0%    | 4.5%         |
| D             | Mission              | 2.3%         | 3.8%  |           | 0.8%   | 0.1%    | 7.1%         |
| E             | Northern             | 6.3%         | 7.8%  |           | 4.0%   | 0.1%    | 18.2%        |
| F             | Park                 | 2.0%         | 2.9%  |           | 1.1%   | 0.0%    | 6.0%         |
| G             | Richmond             | 3.5%         | 5.2%  |           | 3.3%   | 0.0%    | 12.0%        |
| H             | Ingleside            | 2.0%         | 2.8%  |           | 0.8%   | 0.1%    | 5.7%         |
| I             | Taraval              | 2.5%         | 3.5%  | 0.0%      | 1.3%   | 0.1%    | 7.3%         |
| J             | Tenderloin           | 1.2%         | 1.6%  |           | 1.1%   | 0.0%    | 4.0%         |
| X             | Out of SF            | 0.7%         | 0.6%  |           | 0.1%   |         | 1.5%         |
| Grand Total   |                      | 32.7%        | 45.6% | 0.0%      | 21.1%  | 0.6%    | 100.0%       |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q2 2023

**LARCENY THEFT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE**

| LARCENY THEFT | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |        |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
|               | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black  | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| Q2 2022       | 36                                | 1,626                     | 496    | 930               | 4,670  | 588     | 3,474 | 11,820       |
| Q2 2023       | 52                                | 1,837                     | 429    | 950               | 4,299  | 488     | 3,257 | 11,312       |
| Difference    | 16                                | 211                       | -67    | 20                | -371   | -100    | -217  | -508         |
| % Change      | 44.4%                             | 13.0%                     | -13.5% | 2.2%              | -7.9%  | -17.0%  | -6.2% | -4.3%        |

**LARCENY THEFT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE**

| LARCENY THEFT | PERSON COUNT |        |       |       |       |       |         | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------|--------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|--------------|
|               | 0-17         | 18-29  | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+   | Unknown |              |
| Q2 2022       | 241          | 2,528  | 2,406 | 1,608 | 1,347 | 1,030 | 2,660   | 11,820       |
| Q2 2023       | 236          | 2,216  | 2,349 | 1,716 | 1,285 | 1,091 | 2,419   | 11,312       |
| Difference    | -5           | -312   | -57   | 108   | -62   | 61    | -241    | -508         |
| % Change      | -2.1%        | -12.3% | -2.4% | 6.7%  | -4.6% | 5.9%  | -9.1%   | -4.3%        |

**LARCENY THEFT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER**

| LARCENY THEFT | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
|               | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| Q2 2022       | 3,933        | 5,250 | 2         | 2,606  | 29      | 11,820       |
| Q2 2023       | 3,698        | 5,157 | 3         | 2,389  | 65      | 11,312       |
| Difference    | -235         | -93   | 1         | -217   | 36      | -508         |
| % Change      | -6.0%        | -1.8% | 50.0%     | -8.3%  | 124.1%  | -4.3%        |



**MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE**

| MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT |                      | PERSON COUNT              |       |                   |         |         |       |         | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|---------|---------|-------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT            | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS  | Unknown | White |         |              |
| A                   | Central              |                           |       | 1.00              | 126.00  | 2.00    | 3.00  | 132.00  |              |
| B                   | Southern             | 2.00                      | 1.00  | 6.00              | 168.00  | 1.00    | 6.00  | 184.00  |              |
| C                   | Bayview              | 2.00                      | 5.00  | 4.00              | 289.00  | 1.00    | 11.00 | 312.00  |              |
| D                   | Mission              | 2.00                      |       | 3.00              | 240.00  | 1.00    | 3.00  | 249.00  |              |
| E                   | Northern             | 2.00                      | 1.00  | 4.00              | 200.00  | 1.00    | 3.00  | 211.00  |              |
| F                   | Park                 | 2.00                      | 1.00  |                   | 101.00  |         | 3.00  | 107.00  |              |
| G                   | Richmond             |                           | 1.00  |                   | 86.00   |         | 1.00  | 88.00   |              |
| H                   | Ingleside            | 7.00                      |       | 6.00              | 301.00  | 1.00    |       | 315.00  |              |
| I                   | Taraval              |                           | 3.00  |                   | 191.00  |         | 3.00  | 197.00  |              |
| J                   | Tenderloin           |                           | 3.00  | 1.00              | 71.00   | 1.00    | 1.00  | 77.00   |              |
| X                   | Out of SF            |                           | 2.00  |                   | 11.00   |         | 1.00  | 14.00   |              |
| Grand Total         |                      | 17.00                     | 17.00 | 25.00             | 1784.00 | 8.00    | 35.00 | 1886.00 |              |

**MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE**

| MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT |                      | PERSON COUNT              |       |                   |        |         |       |        | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------|--------------|
| DISTRICT            | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |        |              |
| A                   | Central              |                           |       | 0.1%              | 6.7%   | 0.1%    | 0.2%  | 7.0%   |              |
| B                   | Southern             | 0.1%                      | 0.1%  | 0.3%              | 8.9%   | 0.1%    | 0.3%  | 9.8%   |              |
| C                   | Bayview              | 0.1%                      | 0.3%  | 0.2%              | 15.3%  | 0.1%    | 0.6%  | 16.5%  |              |
| D                   | Mission              | 0.1%                      |       | 0.2%              | 12.7%  | 0.1%    | 0.2%  | 13.2%  |              |
| E                   | Northern             | 0.1%                      | 0.1%  | 0.2%              | 10.6%  | 0.1%    | 0.2%  | 11.2%  |              |
| F                   | Park                 | 0.1%                      | 0.1%  |                   | 5.4%   |         | 0.2%  | 5.7%   |              |
| G                   | Richmond             |                           | 0.1%  |                   | 4.6%   |         | 0.1%  | 4.7%   |              |
| H                   | Ingleside            | 0.4%                      |       | 0.3%              | 16.0%  | 0.1%    |       | 16.7%  |              |
| I                   | Taraval              |                           | 0.2%  |                   | 10.1%  |         | 0.2%  | 10.4%  |              |
| J                   | Tenderloin           |                           | 0.2%  | 0.1%              | 3.8%   | 0.1%    | 0.1%  | 4.1%   |              |
| X                   | Out of SF            |                           | 0.1%  |                   | 0.6%   |         | 0.1%  | 0.7%   |              |
| Grand Total         |                      | 0.9%                      | 0.9%  | 1.3%              | 94.6%  | 0.4%    | 1.9%  | 100.0% |              |

**MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE**

| MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT |                      | PERSON COUNT |        |        |        |        |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT            | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29  | 30-39  | 40-49  | 50-59  | 60+    | Unknown |              |
| A                   | Central              |              | 38.00  | 36.00  | 22.00  | 13.00  | 17.00  | 6.00    | 132.00       |
| B                   | Southern             |              | 43.00  | 58.00  | 18.00  | 30.00  | 27.00  | 8.00    | 184.00       |
| C                   | Bayview              | 1.00         | 65.00  | 58.00  | 65.00  | 51.00  | 59.00  | 13.00   | 312.00       |
| D                   | Mission              |              | 48.00  | 58.00  | 46.00  | 38.00  | 53.00  | 6.00    | 249.00       |
| E                   | Northern             |              | 65.00  | 63.00  | 30.00  | 19.00  | 29.00  | 5.00    | 211.00       |
| F                   | Park                 |              | 32.00  | 23.00  | 25.00  | 12.00  | 13.00  | 2.00    | 107.00       |
| G                   | Richmond             |              | 18.00  | 27.00  | 13.00  | 17.00  | 12.00  | 1.00    | 88.00        |
| H                   | Ingleside            |              | 44.00  | 89.00  | 68.00  | 46.00  | 63.00  | 5.00    | 315.00       |
| I                   | Taraval              | 1.00         | 44.00  | 32.00  | 34.00  | 29.00  | 53.00  | 4.00    | 197.00       |
| J                   | Tenderloin           |              | 21.00  | 18.00  | 13.00  | 9.00   | 12.00  | 4.00    | 77.00        |
| X                   | Out of SF            |              | 2.00   | 3.00   | 3.00   | 3.00   | 2.00   | 1.00    | 14.00        |
| Grand Total         |                      | 2.00         | 420.00 | 465.00 | 337.00 | 267.00 | 340.00 | 55.00   | 1886.00      |

#### MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

| MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |       |       |         | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT            | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+   | Unknown |              |
| A                   | Central              |              | 2.0%  | 1.9%  | 1.2%  | 0.7%  | 0.9%  | 0.3%    | 7.0%         |
| B                   | Southern             |              | 2.3%  | 3.1%  | 1.0%  | 1.6%  | 1.4%  | 0.4%    | 9.8%         |
| C                   | Bayview              | 0.1%         | 3.4%  | 3.1%  | 3.4%  | 2.7%  | 3.1%  | 0.7%    | 16.5%        |
| D                   | Mission              |              | 2.5%  | 3.1%  | 2.4%  | 2.0%  | 2.8%  | 0.3%    | 13.2%        |
| E                   | Northern             |              | 3.4%  | 3.3%  | 1.6%  | 1.0%  | 1.5%  | 0.3%    | 11.2%        |
| F                   | Park                 |              | 1.7%  | 1.2%  | 1.3%  | 0.6%  | 0.7%  | 0.1%    | 5.7%         |
| G                   | Richmond             |              | 1.0%  | 1.4%  | 0.7%  | 0.9%  | 0.6%  | 0.1%    | 4.7%         |
| H                   | Ingleside            |              | 2.3%  | 4.7%  | 3.6%  | 2.4%  | 3.3%  | 0.3%    | 16.7%        |
| I                   | Taraval              | 0.1%         | 2.3%  | 1.7%  | 1.8%  | 1.5%  | 2.8%  | 0.2%    | 10.4%        |
| J                   | Tenderloin           |              | 1.1%  | 1.0%  | 0.7%  | 0.5%  | 0.6%  | 0.2%    | 4.1%         |
| X                   | Out of SF            |              | 0.1%  | 0.2%  | 0.2%  | 0.2%  | 0.1%  | 0.1%    | 0.7%         |
| Grand Total         |                      |              | 0.1%  | 22.3% | 24.7% | 17.9% | 14.2% | 18.0%   | 100.0%       |

#### MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

| MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |         |         | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|---------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT            | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male  | OTHERS  | Unknown |              |
| A                   | Central              |              | 6.00  | 126.00  |         | 132.00       |
| B                   | Southern             | 8.00         | 9.00  | 167.00  |         | 184.00       |
| C                   | Bayview              | 9.00         | 14.00 | 289.00  |         | 312.00       |
| D                   | Mission              | 1.00         | 8.00  | 240.00  |         | 249.00       |
| E                   | Northern             | 6.00         | 6.00  | 198.00  | 1.00    | 211.00       |
| F                   | Park                 | 3.00         | 3.00  | 101.00  |         | 107.00       |
| G                   | Richmond             |              | 2.00  | 86.00   |         | 88.00        |
| H                   | Ingleside            | 6.00         | 9.00  | 300.00  |         | 315.00       |
| I                   | Taraval              | 3.00         | 3.00  | 191.00  |         | 197.00       |
| J                   | Tenderloin           | 4.00         | 2.00  | 71.00   |         | 77.00        |
| X                   | Out of SF            | 1.00         | 2.00  | 11.00   |         | 14.00        |
| Grand Total         |                      | 41.00        | 64.00 | 1780.00 | 1.00    | 1886.00      |

#### MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

| MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT |                      | PERSON COUNT |      |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------------|----------------------|--------------|------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT            | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A                   | Central              |              | 0.3% | 6.7%   |         | 7.0%         |
| B                   | Southern             | 0.4%         | 0.5% | 8.9%   |         | 9.8%         |
| C                   | Bayview              | 0.5%         | 0.7% | 15.3%  |         | 16.5%        |
| D                   | Mission              | 0.1%         | 0.4% | 12.7%  |         | 13.2%        |
| E                   | Northern             | 0.3%         | 0.3% | 10.5%  | 0.1%    | 11.2%        |
| F                   | Park                 | 0.2%         | 0.2% | 5.4%   |         | 5.7%         |
| G                   | Richmond             |              | 0.1% | 4.6%   |         | 4.7%         |
| H                   | Ingleside            | 0.3%         | 0.5% | 15.9%  |         | 16.7%        |
| I                   | Taraval              | 0.2%         | 0.2% | 10.1%  |         | 10.4%        |
| J                   | Tenderloin           | 0.2%         | 0.1% | 3.8%   |         | 4.1%         |
| X                   | Out of SF            | 0.1%         | 0.1% | 0.6%   |         | 0.7%         |
| Grand Total         |                      | 2.2%         | 3.4% | 94.4%  | 0.1%    | 100.0%       |

# Victim Demographic Report

Q2 2023

## MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

| MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |        | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|--------|--------------|
|                     | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White  |              |
| Q2 2022             | 1                                 | 19                        | 18    | 22                | 1,468  | 14      | 39     | 1,581        |
| Q2 2023             | 0                                 | 17                        | 17    | 25                | 1,784  | 8       | 35     | 1,886        |
| Difference          | -1                                | -2                        | -1    | 3                 | 316    | -6      | -4     | 305          |
| % Change            | -100.0%                           | -10.5%                    | -5.6% | 13.6%             | 21.5%  | -42.9%  | -10.3% | 19.3%        |

## MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

| MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |       |       |         | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|--------------|
|                     | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+   | Unknown |              |
| Q2 2022             | 6            | 265   | 414   | 288   | 277   | 268   | 63      | 1,581        |
| Q2 2023             | 2            | 420   | 465   | 337   | 267   | 340   | 55      | 1,886        |
| Difference          | -4           | 155   | 51    | 49    | -10   | 72    | -8      | 305          |
| % Change            | -66.7%       | 58.5% | 12.3% | 17.0% | -3.6% | 26.9% | -12.7%  | 19.3%        |

## MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

| MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT | PERSON COUNT |        |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------------|--------------|--------|--------|---------|--------------|
|                     | Female       | Male   | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| Q2 2022             | 37           | 76     | 1,467  | 1       | 1,581        |
| Q2 2023             | 41           | 64     | 1,780  | 1       | 1,886        |
| Difference          | 4            | -12    | 313    | 0       | 305          |
| % Change            | 10.8%        | -15.8% | 21.3%  | 0.0%    | 19.3%        |

#### SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

| SEXUAL ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
| DISTRICT       | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| A              | Central              |                                   | 4.00                      | 8.00  | 2.00              |        | 1.00    | 6.00  | 21.00        |
| B              | Southern             |                                   | 2.00                      | 3.00  | 4.00              | 1.00   |         | 7.00  | 17.00        |
| C              | Bayview              |                                   | 2.00                      | 5.00  | 5.00              |        |         | 1.00  | 13.00        |
| D              | Mission              | 1.00                              | 7.00                      | 6.00  | 27.00             | 4.00   | 3.00    | 19.00 | 67.00        |
| E              | Northern             |                                   | 5.00                      |       | 4.00              | 3.00   | 1.00    | 11.00 | 24.00        |
| F              | Park                 |                                   | 2.00                      | 1.00  |                   |        |         | 5.00  | 8.00         |
| G              | Richmond             |                                   | 2.00                      |       |                   |        |         | 1.00  | 3.00         |
| H              | Ingleside            |                                   | 1.00                      | 1.00  | 14.00             |        | 3.00    | 2.00  | 21.00        |
| I              | Taraval              |                                   | 2.00                      |       | 1.00              | 1.00   |         | 2.00  | 6.00         |
| J              | Tenderloin           |                                   |                           | 4.00  | 3.00              |        | 1.00    | 4.00  | 12.00        |
| X              | Out of SF            |                                   | 2.00                      | 1.00  | 4.00              | 1.00   |         | 1.00  | 9.00         |
| Grand Total    |                      | 1.00                              | 29.00                     | 29.00 | 64.00             | 10.00  | 9.00    | 59.00 | 201.00       |

#### SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

| SEXUAL ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
| DISTRICT       | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| A              | Central              |                                   | 2.0%                      | 4.0%  | 1.0%              |        | 0.5%    | 3.0%  | 10.4%        |
| B              | Southern             |                                   | 1.0%                      | 1.5%  | 2.0%              | 0.5%   |         | 3.5%  | 8.5%         |
| C              | Bayview              |                                   | 1.0%                      | 2.5%  | 2.5%              |        |         | 0.5%  | 6.5%         |
| D              | Mission              | 0.5%                              | 3.5%                      | 3.0%  | 13.4%             | 2.0%   | 1.5%    | 9.5%  | 33.3%        |
| E              | Northern             |                                   | 2.5%                      |       | 2.0%              | 1.5%   | 0.5%    | 5.5%  | 11.9%        |
| F              | Park                 |                                   | 1.0%                      | 0.5%  |                   |        |         | 2.5%  | 4.0%         |
| G              | Richmond             |                                   | 1.0%                      |       |                   |        |         | 0.5%  | 1.5%         |
| H              | Ingleside            |                                   | 0.5%                      | 0.5%  | 7.0%              |        | 1.5%    | 1.0%  | 10.4%        |
| I              | Taraval              |                                   | 1.0%                      |       | 0.5%              | 0.5%   |         | 1.0%  | 3.0%         |
| J              | Tenderloin           |                                   |                           | 2.0%  | 1.5%              |        | 0.5%    | 2.0%  | 6.0%         |
| X              | Out of SF            |                                   | 1.0%                      | 0.5%  | 2.0%              | 0.5%   |         | 0.5%  | 4.5%         |
| Grand Total    |                      | 0.5%                              | 14.4%                     | 14.4% | 31.8%             | 5.0%   | 4.5%    | 29.4% | 100.0%       |

#### SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

| SEXUAL ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |       |      |         | PERSON COUNT |
|----------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT       | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+  | Unknown |              |
| A              | Central              | 7.00         | 2.00  | 6.00  | 5.00  | 1.00  |      |         | 21.00        |
| B              | Southern             | 5.00         | 5.00  | 2.00  | 2.00  | 2.00  | 1.00 |         | 17.00        |
| C              | Bayview              | 6.00         | 3.00  | 1.00  | 1.00  | 2.00  |      |         | 13.00        |
| D              | Mission              | 18.00        | 15.00 | 16.00 | 12.00 | 3.00  | 1.00 | 2.00    | 67.00        |
| E              | Northern             | 2.00         | 10.00 | 2.00  | 5.00  | 1.00  |      | 4.00    | 24.00        |
| F              | Park                 | 1.00         | 2.00  | 3.00  | 1.00  |       | 1.00 |         | 8.00         |
| G              | Richmond             | 2.00         |       | 1.00  |       |       |      |         | 3.00         |
| H              | Ingleside            | 5.00         | 7.00  | 4.00  | 4.00  | 1.00  |      |         | 21.00        |
| I              | Taraval              | 1.00         | 3.00  | 2.00  |       |       |      |         | 6.00         |
| J              | Tenderloin           | 1.00         | 2.00  | 2.00  | 4.00  | 1.00  | 1.00 | 1.00    | 12.00        |
| X              | Out of SF            | 4.00         | 2.00  | 3.00  |       |       |      |         | 9.00         |
| Grand Total    |                      | 52.00        | 51.00 | 42.00 | 34.00 | 11.00 | 4.00 | 7.00    | 201.00       |

**SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE**

| SEXUAL ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |       |      |         | PERSON COUNT |
|----------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT       | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+  | Unknown |              |
| A              | Central              | 3.5%         | 1.0%  | 3.0%  | 2.5%  | 0.5%  |      |         | 10.4%        |
| B              | Southern             | 2.5%         | 2.5%  | 1.0%  | 1.0%  | 1.0%  | 0.5% |         | 8.5%         |
| C              | Bayview              | 3.0%         | 1.5%  | 0.5%  | 0.5%  | 1.0%  |      |         | 6.5%         |
| D              | Mission              | 9.0%         | 7.5%  | 8.0%  | 6.0%  | 1.5%  | 0.5% | 1.0%    | 33.3%        |
| E              | Northern             | 1.0%         | 5.0%  | 1.0%  | 2.5%  | 0.5%  |      | 2.0%    | 11.9%        |
| F              | Park                 | 0.5%         | 1.0%  | 1.5%  | 0.5%  |       | 0.5% |         | 4.0%         |
| G              | Richmond             | 1.0%         |       | 0.5%  |       |       |      |         | 1.5%         |
| H              | Ingleside            | 2.5%         | 3.5%  | 2.0%  | 2.0%  | 0.5%  |      |         | 10.4%        |
| I              | Taraval              | 0.5%         | 1.5%  | 1.0%  |       |       |      |         | 3.0%         |
| J              | Tenderloin           | 0.5%         | 1.0%  | 1.0%  | 2.0%  | 0.5%  | 0.5% | 0.5%    | 6.0%         |
| X              | Out of SF            | 2.0%         | 1.0%  | 1.5%  |       |       |      |         | 4.5%         |
| Grand Total    |                      | 25.9%        | 25.4% | 20.9% | 16.9% | 5.5%  | 2.0% | 3.5%    | 100.0%       |

**SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER**

| SEXUAL ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|----------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT       | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A              | Central              | 17.00        | 3.00  |           |        | 1.00    | 21.00        |
| B              | Southern             | 14.00        | 3.00  |           |        |         | 17.00        |
| C              | Bayview              | 10.00        | 3.00  |           |        |         | 13.00        |
| D              | Mission              | 50.00        | 14.00 | 1.00      | 2.00   |         | 67.00        |
| E              | Northern             | 19.00        | 2.00  |           | 3.00   |         | 24.00        |
| F              | Park                 | 6.00         | 2.00  |           |        |         | 8.00         |
| G              | Richmond             | 3.00         |       |           |        |         | 3.00         |
| H              | Ingleside            | 19.00        | 2.00  |           |        |         | 21.00        |
| I              | Taraval              | 5.00         |       |           | 1.00   |         | 6.00         |
| J              | Tenderloin           | 11.00        | 1.00  |           |        |         | 12.00        |
| X              | Out of SF            | 8.00         | 1.00  |           |        |         | 9.00         |
| Grand Total    |                      | 162.00       | 31.00 | 1.00      | 6.00   | 1.00    | 201.00       |

**SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER**

| SEXUAL ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|----------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT       | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A              | Central              | 8.5%         | 1.5%  |           |        | 0.5%    | 10.4%        |
| B              | Southern             | 7.0%         | 1.5%  |           |        |         | 8.5%         |
| C              | Bayview              | 5.0%         | 1.5%  |           |        |         | 6.5%         |
| D              | Mission              | 24.9%        | 7.0%  | 0.5%      | 1.0%   |         | 33.3%        |
| E              | Northern             | 9.5%         | 1.0%  |           | 1.5%   |         | 11.9%        |
| F              | Park                 | 3.0%         | 1.0%  |           |        |         | 4.0%         |
| G              | Richmond             | 1.5%         |       |           |        |         | 1.5%         |
| H              | Ingleside            | 9.5%         | 1.0%  |           |        |         | 10.4%        |
| I              | Taraval              | 2.5%         |       |           | 0.5%   |         | 3.0%         |
| J              | Tenderloin           | 5.5%         | 0.5%  |           |        |         | 6.0%         |
| X              | Out of SF            | 4.0%         | 0.5%  |           |        |         | 4.5%         |
| Grand Total    |                      | 80.6%        | 15.4% | 0.5%      | 3.0%   | 0.5%    | 100.0%       |

## SEXUAL ASSAULT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

| SEXUAL ASSAULT | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
|                | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| Q2 2022        | 1                                 | 47                        | 29    | 68                | 28     | 8       | 63    | 244          |
| Q2 2023        | 1                                 | 29                        | 29    | 64                | 10     | 9       | 59    | 201          |
| Difference     | 0                                 | -18                       | 0     | -4                | -18    | 1       | -4    | -43          |
| % Change       | 0.0%                              | -38.3%                    | 0.0%  | -5.9%             | -64.3% | 12.5%   | -6.3% | -17.6%       |

## SEXUAL ASSAULT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

| SEXUAL ASSAULT | PERSON COUNT |        |       |       |       |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|----------------|--------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|--------|---------|--------------|
|                | 0-17         | 18-29  | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+    | Unknown |              |
| Q2 2022        | 70           | 75     | 41    | 35    | 8     | 10     | 5       | 244          |
| Q2 2023        | 52           | 51     | 42    | 34    | 11    | 4      | 7       | 201          |
| Difference     | -18          | -24    | 1     | -1    | 3     | -6     | 2       | -43          |
| % Change       | -25.7%       | -32.0% | 2.4%  | -2.9% | 37.5% | -60.0% | 40.0%   | -17.6%       |

## SEXUAL ASSAULT - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

| SEXUAL ASSAULT | PERSON COUNT |        |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|----------------|--------------|--------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
|                | Female       | Male   | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| Q2 2022        | 195          | 42     |           | 6      | 1       | 244          |
| Q2 2023        | 162          | 31     | 1         | 6      | 1       | 201          |
| Difference     | -33          | -11    | 1         | 0      | 0       | -43          |
| % Change       | -16.9%       | -26.2% | not calc  | 0.0%   | 0.0%    | -17.6%       |

**VANDALISM VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE**

| VANDALISM   |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |        |                   |        |         |        |  | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------|-------------------|--------|---------|--------|--|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black  | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White  |  |              |
| A           | Central              | 1.00                              | 29.00                     | 14.00  | 22.00             | 191.00 | 7.00    | 73.00  |  | 337.00       |
| B           | Southern             |                                   | 30.00                     | 22.00  | 23.00             | 128.00 | 8.00    | 45.00  |  | 256.00       |
| C           | Bayview              | 2.00                              | 39.00                     | 58.00  | 45.00             | 65.00  | 10.00   | 43.00  |  | 262.00       |
| D           | Mission              | 1.00                              | 18.00                     | 9.00   | 55.00             | 98.00  | 12.00   | 48.00  |  | 241.00       |
| E           | Northern             | 3.00                              | 34.00                     | 30.00  | 27.00             | 155.00 | 13.00   | 83.00  |  | 345.00       |
| F           | Park                 |                                   | 8.00                      | 6.00   | 3.00              | 30.00  | 6.00    | 36.00  |  | 89.00        |
| G           | Richmond             |                                   | 23.00                     | 7.00   | 5.00              | 59.00  | 5.00    | 24.00  |  | 123.00       |
| H           | Ingleside            | 3.00                              | 48.00                     | 22.00  | 52.00             | 62.00  | 10.00   | 47.00  |  | 244.00       |
| I           | Taraval              | 1.00                              | 44.00                     | 12.00  | 17.00             | 67.00  | 10.00   | 52.00  |  | 203.00       |
| J           | Tenderloin           |                                   | 15.00                     | 22.00  | 12.00             | 71.00  | 8.00    | 21.00  |  | 149.00       |
| X           | Out of SF            |                                   |                           | 1.00   | 1.00              | 3.00   | 3.00    | 1.00   |  | 9.00         |
| Grand Total |                      | 11.00                             | 288.00                    | 203.00 | 262.00            | 929.00 | 92.00   | 473.00 |  | 2258.00      |

**VANDALISM VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE**

| VANDALISM   |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       |  | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |  |              |
| A           | Central              | 0.0%                              | 1.3%                      | 0.6%  | 1.0%              | 8.5%   | 0.3%    | 3.2%  |  | 14.9%        |
| B           | Southern             |                                   | 1.3%                      | 1.0%  | 1.0%              | 5.7%   | 0.4%    | 2.0%  |  | 11.3%        |
| C           | Bayview              | 0.1%                              | 1.7%                      | 2.6%  | 2.0%              | 2.9%   | 0.4%    | 1.9%  |  | 11.6%        |
| D           | Mission              | 0.0%                              | 0.8%                      | 0.4%  | 2.4%              | 4.3%   | 0.5%    | 2.1%  |  | 10.7%        |
| E           | Northern             | 0.1%                              | 1.5%                      | 1.3%  | 1.2%              | 6.9%   | 0.6%    | 3.7%  |  | 15.3%        |
| F           | Park                 |                                   | 0.4%                      | 0.3%  | 0.1%              | 1.3%   | 0.3%    | 1.6%  |  | 3.9%         |
| G           | Richmond             |                                   | 1.0%                      | 0.3%  | 0.2%              | 2.6%   | 0.2%    | 1.1%  |  | 5.4%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 0.1%                              | 2.1%                      | 1.0%  | 2.3%              | 2.7%   | 0.4%    | 2.1%  |  | 10.8%        |
| I           | Taraval              | 0.0%                              | 1.9%                      | 0.5%  | 0.8%              | 3.0%   | 0.4%    | 2.3%  |  | 9.0%         |
| J           | Tenderloin           |                                   | 0.7%                      | 1.0%  | 0.5%              | 3.1%   | 0.4%    | 0.9%  |  | 6.6%         |
| X           | Out of SF            |                                   |                           | 0.0%  | 0.0%              | 0.1%   | 0.1%    | 0.0%  |  | 0.4%         |
| Grand Total |                      | 0.5%                              | 12.8%                     | 9.0%  | 11.6%             | 41.1%  | 4.1%    | 20.9% |  | 100.0%       |

**VANDALISM VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE**

| VANDALISM   |                      | PERSON COUNT |        |        |        |        |        |         |  | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29  | 30-39  | 40-49  | 50-59  | 60+    | Unknown |  |              |
| A           | Central              | 3.00         | 51.00  | 41.00  | 40.00  | 35.00  | 23.00  | 144.00  |  | 337.00       |
| B           | Southern             |              | 36.00  | 37.00  | 35.00  | 21.00  | 18.00  | 109.00  |  | 256.00       |
| C           | Bayview              | 1.00         | 34.00  | 49.00  | 43.00  | 43.00  | 43.00  | 49.00   |  | 262.00       |
| D           | Mission              | 3.00         | 28.00  | 34.00  | 39.00  | 29.00  | 35.00  | 73.00   |  | 241.00       |
| E           | Northern             | 9.00         | 53.00  | 63.00  | 37.00  | 32.00  | 36.00  | 115.00  |  | 345.00       |
| F           | Park                 |              | 15.00  | 15.00  | 14.00  | 12.00  | 12.00  | 21.00   |  | 89.00        |
| G           | Richmond             | 1.00         | 13.00  | 14.00  | 11.00  | 16.00  | 26.00  | 42.00   |  | 123.00       |
| H           | Ingleside            | 6.00         | 28.00  | 52.00  | 45.00  | 36.00  | 36.00  | 41.00   |  | 244.00       |
| I           | Taraval              |              | 30.00  | 39.00  | 25.00  | 28.00  | 44.00  | 37.00   |  | 203.00       |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 1.00         | 14.00  | 16.00  | 18.00  | 15.00  | 15.00  | 70.00   |  | 149.00       |
| X           | Out of SF            |              | 3.00   |        | 1.00   | 2.00   |        | 3.00    |  | 9.00         |
| Grand Total |                      | 24.00        | 305.00 | 360.00 | 308.00 | 269.00 | 288.00 | 704.00  |  | 2258.00      |

VANDALISM VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

| VANDALISM   |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |       |       |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+   | Unknown |              |
| A           | Central              | 0.1%         | 2.3%  | 1.8%  | 1.8%  | 1.6%  | 1.0%  | 6.4%    | 14.9%        |
| B           | Southern             |              | 1.6%  | 1.6%  | 1.6%  | 0.9%  | 0.8%  | 4.8%    | 11.3%        |
| C           | Bayview              | 0.0%         | 1.5%  | 2.2%  | 1.9%  | 1.9%  | 1.9%  | 2.2%    | 11.6%        |
| D           | Mission              | 0.1%         | 1.2%  | 1.5%  | 1.7%  | 1.3%  | 1.6%  | 3.2%    | 10.7%        |
| E           | Northern             | 0.4%         | 2.3%  | 2.8%  | 1.6%  | 1.4%  | 1.6%  | 5.1%    | 15.3%        |
| F           | Park                 |              | 0.7%  | 0.7%  | 0.6%  | 0.5%  | 0.5%  | 0.9%    | 3.9%         |
| G           | Richmond             | 0.0%         | 0.6%  | 0.6%  | 0.5%  | 0.7%  | 1.2%  | 1.9%    | 5.4%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 0.3%         | 1.2%  | 2.3%  | 2.0%  | 1.6%  | 1.6%  | 1.8%    | 10.8%        |
| I           | Taraval              |              | 1.3%  | 1.7%  | 1.1%  | 1.2%  | 1.9%  | 1.6%    | 9.0%         |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 0.0%         | 0.6%  | 0.7%  | 0.8%  | 0.7%  | 0.7%  | 3.1%    | 6.6%         |
| X           | Out of SF            |              | 0.1%  |       | 0.0%  | 0.1%  |       | 0.1%    | 0.4%         |
| Grand Total |                      | 1.1%         | 13.5% | 15.9% | 13.6% | 11.9% | 12.8% | 31.2%   | 100.0%       |

VANDALISM VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

| VANDALISM   |                      | PERSON COUNT |        |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male   | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A           | Central              | 74.00        | 115.00 |           | 148.00 |         | 337.00       |
| B           | Southern             | 53.00        | 95.00  |           | 107.00 | 1.00    | 256.00       |
| C           | Bayview              | 103.00       | 114.00 |           | 45.00  |         | 262.00       |
| D           | Mission              | 60.00        | 107.00 |           | 72.00  | 2.00    | 241.00       |
| E           | Northern             | 85.00        | 142.00 |           | 113.00 | 5.00    | 345.00       |
| F           | Park                 | 27.00        | 43.00  |           | 19.00  |         | 89.00        |
| G           | Richmond             | 34.00        | 47.00  |           | 40.00  | 2.00    | 123.00       |
| H           | Ingleside            | 79.00        | 128.00 |           | 36.00  | 1.00    | 244.00       |
| I           | Taraval              | 71.00        | 94.00  |           | 37.00  | 1.00    | 203.00       |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 30.00        | 47.00  | 2.00      | 66.00  | 4.00    | 149.00       |
| X           | Out of SF            | 3.00         | 2.00   |           | 3.00   | 1.00    | 9.00         |
| Grand Total |                      | 619.00       | 934.00 | 2.00      | 686.00 | 17.00   | 2258.00      |

VANDALISM VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

| VANDALISM   |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A           | Central              | 3.3%         | 5.1%  |           | 6.6%   |         | 14.9%        |
| B           | Southern             | 2.3%         | 4.2%  |           | 4.7%   | 0.0%    | 11.3%        |
| C           | Bayview              | 4.6%         | 5.0%  |           | 2.0%   |         | 11.6%        |
| D           | Mission              | 2.7%         | 4.7%  |           | 3.2%   | 0.1%    | 10.7%        |
| E           | Northern             | 3.8%         | 6.3%  |           | 5.0%   | 0.2%    | 15.3%        |
| F           | Park                 | 1.2%         | 1.9%  |           | 0.8%   |         | 3.9%         |
| G           | Richmond             | 1.5%         | 2.1%  |           | 1.8%   | 0.1%    | 5.4%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 3.5%         | 5.7%  |           | 1.6%   | 0.0%    | 10.8%        |
| I           | Taraval              | 3.1%         | 4.2%  |           | 1.6%   | 0.0%    | 9.0%         |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 1.3%         | 2.1%  | 0.1%      | 2.9%   | 0.2%    | 6.6%         |
| X           | Out of SF            | 0.1%         | 0.1%  |           | 0.1%   | 0.0%    | 0.4%         |
| Grand Total |                      | 27.4%        | 41.4% | 0.1%      | 30.4%  | 0.8%    | 100.0%       |



Victim Demographic Report  
Q2 2023

**VANDALISM - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE**

| VANDALISM  | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |        | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|--------|--------------|
|            | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White  |              |
| Q2 2022    | 3                                 | 301                       | 192   | 296               | 1,112  | 121     | 534    | 2,559        |
| Q2 2023    | 11                                | 288                       | 203   | 262               | 929    | 92      | 473    | 2,258        |
| Difference | 8                                 | -13                       | 11    | -34               | -183   | -29     | -61    | -301         |
| % Change   | 266.7%                            | -4.3%                     | 5.7%  | -11.5%            | -16.5% | -24.0%  | -11.4% | -11.8%       |

**VANDALISM - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE**

| VANDALISM  | PERSON COUNT |       |        |        |        |      |         | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|--------------|-------|--------|--------|--------|------|---------|--------------|
|            | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39  | 40-49  | 50-59  | 60+  | Unknown |              |
| Q2 2022    | 37           | 322   | 421    | 370    | 314    | 285  | 810     | 2,559        |
| Q2 2023    | 24           | 305   | 360    | 308    | 269    | 288  | 704     | 2,258        |
| Difference | -13          | -17   | -61    | -62    | -45    | 3    | -106    | -301         |
| % Change   | -35.1%       | -5.3% | -14.5% | -16.8% | -14.3% | 1.1% | -13.1%  | -11.8%       |

**VANDALISM - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER**

| VANDALISM  | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
|            | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| Q2 2022    | 733          | 1,015 | 1         | 789    | 21      | 2,559        |
| Q2 2023    | 619          | 934   | 2         | 686    | 17      | 2,258        |
| Difference | -114         | -81   | 1         | -103   | -4      | -301         |
| % Change   | -15.6%       | -8.0% | 100.0%    | -13.1% | -19.0%  | -11.8%       |

#### DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

| DOMESTIC VIOLENCE |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |        |                   |        |         |        | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------|-------------------|--------|---------|--------|--------------|
| DISTRICT          | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black  | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White  |              |
| A                 | Central              |                                   | 3.00                      | 17.00  | 27.00             | 1.00   | 4.00    | 37.00  | 89.00        |
| B                 | Southern             | 1.00                              | 10.00                     | 43.00  | 24.00             | 1.00   | 3.00    | 24.00  | 106.00       |
| C                 | Bayview              |                                   | 7.00                      | 81.00  | 38.00             | 2.00   |         | 20.00  | 148.00       |
| D                 | Mission              |                                   | 6.00                      | 25.00  | 62.00             | 2.00   | 2.00    | 29.00  | 126.00       |
| E                 | Northern             |                                   | 15.00                     | 22.00  | 31.00             | 1.00   | 1.00    | 17.00  | 87.00        |
| F                 | Park                 |                                   | 1.00                      | 2.00   | 3.00              |        | 1.00    | 7.00   | 14.00        |
| G                 | Richmond             |                                   | 5.00                      | 2.00   | 4.00              |        | 10.00   | 12.00  | 33.00        |
| H                 | Ingleside            |                                   | 8.00                      | 26.00  | 53.00             | 3.00   | 2.00    | 23.00  | 115.00       |
| I                 | Taraval              |                                   | 22.00                     | 22.00  | 31.00             |        | 1.00    | 28.00  | 104.00       |
| J                 | Tenderloin           | 2.00                              | 10.00                     | 40.00  | 30.00             | 1.00   | 2.00    | 33.00  | 118.00       |
| X                 | Out of SF            |                                   | 2.00                      | 10.00  | 6.00              |        |         |        | 18.00        |
| Grand Total       |                      | 3.00                              | 89.00                     | 290.00 | 309.00            | 11.00  | 26.00   | 230.00 | 958.00       |

#### DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

| DOMESTIC VIOLENCE |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
| DISTRICT          | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| A                 | Central              |                                   | 0.3%                      | 1.8%  | 2.8%              | 0.1%   | 0.4%    | 3.9%  | 9.3%         |
| B                 | Southern             | 0.1%                              | 1.0%                      | 4.5%  | 2.5%              | 0.1%   | 0.3%    | 2.5%  | 11.1%        |
| C                 | Bayview              |                                   | 0.7%                      | 8.5%  | 4.0%              | 0.2%   |         | 2.1%  | 15.4%        |
| D                 | Mission              |                                   | 0.6%                      | 2.6%  | 6.5%              | 0.2%   | 0.2%    | 3.0%  | 13.2%        |
| E                 | Northern             |                                   | 1.6%                      | 2.3%  | 3.2%              | 0.1%   | 0.1%    | 1.8%  | 9.1%         |
| F                 | Park                 |                                   | 0.1%                      | 0.2%  | 0.3%              |        | 0.1%    | 0.7%  | 1.5%         |
| G                 | Richmond             |                                   | 0.5%                      | 0.2%  | 0.4%              |        | 1.0%    | 1.3%  | 3.4%         |
| H                 | Ingleside            |                                   | 0.8%                      | 2.7%  | 5.5%              | 0.3%   | 0.2%    | 2.4%  | 12.0%        |
| I                 | Taraval              |                                   | 2.3%                      | 2.3%  | 3.2%              |        | 0.1%    | 2.9%  | 10.9%        |
| J                 | Tenderloin           | 0.2%                              | 1.0%                      | 4.2%  | 3.1%              | 0.1%   | 0.2%    | 3.4%  | 12.3%        |
| X                 | Out of SF            |                                   | 0.2%                      | 1.0%  | 0.6%              |        |         |       | 1.9%         |
| Grand Total       |                      | 0.3%                              | 9.3%                      | 30.3% | 32.3%             | 1.1%   | 2.7%    | 24.0% | 100.0%       |

#### DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

| DOMESTIC VIOLENCE |                      | PERSON COUNT |        |        |        |       |       |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT          | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29  | 30-39  | 40-49  | 50-59 | 60+   | Unknown |              |
| A                 | Central              | 4.00         | 19.00  | 33.00  | 17.00  | 8.00  | 8.00  |         | 89.00        |
| B                 | Southern             | 6.00         | 28.00  | 35.00  | 23.00  | 9.00  | 3.00  | 2.00    | 106.00       |
| C                 | Bayview              | 22.00        | 30.00  | 45.00  | 24.00  | 16.00 | 9.00  | 2.00    | 148.00       |
| D                 | Mission              | 11.00        | 37.00  | 36.00  | 26.00  | 8.00  | 7.00  | 1.00    | 126.00       |
| E                 | Northern             | 14.00        | 16.00  | 28.00  | 13.00  | 10.00 | 6.00  |         | 87.00        |
| F                 | Park                 |              | 9.00   | 2.00   | 1.00   | 1.00  | 1.00  |         | 14.00        |
| G                 | Richmond             | 7.00         | 4.00   | 9.00   | 5.00   | 4.00  | 2.00  | 2.00    | 33.00        |
| H                 | Ingleside            | 24.00        | 27.00  | 27.00  | 16.00  | 11.00 | 6.00  | 4.00    | 115.00       |
| I                 | Taraval              | 24.00        | 20.00  | 26.00  | 22.00  | 6.00  | 5.00  | 1.00    | 104.00       |
| J                 | Tenderloin           | 5.00         | 30.00  | 36.00  | 21.00  | 18.00 | 7.00  | 1.00    | 118.00       |
| X                 | Out of SF            | 7.00         | 4.00   | 4.00   | 1.00   | 1.00  | 1.00  |         | 18.00        |
| Grand Total       |                      | 124.00       | 224.00 | 281.00 | 169.00 | 92.00 | 55.00 | 13.00   | 958.00       |

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

| DOMESTIC VIOLENCE |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |       |      |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT          | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+  | Unknown |              |
| A                 | Central              | 0.4%         | 2.0%  | 3.4%  | 1.8%  | 0.8%  | 0.8% |         | 9.3%         |
| B                 | Southern             | 0.6%         | 2.9%  | 3.7%  | 2.4%  | 0.9%  | 0.3% | 0.2%    | 11.1%        |
| C                 | Bayview              | 2.3%         | 3.1%  | 4.7%  | 2.5%  | 1.7%  | 0.9% | 0.2%    | 15.4%        |
| D                 | Mission              | 1.1%         | 3.9%  | 3.8%  | 2.7%  | 0.8%  | 0.7% | 0.1%    | 13.2%        |
| E                 | Northern             | 1.5%         | 1.7%  | 2.9%  | 1.4%  | 1.0%  | 0.6% |         | 9.1%         |
| F                 | Park                 |              | 0.9%  | 0.2%  | 0.1%  | 0.1%  | 0.1% |         | 1.5%         |
| G                 | Richmond             | 0.7%         | 0.4%  | 0.9%  | 0.5%  | 0.4%  | 0.2% | 0.2%    | 3.4%         |
| H                 | Ingleside            | 2.5%         | 2.8%  | 2.8%  | 1.7%  | 1.1%  | 0.6% | 0.4%    | 12.0%        |
| I                 | Taraval              | 2.5%         | 2.1%  | 2.7%  | 2.3%  | 0.6%  | 0.5% | 0.1%    | 10.9%        |
| J                 | Tenderloin           | 0.5%         | 3.1%  | 3.8%  | 2.2%  | 1.9%  | 0.7% | 0.1%    | 12.3%        |
| X                 | Out of SF            | 0.7%         | 0.4%  | 0.4%  | 0.1%  | 0.1%  | 0.1% |         | 1.9%         |
| Grand Total       |                      | 12.9%        | 23.4% | 29.3% | 17.6% | 9.6%  | 5.7% | 1.4%    | 100.0%       |

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

| DOMESTIC VIOLENCE |                      | PERSON COUNT |        |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT          | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male   | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A                 | Central              | 58.00        | 31.00  |           |        |         | 89.00        |
| B                 | Southern             | 84.00        | 21.00  |           | 1.00   |         | 106.00       |
| C                 | Bayview              | 110.00       | 38.00  |           |        |         | 148.00       |
| D                 | Mission              | 80.00        | 43.00  | 1.00      | 2.00   |         | 126.00       |
| E                 | Northern             | 61.00        | 25.00  | 1.00      |        |         | 87.00        |
| F                 | Park                 | 8.00         | 6.00   |           |        |         | 14.00        |
| G                 | Richmond             | 19.00        | 12.00  |           |        | 2.00    | 33.00        |
| H                 | Ingleside            | 87.00        | 25.00  |           | 3.00   |         | 115.00       |
| I                 | Taraval              | 74.00        | 30.00  |           |        |         | 104.00       |
| J                 | Tenderloin           | 78.00        | 40.00  |           |        |         | 118.00       |
| X                 | Out of SF            | 10.00        | 8.00   |           |        |         | 18.00        |
| Grand Total       |                      | 669.00       | 279.00 | 2.00      | 6.00   | 2.00    | 958.00       |

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

| DOMESTIC VIOLENCE |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT          | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A                 | Central              | 6.1%         | 3.2%  |           |        |         | 9.3%         |
| B                 | Southern             | 8.8%         | 2.2%  |           | 0.1%   |         | 11.1%        |
| C                 | Bayview              | 11.5%        | 4.0%  |           |        |         | 15.4%        |
| D                 | Mission              | 8.4%         | 4.5%  | 0.1%      | 0.2%   |         | 13.2%        |
| E                 | Northern             | 6.4%         | 2.6%  | 0.1%      |        |         | 9.1%         |
| F                 | Park                 | 0.8%         | 0.6%  |           |        |         | 1.5%         |
| G                 | Richmond             | 2.0%         | 1.3%  |           |        | 0.2%    | 3.4%         |
| H                 | Ingleside            | 9.1%         | 2.6%  |           | 0.3%   |         | 12.0%        |
| I                 | Taraval              | 7.7%         | 3.1%  |           |        |         | 10.9%        |
| J                 | Tenderloin           | 8.1%         | 4.2%  |           |        |         | 12.3%        |
| X                 | Out of SF            | 1.0%         | 0.8%  |           |        |         | 1.9%         |
| Grand Total       |                      | 69.8%        | 29.1% | 0.2%      | 0.6%   | 0.2%    | 100.0%       |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q2 2023

**DOMESTIC VIOLENCE - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE**

| DOMESTIC VIOLENCE | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |        | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|--------|--------------|
|                   | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White  |              |
| Q2 2022           | 4                                 | 104                       | 314   | 331               | 18     | 34      | 275    | 1,080        |
| Q2 2023           | 3                                 | 89                        | 290   | 309               | 11     | 26      | 230    | 958          |
| Difference        | -1                                | -15                       | -24   | -22               | -7     | -8      | -45    | -122         |
| % Change          | -25.0%                            | -14.4%                    | -7.6% | -6.6%             | -38.9% | -23.5%  | -16.4% | -11.3%       |

**DOMESTIC VIOLENCE - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE**

| DOMESTIC VIOLENCE | PERSON COUNT |        |       |        |       |       |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------------|--------------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------|---------|--------------|
|                   | 0-17         | 18-29  | 30-39 | 40-49  | 50-59 | 60+   | Unknown |              |
| Q2 2022           | 143          | 264    | 293   | 216    | 78    | 61    | 25      | 1,080        |
| Q2 2023           | 124          | 224    | 281   | 169    | 92    | 55    | 13      | 958          |
| Difference        | -19          | -40    | -12   | -47    | 14    | -6    | -12     | -122         |
| % Change          | -13.3%       | -15.2% | -4.1% | -21.8% | 17.9% | -9.8% | -48.0%  | -11.3%       |

**DOMESTIC VIOLENCE - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER**

| DOMESTIC VIOLENCE | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
|                   | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| Q2 2022           | 768          | 291   | 1         | 14     | 6       | 1,080        |
| Q2 2023           | 669          | 279   | 2         | 6      | 2       | 958          |
| Difference        | -99          | -12   | 1         | -8     | -4      | -122         |
| % Change          | -12.9%       | -4.1% | 100.0%    | -57.1% | -66.7%  | -11.3%       |

#### ELDER ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

| ELDER ABUSE |                      | PERSON COUNT              |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| A           | Central              | 9.00                      | 1.00  | 1.00              |        |         | 13.00 | 24.00        |
| B           | Southern             | 3.00                      | 1.00  |                   |        |         | 7.00  | 11.00        |
| C           | Bayview              | 2.00                      | 5.00  | 3.00              |        |         | 3.00  | 13.00        |
| D           | Mission              | 4.00                      | 5.00  | 8.00              |        |         | 7.00  | 24.00        |
| E           | Northern             | 7.00                      | 2.00  |                   |        | 1.00    | 7.00  | 17.00        |
| F           | Park                 | 3.00                      |       |                   |        |         | 5.00  | 8.00         |
| G           | Richmond             | 3.00                      |       |                   |        |         | 6.00  | 9.00         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 6.00                      | 3.00  | 4.00              | 1.00   | 1.00    | 13.00 | 28.00        |
| I           | Taraval              | 4.00                      | 1.00  | 1.00              |        |         | 6.00  | 12.00        |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 11.00                     | 2.00  | 3.00              |        | 1.00    | 6.00  | 23.00        |
| Grand Total |                      | 52.00                     | 20.00 | 20.00             | 1.00   | 3.00    | 73.00 | 169.00       |

#### ELDER ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

| ELDER ABUSE |                      | PERSON COUNT              |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| A           | Central              | 5.3%                      | 0.6%  | 0.6%              |        |         | 7.7%  | 14.2%        |
| B           | Southern             | 1.8%                      | 0.6%  |                   |        |         | 4.1%  | 6.5%         |
| C           | Bayview              | 1.2%                      | 3.0%  | 1.8%              |        |         | 1.8%  | 7.7%         |
| D           | Mission              | 2.4%                      | 3.0%  | 4.7%              |        |         | 4.1%  | 14.2%        |
| E           | Northern             | 4.1%                      | 1.2%  |                   |        | 0.6%    | 4.1%  | 10.1%        |
| F           | Park                 | 1.8%                      |       |                   |        |         | 3.0%  | 4.7%         |
| G           | Richmond             | 1.8%                      |       |                   |        |         | 3.6%  | 5.3%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 3.6%                      | 1.8%  | 2.4%              | 0.6%   | 0.6%    | 7.7%  | 16.6%        |
| I           | Taraval              | 2.4%                      | 0.6%  | 0.6%              |        |         | 3.6%  | 7.1%         |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 6.5%                      | 1.2%  | 1.8%              |        | 0.6%    | 3.6%  | 13.6%        |
| Grand Total |                      | 30.8%                     | 11.8% | 11.8%             | 0.6%   | 1.8%    | 43.2% | 100.0%       |

#### ELDER ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

| ELDER ABUSE |                      | PERSON COUNT | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 65+          |              |
| A           | Central              | 24.00        | 24.00        |
| B           | Southern             | 11.00        | 11.00        |
| C           | Bayview              | 13.00        | 13.00        |
| D           | Mission              | 24.00        | 24.00        |
| E           | Northern             | 17.00        | 17.00        |
| F           | Park                 | 8.00         | 8.00         |
| G           | Richmond             | 9.00         | 9.00         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 28.00        | 28.00        |
| I           | Taraval              | 12.00        | 12.00        |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 23.00        | 23.00        |
| Grand Total |                      | 169.00       | 169.00       |

#### ELDER ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

| ELDER ABUSE |                      | PERSON COUNT |              |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 65+          | PERSON COUNT |
| A           | Central              | 14.2%        | 14.2%        |
| B           | Southern             | 6.5%         | 6.5%         |
| C           | Bayview              | 7.7%         | 7.7%         |
| D           | Mission              | 14.2%        | 14.2%        |
| E           | Northern             | 10.1%        | 10.1%        |
| F           | Park                 | 4.7%         | 4.7%         |
| G           | Richmond             | 5.3%         | 5.3%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 16.6%        | 16.6%        |
| I           | Taraval              | 7.1%         | 7.1%         |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 13.6%        | 13.6%        |
| Grand Total |                      | 100.0%       | 100.0%       |

#### ELDER ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

| ELDER ABUSE |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |        | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|--------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male  | OTHERS |              |
| A           | Central              | 10.00        | 14.00 |        | 24.00        |
| B           | Southern             | 6.00         | 5.00  |        | 11.00        |
| C           | Bayview              | 5.00         | 8.00  |        | 13.00        |
| D           | Mission              | 10.00        | 14.00 |        | 24.00        |
| E           | Northern             | 11.00        | 6.00  |        | 17.00        |
| F           | Park                 | 4.00         | 4.00  |        | 8.00         |
| G           | Richmond             | 3.00         | 6.00  |        | 9.00         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 12.00        | 15.00 | 1.00   | 28.00        |
| I           | Taraval              | 6.00         | 6.00  |        | 12.00        |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 8.00         | 15.00 |        | 23.00        |
| Grand Total |                      | 75.00        | 93.00 | 1.00   | 169.00       |

#### ELDER ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

| ELDER ABUSE |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |        | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|--------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male  | OTHERS |              |
| A           | Central              | 5.9%         | 8.3%  |        | 14.2%        |
| B           | Southern             | 3.6%         | 3.0%  |        | 6.5%         |
| C           | Bayview              | 3.0%         | 4.7%  |        | 7.7%         |
| D           | Mission              | 5.9%         | 8.3%  |        | 14.2%        |
| E           | Northern             | 6.5%         | 3.6%  |        | 10.1%        |
| F           | Park                 | 2.4%         | 2.4%  |        | 4.7%         |
| G           | Richmond             | 1.8%         | 3.6%  |        | 5.3%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 7.1%         | 8.9%  | 0.6%   | 16.6%        |
| I           | Taraval              | 3.6%         | 3.6%  |        | 7.1%         |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 4.7%         | 8.9%  |        | 13.6%        |
| Grand Total |                      | 44.4%        | 55.0% | 0.6%   | 100.0%       |

# Victim Demographic Report

Q2 2023

## ELDER ABUSE - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

| ELDER ABUSE | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |          |       | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------------|
|             | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown  | White |              |
| Q2 2022     | 0                                 | 34                        | 20    | 11                | 2      | 0        | 74    | 141          |
| Q2 2023     | 0                                 | 52                        | 20    | 20                | 1      | 3        | 73    | 169          |
| Difference  | 0                                 | 18                        | 0     | 9                 | -1     | 3        | -1    | 28           |
| % Change    | not calc                          | 52.9%                     | 0.0%  | 81.8%             | -50.0% | not calc | -1.4% | 19.9%        |

## ELDER ABUSE - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

| ELDER ABUSE | PERSON COUNT | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|
|             | 65+          |              |
| Q2 2022     | 141          | 141          |
| Q2 2023     | 169          | 169          |
| Difference  | 28           | 28           |
| % Change    | 19.9%        | 19.9%        |

## ELDER ABUSE - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

| ELDER ABUSE | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |          | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|----------|--------------|
|             | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown  |              |
| Q2 2022     | 73           | 66    | 0         | 2      | 0        | 141          |
| Q2 2023     | 75           | 93    | 0         | 1      | 0        | 169          |
| Difference  | 2            | 27    | 0         | -1     | 0        | 28           |
| % Change    | 2.7%         | 40.9% | not calc  | -50.0% | not calc | 19.9%        |

**CHILD ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE**

| CHILD ABUSE |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| A           | Central              |                                   |                           | 2.00  | 4.00              |        | 4.00    | 3.00  | 13.00        |
| B           | Southern             |                                   | 1.00                      | 2.00  |                   | 3.00   |         |       | 6.00         |
| C           | Bayview              |                                   | 1.00                      | 11.00 | 8.00              |        | 3.00    | 1.00  | 24.00        |
| D           | Mission              |                                   | 3.00                      | 3.00  | 20.00             | 1.00   | 1.00    | 2.00  | 30.00        |
| E           | Northern             |                                   | 2.00                      | 1.00  | 5.00              | 1.00   |         |       | 9.00         |
| F           | Park                 |                                   |                           |       | 1.00              |        |         | 4.00  | 5.00         |
| G           | Richmond             |                                   | 2.00                      |       |                   |        |         |       | 2.00         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 1.00                              | 1.00                      | 5.00  | 18.00             |        | 1.00    | 1.00  | 27.00        |
| I           | Taraval              | 2.00                              | 4.00                      | 3.00  | 6.00              |        | 1.00    | 6.00  | 22.00        |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 1.00                              | 2.00                      | 1.00  | 7.00              |        |         | 1.00  | 12.00        |
| X           | Out of SF            |                                   |                           | 3.00  | 2.00              | 1.00   |         | 1.00  | 7.00         |
| Grand Total |                      | 4.00                              | 16.00                     | 31.00 | 71.00             | 6.00   | 10.00   | 19.00 | 157.00       |

**CHILD ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE**

| CHILD ABUSE |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| A           | Central              |                                   |                           | 1.3%  | 2.5%              |        | 2.5%    | 1.9%  | 8.3%         |
| B           | Southern             |                                   | 0.6%                      | 1.3%  |                   | 1.9%   |         |       | 3.8%         |
| C           | Bayview              |                                   | 0.6%                      | 7.0%  | 5.1%              |        | 1.9%    | 0.6%  | 15.3%        |
| D           | Mission              |                                   | 1.9%                      | 1.9%  | 12.7%             | 0.6%   | 0.6%    | 1.3%  | 19.1%        |
| E           | Northern             |                                   | 1.3%                      | 0.6%  | 3.2%              | 0.6%   |         |       | 5.7%         |
| F           | Park                 |                                   |                           |       | 0.6%              |        |         | 2.5%  | 3.2%         |
| G           | Richmond             |                                   | 1.3%                      |       |                   |        |         |       | 1.3%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 0.6%                              | 0.6%                      | 3.2%  | 11.5%             |        | 0.6%    | 0.6%  | 17.2%        |
| I           | Taraval              | 1.3%                              | 2.5%                      | 1.9%  | 3.8%              |        | 0.6%    | 3.8%  | 14.0%        |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 0.6%                              | 1.3%                      | 0.6%  | 4.5%              |        |         | 0.6%  | 7.6%         |
| X           | Out of SF            |                                   |                           | 1.9%  | 1.3%              | 0.6%   |         | 0.6%  | 4.5%         |
| Grand Total |                      | 2.5%                              | 10.2%                     | 19.7% | 45.2%             | 3.8%   | 6.4%    | 12.1% | 100.0%       |

**CHILD ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE**

| CHILD ABUSE |                      | PERSON COUNT | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         |              |
| A           | Central              | 13.00        | 13.00        |
| B           | Southern             | 6.00         | 6.00         |
| C           | Bayview              | 24.00        | 24.00        |
| D           | Mission              | 30.00        | 30.00        |
| E           | Northern             | 9.00         | 9.00         |
| F           | Park                 | 5.00         | 5.00         |
| G           | Richmond             | 2.00         | 2.00         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 27.00        | 27.00        |
| I           | Taraval              | 22.00        | 22.00        |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 12.00        | 12.00        |
| X           | Out of SF            | 7.00         | 7.00         |
| Grand Total |                      | 157.00       | 157.00       |



#### CHILD ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

| CHILD ABUSE |                      | PERSON COUNT |  | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|--|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         |  |              |
| A           | Central              | 8.3%         |  | 8.3%         |
| B           | Southern             | 3.8%         |  | 3.8%         |
| C           | Bayview              | 15.3%        |  | 15.3%        |
| D           | Mission              | 19.1%        |  | 19.1%        |
| E           | Northern             | 5.7%         |  | 5.7%         |
| F           | Park                 | 3.2%         |  | 3.2%         |
| G           | Richmond             | 1.3%         |  | 1.3%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 17.2%        |  | 17.2%        |
| I           | Taraval              | 14.0%        |  | 14.0%        |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 7.6%         |  | 7.6%         |
| X           | Out of SF            | 4.5%         |  | 4.5%         |
| Grand Total |                      | 100.0%       |  | 100.0%       |

#### CHILD ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

| CHILD ABUSE |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |        | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|--------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male  | OTHERS |              |
| A           | Central              | 7.00         | 6.00  |        | 13.00        |
| B           | Southern             | 4.00         | 1.00  | 1.00   | 6.00         |
| C           | Bayview              | 14.00        | 10.00 |        | 24.00        |
| D           | Mission              | 17.00        | 13.00 |        | 30.00        |
| E           | Northern             | 4.00         | 5.00  |        | 9.00         |
| F           | Park                 | 4.00         | 1.00  |        | 5.00         |
| G           | Richmond             | 2.00         |       |        | 2.00         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 15.00        | 12.00 |        | 27.00        |
| I           | Taraval              | 15.00        | 7.00  |        | 22.00        |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 6.00         | 6.00  |        | 12.00        |
| X           | Out of SF            | 3.00         | 4.00  |        | 7.00         |
| Grand Total |                      | 91.00        | 65.00 | 1.00   | 157.00       |

#### CHILD ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

| CHILD ABUSE |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |        | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|--------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male  | OTHERS |              |
| A           | Central              | 4.5%         | 3.8%  |        | 8.3%         |
| B           | Southern             | 2.5%         | 0.6%  | 0.6%   | 3.8%         |
| C           | Bayview              | 8.9%         | 6.4%  |        | 15.3%        |
| D           | Mission              | 10.8%        | 8.3%  |        | 19.1%        |
| E           | Northern             | 2.5%         | 3.2%  |        | 5.7%         |
| F           | Park                 | 2.5%         | 0.6%  |        | 3.2%         |
| G           | Richmond             | 1.3%         |       |        | 1.3%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 9.6%         | 7.6%  |        | 17.2%        |
| I           | Taraval              | 9.6%         | 4.5%  |        | 14.0%        |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 3.8%         | 3.8%  |        | 7.6%         |
| X           | Out of SF            | 1.9%         | 2.5%  |        | 4.5%         |
| Grand Total |                      | 58.0%        | 41.4% | 0.6%   | 100.0%       |

# Victim Demographic Report

Q2 2023

## CHILD ABUSE - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE

| CHILD ABUSE | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |        |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
|             | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black  | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| Q2 2022     | 0                                 | 22                        | 35     | 71                | 10     | 8       | 14    | 160          |
| Q2 2023     | 4                                 | 16                        | 31     | 71                | 6      | 10      | 19    | 157          |
| Difference  | 4                                 | -6                        | -4     | 0                 | -4     | 2       | 5     | -3           |
| % Change    | not calc                          | -27.3%                    | -11.4% | 0.0%              | -40.0% | 25.0%   | 35.7% | -1.9%        |

## CHILD ABUSE - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE

| CHILD ABUSE | PERSON COUNT | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|
|             | 0-17         |              |
| Q2 2022     | 160          | 160          |
| Q2 2023     | 157          | 157          |
| Difference  | -3           | -3           |
| % Change    | -1.9%        | -1.9%        |

## CHILD ABUSE - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER

| CHILD ABUSE | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |          | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|----------|--------------|
|             | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown  |              |
| Q2 2022     | 86           | 72    | 0         | 2      | 0        | 160          |
| Q2 2023     | 91           | 65    | 0         | 1      | 0        | 157          |
| Difference  | 5            | -7    | 0         | -1     | 0        | -3           |
| % Change    | 5.8%         | -9.7% | not calc  | -50.0% | not calc | -1.9%        |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q2 2023

**HOMICIDE VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE**

| HOMICIDE           |            | PERSON COUNT                         |                              |          |                      |          |          |          | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|--------------------|------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT   | American Indian or<br>Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific<br>Islander | Black    | Hispanic or<br>Latin | OTHERS   | Unknown  | White    |                 |
| A                  | Central    |                                      |                              | 1        |                      |          |          |          | 1               |
| B                  | Southern   |                                      | 1                            | 1        | 1                    |          |          | 1        | 4               |
| C                  | Bayview    |                                      |                              | 1        |                      |          |          |          | 1               |
| D                  | Mission    |                                      |                              |          |                      |          |          |          | 0               |
| E                  | Northern   |                                      |                              | 2        |                      |          |          |          | 2               |
| F                  | Park       |                                      | 1                            |          |                      |          |          |          | 1               |
| G                  | Richmond   |                                      | 1                            |          |                      |          |          |          | 1               |
| H                  | Ingleside  |                                      |                              |          |                      |          |          |          | 0               |
| I                  | Taraval    |                                      |                              |          |                      |          |          |          | 0               |
| J                  | Tenderloin |                                      |                              | 4        |                      |          |          |          | 4               |
| X                  | Out of SF  |                                      |                              |          |                      |          |          |          | 0               |
| <b>Grand Total</b> |            | <b>0</b>                             | <b>3</b>                     | <b>9</b> | <b>1</b>             | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>14</b>       |

**HOMICIDE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE**

| HOMICIDE           |            | PERSON COUNT                         |                              |              |                      |             |             |             | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|--------------------|------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------|----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT   | American Indian or<br>Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific<br>Islander | Black        | Hispanic or<br>Latin | OTHERS      | Unknown     | White       |                 |
| A                  | Central    | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                         | 7.1%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 7.1%            |
| B                  | Southern   | 0.0%                                 | 7.1%                         | 7.1%         | 7.1%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 7.1%        | 28.6%           |
| C                  | Bayview    | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                         | 7.1%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 7.1%            |
| D                  | Mission    | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                         | 0.0%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| E                  | Northern   | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                         | 14.3%        | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 14.3%           |
| F                  | Park       | 0.0%                                 | 7.1%                         | 0.0%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 7.1%            |
| G                  | Richmond   | 0.0%                                 | 7.1%                         | 0.0%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 7.1%            |
| H                  | Ingleside  | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                         | 0.0%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| I                  | Taraval    | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                         | 0.0%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| J                  | Tenderloin | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                         | 28.6%        | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 28.6%           |
| X                  | Out of SF  | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                         | 0.0%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| <b>Grand Total</b> |            | <b>0.0%</b>                          | <b>21.4%</b>                 | <b>64.3%</b> | <b>7.1%</b>          | <b>0.0%</b> | <b>0.0%</b> | <b>7.1%</b> | <b>100.0%</b>   |

**Victim Demographic Report**  
**Q2 2023**

**HOMICIDE VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE**

| HOMICIDE           |            | PERSON COUNT |          |          |          |          |          |          | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|--------------------|------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT   | 0-17         | 18-29    | 30-39    | 40-49    | 50-59    | 60+      | Unknown  |                 |
| A                  | Central    |              |          |          | 1        |          |          |          | 1               |
| B                  | Southern   |              | 2        |          | 1        | 1        |          |          | 4               |
| C                  | Bayview    |              |          |          |          | 1        |          |          | 1               |
| D                  | Mission    |              |          |          |          |          |          |          | 0               |
| E                  | Northern   | 1            | 1        |          |          |          |          |          | 2               |
| F                  | Park       |              |          |          |          |          | 1        |          | 1               |
| G                  | Richmond   |              |          |          |          |          | 1        |          | 1               |
| H                  | Ingleside  |              |          |          |          |          |          |          | 0               |
| I                  | Taraval    |              |          |          |          |          |          |          | 0               |
| J                  | Tenderloin |              | 1        | 1        | 1        | 1        |          |          | 4               |
| X                  | Out of SF  |              |          |          |          |          |          |          | 0               |
| <b>Grand Total</b> |            | <b>1</b>     | <b>4</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>14</b>       |

**HOMICIDE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE**

| HOMICIDE           |            | PERSON COUNT |              |             |              |              |              |             | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|--------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT   | 0-17         | 18-29        | 30-39       | 40-49        | 50-59        | 60+          | Unknown     |                 |
| A                  | Central    | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 7.1%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 7.1%            |
| B                  | Southern   | 0.0%         | 14.3%        | 0.0%        | 7.1%         | 7.1%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 28.6%           |
| C                  | Bayview    | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 7.1%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 7.1%            |
| D                  | Mission    | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| E                  | Northern   | 7.1%         | 7.1%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 14.3%           |
| F                  | Park       | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 7.1%         | 0.0%        | 7.1%            |
| G                  | Richmond   | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 7.1%         | 0.0%        | 7.1%            |
| H                  | Ingleside  | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| I                  | Taraval    | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| J                  | Tenderloin | 0.0%         | 7.1%         | 7.1%        | 7.1%         | 7.1%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 28.6%           |
| X                  | Out of SF  | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| <b>Grand Total</b> |            | <b>7.1%</b>  | <b>28.6%</b> | <b>7.1%</b> | <b>21.4%</b> | <b>21.4%</b> | <b>14.3%</b> | <b>0.0%</b> | <b>100.0%</b>   |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q2 2023

**HOMICIDE VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER**

| HOMICIDE           |            | PERSON COUNT |           |          |          | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|--------------------|------------|--------------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT   | Female       | Male      | OTHERS   | Unknown  |                 |
| A                  | Central    |              | 1         |          |          | 1               |
| B                  | Southern   | 1            | 3         |          |          | 4               |
| C                  | Bayview    |              | 1         |          |          | 1               |
| D                  | Mission    |              |           |          |          | 0               |
| E                  | Northern   |              | 2         |          |          | 2               |
| F                  | Park       | 1            |           |          |          | 1               |
| G                  | Richmond   | 1            |           |          |          | 1               |
| H                  | Ingleside  |              |           |          |          | 0               |
| I                  | Taraval    |              |           |          |          | 0               |
| J                  | Tenderloin |              | 4         |          |          | 4               |
| X                  | Out of SF  |              |           |          |          | 0               |
| <b>Grand Total</b> |            | <b>3</b>     | <b>11</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>14</b>       |

**HOMICIDE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER**

| HOMICIDE           |            | PERSON COUNT |              |             |             | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|--------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT   | Female       | Male         | OTHERS      | Unknown     |                 |
| A                  | Central    | 0.0%         | 7.1%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 7.1%            |
| B                  | Southern   | 7.1%         | 21.4%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 28.6%           |
| C                  | Bayview    | 0.0%         | 7.1%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 7.1%            |
| D                  | Mission    | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| E                  | Northern   | 0.0%         | 14.3%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 14.3%           |
| F                  | Park       | 7.1%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 7.1%            |
| G                  | Richmond   | 7.1%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 7.1%            |
| H                  | Ingleside  | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| I                  | Taraval    | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| J                  | Tenderloin | 0.0%         | 28.6%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 28.6%           |
| <b>Grand Total</b> |            | <b>21.4%</b> | <b>78.6%</b> | <b>0.0%</b> | <b>0.0%</b> | <b>100.0%</b>   |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q2 2023

**HOMICIDE - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE**

| HOMICIDE   | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |          |          |       | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|----------|----------|-------|--------------|
|            | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS   | Unknown  | White |              |
| Q2 2022    | 0                                 | 2                         | 8     | 4                 | 0        | 0        | 1     | 15           |
| Q2 2023    | 0                                 | 3                         | 9     | 1                 | 0        | 0        | 1     | 14           |
| Difference | 0                                 | 1                         | 1     | -3                | 0        | 0        | 0     | -1           |
| % Change   | not calc                          | 50.0%                     | 12.5% | -75.0%            | not calc | not calc | 0.0%  | -6.7%        |

**HOMICIDE - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE**

| HOMICIDE   | PERSON COUNT |        |        |       |          |          |          | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|--------------|--------|--------|-------|----------|----------|----------|--------------|
|            | 0-17         | 18-29  | 30-39  | 40-49 | 50-59    | 60+      | Unknown  |              |
| Q2 2022    | 0            | 8      | 5      | 2     | 0        | 0        | 0        | 15           |
| Q2 2023    | 1            | 4      | 1      | 3     | 3        | 2        | 0        | 14           |
| Difference | 1            | -4     | -4     | 1     | 3        | 2        | 0        | -1           |
| % Change   | not calc     | -50.0% | -80.0% | 50.0% | not calc | not calc | not calc | -6.7%        |

**HOMICIDE - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER**

| HOMICIDE   | PERSON COUNT |        |           |          |          | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|--------------|--------|-----------|----------|----------|--------------|
|            | Female       | Male   | Nonbinary | OTHERS   | Unknown  |              |
| Q2 2022    | 0            | 15     | 0         | 0        | 0        | 15           |
| Q2 2023    | 3            | 11     | 0         | 0        | 0        | 14           |
| Difference | 3            | -4     | 0         | 0        | 0        | -1           |
| % Change   | not calc     | -26.7% | not calc  | not calc | not calc | -6.7%        |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q2 2023

**HATE CRIME VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE**

| HATE CRIME         |            | PERSON COUNT                         |                                   |          |                      |          |          |          | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|--------------------|------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT   | American Indian or<br>Alaskan Native | Asian/Asian<br>Indian/Other Asian | Black    | Hispanic or<br>Latin | Others   | White    | Unknown  |                 |
| A                  | Central    |                                      |                                   |          |                      |          |          |          | 0               |
| B                  | Southern   |                                      |                                   |          | 1                    |          | 3        |          | 4               |
| C                  | Bayview    |                                      |                                   |          |                      |          |          |          | 0               |
| D                  | Mission    |                                      |                                   |          | 4                    |          | 1        |          | 5               |
| E                  | Northern   |                                      |                                   |          |                      |          |          |          | 0               |
| F                  | Park       |                                      |                                   |          | 1                    | 1        |          |          | 2               |
| G                  | Richmond   |                                      |                                   |          |                      |          |          |          | 0               |
| H                  | Ingleside  |                                      |                                   |          |                      |          |          |          | 0               |
| I                  | Taraval    |                                      |                                   | 1        |                      |          |          | 1        | 2               |
| J                  | Tenderloin |                                      |                                   | 1        |                      |          |          |          | 1               |
| X                  | Out of SF  |                                      |                                   |          |                      |          |          |          | 0               |
| <b>Grand Total</b> |            | <b>0</b>                             | <b>0</b>                          | <b>2</b> | <b>6</b>             | <b>1</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>14</b>       |

**HATE CRIME VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE**

| HATE CRIME         |            | PERSON COUNT                         |                                   |              |                      |             |              |             | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|--------------------|------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT   | American Indian or<br>Alaskan Native | Asian/Asian<br>Indian/Other Asian | Black        | Hispanic or<br>Latin | Others      | White        | Unknown     |                 |
| A                  | Central    | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                              | 0.0%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| B                  | Southern   | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                              | 0.0%         | 7.1%                 | 0.0%        | 21.4%        | 0.0%        | 28.6%           |
| C                  | Bayview    | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                              | 0.0%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| D                  | Mission    | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                              | 0.0%         | 28.6%                | 0.0%        | 7.1%         | 0.0%        | 35.7%           |
| E                  | Northern   | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                              | 0.0%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| F                  | Park       | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                              | 0.0%         | 7.1%                 | 7.1%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 14.3%           |
| G                  | Richmond   | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                              | 0.0%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| H                  | Ingleside  | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                              | 0.0%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| I                  | Taraval    | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                              | 7.1%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 7.1%        | 14.3%           |
| J                  | Tenderloin | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                              | 7.1%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 7.1%            |
| X                  | Out of SF  | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                              | 0.0%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| <b>Grand Total</b> |            | <b>0.0%</b>                          | <b>0.0%</b>                       | <b>14.3%</b> | <b>42.9%</b>         | <b>7.1%</b> | <b>28.6%</b> | <b>7.1%</b> | <b>100.0%</b>   |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q2 2023

**HATE CRIME VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE**

| HATE CRIME         |            | PERSON COUNT |          |          |          |          |          |          | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|--------------------|------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT   | 0-17         | 18-29    | 30-39    | 40-49    | 50-59    | 60+      | Unknown  |                 |
| A                  | Central    |              |          |          |          |          |          |          | 0               |
| B                  | Southern   |              | 1        | 1        | 1        | 1        |          |          | 4               |
| C                  | Bayview    |              |          |          |          |          |          |          | 0               |
| D                  | Mission    |              | 4        | 1        |          |          |          |          | 5               |
| E                  | Northern   |              |          |          |          |          |          |          | 0               |
| F                  | Park       |              |          | 1        | 1        |          |          |          | 2               |
| G                  | Richmond   |              |          |          |          |          |          |          | 0               |
| H                  | Ingleside  |              |          |          |          |          |          |          | 0               |
| I                  | Taraval    |              |          |          |          |          | 1        | 1        | 2               |
| J                  | Tenderloin |              |          |          |          |          | 1        |          | 1               |
| X                  | Out of SF  |              |          |          |          |          |          |          | 0               |
| <b>Grand Total</b> |            | <b>0</b>     | <b>5</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>14</b>       |

**HATE CRIME VICTIM COUNT - BY PERCENTAGE**

| HATE CRIME         |            | PERSON COUNT |              |              |              |             |              |             | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|--------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT   | 0-17         | 18-29        | 30-39        | 40-49        | 50-59       | 60+          | Unknown     |                 |
| A                  | Central    | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| B                  | Southern   | 0.0%         | 7.1%         | 7.1%         | 7.1%         | 7.1%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 28.6%           |
| C                  | Bayview    | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| D                  | Mission    | 0.0%         | 28.6%        | 7.1%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 35.7%           |
| E                  | Northern   | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| F                  | Park       | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 7.1%         | 7.1%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 14.3%           |
| G                  | Richmond   | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| H                  | Ingleside  | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| I                  | Taraval    | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 7.1%         | 7.1%        | 14.3%           |
| J                  | Tenderloin | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 7.1%         | 0.0%        | 7.1%            |
| X                  | Out of SF  | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| <b>Grand Total</b> |            | <b>0.0%</b>  | <b>35.7%</b> | <b>21.4%</b> | <b>14.3%</b> | <b>7.1%</b> | <b>14.3%</b> | <b>7.1%</b> | <b>100.0%</b>   |



#### HATE CRIME VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

| HATE CRIME  |            | PERSON COUNT |      |           |        |         | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|-------------|------------|--------------|------|-----------|--------|---------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT   | Female       | Male | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |                 |
| A           | Central    |              |      |           |        |         | 0               |
| B           | Southern   | 1            | 3    |           |        |         | 4               |
| C           | Bayview    |              |      |           |        |         | 0               |
| D           | Mission    | 3            | 2    |           |        |         | 5               |
| E           | Northern   |              |      |           |        |         | 0               |
| F           | Park       | 1            | 1    |           |        |         | 2               |
| G           | Richmond   |              |      |           |        |         | 0               |
| H           | Ingleside  |              |      |           |        |         | 0               |
| I           | Taraval    |              | 1    |           |        | 1       | 2               |
| J           | Tenderloin |              | 1    |           |        |         | 1               |
| X           | Out of SF  |              |      |           |        |         | 0               |
| Grand Total |            | 5            | 8    | 0         | 0      | 1       | 14              |

#### HATE CRIME VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

| HATE CRIME  |            | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|-------------|------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT   | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |                 |
| A           | Central    | 0.0%         | 0.0%  | 0.0%      | 0.0%   | 0.0%    | 0.0%            |
| B           | Southern   | 7.1%         | 21.4% | 0.0%      | 0.0%   | 0.0%    | 28.6%           |
| C           | Bayview    | 0.0%         | 0.0%  | 0.0%      | 0.0%   | 0.0%    | 0.0%            |
| D           | Mission    | 21.4%        | 14.3% | 0.0%      | 0.0%   | 0.0%    | 35.7%           |
| E           | Northern   | 0.0%         | 0.0%  | 0.0%      | 0.0%   | 0.0%    | 0.0%            |
| F           | Park       | 7.1%         | 7.1%  | 0.0%      | 0.0%   | 0.0%    | 14.3%           |
| G           | Richmond   | 0.0%         | 0.0%  | 0.0%      | 0.0%   | 0.0%    | 0.0%            |
| H           | Ingleside  | 0.0%         | 0.0%  | 0.0%      | 0.0%   | 0.0%    | 0.0%            |
| I           | Taraval    | 0.0%         | 7.1%  | 0.0%      | 0.0%   | 7.1%    | 14.3%           |
| J           | Tenderloin | 0.0%         | 7.1%  | 0.0%      | 0.0%   | 0.0%    | 7.1%            |
| Grand Total |            | 35.7%        | 57.1% | 0.0%      | 0.0%   | 7.1%    | 100.0%          |

#### HATE CRIME VICTIM COUNT - BY BIAS TYPE

| HATE CRIME  |            | PERSON COUNT - BIAS MOTIVATION |            |            |               |             |             |            |                    |                |           | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|-------------|------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT   | Anti-Transgender               | Anti-Asian | Anti-Black | Anti-Hispanic | Anti-Jewish | Anti-Female | Anti-White | Sexual Orientation | Anti-Christian | Anti-Arab |                 |
| A           | Central    |                                |            |            |               |             |             |            |                    |                |           | 0               |
| B           | Southern   | 3                              |            |            | 1             |             |             |            |                    |                |           | 4               |
| C           | Bayview    |                                |            |            |               |             |             |            |                    |                |           | 0               |
| D           | Mission    | 3                              |            |            | 1             |             |             |            | 1                  |                |           | 5               |
| E           | Northern   |                                |            |            |               |             |             |            |                    |                |           | 0               |
| F           | Park       | 1                              |            |            |               |             |             |            | 1                  |                |           | 2               |
| G           | Richmond   |                                |            |            |               |             |             |            |                    |                |           | 0               |
| H           | Ingleside  |                                |            |            |               |             |             |            |                    |                |           | 0               |
| I           | Taraval    |                                |            | 1          |               |             |             |            |                    | 1              |           | 2               |
| J           | Tenderloin |                                |            | 1          |               |             |             |            |                    |                |           | 1               |
| X           | Out of SF  |                                |            |            |               |             |             |            |                    |                |           | 0               |
| Grand Total |            | 7                              | 0          | 2          | 2             | 0           | 0           | 0          | 2                  | 1              | 0         | 14              |

#### HATE CRIME VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY BIAS TYPE

| HATE CRIME  |            | PERSON COUNT - BIAS MOTIVATION |            |            |               |             |             |            |                    |                |           | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|-------------|------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT   | Anti-Transgender               | Anti-Asian | Anti-Black | Anti-Hispanic | Anti-Jewish | Anti-Female | Anti-White | Sexual Orientation | Anti-Christian | Anti-Arab |                 |
| A           | Central    | 0.0%                           | 0.0%       | 0.0%       | 0.0%          | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%       | 0.0%               | 0.0%           | 0.0%      | 0.0%            |
| B           | Southern   | 21.4%                          | 0.0%       | 0.0%       | 7.1%          | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%       | 0.0%               | 0.0%           | 0.0%      | 28.6%           |
| C           | Bayview    | 0.0%                           | 0.0%       | 0.0%       | 0.0%          | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%       | 0.0%               | 0.0%           | 0.0%      | 0.0%            |
| D           | Mission    | 21.4%                          | 0.0%       | 0.0%       | 7.1%          | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%       | 7.1%               | 0.0%           | 0.0%      | 35.7%           |
| E           | Northern   | 0.0%                           | 0.0%       | 0.0%       | 0.0%          | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%       | 0.0%               | 0.0%           | 0.0%      | 0.0%            |
| F           | Park       | 7.1%                           | 0.0%       | 0.0%       | 0.0%          | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%       | 7.1%               | 0.0%           | 0.0%      | 14.3%           |
| G           | Richmond   | 0.0%                           | 0.0%       | 0.0%       | 0.0%          | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%       | 0.0%               | 0.0%           | 0.0%      | 0.0%            |
| H           | Ingleside  | 0.0%                           | 0.0%       | 0.0%       | 0.0%          | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%       | 0.0%               | 0.0%           | 0.0%      | 0.0%            |
| I           | Taraval    | 0.0%                           | 0.0%       | 7.1%       | 0.0%          | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%       | 0.0%               | 7.1%           | 0.0%      | 14.3%           |
| J           | Tenderloin | 0.0%                           | 0.0%       | 7.1%       | 0.0%          | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%       | 0.0%               | 0.0%           | 0.0%      | 7.1%            |
| X           | Out of SF  | 0.0%                           | 0.0%       | 0.0%       | 0.0%          | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%       | 0.0%               | 0.0%           | 0.0%      | 0.0%            |
| Grand Total |            | 50.0%                          | 0.0%       | 14.3%      | 14.3%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%       | 14.3%              | 7.1%           | 0.0%      | 100.0%          |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q2 2023

**HATE CRIME - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE**

| HATE CRIME | PERSON COUNT               |                                |       |                   |        |          |          | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|----------|----------|--------------|
|            | American Indian or Alaskan | Asian/Asian Indian/Other Asian | Black | Hispanic or Latin | White  | Other    | Unknown  |              |
| Q2 2022    | 0                          | 0                              | 2     | 2                 | 7      | 0        | 0        | 11           |
| Q2 2023    | 0                          | 0                              | 2     | 6                 | 1      | 4        | 1        | 14           |
| Difference | 0                          | 0                              | 0     | 4                 | -6     | 4        | 1        | 3            |
| % Change   | not calc                   | not calc                       | 0.0%  | 200.0%            | -85.7% | not calc | not calc | 27.3%        |

**HATE CRIME - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE**

| HATE CRIME | PERSON COUNT |          |        |        |        |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|--------------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------------|
|            | 0-17         | 18-29    | 30-39  | 40-49  | 50-59  | 60+    | Unknown |              |
| Q2 2022    | 1            | 0        | 4      | 1      | 3      | 1      | 1       | 11           |
| Q2 2023    | 0            | 5        | 3      | 2      | 1      | 2      | 1       | 14           |
| Difference | -1           | 5        | -1     | 1      | -2     | 1      | 0       | 3            |
| % Change   | -100.0%      | not calc | -25.0% | 100.0% | -66.7% | 100.0% | 0.0%    | 27.3%        |

**HATE CRIME - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER**

| HATE CRIME | PERSON COUNT |        |           |          |          | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|--------------|--------|-----------|----------|----------|--------------|
|            | Female       | Male   | Nonbinary | OTHERS   | Unknown  |              |
| Q2 2022    | 2            | 9      | 0         | 0        | 0        | 11           |
| Q2 2023    | 5            | 8      | 0         | 0        | 1        | 14           |
| Difference | 3            | -1     | 0         | 0        | 1        | 3            |
| % Change   | 150.0%       | -11.1% | not calc  | not calc | not calc | 27.3%        |

**HATE CRIME - Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY BIAS TYPE**

| HATE CRIME | PERSON COUNT - BIAS MOTIVATION |            |            |               |             |             |            |                    |                |             |            |           | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|------------|--------------------|----------------|-------------|------------|-----------|--------------|
|            | Anti-Transgender               | Anti-Asian | Anti-Black | Anti-Hispanic | Anti-Jewish | Anti-Female | Anti-White | Sexual Orientation | Anti-Christian | Anti-Muslim | Anti-Other | Anti-Arab |              |
| Q2 2022    | 1                              | 0          | 1          | 1             | 2           | 0           | 1          | 4                  | 1              | 0           | 0          | 0         | 11           |
| Q2 2023    | 7                              | 0          | 2          | 2             | 0           | 0           | 0          | 2                  | 1              | 0           | 0          | 0         | 14           |
| Difference | 6                              | 0          | 1          | 1             | -2          | 0           | -1         | -2                 | 0              | 0           | 0          | 0         | 3            |
| % Change   | 600.0%                         | not calc   | 100.0%     | 100.0%        | -100.0%     | not calc    | -100.0%    | -50.0%             | 0.0%           | not calc    | not calc   | not calc  | 27.3%        |

**AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE**

| AGGRAVATED ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |        |                   |        |         |        | PERSON COUNT |
|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------|-------------------|--------|---------|--------|--------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black  | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White  |              |
| A                  | Central              | 1.00                              | 25.00                     | 35.00  | 39.00             | 15.00  | 9.00    | 58.00  | 182.00       |
| B                  | Southern             | 2.00                              | 18.00                     | 65.00  | 71.00             | 21.00  | 4.00    | 69.00  | 250.00       |
| C                  | Bayview              |                                   | 25.00                     | 107.00 | 90.00             | 26.00  | 3.00    | 25.00  | 276.00       |
| D                  | Mission              |                                   | 15.00                     | 34.00  | 172.00            | 18.00  | 13.00   | 66.00  | 318.00       |
| E                  | Northern             | 2.00                              | 32.00                     | 37.00  | 49.00             | 32.00  | 20.00   | 74.00  | 246.00       |
| F                  | Park                 |                                   | 3.00                      | 4.00   | 15.00             | 5.00   | 9.00    | 24.00  | 60.00        |
| G                  | Richmond             |                                   | 16.00                     | 4.00   | 8.00              | 14.00  | 3.00    | 19.00  | 64.00        |
| H                  | Ingleside            | 3.00                              | 46.00                     | 26.00  | 85.00             | 17.00  | 6.00    | 31.00  | 214.00       |
| I                  | Taraval              | 1.00                              | 22.00                     | 13.00  | 24.00             | 1.00   | 2.00    | 22.00  | 85.00        |
| J                  | Tenderloin           | 1.00                              | 31.00                     | 89.00  | 43.00             | 20.00  | 28.00   | 97.00  | 309.00       |
| X                  | Out of SF            |                                   |                           | 2.00   |                   | 1.00   |         | 1.00   | 4.00         |
| Grand Total        |                      | 10.00                             | 233.00                    | 416.00 | 596.00            | 170.00 | 97.00   | 486.00 | 2008.00      |

**AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE**

| AGGRAVATED ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| A                  | Central              | 0.0%                              | 1.2%                      | 1.7%  | 1.9%              | 0.7%   | 0.4%    | 2.9%  | 9.1%         |
| B                  | Southern             | 0.1%                              | 0.9%                      | 3.2%  | 3.5%              | 1.0%   | 0.2%    | 3.4%  | 12.5%        |
| C                  | Bayview              |                                   | 1.2%                      | 5.3%  | 4.5%              | 1.3%   | 0.1%    | 1.2%  | 13.7%        |
| D                  | Mission              |                                   | 0.7%                      | 1.7%  | 8.6%              | 0.9%   | 0.6%    | 3.3%  | 15.8%        |
| E                  | Northern             | 0.1%                              | 1.6%                      | 1.8%  | 2.4%              | 1.6%   | 1.0%    | 3.7%  | 12.3%        |
| F                  | Park                 |                                   | 0.1%                      | 0.2%  | 0.7%              | 0.2%   | 0.4%    | 1.2%  | 3.0%         |
| G                  | Richmond             |                                   | 0.8%                      | 0.2%  | 0.4%              | 0.7%   | 0.1%    | 0.9%  | 3.2%         |
| H                  | Ingleside            | 0.1%                              | 2.3%                      | 1.3%  | 4.2%              | 0.8%   | 0.3%    | 1.5%  | 10.7%        |
| I                  | Taraval              | 0.0%                              | 1.1%                      | 0.6%  | 1.2%              | 0.0%   | 0.1%    | 1.1%  | 4.2%         |
| J                  | Tenderloin           | 0.0%                              | 1.5%                      | 4.4%  | 2.1%              | 1.0%   | 1.4%    | 4.8%  | 15.4%        |
| X                  | Out of SF            |                                   |                           | 0.1%  |                   | 0.0%   |         | 0.0%  | 0.2%         |
| Grand Total        |                      | 0.5%                              | 11.6%                     | 20.7% | 29.7%             | 8.5%   | 4.8%    | 24.2% | 100.0%       |

**AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE**

| AGGRAVATED ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT |        |        |        |        |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|--------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29  | 30-39  | 40-49  | 50-59  | 60+    | Unknown |              |
| A                  | Central              | 6.00         | 43.00  | 46.00  | 24.00  | 25.00  | 18.00  | 20.00   | 182.00       |
| B                  | Southern             | 8.00         | 60.00  | 61.00  | 41.00  | 36.00  | 20.00  | 24.00   | 250.00       |
| C                  | Bayview              | 35.00        | 52.00  | 58.00  | 37.00  | 30.00  | 35.00  | 29.00   | 276.00       |
| D                  | Mission              | 15.00        | 85.00  | 66.00  | 58.00  | 37.00  | 31.00  | 26.00   | 318.00       |
| E                  | Northern             | 20.00        | 57.00  | 50.00  | 33.00  | 23.00  | 27.00  | 36.00   | 246.00       |
| F                  | Park                 | 11.00        | 12.00  | 8.00   | 11.00  | 5.00   | 8.00   | 5.00    | 60.00        |
| G                  | Richmond             | 6.00         | 7.00   | 11.00  | 8.00   | 6.00   | 13.00  | 13.00   | 64.00        |
| H                  | Ingleside            | 30.00        | 43.00  | 46.00  | 33.00  | 18.00  | 31.00  | 13.00   | 214.00       |
| I                  | Taraval              | 11.00        | 21.00  | 17.00  | 11.00  | 8.00   | 13.00  | 4.00    | 85.00        |
| J                  | Tenderloin           | 8.00         | 48.00  | 61.00  | 49.00  | 65.00  | 37.00  | 41.00   | 309.00       |
| X                  | Out of SF            |              | 2.00   | 1.00   |        |        |        | 1.00    | 4.00         |
| Grand Total        |                      | 150.00       | 430.00 | 425.00 | 305.00 | 253.00 | 233.00 | 212.00  | 2008.00      |

#### AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

| AGGRAVATED ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |       |       |         | PERSON COUNT |
|--------------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+   | Unknown |              |
| A                  | Central              | 0.3%         | 2.1%  | 2.3%  | 1.2%  | 1.2%  | 0.9%  | 1.0%    | 9.1%         |
| B                  | Southern             | 0.4%         | 3.0%  | 3.0%  | 2.0%  | 1.8%  | 1.0%  | 1.2%    | 12.5%        |
| C                  | Bayview              | 1.7%         | 2.6%  | 2.9%  | 1.8%  | 1.5%  | 1.7%  | 1.4%    | 13.7%        |
| D                  | Mission              | 0.7%         | 4.2%  | 3.3%  | 2.9%  | 1.8%  | 1.5%  | 1.3%    | 15.8%        |
| E                  | Northern             | 1.0%         | 2.8%  | 2.5%  | 1.6%  | 1.1%  | 1.3%  | 1.8%    | 12.3%        |
| F                  | Park                 | 0.5%         | 0.6%  | 0.4%  | 0.5%  | 0.2%  | 0.4%  | 0.2%    | 3.0%         |
| G                  | Richmond             | 0.3%         | 0.3%  | 0.5%  | 0.4%  | 0.3%  | 0.6%  | 0.6%    | 3.2%         |
| H                  | Ingleside            | 1.5%         | 2.1%  | 2.3%  | 1.6%  | 0.9%  | 1.5%  | 0.6%    | 10.7%        |
| I                  | Taraval              | 0.5%         | 1.0%  | 0.8%  | 0.5%  | 0.4%  | 0.6%  | 0.2%    | 4.2%         |
| J                  | Tenderloin           | 0.4%         | 2.4%  | 3.0%  | 2.4%  | 3.2%  | 1.8%  | 2.0%    | 15.4%        |
| X                  | Out of SF            |              | 0.1%  | 0.0%  |       |       |       | 0.0%    | 0.2%         |
| Grand Total        |                      | 7.5%         | 21.4% | 21.2% | 15.2% | 12.6% | 11.6% | 10.6%   | 100.0%       |

#### AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

| AGGRAVATED ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT |         |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|--------------------|----------------------|--------------|---------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male    | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A                  | Central              | 42.00        | 125.00  |           | 15.00  |         | 182.00       |
| B                  | Southern             | 63.00        | 166.00  | 1.00      | 20.00  |         | 250.00       |
| C                  | Bayview              | 103.00       | 149.00  |           | 22.00  | 2.00    | 276.00       |
| D                  | Mission              | 94.00        | 206.00  |           | 17.00  | 1.00    | 318.00       |
| E                  | Northern             | 79.00        | 139.00  | 1.00      | 26.00  | 1.00    | 246.00       |
| F                  | Park                 | 27.00        | 30.00   |           | 3.00   |         | 60.00        |
| G                  | Richmond             | 18.00        | 33.00   |           | 13.00  |         | 64.00        |
| H                  | Ingleside            | 76.00        | 122.00  | 1.00      | 15.00  |         | 214.00       |
| I                  | Taraval              | 27.00        | 57.00   |           | 1.00   |         | 85.00        |
| J                  | Tenderloin           | 79.00        | 194.00  | 2.00      | 21.00  | 13.00   | 309.00       |
| X                  | Out of SF            | 3.00         | 1.00    |           |        |         | 4.00         |
| Grand Total        |                      | 611.00       | 1222.00 | 5.00      | 153.00 | 17.00   | 2008.00      |

#### AGGRAVATED ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

| AGGRAVATED ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|--------------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A                  | Central              | 2.1%         | 6.2%  |           | 0.7%   |         | 9.1%         |
| B                  | Southern             | 3.1%         | 8.3%  | 0.0%      | 1.0%   |         | 12.5%        |
| C                  | Bayview              | 5.1%         | 7.4%  |           | 1.1%   | 0.1%    | 13.7%        |
| D                  | Mission              | 4.7%         | 10.3% |           | 0.8%   | 0.0%    | 15.8%        |
| E                  | Northern             | 3.9%         | 6.9%  | 0.0%      | 1.3%   | 0.0%    | 12.3%        |
| F                  | Park                 | 1.3%         | 1.5%  |           | 0.1%   |         | 3.0%         |
| G                  | Richmond             | 0.9%         | 1.6%  |           | 0.6%   |         | 3.2%         |
| H                  | Ingleside            | 3.8%         | 6.1%  | 0.0%      | 0.7%   |         | 10.7%        |
| I                  | Taraval              | 1.3%         | 2.8%  |           | 0.0%   |         | 4.2%         |
| J                  | Tenderloin           | 3.9%         | 9.7%  | 0.1%      | 1.0%   | 0.6%    | 15.4%        |
| X                  | Out of SF            | 0.1%         | 0.0%  |           |        |         | 0.2%         |
| Grand Total        |                      | 30.4%        | 60.9% | 0.2%      | 7.6%   | 0.8%    | 100.0%       |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

**AGGRAVATED ASSAULT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE**

| AGGRAVATED ASSAULT | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |        |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
| DISTRICT           | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black  | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022         | 12                                | 229                       | 515    | 626               | 190    | 93      | 499   | 2,164        |
| Q1-Q2 2023         | 10                                | 233                       | 416    | 596               | 170    | 97      | 486   | 2,008        |
| Difference         | -2                                | 4                         | -99    | -30               | -20    | 4       | -13   | -156         |
| % Change           | -16.7%                            | 1.7%                      | -19.2% | -4.8%             | -10.5% | 4.3%    | -2.6% | -7.2%        |

**AGGRAVATED ASSAULT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE**

| AGGRAVATED ASSAULT | PERSON COUNT |       |        |        |       |      |         | PERSON COUNT |
|--------------------|--------------|-------|--------|--------|-------|------|---------|--------------|
|                    | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39  | 40-49  | 50-59 | 60+  | Unknown |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022         | 147          | 436   | 499    | 371    | 258   | 217  | 236     | 2,164        |
| Q1-Q2 2023         | 150          | 430   | 425    | 305    | 253   | 233  | 212     | 2,008        |
| Difference         | 3            | -6    | -74    | -66    | -5    | 16   | -24     | -156         |
| % Change           | 2.0%         | -1.4% | -14.8% | -17.8% | -1.9% | 7.4% | -10.2%  | -7.2%        |

**AGGRAVATED ASSAULT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER**

| AGGRAVATED ASSAULT | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|--------------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
|                    | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022         | 689          | 1,292 | 3         | 172    | 8       | 2,164        |
| Q1-Q2 2023         | 611          | 1,222 | 5         | 153    | 17      | 2,008        |
| Difference         | -78          | -70   | 2         | -19    | 9       | -156         |
| % Change           | -11.3%       | -5.4% | 66.7%     | -11.0% | 112.5%  | -7.2%        |

**BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE**

| BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |        |                   |        |         |        | PERSON COUNT |
|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------|-------------------|--------|---------|--------|--------------|
| DISTRICT              | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black  | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White  |              |
| A                     | Central              |                                   | 47.00                     | 57.00  | 87.00             | 44.00  | 25.00   | 137.00 | 397.00       |
| B                     | Southern             | 6.00                              | 59.00                     | 88.00  | 115.00            | 25.00  | 20.00   | 113.00 | 426.00       |
| C                     | Bayview              |                                   | 37.00                     | 95.00  | 82.00             | 5.00   | 10.00   | 33.00  | 262.00       |
| D                     | Mission              |                                   | 42.00                     | 70.00  | 271.00            | 33.00  | 29.00   | 142.00 | 587.00       |
| E                     | Northern             | 3.00                              | 49.00                     | 78.00  | 85.00             | 27.00  | 16.00   | 126.00 | 384.00       |
| F                     | Park                 |                                   | 13.00                     | 12.00  | 12.00             | 5.00   | 3.00    | 52.00  | 97.00        |
| G                     | Richmond             | 1.00                              | 29.00                     | 15.00  | 18.00             | 5.00   | 19.00   | 46.00  | 133.00       |
| H                     | Ingleside            |                                   | 40.00                     | 36.00  | 104.00            | 11.00  | 8.00    | 56.00  | 255.00       |
| I                     | Taraval              | 4.00                              | 48.00                     | 39.00  | 36.00             | 8.00   | 8.00    | 70.00  | 213.00       |
| J                     | Tenderloin           | 6.00                              | 74.00                     | 130.00 | 100.00            | 39.00  | 34.00   | 157.00 | 540.00       |
| X                     | Out of SF            |                                   | 2.00                      | 7.00   | 8.00              |        | 2.00    | 1.00   | 20.00        |
| Grand Total           |                      | 20.00                             | 440.00                    | 627.00 | 918.00            | 202.00 | 174.00  | 933.00 | 3314.00      |

**BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE**

| BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
| DISTRICT              | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| A                     | Central              |                                   | 1.4%                      | 1.7%  | 2.6%              | 1.3%   | 0.8%    | 4.1%  | 12.0%        |
| B                     | Southern             | 0.2%                              | 1.8%                      | 2.7%  | 3.5%              | 0.8%   | 0.6%    | 3.4%  | 12.9%        |
| C                     | Bayview              |                                   | 1.1%                      | 2.9%  | 2.5%              | 0.2%   | 0.3%    | 1.0%  | 7.9%         |
| D                     | Mission              |                                   | 1.3%                      | 2.1%  | 8.2%              | 1.0%   | 0.9%    | 4.3%  | 17.7%        |
| E                     | Northern             | 0.1%                              | 1.5%                      | 2.4%  | 2.6%              | 0.8%   | 0.5%    | 3.8%  | 11.6%        |
| F                     | Park                 |                                   | 0.4%                      | 0.4%  | 0.4%              | 0.2%   | 0.1%    | 1.6%  | 2.9%         |
| G                     | Richmond             | 0.0%                              | 0.9%                      | 0.5%  | 0.5%              | 0.2%   | 0.6%    | 1.4%  | 4.0%         |
| H                     | Ingleside            |                                   | 1.2%                      | 1.1%  | 3.1%              | 0.3%   | 0.2%    | 1.7%  | 7.7%         |
| I                     | Taraval              | 0.1%                              | 1.4%                      | 1.2%  | 1.1%              | 0.2%   | 0.2%    | 2.1%  | 6.4%         |
| J                     | Tenderloin           | 0.2%                              | 2.2%                      | 3.9%  | 3.0%              | 1.2%   | 1.0%    | 4.7%  | 16.3%        |
| X                     | Out of SF            |                                   | 0.1%                      | 0.2%  | 0.2%              |        | 0.1%    | 0.0%  | 0.6%         |
| Grand Total           |                      | 0.6%                              | 13.3%                     | 18.9% | 27.7%             | 6.1%   | 5.3%    | 28.2% | 100.0%       |

**BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE**

| BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT |        |        |        |        |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT              | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29  | 30-39  | 40-49  | 50-59  | 60+    | Unknown |              |
| A                     | Central              | 12.00        | 95.00  | 101.00 | 56.00  | 55.00  | 34.00  | 44.00   | 397.00       |
| B                     | Southern             | 22.00        | 106.00 | 108.00 | 68.00  | 51.00  | 39.00  | 32.00   | 426.00       |
| C                     | Bayview              | 32.00        | 53.00  | 58.00  | 37.00  | 43.00  | 31.00  | 8.00    | 262.00       |
| D                     | Mission              | 54.00        | 153.00 | 126.00 | 97.00  | 66.00  | 44.00  | 47.00   | 587.00       |
| E                     | Northern             | 35.00        | 91.00  | 83.00  | 48.00  | 54.00  | 39.00  | 34.00   | 384.00       |
| F                     | Park                 | 8.00         | 24.00  | 21.00  | 16.00  | 13.00  | 10.00  | 5.00    | 97.00        |
| G                     | Richmond             | 14.00        | 24.00  | 29.00  | 21.00  | 16.00  | 20.00  | 9.00    | 133.00       |
| H                     | Ingleside            | 37.00        | 37.00  | 51.00  | 38.00  | 40.00  | 38.00  | 14.00   | 255.00       |
| I                     | Taraval              | 41.00        | 34.00  | 31.00  | 39.00  | 21.00  | 37.00  | 10.00   | 213.00       |
| J                     | Tenderloin           | 16.00        | 100.00 | 121.00 | 100.00 | 81.00  | 73.00  | 49.00   | 540.00       |
| X                     | Out of SF            | 5.00         | 6.00   | 4.00   | 1.00   | 1.00   | 3.00   |         | 20.00        |
| Grand Total           |                      | 276.00       | 723.00 | 733.00 | 521.00 | 441.00 | 368.00 | 252.00  | 3314.00      |

#### BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

| BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |       |       |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT              | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+   | Unknown |              |
| A                     | Central              | 0.4%         | 2.9%  | 3.0%  | 1.7%  | 1.7%  | 1.0%  | 1.3%    | 12.0%        |
| B                     | Southern             | 0.7%         | 3.2%  | 3.3%  | 2.1%  | 1.5%  | 1.2%  | 1.0%    | 12.9%        |
| C                     | Bayview              | 1.0%         | 1.6%  | 1.8%  | 1.1%  | 1.3%  | 0.9%  | 0.2%    | 7.9%         |
| D                     | Mission              | 1.6%         | 4.6%  | 3.8%  | 2.9%  | 2.0%  | 1.3%  | 1.4%    | 17.7%        |
| E                     | Northern             | 1.1%         | 2.7%  | 2.5%  | 1.4%  | 1.6%  | 1.2%  | 1.0%    | 11.6%        |
| F                     | Park                 | 0.2%         | 0.7%  | 0.6%  | 0.5%  | 0.4%  | 0.3%  | 0.2%    | 2.9%         |
| G                     | Richmond             | 0.4%         | 0.7%  | 0.9%  | 0.6%  | 0.5%  | 0.6%  | 0.3%    | 4.0%         |
| H                     | Ingleside            | 1.1%         | 1.1%  | 1.5%  | 1.1%  | 1.2%  | 1.1%  | 0.4%    | 7.7%         |
| I                     | Taraval              | 1.2%         | 1.0%  | 0.9%  | 1.2%  | 0.6%  | 1.1%  | 0.3%    | 6.4%         |
| J                     | Tenderloin           | 0.5%         | 3.0%  | 3.7%  | 3.0%  | 2.4%  | 2.2%  | 1.5%    | 16.3%        |
| X                     | Out of SF            | 0.2%         | 0.2%  | 0.1%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.1%  |         | 0.6%         |
| Grand Total           |                      | 8.3%         | 21.8% | 22.1% | 15.7% | 13.3% | 11.1% | 7.6%    | 100.0%       |

#### BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

| BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT |         |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------|---------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT              | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male    | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A                     | Central              | 138.00       | 216.00  |           | 41.00  | 2.00    | 397.00       |
| B                     | Southern             | 183.00       | 217.00  | 1.00      | 23.00  | 2.00    | 426.00       |
| C                     | Bayview              | 143.00       | 114.00  |           | 5.00   |         | 262.00       |
| D                     | Mission              | 232.00       | 324.00  | 1.00      | 29.00  | 1.00    | 587.00       |
| E                     | Northern             | 162.00       | 194.00  |           | 25.00  | 3.00    | 384.00       |
| F                     | Park                 | 41.00        | 52.00   | 1.00      | 3.00   |         | 97.00        |
| G                     | Richmond             | 58.00        | 68.00   |           | 5.00   | 2.00    | 133.00       |
| H                     | Ingleside            | 133.00       | 108.00  | 1.00      | 11.00  | 2.00    | 255.00       |
| I                     | Taraval              | 109.00       | 97.00   | 1.00      | 6.00   |         | 213.00       |
| J                     | Tenderloin           | 212.00       | 288.00  | 2.00      | 37.00  | 1.00    | 540.00       |
| X                     | Out of SF            | 16.00        | 4.00    |           |        |         | 20.00        |
| Grand Total           |                      | 1427.00      | 1682.00 | 7.00      | 185.00 | 13.00   | 3314.00      |

#### BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

| BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT              | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A                     | Central              | 4.2%         | 6.5%  |           | 1.2%   | 0.1%    | 12.0%        |
| B                     | Southern             | 5.5%         | 6.5%  | 0.0%      | 0.7%   | 0.1%    | 12.9%        |
| C                     | Bayview              | 4.3%         | 3.4%  |           | 0.2%   |         | 7.9%         |
| D                     | Mission              | 7.0%         | 9.8%  | 0.0%      | 0.9%   | 0.0%    | 17.7%        |
| E                     | Northern             | 4.9%         | 5.9%  |           | 0.8%   | 0.1%    | 11.6%        |
| F                     | Park                 | 1.2%         | 1.6%  | 0.0%      | 0.1%   |         | 2.9%         |
| G                     | Richmond             | 1.8%         | 2.1%  |           | 0.2%   | 0.1%    | 4.0%         |
| H                     | Ingleside            | 4.0%         | 3.3%  | 0.0%      | 0.3%   | 0.1%    | 7.7%         |
| I                     | Taraval              | 3.3%         | 2.9%  | 0.0%      | 0.2%   |         | 6.4%         |
| J                     | Tenderloin           | 6.4%         | 8.7%  | 0.1%      | 1.1%   | 0.0%    | 16.3%        |
| X                     | Out of SF            | 0.5%         | 0.1%  |           |        |         | 0.6%         |
| Grand Total           |                      | 43.1%        | 50.8% | 0.2%      | 5.6%   | 0.4%    | 100.0%       |



Victim Demographic Report  
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

**BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE**

| BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT DISTRICT | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
|                                | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022                     | 15                                | 453                       | 578   | 752               | 170    | 170     | 902   | 3,040        |
| Q1-Q2 2023                     | 20                                | 440                       | 627   | 918               | 202    | 174     | 933   | 3,314        |
| Difference                     | 5                                 | -13                       | 49    | 166               | 32     | 4       | 31    | 274          |
| % Change                       | 33.3%                             | -2.9%                     | 8.5%  | 22.1%             | 18.8%  | 2.4%    | 3.4%  | 9.0%         |

**BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE**

| BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |       |      |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-----------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|---------|--------------|
|                       | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+  | Unknown |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022            | 198          | 641   | 692   | 577   | 358   | 342  | 232     | 3,040        |
| Q1-Q2 2023            | 276          | 723   | 733   | 521   | 441   | 368  | 252     | 3,314        |
| Difference            | 78           | 82    | 41    | -56   | 83    | 26   | 20      | 274          |
| % Change              | 39.4%        | 12.8% | 5.9%  | -9.7% | 23.2% | 7.6% | 8.6%    | 9.0%         |

**BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER**

| BATTERY/OTHER ASSAULT | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-----------------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
|                       | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022            | 1,335        | 1,524 | 3         | 157    | 21      | 3,040        |
| Q1-Q2 2023            | 1,427        | 1,682 | 7         | 185    | 13      | 3,314        |
| Difference            | 92           | 158   | 4         | 28     | -8      | 274          |
| % Change              | 6.9%         | 10.4% | 133.3%    | 17.8%  | -38.1%  | 9.0%         |

**ROBBERY VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE**

| ROBBERY     |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |        |                   |        |         |        | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------|-------------------|--------|---------|--------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black  | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White  |              |
| A           | Central              | 2.00                              | 51.00                     | 26.00  | 51.00             | 69.00  | 13.00   | 50.00  | 262.00       |
| B           | Southern             | 2.00                              | 30.00                     | 27.00  | 77.00             | 29.00  | 14.00   | 48.00  | 227.00       |
| C           | Bayview              |                                   | 43.00                     | 23.00  | 109.00            | 40.00  | 2.00    | 20.00  | 237.00       |
| D           | Mission              | 3.00                              | 19.00                     | 15.00  | 137.00            | 32.00  | 8.00    | 43.00  | 257.00       |
| E           | Northern             | 3.00                              | 41.00                     | 12.00  | 53.00             | 32.00  | 10.00   | 77.00  | 228.00       |
| F           | Park                 |                                   | 17.00                     | 3.00   | 4.00              | 15.00  | 2.00    | 26.00  | 67.00        |
| G           | Richmond             |                                   | 29.00                     | 3.00   | 17.00             | 35.00  | 8.00    | 39.00  | 131.00       |
| H           | Ingleside            | 1.00                              | 53.00                     | 21.00  | 96.00             | 32.00  | 4.00    | 22.00  | 229.00       |
| I           | Taraval              |                                   | 45.00                     | 5.00   | 28.00             | 21.00  | 1.00    | 20.00  | 120.00       |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 2.00                              | 34.00                     | 50.00  | 55.00             | 55.00  | 24.00   | 69.00  | 289.00       |
| X           | Out of SF            |                                   | 1.00                      |        |                   |        |         | 1.00   | 2.00         |
| Grand Total |                      | 13.00                             | 363.00                    | 185.00 | 627.00            | 360.00 | 86.00   | 415.00 | 2049.00      |

**ROBBERY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE**

| ROBBERY     |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       |        | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |        |              |
| A           | Central              | 0.1%                              | 2.5%                      | 1.3%  | 2.5%              | 3.4%   | 0.6%    | 2.4%  | 12.8%  |              |
| B           | Southern             | 0.1%                              | 1.5%                      | 1.3%  | 3.8%              | 1.4%   | 0.7%    | 2.3%  | 11.1%  |              |
| C           | Bayview              |                                   | 2.1%                      | 1.1%  | 5.3%              | 2.0%   | 0.1%    | 1.0%  | 11.6%  |              |
| D           | Mission              | 0.1%                              | 0.9%                      | 0.7%  | 6.7%              | 1.6%   | 0.4%    | 2.1%  | 12.5%  |              |
| E           | Northern             | 0.1%                              | 2.0%                      | 0.6%  | 2.6%              | 1.6%   | 0.5%    | 3.8%  | 11.1%  |              |
| F           | Park                 |                                   | 0.8%                      | 0.1%  | 0.2%              | 0.7%   | 0.1%    | 1.3%  | 3.3%   |              |
| G           | Richmond             |                                   | 1.4%                      | 0.1%  | 0.8%              | 1.7%   | 0.4%    | 1.9%  | 6.4%   |              |
| H           | Ingleside            | 0.0%                              | 2.6%                      | 1.0%  | 4.7%              | 1.6%   | 0.2%    | 1.1%  | 11.2%  |              |
| I           | Taraval              |                                   | 2.2%                      | 0.2%  | 1.4%              | 1.0%   | 0.0%    | 1.0%  | 5.9%   |              |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 0.1%                              | 1.7%                      | 2.4%  | 2.7%              | 2.7%   | 1.2%    | 3.4%  | 14.1%  |              |
| X           | Out of SF            |                                   | 0.0%                      |       |                   |        |         | 0.0%  | 0.1%   |              |
| Grand Total |                      | 0.6%                              | 17.7%                     | 9.0%  | 30.6%             | 17.6%  | 4.2%    | 20.3% | 100.0% |              |

**ROBBERY VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE**

| ROBBERY     |                      | PERSON COUNT |        |        |        |        |        |         |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29  | 30-39  | 40-49  | 50-59  | 60+    | Unknown |         |              |
| A           | Central              | 7.00         | 66.00  | 33.00  | 31.00  | 30.00  | 25.00  | 70.00   | 262.00  |              |
| B           | Southern             | 7.00         | 73.00  | 49.00  | 25.00  | 28.00  | 21.00  | 24.00   | 227.00  |              |
| C           | Bayview              | 23.00        | 49.00  | 37.00  | 46.00  | 30.00  | 16.00  | 36.00   | 237.00  |              |
| D           | Mission              | 16.00        | 68.00  | 64.00  | 37.00  | 23.00  | 17.00  | 32.00   | 257.00  |              |
| E           | Northern             | 21.00        | 59.00  | 42.00  | 27.00  | 29.00  | 23.00  | 27.00   | 228.00  |              |
| F           | Park                 | 5.00         | 11.00  | 9.00   | 11.00  | 9.00   | 8.00   | 14.00   | 67.00   |              |
| G           | Richmond             | 16.00        | 26.00  | 17.00  | 13.00  | 11.00  | 12.00  | 36.00   | 131.00  |              |
| H           | Ingleside            | 31.00        | 43.00  | 39.00  | 34.00  | 30.00  | 21.00  | 31.00   | 229.00  |              |
| I           | Taraval              | 21.00        | 25.00  | 17.00  | 17.00  | 11.00  | 7.00   | 22.00   | 120.00  |              |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 5.00         | 68.00  | 54.00  | 34.00  | 39.00  | 20.00  | 69.00   | 289.00  |              |
| X           | Out of SF            |              |        | 2.00   |        |        |        |         | 2.00    |              |
| Grand Total |                      | 152.00       | 488.00 | 363.00 | 275.00 | 240.00 | 170.00 | 361.00  | 2049.00 |              |

#### ROBBERY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

| ROBBERY     |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |       |       |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+   | Unknown |              |
| A           | Central              |              | 0.3%  |       | 3.2%  | 1.6%  | 1.5%  | 1.2%    | 3.4%         |
| B           | Southern             |              | 0.3%  |       | 3.6%  | 2.4%  | 1.2%  | 1.4%    | 1.0%         |
| C           | Bayview              |              | 1.1%  |       | 2.4%  | 1.8%  | 2.2%  | 1.5%    | 0.8%         |
| D           | Mission              |              | 0.8%  |       | 3.3%  | 3.1%  | 1.8%  | 1.1%    | 0.8%         |
| E           | Northern             |              | 1.0%  |       | 2.9%  | 2.0%  | 1.3%  | 1.4%    | 1.1%         |
| F           | Park                 |              | 0.2%  |       | 0.5%  | 0.4%  | 0.5%  | 0.4%    | 0.4%         |
| G           | Richmond             |              | 0.8%  |       | 1.3%  | 0.8%  | 0.6%  | 0.5%    | 0.6%         |
| H           | Ingleside            |              | 1.5%  |       | 2.1%  | 1.9%  | 1.7%  | 1.5%    | 1.0%         |
| I           | Taraval              |              | 1.0%  |       | 1.2%  | 0.8%  | 0.8%  | 0.5%    | 0.3%         |
| J           | Tenderloin           |              | 0.2%  |       | 3.3%  | 2.6%  | 1.7%  | 1.9%    | 1.0%         |
| X           | Out of SF            |              |       |       | 0.1%  |       |       |         |              |
| Grand Total |                      |              | 7.4%  | 23.8% | 17.7% | 13.4% | 11.7% | 8.3%    | 17.6%        |

#### ROBBERY VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

| ROBBERY     |                      | PERSON COUNT |         |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|---------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male    | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A           | Central              | 67.00        | 129.00  |           | 66.00  |         | 262.00       |
| B           | Southern             | 66.00        | 132.00  |           | 28.00  | 1.00    | 227.00       |
| C           | Bayview              | 76.00        | 121.00  |           | 40.00  |         | 237.00       |
| D           | Mission              | 71.00        | 153.00  | 1.00      | 32.00  |         | 257.00       |
| E           | Northern             | 76.00        | 119.00  | 2.00      | 31.00  |         | 228.00       |
| F           | Park                 | 21.00        | 31.00   |           | 15.00  |         | 67.00        |
| G           | Richmond             | 42.00        | 54.00   |           | 33.00  | 2.00    | 131.00       |
| H           | Ingleside            | 77.00        | 120.00  |           | 32.00  |         | 229.00       |
| I           | Taraval              | 43.00        | 56.00   |           | 21.00  |         | 120.00       |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 68.00        | 152.00  | 2.00      | 53.00  | 14.00   | 289.00       |
| X           | Out of SF            |              | 2.00    |           |        |         | 2.00         |
| Grand Total |                      | 607.00       | 1069.00 | 5.00      | 351.00 | 17.00   | 2049.00      |

#### ROBBERY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

| ROBBERY     |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A           | Central              | 3.3%         | 6.3%  |           | 3.2%   |         | 12.8%        |
| B           | Southern             | 3.2%         | 6.4%  |           | 1.4%   | 0.0%    | 11.1%        |
| C           | Bayview              | 3.7%         | 5.9%  |           | 2.0%   |         | 11.6%        |
| D           | Mission              | 3.5%         | 7.5%  | 0.0%      | 1.6%   |         | 12.5%        |
| E           | Northern             | 3.7%         | 5.8%  | 0.1%      | 1.5%   |         | 11.1%        |
| F           | Park                 | 1.0%         | 1.5%  |           | 0.7%   |         | 3.3%         |
| G           | Richmond             | 2.0%         | 2.6%  |           | 1.6%   | 0.1%    | 6.4%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 3.8%         | 5.9%  |           | 1.6%   |         | 11.2%        |
| I           | Taraval              | 2.1%         | 2.7%  |           | 1.0%   |         | 5.9%         |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 3.3%         | 7.4%  | 0.1%      | 2.6%   | 0.7%    | 14.1%        |
| X           | Out of SF            |              | 0.1%  |           |        |         | 0.1%         |
| Grand Total |                      | 29.6%        | 52.2% | 0.2%      | 17.1%  | 0.8%    | 100.0%       |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

**ROBBERY - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE**

| ROBBERY    | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
| DISTRICT   | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022 | 15                                | 289                       | 186   | 470               | 343    | 102     | 423   | 1,828        |
| Q1-Q2 2023 | 13                                | 363                       | 185   | 627               | 360    | 86      | 415   | 2,049        |
| Difference | -2                                | 74                        | -1    | 157               | 17     | -16     | -8    | 221          |
| % Change   | -13.3%                            | 25.6%                     | -0.5% | 33.4%             | 5.0%   | -15.7%  | -1.9% | 12.1%        |

**ROBBERY - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE**

| ROBBERY    | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |       |       |         | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|--------------|
|            | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+   | Unknown |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022 | 65           | 464   | 345   | 273   | 176   | 187   | 318     | 1,828        |
| Q1-Q2 2023 | 152          | 488   | 363   | 275   | 240   | 170   | 361     | 2,049        |
| Difference | 87           | 24    | 18    | 2     | 64    | -17   | 43      | 221          |
| % Change   | 133.8%       | 5.2%  | 5.2%  | 0.7%  | 36.4% | -9.1% | 13.5%   | 12.1%        |

**ROBBERY - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER**

| ROBBERY    | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
|            | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022 | 502          | 969   | 2         | 340    | 15      | 1,828        |
| Q1-Q2 2023 | 607          | 1,069 | 5         | 351    | 17      | 2,049        |
| Difference | 105          | 100   | 3         | 11     | 2       | 221          |
| % Change   | 20.9%        | 10.3% | 150.0%    | 3.2%   | 13.3%   | 12.1%        |

#### BURGLARY VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

| BURGLARY    |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |        |                   |         |         |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------|-------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black  | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS  | Unknown | White   |              |
| A           | Central              | 3.00                              | 76.00                     | 20.00  | 30.00             | 298.00  | 46.00   | 117.00  | 590.00       |
| B           | Southern             | 7.00                              | 53.00                     | 28.00  | 38.00             | 297.00  | 37.00   | 109.00  | 569.00       |
| C           | Bayview              | 1.00                              | 41.00                     | 31.00  | 45.00             | 126.00  | 13.00   | 67.00   | 324.00       |
| D           | Mission              | 6.00                              | 44.00                     | 17.00  | 51.00             | 162.00  | 30.00   | 164.00  | 474.00       |
| E           | Northern             | 6.00                              | 97.00                     | 22.00  | 40.00             | 281.00  | 78.00   | 254.00  | 778.00       |
| F           | Park                 | 2.00                              | 32.00                     | 9.00   | 10.00             | 56.00   | 22.00   | 124.00  | 255.00       |
| G           | Richmond             |                                   | 42.00                     | 17.00  | 15.00             | 90.00   | 19.00   | 119.00  | 302.00       |
| H           | Ingleside            | 7.00                              | 98.00                     | 14.00  | 39.00             | 82.00   | 16.00   | 174.00  | 430.00       |
| I           | Taraval              | 2.00                              | 112.00                    | 13.00  | 23.00             | 105.00  | 16.00   | 133.00  | 404.00       |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 2.00                              | 11.00                     | 23.00  | 8.00              | 93.00   | 18.00   | 34.00   | 189.00       |
| X           | Out of SF            |                                   |                           |        | 1.00              |         |         | 1.00    | 2.00         |
| Grand Total |                      | 36.00                             | 606.00                    | 194.00 | 300.00            | 1590.00 | 295.00  | 1296.00 | 4317.00      |

#### BURGLARY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

| BURGLARY    |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       |        | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |        |              |
| A           | Central              | 0.1%                              | 1.8%                      | 0.5%  | 0.7%              | 6.9%   | 1.1%    | 2.7%  | 13.7%  |              |
| B           | Southern             | 0.2%                              | 1.2%                      | 0.6%  | 0.9%              | 6.9%   | 0.9%    | 2.5%  | 13.2%  |              |
| C           | Bayview              | 0.0%                              | 0.9%                      | 0.7%  | 1.0%              | 2.9%   | 0.3%    | 1.6%  | 7.5%   |              |
| D           | Mission              | 0.1%                              | 1.0%                      | 0.4%  | 1.2%              | 3.8%   | 0.7%    | 3.8%  | 11.0%  |              |
| E           | Northern             | 0.1%                              | 2.2%                      | 0.5%  | 0.9%              | 6.5%   | 1.8%    | 5.9%  | 18.0%  |              |
| F           | Park                 | 0.0%                              | 0.7%                      | 0.2%  | 0.2%              | 1.3%   | 0.5%    | 2.9%  | 5.9%   |              |
| G           | Richmond             |                                   | 1.0%                      | 0.4%  | 0.3%              | 2.1%   | 0.4%    | 2.8%  | 7.0%   |              |
| H           | Ingleside            | 0.2%                              | 2.3%                      | 0.3%  | 0.9%              | 1.9%   | 0.4%    | 4.0%  | 10.0%  |              |
| I           | Taraval              | 0.0%                              | 2.6%                      | 0.3%  | 0.5%              | 2.4%   | 0.4%    | 3.1%  | 9.4%   |              |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 0.0%                              | 0.3%                      | 0.5%  | 0.2%              | 2.2%   | 0.4%    | 0.8%  | 4.4%   |              |
| X           | Out of SF            |                                   |                           |       | 0.0%              |        |         | 0.0%  | 0.0%   |              |
| Grand Total |                      | 0.8%                              | 14.0%                     | 4.5%  | 6.9%              | 36.8%  | 6.8%    | 30.0% | 100.0% |              |

#### BURGLARY VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

| BURGLARY    |                      | PERSON COUNT |        |        |        |        |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29  | 30-39  | 40-49  | 50-59  | 60+    | Unknown |              |
| A           | Central              | 5.00         | 64.00  | 54.00  | 41.00  | 60.00  | 54.00  | 312.00  | 590.00       |
| B           | Southern             | 7.00         | 41.00  | 78.00  | 70.00  | 42.00  | 27.00  | 304.00  | 569.00       |
| C           | Bayview              | 8.00         | 24.00  | 50.00  | 43.00  | 33.00  | 41.00  | 125.00  | 324.00       |
| D           | Mission              | 2.00         | 33.00  | 99.00  | 74.00  | 54.00  | 59.00  | 153.00  | 474.00       |
| E           | Northern             | 9.00         | 115.00 | 135.00 | 89.00  | 53.00  | 88.00  | 289.00  | 778.00       |
| F           | Park                 | 2.00         | 34.00  | 63.00  | 47.00  | 26.00  | 33.00  | 50.00   | 255.00       |
| G           | Richmond             |              | 26.00  | 60.00  | 50.00  | 37.00  | 47.00  | 82.00   | 302.00       |
| H           | Ingleside            | 13.00        | 30.00  | 89.00  | 73.00  | 54.00  | 98.00  | 73.00   | 430.00       |
| I           | Taraval              | 8.00         | 29.00  | 73.00  | 62.00  | 61.00  | 69.00  | 102.00  | 404.00       |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 1.00         | 8.00   | 21.00  | 18.00  | 28.00  | 14.00  | 99.00   | 189.00       |
| X           | Out of SF            |              | 1.00   | 1.00   |        |        |        |         | 2.00         |
| Grand Total |                      | 55.00        | 405.00 | 723.00 | 567.00 | 448.00 | 530.00 | 1589.00 | 4317.00      |

**BURGLARY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE**

| BURGLARY    |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |       |       |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+   | Unknown |              |
| A           | Central              | 0.1%         | 1.5%  | 1.3%  | 0.9%  | 1.4%  | 1.3%  | 7.2%    | 13.7%        |
| B           | Southern             | 0.2%         | 0.9%  | 1.8%  | 1.6%  | 1.0%  | 0.6%  | 7.0%    | 13.2%        |
| C           | Bayview              | 0.2%         | 0.6%  | 1.2%  | 1.0%  | 0.8%  | 0.9%  | 2.9%    | 7.5%         |
| D           | Mission              | 0.0%         | 0.8%  | 2.3%  | 1.7%  | 1.3%  | 1.4%  | 3.5%    | 11.0%        |
| E           | Northern             | 0.2%         | 2.7%  | 3.1%  | 2.1%  | 1.2%  | 2.0%  | 6.7%    | 18.0%        |
| F           | Park                 | 0.0%         | 0.8%  | 1.5%  | 1.1%  | 0.6%  | 0.8%  | 1.2%    | 5.9%         |
| G           | Richmond             |              | 0.6%  | 1.4%  | 1.2%  | 0.9%  | 1.1%  | 1.9%    | 7.0%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 0.3%         | 0.7%  | 2.1%  | 1.7%  | 1.3%  | 2.3%  | 1.7%    | 10.0%        |
| I           | Taraval              | 0.2%         | 0.7%  | 1.7%  | 1.4%  | 1.4%  | 1.6%  | 2.4%    | 9.4%         |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 0.0%         | 0.2%  | 0.5%  | 0.4%  | 0.6%  | 0.3%  | 2.3%    | 4.4%         |
| X           | Out of SF            |              | 0.0%  | 0.0%  |       |       |       |         | 0.0%         |
| Grand Total |                      | 1.3%         | 9.4%  | 16.7% | 13.1% | 10.4% | 12.3% | 36.8%   | 100.0%       |

**BURGLARY VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER**

| BURGLARY    |                      | PERSON COUNT |         |           |         |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|---------|-----------|---------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male    | Nonbinary | OTHERS  | Unknown |              |
| A           | Central              | 101.00       | 177.00  |           | 289.00  | 23.00   | 590.00       |
| B           | Southern             | 93.00        | 170.00  |           | 290.00  | 16.00   | 569.00       |
| C           | Bayview              | 78.00        | 121.00  |           | 121.00  | 4.00    | 324.00       |
| D           | Mission              | 103.00       | 221.00  |           | 148.00  | 2.00    | 474.00       |
| E           | Northern             | 210.00       | 284.00  | 2.00      | 265.00  | 17.00   | 778.00       |
| F           | Park                 | 72.00        | 134.00  |           | 48.00   | 1.00    | 255.00       |
| G           | Richmond             | 86.00        | 136.00  |           | 80.00   |         | 302.00       |
| H           | Ingleside            | 132.00       | 221.00  | 1.00      | 73.00   | 3.00    | 430.00       |
| I           | Taraval              | 134.00       | 171.00  |           | 97.00   | 2.00    | 404.00       |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 34.00        | 53.00   | 2.00      | 93.00   | 7.00    | 189.00       |
| X           | Out of SF            | 2.00         |         |           |         |         | 2.00         |
| Grand Total |                      | 1045.00      | 1688.00 | 5.00      | 1504.00 | 75.00   | 4317.00      |

**BURGLARY VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER**

| BURGLARY    |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A           | Central              | 2.3%         | 4.1%  |           | 6.7%   | 0.5%    | 13.7%        |
| B           | Southern             | 2.2%         | 3.9%  |           | 6.7%   | 0.4%    | 13.2%        |
| C           | Bayview              | 1.8%         | 2.8%  |           | 2.8%   | 0.1%    | 7.5%         |
| D           | Mission              | 2.4%         | 5.1%  |           | 3.4%   | 0.0%    | 11.0%        |
| E           | Northern             | 4.9%         | 6.6%  | 0.0%      | 6.1%   | 0.4%    | 18.0%        |
| F           | Park                 | 1.7%         | 3.1%  |           | 1.1%   | 0.0%    | 5.9%         |
| G           | Richmond             | 2.0%         | 3.2%  |           | 1.9%   |         | 7.0%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 3.1%         | 5.1%  | 0.0%      | 1.7%   | 0.1%    | 10.0%        |
| I           | Taraval              | 3.1%         | 4.0%  |           | 2.2%   | 0.0%    | 9.4%         |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 0.8%         | 1.2%  | 0.0%      | 2.2%   | 0.2%    | 4.4%         |
| X           | Out of SF            | 0.0%         |       |           |        |         | 0.0%         |
| Grand Total |                      | 24.2%        | 39.1% | 0.1%      | 34.8%  | 1.7%    | 100.0%       |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

**BURGLARY - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE**

| BURGLARY   | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |        | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|--------|--------------|
|            | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White  |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022 | 24                                | 648                       | 189   | 318               | 1,407  | 323     | 1,561  | <b>4,470</b> |
| Q1-Q2 2023 | 36                                | 606                       | 194   | 300               | 1,590  | 295     | 1,296  | <b>4,317</b> |
| Difference | 12                                | -42                       | 5     | -18               | 183    | -28     | -265   | <b>-153</b>  |
| % Change   | 50.0%                             | -6.5%                     | 2.6%  | -5.7%             | 13.0%  | -8.7%   | -17.0% | <b>-3.4%</b> |

**BURGLARY - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE**

| BURGLARY   | PERSON COUNT |       |       |        |        |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|--------------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------------|
|            | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49  | 50-59  | 60+    | Unknown |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022 | 55           | 391   | 775   | 655    | 528    | 656    | 1,410   | <b>4,470</b> |
| Q1-Q2 2023 | 55           | 405   | 723   | 567    | 448    | 530    | 1,589   | <b>4,317</b> |
| Difference | 0            | 14    | -52   | -88    | -80    | -126   | 179     | <b>-153</b>  |
| % Change   | 0.0%         | 3.6%  | -6.7% | -13.4% | -15.2% | -19.2% | 12.7%   | <b>-3.4%</b> |

**BURGLARY - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER**

| BURGLARY   | PERSON COUNT |        |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|--------------|--------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
|            | Female       | Male   | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022 | 1,136        | 1,975  | 3         | 1,267  | 89      | <b>4,470</b> |
| Q1-Q2 2023 | 1,045        | 1,688  | 5         | 1,504  | 75      | <b>4,317</b> |
| Difference | -91          | -287   | 2         | 237    | -14     | <b>-153</b>  |
| % Change   | -8.0%        | -14.5% | 66.7%     | 18.7%  | -15.7%  | <b>-3.4%</b> |

#### LARCENY THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

| LARCENY THEFT |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |        |                   |         |         |         | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------|-------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT      | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black  | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS  | Unknown | White   |              |
| A             | Central              | 21.00                             | 977.00                    | 172.00 | 537.00            | 2723.00 | 256.00  | 1977.00 | 6663.00      |
| B             | Southern             | 16.00                             | 335.00                    | 110.00 | 149.00            | 650.00  | 98.00   | 498.00  | 1856.00      |
| C             | Bayview              | 4.00                              | 173.00                    | 107.00 | 154.00            | 291.00  | 57.00   | 176.00  | 962.00       |
| D             | Mission              | 8.00                              | 187.00                    | 72.00  | 257.00            | 595.00  | 87.00   | 474.00  | 1680.00      |
| E             | Northern             | 15.00                             | 635.00                    | 138.00 | 306.00            | 1565.00 | 181.00  | 1332.00 | 4172.00      |
| F             | Park                 | 2.00                              | 142.00                    | 28.00  | 58.00             | 401.00  | 71.00   | 418.00  | 1120.00      |
| G             | Richmond             | 10.00                             | 424.00                    | 53.00  | 148.00            | 1147.00 | 87.00   | 770.00  | 2639.00      |
| H             | Ingleside            | 7.00                              | 222.00                    | 54.00  | 210.00            | 458.00  | 44.00   | 252.00  | 1247.00      |
| I             | Taraval              | 8.00                              | 377.00                    | 53.00  | 120.00            | 559.00  | 66.00   | 407.00  | 1590.00      |
| J             | Tenderloin           | 3.00                              | 114.00                    | 80.00  | 76.00             | 400.00  | 45.00   | 213.00  | 931.00       |
| X             | Out of SF            | 44.00                             | 14.00                     | 24.00  | 81.00             | 10.00   | 102.00  | 275.00  | 275.00       |
| Grand Total   |                      | 94.00                             | 3630.00                   | 881.00 | 2039.00           | 8870.00 | 1002.00 | 6619.00 | 23135.00     |

#### LARCENY THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

| LARCENY THEFT |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
| DISTRICT      | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| A             | Central              | 0.1%                              | 4.2%                      | 0.7%  | 2.3%              | 11.8%  | 1.1%    | 8.5%  | 28.8%        |
| B             | Southern             | 0.1%                              | 1.4%                      | 0.5%  | 0.6%              | 2.8%   | 0.4%    | 2.2%  | 8.0%         |
| C             | Bayview              | 0.0%                              | 0.7%                      | 0.5%  | 0.7%              | 1.3%   | 0.2%    | 0.8%  | 4.2%         |
| D             | Mission              | 0.0%                              | 0.8%                      | 0.3%  | 1.1%              | 2.6%   | 0.4%    | 2.0%  | 7.3%         |
| E             | Northern             | 0.1%                              | 2.7%                      | 0.6%  | 1.3%              | 6.8%   | 0.8%    | 5.8%  | 18.0%        |
| F             | Park                 | 0.0%                              | 0.6%                      | 0.1%  | 0.3%              | 1.7%   | 0.3%    | 1.8%  | 4.8%         |
| G             | Richmond             | 0.0%                              | 1.8%                      | 0.2%  | 0.6%              | 5.0%   | 0.4%    | 3.3%  | 11.4%        |
| H             | Ingleside            | 0.0%                              | 1.0%                      | 0.2%  | 0.9%              | 2.0%   | 0.2%    | 1.1%  | 5.4%         |
| I             | Taraval              | 0.0%                              | 1.6%                      | 0.2%  | 0.5%              | 2.4%   | 0.3%    | 1.8%  | 6.9%         |
| J             | Tenderloin           | 0.0%                              | 0.5%                      | 0.3%  | 0.3%              | 1.7%   | 0.2%    | 0.9%  | 4.0%         |
| X             | Out of SF            | 0.2%                              | 0.1%                      | 0.1%  | 0.1%              | 0.4%   | 0.0%    | 0.4%  | 1.2%         |
| Grand Total   |                      | 0.4%                              | 15.7%                     | 3.8%  | 8.8%              | 38.3%  | 4.3%    | 28.6% | 100.0%       |

#### LARCENY THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

| LARCENY THEFT |                      | PERSON COUNT |         |         |         |         |         |         | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------|----------------------|--------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT      | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29   | 30-39   | 40-49   | 50-59   | 60+     | Unknown |              |
| A             | Central              | 195.00       | 1159.00 | 1214.00 | 1048.00 | 755.00  | 478.00  | 1814.00 | 6663.00      |
| B             | Southern             | 19.00        | 458.00  | 489.00  | 306.00  | 217.00  | 116.00  | 251.00  | 1856.00      |
| C             | Bayview              | 18.00        | 200.00  | 229.00  | 155.00  | 129.00  | 113.00  | 118.00  | 962.00       |
| D             | Mission              | 23.00        | 412.00  | 457.00  | 243.00  | 178.00  | 129.00  | 238.00  | 1680.00      |
| E             | Northern             | 91.00        | 1016.00 | 820.00  | 610.00  | 443.00  | 290.00  | 902.00  | 4172.00      |
| F             | Park                 | 27.00        | 234.00  | 258.00  | 184.00  | 114.00  | 115.00  | 188.00  | 1120.00      |
| G             | Richmond             | 64.00        | 431.00  | 444.00  | 388.00  | 326.00  | 289.00  | 697.00  | 2639.00      |
| H             | Ingleside            | 9.00         | 188.00  | 269.00  | 219.00  | 168.00  | 179.00  | 215.00  | 1247.00      |
| I             | Taraval              | 18.00        | 247.00  | 307.00  | 253.00  | 218.00  | 272.00  | 275.00  | 1590.00      |
| J             | Tenderloin           | 9.00         | 180.00  | 181.00  | 108.00  | 81.00   | 76.00   | 296.00  | 931.00       |
| X             | Out of SF            | 6.00         | 60.00   | 73.00   | 45.00   | 34.00   | 38.00   | 19.00   | 275.00       |
| Grand Total   |                      | 479.00       | 4585.00 | 4741.00 | 3559.00 | 2663.00 | 2095.00 | 5013.00 | 23135.00     |



LARCENY THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

| LARCENY THEFT |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |       |      |         | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT      | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+  | Unknown |              |
| A             | Central              | 0.8%         | 5.0%  | 5.2%  | 4.5%  | 3.3%  | 2.1% | 7.8%    | 28.8%        |
| B             | Southern             | 0.1%         | 2.0%  | 2.1%  | 1.3%  | 0.9%  | 0.5% | 1.1%    | 8.0%         |
| C             | Bayview              | 0.1%         | 0.9%  | 1.0%  | 0.7%  | 0.6%  | 0.5% | 0.5%    | 4.2%         |
| D             | Mission              | 0.1%         | 1.8%  | 2.0%  | 1.1%  | 0.8%  | 0.6% | 1.0%    | 7.3%         |
| E             | Northern             | 0.4%         | 4.4%  | 3.5%  | 2.6%  | 1.9%  | 1.3% | 3.9%    | 18.0%        |
| F             | Park                 | 0.1%         | 1.0%  | 1.1%  | 0.8%  | 0.5%  | 0.5% | 0.8%    | 4.8%         |
| G             | Richmond             | 0.3%         | 1.9%  | 1.9%  | 1.7%  | 1.4%  | 1.2% | 3.0%    | 11.4%        |
| H             | Ingleside            | 0.0%         | 0.8%  | 1.2%  | 0.9%  | 0.7%  | 0.8% | 0.9%    | 5.4%         |
| I             | Taraval              | 0.1%         | 1.1%  | 1.3%  | 1.1%  | 0.9%  | 1.2% | 1.2%    | 6.9%         |
| J             | Tenderloin           | 0.0%         | 0.8%  | 0.8%  | 0.5%  | 0.4%  | 0.3% | 1.3%    | 4.0%         |
| X             | Out of SF            | 0.0%         | 0.3%  | 0.3%  | 0.2%  | 0.1%  | 0.2% | 0.1%    | 1.2%         |
| Grand Total   |                      | 2.1%         | 19.8% | 20.5% | 15.4% | 11.5% | 9.1% | 21.7%   | 100.0%       |

LARCENY THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

| LARCENY THEFT |                      | PERSON COUNT |          |           |         |         | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------|----------------------|--------------|----------|-----------|---------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT      | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male     | Nonbinary | OTHERS  | Unknown |              |
| A             | Central              | 1990.00      | 2856.00  | 1.00      | 1792.00 | 24.00   | 6663.00      |
| B             | Southern             | 655.00       | 940.00   | 1.00      | 248.00  | 12.00   | 1856.00      |
| C             | Bayview              | 384.00       | 468.00   |           | 105.00  | 5.00    | 962.00       |
| D             | Mission              | 572.00       | 865.00   |           | 222.00  | 21.00   | 1680.00      |
| E             | Northern             | 1486.00      | 1801.00  |           | 857.00  | 28.00   | 4172.00      |
| F             | Park                 | 377.00       | 553.00   |           | 184.00  | 6.00    | 1120.00      |
| G             | Richmond             | 802.00       | 1133.00  |           | 698.00  | 6.00    | 2639.00      |
| H             | Ingleside            | 403.00       | 623.00   |           | 210.00  | 11.00   | 1247.00      |
| I             | Taraval              | 554.00       | 759.00   | 1.00      | 264.00  | 12.00   | 1590.00      |
| J             | Tenderloin           | 248.00       | 368.00   | 1.00      | 313.00  | 1.00    | 931.00       |
| X             | Out of SF            | 138.00       | 118.00   |           | 19.00   |         | 275.00       |
| Grand Total   |                      | 7609.00      | 10484.00 | 4.00      | 4912.00 | 126.00  | 23135.00     |

LARCENY THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

| LARCENY THEFT |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT      | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A             | Central              | 8.6%         | 12.3% | 0.0%      | 7.7%   | 0.1%    | 28.8%        |
| B             | Southern             | 2.8%         | 4.1%  | 0.0%      | 1.1%   | 0.1%    | 8.0%         |
| C             | Bayview              | 1.7%         | 2.0%  |           | 0.5%   | 0.0%    | 4.2%         |
| D             | Mission              | 2.5%         | 3.7%  |           | 1.0%   | 0.1%    | 7.3%         |
| E             | Northern             | 6.4%         | 7.8%  |           | 3.7%   | 0.1%    | 18.0%        |
| F             | Park                 | 1.6%         | 2.4%  |           | 0.8%   | 0.0%    | 4.8%         |
| G             | Richmond             | 3.5%         | 4.9%  |           | 3.0%   | 0.0%    | 11.4%        |
| H             | Ingleside            | 1.7%         | 2.7%  |           | 0.9%   | 0.0%    | 5.4%         |
| I             | Taraval              | 2.4%         | 3.3%  | 0.0%      | 1.1%   | 0.1%    | 6.9%         |
| J             | Tenderloin           | 1.1%         | 1.6%  | 0.0%      | 1.4%   | 0.0%    | 4.0%         |
| X             | Out of SF            | 0.6%         | 0.5%  |           | 0.1%   |         | 1.2%         |
| Grand Total   |                      | 32.9%        | 45.3% | 0.0%      | 21.2%  | 0.5%    | 100.0%       |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

**LARCENY THEFT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE**

| LARCENY THEFT | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |              |                   |               |              |             | PERSON COUNT  |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|
|               | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black        | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS        | Unknown      | White       |               |
| Q1-Q2 2022    | 75                                | 3,151                     | 918          | 1,890             | 9,918         | 1,011        | 6,409       | <b>23,372</b> |
| Q1-Q2 2023    | 94                                | 3,630                     | 881          | 2,039             | 8,870         | 1,002        | 6,619       | <b>23,135</b> |
| Difference    | 19                                | 479                       | -37          | 149               | -1,048        | -9           | 210         | <b>-237</b>   |
| % Change      | <b>25.3%</b>                      | <b>15.2%</b>              | <b>-4.0%</b> | <b>7.9%</b>       | <b>-10.6%</b> | <b>-0.9%</b> | <b>3.3%</b> | <b>-1.0%</b>  |

**LARCENY THEFT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE**

| LARCENY THEFT | PERSON COUNT |              |              |              |             |             |              | PERSON COUNT  |
|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|
|               | 0-17         | 18-29        | 30-39        | 40-49        | 50-59       | 60+         | Unknown      |               |
| Q1-Q2 2022    | 411          | 4,985        | 4,828        | 3,233        | 2,517       | 2,011       | 5,387        | <b>23,372</b> |
| Q1-Q2 2023    | 479          | 4,585        | 4,741        | 3,559        | 2,663       | 2,095       | 5,013        | <b>23,135</b> |
| Difference    | 68           | -400         | -87          | 326          | 146         | 84          | -374         | <b>-237</b>   |
| % Change      | <b>16.5%</b> | <b>-8.0%</b> | <b>-1.8%</b> | <b>10.1%</b> | <b>5.8%</b> | <b>4.2%</b> | <b>-6.9%</b> | <b>-1.0%</b>  |

**LARCENY THEFT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER**

| LARCENY THEFT | PERSON COUNT |             |               |              |              | PERSON COUNT  |
|---------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
|               | Female       | Male        | Nonbinary     | OTHERS       | Unknown      |               |
| Q1-Q2 2022    | 7,629        | 10,400      | 6             | 5,259        | 78           | <b>23,372</b> |
| Q1-Q2 2023    | 7,609        | 10,484      | 4             | 4,912        | 126          | <b>23,135</b> |
| Difference    | -20          | 84          | -2            | -347         | 48           | <b>-237</b>   |
| % Change      | <b>-0.3%</b> | <b>0.8%</b> | <b>-33.3%</b> | <b>-6.6%</b> | <b>61.5%</b> | <b>-1.0%</b>  |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

**MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE**

| MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT |                      | PERSON COUNT              |       |                   |         |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|---------|---------|-------|--------------|
| DISTRICT            | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS  | Unknown | White |              |
| A                   | Central              | 2.00                      | 1.00  | 1.00              | 207.00  | 2.00    | 8.00  | 221.00       |
| B                   | Southern             | 3.00                      | 2.00  | 6.00              | 301.00  | 4.00    | 10.00 | 326.00       |
| C                   | Bayview              | 4.00                      | 12.00 | 10.00             | 569.00  | 2.00    | 14.00 | 611.00       |
| D                   | Mission              | 2.00                      |       | 9.00              | 432.00  | 1.00    | 4.00  | 448.00       |
| E                   | Northern             | 3.00                      | 1.00  | 7.00              | 358.00  | 2.00    | 6.00  | 377.00       |
| F                   | Park                 | 2.00                      | 1.00  |                   | 176.00  | 4.00    | 9.00  | 192.00       |
| G                   | Richmond             | 4.00                      | 1.00  |                   | 163.00  | 2.00    | 2.00  | 172.00       |
| H                   | Ingleside            | 8.00                      | 1.00  | 10.00             | 557.00  | 1.00    | 3.00  | 580.00       |
| I                   | Taraval              | 1.00                      | 3.00  | 6.00              | 378.00  |         | 5.00  | 393.00       |
| J                   | Tenderloin           | 1.00                      | 5.00  | 3.00              | 123.00  | 1.00    | 1.00  | 134.00       |
| X                   | Out of SF            |                           | 2.00  | 1.00              | 16.00   |         | 1.00  | 20.00        |
| Grand Total         |                      | 30.00                     | 29.00 | 53.00             | 3280.00 | 19.00   | 63.00 | 3474.00      |

**MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE**

| MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT |                      | PERSON COUNT              |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
| DISTRICT            | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| A                   | Central              | 0.1%                      | 0.0%  | 0.0%              | 6.0%   | 0.1%    | 0.2%  | 6.4%         |
| B                   | Southern             | 0.1%                      | 0.1%  | 0.2%              | 8.7%   | 0.1%    | 0.3%  | 9.4%         |
| C                   | Bayview              | 0.1%                      | 0.3%  | 0.3%              | 16.4%  | 0.1%    | 0.4%  | 17.6%        |
| D                   | Mission              | 0.1%                      |       | 0.3%              | 12.4%  | 0.0%    | 0.1%  | 12.9%        |
| E                   | Northern             | 0.1%                      | 0.0%  | 0.2%              | 10.3%  | 0.1%    | 0.2%  | 10.9%        |
| F                   | Park                 | 0.1%                      | 0.0%  |                   | 5.1%   | 0.1%    | 0.3%  | 5.5%         |
| G                   | Richmond             | 0.1%                      | 0.0%  |                   | 4.7%   | 0.1%    | 0.1%  | 5.0%         |
| H                   | Ingleside            | 0.2%                      | 0.0%  | 0.3%              | 16.0%  | 0.0%    | 0.1%  | 16.7%        |
| I                   | Taraval              | 0.0%                      | 0.1%  | 0.2%              | 10.9%  |         | 0.1%  | 11.3%        |
| J                   | Tenderloin           | 0.0%                      | 0.1%  | 0.1%              | 3.5%   | 0.0%    | 0.0%  | 3.9%         |
| X                   | Out of SF            |                           | 0.1%  | 0.0%              | 0.5%   |         | 0.0%  | 0.6%         |
| Grand Total         |                      | 0.9%                      | 0.8%  | 1.5%              | 94.4%  | 0.5%    | 1.8%  | 100.0%       |

**MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE**

| MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT |                      | PERSON COUNT |        |        |        |        |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT            | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29  | 30-39  | 40-49  | 50-59  | 60+    | Unknown |              |
| A                   | Central              |              | 64.00  | 57.00  | 34.00  | 24.00  | 28.00  | 14.00   | 221.00       |
| B                   | Southern             |              | 68.00  | 95.00  | 51.00  | 53.00  | 38.00  | 21.00   | 326.00       |
| C                   | Bayview              | 4.00         | 125.00 | 129.00 | 128.00 | 97.00  | 103.00 | 25.00   | 611.00       |
| D                   | Mission              |              | 89.00  | 110.00 | 83.00  | 74.00  | 80.00  | 12.00   | 448.00       |
| E                   | Northern             | 2.00         | 113.00 | 97.00  | 58.00  | 41.00  | 54.00  | 12.00   | 377.00       |
| F                   | Park                 |              | 52.00  | 45.00  | 42.00  | 28.00  | 22.00  | 3.00    | 192.00       |
| G                   | Richmond             |              | 42.00  | 40.00  | 29.00  | 32.00  | 25.00  | 4.00    | 172.00       |
| H                   | Ingleside            |              | 107.00 | 140.00 | 114.00 | 94.00  | 119.00 | 6.00    | 580.00       |
| I                   | Taraval              | 1.00         | 78.00  | 68.00  | 64.00  | 67.00  | 102.00 | 13.00   | 393.00       |
| J                   | Tenderloin           | 1.00         | 33.00  | 35.00  | 23.00  | 14.00  | 18.00  | 10.00   | 134.00       |
| X                   | Out of SF            | 1.00         | 3.00   | 5.00   | 3.00   | 3.00   | 2.00   | 3.00    | 20.00        |
| Grand Total         |                      | 9.00         | 774.00 | 821.00 | 629.00 | 527.00 | 591.00 | 123.00  | 3474.00      |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

**MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE**

| MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |       |       |         | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT            | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+   | Unknown |              |
| A                   | Central              |              | 1.8%  | 1.6%  | 1.0%  | 0.7%  | 0.8%  | 0.4%    | 6.4%         |
| B                   | Southern             |              | 2.0%  | 2.7%  | 1.5%  | 1.5%  | 1.1%  | 0.6%    | 9.4%         |
| C                   | Bayview              | 0.1%         | 3.6%  | 3.7%  | 3.7%  | 2.8%  | 3.0%  | 0.7%    | 17.6%        |
| D                   | Mission              |              | 2.6%  | 3.2%  | 2.4%  | 2.1%  | 2.3%  | 0.3%    | 12.9%        |
| E                   | Northern             | 0.1%         | 3.3%  | 2.8%  | 1.7%  | 1.2%  | 1.6%  | 0.3%    | 10.9%        |
| F                   | Park                 |              | 1.5%  | 1.3%  | 1.2%  | 0.8%  | 0.6%  | 0.1%    | 5.5%         |
| G                   | Richmond             |              | 1.2%  | 1.2%  | 0.8%  | 0.9%  | 0.7%  | 0.1%    | 5.0%         |
| H                   | Ingleside            |              | 3.1%  | 4.0%  | 3.3%  | 2.7%  | 3.4%  | 0.2%    | 16.7%        |
| I                   | Taraval              | 0.0%         | 2.2%  | 2.0%  | 1.8%  | 1.9%  | 2.9%  | 0.4%    | 11.3%        |
| J                   | Tenderloin           | 0.0%         | 0.9%  | 1.0%  | 0.7%  | 0.4%  | 0.5%  | 0.3%    | 3.9%         |
| X                   | Out of SF            | 0.0%         | 0.1%  | 0.1%  | 0.1%  | 0.1%  | 0.1%  | 0.1%    | 0.6%         |
| Grand Total         |                      | 0.3%         | 22.3% | 23.6% | 18.1% | 15.2% | 17.0% | 3.5%    | 100.0%       |

**MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER**

| MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT |                      | PERSON COUNT |        |         |         | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|---------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT            | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male   | OTHERS  | Unknown |              |
| A                   | Central              | 4.00         | 10.00  | 207.00  |         | 221.00       |
| B                   | Southern             | 10.00        | 16.00  | 300.00  |         | 326.00       |
| C                   | Bayview              | 19.00        | 22.00  | 569.00  | 1.00    | 611.00       |
| D                   | Mission              | 5.00         | 11.00  | 432.00  |         | 448.00       |
| E                   | Northern             | 10.00        | 10.00  | 356.00  | 1.00    | 377.00       |
| F                   | Park                 | 8.00         | 8.00   | 176.00  |         | 192.00       |
| G                   | Richmond             | 2.00         | 7.00   | 163.00  |         | 172.00       |
| H                   | Ingleside            | 8.00         | 16.00  | 556.00  |         | 580.00       |
| I                   | Taraval              | 7.00         | 8.00   | 378.00  |         | 393.00       |
| J                   | Tenderloin           | 4.00         | 7.00   | 123.00  |         | 134.00       |
| X                   | Out of SF            | 1.00         | 3.00   | 16.00   |         | 20.00        |
| Grand Total         |                      | 78.00        | 118.00 | 3276.00 | 2.00    | 3474.00      |

**MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER**

| MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT |                      | PERSON COUNT |      |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------------|----------------------|--------------|------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT            | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A                   | Central              | 0.1%         | 0.3% | 6.0%   |         | 6.4%         |
| B                   | Southern             | 0.3%         | 0.5% | 8.6%   |         | 9.4%         |
| C                   | Bayview              | 0.5%         | 0.6% | 16.4%  | 0.0%    | 17.6%        |
| D                   | Mission              | 0.1%         | 0.3% | 12.4%  |         | 12.9%        |
| E                   | Northern             | 0.3%         | 0.3% | 10.2%  | 0.0%    | 10.9%        |
| F                   | Park                 | 0.2%         | 0.2% | 5.1%   |         | 5.5%         |
| G                   | Richmond             | 0.1%         | 0.2% | 4.7%   |         | 5.0%         |
| H                   | Ingleside            | 0.2%         | 0.5% | 16.0%  |         | 16.7%        |
| I                   | Taraval              | 0.2%         | 0.2% | 10.9%  |         | 11.3%        |
| J                   | Tenderloin           | 0.1%         | 0.2% | 3.5%   |         | 3.9%         |
| X                   | Out of SF            | 0.0%         | 0.1% | 0.5%   |         | 0.6%         |
| Grand Total         |                      | 2.2%         | 3.4% | 94.3%  | 0.1%    | 100.0%       |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

**MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE**

| MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |        |                   |        |         |        | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------|-------------------|--------|---------|--------|--------------|
|                     | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black  | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White  |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022          | 2                                 | 34                        | 35     | 40                | 3,148  | 35      | 93     | 3,387        |
| Q1-Q2 2023          | 0                                 | 30                        | 29     | 53                | 3,280  | 19      | 63     | 3,474        |
| Difference          | -2                                | -4                        | -6     | 13                | 132    | -16     | -30    | 87           |
| % Change            | -100.0%                           | -11.8%                    | -17.1% | 32.5%             | 4.2%   | -45.7%  | -32.3% | 2.6%         |

**MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE**

| MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |        |      |         | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|------|---------|--------------|
|                     | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59  | 60+  | Unknown |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022          | 9            | 604   | 823   | 635   | 595    | 586  | 135     | 3,387        |
| Q1-Q2 2023          | 9            | 774   | 821   | 629   | 527    | 591  | 123     | 3,474        |
| Difference          | 0            | 170   | -2    | -6    | -68    | 5    | -12     | 87           |
| % Change            | 0.0%         | 28.1% | -0.2% | -0.9% | -11.4% | 0.9% | -8.9%   | 2.6%         |

**MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER**

| MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT | PERSON COUNT |        |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|---------------------|--------------|--------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
|                     | Female       | Male   | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022          | 75           | 155    | 0         | 3,145  | 12      | 3,387        |
| Q1-Q2 2023          | 78           | 118    | 0         | 3,276  | 2       | 3,474        |
| Difference          | 3            | -37    | 0         | 131    | -10     | 87           |
| % Change            | 4.0%         | -23.9% | not calc  | 4.2%   | -83.3%  | 2.6%         |

**SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE**

| SEXUAL ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |        | PERSON COUNT |
|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|--------|--------------|
| DISTRICT       | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White  |              |
| A              | Central              |                                   | 10.00                     | 8.00  | 5.00              |        | 2.00    | 12.00  | 37.00        |
| B              | Southern             |                                   | 8.00                      | 8.00  | 9.00              | 1.00   | 3.00    | 20.00  | 49.00        |
| C              | Bayview              |                                   | 4.00                      | 7.00  | 11.00             |        |         | 1.00   | 23.00        |
| D              | Mission              | 1.00                              | 8.00                      | 21.00 | 47.00             | 19.00  | 6.00    | 33.00  | 135.00       |
| E              | Northern             |                                   | 5.00                      |       | 10.00             | 4.00   | 1.00    | 20.00  | 40.00        |
| F              | Park                 |                                   | 2.00                      | 3.00  | 1.00              |        |         | 7.00   | 13.00        |
| G              | Richmond             |                                   | 2.00                      |       | 1.00              |        | 1.00    | 3.00   | 7.00         |
| H              | Ingleside            |                                   | 2.00                      | 3.00  | 30.00             | 1.00   | 3.00    | 4.00   | 43.00        |
| I              | Taraval              |                                   | 5.00                      | 2.00  | 10.00             | 2.00   |         | 7.00   | 26.00        |
| J              | Tenderloin           | 1.00                              | 4.00                      | 9.00  | 9.00              |        | 2.00    | 12.00  | 37.00        |
| X              | Out of SF            |                                   | 6.00                      | 3.00  | 6.00              | 2.00   | 4.00    | 2.00   | 23.00        |
| Grand Total    |                      | 2.00                              | 56.00                     | 64.00 | 139.00            | 29.00  | 22.00   | 121.00 | 433.00       |

**SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE**

| SEXUAL ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
| DISTRICT       | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| A              | Central              |                                   | 2.3%                      | 1.8%  | 1.2%              |        | 0.5%    | 2.8%  | 8.5%         |
| B              | Southern             |                                   | 1.8%                      | 1.8%  | 2.1%              | 0.2%   | 0.7%    | 4.6%  | 11.3%        |
| C              | Bayview              |                                   | 0.9%                      | 1.6%  | 2.5%              |        |         | 0.2%  | 5.3%         |
| D              | Mission              | 0.2%                              | 1.8%                      | 4.8%  | 10.9%             | 4.4%   | 1.4%    | 7.6%  | 31.2%        |
| E              | Northern             |                                   | 1.2%                      |       | 2.3%              | 0.9%   | 0.2%    | 4.6%  | 9.2%         |
| F              | Park                 |                                   | 0.5%                      | 0.7%  | 0.2%              |        |         | 1.6%  | 3.0%         |
| G              | Richmond             |                                   | 0.5%                      |       | 0.2%              |        | 0.2%    | 0.7%  | 1.6%         |
| H              | Ingleside            |                                   | 0.5%                      | 0.7%  | 6.9%              | 0.2%   | 0.7%    | 0.9%  | 9.9%         |
| I              | Taraval              |                                   | 1.2%                      | 0.5%  | 2.3%              | 0.5%   |         | 1.6%  | 6.0%         |
| J              | Tenderloin           | 0.2%                              | 0.9%                      | 2.1%  | 2.1%              |        | 0.5%    | 2.8%  | 8.5%         |
| X              | Out of SF            |                                   | 1.4%                      | 0.7%  | 1.4%              | 0.5%   | 0.9%    | 0.5%  | 5.3%         |
| Grand Total    |                      | 0.5%                              | 12.9%                     | 14.8% | 32.1%             | 6.7%   | 5.1%    | 27.9% | 100.0%       |

**SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE**

| SEXUAL ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT |        |       |       |       |      |         | PERSON COUNT |
|----------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT       | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29  | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+  | Unknown |              |
| A              | Central              | 10.00        | 8.00   | 11.00 | 7.00  | 1.00  |      |         | 37.00        |
| B              | Southern             | 10.00        | 18.00  | 11.00 | 6.00  | 3.00  | 1.00 |         | 49.00        |
| C              | Bayview              | 12.00        | 7.00   | 1.00  | 1.00  | 2.00  |      |         | 23.00        |
| D              | Mission              | 35.00        | 39.00  | 34.00 | 14.00 | 7.00  | 1.00 | 5.00    | 135.00       |
| E              | Northern             | 7.00         | 16.00  | 5.00  | 5.00  | 2.00  |      | 5.00    | 40.00        |
| F              | Park                 | 2.00         | 4.00   | 4.00  | 2.00  |       | 1.00 |         | 13.00        |
| G              | Richmond             | 4.00         |        | 2.00  | 1.00  |       |      |         | 7.00         |
| H              | Ingleside            | 13.00        | 12.00  | 7.00  | 6.00  | 3.00  | 1.00 | 1.00    | 43.00        |
| I              | Taraval              | 8.00         | 8.00   | 5.00  | 2.00  | 2.00  |      | 1.00    | 26.00        |
| J              | Tenderloin           | 5.00         | 6.00   | 12.00 | 7.00  | 3.00  | 2.00 | 2.00    | 37.00        |
| X              | Out of SF            | 11.00        | 5.00   | 6.00  |       |       |      | 1.00    | 23.00        |
| Grand Total    |                      | 117.00       | 123.00 | 98.00 | 51.00 | 23.00 | 6.00 | 15.00   | 433.00       |

SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

| SEXUAL ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |       |      |         | PERSON COUNT |
|----------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT       | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+  | Unknown |              |
| A              | Central              | 2.3%         | 1.8%  | 2.5%  | 1.6%  | 0.2%  |      |         | 8.5%         |
| B              | Southern             | 2.3%         | 4.2%  | 2.5%  | 1.4%  | 0.7%  | 0.2% |         | 11.3%        |
| C              | Bayview              | 2.8%         | 1.6%  | 0.2%  | 0.2%  | 0.5%  |      |         | 5.3%         |
| D              | Mission              | 8.1%         | 9.0%  | 7.9%  | 3.2%  | 1.6%  | 0.2% | 1.2%    | 31.2%        |
| E              | Northern             | 1.6%         | 3.7%  | 1.2%  | 1.2%  | 0.5%  |      | 1.2%    | 9.2%         |
| F              | Park                 | 0.5%         | 0.9%  | 0.9%  | 0.5%  |       | 0.2% |         | 3.0%         |
| G              | Richmond             | 0.9%         |       | 0.5%  | 0.2%  |       |      |         | 1.6%         |
| H              | Ingleside            | 3.0%         | 2.8%  | 1.6%  | 1.4%  | 0.7%  | 0.2% | 0.2%    | 9.9%         |
| I              | Taraval              | 1.8%         | 1.8%  | 1.2%  | 0.5%  | 0.5%  |      | 0.2%    | 6.0%         |
| J              | Tenderloin           | 1.2%         | 1.4%  | 2.8%  | 1.6%  | 0.7%  | 0.5% | 0.5%    | 8.5%         |
| X              | Out of SF            | 2.5%         | 1.2%  | 1.4%  |       |       |      | 0.2%    | 5.3%         |
| Grand Total    |                      | 27.0%        | 28.4% | 22.6% | 11.8% | 5.3%  | 1.4% | 3.5%    | 100.0%       |

SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

| SEXUAL ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|----------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT       | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A              | Central              | 33.00        | 3.00  |           |        | 1.00    | 37.00        |
| B              | Southern             | 39.00        | 9.00  |           |        | 1.00    | 49.00        |
| C              | Bayview              | 20.00        | 3.00  |           |        |         | 23.00        |
| D              | Mission              | 107.00       | 25.00 | 1.00      | 2.00   |         | 135.00       |
| E              | Northern             | 34.00        | 2.00  |           | 4.00   |         | 40.00        |
| F              | Park                 | 9.00         | 4.00  |           |        |         | 13.00        |
| G              | Richmond             | 5.00         | 2.00  |           |        |         | 7.00         |
| H              | Ingleside            | 38.00        | 4.00  |           |        | 1.00    | 43.00        |
| I              | Taraval              | 19.00        | 5.00  |           | 2.00   |         | 26.00        |
| J              | Tenderloin           | 32.00        | 5.00  |           |        |         | 37.00        |
| X              | Out of SF            | 21.00        | 2.00  |           |        |         | 23.00        |
| Grand Total    |                      | 357.00       | 64.00 | 1.00      | 8.00   | 3.00    | 433.00       |

SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

| SEXUAL ASSAULT |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|----------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT       | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A              | Central              | 7.6%         | 0.7%  |           |        | 0.2%    | 8.5%         |
| B              | Southern             | 9.0%         | 2.1%  |           |        | 0.2%    | 11.3%        |
| C              | Bayview              | 4.6%         | 0.7%  |           |        |         | 5.3%         |
| D              | Mission              | 24.7%        | 5.8%  | 0.2%      | 0.5%   |         | 31.2%        |
| E              | Northern             | 7.9%         | 0.5%  |           | 0.9%   |         | 9.2%         |
| F              | Park                 | 2.1%         | 0.9%  |           |        |         | 3.0%         |
| G              | Richmond             | 1.2%         | 0.5%  |           |        |         | 1.6%         |
| H              | Ingleside            | 8.8%         | 0.9%  |           |        | 0.2%    | 9.9%         |
| I              | Taraval              | 4.4%         | 1.2%  |           | 0.5%   |         | 6.0%         |
| J              | Tenderloin           | 7.4%         | 1.2%  |           |        |         | 8.5%         |
| X              | Out of SF            | 4.8%         | 0.5%  |           |        |         | 5.3%         |
| Grand Total    |                      | 82.4%        | 14.8% | 0.2%      | 1.8%   | 0.7%    | 100.0%       |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

**SEXUAL ASSAULT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE**

| SEXUAL ASSAULT | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |        | PERSON COUNT |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|--------|--------------|
|                | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White  |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022     | 3                                 | 70                        | 62    | 140               | 42     | 18      | 147    | 482          |
| Q1-Q2 2023     | 2                                 | 56                        | 64    | 139               | 29     | 22      | 121    | 433          |
| Difference     | -1                                | -14                       | 2     | -1                | -13    | 4       | -26    | -49          |
| % Change       | -33.3%                            | -20.0%                    | 3.2%  | -0.7%             | -31.0% | 22.2%   | -17.7% | -10.2%       |

**SEXUAL ASSAULT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE**

| SEXUAL ASSAULT | PERSON COUNT |        |       |       |       |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|----------------|--------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|--------|---------|--------------|
|                | 0-17         | 18-29  | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+    | Unknown |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022     | 137          | 146    | 93    | 55    | 18    | 24     | 9       | 482          |
| Q1-Q2 2023     | 117          | 123    | 98    | 51    | 23    | 6      | 15      | 433          |
| Difference     | -20          | -23    | 5     | -4    | 5     | -18    | 6       | -49          |
| % Change       | -14.6%       | -15.8% | 5.4%  | -7.3% | 27.8% | -75.0% | 66.7%   | -10.2%       |

**SEXUAL ASSAULT - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER**

| SEXUAL ASSAULT | PERSON COUNT |        |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|----------------|--------------|--------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
|                | Female       | Male   | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022     | 397          | 72     | 0         | 11     | 2       | 482          |
| Q1-Q2 2023     | 357          | 64     | 1         | 8      | 3       | 433          |
| Difference     | -40          | -8     | 1         | -3     | 1       | -49          |
| % Change       | -10.1%       | -11.1% | not calc  | -27.3% | 50.0%   | -10.2%       |



**VANDALISM VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE**

| VANDALISM   |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |        |                   |         |         |        | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------|-------------------|---------|---------|--------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black  | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS  | Unknown | White  |              |
| A           | Central              | 3.00                              | 83.00                     | 30.00  | 52.00             | 486.00  | 25.00   | 153.00 | 832.00       |
| B           | Southern             |                                   | 57.00                     | 42.00  | 39.00             | 244.00  | 19.00   | 81.00  | 482.00       |
| C           | Bayview              | 5.00                              | 67.00                     | 103.00 | 91.00             | 128.00  | 23.00   | 79.00  | 496.00       |
| D           | Mission              | 2.00                              | 34.00                     | 27.00  | 125.00            | 217.00  | 30.00   | 111.00 | 546.00       |
| E           | Northern             | 6.00                              | 68.00                     | 61.00  | 46.00             | 311.00  | 39.00   | 163.00 | 694.00       |
| F           | Park                 |                                   | 21.00                     | 11.00  | 10.00             | 69.00   | 7.00    | 67.00  | 185.00       |
| G           | Richmond             | 1.00                              | 54.00                     | 9.00   | 15.00             | 132.00  | 19.00   | 68.00  | 298.00       |
| H           | Ingleside            | 4.00                              | 94.00                     | 38.00  | 90.00             | 123.00  | 18.00   | 83.00  | 450.00       |
| I           | Taraval              | 1.00                              | 85.00                     | 28.00  | 32.00             | 156.00  | 19.00   | 89.00  | 410.00       |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 3.00                              | 33.00                     | 36.00  | 38.00             | 132.00  | 16.00   | 39.00  | 297.00       |
| X           | Out of SF            |                                   |                           | 1.00   | 2.00              | 3.00    | 3.00    | 2.00   | 11.00        |
| Grand Total |                      | 25.00                             | 596.00                    | 386.00 | 540.00            | 2001.00 | 218.00  | 935.00 | 4701.00      |

**VANDALISM VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE**

| VANDALISM   |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| A           | Central              | 0.1%                              | 1.8%                      | 0.6%  | 1.1%              | 10.3%  | 0.5%    | 3.3%  | 17.7%        |
| B           | Southern             |                                   | 1.2%                      | 0.9%  | 0.8%              | 5.2%   | 0.4%    | 1.7%  | 10.3%        |
| C           | Bayview              | 0.1%                              | 1.4%                      | 2.2%  | 1.9%              | 2.7%   | 0.5%    | 1.7%  | 10.6%        |
| D           | Mission              | 0.0%                              | 0.7%                      | 0.6%  | 2.7%              | 4.6%   | 0.6%    | 2.4%  | 11.6%        |
| E           | Northern             | 0.1%                              | 1.4%                      | 1.3%  | 1.0%              | 6.6%   | 0.8%    | 3.5%  | 14.8%        |
| F           | Park                 |                                   | 0.4%                      | 0.2%  | 0.2%              | 1.5%   | 0.1%    | 1.4%  | 3.9%         |
| G           | Richmond             | 0.0%                              | 1.1%                      | 0.2%  | 0.3%              | 2.8%   | 0.4%    | 1.4%  | 6.3%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 0.1%                              | 2.0%                      | 0.8%  | 1.9%              | 2.6%   | 0.4%    | 1.8%  | 9.6%         |
| I           | Taraval              | 0.0%                              | 1.8%                      | 0.6%  | 0.7%              | 3.3%   | 0.4%    | 1.9%  | 8.7%         |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 0.1%                              | 0.7%                      | 0.8%  | 0.8%              | 2.8%   | 0.3%    | 0.8%  | 6.3%         |
| X           | Out of SF            |                                   |                           | 0.0%  | 0.0%              | 0.1%   | 0.1%    | 0.0%  | 0.2%         |
| Grand Total |                      | 0.5%                              | 12.7%                     | 8.2%  | 11.5%             | 42.6%  | 4.6%    | 19.9% | 100.0%       |

**VANDALISM VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE**

| VANDALISM   |                      | PERSON COUNT |        |        |        |        |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29  | 30-39  | 40-49  | 50-59  | 60+    | Unknown |              |
| A           | Central              | 7.00         | 126.00 | 128.00 | 95.00  | 79.00  | 45.00  | 352.00  | 832.00       |
| B           | Southern             | 2.00         | 62.00  | 76.00  | 56.00  | 46.00  | 31.00  | 209.00  | 482.00       |
| C           | Bayview              | 4.00         | 65.00  | 83.00  | 92.00  | 85.00  | 68.00  | 99.00   | 496.00       |
| D           | Mission              | 5.00         | 69.00  | 76.00  | 76.00  | 74.00  | 66.00  | 180.00  | 546.00       |
| E           | Northern             | 15.00        | 109.00 | 139.00 | 72.00  | 63.00  | 63.00  | 233.00  | 694.00       |
| F           | Park                 |              | 36.00  | 29.00  | 30.00  | 24.00  | 24.00  | 42.00   | 185.00       |
| G           | Richmond             | 3.00         | 21.00  | 42.00  | 33.00  | 43.00  | 53.00  | 103.00  | 298.00       |
| H           | Ingleside            | 10.00        | 45.00  | 82.00  | 84.00  | 69.00  | 69.00  | 91.00   | 450.00       |
| I           | Taraval              | 2.00         | 53.00  | 73.00  | 53.00  | 62.00  | 73.00  | 94.00   | 410.00       |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 2.00         | 28.00  | 37.00  | 35.00  | 34.00  | 29.00  | 132.00  | 297.00       |
| X           | Out of SF            |              | 4.00   |        | 1.00   | 2.00   | 1.00   | 3.00    | 11.00        |
| Grand Total |                      | 50.00        | 618.00 | 765.00 | 627.00 | 581.00 | 522.00 | 1538.00 | 4701.00      |

**VANDALISM VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE**

| VANDALISM   |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |       |       |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+   | Unknown |              |
| A           | Central              | 0.1%         | 2.7%  | 2.7%  | 2.0%  | 1.7%  | 1.0%  | 7.5%    | 17.7%        |
| B           | Southern             | 0.0%         | 1.3%  | 1.6%  | 1.2%  | 1.0%  | 0.7%  | 4.4%    | 10.3%        |
| C           | Bayview              | 0.1%         | 1.4%  | 1.8%  | 2.0%  | 1.8%  | 1.4%  | 2.1%    | 10.6%        |
| D           | Mission              | 0.1%         | 1.5%  | 1.6%  | 1.6%  | 1.6%  | 1.4%  | 3.8%    | 11.6%        |
| E           | Northern             | 0.3%         | 2.3%  | 3.0%  | 1.5%  | 1.3%  | 1.3%  | 5.0%    | 14.8%        |
| F           | Park                 |              | 0.8%  | 0.6%  | 0.6%  | 0.5%  | 0.5%  | 0.9%    | 3.9%         |
| G           | Richmond             | 0.1%         | 0.4%  | 0.9%  | 0.7%  | 0.9%  | 1.1%  | 2.2%    | 6.3%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 0.2%         | 1.0%  | 1.7%  | 1.8%  | 1.5%  | 1.5%  | 1.9%    | 9.6%         |
| I           | Taraval              | 0.0%         | 1.1%  | 1.6%  | 1.1%  | 1.3%  | 1.6%  | 2.0%    | 8.7%         |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 0.0%         | 0.6%  | 0.8%  | 0.7%  | 0.7%  | 0.6%  | 2.8%    | 6.3%         |
| X           | Out of SF            |              | 0.1%  |       | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.1%    | 0.2%         |
| Grand Total |                      | 1.1%         | 13.1% | 16.3% | 13.3% | 12.4% | 11.1% | 32.7%   | 100.0%       |

**VANDALISM VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER**

| VANDALISM   |                      | PERSON COUNT |         |           |         |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|---------|-----------|---------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male    | Nonbinary | OTHERS  | Unknown |              |
| A           | Central              | 172.00       | 303.00  |           | 356.00  | 1.00    | 832.00       |
| B           | Southern             | 109.00       | 169.00  |           | 201.00  | 3.00    | 482.00       |
| C           | Bayview              | 189.00       | 212.00  |           | 92.00   | 3.00    | 496.00       |
| D           | Mission              | 125.00       | 249.00  |           | 164.00  | 8.00    | 546.00       |
| E           | Northern             | 180.00       | 278.00  |           | 228.00  | 8.00    | 694.00       |
| F           | Park                 | 58.00        | 85.00   |           | 42.00   |         | 185.00       |
| G           | Richmond             | 84.00        | 114.00  |           | 95.00   | 5.00    | 298.00       |
| H           | Ingleside            | 130.00       | 233.00  |           | 82.00   | 5.00    | 450.00       |
| I           | Taraval              | 144.00       | 169.00  |           | 93.00   | 4.00    | 410.00       |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 56.00        | 112.00  | 2.00      | 123.00  | 4.00    | 297.00       |
| X           | Out of SF            | 5.00         | 2.00    |           | 3.00    | 1.00    | 11.00        |
| Grand Total |                      | 1252.00      | 1926.00 | 2.00      | 1479.00 | 42.00   | 4701.00      |

**VANDALISM VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER**

| VANDALISM   |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A           | Central              | 3.7%         | 6.4%  |           | 7.6%   | 0.0%    | 17.7%        |
| B           | Southern             | 2.3%         | 3.6%  |           | 4.3%   | 0.1%    | 10.3%        |
| C           | Bayview              | 4.0%         | 4.5%  |           | 2.0%   | 0.1%    | 10.6%        |
| D           | Mission              | 2.7%         | 5.3%  |           | 3.5%   | 0.2%    | 11.6%        |
| E           | Northern             | 3.8%         | 5.9%  |           | 4.9%   | 0.2%    | 14.8%        |
| F           | Park                 | 1.2%         | 1.8%  |           | 0.9%   |         | 3.9%         |
| G           | Richmond             | 1.8%         | 2.4%  |           | 2.0%   | 0.1%    | 6.3%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 2.8%         | 5.0%  |           | 1.7%   | 0.1%    | 9.6%         |
| I           | Taraval              | 3.1%         | 3.6%  |           | 2.0%   | 0.1%    | 8.7%         |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 1.2%         | 2.4%  | 0.0%      | 2.6%   | 0.1%    | 6.3%         |
| X           | Out of SF            | 0.1%         | 0.0%  |           | 0.1%   | 0.0%    | 0.2%         |
| Grand Total |                      | 26.6%        | 41.0% | 0.0%      | 31.5%  | 0.9%    | 100.0%       |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

**VANDALISM - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE**

| VANDALISM  | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
|            | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022 | 23                                | 604                       | 390   | 556               | 2,241  | 232     | 1,024 | 5,070        |
| Q1-Q2 2023 | 25                                | 596                       | 386   | 540               | 2,001  | 218     | 935   | 4,701        |
| Difference | 2                                 | -8                        | -4    | -16               | -240   | -14     | -89   | -369         |
| % Change   | 8.7%                              | -1.3%                     | -1.0% | -2.9%             | -10.7% | -6.0%   | -8.7% | -7.3%        |

**VANDALISM - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE**

| VANDALISM  | PERSON COUNT |       |        |        |       |       |         | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|--------------|-------|--------|--------|-------|-------|---------|--------------|
|            | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39  | 40-49  | 50-59 | 60+   | Unknown |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022 | 60           | 666   | 855    | 720    | 626   | 573   | 1,570   | 5,070        |
| Q1-Q2 2023 | 50           | 618   | 765    | 627    | 581   | 522   | 1,538   | 4,701        |
| Difference | -10          | -48   | -90    | -93    | -45   | -51   | -32     | -369         |
| % Change   | -16.7%       | -7.2% | -10.5% | -12.9% | -7.2% | -8.9% | -2.0%   | -7.3%        |

**VANDALISM - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER**

| VANDALISM  | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
|            | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022 | 1,407        | 2,064 | 2         | 1,554  | 43      | 5,070        |
| Q1-Q2 2023 | 1,252        | 1,926 | 2         | 1,479  | 42      | 4,701        |
| Difference | -155         | -138  | 0         | -75    | -1      | -369         |
| % Change   | -11.0%       | -6.7% | 0.0%      | -4.8%  | -2.3%   | -7.3%        |

**DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE**

| DOMESTIC VIOLENCE |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |        |                   |        |         |        | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------|-------------------|--------|---------|--------|--------------|
| DISTRICT          | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black  | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White  |              |
| A                 | Central              | 1.00                              | 10.00                     | 34.00  | 44.00             | 3.00   | 8.00    | 60.00  | 160.00       |
| B                 | Southern             | 1.00                              | 20.00                     | 88.00  | 60.00             | 4.00   | 8.00    | 52.00  | 233.00       |
| C                 | Bayview              |                                   | 14.00                     | 171.00 | 81.00             | 4.00   | 2.00    | 32.00  | 304.00       |
| D                 | Mission              | 2.00                              | 14.00                     | 45.00  | 145.00            | 2.00   | 5.00    | 55.00  | 268.00       |
| E                 | Northern             |                                   | 26.00                     | 44.00  | 52.00             | 4.00   | 2.00    | 39.00  | 167.00       |
| F                 | Park                 |                                   | 3.00                      | 10.00  | 14.00             | 1.00   | 4.00    | 19.00  | 51.00        |
| G                 | Richmond             |                                   | 9.00                      | 4.00   | 16.00             | 1.00   | 15.00   | 27.00  | 72.00        |
| H                 | Ingleside            |                                   | 24.00                     | 37.00  | 108.00            | 6.00   | 7.00    | 44.00  | 226.00       |
| I                 | Taraval              |                                   | 36.00                     | 46.00  | 63.00             |        | 3.00    | 60.00  | 208.00       |
| J                 | Tenderloin           | 3.00                              | 16.00                     | 94.00  | 53.00             | 3.00   | 8.00    | 75.00  | 252.00       |
| X                 | Out of SF            |                                   | 5.00                      | 16.00  | 13.00             |        | 1.00    | 2.00   | 37.00        |
| Grand Total       |                      | 7.00                              | 177.00                    | 589.00 | 649.00            | 28.00  | 63.00   | 465.00 | 1978.00      |

**DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE**

| DOMESTIC VIOLENCE |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
| DISTRICT          | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| A                 | Central              | 0.1%                              | 0.5%                      | 1.7%  | 2.2%              | 0.2%   | 0.4%    | 3.0%  | 8.1%         |
| B                 | Southern             | 0.1%                              | 1.0%                      | 4.4%  | 3.0%              | 0.2%   | 0.4%    | 2.6%  | 11.8%        |
| C                 | Bayview              |                                   | 0.7%                      | 8.6%  | 4.1%              | 0.2%   | 0.1%    | 1.6%  | 15.4%        |
| D                 | Mission              | 0.1%                              | 0.7%                      | 2.3%  | 7.3%              | 0.1%   | 0.3%    | 2.8%  | 13.5%        |
| E                 | Northern             |                                   | 1.3%                      | 2.2%  | 2.6%              | 0.2%   | 0.1%    | 2.0%  | 8.4%         |
| F                 | Park                 |                                   | 0.2%                      | 0.5%  | 0.7%              | 0.1%   | 0.2%    | 1.0%  | 2.6%         |
| G                 | Richmond             |                                   | 0.5%                      | 0.2%  | 0.8%              | 0.1%   | 0.8%    | 1.4%  | 3.6%         |
| H                 | Ingleside            |                                   | 1.2%                      | 1.9%  | 5.5%              | 0.3%   | 0.4%    | 2.2%  | 11.4%        |
| I                 | Taraval              |                                   | 1.8%                      | 2.3%  | 3.2%              |        | 0.2%    | 3.0%  | 10.5%        |
| J                 | Tenderloin           | 0.2%                              | 0.8%                      | 4.8%  | 2.7%              | 0.2%   | 0.4%    | 3.8%  | 12.7%        |
| X                 | Out of SF            |                                   | 0.3%                      | 0.8%  | 0.7%              |        | 0.1%    | 0.1%  | 1.9%         |
| Grand Total       |                      | 0.4%                              | 8.9%                      | 29.8% | 32.8%             | 1.4%   | 3.2%    | 23.5% | 100.0%       |

**DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE**

| DOMESTIC VIOLENCE |                      | PERSON COUNT |        |        |        |        |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT          | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29  | 30-39  | 40-49  | 50-59  | 60+    | Unknown |              |
| A                 | Central              | 8.00         | 44.00  | 53.00  | 29.00  | 14.00  | 11.00  | 1.00    | 160.00       |
| B                 | Southern             | 20.00        | 61.00  | 74.00  | 39.00  | 17.00  | 15.00  | 7.00    | 233.00       |
| C                 | Bayview              | 44.00        | 72.00  | 86.00  | 52.00  | 31.00  | 16.00  | 3.00    | 304.00       |
| D                 | Mission              | 28.00        | 82.00  | 70.00  | 52.00  | 22.00  | 12.00  | 2.00    | 268.00       |
| E                 | Northern             | 25.00        | 39.00  | 45.00  | 25.00  | 19.00  | 11.00  | 3.00    | 167.00       |
| F                 | Park                 | 10.00        | 20.00  | 11.00  | 6.00   | 2.00   | 1.00   | 1.00    | 51.00        |
| G                 | Richmond             | 11.00        | 16.00  | 20.00  | 12.00  | 5.00   | 4.00   | 4.00    | 72.00        |
| H                 | Ingleside            | 47.00        | 48.00  | 56.00  | 33.00  | 24.00  | 12.00  | 6.00    | 226.00       |
| I                 | Taraval              | 45.00        | 45.00  | 51.00  | 41.00  | 12.00  | 12.00  | 2.00    | 208.00       |
| J                 | Tenderloin           | 17.00        | 65.00  | 82.00  | 41.00  | 30.00  | 13.00  | 4.00    | 252.00       |
| X                 | Out of SF            | 9.00         | 10.00  | 9.00   | 4.00   | 3.00   | 2.00   |         | 37.00        |
| Grand Total       |                      | 264.00       | 502.00 | 557.00 | 334.00 | 179.00 | 109.00 | 33.00   | 1978.00      |

#### DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

| DOMESTIC VIOLENCE |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |       |      |         |        | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|---------|--------|--------------|
| DISTRICT          | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+  | Unknown |        |              |
| A                 | Central              | 0.4%         | 2.2%  | 2.7%  | 1.5%  | 0.7%  | 0.6% | 0.1%    | 8.1%   |              |
| B                 | Southern             | 1.0%         | 3.1%  | 3.7%  | 2.0%  | 0.9%  | 0.8% | 0.4%    | 11.8%  |              |
| C                 | Bayview              | 2.2%         | 3.6%  | 4.3%  | 2.6%  | 1.6%  | 0.8% | 0.2%    | 15.4%  |              |
| D                 | Mission              | 1.4%         | 4.1%  | 3.5%  | 2.6%  | 1.1%  | 0.6% | 0.1%    | 13.5%  |              |
| E                 | Northern             | 1.3%         | 2.0%  | 2.3%  | 1.3%  | 1.0%  | 0.6% | 0.2%    | 8.4%   |              |
| F                 | Park                 | 0.5%         | 1.0%  | 0.6%  | 0.3%  | 0.1%  | 0.1% | 0.1%    | 2.6%   |              |
| G                 | Richmond             | 0.6%         | 0.8%  | 1.0%  | 0.6%  | 0.3%  | 0.2% | 0.2%    | 3.6%   |              |
| H                 | Ingleside            | 2.4%         | 2.4%  | 2.8%  | 1.7%  | 1.2%  | 0.6% | 0.3%    | 11.4%  |              |
| I                 | Taraval              | 2.3%         | 2.3%  | 2.6%  | 2.1%  | 0.6%  | 0.6% | 0.1%    | 10.5%  |              |
| J                 | Tenderloin           | 0.9%         | 3.3%  | 4.1%  | 2.1%  | 1.5%  | 0.7% | 0.2%    | 12.7%  |              |
| X                 | Out of SF            | 0.5%         | 0.5%  | 0.5%  | 0.2%  | 0.2%  | 0.1% |         | 1.9%   |              |
| Grand Total       |                      | 13.3%        | 25.4% | 28.2% | 16.9% | 9.0%  | 5.5% | 1.7%    | 100.0% |              |

#### DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

| DOMESTIC VIOLENCE |                      | PERSON COUNT |        |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT          | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male   | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A                 | Central              | 103.00       | 56.00  |           |        | 1.00    | 160.00       |
| B                 | Southern             | 176.00       | 51.00  |           | 4.00   | 2.00    | 233.00       |
| C                 | Bayview              | 223.00       | 80.00  |           | 1.00   |         | 304.00       |
| D                 | Mission              | 180.00       | 85.00  | 1.00      | 2.00   |         | 268.00       |
| E                 | Northern             | 126.00       | 37.00  | 1.00      | 3.00   |         | 167.00       |
| F                 | Park                 | 36.00        | 14.00  |           | 1.00   |         | 51.00        |
| G                 | Richmond             | 48.00        | 21.00  |           | 1.00   | 2.00    | 72.00        |
| H                 | Ingleside            | 160.00       | 60.00  |           | 6.00   |         | 226.00       |
| I                 | Taraval              | 149.00       | 59.00  |           |        |         | 208.00       |
| J                 | Tenderloin           | 176.00       | 73.00  | 1.00      | 2.00   |         | 252.00       |
| X                 | Out of SF            | 28.00        | 9.00   |           |        |         | 37.00        |
| Grand Total       |                      | 1405.00      | 545.00 | 3.00      | 20.00  | 5.00    | 1978.00      |

#### DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

| DOMESTIC VIOLENCE |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
| DISTRICT          | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| A                 | Central              | 5.2%         | 2.8%  |           |        | 0.1%    | 8.1%         |
| B                 | Southern             | 8.9%         | 2.6%  |           | 0.2%   | 0.1%    | 11.8%        |
| C                 | Bayview              | 11.3%        | 4.0%  |           | 0.1%   |         | 15.4%        |
| D                 | Mission              | 9.1%         | 4.3%  | 0.1%      | 0.1%   |         | 13.5%        |
| E                 | Northern             | 6.4%         | 1.9%  | 0.1%      | 0.2%   |         | 8.4%         |
| F                 | Park                 | 1.8%         | 0.7%  |           | 0.1%   |         | 2.6%         |
| G                 | Richmond             | 2.4%         | 1.1%  |           | 0.1%   | 0.1%    | 3.6%         |
| H                 | Ingleside            | 8.1%         | 3.0%  |           | 0.3%   |         | 11.4%        |
| I                 | Taraval              | 7.5%         | 3.0%  |           |        |         | 10.5%        |
| J                 | Tenderloin           | 8.9%         | 3.7%  | 0.1%      | 0.1%   |         | 12.7%        |
| X                 | Out of SF            | 1.4%         | 0.5%  |           |        |         | 1.9%         |
| Grand Total       |                      | 71.0%        | 27.6% | 0.2%      | 1.0%   | 0.3%    | 100.0%       |

**DOMESTIC VIOLENCE - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE**

| DOMESTIC VIOLENCE | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |        | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|--------|--------------|
|                   | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White  |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022        | 8                                 | 222                       | 631   | 618               | 41     | 66      | 550    | 2,136        |
| Q1-Q2 2023        | 7                                 | 177                       | 589   | 649               | 28     | 63      | 465    | 1,978        |
| Difference        | -1                                | -45                       | -42   | 31                | -13    | -3      | -85    | -158         |
| % Change          | -12.5%                            | -20.3%                    | -6.7% | 5.0%              | -31.7% | -4.5%   | -15.5% | -7.4%        |

**DOMESTIC VIOLENCE - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE**

| DOMESTIC VIOLENCE | PERSON COUNT |       |       |        |       |      |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------------|--------------|-------|-------|--------|-------|------|---------|--------------|
|                   | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49  | 50-59 | 60+  | Unknown |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022        | 275          | 531   | 574   | 415    | 178   | 109  | 54      | 2,136        |
| Q1-Q2 2023        | 264          | 502   | 557   | 334    | 179   | 109  | 33      | 1,978        |
| Difference        | -11          | -29   | -17   | -81    | 1     | 0    | -21     | -158         |
| % Change          | -4.0%        | -5.5% | -3.0% | -19.5% | 0.6%  | 0.0% | -38.9%  | -7.4%        |

**DOMESTIC VIOLENCE - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER**

| DOMESTIC VIOLENCE | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------------|
|                   | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022        | 1,523        | 574   | 2         | 31     | 6       | 2,136        |
| Q1-Q2 2023        | 1,405        | 545   | 3         | 20     | 5       | 1,978        |
| Difference        | -118         | -29   | 1         | -11    | -1      | -158         |
| % Change          | -7.7%        | -5.1% | 50.0%     | -35.5% | -16.7%  | -7.4%        |

#### ELDER ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

| ELDER ABUSE |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |        | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|--------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White  |              |
| A           | Central              |                                   | 11.00                     | 1.00  | 2.00              |        |         | 17.00  | 31.00        |
| B           | Southern             |                                   | 4.00                      | 5.00  |                   |        |         | 12.00  | 21.00        |
| C           | Bayview              |                                   | 7.00                      | 6.00  | 4.00              |        |         | 4.00   | 21.00        |
| D           | Mission              |                                   | 8.00                      | 6.00  | 19.00             |        |         | 10.00  | 43.00        |
| E           | Northern             |                                   | 9.00                      | 7.00  |                   |        | 1.00    | 14.00  | 31.00        |
| F           | Park                 |                                   | 3.00                      | 3.00  | 1.00              |        |         | 9.00   | 16.00        |
| G           | Richmond             | 1.00                              | 11.00                     |       |                   | 1.00   | 1.00    | 13.00  | 27.00        |
| H           | Ingleside            |                                   | 11.00                     | 5.00  | 6.00              | 1.00   | 1.00    | 21.00  | 45.00        |
| I           | Taraval              |                                   | 7.00                      | 2.00  | 1.00              | 1.00   |         | 11.00  | 22.00        |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 1.00                              | 15.00                     | 10.00 | 5.00              |        | 3.00    | 12.00  | 46.00        |
| Grand Total |                      | 2.00                              | 86.00                     | 45.00 | 38.00             | 3.00   | 6.00    | 123.00 | 303.00       |

#### ELDER ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

| ELDER ABUSE |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| A           | Central              |                                   | 3.6%                      | 0.3%  | 0.7%              |        |         | 5.6%  | 10.2%        |
| B           | Southern             |                                   | 1.3%                      | 1.7%  |                   |        |         | 4.0%  | 6.9%         |
| C           | Bayview              |                                   | 2.3%                      | 2.0%  | 1.3%              |        |         | 1.3%  | 6.9%         |
| D           | Mission              |                                   | 2.6%                      | 2.0%  | 6.3%              |        |         | 3.3%  | 14.2%        |
| E           | Northern             |                                   | 3.0%                      | 2.3%  |                   |        | 0.3%    | 4.6%  | 10.2%        |
| F           | Park                 |                                   | 1.0%                      | 1.0%  | 0.3%              |        |         | 3.0%  | 5.3%         |
| G           | Richmond             | 0.3%                              | 3.6%                      |       |                   | 0.3%   | 0.3%    | 4.3%  | 8.9%         |
| H           | Ingleside            |                                   | 3.6%                      | 1.7%  | 2.0%              | 0.3%   | 0.3%    | 6.9%  | 14.9%        |
| I           | Taraval              |                                   | 2.3%                      | 0.7%  | 0.3%              | 0.3%   |         | 3.6%  | 7.3%         |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 0.3%                              | 5.0%                      | 3.3%  | 1.7%              |        | 1.0%    | 4.0%  | 15.2%        |
| Grand Total |                      | 0.7%                              | 28.4%                     | 14.9% | 12.5%             | 1.0%   | 2.0%    | 40.6% | 100.0%       |

#### ELDER ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

| ELDER ABUSE |                      | PERSON COUNT | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 65+          |              |
| A           | Central              | 31.00        | 31.00        |
| B           | Southern             | 21.00        | 21.00        |
| C           | Bayview              | 21.00        | 21.00        |
| D           | Mission              | 43.00        | 43.00        |
| E           | Northern             | 31.00        | 31.00        |
| F           | Park                 | 16.00        | 16.00        |
| G           | Richmond             | 27.00        | 27.00        |
| H           | Ingleside            | 45.00        | 45.00        |
| I           | Taraval              | 22.00        | 22.00        |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 46.00        | 46.00        |
| Grand Total |                      | 303.00       | 303.00       |

#### ELDER ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

| ELDER ABUSE |                      | PERSON COUNT |              |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 65+          | PERSON COUNT |
| A           | Central              | 10.2%        | 10.2%        |
| B           | Southern             | 6.9%         | 6.9%         |
| C           | Bayview              | 6.9%         | 6.9%         |
| D           | Mission              | 14.2%        | 14.2%        |
| E           | Northern             | 10.2%        | 10.2%        |
| F           | Park                 | 5.3%         | 5.3%         |
| G           | Richmond             | 8.9%         | 8.9%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 14.9%        | 14.9%        |
| I           | Taraval              | 7.3%         | 7.3%         |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 15.2%        | 15.2%        |
| Grand Total |                      | 100.0%       | 100.0%       |

#### ELDER ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

| ELDER ABUSE |                      | PERSON COUNT |        |        | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|--------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male   | OTHERS |              |
| A           | Central              | 14.00        | 17.00  |        | 31.00        |
| B           | Southern             | 10.00        | 11.00  |        | 21.00        |
| C           | Bayview              | 11.00        | 10.00  |        | 21.00        |
| D           | Mission              | 20.00        | 23.00  |        | 43.00        |
| E           | Northern             | 19.00        | 12.00  |        | 31.00        |
| F           | Park                 | 8.00         | 8.00   |        | 16.00        |
| G           | Richmond             | 12.00        | 15.00  |        | 27.00        |
| H           | Ingleside            | 21.00        | 23.00  | 1.00   | 45.00        |
| I           | Taraval              | 10.00        | 12.00  |        | 22.00        |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 20.00        | 26.00  |        | 46.00        |
| Grand Total |                      | 145.00       | 157.00 | 1.00   | 303.00       |

#### ELDER ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

| ELDER ABUSE |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |        | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|--------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male  | OTHERS |              |
| A           | Central              | 4.6%         | 5.6%  |        | 10.2%        |
| B           | Southern             | 3.3%         | 3.6%  |        | 6.9%         |
| C           | Bayview              | 3.6%         | 3.3%  |        | 6.9%         |
| D           | Mission              | 6.6%         | 7.6%  |        | 14.2%        |
| E           | Northern             | 6.3%         | 4.0%  |        | 10.2%        |
| F           | Park                 | 2.6%         | 2.6%  |        | 5.3%         |
| G           | Richmond             | 4.0%         | 5.0%  |        | 8.9%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 6.9%         | 7.6%  | 0.3%   | 14.9%        |
| I           | Taraval              | 3.3%         | 4.0%  |        | 7.3%         |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 6.6%         | 8.6%  |        | 15.2%        |
| Grand Total |                      | 47.9%        | 51.8% | 0.3%   | 100.0%       |



Victim Demographic Report  
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

**ELDER ABUSE - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE**

| ELDER ABUSE | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
|             | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022  | 2                                 | 75                        | 41    | 27                | 5      | 5       | 112   | 267          |
| Q1-Q2 2023  | 2                                 | 86                        | 45    | 38                | 3      | 6       | 123   | 303          |
| Difference  | 0                                 | 11                        | 4     | 11                | -2     | 1       | 11    | 36           |
| % Change    | 0.0%                              | 14.7%                     | 9.8%  | 40.7%             | -40.0% | 20.0%   | 9.8%  | 13.5%        |

**ELDER ABUSE - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE**

| ELDER ABUSE | PERSON COUNT | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|
|             | 65+          |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022  | 267          | 267          |
| Q1-Q2 2023  | 303          | 303          |
| Difference  | 36           | 36           |
| % Change    | 13.5%        | 13.5%        |

**ELDER ABUSE - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER**

| ELDER ABUSE | PERSON COUNT |       |           |        |          | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|----------|--------------|
|             | Female       | Male  | Nonbinary | OTHERS | Unknown  |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022  | 140          | 122   | 0         | 5      | 0        | 267          |
| Q1-Q2 2023  | 145          | 157   | 0         | 1      | 0        | 303          |
| Difference  | 5            | 35    | 0         | -4     | 0        | 36           |
| % Change    | 3.6%         | 28.7% | not calc  | -80.0% | not calc | 13.5%        |

CHILD ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE

| CHILD ABUSE |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| A           | Central              |                                   | 1.00                      | 5.00  | 7.00              | 1.00   | 6.00    | 3.00  | 23.00        |
| B           | Southern             |                                   | 3.00                      | 6.00  | 7.00              | 3.00   | 2.00    | 3.00  | 24.00        |
| C           | Bayview              | 1.00                              | 4.00                      | 24.00 | 18.00             |        | 3.00    | 3.00  | 53.00        |
| D           | Mission              |                                   | 3.00                      | 10.00 | 41.00             | 6.00   | 4.00    | 4.00  | 68.00        |
| E           | Northern             |                                   | 3.00                      | 8.00  | 13.00             | 2.00   |         |       | 26.00        |
| F           | Park                 |                                   |                           | 1.00  | 2.00              |        |         | 6.00  | 9.00         |
| G           | Richmond             |                                   | 3.00                      | 1.00  | 1.00              |        |         | 7.00  | 12.00        |
| H           | Ingleside            | 1.00                              | 2.00                      | 9.00  | 33.00             |        | 3.00    | 5.00  | 53.00        |
| I           | Taraval              | 3.00                              | 9.00                      | 15.00 | 9.00              |        | 2.00    | 12.00 | 50.00        |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 1.00                              | 4.00                      | 5.00  | 11.00             |        |         | 3.00  | 24.00        |
| X           | Out of SF            |                                   |                           | 6.00  | 5.00              | 1.00   | 3.00    | 1.00  | 16.00        |
| Grand Total |                      | 6.00                              | 32.00                     | 90.00 | 147.00            | 13.00  | 23.00   | 47.00 | 358.00       |

CHILD ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE

| CHILD ABUSE |                      | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |        |         |       | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS | Unknown | White |              |
| A           | Central              |                                   | 0.3%                      | 1.4%  | 2.0%              | 0.3%   | 1.7%    | 0.8%  | 6.4%         |
| B           | Southern             |                                   | 0.8%                      | 1.7%  | 2.0%              | 0.8%   | 0.6%    | 0.8%  | 6.7%         |
| C           | Bayview              | 0.3%                              | 1.1%                      | 6.7%  | 5.0%              |        | 0.8%    | 0.8%  | 14.8%        |
| D           | Mission              |                                   | 0.8%                      | 2.8%  | 11.5%             | 1.7%   | 1.1%    | 1.1%  | 19.0%        |
| E           | Northern             |                                   | 0.8%                      | 2.2%  | 3.6%              | 0.6%   |         |       | 7.3%         |
| F           | Park                 |                                   |                           | 0.3%  | 0.6%              |        |         | 1.7%  | 2.5%         |
| G           | Richmond             |                                   | 0.8%                      | 0.3%  | 0.3%              |        |         | 2.0%  | 3.4%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 0.3%                              | 0.6%                      | 2.5%  | 9.2%              |        | 0.8%    | 1.4%  | 14.8%        |
| I           | Taraval              | 0.8%                              | 2.5%                      | 4.2%  | 2.5%              |        | 0.6%    | 3.4%  | 14.0%        |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 0.3%                              | 1.1%                      | 1.4%  | 3.1%              |        |         | 0.8%  | 6.7%         |
| X           | Out of SF            |                                   |                           | 1.7%  | 1.4%              | 0.3%   | 0.8%    | 0.3%  | 4.5%         |
| Grand Total |                      | 1.7%                              | 8.9%                      | 25.1% | 41.1%             | 3.6%   | 6.4%    | 13.1% | 100.0%       |

CHILD ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE

| CHILD ABUSE |                      | PERSON COUNT | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         |              |
| A           | Central              | 23.00        | 23.00        |
| B           | Southern             | 24.00        | 24.00        |
| C           | Bayview              | 53.00        | 53.00        |
| D           | Mission              | 68.00        | 68.00        |
| E           | Northern             | 26.00        | 26.00        |
| F           | Park                 | 9.00         | 9.00         |
| G           | Richmond             | 12.00        | 12.00        |
| H           | Ingleside            | 53.00        | 53.00        |
| I           | Taraval              | 50.00        | 50.00        |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 24.00        | 24.00        |
| X           | Out of SF            | 16.00        | 16.00        |
| Grand Total |                      | 358.00       | 358.00       |

#### CHILD ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE

| CHILD ABUSE |                      | PERSON COUNT |              |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | 0-17         | PERSON COUNT |
| A           | Central              | 6.4%         | 6.4%         |
| B           | Southern             | 6.7%         | 6.7%         |
| C           | Bayview              | 14.8%        | 14.8%        |
| D           | Mission              | 19.0%        | 19.0%        |
| E           | Northern             | 7.3%         | 7.3%         |
| F           | Park                 | 2.5%         | 2.5%         |
| G           | Richmond             | 3.4%         | 3.4%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 14.8%        | 14.8%        |
| I           | Taraval              | 14.0%        | 14.0%        |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 6.7%         | 6.7%         |
| X           | Out of SF            | 4.5%         | 4.5%         |
| Grand Total |                      | 100.0%       | 100.0%       |

#### CHILD ABUSE VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER

| CHILD ABUSE |                      | PERSON COUNT |        |        | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|--------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male   | OTHERS |              |
| A           | Central              | 15.00        | 8.00   |        | 23.00        |
| B           | Southern             | 10.00        | 13.00  | 1.00   | 24.00        |
| C           | Bayview              | 30.00        | 23.00  |        | 53.00        |
| D           | Mission              | 45.00        | 22.00  | 1.00   | 68.00        |
| E           | Northern             | 13.00        | 13.00  |        | 26.00        |
| F           | Park                 | 8.00         | 1.00   |        | 9.00         |
| G           | Richmond             | 8.00         | 4.00   |        | 12.00        |
| H           | Ingleside            | 27.00        | 26.00  |        | 53.00        |
| I           | Taraval              | 32.00        | 18.00  |        | 50.00        |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 14.00        | 10.00  |        | 24.00        |
| X           | Out of SF            | 9.00         | 7.00   |        | 16.00        |
| Grand Total |                      | 211.00       | 145.00 | 2.00   | 358.00       |

#### CHILD ABUSE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER

| CHILD ABUSE |                      | PERSON COUNT |       |        | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------|--------|--------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT DESCRIPTION | Female       | Male  | OTHERS |              |
| A           | Central              | 4.2%         | 2.2%  |        | 6.4%         |
| B           | Southern             | 2.8%         | 3.6%  | 0.3%   | 6.7%         |
| C           | Bayview              | 8.4%         | 6.4%  |        | 14.8%        |
| D           | Mission              | 12.6%        | 6.1%  | 0.3%   | 19.0%        |
| E           | Northern             | 3.6%         | 3.6%  |        | 7.3%         |
| F           | Park                 | 2.2%         | 0.3%  |        | 2.5%         |
| G           | Richmond             | 2.2%         | 1.1%  |        | 3.4%         |
| H           | Ingleside            | 7.5%         | 7.3%  |        | 14.8%        |
| I           | Taraval              | 8.9%         | 5.0%  |        | 14.0%        |
| J           | Tenderloin           | 3.9%         | 2.8%  |        | 6.7%         |
| X           | Out of SF            | 2.5%         | 2.0%  |        | 4.5%         |
| Grand Total |                      | 58.9%        | 40.5% | 0.6%   | 100.0%       |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

**CHILD ABUSE - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE**

| CHILD ABUSE | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |              |                   |               |              |              | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|             | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black        | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS        | Unknown      | White        |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022  | 1                                 | 36                        | 95           | 161               | 23            | 17           | 29           | <b>362</b>   |
| Q1-Q2 2023  | 6                                 | 32                        | 90           | 147               | 13            | 23           | 47           | <b>358</b>   |
| Difference  | 5                                 | -4                        | -5           | -14               | -10           | 6            | 18           | <b>-4</b>    |
| % Change    | <b>500.0%</b>                     | <b>-11.1%</b>             | <b>-5.3%</b> | <b>-8.7%</b>      | <b>-43.5%</b> | <b>35.3%</b> | <b>62.1%</b> | <b>-1.1%</b> |

**CHILD ABUSE - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE**

| CHILD ABUSE | PERSON COUNT | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|
|             | 0-17         |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022  | 362          | <b>362</b>   |
| Q1-Q2 2023  | 358          | <b>358</b>   |
| Difference  | -4           | <b>-4</b>    |
| % Change    | <b>-1.1%</b> | <b>-1.1%</b> |

**CHILD ABUSE - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER**

| CHILD ABUSE | PERSON COUNT |              |                 |               |                 | PERSON COUNT |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|
|             | Female       | Male         | Nonbinary       | OTHERS        | Unknown         |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022  | 201          | 154          | 0               | 7             | 0               | <b>362</b>   |
| Q1-Q2 2023  | 211          | 145          | 0               | 2             | 0               | <b>358</b>   |
| Difference  | 10           | -9           | 0               | -5            | 0               | <b>-4</b>    |
| % Change    | <b>5.0%</b>  | <b>-5.8%</b> | <b>not calc</b> | <b>-71.4%</b> | <b>not calc</b> | <b>-1.1%</b> |

**Victim Demographic Report**  
**Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023**

**HOMICIDE VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE**

| HOMICIDE           |            | PERSON COUNT                         |                              |           |                      |          |          |          | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|--------------------|------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|----------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT   | American Indian or<br>Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific<br>Islander | Black     | Hispanic or<br>Latin | OTHERS   | Unknown  | White    |                 |
| A                  | Central    |                                      |                              | 2         |                      |          |          |          | 2               |
| B                  | Southern   |                                      | 1                            | 1         | 1                    |          |          | 1        | 4               |
| C                  | Bayview    |                                      |                              | 3         |                      |          |          | 2        | 5               |
| D                  | Mission    |                                      |                              |           | 1                    |          |          |          | 1               |
| E                  | Northern   |                                      |                              | 2         |                      |          |          | 1        | 3               |
| F                  | Park       |                                      | 1                            |           |                      |          |          |          | 1               |
| G                  | Richmond   |                                      | 2                            |           |                      |          |          |          | 2               |
| H                  | Ingleside  |                                      |                              |           | 1                    |          |          | 1        | 2               |
| I                  | Taraval    |                                      |                              |           |                      |          |          |          | 0               |
| J                  | Tenderloin |                                      |                              | 4         | 1                    |          |          |          | 5               |
| X                  | Out of SF  |                                      |                              |           |                      |          |          |          | 0               |
| <b>Grand Total</b> |            | <b>0</b>                             | <b>4</b>                     | <b>12</b> | <b>4</b>             | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>25</b>       |

**HOMICIDE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE**

| HOMICIDE           |            | PERSON COUNT                         |                              |              |                      |             |             |              | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|--------------------|------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------|----------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT   | American Indian or<br>Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific<br>Islander | Black        | Hispanic or<br>Latin | OTHERS      | Unknown     | White        |                 |
| A                  | Central    | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                         | 8.0%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 8.0%            |
| B                  | Southern   | 0.0%                                 | 4.0%                         | 4.0%         | 4.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 4.0%         | 16.0%           |
| C                  | Bayview    | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                         | 12.0%        | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 8.0%         | 20.0%           |
| D                  | Mission    | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                         | 0.0%         | 4.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 4.0%            |
| E                  | Northern   | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                         | 8.0%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 4.0%         | 12.0%           |
| F                  | Park       | 0.0%                                 | 4.0%                         | 0.0%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 4.0%            |
| G                  | Richmond   | 0.0%                                 | 8.0%                         | 0.0%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 8.0%            |
| H                  | Ingleside  | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                         | 0.0%         | 4.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 4.0%         | 8.0%            |
| I                  | Taraval    | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                         | 0.0%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%            |
| J                  | Tenderloin | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                         | 16.0%        | 4.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 20.0%           |
| X                  | Out of SF  | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                         | 0.0%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%            |
| <b>Grand Total</b> |            | <b>0.0%</b>                          | <b>16.0%</b>                 | <b>48.0%</b> | <b>16.0%</b>         | <b>0.0%</b> | <b>0.0%</b> | <b>20.0%</b> | <b>100.0%</b>   |

**Victim Demographic Report**  
**Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023**

**HOMICIDE VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE**

| HOMICIDE           |            | PERSON COUNT |          |          |          |          |          |          | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|--------------------|------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT   | 0-17         | 18-29    | 30-39    | 40-49    | 50-59    | 60+      | Unknown  |                 |
| A                  | Central    |              |          |          | 2        |          |          |          | 2               |
| B                  | Southern   |              | 2        |          | 1        | 1        |          |          | 4               |
| C                  | Bayview    |              | 2        | 1        | 1        | 1        |          |          | 5               |
| D                  | Mission    |              | 1        |          |          |          |          |          | 1               |
| E                  | Northern   | 1            | 1        |          | 1        |          |          |          | 3               |
| F                  | Park       |              |          |          |          |          | 1        |          | 1               |
| G                  | Richmond   |              |          |          |          |          | 2        |          | 2               |
| H                  | Ingleside  |              | 1        |          |          | 1        |          |          | 2               |
| I                  | Taraval    |              |          |          |          |          |          |          | 0               |
| J                  | Tenderloin |              | 1        | 1        | 2        | 1        |          |          | 5               |
| X                  | Out of SF  |              |          |          |          |          |          |          | 0               |
| <b>Grand Total</b> |            | <b>1</b>     | <b>8</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>7</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>25</b>       |

**HOMICIDE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY AGE**

| HOMICIDE           |            | PERSON COUNT |              |             |              |              |              |             | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|--------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT   | 0-17         | 18-29        | 30-39       | 40-49        | 50-59        | 60+          | Unknown     |                 |
| A                  | Central    | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 8.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 8.0%            |
| B                  | Southern   | 0.0%         | 8.0%         | 0.0%        | 4.0%         | 4.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 16.0%           |
| C                  | Bayview    | 0.0%         | 8.0%         | 4.0%        | 4.0%         | 4.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 20.0%           |
| D                  | Mission    | 0.0%         | 4.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 4.0%            |
| E                  | Northern   | 4.0%         | 4.0%         | 0.0%        | 4.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 12.0%           |
| F                  | Park       | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 4.0%         | 0.0%        | 4.0%            |
| G                  | Richmond   | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 8.0%         | 0.0%        | 8.0%            |
| H                  | Ingleside  | 0.0%         | 4.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 4.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 8.0%            |
| I                  | Taraval    | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| J                  | Tenderloin | 0.0%         | 4.0%         | 4.0%        | 8.0%         | 4.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 20.0%           |
| X                  | Out of SF  | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| <b>Grand Total</b> |            | <b>4.0%</b>  | <b>32.0%</b> | <b>8.0%</b> | <b>28.0%</b> | <b>16.0%</b> | <b>12.0%</b> | <b>0.0%</b> | <b>100.0%</b>   |

**Victim Demographic Report**  
**Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023**

**HOMICIDE VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER**

| HOMICIDE           |            | PERSON COUNT |           |          |          | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|--------------------|------------|--------------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT   | Female       | Male      | OTHERS   | Unknown  |                 |
| A                  | Central    |              | 2         |          |          | 2               |
| B                  | Southern   | 1            | 3         |          |          | 4               |
| C                  | Bayview    |              | 5         |          |          | 5               |
| D                  | Mission    |              | 1         |          |          | 1               |
| E                  | Northern   |              | 3         |          |          | 3               |
| F                  | Park       | 1            |           |          |          | 1               |
| G                  | Richmond   | 2            |           |          |          | 2               |
| H                  | Ingleside  | 1            | 1         |          |          | 2               |
| I                  | Taraval    |              |           |          |          | 0               |
| J                  | Tenderloin |              | 5         |          |          | 5               |
| X                  | Out of SF  |              |           |          |          | 0               |
| <b>Grand Total</b> |            | <b>5</b>     | <b>20</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>25</b>       |

**HOMICIDE VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER**

| HOMICIDE           |            | PERSON COUNT |              |             |             | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|--------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT   | Female       | Male         | OTHERS      | Unknown     |                 |
| A                  | Central    | 0.0%         | 8.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 8.0%            |
| B                  | Southern   | 4.0%         | 12.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 16.0%           |
| C                  | Bayview    | 0.0%         | 20.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 20.0%           |
| D                  | Mission    | 0.0%         | 4.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 4.0%            |
| E                  | Northern   | 0.0%         | 12.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 12.0%           |
| F                  | Park       | 4.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 4.0%            |
| G                  | Richmond   | 8.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 8.0%            |
| H                  | Ingleside  | 4.0%         | 4.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 8.0%            |
| I                  | Taraval    | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%            |
| J                  | Tenderloin | 0.0%         | 20.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 20.0%           |
| <b>Grand Total</b> |            | <b>20.0%</b> | <b>80.0%</b> | <b>0.0%</b> | <b>0.0%</b> | <b>100.0%</b>   |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

**HOMICIDE - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE**

| HOMICIDE   | PERSON COUNT                      |                           |       |                   |         |          |        | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------|---------|----------|--------|--------------|
|            | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic or Latin | OTHERS  | Unknown  | White  |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022 | 0                                 | 3                         | 12    | 6                 | 1       | 0        | 2      | 24           |
| Q1-Q2 2023 | 0                                 | 4                         | 12    | 4                 | 0       | 0        | 5      | 25           |
| Difference | 0                                 | 1                         | 0     | -2                | -1      | 0        | 3      | 1            |
| % Change   | not calc                          | 33.3%                     | 0.0%  | -33.3%            | -100.0% | not calc | 150.0% | 4.2%         |

**HOMICIDE - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE**

| HOMICIDE   | PERSON COUNT |        |        |       |          |        |          | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|--------------|--------|--------|-------|----------|--------|----------|--------------|
|            | 0-17         | 18-29  | 30-39  | 40-49 | 50-59    | 60+    | Unknown  |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022 | 0            | 10     | 8      | 5     | 0        | 1      | 0        | 24           |
| Q1-Q2 2023 | 1            | 8      | 2      | 7     | 4        | 3      | 0        | 25           |
| Difference | 1            | -2     | -6     | 2     | 4        | 2      | 0        | 1            |
| % Change   | not calc     | -20.0% | -75.0% | 40.0% | not calc | 200.0% | not calc | 4.2%         |

**HOMICIDE - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER**

| HOMICIDE   | PERSON COUNT |        |           |          |          | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|--------------|--------|-----------|----------|----------|--------------|
|            | Female       | Male   | Nonbinary | OTHERS   | Unknown  |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022 | 0            | 24     | 0         | 0        | 0        | 24           |
| Q1-Q2 2023 | 5            | 20     | 0         | 0        | 0        | 25           |
| Difference | 5            | -4     | 0         | 0        | 0        | 1            |
| % Change   | not calc     | -16.7% | not calc  | not calc | not calc | 4.2%         |



Victim Demographic Report  
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

**HATE CRIME VICTIM COUNT - BY RACE**

| HATE CRIME         |            | PERSON COUNT                         |                                   |          |                      |          |          |          | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|--------------------|------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT   | American Indian or<br>Alaskan Native | Asian/Asian<br>Indian/Other Asian | Black    | Hispanic or<br>Latin | Others   | White    | Unknown  |                 |
| A                  | Central    |                                      |                                   |          |                      |          |          |          | 0               |
| B                  | Southern   |                                      | 3                                 |          | 3                    |          | 5        |          | 11              |
| C                  | Bayview    |                                      |                                   |          |                      |          |          |          | 0               |
| D                  | Mission    |                                      | 3                                 | 1        | 4                    |          | 2        |          | 10              |
| E                  | Northern   |                                      | 2                                 |          | 1                    |          |          |          | 3               |
| F                  | Park       |                                      |                                   |          | 1                    | 1        |          |          | 2               |
| G                  | Richmond   |                                      | 1                                 |          |                      |          |          | 4        | 5               |
| H                  | Ingleside  |                                      |                                   |          |                      |          |          |          | 0               |
| I                  | Taraval    |                                      |                                   | 1        |                      |          |          | 1        | 2               |
| J                  | Tenderloin |                                      |                                   | 3        |                      |          |          | 1        | 4               |
| X                  | Out of SF  |                                      |                                   |          |                      |          |          |          | 0               |
| <b>Grand Total</b> |            | <b>0</b>                             | <b>9</b>                          | <b>5</b> | <b>9</b>             | <b>1</b> | <b>7</b> | <b>6</b> | <b>37</b>       |

**HATE CRIME VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY RACE**

| HATE CRIME         |            | PERSON COUNT                         |                                   |              |                      |             |              |              | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|--------------------|------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT   | American Indian or<br>Alaskan Native | Asian/Asian<br>Indian/Other Asian | Black        | Hispanic or<br>Latin | Others      | White        | Unknown      |                 |
| A                  | Central    | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                              | 0.0%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%            |
| B                  | Southern   | 0.0%                                 | 8.1%                              | 0.0%         | 8.1%                 | 0.0%        | 13.5%        | 0.0%         | 29.7%           |
| C                  | Bayview    | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                              | 0.0%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%            |
| D                  | Mission    | 0.0%                                 | 8.1%                              | 2.7%         | 10.8%                | 0.0%        | 5.4%         | 0.0%         | 27.0%           |
| E                  | Northern   | 0.0%                                 | 5.4%                              | 0.0%         | 2.7%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 8.1%            |
| F                  | Park       | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                              | 0.0%         | 2.7%                 | 2.7%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 5.4%            |
| G                  | Richmond   | 0.0%                                 | 2.7%                              | 0.0%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 10.8%        | 13.5%           |
| H                  | Ingleside  | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                              | 0.0%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%            |
| I                  | Taraval    | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                              | 2.7%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 2.7%         | 5.4%            |
| J                  | Tenderloin | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                              | 8.1%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 2.7%         | 10.8%           |
| X                  | Out of SF  | 0.0%                                 | 0.0%                              | 0.0%         | 0.0%                 | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%            |
| <b>Grand Total</b> |            | <b>0.0%</b>                          | <b>24.3%</b>                      | <b>13.5%</b> | <b>24.3%</b>         | <b>2.7%</b> | <b>18.9%</b> | <b>16.2%</b> | <b>100.0%</b>   |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

**HATE CRIME VICTIM COUNT - BY AGE**

| HATE CRIME  |            | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |       |     |         | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|-------------|------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|---------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT   | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+ | Unknown |                 |
| A           | Central    |              |       |       |       |       |     |         | 0               |
| B           | Southern   |              | 4     | 1     | 3     | 2     |     | 1       | 11              |
| C           | Bayview    |              |       |       |       |       |     |         | 0               |
| D           | Mission    |              | 4     | 2     | 1     | 1     | 2   |         | 10              |
| E           | Northern   |              | 1     |       |       | 1     | 1   |         | 3               |
| F           | Park       |              |       | 1     | 1     |       |     |         | 2               |
| G           | Richmond   |              |       | 1     |       |       |     | 4       | 5               |
| H           | Ingleside  |              |       |       |       |       |     |         | 0               |
| I           | Taraval    |              |       |       |       |       | 1   | 1       | 2               |
| J           | Tenderloin |              | 1     |       | 1     | 1     | 1   |         | 4               |
| X           | Out of SF  |              |       |       |       |       |     |         | 0               |
| Grand Total |            | 0            | 10    | 5     | 6     | 5     | 5   | 6       | 37              |

**HATE CRIME VICTIM COUNT - BY PERCENTAGE**

| HATE CRIME  |            | PERSON COUNT |       |       |       |       |       |         | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|-------------|------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT   | 0-17         | 18-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+   | Unknown |                 |
| A           | Central    | 0.0%         | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%    | 0.0%            |
| B           | Southern   | 0.0%         | 10.8% | 2.7%  | 8.1%  | 5.4%  | 0.0%  | 2.7%    | 29.7%           |
| C           | Bayview    | 0.0%         | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%    | 0.0%            |
| D           | Mission    | 0.0%         | 10.8% | 5.4%  | 2.7%  | 2.7%  | 5.4%  | 0.0%    | 27.0%           |
| E           | Northern   | 0.0%         | 2.7%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 2.7%  | 2.7%  | 0.0%    | 8.1%            |
| F           | Park       | 0.0%         | 0.0%  | 2.7%  | 2.7%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%    | 5.4%            |
| G           | Richmond   | 0.0%         | 0.0%  | 2.7%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 10.8%   | 13.5%           |
| H           | Ingleside  | 0.0%         | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%    | 0.0%            |
| I           | Taraval    | 0.0%         | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 2.7%  | 2.7%    | 5.4%            |
| J           | Tenderloin | 0.0%         | 2.7%  | 0.0%  | 2.7%  | 2.7%  | 2.7%  | 0.0%    | 10.8%           |
| X           | Out of SF  | 0.0%         | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%    | 0.0%            |
| Grand Total |            | 0.0%         | 27.0% | 13.5% | 16.2% | 13.5% | 13.5% | 16.2%   | 100.0%          |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

**HATE CRIME VICTIM COUNT - BY GENDER**

| HATE CRIME         |            | PERSON COUNT |           |           |          |          | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|--------------------|------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT   | Female       | Male      | Nonbinary | OTHERS   | Unknown  |                 |
| A                  | Central    |              |           |           |          |          | 0               |
| B                  | Southern   | 5            | 6         |           |          |          | 11              |
| C                  | Bayview    |              |           |           |          |          | 0               |
| D                  | Mission    | 6            | 4         |           |          |          | 10              |
| E                  | Northern   | 1            | 2         |           |          |          | 3               |
| F                  | Park       | 1            | 1         |           |          |          | 2               |
| G                  | Richmond   | 1            |           |           |          | 4        | 5               |
| H                  | Ingleside  |              |           |           |          |          | 0               |
| I                  | Taraval    |              | 1         |           |          | 1        | 2               |
| J                  | Tenderloin | 3            | 1         |           |          |          | 4               |
| X                  | Out of SF  |              |           |           |          |          | 0               |
| <b>Grand Total</b> |            | <b>17</b>    | <b>15</b> | <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>37</b>       |

**HATE CRIME VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY GENDER**

| HATE CRIME         |            | PERSON COUNT |              |             |             |              | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|--------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT           | DISTRICT   | Female       | Male         | Nonbinary   | OTHERS      | Unknown      |                 |
| A                  | Central    | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%            |
| B                  | Southern   | 13.5%        | 16.2%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 29.7%           |
| C                  | Bayview    | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%            |
| D                  | Mission    | 16.2%        | 10.8%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 27.0%           |
| E                  | Northern   | 2.7%         | 5.4%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 8.1%            |
| F                  | Park       | 2.7%         | 2.7%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 5.4%            |
| G                  | Richmond   | 2.7%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 10.8%        | 13.5%           |
| H                  | Ingleside  | 0.0%         | 0.0%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 0.0%            |
| I                  | Taraval    | 0.0%         | 2.7%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 2.7%         | 5.4%            |
| J                  | Tenderloin | 8.1%         | 2.7%         | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%         | 10.8%           |
| <b>Grand Total</b> |            | <b>45.9%</b> | <b>40.5%</b> | <b>0.0%</b> | <b>0.0%</b> | <b>13.5%</b> | <b>100.0%</b>   |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

HATE CRIME VICTIM COUNT - BY BIAS TYPE

| HATE CRIME  |            | PERSON COUNT - BIAS MOTIVATION |            |            |               |             |             |            |                    |                |           | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|-------------|------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT   | Anti-Transgender               | Anti-Asian | Anti-Black | Anti-Hispanic | Anti-Jewish | Anti-Female | Anti-White | Sexual Orientation | Anti-Christian | Anti-Arab |                 |
| A           | Central    |                                |            |            |               |             |             |            |                    |                |           | 0               |
| B           | Southern   |                                | 4          |            | 1             | 1           |             |            | 5                  |                |           | 11              |
| C           | Bayview    |                                |            |            |               |             |             |            |                    |                |           | 0               |
| D           | Mission    | 3                              | 3          | 1          | 1             | 1           |             |            | 1                  |                |           | 10              |
| E           | Northern   | 1                              | 2          |            |               |             |             |            |                    |                |           | 3               |
| F           | Park       | 1                              |            |            |               |             |             |            | 1                  |                |           | 2               |
| G           | Richmond   |                                | 1          |            |               | 4           |             |            |                    |                |           | 5               |
| H           | Ingleside  |                                |            |            |               |             |             |            |                    |                |           | 0               |
| I           | Taraval    |                                |            | 1          |               |             |             |            |                    | 1              |           | 2               |
| J           | Tenderloin | 1                              |            | 3          |               |             |             |            |                    |                |           | 4               |
| X           | Out of SF  |                                |            |            |               |             |             |            |                    |                |           | 0               |
| Grand Total |            | 6                              | 10         | 5          | 2             | 6           | 0           | 0          | 7                  | 1              | 0         | 37              |

HATE CRIME VICTIM PERCENTAGE - BY BIAS TYPE

| HATE CRIME  |            | PERSON COUNT - BIAS MOTIVATION |            |            |               |             |             |            |                    |                |           | PERSON<br>COUNT |
|-------------|------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------|-----------------|
| DISTRICT    | DISTRICT   | Anti-Transgender               | Anti-Asian | Anti-Black | Anti-Hispanic | Anti-Jewish | Anti-Female | Anti-White | Sexual Orientation | Anti-Christian | Anti-Arab |                 |
| A           | Central    | 0.0%                           | 0.0%       | 0.0%       | 0.0%          | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%       | 0.0%               | 0.0%           | 0.0%      | 0.0%            |
| B           | Southern   | 0.0%                           | 10.8%      | 0.0%       | 2.7%          | 2.7%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%       | 13.5%              | 0.0%           | 0.0%      | 29.7%           |
| C           | Bayview    | 0.0%                           | 0.0%       | 0.0%       | 0.0%          | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%       | 0.0%               | 0.0%           | 0.0%      | 0.0%            |
| D           | Mission    | 8.1%                           | 8.1%       | 2.7%       | 2.7%          | 2.7%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%       | 2.7%               | 0.0%           | 0.0%      | 27.0%           |
| E           | Northern   | 2.7%                           | 5.4%       | 0.0%       | 0.0%          | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%       | 0.0%               | 0.0%           | 0.0%      | 8.1%            |
| F           | Park       | 2.7%                           | 0.0%       | 0.0%       | 0.0%          | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%       | 2.7%               | 0.0%           | 0.0%      | 5.4%            |
| G           | Richmond   | 0.0%                           | 2.7%       | 0.0%       | 0.0%          | 10.8%       | 0.0%        | 0.0%       | 0.0%               | 0.0%           | 0.0%      | 13.5%           |
| H           | Ingleside  | 0.0%                           | 0.0%       | 0.0%       | 0.0%          | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%       | 0.0%               | 0.0%           | 0.0%      | 0.0%            |
| I           | Taraval    | 0.0%                           | 0.0%       | 2.7%       | 0.0%          | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%       | 0.0%               | 2.7%           | 0.0%      | 5.4%            |
| J           | Tenderloin | 2.7%                           | 0.0%       | 8.1%       | 0.0%          | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%       | 0.0%               | 0.0%           | 0.0%      | 10.8%           |
| X           | Out of SF  | 0.0%                           | 0.0%       | 0.0%       | 0.0%          | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%       | 0.0%               | 0.0%           | 0.0%      | 0.0%            |
| Grand Total |            | 16.2%                          | 27.0%      | 13.5%      | 5.4%          | 16.2%       | 0.0%        | 0.0%       | 18.9%              | 2.7%           | 0.0%      | 100.0%          |

Victim Demographic Report  
Q1 THROUGH Q2 2023

**HATE CRIME - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY RACE**

| HATE CRIME | PERSON COUNT                      |                                |       |                   |        |          |          | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|----------|----------|--------------|
|            | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian/Asian Indian/Other Asian | Black | Hispanic or Latin | White  | Other    | Unknown  |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022 | 0                                 | 4                              | 3     | 3                 | 11     | 0        | 0        | 21           |
| Q1-Q2 2023 | 0                                 | 9                              | 5     | 9                 | 7      | 1        | 6        | 37           |
| Difference | 0                                 | 5                              | 2     | 6                 | -4     | 1        | 6        | 16           |
| % Change   | not calc                          | 125.0%                         | 66.7% | 200.0%            | -36.4% | not calc | not calc | 76.2%        |

**HATE CRIME - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY AGE**

| HATE CRIME | PERSON COUNT |          |        |       |       |        |         | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|--------------|----------|--------|-------|-------|--------|---------|--------------|
|            | 0-17         | 18-29    | 30-39  | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60+    | Unknown |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022 | 1            | 0        | 8      | 4     | 5     | 2      | 1       | 21           |
| Q1-Q2 2023 | 0            | 10       | 5      | 6     | 5     | 5      | 6       | 37           |
| Difference | -1           | 10       | -3     | 2     | 0     | 3      | 5       | 16           |
| % Change   | -100.0%      | not calc | -37.5% | 50.0% | 0.0%  | 150.0% | 500.0%  | 76.2%        |

**HATE CRIME - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY GENDER**

| HATE CRIME | PERSON COUNT |      |           |          |          | PERSON COUNT |
|------------|--------------|------|-----------|----------|----------|--------------|
|            | Female       | Male | Nonbinary | OTHERS   | Unknown  |              |
| Q1-Q2 2022 | 7            | 14   | 0         | 0        | 0        | 21           |
| Q1-Q2 2023 | 17           | 15   | 0         | 0        | 5        | 37           |
| Difference | 10           | 1    | 0         | 0        | 5        | 16           |
| % Change   | 142.9%       | 7.1% | not calc  | not calc | not calc | 76.2%        |

**HATE CRIME - Q1 THROUGH Q2 2022 VS 2023 - VICTIM COUNT BY BIAS TYPE**

| HATE CRIME | PERSON COUNT - BIAS MOTIVATION |            |            |               |             |             |            |                    |                |             |                  |           | PERSON |
|------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|------------|--------------------|----------------|-------------|------------------|-----------|--------|
|            | Anti-Transgender               | Anti-Asian | Anti-Black | Anti-Hispanic | Anti-Jewish | Anti-Female | Anti-White | Sexual Orientation | Anti-Christian | Anti-Muslim | Anti-Other Races | Anti-Arab |        |
| Q1-Q2 2022 | 2                              | 4          | 2          | 2             | 2           | 1           | 1          | 6                  | 1              | 0           | 0                | 0         | 21     |
| Q1-Q2 2023 | 6                              | 10         | 5          | 2             | 6           | 0           | 0          | 7                  | 1              | 0           | 0                | 0         | 37     |
| Difference | 4                              | 6          | 3          | 0             | 4           | -1          | -1         | 1                  | 0              | 0           | 0                | 0         | 16     |
| % Change   | 200.0%                         | 150.0%     | 150.0%     | 0.0%          | 200.0%      | -100.0%     | -100.0%    | 16.7%              | 0.0%           | not calc    | not calc         | not calc  | 76.2%  |

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#) on behalf of [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: SF Immigrant Rights Commission - LGBTQIA+ immigrants and City Department Recommendations  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 7:27:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [IRC FullComm Special Hearing Minutes 5.8.23.pdf](#)  
[IRC Recommendations on LGBTQIA+ Immigrants 2023.pdf](#)  
[image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)

---

**From:** Rivas, Jorge (ADM) <Jorge.Rivas@sfgov.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 19, 2023 2:56 PM  
**To:** Engagement, Civic (ADM) <civic.engagement@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Mainardi, Jesse (MYR) <jesse.mainardi@sfgov.org>; Shore, Elena (ADM) <elena.shore@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** SF Immigrant Rights Commission - LGBTQIA+ immigrants and City Department Recommendations

Dear Colleagues,

In May, the Immigrant Rights Commission held a special hearing at the LGBT Center on the needs of LGBTQIA+ immigrants. The Commission heard testimony from community organizations and members of the public, and developed recommendations for several City departments based on the needs identified by LGBTQIA+ immigrant community members.

On behalf of the Commission, I would like to share with you the attached recommendations, and learn about your work with LGBTQIA+ immigrants. (As you will see, some of these recommendations may be things you are already doing, and others may be considered for possible implementation in the future.)

You are welcome to email me, or we can connect virtually or in person. Please let me know when would work for you, and I'm happy to accommodate your schedule. I would love to share back with the Commission all the great work that you are doing.

Thank you for your time,  
Jorge

**Jorge Rivas | Executive Director | He, Him, His**

Office of Civic Engagement & Immigrant Affairs | City & County of San Francisco

1155 Market Street, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103

Direct: (415) 581-2317

[jorge.rivas@sfgov.org](mailto:jorge.rivas@sfgov.org) | [OCEIA](#) | [Immigrant Rights Commission](#)

**Connect with OCEIA:**   

## Introduction

The San Francisco Immigrant Rights Commission (IRC) held a special hearing on issues concerning LGBTQIA+ immigrants at the San Francisco LGBT Center on May 8, 2023. With over 500 anti-LGBTQIA+ bills proposed across the country, in addition to local challenges facing immigrant communities, including housing and economic insecurity, the hearing focused on the needs of LGBTQIA+ immigrants in San Francisco and steps the City can take to support community members. The Commission heard testimony from the following organizations:

1. San Francisco Office of Transgender Initiatives (OTI)
2. Parivar Bay Area
3. El/La Para TransLatinas
4. Oasis Legal Services
5. LGBT Asylum Project
6. UCSF Health and Human Rights Initiative
7. National Center for Lesbian Rights

After extensive testimony from community organizations and members of the public, the Commission identified four major needs of the LGBTQIA+ community: 1) health care and mental health services; 2) emergency housing and shelter; 3) legal resources and services; and 4) employment and training opportunities. In response, the Commission makes the following recommendations:

- Recommendation 1: Expand Access to Health Care and Mental Health Services
- Recommendation 2: Prioritize Safe Housing and Shelter for Transgender Immigrants
- Recommendation 3: Increase Funding for Legal Support and Assistance Programs
- Recommendation 4: Support Employment and Training Programs

The IRC's role is to advise the Mayor's Office, Board of Supervisors and City Departments on important issues impacting San Francisco immigrants. The recommendations included below impact multiple City offices, including the Board of Supervisors, Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs, District Attorney's Office, Office of Economic and Workforce Development, Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, Human Services Agency, Mayor's Office, Department of Public Health, and the Office of Transgender Initiatives.

## **Recommendation 1: Expand Access to Health Care and Mental Health Services**

### **Recommendation 1.A:**

Support physical and mental health resources for transgender immigrants, including trauma-informed care, substance abuse awareness and education.

### **Recommendation 1.B:**

Medi-Cal is expanding to all Californians regardless of immigration status, yet many people are not prepared to get the health care they need. Work with City and community partners to develop and implement a campaign centering LGBTQIA+ communities and encourage them to enroll in Medi-Cal.

## **Recommendation 2: Prioritize Safe Housing and Shelter for Transgender Immigrants**

### **Recommendation 2.A:**

Compile a list of shelters that are LGBTQIA+ friendly and safe for transgender immigrants and share with community partners.

### **Recommendation 2.B:**

Work with City partners to revisit shelter application requirements, such as filling out the form in English, presenting an ID, and answering questions that may be intrusive.

### **Recommendation 2.C:**

Make recommendations to the Mayor's plan to end transgender homelessness by 2027 with a specific focus on transgender immigrants.

## **Recommendation 3: Increase Funding for Legal Support and Assistance Programs**

### **Recommendation 3.A:**

Support screenings for immigration benefits including asylum and Special Immigrant Juvenile Status (SIJS).

### **Recommendation 3.B:**

Work with the District Attorney's Office on certifying U-Visa Supplement B forms and listing the reasons when denied.

### **Recommendation 3.C:**

Advocate for continued funding of resources for transgender immigrants.

### **Recommendation 3.D:**

Advocate for funding to screen clients for immigration relief and provide free legal representation and wraparound services for LGBTQIA+ immigrants.

### **Recommendation 3.E:**



Increase support to create a stronger safety net of social services for LGBTQIA+ immigrants, including continued funding for the Guaranteed Income for Trans People (GIFT) Program and expansion beyond its 55 participants.

## **Recommendation 4: Support Employment and Training Programs**

### **Recommendation 4.A:**

Provide training to immigrant legal services providers, especially those receiving City funding, so they have the capacity to effectively work with LGBTQIA+ immigrants.

### **Recommendation 4.B:**

Advocate to extend the notice time an employer must give when conducting layoffs to 180 days for those on employer-based visas.

### **Recommendation 4.C:**

Support employment resources and advocate for job opportunities for transgender immigrants.

### **Recommendation 4.D:**

Continue to support programs like OCEIA's DreamSF Fellowship Program and encourage organizations to hire independent contractors.

### **Recommendation 4.E:**

Promote the hiring at local organizations of LGBTQIA+ immigrants to continue the tradition of peer-led transgender organizations.

## **Appendix A: Immigrant Rights Commission May 8, 2023 Meeting Minutes**





# CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

## IMMIGRANT RIGHTS COMMISSION

**San Francisco Immigrant Rights Commission  
Full Commission Meeting  
May 8, 2023 at 5:30 pm PDT  
SF LGBT Center, 1800 Market Street, Rainbow Room  
San Francisco, CA 94102**

**Online:** <https://sfpublic.webex.com/sfpublic/j.php?MTID=mad94e66babb9af81ddba1ebdfb9373b1>

**Phone:** 1-415-655-0001 / Access code: 2590 629 4315 / Password: 2023

**Overview:** Members of the Commission will attend this meeting in-person. Members of the public are invited to observe the meeting in-person or remotely using Webex or by calling the phone number and entering the access code above.

Each member of the public, whether attending remotely or in person, may address the Commission for up to two minutes. Members of the public attending the meeting in person will have an opportunity to provide public comment on every item. In addition to in-person public comment, the Commission will hear up to 20 minutes of remote public comment on each agenda item. The Commission will hear remote public comment on each item in the order that commenters add themselves to the queue to comment on the item. Because of the 20-minute time limit, it is possible that not every person in the queue will have an opportunity to provide remote public comment. Remote public comment from people who have received an accommodation due to disability will not count toward the 20-minute limit.

### **1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

Chair Kennelly called the meeting to order at 5:40 p.m.

Present: Chair Kennelly, Vice Chair Paz, Commissioners Chaudhary, Gaime, Latt, Obregon, Ricarte, Ruiz, Senghor, Souza, Wang (arrived 5:41 p.m.)

Not present: Commissioners Enssani (excused), Rahimi (excused).

OCEIA staff present: Director Rivas, Clerk Shore, Filipino Language Specialist Borres, Operations and Grants Administrator Chan, Senior Communications Specialist Richardson, Deputy Director Whipple.

### **2. Ramaytush Ohlone Land Acknowledgment**

This item is to allow the Commission Chair to acknowledge that the Commission is on the unceded ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone who are the original inhabitants of the San Francisco Peninsula.

Chair Kennelly read the land acknowledgment statement.

### **3. Announcements and General Public Comment (Information)**

This item is to allow Director Rivas to provide announcements on interpretation services, public comment, and other information related to today's hearing; and to allow members of the public to address the Commission on matters that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission and that do not appear on today's agenda.

Director Rivas provided announcements on how to access interpretation services and make public comment. Chair Kennelly called for general public comment.

1. A speaker who is from Brazil and works as a program director for mental health services in the LGBT Center, said that all of his clients are immigrants, and 75% of them are asylum seekers. All are Portuguese speakers, and more than half of them are HIV positive. He noted that Portuguese and Brazilian consular support is lacking for LGBTQ people in San Francisco.

#### **4. IRC Hearing on LGBTQIA+ Immigrants in San Francisco**

##### **a. Introduction (Chair Kennelly, OCEIA Deputy Director Whipple, Commissioners Latt and Ruiz)**

*(Information)*

This item is to allow the Chair, OCEIA Deputy Director Whipple, and Commissioners Latt and Ruiz to introduce today's hearing, thank the hearing's partners and co-sponsors, and provide an overview of the purpose of the hearing. The hearing will focus on the needs of LGBTQIA+ immigrants in San Francisco and steps the City of San Francisco can take to support community members.

Chair Kennelly welcomed attendees and recognized co-sponsors Sen. Scott Wiener, Supervisor Rafael Mandelman, and Supervisor Joel Engardio. She thanked Commissioners Jessy Ruiz and Zay Latt, staff from the Office of Civic Engagement & Immigrant Affairs (OCEIA) and the Office of Transgender Initiatives (OTI), and Anjali Rimi, executive director of Parivar Bay Area.

Deputy Director Whipple introduced the hearing. According to estimates by UCLA's Williams Institute, 1,274,500 LGBTQ foreign-born adults live in the United States, including 289,700 who are undocumented. One in three LGBTQ asylum seekers lives in California. In 2015, the Immigrant Rights Commission held a hearing on LGBTQ immigrants with then-Supervisor Scott Wiener. Community members discussed the need for culturally competent services, and gaps in resources, with many individuals being turned away because of lack of capacity. OCEIA, OTI, and Equality California began convening quarterly meetings with service providers. Currently, OCEIA provides limited funding to organizations that serve LGBTQ immigrants.

Commissioner Latt welcomed attendees and discussed the need to do more to support LGBTQ immigrants, and Commissioner Ruiz shared her experience as an asylum seeker who has struggled to find stable housing.

**b. Opening Remarks (Supervisor Mandelman)**

*(Information)*

This item is to allow Supervisor Mandelman to provide opening remarks on today's hearing.

Chair Kennelly introduced Supervisor Mandelman, who provided opening remarks. With over 500 anti-LGBTQ bills proposed across the country, and the prevalence of anti-transgender and anti-queer violence, in addition to housing and economic insecurity, and planned cuts to the City's budget, he said it is critical to figure out how to prioritize the most vulnerable. He noted the work of those serving LGBTQ immigrants at today's hearing, in addition to AGUILAS, Openhouse, and other organizations.

**c. Invited Speakers**

*(Information/Discussion)*

This item is to allow the Commission to hear from invited speakers on the topic of today's hearing.

**1. Pau Crego, San Francisco Office of Transgender Initiatives**

Pau Crego, executive director of the Office of Transgender Initiatives (OTI), described OTI's role in building trust between transgender communities and local government. He discussed OTI's work on housing for transgender San Franciscans, a guaranteed income pilot program, an economic fellowship program for transgender immigrants, and the City's commitment to end homelessness for transgender community members. Despite these efforts, local providers continue to face challenges and are receiving threats.

**2. Anjali Rimi, Parivar Bay Area**

Anjali Rimi, executive director of Parivar Bay Area, provided an overview of Parivar Bay Area's work, and J Jha of Parivar Bay Area described their experience seeking asylum. Director Rimi introduced videos by community members and highlighted the importance of funding resources for transgender immigrants and continuing these conversations. Parivar also has launched a community survey that is available in 10 languages.

3. Sofia Dorantes, El/La Para TransLatinas  
Sofia Dorantes, deputy director of El/La Para TransLatinas, provided an overview of the work of El/La Para TransLatinas. The organization provides trauma-informed care, advocates to end immigrant detention, and helps some of the most marginalized community members. Its staff are transgender, intersex, and gender diverse immigrants, and its two case managers serve over 300 participants. El/La Para TransLatinas, Parivar Bay Area, and the LGBT Asylum Project work together on the Trans Immigrant Coalition and held their first symposium in 2022.
4. John Ilesha Ena, Samoan Community Development Center  
The Samoan Community Development Center was unable to attend the hearing.
5. Black LGBTQI+ Migrant Project (invited)  
The Black LGBTQI+ Migrant Project was unable to attend the hearing.
6. Rachel Kafele, Oasis Legal Services  
Rachel Kafele, who helped found Oasis Legal Services and directs its legal program, provided an overview of the organization's work using a preventative care model to provide legal and social services to LGBTQ immigrants. She discussed the need for funding to screen clients for immigration relief, provide free legal representation to LGBTQ immigrants, and conduct trainings so all legal providers can work effectively with LGBTQ clients. She highlighted the need for sustainable funding to provide universal representation and wraparound services for all LGBTQ immigrants.
7. Okan Sengun, LGBT Asylum Project  
Okan Sengun, executive director and co-founder of the LGBT Asylum Project, explained key differences between LGBTQ and other asylum seekers. For example, other asylum seekers often have access to the support of their families. The one-year deadline to apply for asylum can be more challenging for LGBTQ asylum seekers, who have been forced to keep their own sexuality or true gender hidden. He highlighted the need to fund LGBTQ asylum service providers in San Francisco. In 2023, his organization served 420 LGBTQ immigrants in San Francisco. The LGBT Asylum Project currently represents 28 transgender immigrants and has a waitlist.
8. Dr. Triveni Defries and Dr. Raul Gutierrez, UCSF Health and Human Rights Initiative  
UCSF Health and Human Rights Initiative Pediatric Co-Director Dr. Raul Gutierrez and Education and Training Director Dr. Triveni Defries discussed their work providing trauma-informed health care and medical evaluations for asylum seekers. Dr. Gutierrez stated that asylum seekers who undergo evaluations increase their

chances of attaining asylum, from 42% to 82%. UCSF Health and Human Rights Initiative currently has a 100% success rate. Dr. Defries described one client whose medical evaluation reflected years of attacks and forced conversion. Although the client was successful in attaining asylum, he faces other challenges, including isolation and racism in the United States, trouble being accepted both in queer spaces here, and by other immigrants from his home country. Dr. Defries highlighted the importance of providing trauma-informed care.

9. Cara Jobson of Wiley & Jobson PC and Pamela Mercado Garcia, National Center for Lesbian Rights

Pamela Mercado Garcia, immigration project associate with the National Center for Lesbian Rights (NCLR), described NCLR's work with asylum seekers. LGBTQ migrants often have trouble finding shelter that is safe. She recommended that the City provide housing and shelter assistance, and a list of shelters that are LGBTQ friendly. She discussed the need for an organizing network of professionals, and highlighted the importance of psychological evaluations and medical and psychological services. She also stressed the need to fund organizations that serve LGBTQ migrants. Cara Jobson, a private practice attorney who serves as a pro-bono attorney for NCLR, noted that individuals have a greater chance of attaining asylum if they have an attorney. She discussed the Biden administration's new rule on asylum, which considers migrants ineligible for asylum if they did not first seek asylum in a country they traveled through. Many of the countries they pass through on their way to the United States have high rates of violence against LGBTQ people.

Chair Kennelly thanked the speakers and invited Commissioners to ask questions.

In response to a question from Commissioner Souza, speakers discussed barriers to housing for LGBTQ immigrants. Rachel Kafele of Oasis Legal Services noted that barriers to enter shelters include the requirement to fill out the form in English, present an ID, and answer questions that may feel intrusive. She recommended making it easier to apply by lowering the threshold of what is required. Pamela Mercado Garcia of National Center for Lesbian Rights (NCLR) noted that shelters are not safe for many transgender immigrants, and there is a long waitlist, which further puts them at risk. Anjali Rimi of Parivar Bay Area highlighted the importance of understanding transgender needs in a housing space and community members' awareness of where they can go. J Jha of Parivar Bay Area and Sofia Dorantes of El/La Para TransLatinas discussed the difficulty of finding a job. Dr. Gutierrez noted that many community organizations have had to create their own navigation

systems. Commissioner Ruiz thanked the speakers and discussed the discrimination she encountered as a transgender woman in North Carolina and challenges she faced finding housing in San Francisco.

Commissioner Obregon asked Anjali Rimi of Parivar Bay Area about recommendations to address the needs of LGBTQ immigrants and growing resettlement programs for transgender immigrants. Anjali Rimi noted that resources for immigrants do not address the needs of LGBTQ individuals, and LGBTQ resources do not address the needs of immigrants. She highlighted the need to provide resources beyond legal services, such as information about which shelters are safe for transgender immigrants, and how to find work and educational opportunities.

In response to a question from Commissioner Chaudhary, speakers discussed how to increase awareness about asylum in the transgender community. Ruby Rose of Parivar Bay Area recommended that mental health professionals and those who work in housing learn about asylum to help inform community members. J Jha of Parivar Bay Area urged the Commission to increase the visibility of the transgender community and to make information available for all organizations.

**d. Public Comment**

This item is to allow members of the public to address the Commission on matters related to the topic of today's hearing.

Chair Kennelly called for public comment on this item, beginning with in-person public comment.

1. The first speaker recalled being placed in a men's shelter as a transgender female. She described having to shower at 4:00 a.m. and needing a chaperone to use the restroom. She also noted that much funding goes to staff salaries at organizations.
2. Gerardo, who identified as a gay undocumented San Francisco resident, highlighted the need to build trust. He said the District Attorney's Office has refused to certify U-Visa Supplement B forms without listing the reasons for their denial. He asked that the District Attorney's Office respond with a detailed reason for the denials.
3. Ruby Rose of Parivar Bay Area said that if her employer laid her off, she would only have 29 days to find another job, noting that she does not have a family she can go home to. She noted the importance of mental health care and transgender care. She asked the Commission to advocate to extend the 29-day limit to 180 days for those who



are laid off to find another job.

4. David described the effects of substance abuse, noting that LGBTQ immigrants are more at risk. Many have to resort to sex work. Clients ask escorts to consume drugs with them, and those who refuse are not hired again. David recommended that substance abuse awareness education be offered to LGBTQ immigrant community members.

5. Dora, who is from Colombia, has lived in the United States for one and a half years, and has moved seven times. Thanks to the LGBT Asylum Project, Dora did not have to pay for legal representation. However, housing remains a challenge and more support is needed.

6. Alessandra Garcia, who identifies as trans Latina, stressed the importance of continuing to work together. She said the first goal is to find a safe place for everyone to live. She also highlighted the need for job opportunities for transgender immigrants.

7. Parivar Bay Area played a video clip from Ashish, who is from India and identifies as genderqueer. They work in tech and are dependent on their employer-sponsored visa. Going back to India is not an option, they said, noting that they would be persecuted.

8. Anjali Rimi, executive director of Parivar Bay Area, said that in India, transgender people are relegated to begging and sex work. She noted that some transgender immigrants in the United States do not access asylum services because they don't know they exist, or they have been in the country for longer than a year.

9. Sasha, an intersex immigrant from Russia, suggested hosting an LGBTQ Immigrant Week or Month, with community events, and more brochures in different languages.

10. Jupiter, a transgender Latina DACA recipient working with Parivar Bay Area, highlighted the need for physical and mental health resources and employment resources. She called for a more solidified safety net of social services for LGBTQ immigrants, including continued funding for the Guaranteed Income for Trans People (GIFT) Program and expansion beyond its 55 participants; continued funding for the LGBT Asylum Project, El/La Para TransLatinas, Parivar Bay Area, and other organizations; making recommendations to the Mayor's plan to end transgender homelessness by 2027 with a specific focus on transgender immigrants; and the importance of hiring LGBTQ immigrants to continue the tradition of peer-led transgender organizations.

11. Dr. Raul Gutierrez of UCSF Health and Human Rights Initiative discussed Medi-Cal's

expansion to all Californians regardless of immigration status, noting that many people are not prepared to get the health care they need. He suggested that the Commission work with the Department of Public Health (DPH) and the San Francisco Health Network to roll out a campaign targeting communities to enroll in Medi-Cal.

12. Valeria Suarez, the coordinator for OCEIA's DreamSF fellowship program, identified themselves as a queer undocumented person who migrated at the age of 16 and was never eligible for DACA. They noted the importance of screening for immigration benefits including asylum and Special Immigrant Juvenile Status (SIJS), and investing in basic needs. They called on the Commission to continue to push for programs like DreamSF and to encourage organizations to hire independent contractors. They highlighted the importance of addressing those who don't qualify for DACA, and asked how we can support the undocumented community as a whole to thrive, not just adjust.

13. Ryan Hundley, president of the board for the LGBT Asylum Project, discussed the importance of amplifying the work of non-profits, noting that much of their work is fragmented. He suggested pulling all of the information together in a way that is easy to navigate. One option is a physical location where immigrants can go to learn about City and non-profit resources.

14. Anjali Rimi, executive director of Parivar Bay Area, recommended making every organization that is funded by OCEIA transgender-competent, and suggested that the Office of Transgender Initiatives (OTI) provide the trainings.

15. J Jha of Parivar Bay Area asked for more opportunities like this hearing, where the community can define what it needs and execute it together, and suggested that the Commission use its position to convene community organizations on a regular basis.

Chair Kennelly thanked members of the public for their comments. She called for remote public comment and there was no remote public comment on this item.

**e. Closing Remarks**  
*(Information)*

This item is to allow the Chair and Commissioners Latt and Ruiz to provide brief closing remarks on today's hearing.

Commissioner Latt summarized some of the key themes that were raised at the hearing, including housing, mental health, and career training opportunities, and advocacy for a more lenient timeline and fewer restrictions for community members. Commissioner

Ruiz thanked speakers and members of the public for attending the hearing. Chair Kennelly discussed the importance of addressing the needs of LGBTQ immigrants and looks forward to working with Commissioner Latt to develop recommendations on how the City can support LGBTQ immigrants.

**5. Action Item: Approval of previous minutes**

*(Discussion/Action)*

a. Approval of March 20, 2023 Full Commission Meeting Minutes

Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Immigrant Rights Commission's March 20, 2023 Full Commission meeting. Explanatory document: [IRC Full Commission Minutes - March 20, 2023](#)

Commissioner Obregon motioned to approve the March 20, 2023 Full Commission meeting minutes, seconded by Commissioner Chaudhary. Chair Kennelly called for public comment, and there was no public comment on this item. In response to a question from Commissioner Wang, Director Rivas stated that Commissioners may not abstain from voting unless they have a conflict of interest. The motion was approved, with 10 Commissioners voting yes and one Commissioner (Commissioner Wang) voting no.

**6. Action Item: Proposed Resolution on California Domestic Workers Bill SB-686 (Commissioner Souza)**

*(Discussion/Action)*

This item allows the Full Commission to discuss and take possible action on Commissioner Souza's proposed resolution in support of SB-686 (Durazo). The Executive Committee has voted to issue the resolution in support of SB-686, following edits by the Executive Committee and OCEIA staff. In 2021, the Full Commission issued a resolution in support of SB-321 (Durazo), the Health and Safety for All Workers Act.

Vice Chair Paz motioned to issue the resolution in support of Senate Bill 686, seconded by Commissioner Obregon. Chair Kennelly called for public comment, and there was no public comment on this item. The motion was approved unanimously by the 11 Commissioners present.

**7. Adjournment**

Chair Kennelly thanked everyone for attending the special hearing and adjourned the meeting at 7:56 p.m.

