

File No: 190433

Petitions and Communications received from April 8, 2019, through April 15, 2019, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on April 23, 2019.

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, pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18), making the following appointment: Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

Darshan Singh- Human Services Commission- term ending January 15, 2020
Margaret Brodtkin - Juvenile Probation Commission - term ending
January 15, 2023

From the Office of the Mayor, pursuant to Health and Safety Code, Section 34173(g) and Ordinance 215-12 making the following appointment to the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure: Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

Mara Rosales - term ending November 3, 2022
Bivett Brackett - term ending November 3, 2020
Desi Danganan - term ending November 3, 2022

From the Office of the Controller, submitting a memorandum on the field follow-up of its 2016 audit of the processes the Department of Public Health uses when its employees leave their jobs. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From the Office of the Controller and the Airport Commission, submitting an audit of Paradies-SFO, LLC (tenant). Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From the Department of Park and Recreation, pursuant to Park Code, Section 16.107, submitting the FY2019-2023 five year strategic plan and the two-year capital Expenditure Plan and Operational Plan for FY2020-2021. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From SFERS, submitting the Retirement Contribution Rates for Fiscal Year 2019-2020. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From the Department of Elections, submitting notice that voters will begin using Dominions's voting system, Democracy Suite, in the November 9, 2019 election. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From Vision Zero Coalition members, regarding the City's latest Vision Zero Action Strategy, released on February 28, 2019. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From Brian Hofer, Executive Director of Secure Justice, regarding Surveillance Technology Ordinance. File No. 190110. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From Lisa Hill, regarding the proposed legislation to close Juvenile Hall. File No. 190392. Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From Jeri Papuga, regarding Edna, the Station 49 Firehouse cat. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From concerned citizens, regarding appointments to the SRO Task Force. File No. 190379. 3 letters. Copy Each Supervisor. (12)

From concerned citizens, regarding California State Assembly Bill No. 362 (Eggman, Wiener, Friedman). File No. 190221. 98 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (13)

From concerned citizens, regarding the proposed project at 1052-1060 Folsom and 190-194 Russ. File No. 190097. 7 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From concerned citizens, regarding California State Senate Bill 50 (Wiener). File No. 190319. 33 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From the Office of the Mayor, submitting State Legislation Committee minutes from the April 11, 2019 meeting. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From the Office of the Mayor, pursuant to Charter, Section 8A.102, making the following appointment to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors: Copy: Each Supervisor. (17)

Amanda Eaken - term ending March 1, 2023

From the San Francisco Democratic Party, regarding the Resolution in Support of Fair and Equitable Contract for City and County of San Francisco Employees. Copy: Each Supervisor. (18)

From Gerrie Scott, regarding renaming Gilbert Street to "Jeff Adachi Way." Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From concerned citizens, regarding the elimination of street cleaning on Cresta Vista Drive. 4 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

From the City Administrator and Capital Planning Committee Chair, pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 3.21, regarding Public Utilities Commission Revenue Bonds and Hall of Justice Exit Projects. Copy: Each Supervisor. (21)

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

 MEMORANDUM

Date: April 15, 2019
 To: Members, Board of Supervisors
 From: *ACC* Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
 Subject: Mayoral Appointment

On April 12, 2019, the Mayor submitted the following complete appointment package, pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18):

- **Darshan Singh** - Human Services Commission - term ending January 15, 2020

This appointment is effective immediately unless rejected by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors. Pursuant to Board Rule 2.18.3, a Supervisor may request a hearing on a Mayoral appointment by 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 appointment as provided in Charter, Section 3.100(18).

If you are interested in requesting a hearing on this appointment, please notify me in writing by **12:00 p.m., Friday, April 19, 2019.**

(Attachments)

c: John Carroll - Acting Legislative Deputy
 Victor Young - Rules Clerk
 Jon Givner - Deputy City Attorney
 Sophia Kittler - Mayor's Legislative Liaison

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

Notice of Appointment

April 12, 2019

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2019 APR 12 PM 4:49
BY *eu*

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

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

Darshan Singh to the Human Services Commission to fill the unexpired portion of Dr. Pablo Stewart's term ending January 15, 2020.

I am confident that Mr. Singh will 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 Appointments, Kanishka Cheng, at 415.554.6696.

Sincerely,

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

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

From: [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Nevin, Peggy \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [GIVNER, JON \(CAT\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [Karunaratne, Kanishka \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: TIME SENSITIVE: Mayoral Appointment, Charter 3.100(18)
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 12:47:00 PM
Attachments: [Clerk's Memo 4.11.19.pdf](#)
[Mayor's Appointment Letter 4.11.19.pdf](#)

Hello,

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

Thank you,

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

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

MEMORANDUM

Date: April 11, 2019
To: Members, Board of Supervisors
From: *acc* Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Subject: Mayoral Appointment

On April 10, 2019, the Mayor submitted the following complete appointment package, pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18):

- **Margaret Brodtkin** - Juvenile Probation Commission - term ending January 15, 2023

This appointment is effective immediately unless rejected by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors. Pursuant to Board Rule 2.18.3, a Supervisor may request a hearing on a Mayoral appointment by 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 appointment as provided in Charter, Section 3.100(18).

If you are interested in requesting a hearing on this appointment, please notify me in writing by **12:00 p.m., Wednesday, April 17, 2019.**

(Attachments)

c: John Carroll - Acting Legislative Deputy
Victor Young - Rules Clerk
Jon Givner - Deputy City Attorney
Sophia Kittler - Mayor's Legislative Liaison

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO




LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

Notice of Appointment

April 10, 2019

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2019 APR 10 PM 4:14
BY 

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

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

Margaret Brodtkin to the Juvenile Probation Commission for a four year term ending January 15, 2023, replacing Rebecca Woodson.

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

Should you have any question about this appointment, please contact my Director of Appointments, Mawuli Tugbenyoh, at 415.554.6298.

Sincerely,

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

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

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

MEMORANDUM

Date: April 12, 2019
To: Members, Board of Supervisors
From: *AC* Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Subject: Nominations by the Mayor

On April 12, 2019, the Mayor submitted the following complete nomination packages to the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure, pursuant to the California Health and Safety Code, Section 34173 and Ordinance 215-12.

- **Mara Rosales** - term ending November 3, 2022 (re-nomination)
- **Bivett Brackett** - term ending November 3, 2020
- **Desi Danganan** - term ending November 3, 2022

These nominations are subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by a majority vote.

The Office of the Clerk of the Board will open files for these nominations and the hearings will be scheduled before the Rules Committee.

(Attachments)

c: John Carroll - Acting Legislative Deputy
Victor Young - Rules Clerk
Kanishka Cheng - Mayor's Legislative Liaison
Jon Givner - Deputy City Attorney

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

Notice of Re-appointment

April 11, 2019

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2019 APR 12 PM 4:52
BY JK

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to CA Health and Safety Code § 34173(g); Ordinance No. 215-12, I make the following re-appointment:

Mara Rosales to the Successor Agency Commission (Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure) for a four year term ending November 3, 2022.

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

Should you have any question about this appointment, please contact my Director of Commission Affairs, Kanishka Cheng, at 415.554.6696

Sincerely,

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

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

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

Notice of Appointment

April 12, 2019

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2019 APR 12 PM 4:53
BY *BT*

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to CA Health and Safety Code § 34173(g); Ordinance No. 215-12, I make the following appointment:

Bivett Brackett to the Successor Agency Commission (Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure) to fill the unexpired portion of the term held by Darshan Singh ending on November 3, 2020.

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

Should you have any question about this appointment, please contact my Director of Commission Affairs, Kanishka Cheng, at 415.554.6696.

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

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

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

Notice of Appointment

April 11, 2019

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2019 APR 12 PM 4:53
BY *JK*

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to CA Health and Safety Code § 34173(g); Ordinance No. 215-12, I make the following appointment:

Desi Danganan to the Successor Agency Commission (Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure) for a four year term ending November 3, 2022, replacing Marily Mondejar in Seat 2.

I am confident that Mr. Danganan will 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 Commission Affairs, Kanishka Cheng, at 415.554.6696.

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

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

From: [Reports, Controller \(CON\)](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [Bruss, Andrea \(MYR\)](#); [Kirkpatrick, Kelly \(MYR\)](#); [Cretan, Jeff \(MYR\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [alubos@sftc.org](#); [pkilkenny@sftc.org](#); [Campbell, Severin \(BUD\)](#); [Newman, Debra \(BUD\)](#); [Rose, Harvey \(BUD\)](#); [Docs, SF \(LIB\)](#); [CON-EVERYONE](#); [Colfax, Grant \(DPH\)](#); [Weigelt, Ron \(DPH\)](#); [Daevu, Darlene \(DPH\)](#)
Subject: Issued: Field Follow-up of the Department of Public Health's Employee Separation Process
Date: Monday, April 15, 2019 2:03:25 PM

The Office of the Controller's City Services Auditor (CSA) today issued a memorandum on the field follow-up of its 2016 audit of the processes the Department of Public Health uses when its employees leave their jobs (separate). The assessment found that the department fully implemented and closed 11 of the audit's 13 recommendations with 2 recommendations remaining open.

To view the memorandum, please visit our website at:

<http://openbook.sfgov.org/webreports/details3.aspx?id=2694>

This is a send-only e-mail address. For questions about the memorandum, please contact Chief Audit Executive Tonia Lediju at tonia.lediju@sfgov.org or 415-554-5393 or CSA at 415-554-7469.

Follow us on Twitter @SFController.



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER


CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller

Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

FIELD FOLLOW-UP MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Grant Colfax, Director of Health
Department of Public Health

FROM: Tonia Lediju, PhD, Chief Audit Executive
Audits Division, City Services Auditor 

DATE: April 15, 2019

SUBJECT: Field Follow-up of the 2016 Audit of the Department of Public Health's Employee Separation Process

SUMMARY

The Office of the Controller's City Services Auditor (CSA) issued a report in October 2016, *Public Health's Employee Separation Process Needs Improvement to Minimize the Risk of Unauthorized Access to Buildings, Property, and Data*. CSA has completed a field follow-up to determine the corrective actions that the Department of Public Health (Public Health) has taken in response to the report. The report contains 13 recommendations, 11 of which have been implemented and closed and 2 of which have been partially implemented and are still open.

BACKGROUND, OBJECTIVES & METHODOLOGY

Background

The Department and Its Employees. Public Health provides direct health services through the San Francisco Health Network, which includes Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital and Trauma Center (General Hospital), Laguna Honda Hospital and Rehabilitation Center (Laguna Honda), and numerous clinics throughout San Francisco. As of 2016, when the audit was completed, the department had approximately 8,000 civil service (city) employees and approximately 3,000 employees of the University of California, San Francisco, (UCSF) worked at Public Health locations, primarily General Hospital. These personnel were complemented by approximately 500 volunteers.

Access and Items Given to Employees. Public Health may grant employees, contractors, UCSF employees, and volunteers providing services at Public Health locations access to a variety of information technology (IT) systems that contain confidential information. They are also granted access to buildings where patients are cared for and patient-related confidential records are stored, according

to the managers of Public Health's IT units. In addition to using badges to control general access to buildings, Public Health hospitals and clinics also issue keys to some employees for access to specific parts of buildings, according to Public Health management and staff.

Public Health may issue a variety of items to employees depending on their roles. Examples of items issued to some employees include:

- Laptop or notebook computers (laptops)
- Electronic tablets
- Mobile phones
- Pagers
- Prescription pads

Numerous Public Health units are responsible for issuing these items.

Employee Separations. Separations are overseen by one of three units of Public Health's Human Resources (HR) organization: General Hospital's HR Operations unit, Laguna Honda's HR Operations unit, or the Central Office's HR Operations unit. All separations from units other than the two hospitals are overseen by the Central Office, according to staff. The process for separating Public Health employees varies by location. According to Volunteer Services staff, separations of volunteers, most of whom work at General Hospital and Laguna Honda, are performed by the volunteer services units at each hospital. Deactivation of IT access to three systems is administered by different units of Public Health's Information Technology Applications Group.

Findings of the 2016 Audit. CSA's 2016 audit of Public Health's employee separations processes found that units of Public Health do not coordinate sufficiently or track information systems access, building access, or property issuances appropriately, putting confidential data and departmental property at risk.

Objective

The objective of this field follow-up was to determine whether Public Health has taken the corrective actions recommended in CSA's October 12, 2016, audit report. Consistent with Government Auditing Standards, Section 7.05, promulgated by the U.S. Government Accountability Office, the purposes of audit reports include facilitating follow-up to determine whether appropriate corrective actions have been taken.

This field follow-up is a nonaudit service. Government Auditing Standards do not cover nonaudit services, which are defined as professional services other than audits or attestation engagements. Therefore, Public Health is responsible for the substantive outcomes of the work performed during this field follow-up and is responsible to be in a position, in fact and appearance, to make an informed judgment on the results of the nonaudit service.

Methodology

To conduct the field follow-up, CSA:

- Obtained and reviewed documentary evidence from Public Health.
- Interviewed Public Health staff to understand and verify the status and nature of the corrective actions taken.
- Verified the status of the recommendations that Public Health had reported as implemented.

RESULTS

Public Health has fulfilled the intent of 11 (85 percent) of the 13 recommendations made in CSA's 2016 audit report, which are now closed. CSA determined that 2 recommendations are partially implemented and still open.

Implemented and Closed Recommendations

Recommendation	Conclusion
Public Health should:	
1. Implement a process to have the department's Human Resources system notify the department's Information Technology units of impending employee separations no later than on the employee's termination date.	Public Health maintains an Exit List Database, which is updated nightly to ensure the IT unit is notified of separations by the employee's termination date. CSA verified the implementation status by reviewing reports from the Exit List Database and the HR 2000 system that show employee separations and include separation dates.
2. Implement a policy that the department's Information Technology units must deactivate employees' system accounts within three days after notification of an employee separation and ensure the policy is followed. In the case of an employee's removal under involuntary or adverse conditions, ensure that access is deactivated at the time the employee is advised of the removal.	A process runs nightly to automatically deactivate separated employees' accounts in the IN Domain Active Directory based on employee separation dates in the Exit List Database. All access of separated employees to applications that use the IN Domain Active Directory authentication are automatically terminated, including Public Health's network and remote desktops. The employee accounts themselves are not always deactivated within three days of employee separation because access to them is terminated. Therefore, Public Health uses a manual process to deactivate those accounts. CSA verified the implementation status by reviewing the formal policies and procedures that document the requirements for this process and a report from the Exit List Database that shows employee's account deactivation dates.

Recommendation	Conclusion
3. Base initial disconnection decisions on accurate information provided to the department's Information Technology units by its Human Resources organization.	Initial disconnection decisions are based on accurate information provided by Public Health's use of a universal employee checklist, employee separation notification e-mails to the IT unit, and the nightly updating of the Exit List Database. CSA verified the implementation status by reviewing samples of the universal employee checklist, e-mails to the IT unit, and reports from the Exit List Database, which all show separation dates for separating employees.
4. Track contractor access separately in all badging and information technology systems and check with contracting agencies monthly as to whether each of their employees should still have access to the premises and information technology system.	Public Health's contractors are tracked separately in the badging system (P2000) and through color coding the physical badges. Public Health stated that because there are more than 300 contracting agencies it cannot reasonably comply with the recommended action to check the status of each contractor monthly. Public Health uses a mitigating control to periodically check the status of its contractors' employees by setting their badges to expire every six months and requiring their supervisor to approve reactivation. CSA verified the implementation status by reviewing the badge color coding matrix, sample badges, and screen shots of the system field used to classify employees as contractors and to set expiration at a six-month interval. CSA deems the portion of the recommendation to check contractor status monthly no longer applicable and the recommendation closed.
5. Ensure that each contractor badge is assigned an expiration date when the badge is issued.	The badges of contractor employees are assigned expiration dates in the badging system (P2000) when they are issued and renewed. The system automatically deactivates the badges on the expiration dates. CSA verified the implementation status by reviewing screen shots from the badging system that show badge access rights definitions, including descriptions of an employee's status as a contractor and the badge's expiration date.
6. Ensure that the Human Resources unit notifies the Operations and Facilities units of upcoming separations so that these units can ensure that access to the premises is terminated in a timely manner.	Access to the premises is often terminated by Public Health supervisors and HR units instead of the facilities units. The supervisor collects keys and badges on the employee's last day. According to Public Health, HR units deactivate badges that allow site access by changing the badge expiration date. CSA verified the implementation status by reviewing a sample of completed universal employee checklists, which both HR and the separating

Recommendation	Conclusion
	employee's supervisors use in this process. CSA suggests that Public Health update its policies and procedures to reflect HR's practice of deactivating badges.
7. Ensure that when policies involving multiple Public Health units are instituted, all units that are to carry out the policies are aware of their responsibilities.	Public Health's employee separation policy outlines the duties the various units are to carry out. When this policy was instituted, Public Health held a training for supervisors and employees handling employee separations. CSA verified the implementation status by reviewing the training e-mail communication, sign-in sheet, presentation slides, and policy distributed at the training, which indicate that responsible parties were notified of their respective duties.
8. Ensure that all policies specify which unit or employee is responsible for carrying out each function.	CSA verified the implementation status by reviewing Public Health's staff identification badge (ID) policy and employee separation policy, standard work instruction for badge issuance, and Security Services Standard Operating Procedure. All policies and procedures state which unit is responsible for carrying out each function.
9. Ensure that units responsible for badge assignment give each employee a unique badge number and do not reassign old badge numbers that belonged to separated employees.	Public Health's badging system (P2000) has parameters to prevent reuse of badge numbers. Public Health also keeps logs of used badge numbers as a secondary control. CSA verified the implementation status by reviewing the logs of used badge numbers and screen shots of the badging system error that occurs when reuse of a badge number is attempted.
10. Institute processes at all of its facilities to track each key by key number, record to whom each key was issued, and document that it was collected when the key holder separated.	Public Health tracks keys by key number, key holder, and return date via the Sight Master 2000 system. CSA verified the implementation status by reviewing a return key report from Sight Master 2000. The report shows that each key is tracked by key number, who each key holder is, and the return date of each key.
11. Require every unit to track the items it issues to each employee in sufficient detail to identify the individual item.	Public Health uses the universal employee checklist as the centralized tool to track items issued to employees. On the checklist, keys have stamp numbers indicated, laptops have IT tag numbers indicated, and pagers have phone numbers indicated. This provides sufficient detail to identify individual items that are tracked. CSA verified the implementation status by reviewing samples of the universal employee checklist, which is used to document and track the items issued to employees.

Partially Implemented and Open Recommendations

Recommendation	Conclusion
Public Health should:	
12. Require every unit that issues items to staff to track whether issued items are collected.	Public Health uses the universal employee checklist to track items issued to employees by inventorying these items at onboarding and using the list to collect the items at offboarding. However, because of employment longevity and equipment turnover, the checklist cannot guarantee all equipment is tracked and recovered. Equipment that is replaced or newly assigned to an employee after hire often will not be included on the checklist. To aid equipment tracking, in 2019 Public Health plans to implement a new procedure to inventory equipment assigned to employees during their annual evaluations. Using the issued-items inventory list from evaluations in conjunction with the universal employee checklist, Public Health should be able to ensure all items are recovered from separating employees.
13. Require managers to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verify the items that were issued to an employee before the employee separates. • Collect the items from the employee before the employee separates. • Provide the collected items to the unit in charge of tracking issuance and collections. 	

CSA follows up on recommendations for open reports and memorandums every six months after they are issued. CSA extends its appreciation to you and your staff who assisted with this project. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at (415) 554-5393 or tonia.lediju@sfgov.org.

cc: Public Health
 Ron Weigelt
 Darlene Daevu

Controller
 Ben Rosenfield
 Todd Rydstrom
 Mark de la Rosa
 Mark Tipton
 Eryl Karr

Attachment: Department Response

City and County of San Francisco



Department of Public Health

London N. Breed
Mayor

Dr. Grant Colfax
Director of Health

April 5th, 2019

Tonia Lediju, Audit Director
Office of the Controller, City Services Auditor Division
City Hall, Room 476
One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Subject: DPH Acknowledgement to CSA Field Follow-up of the 2016 Audit of the
Department of Public Health's Employee Separation Process

Dr. Ms. Lediju,

Thank you for providing us the opportunity to respond to your field follow-up audit of your report, "*The 2016 Audit of the Department of Public Health's Employee Separation Process*" as prepared by the Controller's Office, City Services Auditor.

We acknowledge that eleven recommendations are now closed and two are partially implemented. We appreciate the time spent by your staff to review the Department of Public Health Employee Separation Process.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact Ron Weigelt at (415) 554-2592.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Grant Colfax".

Dr. Grant Colfax
San Francisco Director of Health

CC w/enclosure:
Tomas Aragon, Population Health Division Director
Roland Pickens, SF Health Network Director
Susan Ehrlich, ZSFG Chief Executive Director
Mivic Hirose, LHH Chief Executive Director
Ron Weigelt, Human Resources Director
Winona Mindolovich, CIO (Acting)
Basil Price, Security Director
Kathy Jung, Facilities and Capital Planning Director
Karen Hill, HR Staffing and Lean Director
Darlene Daevu, Project Director (PHD, Finance & Performance Mgt.)

101 Grove Street, #308, San Francisco CA 94102

From: [Reports, Controller \(CON\)](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [Bruss, Andrea \(MYR\)](#); [Kirkpatrick, Kelly \(MYR\)](#); [Cretan, Jeff \(MYR\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [alubos@sftc.org](#); [pkilkenny@sftc.org](#); [Docs, SF \(LIB\)](#); [CON-EVERYONE](#); [Ivar Satero \(AIR\)](#); [Corina Monzon \(AIR\)](#); [Leo Fermin \(AIR\)](#); [Wallace Tang \(AIR\)](#); [Shane Balanon \(AIR\)](#); [Cheryl Nashir \(AIR\)](#); [Nanette Hendrickson \(AIR\)](#); [Sharon Perez \(AIR\)](#); [Scott P. Johnson](#); [Harrison Murk](#); [veronique.dubois@paradies-na.com](#); [chuck.kersey@paradies-na.com](#)
Subject: Issued: Audit of Paradies-SFO, LLC
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 2:46:13 PM

The City and County of San Francisco's Airport Commission (Airport) coordinates with the Office of the Controller's City Services Auditor (CSA) to conduct periodic compliance audits of the Airport's tenants and airlines. CSA engaged Macias Gini & O'Connell LLP (MGO) to audit Airport tenants and airlines to determine whether they complied with the reporting, payment, and selected other provisions of their agreements with the Airport.

CSA presents the report of MGO's audit of Paradies-SFO, LLC, (tenant). The tenant reported gross revenues of \$5,338,885 and paid \$916,956 in rent to the Airport in accordance with the lease agreement. However, the tenant submitted the required 2016 annual report late to the Airport.


To view the full report, please visit our website.
<http://openbook.sfgov.org/webreports/details3.aspx?id=2693>

This is a send-only e-mail address. For questions about the report, please contact Chief Audit Executive Tonia Lediju at tonia.lediju@sfgov.org or 415-554-5393 or the CSA Audits Division at 415-554-7469.

Follow us on Twitter @SFController.

Paradies-SFO, LLC, Reported Its Revenue and Paid Rent for August 2015 Through July 2017 in Accordance With Its Lease Agreement but Submitted the Required 2016 Annual Report Late

Airport Commission



April 11, 2019

City & County of San Francisco
Office of the Controller
City Services Auditor

About the Audits Division

The City Services Auditor (CSA) was created in the Office of the Controller through an amendment to the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco (City) that voters approved in November 2003. Within CSA, the Audits Division ensures the City's financial integrity and promotes efficient, effective, and accountable government by:

- Conducting performance audits of city departments, contractors, and functions to assess efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery and business processes.
- Investigating reports received through its whistleblower hotline of fraud, waste, and abuse of city resources.
- Providing actionable recommendations to city leaders to promote and enhance accountability and improve the overall performance and efficiency of city government.

Audit Team:

Winnie Woo, Senior Auditor

Audit Consultant:

Macias Gini & O'Connell LLP (MGO)

For more information please contact:

Tonia Lediju, PhD
Chief Audit Executive
Office of the Controller
City and County of San Francisco
(415) 554-5393



<http://www.sfcontroller.org>



[@sfcontroller](https://twitter.com/sfcontroller)



<https://www.linkedin.com/company/sfaudits/>

Audit Authority

CSA conducted this audit under the authority of the San Francisco Charter, Section 3.105 and Appendix F, which requires that CSA conduct periodic, comprehensive financial and performance audits of city departments, services and activities.



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield
Controller

Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

April 11, 2019

San Francisco Airport Commission
San Francisco International Airport
P.O. Box 8097
San Francisco, CA 94128-8097

Mr. Ivar Satero, Airport Director
San Francisco International Airport
P.O. Box 8097
San Francisco, CA 94128-8097

Dear Commission President, Commissioners, and Mr. Satero:

The City and County of San Francisco's Airport Commission (Airport) coordinates with the Office of the Controller's City Services Auditor (CSA) to conduct periodic compliance audits of Airport tenants and airlines. CSA engaged Macias Gini & O'Connell LLP (MGO) to audit airlines that do business with the Airport to ensure they comply with the landing fee provisions of their agreements. CSA's Audits Division presents the attached report for the compliance audit of Paradies-SFO, LLC, (tenant), prepared by MGO.

Reporting Period: August 1, 2015, through July 31, 2017

Rent Paid: \$916,956

Results:

The tenant reported gross revenues of \$5,338,885 and paid \$916,956 in rent to the Airport in accordance with the lease agreement. However, the tenant submitted the required 2016 annual report late to the Airport.

The responses of the Airport and the tenant are attached to this report.

CSA and MGO appreciate the assistance and cooperation of Airport and tenant staff during the audit. For questions about the report, please contact me at tonia.lediju@sfgov.org or 415-554-5393 or CSA at 415-554-7469.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tonia Lediju".

Tonia Lediju, PhD
Chief Audit Executive

cc: Board of Supervisors
Budget Analyst
Citizens Audit Review Board
City Attorney
Civil Grand Jury
Mayor
Public Library

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER**

**PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT
Paradies-SFO, LLC**

August 1, 2015 through July 31, 2017



**Certified
Public
Accountants**

Performance Audit Report

Chief Audit Executive
City and County of San Francisco

Macias Gini & O'Connell LLP (MGO) presents its report concerning the performance audit of Paradies-SFO, LLC (Tenant) for the period August 1, 2015 through July 31, 2017 as follows:

Background

The Tenant entered into a lease agreement number 11-0211 (Agreement) with the Airport Commission of the City and County of San Francisco (Commission) for operations of a newsstand in Boarding Area F of Terminal 3 at the San Francisco International Airport. The Agreement requires the Tenant to submit to the City and County of San Francisco's Airport Department (Airport) a monthly report showing its gross revenues and rent due.

For the period of our performance audit, August 1, 2015 through July 31, 2017, the Agreement required payment of the greater of monthly minimum rent or percentage rent thresholds as outlined below.

Lease:	11-0211
Reporting Periods:	August 1, 2015 to July 31, 2017
Lease Term:	August 1, 2012 to July 31, 2019
Percentage Rent:	12% of Gross Revenues up to \$500,000, plus 14% of Gross Revenues over \$500,000 up to and including \$1,000,000, plus 16% of Gross Revenues over \$1,000,000

Minimum monthly rent is specified in the lease and has step increases stipulated by the Agreement.

<u>Period</u>	<u>Minimum Monthly Rent</u>
August 2015 through July 2016	\$ 36,022.63
August 2016 through July 2017	36,993.45

As specified in the Agreement, the Tenant shall pay the minimum monthly rent or percentage rent, whichever is greater. The percentage rent owed each month in excess of the monthly minimum is due as additional rent to the Airport.

Objectives and Scope

The objectives of this performance audit was to determine whether the Tenant was in substantial compliance with the reporting, payment, and other rent related provisions of its Agreement with the Commission. To meet the objectives of our performance audit and based upon the provisions of the City and County of San Francisco (City) contract number P-600 (9-15) dated November 15, 2016, between MGO and the City, and per Appendix A therein, we performed tests that gross revenues for the audit period were reported to the Airport in accordance with the Agreement provisions, and that such amounts agreed with the Tenant's underlying accounting records. Our testing also included identifying whether any significant discrepancies (over or under) in reporting exist. If such discrepancies were identified, this report includes the adjustments to rent payable to the Airport and our recommendations to improve record keeping and reporting processes of the Tenant relative to its ability to comply with Agreement provisions.

The scope of our audit was limited to the records and reports supporting the gross revenues reported and rent paid or payable by the Tenant to the Airport for the period from August 1, 2015 through July 31, 2017.

This audit and the resulting report relates only to the gross revenues and rents reported by the Tenant, and does not extend to any other performance or financial audits of the Commission, the City and the Tenant.

Methodology

To meet the objectives of our performance audit, we performed the following procedures: inspected and identified the applicable terms of the Agreement; inspected the procedures and internal controls of the Tenant for collecting, recording, summarizing and reporting its gross revenues and calculating its payments to the Airport; conducted interviews and walkthroughs with Tenant and Airport personnel; and conducted non-statistical testing, without projecting to the population, using a random selection of 2 sample months for each lease year and randomly selected 3 sample days for each sample month per guidelines provided by the City. We also recalculated monthly rent due (greater of percentage rent or minimum rent) by computing the monthly percentage rent and comparing to the minimum monthly rent due for each month within the audit period and verified the timeliness of reporting gross revenues and rent and submitting rent payments to the Airport. We noted no exceptions within the results of our non-statistical sample testing.

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards set forth in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

Audit Results

Based on the results of our performance audit for the period from August 1, 2015 through July 31, 2017, the Tenant reported gross receipts of \$5,338,885 and paid rent of \$916,956 to the Airport in accordance with its Agreement provisions. The reported amounts agreed to the underlying records.

The Agreement between the Tenant and the Commission defines gross revenues and percentage rent. The table below shows the Tenant reported total gross revenue and percentage rent paid to the Airport for the period under audit.

Gross Revenues and Percentage Rent Paid

August 1, 2015 through July 31, 2017

Lease No. 11-0211

Lease Period	Gross Revenue Reported by Tenant	Calculated Percentage Rent Stipulated by Lease	Minimum Rent Stipulated by Lease	Additional Rent Due	Rent Paid per Airport Payment Records	Over (Under) Payment
	A	B	C	D (B-C)	E	F (E-C-D)
August 1, 2015 through July 31, 2016	\$ 2,602,837	\$ 386,454	\$ 432,272	\$ -	\$ 448,569	\$ 16,297 *
August 1, 2016 through July 31, 2017	2,736,048	407,768	443,921	-	468,387	24,466 *
Total	\$ 5,338,885	\$ 794,222	\$ 876,193	\$ -	\$ 916,956	\$ 40,763

* A true-up is performed at the end of each lease year by the Airport to determine the total amount of rent that the Tenant is required to pay each lease year. The greater amount between column B and column C is the amount of rent that the Tenant should have paid during the respective lease year. If the rent paid (column E) is greater than the greater of column B or C, the overpayment is applied as a credit to the Tenant's monthly rent in the future. For lease years 2016 and 2017, the Tenant received credits of \$16,297 and \$24,466, respectively, as a result of the true-up performed by the Airport. The overpayment for lease year 2016 was applied to the Tenant's minimum monthly rent for October 2016 and the overpayment for lease year 2017 was applied to the Tenant's minimum monthly rent for December 2017.

Finding 2016-01 – The Tenant submitted the required financial report, certified by an independent Certified Public Accountant (CPA), to the Airport for the audit period after the ninety days deadline.

According to Section 4.7 of the Agreement, “Within ninety (90) days after the end of each Lease Year, Tenant shall submit to Director an unqualified year-end financial report certified by an independent Certified Public Accountant showing Gross Revenues achieved with respect to the prior Lease Year.” MGO inspected and evaluated the certified annual sales reports for lease years 2016 and 2017 submitted by the Tenant to the Airport on November 1, 2016 and October 27, 2017, respectively.

The lease year period is August 1 through July 31. The due date for the annual report is October 29th. The annual report for lease year 2016 was submitted on November 1, 2016, which is three days after the due date. The Tenant should submit the annual report within the timeframe indicated in Section 4.7 of the Agreement in order to be in compliance with the Agreement. MGO had a similar finding on a previous audit and the Airport has since implemented a procedure in which a Property Manager will remind a Tenant twice via email to submit their certified annual report, typically 60 and 30 days prior to the due date. This procedure was implemented by the Airport in 2017, which is after the due date of the certified annual report for lease year 2016. Per Section 15.8 of the Agreement, the Director may elect to impose a \$100 fine for each day after the due date that the annual report is submitted, which would be up to \$300 for the three day late submittal of the 2016 annual report.

Recommendation 2016-01

The Airport should determine the extent of the fine, if any, to be imposed on the Tenant for the late submittal of the 2016 annual report.

Conclusion

With the exception noted above in finding 2016-01, we conclude that the Tenant was in substantial compliance with the reporting, payment, and other rent related provisions of its Agreement with the Commission.

A copy of this report has been provided to the Airport and the Tenant. The respective responses are attached to this report.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the City, the Commission, and the Tenant, and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Macias Gini & O'Connell LLP

Walnut Creek, California
April 4, 2019



San Francisco International Airport

March 20, 2019

Ms. Tonia Lediju
Director of City Audits
City Hall, Room 476
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102


Subject: Performance Audit of Paradies-SFO, LLC – Lease No. 11-0211

Dear Ms. Lediju:

We have received and reviewed the final draft audit report regarding the performance audit of Paradies-SFO, LLC. This letter is to confirm that, based upon the details provided, we agree with the audit result.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call us at 650.821.2850 (Wallace) or 650.821.4501 (Cheryl).

Very truly yours,



Wallace Tang, CPA, CGMA
Airport Controller



Cheryl Nashir
Director
Revenue Development & Management

Attachment

cc: Ivar Satero – SFO, Director
Jeff Littlefield – SFO, Chief Operating Officer
Leo Fermin – SFO, Chief Business & Finance Officer
Wallace Tang – SFO, Controller
Nanette Hendrickson – SFO, Assistant Director RDM
Sharon Perez – SFO, Property Manager RDM
Harrison Murk – MGO (hmurk@mgocpa.com)

AIRPORT COMMISSION CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

LARRY MAZZOLA
PRESIDENT

LINDA S. CRAYTON
VICE PRESIDENT

ELEANOR JOHNS

RICHARD J. GUGGENHIME

MALCOLM YEUNG

IVAR C. SATERO
AIRPORT DIRECTOR

Recommendation and Response

Audit: Paradies-SFO, LLC

For each recommendation, the responsible agency should indicate in the column labeled *Agency Response* whether it concurs, does not concur, or partially concurs and provide a brief explanation. If it concurs with the recommendation, it should indicate the expected implementation date and implementation plan. If the responsible agency does not concur or partially concurs, it should provide an explanation and an alternate plan of action to address the identified issue.

Recommendation	Agency Response	<u>CSA Use Only</u> Status Determination*
1. The Airport should determine the extent of the fine, if any, to be imposed on the Tenant for the late submittal of the 2016 annual report.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concur <input type="checkbox"/> Do Not Concur <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Concur Airport will impose a \$300 fine for Tenant's late submittal (3 days x \$100 per day) of their 2016 annual report per Section 15.8 of their Lease.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Open <input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Contested

* Status Determination based on audit team's review of the agency's response and proposed corrective action.



April 2nd, 2019

Tonia Lediju, PhD
Chief Audit Executive
City Hall, Room 476
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Response to Performance Audit Report Paradies-SFO, LLC (Tenant): August 1, 2015 through July 31, 2017

We have reviewed the report on this performance audit that was conducted to ensure that as a Tenant we were in substantial compliance with the reporting, payment, and other rent related provisions of our Agreement with the Airport Commission of the City and County of San Francisco (Commission) for the period between August 1, 2015 through July 31, 2017. We find the report acceptable and accurate.

It was a pleasure to work with the professionals of the audit staff.

Sincerely,

Chuck Kersey
CFO

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Chuck Kersey". The signature is written in a cursive style.

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: per Park Code 16.107
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 12:21:00 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[Ops Plan FY20 and FY21 staff report.pdf](#)
[Capital Expenditure Plan FY19 and FY20.pdf](#)
[SFRPD Strategic Plan FY19-23.pdf](#)

From: Emerson, Taylor (REC) <taylor.emerson@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, April 9, 2019 9:21 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Anderson, Raven (MYR) <raven.anderson@sfgov.org>
Subject: per Park Code 16.107

Dear Mayor's Budget Office and Board of Supervisors,

In compliance with Park Code 16.107 Park, Recreation, and Open Space Fund, last amended by voters in June 2016 as Proposition B, I am sending you both the current five year FY19-23 Strategic Plan approved by the Recreation and Park Commission (also available for download on our website), and the associated two-year Capital Expenditure Plan and Operational Plan FY20-21.

Yours in public service,
Taylor Emerson

Taylor Emerson

Director of Strategic Planning
 San Francisco Recreation and Park Department | City & County of San Francisco
 501 Stanyan | San Francisco, CA | 94117

(415) 831-2081 | taylor.emerson@sfgov.org



Visit us at sfrecpark.org
 Like us on [Facebook](#)
 Follow us on [Twitter](#)
 Watch us on [sfRecParkTV](#)
 Sign up for our [e-News](#)



STRATEGIC PLAN

SAN FRANCISCO
RECREATION
AND **PARKS** | 2019-23
UPDATE

Inspire, Connect, Play!





Welcome

The San Francisco Recreation and Park Department introduced a five-year Strategic Plan in 2016 which set forth our core strategies and objectives, and the specific initiatives to achieve our goals. This is the third annual update since our original Strategic Plan, which continues to guide us in creating a more livable city by ensuring that San Francisco's parks connect everyone in our diverse community to play, nature, and each other.

In the past year, we're happy to report that of the 61 initiatives, 23 were completed (including 11 equity-related initiatives) and another 35 are in progress, for a total of 95% undertaken or accomplished. A highlight accomplishment in each core strategy is:

- **a year of inspiring place with successful activation at Civic Center, the Jerry Garcia Amphitheater, and the Stanyan Edge of Golden Gate Park**
- **opening the City's first nature-based play area at Rolph Nicol Park (a partial conversion) which now provides inspiring opportunities to connect with nature for children in the neighborhood, nearby preschools, and many visitors, making it a destination park**
- **completion of an external engagement process to better understand the needs and interests of park users in equity zones with results staff have already used to inspire investment**
- **development and pilot of a nursery database, inventory, and ordering system that has already improved plant selection for resilience, efficiency of resources, and stewardship of our parks**
- **our first annual RPD-University employee conference, which included workshops on workforce development, organizational learning, and opportunities to build stronger connections to each other**

This updated Strategic Plan for the five-year period of FY19-23 introduces new initiatives to expand our park and recreation objectives, especially where it strengthens our work in disadvantaged communities to ensure park users everywhere have access to clean, safe, and fun parks.

I am most proud of the collaborative effort of our staff to keep our Strategic Plan a living, breathing document with a heart. I thank everyone who has offered feedback and helped to shape a dynamic vision for our parks -- including our Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Recreation and Park Commission, thousands of park advocates, and millions of park visitors. Together, we create an opportunity for everyone to get out and play, which makes us all happier, healthier, and more connected to nature and each other.

Phil Ginsburg, General Manager
San Francisco Recreation and Parks

Contributors

City & County of San Francisco

Mayor London N. Breed

Board of Supervisors

Norman Yee, President
Vallie Brown
Sandra Lee Fewer
Matt Haney
Rafael Mandelman
Gordon Mar

Aaron Peskin
Hillary Ronen
Ahsha Safai
Catherine Stefani
Shamann Walton

Recreation and Park Commission

Mark Buell, President
Allan Low, Vice President
Kat Anderson
Gloria Bonilla
Tom Harrison
Larry Mazzola, Jr.
Eric McDonnell

San Francisco Recreation and Parks

Phil Ginsburg	General Manager
Toks Ajike	Director of Capital and Planning
Lisa Bransten	Director of Partnerships
Derek Chu	Director of Administration & Finance
Dana Ketcham	Director of Property Management
Dennis Kern	Director of Operations
Sarah Madland	Director of Policy and Public Affairs
Staci White	Executive Assistant to the General Manager
Taylor Emerson	Analyst, Administration & Finance
Eric Pawlowsky	Analyst, Administration & Finance



Special thanks to the Park, Recreation, Open Space Advisory Committee

Our Mission (what we do)

The San Francisco Recreation and Park Department’s mission is to provide enriching recreational activities, maintain beautiful parks, and preserve the environment for the well-being of everyone in our diverse community.

Our Vision (what we aspire to achieve)

Inspiring a more livable city for all, San Francisco’s parks connect us to play, nature, and each other.

Inspire, connect, play!

Our Values (how we work)

RESPECT: We honor each other, the park users we serve, and the land we steward.

RESILIENCE: We address challenges with empathy, perspective, and determination. We creatively adapt to change.

RELATIONSHIPS: Our greatest strength lies in the teamwork and trust we cultivate with our colleagues, our park partners, and the park users we serve.

RESPONSIVENESS: We communicate openly, honestly, and reliably.

RESULTS: Because of our efforts our City is more livable; visitors revel in their experiences and return.

Our Strategies



Inspire Space

Keep today's parks safe, clean, and fun; promote our parks' historic and cultural heritage; and build the great parks of tomorrow



Inspire Play

Promote active living, well-being, and community for San Francisco's diverse and growing population



Inspire Investment

Through community engagement, advocacy, and partnerships, cultivate more financial resources to keep San Francisco's parks and programs accessible for all



Inspire Stewardship

Protect and enhance San Francisco's precious natural resources through conservation, education, and sustainable land/facility management practices



Inspire Our Team

Encourage innovation and cultivate a connected, engaged, and aligned workforce that delivers outstanding service



Strategy One: Inspire Place

Keep today's parks safe, clean, and fun; promote our parks' historic and cultural heritage; and build the great parks of tomorrow

OBJECTIVE 1.1

Develop more open space to address population growth in high-needs areas and emerging neighborhoods

- a** Commence remediation at India Basin in FY19 and plan interim activation
- b** In collaboration with OCII at the Shipyard, TIDA at Treasure Island, and OWED at Balboa Reservoir, maximize active recreation amenities to deliver RPD's component of the Executive Directive on Housing
- c** Complete detailed design of Francisco Reservoir by 2020

OBJECTIVE 1.2

Strengthen the quality of existing parks and facilities

- a** Break ground on the Golden Gate Tennis Center by Spring 2019
- b** Plan, design, and construct Tier 1 and 2 playgrounds in the Let'sPlaySF initiative
- c** Enter into MOU with HOPE SF Sunnydale team and identify funding strategy for a new gym and improved access to Herz Playground
- d** Develop and implement a Facility Management program at Recreation Centers
- e** Prioritize deferred maintenance renewals and discretionary capital resources in equity zone parks with below average park scores
- f** Finalize regulatory approvals to address environmental remediation and infrastructure enhancements at the Marina East Harbor
- g** Initiate asset data collection to implement TMA Preventative Maintenance module
- h** Create and implement a site evaluation program for indoor facilities
- i** Convene Ops and Capital Task Force to update project standards
- j** Improve and activate one mini park within an equity zone

OBJECTIVE 1.3 Steward and promote good park behavior

- a** Conduct one Sister Park event annually with PROSAC
- b** Right-size waste management at one additional park in FY19
- c** Develop standards, materials, and signage protocols for rec center entrances

OBJECTIVE 1.4 Preserve and celebrate historic and cultural resources

- a** Scope and commence planning to renovate the Japanese Tea Garden Pagoda
- b** Establish requirement for interpretive signage as part of all capital projects at park sites with historic, cultural, or natural resources
- c** Hold one kick-off event for Golden Gate Park's 150th anniversary
- d** Inventory and incorporate into Lifecycle database all historic and cultural resources
- e** Develop a concept, design, and public engagement plan for the Conservatory of Flowers campus
- f** Plan for a Summer Solstice event at the Conservatory of Flowers





Strategy Two: Inspire Play

Promote active living, well-being, and community for San Francisco's diverse and growing population

OBJECTIVE 2.1

Strengthen the quality, responsiveness, and accessibility of recreation programs

- a** Annually increase the number of inclusive recreation program participants
- b** Conduct a census at one Recreation Center and one Clubhouse
- c** Adopt and implement a departmental language access policy



OBJECTIVE 2.2

Strengthen and promote the safety, health, and well-being of San Francisco's youth and seniors


- a** Expand and promote senior programs that emphasize activity and community
- b** Restructure and align violence prevention programs
- c** Promote community activities post-renovation at first six Let'sPlaySF sites by early 2020



OBJECTIVE 2.3

Work with partners and neighborhood groups to activate parks through organized events, activities, and unstructured play

- a** Commence environmental impact report for Lake Merced West redevelopment
- b** Develop a guidance document to assist community organizations in developing and organizing community events in neighborhood parks
- c** Test new public realm activation strategies at Civic Center, Jerry Garcia Ampitheater, and Stanyan edge of Golden Gate Park annually
- d** Install ropes course at John McLaren Park
- e** Pilot one timed-use Dog Play Area
- f** Identify high-need areas for additional Dog Play Areas
- g** Plan a Summer solstice event at the Conservatory of Flowers





Strategy Three: Inspire Investment

Through community engagement, advocacy, and partnerships, cultivate more financial resources to keep San Francisco's parks and programs accessible for all

OBJECTIVE 3.1

Increase public investment to better align with infrastructure needs and service expectations

- a** Ensure short-term, continuing activation at the Palace of Fine Arts
- b** Develop timeline and size of next park bond in partnership with the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Capital Planning Committee, park advocates, and the community
- c** Release RFP for a new operator at Lincoln Golf Course
- d** Complete RFP process for Union Square concession spaces

OBJECTIVE 3.2

Broaden engagement and strengthen external communications with park users and park partners

- a** Engage in sustained community outreach, activation, and stewardship at Margaret Hayward Playground to increase visitation and build community connections
- b** Design the new RPD website in FY19; launch in FY20
- c** Migrate 50% of permits from CLASS to ActiveNet to enable online reservations in FY19; remainder in FY20

OBJECTIVE 3.3

Cultivate increased philanthropic support

- a** With the SF Parks Alliance, bring private support for Let'sPlay Playgrounds to \$14.5 million by 2020
- b** Work with the Francisco Park Conservancy support the park's renovation and develop a post renovation plan by Spring 2020
- c** Survey usage patterns to measure the impact of capital investment at all Let'sPlaySF sites



Strategy Four: Inspire Stewardship

Protect and enhance San Francisco's precious natural resources through conservation, education, and sustainable land/facility management practices

OBJECTIVE 4.1 Conserve and strengthen natural resources

- a** Obtain Audubon certification of one public golf course
- b** Develop reforestation guidelines for all maintained park sites to sustain a healthy and vibrant tree canopy
- c** Create an urban forestry data collection methodology to record and track annual progress in tree maintenance cycle
- d** Lead the national Urban Wildlife Information Network study for San Francisco
- e** Define and implement best practices for maintenance of lakes within Golden Gate Park
- f** Scope San Francisco's first carbon-neutral facility



OBJECTIVE 4.2 Increase biodiversity and interconnectivity on City parkland

- a** Inventory the Department's landscape & habitat enhancements that support biodiversity
- b** Assist in planning efforts toward the Ocean Beach Master Plan by completing a detailed design of a new multi-use trail from Sloat to Skyline by 2020
- c** Operationalize new nursery database and inventory system
- d** Expand staffing to support access to and sustainability of San Francisco's trail network



OBJECTIVE 4.3 Increase eco-literacy of park users and park maintenance staff

- a** Increase volunteer support in equity zone parks
- b** Work with the San Francisco Parks Alliance to create a Sister Park stewardship model
- c** Train field staff in biodiversity, sustainable landscape and maintenance practices, and Bay Friendly best practices



Strategy Five: Inspire Our Team

Encourage innovation and cultivate a connected, engaged, and aligned workforce that delivers outstanding service

OBJECTIVE 5.1 Strengthen organizational efficiency and support innovation

- a** Align the Information Technology Division with the Department's strategic goals and objectives through the development and implementation of an IT strategic plan
- b** Expand RPD-U to include workforce development on test-taking and interviewing
- c** Conduct workforce analysis to right-size classifications and staffing levels across the Operations division to support operations and maintenance of current and future park sites

OBJECTIVE 5.2 Strengthen internal communications and collaboration

- a** Implement the Park Ranger module of ParkStat to guide transparent, data-driven decision-making
- b** Create one new data partnership annually to enhance outcome data of RPD programs
- c** Publish the department's first Racial Equity Action Plan





2018 Highlights and Accomplishments

In the third year of the department’s Strategic Plan, our staff worked diligently to complete 23 initiatives and continued work on another 35. A table of all completed initiatives can be found on the following page.

FY18-22 Initiative Status				
Inspire	Complete	In Progress	Not Yet Started	Total
Place	4	15	2	21
Play	6	6	0	12
Investment	3	8	1	12
Stewardship	5	5	0	10
Our Team	5	1	0	6
Total	23	35	3	61
95% commenced or completed				



Planning, design and implementation of the Civic Center Commons project



Increased language access and signups for low-income neighborhoods



85% of employees indicate they have sufficient training opportunities



56% of gardening staff have now received Bay Friendly certifications



Pursued equity-focused initiatives for staff, including implicit bias training



Process to better understand needs and interests of park users in equity zones



Expanded youth programs that connected children to nature



16,307 youth and seniors served, promoting safety, health and well-being

Completed Initiatives in Strategic Plan FY18-22

* bold indicates equity-related initiative

Inspire Place

- 1.2 f Collaborate in the planning, design, and implementation of the Civic Center Commons initiative
- 1.3 b Implement a community-based, fixed post Park Ranger staffing model with an interpretive nature unit
- 1.3 d Reduce vehicle traffic and improve circulation in Golden Gate Park and McLaren Park
- 1.4 f Develop concept, design, and public engagement plan for the Conservatory of Flowers Campus

Inspire Play

- 2.1 a Improve data collection of drop-in, partner, and playfield participants
- 2.1 b Conduct a needs assessment to gauge recreational service demand and programming gaps
- 2.1 e Develop and implement an outreach plan that increases language access, registers more people from low-income neighborhoods and public housing, and increases inclusive and adaptive programming
- 2.2 a Expand and promote youth programs that connect children to nature
- 2.3 a Support safe bicycling to and through parks, and increase recreational bicycling within parks
- 2.3 e Pursue public realm strategies at Civic Center, the Jerry Garcia Amphitheater, and the Stanyan edge of Golden Gate Park

Inspire Investment

- 3.2 a Develop an external engagement process to better understand the needs and interests of park users in equity zones
- 3.3 a Develop annual list of operational and capital needs for our philanthropic community that prioritizes park access and equity
- 3.3 c Establish a baseline to track the distribution of partnership projects in and outside equity zones

Inspire Stewardship

- 4.1 b Increase green waste production cycle and expand the compost product menu
- 4.2 a Develop planting design and selection palettes to support landscaping goals and objectives
- 4.2 b Pilot the use of a new nursery inventory database and ordering system
- 4.2 c Continue to increase programmatic trail access on San Francisco's trail network
- 4.3 c Train field staff in biodiversity, sustainable landscape, and Bay Friendly best practices

Inspire Our Team


- 5.1 b Strengthen audit and oversight of tenant, concession, and partnership agreements
- 5.1 c Create business planning capacity in the Department
- 5.2 a Implement the TMA Module of ParkStat to guide transparent, data-driven decisionmaking
- 5.2 b Create RPD University to provide ongoing professional development opportunities, knowledge transfer seminars, and an annual conference for staff
- 5.2 c Pursue an equity-focused internal learning initiative to develop alignment with the Department's equity goals, including implicit bias training

Equity Metrics

With the approval of Proposition B in June 2016, a revision to Section 16.107 Park, Recreation, and Open Space Fund of the City Charter mandates the Department to formally consider and measure equity. Specifically, the Charter directs the Department to

“adopt, a set of equity metrics to be used to establish a baseline of existing Recreation and park services and resources in “low income neighborhoods and disadvantaged communities, compared to services and resources available in the City as a whole.”

A dataset developed by the State of California called CalEnviroScreen 2.0 provides a standard definition of “disadvantaged” by census tract. Setting the standard at the 20% most disadvantaged residents by census tract in San Francisco, the map below illustrates these areas now designated as Equity Zones. With this designation, the parks in service of these residents are named, and data for those sites is collected, calculated, and compared to all other sites and the City as a whole.



FY18-22 Equity-related Initiative Status				
Inspire	Complete	In Progress	Not Yet Started	Total
Place	2	4	0	6
Play	5	2	0	7
Investment	3	1	0	4
Stewardship	0	2	0	2
Our Team	1	0	0	1
Total	11	9	0	20
100% commenced or completed				

Equity Metrics with FY18 Data			
	Equity Zone	Non Equity Zone	City as a Whole
Population	176,873	707,490	884,363
% Population	20%	80%	100%
Number of Parks	89	130	219
% of Parks	41%	59%	100%
Number of parks/1,000 people	0.50	0.18	0.25
Park Acreage	6/1	2,603	3,2/4
% of Park Acreage	20%	80%	100%
Acres of park/1,000 people	3.79	3.68	3.70
SFPD Incidents within 500' of Parks/1,000 people	140	41	61
% of Incidents within 500' of Parks	46%	54%	100%
Park Evaluation Scores	88.2%	89.7%	88.9%
Maintenance and repair requests completed	76.4%	74.6%	74.7%
Capital Investment/1,000 people	\$239,040	\$38,490	\$78,600
% of Capital Investment	61%	39%	100%
Recreation Volunteers Hours/1,000 people	71	47	52
Park Volunteers Hours/acre	61	31	37
% of Total Volunteer hours	32%	68%	100%
Hours of Recreational Resources/1,000 people	505	200	180
% of Recreational Resources	38.7	61.3	100
Scholarships Granted/1,000 people	8.3	1.0	2.4
% of Scholarships	68%	32%	100%
Outdoor Recreation registrants 18 and under	711	2,253	2,964
	24%	76%	100%





San Francisco Recreation and Park Department

Strategic Plan

2019-23 Update

City & County of San Francisco

Mayor London N. Breed

Board of Supervisors

Recreation and Park Commission

Mark Buell, President

Allan Low, Vice President

Kat Anderson

Gloria Bonilla

Tom Harrison

Larry Mazzola, Jr.

Eric McDonnell

Recreation and Park Department

Phil Ginsburg, General Manager

McLaren Lodge in Golden Gate Park

501 Stanyan Street

San Francisco, CA 94117

sfrecpark.org





London N. Breed, Mayor
Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager

Date: January 17, 2019
To: Recreation and Park Commission
Through: Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager
From: Toks Ajike, Director of Capital & Planning Division
Subject: Proposed Capital Expenditure Plan for Fiscal Year 2019-2020

Agenda Wording

Discussion and possible action to approve, and to recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve, the annual Capital Expenditure Plan as required by Charter Section 16.107(h)(3).

Strategic Plan

This Capital Plan is consistent with multiple Strategic Plan strategies, objectives and initiatives. Attachment A, Capital Plan Initiatives for FY19-20, provides all the Strategic Plan Initiatives related to capital efforts from the FY19-23 Strategic Plan.

Background

With passage of Proposition B in June 2016, Section 16.107 of the City Charter was revised. The changes include establishing a baseline of General Fund support for the Department; mandate formal consideration of equity measures in the allocation of resources; and require additional planning and reporting documents including an annual Capital Expenditure Plan and annual Operations Plan.

This report describes the Department's Capital Expenditure Plan per Section 16.107(h)3 for FY19-20. The Capital Expenditure Plan is comprised of three tables attached to this report. Consistent with the Department's Operations Plan, this Capital Plan is designed to follow the budget cycle by providing a road map for the next two fiscal years. The Initiatives and capital projects within the Capital Expenditure Plan align with the projects in the annual appropriation process undertaken by the Department and City as a whole every spring.

In addition, the Department already provides several reports describing the status and financing of RPD capital projects (available online: <http://sfrecpark.org/park-improvements/capital-publications/>):

1. Monthly Financial Report submitted to the Commission
2. Quarterly General Obligation (GO) Bond reports submitted to the GO Bond Oversight Committee ("GOBOC reports")
3. The City's Ten-Year Capital Plan submitted to the BOS

On November 15, 2018 the Commission received an assessment of the Department's progress implementing the equity-based initiatives of the FY18-22 Strategic Plan as well as the Department's equity metrics. For FY18, 61% of the Department's total capital investments were in equity zones, and increase from 53% last fiscal year. The Department invests \$239,040 per 1,000 people in the equity zones, compared to \$38,490 in non-equity zones and \$78,600 per 1,000 people in the city as a whole. The report is available online: <http://sfrecpark.org/about/recreation-park-commission/full-commission-documents/>.

Proposed Capital Expenditure Plan FY19-20

The proposed Capital Expenditure Plan for FY19-20 focuses on the Department's capital projects planned for the next two fiscal years to be consistent with the city's two-year budget cycle. The Capital Expenditure Plan provides a compilation of the ongoing and new capital initiatives and projects undertaken by the RPD Capital and Planning Division.

The Capital Plan for FY19-20 consists of three tables, attached to this report:

- A. **Capital Plan Initiatives for FY19-20** – a list of FY19-23 Strategic Plan Initiatives related to capital planning efforts
- B. **Planned RPD Acquisitions during FY19-23 Five-Year Strategic Plan** – a list of all known acquisitions planned during the FY19-23 Five-Year Strategic Plan
- C. **Capital Projects: FY18-19, FY19-20, FY20-21** – a list of the current and planned capital projects in the coming years

Linkages with the Strategic and Operational Plans

To provide clearer linkages between the Strategic, Operational, and Capital Plan through greater cross-referencing, the Capital Expenditure Plan includes 1) **Attachment A**, Capital Plan Initiatives for FY19-20 with a list Strategic Plan Initiatives related to capital planning efforts and 2) **Attachment C**, Capital Projects: FY18-19, FY19-20, FY20-21, which includes a cross-reference to the FY19-23 Strategic Plan Objective and/or Initiative that the capital project fulfills.

Highlights of the Capital Expenditure Plan

The City has released a draft of its 10-year Capital Plan and has identified a \$255M Parks Bond in 2020 and a \$200M Parks Bond in 2028. The plan will be submitted to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor by March 1, 2019 and is expected to be approved by May 1, 2019. Once the date and amount are finalized, the Department will begin working with the Commission and community to identify Bond programming.

As discussed in earlier Bond updates, project selection will be an iterative process with the community and this Commission, similar to the processes for the 2008 & 2012 Bond Measures. For instance, we anticipate using similar planning criteria for project selection: Conditions Assessment; Seismic Condition; High Needs, using our recently developed Equity Zones as well as Growth Areas determined by the Planning Department; and Multi-Use Sites/Community Hubs. The General Manager and the Capital and Planning Division will continue to provide updates as the process continues.

Plan highlights for the upcoming two years include:

- Complete the remaining 2012 bond-funded neighborhood park projects. Progress will continue on water conservation, irrigation improvements, and urban forestry projects over the duration of the bond program.

Attachment A

Capital initiatives for FY19-20 from FY19-23 Strategic Plan



Equity-related initiatives in bold and italics

INSPIRE PLACE

Objective		Initiative	Lead	Support
1.1: Develop more open space to address population growth in high-need areas and emerging neighborhoods	a	<i>Commence remediation at India Basin in FY19 and plan interim activation</i>	Capital & Planning	Operations, Partnership
	b	<i>In collaboration with OCII at the Shipyard, TIDA at Treasure Island, and OWED at Balboa Reservoir, maximize active recreation amenities to deliver RPD's component of the Executive Directive on Housing</i>	Capital & Planning	-
	c	Complete detailed design of Francisco Reservoir by 2020	Capital & Planning	-
1.2: Strengthen the quality of existing parks and facilities	b	<i>Plan, design, and construct Tier 1 and Tier 2 playgrounds in the Let'sPlaySF initiative</i>	Capital & Planning	Partnerships
	c	<i>Enter into MOU with HOPE SF Sunnydale team and identify funding strategy for a new gym and improved access to Herz Playground</i>	Capital & Planning	Partnerships
	f	Finalize regulatory approvals to address environmental remediation and infrastructure enhancements at the Marina East Harbor	Capital & Planning	Operations, Policy & Public Affairs
	g	Initiate asset data collection to implement TMA Preventative Maintenance module	Capital & Planning, Operations	-
	i	Convene Ops and Capital Task Force to update project standards	Capital & Planning, Operations	-
1.4: Preserve and celebrate historic and cultural resources	b	Establish requirement for interpretive signage as part of all capital projects at park sites with historic, cultural, or natural resources	Capital & Planning	Policy & Public Affairs
	d	Inventory and incorporate into Lifecycle database all historic and cultural resources	Capital & Planning	-

Attachment B

Planned RPD Acquisitions during FY19-23 Five-Year Strategic Plan								
Acquisition Name	Neighborhood	District	Acres	Equity Zone Y/N (2017 zones)	Miles to Equity Zone	Acq. Cost (Millions)	Acq. Year	Open Year
Schlage Lock Parks	Visitacion Valley	10	1.75	Y	n/a	\$4.50	unknown	unknown
Potrero "Central Park"	Potrero Hill	10	0.75	N	0.84	\$0	unknown	unknown

Recent RPD Acquisitions (2007-2018)								
Acquisition Name	Neighborhood	District	Acres	Equity Zone Y/N (2017 zones)	Miles to Equity Zone	Acq. Cost (Millions)	Acq. Year	Open Year
11th and Natoma	SoMa	6	0.48	Y	n/a	\$9.70	2018	Est. 2022
Shoreview	Bayview	10	0.5	Y	n/a	\$0	2017	2019
500 Pine	Financial District	3	0.14	Y	n/a	\$0	2017	2017
Francisco Reservoir	Russian Hill	2	3.29	N	0.43	\$9.90	2014	2019
900 Innes / India Basin	Bayview	10	1.93	Y	n/a	\$2.90	2014	Est. 2022
Noe Valley Town Sq	Noe Valley	8	0.25	N	0.70	\$4.20	2013	2016
17th and Folsom	Mission	6	0.79	Y	n/a	\$2.30	2011	2017
Guy Place Park	Rincon Hill	6	0.09	N	0.30	\$1.80	2007	2018

Attachment C

[illegible]



London Breed, Mayor
Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager

Date: December 6, 2018

To: Operations Committee of the Recreation and Park Commission

Through: Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager
Derek Chu, Deputy Director of Finance and Administration

From: Taylor Emerson, Director of Strategic Planning

Subject: Proposed Operational Plan FY20 and FY21, assessment of progress on the prior Operational Plan FY19 and FY20, and Equity Analysis

Agenda Wording

Operational Plan Status Updates and Approvals - Discussion and possible action to approve the Department's proposed Operational Plan for FY20 and FY21, with progress assessment on the FY19-20 Operational Plan and Equity Analysis.

Background

With the passage of Proposition B in June 2016, there is a revision to Section 16.107 Park, Recreation and Open Space Fund of the Charter. The new Charter language dedicates a baseline of General Fund support and new revenue for capital and operating needs; mandates the Department to formally consider and measure equity in allocation of resources; and, requires additional planning processes and documents, including an annual Operational Plan. Specifically, new language in Section 16.107(h)(4) states,

By February 1, 2017 and for each annual or biennial budgetary cycle ...the Department shall prepare, for Commission consideration and approval, an Operational Plan... shall a statement of the objectives and initiatives within the Strategic Plan that the Department plans to undertake and/or accomplish during the next budgetary period... include an equity analysis of Recreation and Park services and resources, using the equity metrics adopted under subsection (h)(1). Each Operational Plan shall further include an assessment of the Department's progress on the previous Operational Plan.

To develop the Department's first Operational Plan, the Department's Executive Staff reviewed, prioritized, and sequenced the Initiatives in the then-current Strategic Plan. They considered factors such as policy priorities, currently active projects, available staff and financial resources. Each Division individually and collectively defined the work it would undertake and/or accomplish during the two-year period of FY17-18 and FY18-19, as directed by the Charter.



In the Department's current Strategic Plan FY19-23, the Mission, Vision, Values, Strategies (Goals), and Objectives are reaffirmed from the original. Beneath these are the detailed Initiatives - actions and projects - that achieve the Objectives and move the needle on the Indicators. By sequencing the Initiatives over the two-year period and defining the lead division, the Operational Plan provides transparency about the Department's work and priorities in furtherance of the Strategic Plan and guides the collective work effort.

Progress Assessed

To assess and report the progress achieved under the direction of the Operational Plan FY19 and FY20, each Initiative was evaluated for its status: completed, in-progress, or not yet started/to commence in the future. This progress assessment is as of Oct 31, 2018, just five months into the two-year Operational Plan, yet substantial progress has been achieved.

The table below provides a summary Progress Assessment to-date in the Two-Year Operational Plan FY19 and FY20.

Operational Plan FY19 and FY20 Initiative Progress Assessment				
Inspire	Complete	In Progress	Not Yet Started	Total
Place	1	12	1	14
Play	4	3	0	7
Investment	3	7	0	10
Stewardship	3	3	0	6
Our Team	2	1	0	3
Total	13	26	1	40

One completed Initiative highlight for each Strategy as follows:

- John McLaren Park and Golden Gate Park are now safer and more inspiring places with traffic calming and all Vision Zero recommendations for pedestrian safety now implemented;
- The new McLaren Bike Park (combined with the new bike lanes in Mansall Corridor completed in the prior year) inspires play on bikes riding to, through, and in parks;
- A new, annual list of operational and capital needs, prioritized for equity and access, now makes it easier inspire investment by the philanthropic community to fund the most-needed projects;
- Inspiring stewardship continues as another 40 field staff were trained in Bay Friendly landscaping best practices; and
- ParkStat uses visualized data to understand and manage resource allocation at the Structural Maintenance Yard, which has inspired our team to do even better.

Detail on the status of all Initiatives in the Operational Plan FY19 and FY20 is Attachment A.

Assessment of Equity

Of the 61 total Initiatives, 14 were equity-related by being either: located at park and recreation facilities within an Equity Zone, service expansions for residents of Equity Zones, or professional development to deepen staff understanding of equity in our work together and with the public we serve.

The table below provides a summary of Assessment of Progress to-date on the Equity-related Initiatives within the Two-Year Operational Plan FY19 and FY20.

Operational Plan FY19 and FY20 Equity-related Initiative Progress Assessment				
Inspire	Complete	In Progress	Not Yet Started	Total
Place	1	4	0	5
Play	3	0	0	3
Investment	3	1	0	4
Stewardship	0	2	0	2
Our Team	0	0	0	0
Total	7	7	0	14

Detail and status on all Equity Initiatives is provided in Attachment B. The FY18 Equity Metrics and Analysis, approved by the Commission in September 2018, are provided in Attachment B for context and additional information.

Proposed Operational Plan FY20 and FY21

The proposed Operational Plan focuses the Department's work over the next two years, drawing from the evolving set of Initiatives laid out in the five-year Strategic Plan. As a trio with the Capital Plan, these are living documents, updated annually to reflect accomplishments, learning, and new context. The Operational Plan serves as our best guess as to which actions or projects will be commenced or completed between now and approximately the half way point of our five-year plan. Some of these are ongoing, others have not yet been started, and a few are new, or newly revised for clarity. Initiatives in the proposed Operational Plan are our best guess at the steps our department can take to better achieve the objectives, strategies, and performance targets. Attachment C is the Proposed Two-Year Operational Plan FY20 and FY21.

Next Steps

In January 2019, the Capital Plan will be presented to PROSAC, Capital Committee, and full Commission. In February 2019, the Department's budget for FY20 and FY21 will be presented to Commission and will reflect the priorities included in the Operational Plan and Capital Plan to further support implementation of the Strategic Plan.

Staff Recommendation: Approve the Operational Plan for FY20 and FY21 as submitted
Supported By: Department staff
Opposed By: None known
Supported By: None known

Attachments
 A - Progress Assessment on Operational Plan FY19 and FY20
 B - FY18 Equity Metrics
 C - Proposed Operational Plan FY19 and FY20

Status Report

San Francisco Recreation and Parks Operational Plan

FY18-19 and FY19-20

(Equity initiatives in bold)



INSPIRE PLACE

Objective	Initiative	Status
1.1: Develop more open space to address population growth in high-need areas and emerging neighborhoods	Plan, design, construct, and open new parks at India Basin, Francisco Reservoir, Schlage Lock, and 11th & Natoma	In Progress
	Engage in collaborative planning with City agencies and the community to ensure adequate open space and recreation opportunities at HOPE SF sites	In Progress
1.2: Strengthen the quality of existing parks and facilities	Support LetsPlaySF to renovate playgrounds	In Progress
	Plan collaboratively with city agencies and the public to implement the Ocean Beach Master Plan	In Progress
	Prioritize deferred maintenance renewals and discretionary capital resources in equity zone parks with failing park scores	In Progress
	Develop a remediation and rehabilitation plan for East Harbor	In Progress
	Complete remaining 2012 Bond projects; develop and earn voter approval for November 2019 Bond	In Progress
1.3: Steward and promote good park behavior	Expand the Park Ambassador program to include PROSAC and 'Friends Of' groups	Not Yet Started
	Expand Leave No Trace campaign to another high-profile, destination park	In Progress
	Reduce vehicle traffic and improve circulation in Golden Gate Park and McLaren Park	Complete
1.4: Preserve and celebrate historic and cultural resources	Initiate studies and begin community engagement to re-envision and renovate Kezar Pavilion, McLaren Lodge, and Japantown Peace Plaza	In Progress
	Install interpretive signage to showcase the park system's historic and cultural resources	In Progress
	Complete safety improvements to the Murphy Windmill	In Progress
	Plan for GGP's 150th Anniversary in 2021; identify public and private funds for a GGP capital campaign	In Progress

INSPIRE PLAY

Objective	Initiative	Lead
2.1: Strengthen the quality, responsiveness, and accessibility of recreation programs	Improve data collection of drop-in, partner, and playfield participants	Complete
	Conduct a needs assessment to gauge recreational service demand and programming gaps	Complete
	Increase number of inclusive recreation program participants	In Progress
	Develop a census of Rec Center and Clubhouse visitors	In Progress
2.2: Strengthen and promote the safety, health, and well-being of San Francisco's youth and seniors	Expand and promote youth programs that connect children to nature	Complete
2.3: Work with partners and neighborhood groups to activate parks through organized events, activities, and unstructured play	Support safe bicycling to and through parks, and increase recreational bicycling within parks	Complete
	Secure new long-term tenant at Lake Merced West	In Progress

Status Report

San Francisco Recreation and Parks Operational Plan

FY18-19 and FY19-20

(Equity initiatives in bold)



INSPIRE INVESTMENT

Objective	Initiative	Lead
3.1: Increase park investment to better align with infrastructure needs and service expectations	Work with community partners and city agencies to ensure CBD's and GBD's support park maintenance, safety, and program objectives	In Progress
	Work collaboratively with city agencies to ensure Development Agreements and Plan Areas fund park acquisition, development, and maintenance	In Progress
	Secure a new long term tenant at the Palace of Fine Arts	In Progress
3.2: Broaden engagement and strengthen external communications with park users and park partners	Develop an external engagement process to better understand the needs and interests of park users in equity zones	Complete
	Invest in a CRM system to provide users real-time information about the park system and provide real-time status of complaints, issues, and requests	In Progress
	Complete the RPD website upgrade and redesign	In Progress
	Complete the migration of permits and reservations from CLASS to ActiveNet to enable online reservations	In Progress
3.3: Cultivate increased philanthropic support	Develop annual list of operational and capital needs for our philanthropic community that prioritizes park access and equity	Complete
	Support fundraising, planning, and ongoing stewardship efforts for existing partner-driven renovation projects including LetsPlaySF, Botanical Nursery, Gene Friend Rec, Francisco Reservoir, Geneva Car Barn, and GGP Tennis Courts	In Progress
	Establish a baseline to track the distribution of partnership projects in and outside equity zones	Complete

INSPIRE STEWARDSHIP

Objective	Initiative	Lead
4.1: Conserve and strengthen natural resources	Implement programmatic tree assessment, maintenance and reforestation program that sustains a 15-year tree maintenance cycle	Complete
	Obtain Bay Friendly Certification of public park landscapes and Audubon certification of public golf courses	In Progress
4.2: Increase biodiversity and interconnectivity on City parkland	Continue to increase programmatic trail access on San Francisco's trail network	Complete
4.3: Increase eco-literacy of our park users and park maintenance staff	Increase volunteer support in equity zone parks	In Progress
	Expand Sister Park stewardship model	In Progress
	Train field staff in biodiversity, sustainable landscape, and Bay Friendly best practices	Complete

INSPIRE TEAM

Objective	Initiative	Lead
5.1: Strengthen organizational efficiency and support innovation	Right-size and restructure IT service delivery model	In Progress
	Strengthen audit and oversight of tenant, concession, and partnership agreements	Complete
5.2: Strengthen internal communications and professional development	Implement the TMA Module of ParkStat to guide transparent, data-driven decisionmaking	Complete

FY18 Equity Metrics and Data

	Equity Zone	Non Equity Zone	City as a Whole
Population ¹	176,873	707,490	884,363
% Population	20%	80%	100%
Number of Parks	89	130	219
% of Parks	41%	59%	100%
Number of parks/1,000 people	0.50	0.18	0.25
Park Acreage ²	671	2,603	3,274
% of Park Acreage	20%	80%	100%
Acres of park/1,000 people	3.79	3.68	3.70
SFPD Incidents ³ within 500' of Parks/1,000 people	140	41	61
% of Incidents within 500' of Parks	46%	54%	100%
Park Evaluation Scores ⁴	88.2%	89.7%	88.9%
Maintenance and repair requests completed ⁵	76.4%	74.6%	74.7%
Capital Investment ⁶ /1,000 people	\$239,040	\$38,490	\$78,600
% of Capital Investment	61%	39%	100%
Recreation Volunteers ⁷ Hours/1,000 people	71	47	52
Park Volunteers Hours/acre	61	31	37
% of Total Volunteer hours	32%	68%	100%
Hours of Recreational Resources ⁸ /1,000 people	505	200	TBD
% of Recreational Resources	38.7	61.3	100
Scholarships Granted ⁹ /1,000 people	8.3	1.0	2.4
% of Scholarships	68%	32%	100%
Outdoor Recreation ¹⁰ registrants 18 and under	773	2,496	3,269
	24%	76%	100%



INSPIRE PLACE

Objective	Initiative	Lead
1.1: Develop more open space to address population growth in high-need areas and emerging neighborhoods	a Commence remediation at India Basin in FY19 and plan interim activation	Capital & Planning
1.2: Strengthen the quality of existing parks and facilities	a Break ground on the Golden Gate Tennis Center by Spring 2019	Partnerships
	d Develop and implement a Facility Management program at Recreation Centers	Operations
	e Prioritize deferred maintenance renewals and discretionary capital resources in equity zone parks with below average park scores	Operations
	g Initiate asset data collection to implement TMA Preventative Maintenance module	Capital & Planning, Ops
	h Create and implement a site evaluation program for indoor facilities	Policy & Public Affairs
	i Convene Ops and Capital Task Force to update project standards	Capital & Planning, Ops
	j Improve and activate one mini park within an equity zone	Operations
1.3: Steward and promote good park behavior	a Conduct one Sister Park event annually with PROSAC	Policy & Public Affairs
	b Right-size waste management at one additional park in FY19	Policy & Public Affairs
	c Develop standards, materials, and signage protocols for Recreation Center entrances	Policy & Public Affairs
1.4: Preserve and celebrate historic and cultural resources	a Scope and commence planning to renovate the Japanese Tea Garden Pagoda	Operations
	b Establish requirement for interpretive signage as part of all capital projects at park sites with historic, cultural, or natural resources	Capital & Planning
	c Hold one kick-off event for Golden Gate Park's 150th anniversary	Partnerships
	e Develop a concept, design, and public engagement plan for the Conservatory of Flowers campus	Operations
	f Plan for a Summer Solstice event at the Conservatory of Flowers	Partnerships

INSPIRE PLAY

Objective	Initiative	Lead
2.1: Strengthen the quality , responsiveness, and accessibility of recreation programs	a Annually increase the number of inclusive recreation program participants	Operations
	b Conduct a census at one Recreation Center and one Clubhouse	Finance & Admin
	c Adopt and implement a departmental language access policy	Finance & Admin
2.2: Strengthen and promote the safety, health, and well-being of San Francisco's youth and seniors	a Expand and promote senior programs that emphasize activity and community	Operations
	b Restructure and align violence prevention programs	Operations
	c Promote community activities post-renovation at first six Let'sPlaySF sites by early 2020	Partnerships
2.3: Work with partners and neighborhood groups to activate parks through organized events, activities, and unstructured play	a Commence environmental impact report for Lake Merced West redevelopment	Property Management
	b Develop a guidance document to assist community organizations in developing and organizing community events in neighborhood parks	Property Management
	c Test new public realm activation strategies at Civic Center, Jerry Garcia Ampitheater, and Stanyan edge of Golden Gate Park annually	Property Management
	d Install ropes course at John McLaren Park	Property Management
	e Pilot one timed-use Dog Play Area	Operations
	f Identify high-need areas for additional Dog Play Areas	Policy & Public Affairs



INSPIRE INVESTMENT

Objective	Initiative	Lead
3.1: Increase park investment to better align with infrastructure needs and service expectations	a Ensure short-term, continuing activation at the Palace of Fine Arts	Property Management
	c Release RFP for a new operator at Lincoln Golf Course	Property Management
	d Complete RFP process for Union Square concession spaces	Property Management
3.2: Broaden engagement and strengthen external communications with park users and park partners	a Engage in sustained community outreach, activation, and stewardship at Margaret Hayward Playground to increase visitation and build community connections	Policy & Public Affairs
	b Design the new RPD website in FY19; launch in FY20	Policy & Public Affairs
	c Migrate 50% of permits from CLASS to ActiveNet to enable online reservations in FY19; remainder in FY20	Property Management
3.3: Cultivate increased philanthropic support	a With SF Parks Alliance, bring private support for Let'sPlay Playgrounds to \$14.5 million by 2020	Partnerships
	b Work with the Francisco Park Conservancy to support the park's renovation and develop a post renovation plan by Spring 2020	Partnerships
	c Survey usage patterns to measure the impact of capital investment at all LetsPlaySF sites	Partnerships

INSPIRE STEWARDSHIP

Objective	Initiative	Lead
4.1: Conserve and strengthen natural resources	b Develop reforestation guidelines for all maintained park sites to sustain a healthy and vibrant tree canopy	Operations
	c Create an urban forestry data collection methodology to record and track annual progress in tree maintenance cycle	Operations
	e Define and implement best practices for maintenance of lakes within Golden Gate Park	Operations
4.2: Increase biodiversity and interconnectivity on City parkland	a Inventory the Department's landscape & habitat enhancements that support biodiversity	Operations
	c Operationalize new nursery database and inventory system	Operations
	d Expand staffing to support access to and sustainability of San Francisco's trail network	Operations
4.3: Increase eco-literacy of our park users and park maintenance staff	b Create a nature interpretation job classification	Policy & Public Affairs
	c Develop and program an Urban Agriculture hub in the southern portion of San Francisco	Policy & Public Affairs

INSPIRE TEAM

Objective	Initiative	Lead
5.1: Strengthen organizational efficiency and support innovation	a Align the Information Technology Division with the Department's strategic goals and objectives through the development and implementation of an IT strategic plan	Finance & Admin
	b Expand RPD-U to include workforce development on test-taking and interviewing	Finance & Admin
	c Conduct workforce analysis to right-size classifications and staffing levels across the Operations division to support operations and maintenance of current and future park sites	Finance & Admin
5.2: Strengthen internal communications and professional development	a Implement the Park Ranger module of ParkStat to guide transparent, data-driven decision-making	Finance & Admin
	b Create one new data partnership annually to enhance outcome data of RPD programs	Finance & Admin
	c Publish the department's first Racial Equity Action Plan	Finance & Admin

From: [Armanino, Darlene \(RET\)](#)
To: [Alfaro, Nancy \(ADM\)](#); [Arntz, John \(REG\)](#); [Beck, Bob \(MYR\)](#); [Bell, Marcia \(LLB\)](#); [Bohn, Nicole \(ADM\)](#); [Brown, Michael \(CSC\)](#); [Buckley, Jeff \(MYR\)](#); [Bukowski, Kenneth \(ADM\)](#); [Callahan, Micki \(HRD\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Campbell, Thomas \(FAM\)](#); [Carroll, Maryellen \(DEM\)](#); [Chancellor, \(MYR\)](#); [Chandler, Mark \(ECN\)](#); [Chu, Carmen \(ASR\)](#); [Cisneros, Jose \(TTX\)](#); [Cohen, Martha \(ADM\)](#); [Collins, Robert \(RNT\)](#); [Davis, Sheryl \(HRC\)](#); [DeCaigny, Tom \(ART\)](#); [Dick-Endrizzi, Regina \(ECN\)](#); [Donohue, Virginia \(ADM\)](#); [Elsbernd, Sean \(MYR\)](#); [Farley, Clair \(ADM\)](#); [FEITELBERG, BRITTANY \(CAT\)](#); [Fletcher, Karen \(ADP\)](#); [Fong, Jaci \(ADM\)](#); [Forbes, Elaine \(PRT\)](#); [Garcia, Barbara \(DPH\)](#); [Gascon, George \(DAT\)](#); [Gerull, Linda \(TIS\)](#); [Ginsburg, Phil \(REC\)](#); [Gordon, Rachel \(DPW\)](#); [Griggs, Mitchell \(HSS\)](#); [Hartley, Kate \(MYR\)](#); [Hayes-White, Joanne \(FIR\)](#); [Henderson, Paul \(DPA\)](#); [Hennessy, Vicki \(SHF\)](#); [Herrera, Luis \(LIB\)](#); [Hervey, Myisha \(DPW\)](#); [Hinton, Anne \(HSA\)](#); [Hong, Karen \(TIS\)](#); [Howard, Kate \(HRD\)](#); [Hui, Tom \(DBI\)](#); [Huish, Jay \(RET\)](#); [Hunter, Michael \(ADM\)](#); [Ivar Satero \(AIR\)](#); [Johnston, Jennifer \(ADM\)](#); [Jue, Tyrone \(MYR\)](#); [Kelly, Jr, Harlan \(PUC\)](#); [Kelly, Naomi \(ADM\)](#); [Khambatta, Arfaraz \(ADM\)](#); [Kloomok, Laurel \(CFC\)](#); [Kositsky, Jeff \(HOM\)](#); [Kronenberg, Anne \(DEM\)](#); [Lambert, Michael \(LIB\)](#); [Lee, William \(LIB\)](#); [Mattias, Daniella \(MYR\)](#); [McSpadden, Shireen \(HSA\)](#); [Mezquita, Ingrid \(HSA\)](#); [Miller, Theodore \(MYR\)](#); [Moore, Jenny \(MYR\)](#); [Murase, Emily \(VOM\)](#); [Murray, Elizabeth \(WAR\)](#); [Nance, Allen \(JUV\)](#); [Noguchi, John \(ADM\)](#); [Nuru, Mohammed \(DPW\)](#); [Pelham, Leeann \(ETH\)](#); [Penick, Andrico](#); [Pon, Adrienne \(ADM\)](#); [Prohaska, Ed \(FAM\)](#); [Rahaim, John \(CPC\)](#); [Raju, Manohar \(PDR\)](#); [Raphael, Deborah \(ENV\)](#); [Rea, Diane \(ADM\)](#); [Reiskin, Ed \(MTA\)](#); [Rhorer, Trent \(HSA\)](#); [Rich, Ken \(ECN\)](#); [Robbins, Susannah \(ECN\)](#); [Rosenberg, Julie \(BOA\)](#); [Rosenfield, Ben \(CON\)](#); [Roye, Karen \(CSS\)](#); [Schulman, Kary \(ADM\)](#); [Scott, William \(POL\)](#); [Sesay, Nadia \(CII\)](#); [Sesay, Nadia \(CON\)](#); [Simonelli, Anabel \(ECN\)](#); [Smith, Barbara \(SFHA\)](#); [Su, Maria \(CHF\)](#); [Sun, Selina \(MYR\)](#); [Sweeney, Edward \(DBI\)](#); [Torres, Joaquin \(ECN\)](#); [Wagner, Greg \(DPH\)](#); [Weiland, Maggie \(ADM\)](#); [Whitehouse, Melissa \(ADM\)](#); [Wirowek, Christopher \(ADM\)](#); [Xu, Jay \(MYR\)](#); [Yant, Abbie \(HSS\)](#)
Cc: [Huish, Jay \(RET\)](#); [Bortnick, Caryn \(RET\)](#)
Subject: SFERS Retirement Contribution Rates for FY 2019-2020
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 11:08:31 AM
Attachments: [SFERS Retirement Contribution Rates for FY 2019-20 \(Dept Heads\).pdf](#)

TO: DEPARTMENT HEADS

Please find attached the SFERS Retirement Contribution Rates for Fiscal Year 2019-2020.

Best Regards,

Darlene Armanino
Executive Assistant/Board Secretary
SAN FRANCISCO EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM
1145 Market Street, 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103-1561
Telephone: (415) 487-7012
Facsimile: (415) 487-7023
darlene.armanino@sfgov.org



City and County of San Francisco
Employees' Retirement System
Office of the Executive Director

Date: April 11, 2019

To: Department Heads
Interested Parties
Labor Organizations
Retiree Associations

From: Jay Huish, Executive Director, SFERS

Re: **SFERS Retirement Contribution Rates for Fiscal Year 2019-2020**

At its February 13, 2019 regular meeting, the SFERS Retirement Board approved a 25.19% employer contribution rate for Fiscal Year 2019-2020 for all SFERS Miscellaneous, Police and Fire plans, as well as the new SFERS Sheriff and Miscellaneous Safety plans. In accordance with San Francisco Charter sections 12.100 and A8.510, this employer contribution rate was determined by the Retirement Board's consulting actuarial firm as part of the annual valuation process.

As a result of the cost-sharing provisions of Proposition C approved by the voters in November 2011, the net employee and employer contribution rates for Fiscal Year 2019-2020 for each SFERS member group are as follows:

SFERS Member Group	FY 2019-2020 Net Employee Contribution Rates	FY 2019-2020 Net Employer Contribution Rates
<u>Miscellaneous Plan</u> members with a base rate of pay less than \$29.3976 per hour or its equivalent	Old Plan: 8.0% New Plans: 7.5%	25.19%
<u>Miscellaneous Plan</u> members with a base rate of pay at or above \$29.3976 per hour or its equivalent, but less than \$58.7956 per hour or its equivalent	Old Plan: 11.5% New Plans: 11.0%	21.69%
<u>Miscellaneous Plan</u> members with a base rate of pay at or above \$58.7956 per hour or its equivalent	Old Plan: 12.0% New Plans: 11.5%	21.19%

Pre-July 1, 2010 <u>Police and Fire Plan</u> members	Old Plan: 11.5% New Plans: 12.0%	20.69%
2010 Prop D and 2012 Prop C <u>Police and Fire Plan</u> members with a base rate of pay less than \$58.7956 per hour or its equivalent	Prop D: 12.5% Prop C: 12.5%	21.69%
2010 Prop D and 2012 Prop C <u>Police and Fire Plan</u> members with a base rate of pay at or above \$58.7956 per hour or its equivalent	Prop D: 13.0% Prop C: 13.0%	21.19%
2012 Prop C <u>Sheriff and Miscellaneous Safety Plan</u> members with a base rate of pay less than \$58.7956 per hour or its equivalent	Prop C: 12.5%	21.69%
2012 Prop C <u>Sheriff and Miscellaneous Safety Plan</u> members with a base rate of pay at or above \$58.7956 per hour or its equivalent	Prop C: 13.0%	21.19%

The employer and employee contribution rates are effective July 1, 2019.

An electronic copy of the July 1, 2018 SFERS Actuarial Valuation is available at the SFERS website (www.mysfers.org). Click ABOUT SFERS on the homepage and then select PUBLICATIONS.

Do not hesitate to contact me at 487-7015 if you have any questions.

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: The Department of Elections Announces That San Francisco Voters will Begin Using the New Voting System in the November 5, 2019 Election
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 9:22:00 AM

From: SFVote, (REG) <sfvote@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, March 18, 2019 12:25 PM
Subject: The Department of Elections Announces That San Francisco Voters will Begin Using the New Voting System in the November 5, 2019 Election

Department of Elections
 City and County of San Francisco
 John Arntz, Director

For Immediate Release

SAN FRANCISCO, Monday, March 18, 2019 – Last week, the City approved a lease agreement between the Department of Elections and Dominion Voting Systems for the use of Dominion's voting system, Democracy Suite, to conduct elections in San Francisco. The Department of Elections will conduct the City's November 5, 2019, Consolidated Municipal Election using the new system.

The new voting system has several advantages over the previous system. The new system features a more intuitive method for marking the paper ballots, allows voters to rank a greater number of candidates in contests that use ranked-choice voting, and provides enhanced audio and touchscreen ballot navigation for voters with disabilities. The new voting system also improves election transparency by using paper-based optical scan tabulating equipment that creates annotated images of voted ballots for public viewing and verifying election results. The new voting system adheres to the most recent security standards from the California Secretary of State's Office and has been certified for use in California.

The Department of Elections developed a new webpage—sfelections.org/new-voting-system—that provides more information about the new voting system. As well as highlighting the system's features and components, this dedicated page introduces voters to the new ballot format and provides an animation of marking a ranked-choice voting ballot. More information about ranked-choice voting including graphics showing how to mark the new ballot with expanded number of rankings can be viewed on sfelections.org/RCV.

To educate City voters about the new voting system and the increased number of rankings in ranked-choice voting contests, the Department will utilize various outreach strategies, including newspaper notices in multiple languages, posters on Muni and BART vehicles, press releases, public service announcements for television and radio, household mailers, posts on social media, and presentations throughout the City. These strategies are discussed in the Department's Draft Outreach Plan.

The Department invites community stakeholders, the media, and members of the general public to provide feedback on the Draft Outreach Plan. To provide an easy navigation path to the Draft Outreach Plan, the "TOPICS IN FOCUS" section of the homepage of sfelections.org prominently features a new

section “We Seek Your Input on Our Outreach Plan!” This section includes a link to the Department’s Draft Outreach plan, an invitation to comment on the plan, and a feedback form.

The San Francisco Department of Elections invites organizations, the media, and members of the public to contact the Department at sfvote@sfgov.org or (415) 554-4375 for more information about the new voting system or to request a presentation by the Department’s outreach team at a public event.

###

Department of Elections
City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place,
City Hall, Room 48
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-4375
Sfelections.org



Follow the San Francisco Department of Elections on [Facebook](#) and [Twitter](#)!

Your feedback is important to us! Please take our [Customer Service Survey](#)

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Letter from Vision Zero Coalition re: Vision Zero Action Strategy
Date: Thursday, March 14, 2019 1:54:00 PM
Attachments: [VZCoalitionResponse_2019VZActionStrategy_FINAL.pdf](#)

From: Cathy DeLuca <cathy@walksf.org>

Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2019 10:48 AM

To: Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; SFPD, Chief (POL) <sfpdchief@sfgov.org>; Tilly Chang <tilly.chang@sfcta.org>; Nuru, Mohammed (DPW) <mohammed.nuru@sfdpw.org>; Rahaim, John (CPC) <john.rahaim@sfgov.org>; Raphael, Deborah (ENV) <deborah.raaphael@sfgov.org>; Bohn, Nicole (ADM) <nicole.bohn@sfgov.org>; Kelly, Naomi (ADM) <naomi.kelly@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Reiskin, Ed (MTA) <Ed.Reiskin@sfmta.com>; Colfax, Grant (DPH) <grant.colfax@sfdph.org>

Cc: Maguire, Tom (MTA) <Tom.Maguire@sfmta.com>; Supawanich, Paul (MYR) <paul.supawanich@sfgov.org>; Power, Andres (MYR) <andres.power@sfgov.org>; Maybaum, Erica (BOS) <erica.maybaum@sfgov.org>; Carr, Rowena (POL) <Rowena.Carr@sfgov.org>; MTABoard <MTABoard@sfmta.com>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Wier, Megan (DPH) <megan.wier@sfdph.org>; Gascon, George (DAT) <george.gascon@sfgov.org>; Bastian, Alex (DAT) <alex.bastian@sfgov.org>; Joanne Hayes-White <FireChief@sfgov.org>; Ginsburg, Phil (REC) <phil.ginsburg@sfgov.org>; Vincent Matthews <matthewsv@sfusd.edu>; Wiener, Scott <Scott.wiener@sen.ca.gov>; Annie Fryman (Wiener) <ann.fryman@sen.ca.gov>; David Chiu <assemblymember.chiu@assembly.ca.gov>; Mark Chekal-Bain (Ting) <Mark.Chekal-Bain@asm.ca.gov>; Phil Ting <Assemblymember.Ting@assembly.ca.gov>; Donnelly-Landolt, Wyatt (BOS) <wyatt.donnelly-landolt@sfgov.org>; Hepner, Lee (BOS) <lee.hepner@sfgov.org>; Angulo, Sunny (BOS) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Kelly, Jr, Harlan (PUC) <HKelly@sfgov.org>; Jodie Medeiros <jodie@walksf.org>; Marta Lindsey <marta@walksf.org>; Kronenberg, Chava (MTA) <Chava.Kronenberg@sfmta.com>; Jacobson, Michael (MTA) <Michael.Jacobson@sfmta.com>; Forbes, Elaine (PRT) <elaine.forbes@sfport.com>; Parks, Jamie (MTA) <Jamie.Parks@sfmta.com>

Subject: Letter from Vision Zero Coalition re: Vision Zero Action Strategy

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

Dear Mayor Breed, Board President Yee, Director Reiskin, Chief Scott, Director Colfax, Director Raphael, Director Chang, Director Bohn, Director Nuru, Director Rahaim, and City Administrator Kelly,

Attached please find the Vision Zero Coalition's response to the City's latest Vision Zero Action Strategy.

We hope to hear from you soon, and we look forward to our continuing collaboration on Vision Zero.

Best,
Cathy

--

Cathy DeLuca

Policy & Program Director

Walk San Francisco

333 Hayes St, Suite 202, San Francisco, CA 94102

415.431.9255 (office) | 415.610.8025 (cell) | walksf.org

March 14, 2019



Honorable Mayor London Breed
City of San Francisco

Norman Yee
President, Board of Supervisors
Chair, SFCTA Vision Zero Committee

Director Ed Reiskin
SF Municipal Transportation Agency

Chief Bill Scott
San Francisco Police Department

Director Grant Colfax
SF Department of Public Health

Director Deborah Raphael
SF Department of the Environment

Director Tilly Chang
SF County Transportation Authority

Director Nicole Bohn
Mayor's Office on Disability

Director Mohammed Nuru
SF Public Works

Director John Rahaim
SF Planning

City Administrator Naomi Kelly
Office of the City Administrator

Dear Mayor Breed, Board President Yee, Director Reiskin, Chief Scott, Director Colfax, Director Raphael, Director Chang, Director Bohn, Director Nuru, Director Rahaim, and City Administrator Kelly,

We are writing in response to the City's latest Vision Zero Action Strategy, released on February 28. In light of the recent rash of traffic deaths in San Francisco, and with only five years left to reach our goal of zero deaths, the City's work on Vision Zero is more important than ever.

First, we want to thank Mayor Breed for her deep commitment to Vision Zero and the swift action she has taken to make our streets safer. From ensuring the prioritization of infrastructure projects like Valencia and Taylor Streets, to the recent directive that includes the rapid improvement of all high-injury corridors, Mayor Breed is taking bold steps to lead the City's Vision Zero work. Such leadership is crucial when our deadline is five years away.

We also want to recognize the many City agencies who have put in years of hard work and dedication toward enacting important Vision Zero policies, projects, and programs. In particular, we want to thank the SFMTA and SFDPH for cochairing the Vision Zero Task Force and spearheading so many of the City's Vision Zero efforts.

Finally, we thank the City for its extensive Vision Zero outreach over the past two years, as well as for including 5-year goals in the current Action Strategy. The Vision Zero Coalition requested both of these actions after the release of the last Strategy, and we appreciate the City's responsiveness.

This Action Strategy has many of the components needed to make a strong plan. It mentions important big-picture policies — both local and statewide — whose implementation is

necessary to reach zero. It also includes 58 actions, both big and small, that the City is committing to take between now and 2024.

Nevertheless, a list of policies and actions is not a strategy or a roadmap to get us to zero. It is unclear from this Strategy exactly how the City plans to get the transformative policies passed, how it plans to reach the complementary City goals listed, and what impact the 58 actions will have. Also, the plan doesn't give any sense of whether these policies and actions, if implemented, will have the desired impact by 2024.

In addition, the Strategy lacks specific actions to improve Muni, improvements which are needed for us to reach zero, since transit-robust cities have fewer crashes and most major Muni corridors are on the high-injury network.

Without providing a clear roadmap to zero and without a laser focus on improving transit and increasing ridership, we fear the Strategy will not guide the City to reaching its ambitious goal of zero severe and fatal traffic crashes by 2024.

The Vision Zero Coalition would like the City to swiftly address the concerns we have with the latest Vision Zero Action Strategy, which are outlined in greater detail below.

No Mention of Progress to Date

We are five years into Vision Zero, with only five years left to reach our goal. Nevertheless, this Strategy does not include any mention of progress to date, except in one paragraph in the "Note from the Mayor." There is no update on the actions and metrics from the previous two Strategies, which leaves the City completely unaccountable and leaves us with little faith in the current Strategy.

Transit and Mode Shift Goals Are Central to Vision Zero, Not Complementary

We are pleased to see the City list SFMTA's Transit First Policy explicitly in the Action Strategy, with a clear acknowledgement that "A strong public transit system is critical to realize Vision Zero and shift people out of their cars."

According to the American Public Transportation Association, using public transportation is ten times safer per mile than traveling by car. In addition, metro areas with higher public transportation use have lower traffic fatality rates.

Two other complementary City goals in this section — the Mode Shift goal and the Climate Action goal — are reliant on the City's ability to provide a frequent, reliable transit system. We will not reach 80% of trips by sustainable modes by 2030 without a robust transit system, and the same is true of our goal to reduce transportation emissions by 80%.

It is misleading to list these goals as complementary, especially the Mode Shift goal and the Transit First goal, because they are critical to reaching Vision Zero. **Instead, the Transit First and Mode Shift goals should be included in this document as primary Vision Zero strategies with measurable actions and outcomes that will help us get to zero by 2024.**

The agencies and City departments responsible for these initiatives — like the Muni team at the SFMTA — should be helping lead the City's Vision Zero work. Until that happens, the City will just be putting band-aids on a transportation system comprised of too many private vehicles that are injuring and killing pedestrians and bicyclists.

Transformative Policies Are Vital, But Difficult to Achieve by 2024 ***They also lack ownership and S.M.A.R.T. actions***

Naming larger policies needed to reach Vision Zero is important, and the Coalition has lent its support to state policies like automated speed enforcement and will continue to do so. At the same time, the Action Strategy does not mention that each of these transformative policies will be extremely difficult to realize by any future date, let alone before or by 2024. Most are dependent on state legislation and therefore not within the control of the City.

Suggesting that these policies are necessary for the City to reach Vision Zero, but not mentioning the timeframe or likelihood of these being enacted, absolves the City of what actions it must take to reach zero between now and 2024 in the absence of these policies.

In addition, the Strategy does not clearly list which agency is responsible for working towards enactment of each of these transformative policies or what Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-oriented (S.M.A.R.T.) local actions will be undertaken to push these state policies forward.

It's Unclear Whether the Strategic Actions Are Strategic ***Also, most are not S.M.A.R.T.***

It's encouraging to see the City commit to taking 58 separate actions as part of its Vision Zero work. At the same time, a list of 58 actions is not a strategy. It is a compilation of all the actions that eight agencies are taking related to traffic safety, but it doesn't mean there is an overall Plan behind the list or any evidence that this combination of actions will get us to zero. There is no indication what the high-impact actions are and what the supporting actions are. There is no indication of how many of the actions are high-impact or what evidence is used to prove the efficacy of the various actions. In conclusion, there is no evidence of a coordinated, strategic plan to reach zero.

In addition, for actions to have real impact, they should be S.M.A.R.T. — Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-oriented. The actions in the last Action Strategy were not S.M.A.R.T. and, unfortunately, the same critique applies to many of the actions in the current Strategy. Several examples include:

Action	Is it S.M.A.R.T.?
Increase the total miles of high-impact sustainable travel lanes — transit-only lanes, protected bicycle facilities, and wider sidewalks — by 8 miles annually to improve safety for sustainable modes.	Not specific. The number of miles should be broken down by mode.
Reduce delivery timelines for 6th Street and Taylor Street projects.	Not specific. How much will the delivery timelines be reduced by?
Complete near-term improvements — signal timing and intersection crossing upgrades — at all intersections on the Vision Zero High-Injury Network. This includes retiming all High-Injury Network signals for slower walking speeds.	Not specific enough. What specific improvements are planned for what intersections?
Train outreach street team on culturally competent outreach to vulnerable populations.	Hard to measure
Share city accomplishments through press releases and social media.	Hard to measure
Explore additional collision avoidance technologies for SFMTA city fleet.	Not specific and hard to measure

Severe Injuries Missing from Metrics

Five hundred people are severely injured in traffic crashes every year in San Francisco, and yet the new Action Strategy doesn't list the number of severe injuries as a metric. This is a missed opportunity to measure the City's progress toward Vision Zero.

Actions We Are Asking For¹

- **Transit / Mode Shift Plans and Staffing**

The Coalition would like the City to make transit and mode shift major Vision Zero strategies through the following actions:

1. The SFMTA should commit to specific Muni service improvements, with the goal of increased ridership, as a Vision Zero strategy. The agency should create a plan by August 2019 that states specific goals for Muni service expansion, on-time performance, and ensuring an adequate operator pool as well as specific actions they will take to achieve these goals. Priorities for service expansion should support the Muni Equity Strategy.

¹ The Senior & Disability Workgroup of the Vision Zero Coalition will submit a separate letter outlining concerns and questions related to Action Strategy content around seniors and people with disabilities. Those concerns were not finalized by the date of this letter's publication.

2. To successfully deliver transit improvements, the SFMTA should significantly increase staffing in the Transit Planning group. Perpetual understaffing of this group has meant the City has not had the resources to improve high-injury corridors, increase service, and spend down the \$500 million Prop A bond money approved by voters. To reach Vision Zero, the Transit Planning group must have at least 6-8 projects in the planning and outreach phases at a single time, and we are asking for a staffing increase that allows this level of project delivery.
3. SFMTA's Muni Team should play a major role in the City's Vision Zero Steering Committee and should attend quarterly Vision Zero Task Force and Vision Zero Committee meetings.
4. Other agencies leading the City's work to achieve 80% of trips by sustainable modes by 2030 (e.g., SF Department of the Environment, SF Planning) should clearly outline the City's overall plan to meet this goal and explain how the plan is specifically being used as a Vision Zero strategy (by August 2019).

- **More Details Regarding Transformative Policies**

For the four Transformative Policies listed in the Action Strategy, the Coalition would like the City to report:

1. What agencies are responsible for each of the policies
2. What the detailed plan is to get those policies adopted and implemented in San Francisco

- **Severe Injuries as a Metric**

The Coalition would like the City to explicitly include the number of severe injuries as a Vision Zero metric.

- **New Vision Zero "Strategic Actions"**

The Vision Zero Coalition would like the City to add the following actions to the Action Strategy:

New Action	Lead Agency	Reasoning
1. Release a quarterly report on Focus on the Five traffic citations by race/ethnicity (immediately)	SFPD	Vision Zero enforcement must not result in racial profiling; the public needs the data to hold SFPD accountable and ensure that Vision Zero is implemented equitably.

New Action	Lead Agency	Reasoning
2. Release an SFPD statement that Vision Zero enforcement will not result in racial profiling (immediately)	SFPD	SFPD has been found to stop and search black and brown communities at disproportionate rates. The City must commit to an equitable approach to Vision Zero so that communities aren't harmed by an approach that is supposed to be helping them.
3. Commit to the use of trained, culturally competent, multilingual outreach professionals in SFMTA's Sustainable Streets Division (SSD) at a level equal to other SFMTA divisions (2 years)	SFMTA	Skillful public outreach is vital to equitable implementation of safety improvements and to getting Vision Zero projects passed with minimal delays. All MTA divisions, especially the one that leads bike and pedestrian projects, should have a strong team of expert outreach workers.
4. Identify funding and resources needed to expand the Crisis Response Protocol to include critical injury crashes (1 year)	SFDPH	The Crisis Response Protocol is an amazing success for fatal crashes, and the 100 people critically injured each year should be afforded the same services.

- **Modified “Strategic Actions”**

The Vision Zero Coalition would like to see the following two actions modified, as indicated below.

1. In Action Strategy:

Complete near-term improvements – signal timing and intersection crossing upgrades – at all intersections on the High Injury Network (5 years)

Modification:

Add this action:

Develop a detailed, publicly shared plan to install safety improvements on all high-injury corridors by 2024 that goes beyond high-visibility crosswalks and adherence to the new crossing time standard (1 year)

2. In Action Strategy:

Reduce delivery timelines through quick-build projects – work done entirely by City forces – on five corridors to advance short-term safety benefits at high priority corridors including Valencia and Townsend (2 years)

Modifications:

- The Coalition asks the City to commit to implementing quick-build projects on the corridors below in the next two years, in addition to Valencia and Townsend. Each are located on high-injury corridors for which the community has shown strong support and which are not likely to see improvements in the next two years.

Leavenworth Street	Street identified by community as having high need; no project planned
Jones Street	Street with one of the highest concentrations of crashes in city; no project planned
Hyde Street	Street with one of the highest concentrations of crashes in city; grant application for long-term project submitted by City
7th Street	Important bicycle connector between SoMa, Caltrain and Mission Bay with no protection south of Folsom.
11th Street	Project has been long delayed (was scheduled to be approved in 2018 and built in 2019). Design has begun, and near-term solutions should be implemented.
Embarcadero near-term	This project has been delayed for years, and someone was killed on the corridor in 2018.
One corridor identified through the Bayview Community-Based Transportation Planning process	Few Bayview streets have received safety improvements since the City adopted Vision Zero, and more Bayview streets are on the new high-injury network map than the previous one.
California Street, from 18th Avenue to Arguello	One of the few high-injury corridors in the Richmond District that lacks a comprehensive improvement plan. Until a permanent project is implemented, this corridor needs short-term fixes.

The Vision Zero Coalition commends the substantial work the Mayor and City agencies have put into making the streets of San Francisco safer for everyone. We are confident that the City can reach its ambitious Vision Zero goal by 2024, but with only 5 years left, the City must pull out all the stops to get there, including implementing a strong transit plan.

We look forward to hearing how the City can implement the recommendations outlined above in order to successfully move forward its Vision Zero work.

Sincerely,

The Undersigned Vision Zero Coalition members

California Alliance for Retired Americans (CARA)
CC Puede
Community Housing Partnership
Chinatown TRIP
East Cut Community Benefit District
FDR Democratic Club of San Francisco
Livable City
Richmond Senior Center
San Francisco Bicycle Coalition
San Francisco Housing Action Coalition
Safe Routes to School National Partnership, Northern California Region
San Francisco Transit Riders
Senior & Disability Action
South Beach | Rincon | Mission Bay NA Board of Directors
SPUR
Tenderloin Community Benefit District – Safe Passage
United Playaz
Walk San Francisco

cc: SF Board of Supervisors
SFMTA Board of Directors
District Attorney George Gascón
Port Authority Director Elaine Forbes
Fire Chief Joanne Hayes-White
Rec and Park General Manager Phil Ginsburg
SFUSD Superintendent Vincent Matthews
SFPUC General Manager Harlan Kelly
Senator Scott Wiener
Assemblymember David Chiu
Assemblymember Phil Ting

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors; Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Acquisition of Surveillance Technology Ordinance vote
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 2:24:00 PM
Attachments: [SF Board Surveillance Ordinance 4-12-19.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)

From: Brian Hofer <brian@secure-justice.org>

Sent: Friday, April 12, 2019 12:15 PM

To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Brown, Vallie (BOS) <vallie.brown@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Hepner, Lee (BOS) <lee.hepner@sfgov.org>

Subject: Acquisition of Surveillance Technology Ordinance vote

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

Hon. Supervisors,

Please see the attached letter regarding the Acquisition of Surveillance Technology Ordinance committee vote on April 15.

Brian Hofer

Executive Director



(510) 303-2871 cell

@b_haddy

@Secure-Justice

secure-justice.org

**Disclaimer: This email may contain confidential and privileged material, including attachments, for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) named above. Please do not review, use, copy, forward, or in any way distribute or disclose the contents of this e-mail including any attachments unless you are the intended recipient(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, or authorized to receive this message for the recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and delete all copies of this message.*



April 12, 2019

VIA E-MAIL ONLY

Hon. Norman Yee (President)
Hon. Vallie Brown
Hon. Sandra Lee Fewer
Hon. Matt Haney
Hon. Rafael Mandelman
Hon. Gordon Mar
Hon. Aaron Peskin
Hon. Hillary Ronen
Hon. Ahsha Safai
Hon. Catherine Stefani
Hon. Shamann Walton
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA
E-Mail: Board.of.Supervisors.@sfgov.org

Re: Acquisition of Surveillance Technology Ordinance (Peskin)

Dear Honorable Board of Supervisors:

I write to urge you to support Supervisor Peskin's Acquisition of Surveillance Technology Ordinance ("Ordinance"), and to share with you my experiences with similar ordinances around the greater Bay Area.

Secure Justice is a 501c (3) advocating against state abuse of power, and for reduction in government and corporate over-reach. We target change in government contracting, and corporate complicity with government policies and practices that are inconsistent with democratic values and principles of human rights.

Surveillance Technology Ordinance

Like other local jurisdictions, Supervisor Peskin has proposed a framework for vetting the potential acquisition or use of surveillance technology. Following the best practices first established in Santa Clara County in 2016, and subsequently enacted into law in Davis, Berkeley, Oakland, Palo Alto, and BART, Supervisor Peskin's proposed Ordinance would require that an impact analysis for each proposed technology acquisition first be performed, and that a proposed use policy be first reviewed, so that the Board can determine whether the benefits of using such technology outweigh the costs (both fiscal, and as to our civil liberties).

I have advocated for all six of the above ordinances, and co-authored four of them, and as Chair of the City of Oakland's Privacy Advisory Commission, I represent to you that the meaningful vetting and deliberation that will occur will lead to greater political buy-in and legitimacy, especially as to the police department's use of surveillance equipment. In addition, the potential impact on civil liberties and misuse of data will be greatly lessened, as experts and members of the public weigh in on the proposed acquisitions and use policies. As a sanctuary city/county, the use and protection of your resident's data should be a heightened concern.¹

Facts as of the date of this letter

- Each of the six existing ordinances follows a similar approval process as the Ordinance. **Each of the six existing ordinances was adopted by unanimous vote of its governing body.**
- Under this model, **no proposal has been permanently rejected** (several have been sent back to staff for additional analysis or draft policy amendments), and **no directive to cease use of existing equipment** has been issued. What we are seeing in practice is that various stakeholders, including the general public and outside subject matter experts, provide feedback to the staff's proposed use policy which usually results in several amendments, before eventual and subsequent unanimous adoption by the governing board.
- As the first entity to adopt this model in the country (June 2016), Santa Clara County has had sufficient time to do a formal review of the ordinance. Only minor amendments were proposed in September 2018 (edits to several headings, and re-arranging several sections for ease of reference). **No amendments to the framework or process were formally proposed by any department. No formal challenges to the governance structure have occurred. No department formally requested relief from compliance.**
- **No disciplinary action has occurred** under this model in the six above jurisdictions pursuant to a complaint from a member of the public (or otherwise, to our knowledge), suggesting that staff is able to comply and that the heightened scrutiny and transparency around both the policy rules and equipment use is ensuring that operators stay within the approved guidelines.
- **No legal actions have commenced** pursuant to the private right of action in the six above jurisdictions, against suggesting that the model is pragmatic.

The above facts demonstrate that this model works in practice, and that compliance is being achieved across the board. It is an elegant solution to complicated questions regarding the use of potentially invasive equipment and our sprint into the age of Big Data, Smart Cities, and proliferation of algorithms making important decisions about our daily lives.

With the passage of your Privacy Principles ballot measure (Prop B), voters in San Francisco recognized that our right to privacy is increasingly impacted with the advance of technology and data mining. The Ordinance provides a mechanism whereby the citizens of San Francisco can

¹ <https://www.mercurynews.com/2018/09/12/bart-staff-ignored-board-to-spy-on-riders-sent-info-ice-could-access/>
("The word sanctuary has lost a lot of its strength," Prieto said. "Trusting any state agency to fully support the undocumented community through sanctuary farces is something we are no longer gambling with."
Those lapses of trust, however, are what privacy advocates want to avoid with a surveillance use policy BART's board will consider adopting...")

determine collectively where to draw the lines around the use of surveillance technology and the data collected by it. It is local government at its best.

San Francisco will also benefit from the knowledge and best practices developed by the six jurisdictions that have preceded it. We likely have templates for any existing technology you are using presently, and we routinely provide feedback and templates to any department that asks. I am available to help any San Francisco department achieve compliance with this Ordinance, and I am willing to walk anyone through the Ordinance, and discuss how the process has been working for others.

Your leadership and acknowledgment of your constituent's concerns regarding privacy is appreciated. I look forward to San Francisco's talent and sophistication being used to address these important matters of public policy.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Brian Hofer", is shown on a light-colored background.

Brian Hofer
Executive Director
(510) 303-2871
brian@secure-justice.org
<https://secure-justice.org/>

cc: Angela Calvillo

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors; Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Praise for efforts to close Juvenile Hall
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 2:22:00 PM
Attachments: [Book Cover](#)

From: Lisa Hill <afrocentric315@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 11, 2019 6:01 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>
Subject: Praise for efforts to close Juvenile Hall

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

Greetings,

I recently read the article regarding the Supervisors who are drafting legislation to close Juvenile Hall. I want to commend their efforts. I worked for Alameda County Probation Department for three decades. I retired as Superintendent of the Camp program after tiredness efforts to introduce reforms. I am currently a professor at California State University, Eastbay teaching in the Criminal Justice Department. My goal is to educate and train compassionate and ethical Criminal Justice professionals. I recently published a book entitled "Keeping Kids in the Home and out of the System."

I applaud the Supervisors efforts to reform a costly and failing intervention to address juvenile delinquency.

Please consider offering my book to families as you make the transition.

Lisa Hill, Ph.D., LMFT

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Edna Station 49
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 1:23:00 PM

From: Jeri Papuga <jolsenpapuga@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 12, 2019 7:11 AM
To: fireadmistration@sfgov.org; FirePIO, FIR (FIR) <firepio@sfgov.org>; Mayororlandobreed@sfgov.org; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Edna Station 49

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

Hello all! I know SF has a great deal of pressing issues. My simple request is please listen and fairly consider the importance of Edna to this SFFD Station 49 of the cat, Edna.

Thank You, Jeri Papuga

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors; Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Reconsider Recommendations for SRO Task Force
Date: Tuesday, April 9, 2019 10:35:00 AM

From: Lisa Windes <lmwindes@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 9, 2019 6:40 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Reconsider Recommendations for SRO Task Force

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We are writing to you to urge that the recommendations of the Rules Committee be reconsidered, and that the SRO Housing Justice slate is appointed, specifically Christopher Mika for Seat 1, Courtney Brown for Seat 4, and Jordan Davis for Seat 9.

Christopher Mika is a disabled Mission District SRO tenant who has helped to deliver N95 masks when the smoke from the Camp Fire was choking the city. In addition, he serves on the LGBTQ+ Equity Workgroup, is involved in homelessness rights, and would be a welcome departure from the transphobia, ableism, and sexism from the previous tenant representative.

Courtney Brown is a District 4 constituent and a pansexual woman who works at a non-profit serving a diverse clientele and whose background in palliative care and suicide prevention would be an asset to the Task Force, and is somebody who really cares about tenants. The person who was recommended has deep ties to the mayor and it is concerning that London Breed is trying to stack a task force that the board has nine appointees to.

And last, but not least, we are disappointed to hear that Jordan Davis, despite her many credentials, will not be reappointed to Seat 9, due to some backroom deals by Supervisor Peskin and the Central City SRO Collaborative. We urge that Jordan, the only LGBTQ+ incumbent, one of very few transgender women and autistic people serving on boards and commissions, be reappointed to the SRO Task Force

The full Board of Supervisors has the right to reverse any recommendation of the Rules Committee, and we encourage the appointment of Christopher Mika to Seat 1, Courtney Brown to Seat 4, and the reappointment of Jordan Davis to Seat 9. The future of SRO tenants depends on leadership, a can-do attitude, and a willingness to work in good faith to advance the needs of the most vulnerable.

Sincerely,
Lisa Windes
District 9

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors; Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Appointments to SRO Task Force
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 12:29:00 PM

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

From: sasha harris-cronin <sasha@mortalspaces.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2019 1:36 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Appointments to SRO Task Force

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

I urge you you appoint Christopher Mika to Seat 1, Courtney Brown to seat 4 and reappoint Jordan Davis to seat 9 of the SRO Task Force. We need voices on the task force who are queer, who are trans, and who have lived in SROs. We cannot adequately represent the community without voices from the community.

Thank you.

Sasha.

.. sasha harris-cronin ..
.. sasha@mortalspaces.com .. 415.516.2049..

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors; Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Appoint Christopher Mika, Courtney Brown, and Jordan Davis for the SRO Task Force!
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 2:14:00 PM

From: Robert Rogers <scatalogic@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 11, 2019 4:21 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Courtney Brown <greetingsfellowhuman@gmail.com>; Jordan Davis <jodav1026@gmail.com>; Christopher Mika <mika.christopher@gmail.com>; lee.hefner@sfgov.org; Angulo, Sunny (BOS) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>; Donnelly-Landolt, Wyatt (BOS) <wyatt.donnelly-landolt@sfgov.org>; SF-DSA-Housing <sf-dsa-housing@googlegroups.com>; Cynthia Fong <cynthia@hrcsf.org>; deepaalluri@gmail.com; William Pope <williamhpope@outlook.com>; Shanti Singh <shanti.priyasingh@gmail.com>
Subject: Appoint Christopher Mika, Courtney Brown, and Jordan Davis for the SRO Task Force!

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to you today to urge that the recommendations of the Rules Committee be reconsidered, and that the SRO Housing Justice slate is appointed, specifically Christopher Mika for Seat 1, Courtney Brown for Seat 4, and Jordan Davis for Seat 9.

Christopher Mika is a disabled Mission District SRO tenant who has helped to deliver N95 masks when the smoke from the Camp Fire was choking the city. In addition, he serves on the LGBTQ+ Equity Workgroup, is involved in homelessness rights, and would be a welcome departure from the transphobia, ableism, and sexism from the previous tenant representative.

Courtney Brown is a District 4 constituent and a pansexual woman who is a deputy director of supportive housing and case management at the largest supportive housing agency in San Francisco. Her background in counseling individuals on the margins of society, and her citywide leadership on suicide prevention programming -- which included leading regular trainings for first responders with San Francisco Suicide Prevention -- would also be a tremendous asset to the Task Force. More importantly, she is somebody who genuinely cares about tenants, and has depth of experience negotiating with property managers, hotel owners, and city government social service officials on behalf of tenants, that is sorely lacking on the SRO task force. The person who was recommended by the Rules Committee, meanwhile, has deep ties to the mayor. The impression this leaves -- that London Breed is attempting to stack a task force that is the Board of Supes discretion to appoint -- is deeply concerning.

And last, but not least, we are disappointed to hear that Jordan Davis, despite her many credentials, may not be reappointed to Seat 9, due to possible backroom deals by Supervisor Peskin and the Central City SRO Collaborative. We urge that Jordan, the only LGBTQ+ incumbent, and one of the few transgender women and autistic individuals serving on City Hall boards and commissions, be reappointed to the SRO Task Force

The full Board of Supervisors has the right to reverse any recommendation of the Rules Committee, and we encourage the appointment of Christopher Mika to Seat 1, Courtney Brown to Seat 4, and the reappointment of Jordan Davis to Seat 9. The future of SRO tenants depends on leadership, a can do attitude, and a willingness to work in good faith to advance the needs of the most vulnerable.

Sincerely,

Robert Rogers

District 2

From: [JT](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Camera Legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 4:55:35 PM

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

We live in District 7, on same block as a former police chief. My cars have been broken into 7 times, one time stolen in front of my house. It has cost me not only time and money but left us with a terrible sense of being unsafe. People broke into my next door neighbor's home (south of me) and took all her valuables and personal family items. The house next to her was broken into 3 times in 2 years. An elderly neighbor half a block north of me was unfortunate to be home when robbers broke into her home. She was beaten with a baseball bat. My elderly neighbor mid-block west of me had their house robbed when they went to lunch. Lots of items of personal value, medals all taken. I confronted and stopped a team of young robbers as they attempted rob the elderly gentleman's home next to that house. That group came in a team of 2 cars. A neighbor down the block went on vacation and came home to discover that 2 crooks broke in and had been living there and robbed him. They took not only valuables, family heirlooms, but also broke into his safe and took a gun. I am describing all the robberies within the past 2 or 3 years. I can tolerate the thieves stealing my plants and wind chimes from my front yard but the robberies and break ins are terrifying. My sister 2 blocks away lost all her valuables when they broke into her house a few years ago. She now lives behind bars.

We live in a "nice" neighborhood but we do not feel safe. We feel vulnerable. Unfortunately, because we are in a nice neighborhood, crooks came and target us. We feel that our concerns are a bit neglected too. Please do not pass legislation to restrict use of cameras. In fact, we are hoping for funding for increase cameras at certain intersections that can capture the license plates and thieves even more clearly.

Jane Fujimoto

From: [mwrench](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Camera Legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 5:21:47 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Margaret Wrench. I have been a home owner and lived in the Sunset then GG Heights neighborhoods for 45 years. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. Honestly, in my many decades of living in San Francisco, I have never seen the indifference to crime by our elected officials that we've had in the past few years. It seemed to start with the 2008 recession (possibly by cutting back funding for the police department) and has only gotten worse since then. I understand that violent crime is down, but property crime and serious traffic violations (speeding, running stop signs, illegal turns, etc) are rampant. I personally know two neighbors (one who is directly next door) who have experienced break-ins in which 2-3 people were involved and clearly had been casing the neighborhood. The most recent episode next door to me occurred at 6:30pm, led me, for the first time, to install an alarm system.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Margaret Wrench
1250 Pacheco St.

PS: Although this legislation is not specifically about traffic violation videos, I wish the supervisors would allow more video recording related to traffic violations. We should have a policy in SF to have serious consequences for people who speed or otherwise violate important traffic safety measures. In my neighborhood, 17th Ave and Pacheco St, there is essentially no enforcement of traffic laws and there hasn't been for years. It's incomprehensible to me why this is? No amount of speed bumps will overcome the need for traffic law enforcement.

From: [Diana Eng](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Concern for to regulate video surveillance
Date: Saturday, April 13, 2019 5:21:06 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Diana Eng, and I live in the Sunset neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. My in-law's home was broken into and many personal valuables was stolen without any of them retrieved. My father-in-law was robbed of his wallet(\$200 plus) on his way home in the street, worst was that he was hit and sustained a bloody nose in the incident.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Diana Eng
1706-16th Avenue
SF

From: [Robert Passaro](#)
To: [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Karena Passaro](#)
Subject: Concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance" legislation
Date: Saturday, April 13, 2019 12:05:14 AM

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

Dear Supervisor Walton,

My name is Robert Passaro and I live in Potrero Hill. I care deeply about the massive increase in property crime in San Francisco, as I have had to come to the support of literally DOZENS of car break-in victims (including many tourists who lost passports and irreplaceable items) over the past few years. The near daily additional broken window glass is now a common site, and I have personally swept this sad remnant up on my block over 20 times. Additionally, my young son was robbed by two teenagers of the very bicycle he was riding on, in the middle of a sunny, clear Sunday, in our neighborhood. They were apprehended and plead guilty, and this was possible ONLY because of the availability of surveillance footage from various neighbors. Without this, the police and DA would have had very little information with which to proceed on an investigation and eventual prosecution. I am a big advocate of a smart and prudent use of this technology in reducing crime in our city.

[Stop Crime SF](#), a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an [open letter](#) to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered [reasonable amendments](#) in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from

the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

Robert Passaro

382 Texas Street

From: [Jennifer Benz](#)
To: [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Concerns about video surveillance law
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 6:57:52 PM

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

Hello Shamann and the Board of Supervisors,

I live in Potrero Hill and work in SOMA. My office and apartment have both been broken into in the last several years and I'm very concerned about the growing property crime in San Francisco.

At my home, I recently installed a security system and a camera in my back yard because there have been so many aggressive breakins on my block of Pennsylvania between 20th and 22nd.

My neighbors who live two doors down had their building broken into a few months ago, while they were home with a month-old baby sleeping. Video surveillance helped catch the criminals, who left them quite scared to live in our beautiful neighborhood.

I am concerned that the video surveillance law being considered by the supervisors would have unintended consequences and make the city less safe. While it has good intentions to protect privacy, please slow down the process and ensure there is time to gather input from citizens and the community.

Thank you,

Jennifer Benz

415-806-3005

From: [Amy Johnson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Dangerous video surveillance law
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 3:23:50 PM

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

I fully stand with stop crime SF in opposition to several aspects of the proposed video surveillance law. Privacy is a concern but not at the expense of catching dangerous criminals, and possibly solving murders. The legislation as proposed is wholly unacceptable and should either be abandoned, or contain the modifications recommended by Stop Crime SF.

Thank you.

Amy Johnson
District 7 homeowner

Sent from my iPhone

From: [ALICE XAVER](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fwd: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 3:53:47 PM

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

From: ALICE XAVER <acxavier@aol.com>
Date: April 11, 2019 at 6:28:32 PM PDT
To: Sandra.Fewer@sfgov.org, Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org,
Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org, Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org, Vallie.Brown@sfgov.org,
Matt.Haney@sfgov.org, Norman.Yee@sfgov.org, MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org,
Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org, Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org, Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org,
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Christopher Xavier and I live in the Golden Gate Heights neighborhood.

I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. I have relatives, friends, neighbors who have been a victim of property crime/car break-in/stolen packages/home robbery!

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door

community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Dr Christopher Xavier
1709-16th Ave, SF

Sent from my iPhone
Please excuse any typos

From: [Aaron Burby](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fwd: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 3:43:46 PM

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

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

From: Aaron Burby <aburby@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, Apr 11, 2019 at 8:07 PM
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
To: <Sandra.Fewer@sfgov.org>, <Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org>, <Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org>, <Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org>, <Vallie.Brown@sfgov.org>, <Matt.Haney@sfgov.org>, <Norman.Yee@sfgov.org>, <MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org>, <Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org>, <Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org>, <Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org>, <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Aaron Burby and I live in the Golden Gate Heights neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. We have been victims of car break-ins and stolen packages. A number of our neighbors have been victims of robbery and other crimes. Our street, near the Moraga 16th Ave steps, has been a site of ongoing car break-ins and crimes. After more of our neighbors installed cameras, the rate of crimes have decreased.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Aaron Burby
1735 16th Ave, SF, CA 94122

From: [Aaron Burby](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Kristen Stuecher](#)
Subject: Fwd: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 3:43:18 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Aaron Burby and I live in the Golden Gate Heights neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. We have been victims of car break-ins and stolen packages. A number of our neighbors have been victims of robbery and other crimes. Our street, near the Moraga 16th Ave steps, has been a site of ongoing car break-ins and crimes. After more of our neighbors installed cameras, the rate of crimes have decreased.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Aaron Burby
1735 16th Ave, SF, CA 94122

From: [Yvonne Lee](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fwd: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 3:04:04 PM

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

Pls see my email below.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Yvonne Lee <ylee1foru@gmail.com>
Date: April 12, 2019 at 3:02:40 PM PDT
To: Sandra.Fewer@sfgov.org, Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org,
Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org, Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org, Vallie.Brown@sfgov.org,
Matt.Haney@sfgov.org, Norman.Yee@sfgov.org, MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org,
Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org, Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org, Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org,
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Yvonne Lee and my daughter and granddaughter live in the Midtown neighborhood. We care deeply about crime in San Francisco. My daughter has had her car stolen in front of her home, which I luckily spotted couple blocks away the next day after driving around searching for it.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should

do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Yvonne L. Lee
c/o 6 Sunview Drive
San Francisco, CA 94131

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Scott Sellman](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fwd: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 6:38:15 PM

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

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

From: **Scott Sellman** <ssellman@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, Apr 11, 2019, 7:33 PM
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
To: <Sandra.Fewer@sfgov.org>, <Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org>, <Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org>, <Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org>, <Vallie.Brown@sfgov.org>, <Matt.Haney@sfgov.org>, <Norman.Yee@sfgov.org>, <MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org>, <Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org>, <Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org>, <Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org>, <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Scott Sellman and I live in the Golden Gate Heights neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco, having been a victim of repeated burglaries and car break-ins, which the police have been able to do nothing about. We need to change something.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Scott Sellman
849 Noriega St

From: [T. Stephen Henderson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fwd: Stop The Surveillance Legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 3:11:25 PM

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

Subject: Stop The Surveillance Legislation

Dear Supervisor Fewer, Members of the Board of Supervisors

I am writing to strongly encourage you to properly vet the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" legislation. Surveillance technology is a highly complex issue that should be debated with a robust public process and debate. In particular, our neighborhood watch group has shared nearly a dozen pieces of video footage of crimes with the SFPD. Limiting our ability to share this footage would hamper our efforts to reduce crime in our neighborhood. Please give this legislation the proper amount of debate and scrutiny it deserves.

Sincerely yours,

Steve Henderson
Member, Community Police Advisory Board

From: [Peter Fortune](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please OPPOSE and then AMEND "Stop Secret Surveillance"
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 8:48:02 PM

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

Dear Supervisor -

I live in the Marina and have been a victim of an auto break-in. I also have worked to help the SFPD reduce these crimes in our and other neighborhoods. I also am a member of the Marina Community Association's Crime & Safety Committee.

I and many of my neighbors have installed cameras to surveil our homes and the streets and areas around our homes. Already, my neighbors, with their video cameras, have been successful in helping get SFPD identify some of these criminals.

Because of the epidemic of auto break-ins, I joined Stop Crime SF in order to try to do something to help my neighbors, many of whom have likewise been victims of these burglaries. We in Stop Crime SF are a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents who are working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime.

After carefully analyzing "Stop Secret Surveillance," Stop Crime SF wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors, explaining our grave concerns about this proposed legislation. This proposed legislation, seemingly knee-jerk in origin, could have unintended consequences that would render us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies (e.g., the SFPD) in a bureaucratic approval process.

You surely know that PROPERTY CRIME IS A MAJOR ISSUE in our City and that the SFPD needs all the help it can get from technology.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no publicity, input from the community, public safety agencies, and departments that rely on video surveillance (e.g., the airport). In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone.

We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders, including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders, and business owners that have surveillance cameras, should be represented and heard.

Please allow this public process to happen, and amend the legislation, before voting on it.

Thank you.

Peter Fortune
3579 Pierce Street, SF

From: [Kelly Kruger](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary;](#)
[MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann](#)
[\(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Monday, April 15, 2019 9:50:33 PM

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

Dear Supervisor, My name is Kelly Kruger_____ and I live in the _Bernal Heights_____ neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process. While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter. I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

From: [biged1458](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Monday, April 15, 2019 8:27:42 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is ___ed___ and I live in the _excelsior ____ neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. [Note if you or a family member/friend has been a victim of property crime/car break-in/stolen packages/home robbery]

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S7 active, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone

From: fprice@ohlrch.com
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); info@sfmca.org; stopcrimesf@gmail.com; [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Monday, April 15, 2019 5:02:11 PM

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

Dear Supervisor, My name is Frana Price and I live in the Marina neighborhood. I am SICK of crime in this city. I'm TIRED OF being a good tax paying citizen and suffering the crime of BAD CITIZENS. I TRULY DON'T UNDERSTAND WHY YOU ARE PROPOSING THIS LEGISLATION. I am sick of walking down the street and seeing AUTO GLASS. The other day I returned a wallet, minus money, to someone who had her car broken into. SHE WAS VERY UPSET. WHY GIVE BURGLARS any shelter. Frana Price, 67 Rico Way

HERE IS THE NICE WAY THEY TOLD ME TO PUT IN MY SUPPLICATION TO YOU.

I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. (Please state if you have been affected by property crime) Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process. While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter. I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco. All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation. Sincerely, Frana Price, 67 Rico Way

From: [Magnus Chow](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Monday, April 15, 2019 12:20:59 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Magnus Chow and I live in the Sunset neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. Our Camry was broken into and our Odyssey was vandalized while parked on the street.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

Sent from [Outlook](#)

From: [Brynn deLorimier](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Monday, April 15, 2019 11:10:47 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Brynn and I live in the Potrero Hill neighborhood. I'm very worried about crime in San Francisco, especially as it pertains to my house and myself. My next-door neighbor is dangerous -- he's been violent toward other neighbors (as in, has chased them down the street with an axe or hammer on multiple occasions), harasses me constantly, has broken into my house once, and my truck twice. I have caught him intentionally trying to damage an already-damaged piece of property that he won't allow my construction crew on his yard to fix. You can ask my former district supervisor, Malia Cohen, how she feels about Jerry Bonafair at 1001 Kansas Street, and I could give you a list of ten other city employees he's harassed. Living next to him is not safe -- and unfortunately, because he's complained about our fixer house right after we bought it resulting in a Notice of Violating from the Building Department, yet won't allow us on his property which is necessary to fix it, we are stuck here -- we can't even sell it. I would LOVE to sell this house and get away from this horrible man. After all this and plenty more, the city would still not grant me a restraining order. So I bought I gun, I now carry pepper gel with me whenever leaving my house, and I have seven surveillance cameras up around my property. My life has been a miserable nightmare since moving here two years ago and I cannot take down my surveillance cameras as long as we are stuck in this horrible situation.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners who invested in professional-grade video surveillance for the reasons I described above, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

Brynn deLorimier
2119 22nd St
San Francisco, CA 94107
415.580.2483

From: [Saira Malik](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safal, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Monday, April 15, 2019 10:48:32 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Saira Malik and I work in the Cathedral Hill neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. [Note if you or a family member/friend has been a victim of property crime/car break-in/stolen packages/home robbery]

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras to protect their interests should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Saira Malik
Director of Finance & Administration
First Unitarian Universalist Society of San Francisco

From: [Pierce, Hilary C.](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, IBOS](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Monday, April 15, 2019 10:35:18 AM
Attachments: [image81dd63.PNG](#)

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

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Hilary Pierce and I live in the Marina neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco and have had packages stolen, my car broken into and people defecating in my entryway as well as illicit drug usage in my entryway. I have young children and have a nest camera to know my children are safe when entering and exiting my home.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns.

The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process. While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco. All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Thank you.

Hilary Pierce

Hilary C. Pierce
Partner



Sideman & Bancroft LLP
One Embarcadero Center
Twenty-Second Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Main: 415.392.1960
Direct: 415.733.3911
Fax: 415.392.0827
hpierce@sideman.com
Visit us at www.sideman.com

Please consider the environment before you print this email.

CONFIDENTIALITY

This e-mail may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any review, use, distribution or disclosure by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorized to receive for the recipient), please contact the sender by reply e-mail [or at (415) 392-1960] and delete all copies of this message. It is the recipient's responsibility to scan this e-mail and any attachments for viruses.

From: [Steve Bosshard](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Sunday, April 14, 2019 11:55:25 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is __Steve Bosshard__ and I no longer live in San Francisco. I used to care deeply about crime in San Francisco. By staying away from the city I don't have to worry about my car being broken into, stepping in human feces, being attacked by a homeless crazy or watching public urination. I also don't need to worry about lack of criminal justice or any form of deterrent. You have let the city become a mockery. You are harvesting what you sowed. Enjoy.

Can you please explain to me how anyone can think they have privacy rights on a public street. You are idiots and you are getting what you deserve. LMAO

The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

Why should you want advice from the people of SF. You think you know it all.

From: [Steve Bosshard](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Sunday, April 14, 2019 11:54:51 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is __Steve Bosshard__ and I no longer live in San Francisco. I used to care deeply about crime in San Francisco. By staying away from the city I don't have to worry about my car being broken into, stepping in human feces, being attacked by a homeless crazy or watching public urination. I also don't need to worry about lack of criminal justice or any form of deterrent. You have let the city become a mockery. You are harvesting what you sowed. Enjoy.

Can you please explain to me how anyone can think they have privacy rights on a public street. You are idiots and you are getting what you deserve. LMAO

The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

Why should you want advice from the people of SF. You think you know it all.

From: [Alix Lipson](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [info@sfmca.org](#); [stopcrimesf@gmail.com](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Sunday, April 14, 2019 10:25:18 AM

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

Dear supervisors,

My name is Alix and I live in the marina neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco, as both a native San Franciscan who has seen the city become more dangerous, and as a current resident who is there to live through all of the changes.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns.

The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Alix Alioto
1754 francisco street

Sent from my iPhone

From: [John Grauel](#)
To: [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Marina Community Association](#); stopcrimesf@gmail.com; [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Saturday, April 13, 2019 5:12:32 PM
Attachments: [Please re-think video surveillance legislation.msg](#)

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

From: [John Grauel](#)
To: [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Marina Community Association](#); stopcrimesf@gmail.com; [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Saturday, April 13, 2019 5:12:27 PM

Dear Supervisor,

My name is John Grauel and I live in the Marina neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. I have witnessed crime and have provided video evidence to the police department on crime in front of my home.

While the idea of the legislation may be based on good intents, the current form is beyond ridiculous. We need to get out of the way of law enforcement and allow them to protect the public. If you are concerned about the effectiveness of software to identify folks then let's craft a way to discuss rules for that identification. If a low resolution camera captures a license plate that information should be instantly available to the police.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns.

The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

John Grauel
john@carbonrose.com
3700 Broderick Street
San Francisco, CA 94123-1009
650-678-8040

From: [Brandon Disbrow](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Saturday, April 13, 2019 1:10:05 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Brandon Disbrow and I work in the Mission neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

From: [Tommy Ahern](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Saturday, April 13, 2019 11:01:26 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Jay Ahern and I live in the Ingleside Heights neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. I know multiple people who have been victims of property crime in the city as well as myself.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the San Francisco International airport.

Please stop making it easier for criminals to commit and get away with crime.

Respectfully submitted.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Kathleen Mayeda](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); info@sfmca.org; stopcrimesf@gmail.com; [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Saturday, April 13, 2019 10:32:20 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Kathleen and I live in the Marina neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. (Please state if you have been affected by property crime)

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns.

The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process. Neighbors are very concerned about these thefts. The cameras to verify the perpetrators brings them some comfort that their neighborhood is protected.

We bring packages to the first level so none are outside or in the lobby.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Mayeda
3555 Broderick St.
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: [Charnab1](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [info@sfmca.org](#); [stopcrimesf@gmail.com](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Saturday, April 13, 2019 9:43:18 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Charna Ball and I live in the Marina neighborhood for the past 3+ decades. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. My quality of life has been diminished dramatically over the past several years due to the increase in crime locally here in my city and in my neighborhood.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns.

The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Charna Ball
3475 Pierce Street
SF, CA 94123

From: [Kenneth Lipson](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); info@sfmca.org; stopcrimesf@gmail.com; [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Saturday, April 13, 2019 9:22:22 AM

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

>>

>> Dear Supervisor,

>> I am adamantly against the upcoming proposal set forth by Peskin Yee & Walton

>>

>> My name is Kenneth LIPSON, and I live in the sea cliff neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. We have had several incidents - even in our neighborhood, that have been supported by property owner's surveillance. It is a very important .

>>

>> Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance."

>> The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic mess.

>>

>> I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

>>

>> All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

>>

>> Sincerely,

>> Kenneth Lipson

>> 75. 27 th ave

>>

From: [sfsaber17](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Saturday, April 13, 2019 9:20:20 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Max Zubko and I live in the Parkmerced neighborhood. As a SF native, I care deeply about crime in San Francisco.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

This city is degrading at a rapid level. Do your jobs and start making a positive difference rather than just doing what will further your political careers.

From: [John H. Dowell](#)
To: [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Saturday, April 13, 2019 9:12:14 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is John Dowell and I live in the Cow Hollow neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns.

The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
John Dowell
2480 Filbert Street
San Francisco 94123

From: [Lindsay](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [info@sfmca.org](#); [stopcrimesf@gmail.com](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Saturday, April 13, 2019 8:46:35 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Lindsay Lovier and I live in the Marina/Cow Hollow neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. Our family has been a victim of property crime in San Francisco and it was a deeply frustrating experience.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns.

The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Lindsay Lovier
3190 Scott Street

Sent from my iPhone

From: [beverly spector](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [info@sfmca.org](#); [stopcrimesf@gmail.com](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Saturday, April 13, 2019 8:46:30 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

I am adamantly against the upcoming proposal set forth by Peskin Yee & Walton

My name is _bev spector ____ and I live in the __sea cliff ____ neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. We have had several incidents - even in our neighborhood, that have been supported by property owner's surveillance. It is a very important .

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance."

The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic mess.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Bev Spector
75. 27 th ave
Sf 94121

Sent from my iPhone

Please Reduce, Reuse & Recycle, we can all make a difference .

From: [Patricia Berkowitz](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Marina Community Association](#); stopcrimesf@gmail.com; [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Saturday, April 13, 2019 8:40:40 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Patricia Berkowitz and I live in the Pacific Heights neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. I know that property crime is rampant in my neighborhood.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns.

The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

Patricia B. Berkowitz
2750 Scott Street
San Francisco CA, 94123

From: [Sean Sharp](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); info@sfmca.org; stopcrimesf@gmail.com; [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Saturday, April 13, 2019 8:22:14 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Sean Sharp and I live in the Marina. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns.

The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Sean Sharp
2040 Jefferson St. #106
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: [Julie Mascheroni](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); info@sfmca.org; stopcrimesf@gmail.com; [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Saturday, April 13, 2019 8:16:46 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Julie and I live in the Marina neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. My apartment building has been broken into numerous times and I'm really mad that I can't be safe in my own home.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns.

The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Julie Mascheroni
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: [W Bear](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Saturday, April 13, 2019 6:35:50 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is __Wendy__ and I work in the __SOMA__ neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco and am tired of all the car burglaries and brazen robberies!

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

Sent from my iPad

From: [Angelique Marin](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Saturday, April 13, 2019 2:37:38 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Angelique Marin and I live in Noe Valley. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. My father was a victim of a violent robbery which almost took his life. However, left him severely disabled. He was stabbed multiple times for loose coins in his pockets. He lost the ability to walk independently and suffers from PTSD from that attack. More than 90% of my neighbors (and myself) on our block including the surrounding blocks have been victim of car break-ins and porch theft. It is deeply sad to know as a citizen of San Francisco we are repeatedly victimized in various ways most often resulting in little to no justice.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

Regards,
Angelique Marin

From: [Thomas Johnson](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 9:33:50 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is ___Thomas J Johnson___ and I live in the ___Sunnyside___ neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Jim O'Meara](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 8:14:20 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Yee and his Constituents,

Our names are Jim and Colleen O'Meara and we live in the Lakeshore Plaza neighborhood. We are residents and voters in District 7. We care deeply about crime in San Francisco. We have had two of our cars auto boosted in the last two years. Our next door neighbor's house was broken into and the intruder was caught on a video surveillance camera. My wife recently caught a potential burglar pull into our neighbor's driveway and attempt to take two packages off the doorstep of their house. My wife startled them causing them to make up a story that they were visiting the son of our neighbor's. The only problem was they didn't give my wife the correct name. They had been following a white truck delivering packages for Amazon. The video surveillance helped in the arrest of one of these suspects and identify the other two subjects. We have had three residential burglaries in the last year in our neighborhood and now you are voting to STOP SECRET VIDEO SURVEILLANCE. Do you think this is going to help reduce property crime in San Francisco or increase it! The worst legislation that was ever passed was Prop 47 which has had a snowball affects in property crime in San Francisco. I would hope the Board of Supervisors' rethinks the passing of this legislation!

The Stop Crime Committee in SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." We share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

We are also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

Thank you for listening to two native San Franciscans who have never seen as much property crime occurring in San Francisco than ever before! A recent article in SF Gate stated that there were over 36,000 reportable break-ins in 2017 if you average it out over a period of twelve months. We must find a way to deter the this crime not help it!

Thank you,
Jim and Colleen O'Meara

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Mariel and Paul](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 6:16:36 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Paul Batjiaka and I live in the inner sunset neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Paul Batjiaka

700 Pacheco Street
S.F., CA

From: lokwy@yahoo.com
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 5:43:18 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Wayne Lok and I live in the Richmond neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. [Note if you or a family member/friend has been a victim of property crime/car break-in/stolen packages/home robbery]

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

Wayne Lok
Concerned Resident of San Francisco

From: [Kopunks](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 5:17:33 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Kevin O'Donnell and I live in the Lone Mountain neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. I, as well as several of my family members and friends have been victims of auto burglaries in the last few years.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

Sincerely,
Kevin O'Donnell
3173 Turk Blvd, S.F.
California, 94118

From: [Susan Fisch](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 5:08:22 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Susan Fisch and I live in the Ashbury Heights neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. [Note if you or a family member/friend has been a victim of property crime/car break-in/stolen packages/home robbery]

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Susan Fisch

Susan Fisch
sfisch116@comcast.net
415-377-0309

From: [Our Email](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 5:05:47 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

We are Mr. and Mrs. Clausen and we live in the Parkside neighborhood. We care deeply about crime in San Francisco. Our cars have been vandalized several times over the past two weeks, along with those of our neighbors.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." We share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

We are also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

Mr and Mrs Clausen.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Michael A](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 4:41:46 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Michael and I live in the OMI neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

As a voter and SF tax payer, I urge to vote against the proposed legislation and go back to the drawing board. This time, include law enforcement and tech experts in the conversation so you can learn the realities of how surveillance cameras and recognition technology REALLY works and how it will benefit public safety.

Michael A
OMI, San Francisco

From: [ALICE XAVER](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 3:54:41 PM

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

To: Sandra.Fewer@sfgov.org, Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org,
Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org, Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org, Vallie.Brown@sfgov.org,
Matt.Haney@sfgov.org, Norman.Yee@sfgov.org, MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org,
Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org, Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org, Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org,
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation

Dear Supervisors:

My name is Alice Xavier and I live in the Golden Gate Heights neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. We have witnessed many victim of car break-ins, know many people who have had packages stolen and know many, many victims home robberies whose lives will never be the same.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Alice Xavier
1700-16th Ave, SF

Sent from my iPhone
Please excuse any typos

From: [Tracy McCray](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 3:16:15 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Brown,

My name is Dorothy Cain and I live in the Western Addition neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

Thank you,

Dorothy Cain

From: [Tracy McCray](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 3:15:00 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Yee

My name is Tracy McCray and I live in the Sunnyside neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

Thank you,

Tracy McCray

From: [Yvonne Lee](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 3:02:49 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Yvonne Lee and my daughter and granddaughter live in the Midtown neighborhood. We care deeply about crime in San Francisco. My daughter has had her car stolen in front of her home, which I luckily spotted couple blocks away the next day after driving around searching for it.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Yvonne L. Lee
c/o 6 Sunview Drive
San Francisco, CA 94131

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Brian Delahunty](#)
To: [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 2:56:23 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Yee, My name is Brian Delahunty and I live in the Forest Hill Extension neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process. While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter. I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

From: [Miner Lowe](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 2:50:29 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is __Miner G. Lowe__ and I live in the Balboa Terrace_____ neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. [Note if you or a family member/friend has been a victim of property crime/car break-in/stolen packages/home robbery]

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

Name Miner G. Lowe

Address 401 Darien Way, 94127

From: curtisnakano@yahoo.com
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 2:05:44 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Curtis Nakano___ and I live in the Richmond District neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. Numerous family and friends vehicles have been broken into.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Anthony](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 1:54:49 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Anthony Orge and I work in the marina neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. [Note if you or a family member/friend has been a victim of property crime/car break-in/stolen packages/home robbery]

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

From: [Chris Hardy](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 1:40:17 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Christopher Hardy and I live in the Outer Sunset neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. I have personally been the victim of several crimes while living in San Francisco .

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

Christopher Hardy

1914 33rd Ave

San Francisco CA

From: [Samuel F](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 1:12:16 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Samuel Fung and I live in the Excelsior neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco.

In the past year, I have installed a Ring floodlight camera device on my home, which has captured video of home invasion burglary suspects casing my parents' house two doors down. The video footage, which contained a description of the suspect and vehicle, helped in leading police investigators to detain the vehicle, and later to a search warrant, where multiple suspects of prior home invasions were apprehended, as well as recovering firearms and stolen property. I strongly believe that the ability of the police department to retrieve relevant video surveillance assisted in this investigation.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

Please consider amending this proposed ordinance.

Respectfully,

Samuel Fung

From: wmmccarthy1880@gmail.com
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 12:56:49 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

My name is William McCarthy and I live in the Forest Knolls neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. I had my car broken into on Market Street at Pearl Street while having dinner at Sushi Zone several months ago. There was nothing left in the vehicle because I know better and the repair to the rear window of my SUV cost me a \$ 1000.00.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

William McCarthy

From: [Mark Silva](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 12:52:14 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Mandelman, my name is Mark Silva...I live in the Castro neighborhood and work in the Cathedral Hill neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process. While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter. I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

Crime committed by those within the homeless population who are unfortunately addicted to drugs is rampant. Laws such as this will only embolden criminal activity. We law abiding citizens, businesses leaders and organizations are entitled to reasonable tools to protect our property and to pursue legal remedies when crimes are committed against us.

I am a daily rider of the F-Car from Castro to Van Ness. I find it deplorable that certain segments of the population are allowed to ride Muni as if it's free transportation. I am exasperated by City Hall's proclivity to make the environment easy on drug-addicted homeless criminals.

Mark Silva
61 Pond Street
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: [Bret Grennell](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 12:40:57 PM

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

My name is Bret Grennell and I live in the Portola neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. I personally know many people who have been affected by crime in this city, including people on my street who have been victims of crimes ranging from package theft to violent home invasion robberies. Some of these neighbors are not English speakers, so please consider that I am voicing not only my concerns, but some of theirs as well.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Thank you for your time. Sincerely,

Bret Grennell

From: [kevin moylan](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 12:37:24 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Kevin Moylan_____ and I live in the Noe Valley_____ neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. [Note if you or a family member/friend has been a victim of property crime/car break-in/stolen packages/home robbery]

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. And how about focusing on the real issues in SF instead of all this other BS legislation crap about store fronts, screwing up all the streets, navigation centers (meeting spots for junkies and crooks) in tourist area's.

From: [Joshua Phillips](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 12:23:17 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is ___joshua Phillips___ and I live in the ___Westwood Park ___ neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. [Note if you or a family member/friend has been a victim of property crime/car break-in/stolen packages/home robbery]

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Steve Coleman](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 12:06:49 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Stephen Coleman and I grew up, work in, and have many family members who currently live in San Francisco. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

Thank you,
Stephen Coleman

From: [cle50841](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 12:06:49 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is carla Hurley and I work in San Francisco. . I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. I and several of my family and friends have been the victim of residential burglaries and auto burglaries.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

From: [Lauren DeFilippo](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 11:38:51 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Lauren DeFilippo and I work in the Richmond neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. A handful of my friends and neighbors have been victims of property related crimes in San Francisco.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

Lauren DeFilippo

- Sent from an iPhone

From: [Tara Allen](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 11:31:31 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Tara Allen__ and I live in the Bayview/Hunters Point__ neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. [Note if you or a family member/friend has been a victim of property crime/car break-in/stolen packages/home robbery]

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Moose Canedo](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 11:04:39 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is _Brian Canedo_____ and I live in the west Portal _____ neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. [Note if you or a family member/friend has been a victim of property crime/car break-in/stolen packages/home robbery]

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport.

From: [Loren Adrian](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 10:27:28 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Lorn Adrian and I live near the 16th Ave tiled steps . I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. There are car and home robberies constantly in our area.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Loren Adrian
1001 Moraga St.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Jake Dolan](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, IBOS](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safal, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 9:31:59 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Jacob Dolan and I live in the Duboce Triangle neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco and we have had repeated issues with crime in our neighborhood. Just last week we were able to use our Ring doorbell camera catching a meth addict trying to break into our front door.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Jacob Dolan
74 Beaver St

From: [Janine DeAndre](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safal, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 9:31:19 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Janine and I live in the Pac Heights neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Janine DeAndre
1745 Pacific Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94109

From: [Caroline Dolan](#)
To: [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 9:27:26 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Mandelman,

My name is Caroline Dolan and I live in the Duboce Triangle neighborhood. I'm on the DTNA and also the land use committees (I just joined - we met a few weeks ago during the Belcher Street meeting). I really appreciate all your support, genuine care, and service to our neighborhood.

I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. I am very much concerned by the proposed legislation as the Ring Camera App has been invaluable to my family for safety concerns. We are, in fact, in the middle of trying to get SFPD to arrest a man that attempted to break into our house last week. We captured it on video and were able to clearly see his face. A week later, another neighbor on 16th and Castro, posted a video with the exact same man doing the exact same thing. It's because of Ring that we are able to build a case with SFPD and hopefully get an arrest started.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Caroline Dolan
74 Beaver Street

From: [John Cranshaw](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safal, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 8:34:09 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is John Cranshaw and I live in the Inner Sunset neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco, having been a victim of crime myself.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Name
Address

From: [Roger Capilos](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 8:15:09 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is __Roger Capilos __ and I live in the __Crocker Amazon __ neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. [Note if you or a family member/friend has been a victim of property crime/car break-in/stolen packages/home robbery]

I have seen 3 different tourists standing next to there robbed cars over the last year. When I talk to friends about visiting me they say they know people who warn them SF is dirty and unsafe.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
NameRoger Capilos
Address
318 Allison St. San Francisco Ca. 94112

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Aaron Burby](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 8:07:40 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Aaron Burby and I live in the Golden Gate Heights neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. We have been victims of car break-ins and stolen packages. A number of our neighbors have been victims of robbery and other crimes. Our street, near the Moraga 16th Ave steps, has been a site of ongoing car break-ins and crimes. After more of our neighbors installed cameras, the rate of crimes have decreased.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Aaron Burby
1735 16th Ave, SF, CA 94122

From: [armand-der-hacobian](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 7:49:51 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is ___Armand Der-Hacobian___ and I live in the ___West Portal ___ neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco where I've lived since 1984 and where I work as a real estate broker.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Respectfully submitted,

Name Armand Der Hacobian
Address 1290 Portola SF CA 94237

From: [Scott Sellman](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, IBOS](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 7:33:28 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Scott Sellman and I live in the Golden Gate Heights neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco, having been a victim of repeated burglaries and car break-ins, which the police have been able to do nothing about. We need to change something.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Scott Sellman
849 Noriega St

From: [Owen Linzmayer](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 7:18:37 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Owen Linzmayer and I've been in SF for 30 years, presently living in the Mission District. Like most citizens, I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. In the two years I've lived at this location on "The Track," the simple home video surveillances operated by neighbors have documented nightly prostitution, porch pirate package theft, armed robberies, and officer-involved shootings.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

Owen W. Linzmayer
651 Capp St.
San Francisco, CA 94110-2509 USA
(415) 519-1418

From: [Jamie Whitaker](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 7:03:59 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Jamie Whitaker and I live in the South of Market neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. We all deserve to feel safe to walk downtown.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Jamie Whitaker
201 Harrison St., Apt. 229
San Francisco, CA 94105

From: [jared001](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safal, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 6:38:19 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Jared and I live in the Castro. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Jared Waterman

From: [Sheila Warren](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safal, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 6:33:21 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Sheila Warren and I live in the Mission neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. We have had our garage and vehicles broken into and have also been the victims of package theft. Property crime is a serious issue all over San Francisco.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Sheila Warren

From: [ALICE XAVER](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 6:28:43 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Christopher Xavier and I live in the Golden Gate Heights neighborhood.

I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. I have relatives, friends, neighbors who have been a victim of property crime/car break-in/stolen packages/home robbery!

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Dr Christopher Xavier
1709-16th Ave, SF

Sent from my iPhone
Please excuse any typos

From: [ALICE XAVER](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 6:23:46 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Alice Xavier and I live in the Golden Gate Heights neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. We have witnessed many victim of car break-ins, know many people who have had packages stolen and know many, many victims home robberies whose lives will never be the same.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Alice Xavier
1700-16th Ave, SF

Sent from my iPhone
Please excuse any typos

From: [Art Wydler](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safal, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 6:14:04 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is __Art Wydler__ and I live in the __North Beach__ neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. [Note if you or a family member/friend has been a victim of property crime/car break-in/stolen packages/home robbery]

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Name Art Wydler
408 Francisco Street, SF, CA
Address

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Jay Gifford](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 6:11:07 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Jay Gifford__ and I live in the Duboce Triangle _ neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. We have been burglarized while we were home.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Name
Address

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Nancy Panelo](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 6:06:11 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is _Nancy ____ and I live in the __Bernal Heights__ neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. [Note if you or a family member/friend has been a victim of property crime/car break-in/stolen packages/home robbery]

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Name
Address

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Don Mariacher](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 6:01:47 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Don Mariacher and I live in the Cathedral Hill neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. I also am active on a neighborhood safety committee because of increased crime incidents here.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Don Mariacher
1200 Gough Street, 6C
San Francisco 94109

From: [Fix Shotwell](#)
To: [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Goossen, Carolyn \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 5:59:34 PM
Importance: High

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Andrew Oglesby and my partner and I are 20+ year residents of the Inner Mission. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. At night (as you are well aware, Supervisor Ronen), the 500 block of Shotwell where I live becomes an open-air prostitution market, run by pimps from the East Bay, involving girls as young as their early teens, who are exploited mercilessly by both the pimps, and the City of San Francisco for allowing this situation to exist unfettered for decades. We are also subject to violence, such as shootings resulting in murder and attempted murder, related to this trade (this is well documented).

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation may be well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Speaking as someone who meets all those criteria (I could provide you hours upon hours of documented criminal activity on my block), I implore you to allow us to use technology to aid the city in its duty to prevent and prosecute crime. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Andrew Oglesby
554 Shotwell Street
415 810-7962

From: [Marina Franco](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 5:50:41 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Marina Franco and I live near Dolores Park. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. Friends and family have been victims of property crimes in SF such as home - break in, car theft, stolen packages and more.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

Marina Franco

Cumberland Street

From: [Nancy Panelo](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 5:50:03 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is __Ronan__ and I live in the __Bernal Heights__ neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. [Note if you or a family member/friend has been a victim of property crime/car break-in/stolen packages/home robbery]

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Name
Address

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Kevin Mangan](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 5:45:31 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Kevin Mangan and I live in the Parkside neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. My wife was robbed on her third day in San Francisco (about 3 years ago).

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Kevin Mangan
Parkside Neighborhood Resident

From: [Steven Madrid](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, IBOS](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safal, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 5:40:13 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Steven Madrid and I live in the Cole Valley / Upper Haight neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Steven Madrid

From: [David Troup](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 5:34:19 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is David Troup and I live in the Duboce Triangle neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. Nearly everyone I know, myself included, has been a crime victim in recent years... in my case, my building's mailbox has been broken into multiple times, and my car has been broken into.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
David Troup
2224 15th St.
415-861-0920

From: [Devi Joseph](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safal, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 5:33:15 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Dr. Devorah Joseph and I live in the Outer Richmond neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Devorah Joseph
862 39th Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: [John Lin](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Thursday, April 11, 2019 5:29:08 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is John Lin and I live in the North Beach neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. With crime already fairly high taking away a tool to help prosecute and gather evidence is very concerning

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns. The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
John Lin
690 chestnut #208

From: [Mary Smith](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [info@sfmca.org](#); [stopcrimesf@gmail.com](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: PLEASE re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Saturday, April 13, 2019 8:23:15 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My Supervisor Catherine Stefani's email address was rejected as "not valid." I needed to delete her before this letter could be sent. It doesn't surprise me. My district is often represented by politically ambitious "insiders" who really do not have the time to protect the residents whose property taxes INDIVIDUALLY pay the salaries of at least one supervisor on the Board!

My name is _Mary Smith_ and I live in the Marina neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. (Please state if you have been affected by property crime)

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns.

The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Name. Mary Smith
Address. 153 Avila Street, SF, 94123

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Lindsay; Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\); Mar, Gordon \(BOS\); Brown, Vallie \(BOS\); Haney, Matt \(BOS\); Yee, Norman \(BOS\); MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]; Ronen, Hillary; Walton, Shamann \(BOS\); info@sfmca.org; stopcrimesf@gmail.com; Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\); Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Saturday, April 13, 2019 2:52:47 PM

Hello, Ms. Lovier – thank you for this email. I share your concerns about crime in San Francisco, and if I thought that this policy would make our communities less safe, I would not have authored it. In fact, I strongly believe that basic oversight of government surveillance technology will build stronger relationships between law enforcement agencies and the communities they serve – and, in doing so, help make our neighborhoods more safe.

I have strongly supported the installation of security cameras in my District. As the Supervisor who represents Union Square and some of the City's most vibrant tourist destinations, I understand that these security cameras are critical to ensuring the safety of everyone who visits and lives in San Francisco. This ordinance will not affect law enforcement's use of those security cameras or any other privately-owned security system in San Francisco.

I appreciate the suggestions of Stop Crime SF, which mirror some of the feedback I've received directly from City departments. In response to these concerns, I intend to amend this ordinance in order to make it even easier for law enforcement agencies to comply with its terms. Those same amendments will also ensure that departments are only required to develop a policy once, and not be required to return for further approvals when acquiring further security apparatuses.

Lastly, I want to clarify that this legislation has not been rushed. To the contrary, this legislation has been publicly available for months – longer than most pieces of legislation that are passed by the Board of Supervisors. Additionally, my office has met with several departments – including the Airport, Port, Police Department, Public Utilities Commission, Department of Public Health, SFMTA and others – to field their input and incorporate useful feedback into the legislation. My office took the extra step of bringing this item before a public hearing at the Committee on Information Technology, which includes among its members over a dozen Department heads.

Thank you for recognizing the positive intent behind this ordinance. I am confident that this deliberate and thoughtful policy will match that intent.

Sincerely,

Aaron Peskin

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

From: Lindsay <llovier@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 13, 2019 8:46 AM
To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Brown, Vallie (BOS) <vallie.brown@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; info@sfmca.org; stopcrimesf@gmail.com; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Lindsay Lovier and I live in the Marina/Cow Hollow neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. Our family has been a victim of property crime in San Francisco and it was a deeply frustrating experience.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns.

The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,
Lindsay Lovier
3190 Scott Street

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Kathleen Mayeda](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [info@sfmca.org](#); [stopcrimesf@gmail.com](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Please re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Saturday, April 13, 2019 3:03:51 PM

Hello, Ms. Mayeda – thank you for this email. I share your concerns about crime in San Francisco, and if I thought that this policy would make our communities less safe, I would not have authored it. In fact, I strongly believe that basic oversight of government surveillance technology will build stronger relationships between law enforcement agencies and the communities they serve – and, in doing so, help make our neighborhoods more safe.

I have strongly supported the installation of security cameras in my District. As the Supervisor who represents Union Square and some of the City's most vibrant tourist destinations, I understand that these security cameras are critical to ensuring the safety of everyone who visits and lives in San Francisco. **This ordinance will not affect law enforcement's use of those security cameras or any other privately-owned security system in San Francisco.**

I appreciate the suggestions of Stop Crime SF, which mirror some of the feedback I've received directly from City departments. In response to these concerns, I intend to amend this ordinance in order to make it even easier for law enforcement agencies to comply with its terms. Those same amendments will also ensure that departments are only required to develop a policy once, and not be required to return for further approvals when acquiring further security apparatuses.

Lastly, I want to clarify that this legislation has not been rushed. To the contrary, this legislation has been publicly available for months – longer than most pieces of legislation that are passed by the Board of Supervisors. Additionally, my office has met with several departments – including the Airport, Port, Police Department, Public Utilities Commission, Department of Public Health, SFMTA and others – to field their input and incorporate useful feedback into the legislation. My office took the extra step of bringing this item before a public hearing at the Committee on Information Technology, which includes among its members over a dozen Department heads.

Thank you for recognizing the positive intent behind this ordinance. I am confident that this deliberate and thoughtful policy will match that intent.

Sincerely,

Aaron Peskin

From: Kathleen Mayeda <kathleenmayeda@hotmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, April 13, 2019 10:32 AM

To: Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Brown, Vallie (BOS) <vallie.brown@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>;

MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; info@sfmca.org; stopcrimesf@gmail.com; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: Please re-think video surveillance legislation

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Kathleen and I live in the Marina neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. (Please state if you have been affected by property crime)

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns.

The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process. Neighbors are very concerned about these thefts. The cameras to verify the perpetrators brings them some comfort that their neighborhood is protected.

We bring packages to the first level so none are outside or in the lobby.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Mayeda
3555 Broderick St.
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: [SHARP](#)
To: [Yee, Norman \(BOS\); Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Surveillance Technology Ordinance - Rules Committee on April 15
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 3:07:17 PM
Attachments: [Oclip_image002.png](#)
[SHARP-camera law.pdf](#)

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

<!--[if !vml]-->



<!--[endif]-->

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

RE: Surveillance Technology Ordinance - Rules Committee on April 15

Dear Supervisors,

The Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP) is both a neighborhood association with more than 130 members and a foundation that provides grants that support dozens of San Francisco community organizations.

We are writing regarding the proposed Surveillance Technology Ordinance before the Rules Committee on April 15. While the intent to protect civil liberties is laudable, we believe the legislation needs further work because it could potentially impact the safety of everyone who visits and lives in San Francisco. This ordinance could affect local government and law enforcement's use of security cameras as well as other privately-owned security systems in San Francisco.

While we support reasonable policies to control surveillance technology, we recognize that criminal activity and organized crime can have a greater impact on citizens' sense of security and their very freedom than potential San Francisco government abuse. A key role of local government is to provide an environment in which citizens can live with freedom from fear and feel secure in their persons and property.

Video surveillance and other technologies such as GPS, license plate recognition, gunfire detection technologies and others play an essential role in capturing suspects and assisting in their conviction for crimes. This not only takes individual criminals off the streets, but facilitates breaking up criminal gangs large and small, and creates an environment which signals to potential criminals that San Francisco cares about the safety of its citizens and visitors and will act effectively to assure it, thus preventing crime in the future.

Such technology is also a force multiplier that aids law enforcement in preventing and discouraging terrorist incidents and apprehending those engaged in terrorist acts. Such acts might be aimed at major crowd events that celebrate San Francisco's diversity such as the Pride Parade, Lunar New Year and musical concerts in Golden Gate Park.

The proposed law seemingly bans San Francisco residents and businesses from sharing security camera video or photos with the SFPD unless and until the Board enacts a camera policy. It explicitly prohibits City agencies from:

"entering into agreement with a non-city entity (e.g., a San Francisco resident or business) to acquire, share, or otherwise use surveillance technology."

The SFPD or DA's office would be unable to share video technology from homeowners or merchants hit by burglars or violent offenders.

We express our strong opposition to this as currently written, and suggest that the Board of Supervisors make the changes recommended by Stop Crime SF before passage of this enabling legislation.

In particular, we suggest:

- <!--[if !supportLists]-->1) <!--[endif]-->Exempting private citizens, non-profits and businesses from the ordinance;
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->2) <!--[endif]-->Exempting the Airport and Port from the ordinance;
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->3) <!--[endif]-->Exempt all investigations for hate crimes, sexual assault, property and violent crimes and terrorism from the ordinance;
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->4) <!--[endif]-->Adding additional time to plan for compliance with the ordinance;
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->5) <!--[endif]-->Adding additional funds for relevant agencies to comply with the ordinance;
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->6) <!--[endif]-->Conducting a cost benefit analysis of technology and the failure to acquire such technology;
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->7) <!--[endif]-->Revising the ordinance after conducting outreach to and dialogue with stakeholders, including crime prevention, anti-crime and victim's rights groups, as well as business, civil rights and neighborhood groups and law enforcement unions; and
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->8) <!--[endif]-->Include sunset clauses on any ban on technology (e.g., facial recognition tech) after 12 months that may improve in performance over time, to allow time for evaluation of new improvements.

As citizens of San Francisco, we believe that the potential misuse of technology to invade the privacy or abuse the civil liberties of Americans or visitors requires vigilance and policies are warranted. But no ban on cameras or other technologies should be imposed until the policies are first enacted by the Board.

Please let us know if you have any questions by contacting us at: sharp@sharpsf.com.

Sincerely,

S.H.A.R.P. Board of Directors

S.H.A.R.P. c/o 1661 7th Ave. San Francisco, CA 94122

From: [Dick Robinson](#)
To: [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Marina Community Association](#); stopcrimesf@gmail.com; [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re-think video surveillance legislation
Date: Sunday, April 14, 2019 12:48:43 AM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Dick Robinson and I live in the Marina neighborhood. I care deeply about crime in San Francisco. I have had items stolen from my garage by a thief who squirted liquid into a keyed opener for the garage door. I've since changed to a keypad opener and have now installed cameras and other security devices. The last robbery occurred while I was in the house on the top floor. By the time I got to the garage after hearing the door open, the thief had left.

Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed "Stop Secret Surveillance Ordinance." I share those concerns.

The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments that rely on video surveillance like the airport. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

Dick Robinson
2033 Jefferson Street
San Francisco, CA. 94123

(415)931-8750

Robinson27@aol.com

From: [Meredith Serra](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Video surveillance legislation - please seek public input first
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 6:34:27 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I contacted each of you previously urging a "no" vote on the "Stop Secret Surveillance" ordinance, and again request that you vote "no" on April 15. While the essence of this legislation is well-intended, amendments are needed to achieve its goal of protecting privacy while also allowing for the proper use of technology that can keep us safe. Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce and prevent our city's current epidemic of property crime, wrote an open letter to the Board of Supervisors with concerns about the proposed ordinance. Stop Crime S.F. has offered reasonable amendments in its open letter.

The proposed legislation could have unintended consequences that make us less safe by severely curtailing the use of effective traditional video surveillance by burying agencies like the police department in a bureaucratic approval process.

I am also concerned that this legislation has been rushed with little or no input from the community, public safety agencies and departments like the airport that rely on video surveillance. In other cities where similar technology privacy legislation was drafted and passed, community working groups were formed and a collaborative process crafted a sensible law that worked for everyone. We should do the same in San Francisco.

All stakeholders including homeowners with Nest/Ring video, Next Door community leaders and business owners that have surveillance cameras should be represented. Please allow this public process to happen before voting on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

Meredith Serra
460 Hazelwood Ave.
San Francisco, CA

From: [Eleonardo Zandanel](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Video surveillance legislation
Date: Monday, April 15, 2019 12:01:07 PM

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

Dear Supervisor,

My name is Eleonardo Zandanel and I live in Sunset neighborhood. I have made aware of the proposed video surveillance legislation by the group Stop Crime SF and am appalled. While I value the people's right to privacy, I do not think that it should be at the expense of others. The proposed legislation in its current form will make it more difficult for our police to use video surveillance in a timely and effective manner.

Having been the victim of crimes myself, I know that time is essential in finding the perpetrators. Not allowing police to do their job (and what I/we pay them to do) in a timely manner will significantly make myself and my family unsafe.

As a resident of San Francisco I already live in constant fear for my property being stolen or vandalized. Making it difficult for police to catch the perpetrators is something that my neighbors and I will not tolerate.

Sincerely upset,

Eleonardo Zandanel
45th Ave / Lincoln Way

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: 63-Unit Project at Folsom and Russ
Date: Tuesday, April 9, 2019 3:19:00 PM

From: Meg Pirnie Kammerud <meg.kammerud@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 9, 2019 11:12 AM
To: Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: 63-Unit Project at Folsom and Russ

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

Good morning:

I am writing today as a San Francisco resident, voter, and home owner. I ask that you approve the 63-unit project at Folsom and Russ. It is imperative that our city build housing for all of its residents - - poor to rich -- to ensure that everyone can continue to live here. Without more housing, we will continue to lose San Francisco's middle class. A small shadow on a public park is NO reason to deny a project that will put another 63 units on the market. Objecting for shadows is nothing more than NIMBYism at its worst and cannot be condoned.

Please approve the project. We are counting on you to keep San Franciscans housed.

Best,
Meg Kammerud
Glen Park

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: 1052-1060 Folsom & 190-194 Russ St Appeal
Date: Tuesday, April 9, 2019 10:38:00 AM
Attachments: [scan0125.pdf](#)

From: Bob Goldfarb <bob.goldfarb@sflcd.org>
Sent: Tuesday, April 9, 2019 12:15 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: rlastimosa@somapilipinas.org
Subject: 1052-1060 Folsom & 190-194 Russ St Appeal

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

Dear Supervisors:

I am writing to support appeal of the 1052-1060 Folsom & 190-194 Russ St permits. Please see the attached letter.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Bob Goldfarb
Chairperson
Leather & LGBTQ Cultural District

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Housing at Folsom and Russ
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 12:26:00 PM

From: Patrick Traughber <patricktraughber@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2019 9:59 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Housing at Folsom and Russ

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

Hi Supervisors,

I am extremely disappointed in the Board's recent vote against housing in Folsom and Russ. I believe this is a sign that you do not take seriously the housing crisis we are in. This project would have provided homes for 64 families, with more than a dozen BMR units for families with limited assets and income. We have more than 7,000 people on a given day who are homeless in San Francisco. This housing crisis is caused by the city's lack of urgency in approving more housing in the city. Other cities which have added new housing as the population grows do not have a housing price crisis nor homeless crisis.

The housing crisis is further worsened by your vote this week.

- Patrick

--

Patrick Traughber
patricktraughber@gmail.com
310.940.3273
San Francisco, CA

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Neighbor support for 1052 Folsom Street project
Date: Tuesday, April 9, 2019 10:38:00 AM

From: Hunter Oatman-Stanford <hoatmanstanford@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 9, 2019 12:29 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fwd: Neighbor support for 1052 Folsom Street project

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

Hi there,

I just wanted to voice my support for the housing project still attempting to receive approval at 1052 Folsom St.

As a neighbor in a BRM unit, we desperately need more housing in SoMa's underutilized lots, even if it means a few minutes of shadows on our parks. This particular project comes with so many great community benefits (from affordable housing to support for park staff) that it will certainly benefit all of SoMa's residents.

Please share this comment with whomever is appropriate at the Planning Department; thanks,

Hunter Oatman-Stanford
855 Folsom St. #502
SF CA 94107

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Please vote to APPROVE project at Russ and Folsom
Date: Tuesday, April 9, 2019 2:50:00 PM

From: Matt Larson <larsonmp@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 8, 2019 6:16 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Please vote to APPROVE project at Russ and Folsom

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

Hi,

My name is Matt and I am a renter and I live in a one bedroom unit, which I share. Recently my rent went up \$150/month. When I got the news, I went on Craigslist to see if I could find anything comparable at my current rent. There was nothing. I then raised the cap to see if I could find anything comparable to my new rent, and there was nothing. I do not live in a luxury unit-- I live in a 1970s unit without a dishwasher. That is not a complaint, but this is far from a luxury unit. I will have to eat this cost because housing has become a scarcity and that is the problem. Thoughtful projects like this one make housing less scarce. While shadows on parks are an issue, it is decisively less important than making housing no longer a scarcity in this area.

Thank you,
Matt Larson

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Russ and Folsom St. project
Date: Tuesday, April 9, 2019 2:56:00 PM

From: Eugene Novikov <gene.novikov@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 8, 2019 12:55 PM
To: Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>
Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Russ and Folsom St. project

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

Dear Matt and the Board:

I live a few blocks away from the proposed Russ and Folsom St. project, near the Caltrain station. I understand that there is a vote tomorrow concerning this project and I wanted to voice my support for this badly needed addition to the housing market in the area.

When it comes time to renew my lease this summer, I expect the rent for my small, completely unremarkable one-bedroom apartment to rise to nearly \$4,000 per month. I am very fortunate to be able to afford to stay here for right now, but lots of people can't, and many of my District 6 neighbors are obviously facing far more dire straits than I am. It can't be right that concerns over a building casting a small shadow on a park can thwart the desperate need for more places for people to live.

Gene

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Subject line: 1052-1060 Folsom & 190-194 Russ St Appeal
Date: Tuesday, April 9, 2019 10:37:00 AM

From: Runa Miah <runamiah003@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 9, 2019 2:28 AM
To: Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Brown, Vallie (BOS) <vallie.brown@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>
Cc: rlastimosa@somapilipinas.org; paul@somapilipinas.org; Vida K <vidak013@gmail.com>
Subject: Subject line: 1052-1060 Folsom & 190-194 Russ St Appeal

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

Dear President Yee and Members of the Board of Supervisors:

Thank you so for your commitment to equality, fairness, and making San Francisco a great city to live in.

I am writing urge you to support the 1052-1060 Folsom & 190-194 Russ St Appeal.

I am writing to express my great concern and opposition to the proposed 1052-1060 Folsom Street & 190-194 Russ Street project which will shadow VMD Park and will have a significant adverse impact on quality of life for SOMA residents and all users of VMD Park.

I have lived in SOMA for over 10 years and am heart-broken to hear that this 7 story luxury market-rate housing project will be allowed to shadow our beloved park. My siblings who attend and have attended Bessie Carmichael Elementary school, often play at this park. It is saddening to learn that they may have to play in the shadows and darkness.

Not only will this make it more unsafe to play in but also uninviting. I can foresee VMD Park becoming barren and lonely due to the gentrification and hostile environment.

VMD Park is our only community park in SOMA which has the lowest per capita of open space in the whole City. New shadows would occur for eight months out of the year, affecting heavily used areas including the basketball court, children's play area, grassy areas, benches, and park entry.

As you know, the project was denied in 2015 based on shadow impacts, and now the shadow and the

project are both larger (0.07% shadow in 2015 VS 0.38% shadow currently).

If this project is passed, it will set a dangerous precedent for future developments to further encroach upon access to sunshine at VMD. Children already do not go out enough to get sunshine. Passing this project will make it easier for our kids and younger generations to dismiss the park as a place to go.

This issue is a matter of access to open space for a community that is park-starved. We are counting on you to uphold equity and champion our community efforts to protect our neighborhood.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Runa Miah

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 30 Communications regarding SB50
Date: Tuesday, April 9, 2019 1:27:00 PM
Attachments: [SB50 Items.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please see the attached 30 letters regarding Senate Bill 50, Item No. 29 on today's agenda.

Thank you,

Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
(415) 554-5163 fax
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form by clicking
<http://www.sfbos.org/index.aspx?page=104>

From: [Christopher Pederson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Agenda Item 29 - Resolution regarding S.B. 50 (File No. 190319)
Date: Friday, April 5, 2019 6:28:38 PM

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

Dear President Yee and Members of the Board of Supervisors:

I urge the Board to amend the proposed resolution regarding S.B. 50 to acknowledge the necessity for statewide legislation to require local governments to allow multi-family housing near transit and major employment centers.

California faces two intertwined crises that demand urgent action: the climate crisis and the housing crisis. The California Air Resources Board has determined that the state will not reach its climate change goals unless it significantly reduces vehicle miles traveled. To do so, local governments must swiftly allow much more multi-family housing near public transit and major employment centers.

Unfortunately, too few local governments have done this and too many adamantly refuse. To overcome this inaction and deliberate obstructionism, the state must enact legally enforceable legislation. Without state action, too many suburbs will continue to refuse to bear their fare share. Cities such as San Francisco cannot solve these problems on their own.

I do agree that the inclusionary housing provisions of S.B. 50 need to be strengthened, especially regarding smaller size projects, but that's a fixable problem.

Please do not join bad actors such as the Cities of Cupertino and Huntington Beach in outright opposition to S.B. 50. Those cities act with callous disregard for the climate and housing crises. To ally San Francisco with local governments of that ilk would make a mockery of the Board's recently adopted declaration that the climate crisis is an emergency.

Sincerely,

Christopher Pederson

From: [aj](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Low, Jen \(BOS\)](#); [Maybaum, Erica \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Comment on File #190319, Resolution Opposing Senate Bill 50/ Balboa Reservoir
Date: Saturday, April 6, 2019 3:31:37 AM
Attachments: [2018-9-4 AFFORDABLE HOUSING SCAM.docx](#)

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

BOS:

I wish to express support Gordon Mar's Resolution to Oppose SB 50.

Balboa Reservoir is case in point regarding the inequitable transfer of benefits conferred to private interests (privatization of public assets).

Especially for the newly-elected Supervisors, here is an Environmental Review Scoping comment for the Balboa Reservoir Project dated 11/5/2018 that had also been sent to the 2018 BOS that relates to this issue:

ON OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Even if the Subsequent EIR finds significant and unavoidable impacts, the Reservoir Project holds a trump card. That trump card would be a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Such a Statement of Overriding Consideration would more than likely put forth the idea that the Reservoir Project would make a substantial contribution in alleviating the housing crisis.

However, in making such an argument of overriding consideration, extreme care must be taken to distinguish between slick marketing hype and PR and the reality contained in the Development Parameters and the Exclusive Negotiating Agreement (ENA).

OVERVIEW

The **Balboa Park Station (BPS) Area Plan** adopted by the City & County of SF is used as justification for the Balboa Reservoir Project. However, this justification for housing in the Reservoir was cherry-picked from the BPS Area Plan.

In actuality the BPS Area Plan asked for **consideration of the best use** of Reservoir:

- Housing was one **consideration**. It was not a mandate.
- Open Space was another **consideration**;
- **Education** should logically have been another consideration because of location

and existing use, but was not contained in the BPS Area Plan.

The **Public Lands for Housing Program** has been the main lever for the Balboa Reservoir Project.

According to Administrative Code 23.a.2 (l), the Surplus Public Lands Ordinance can serve only as **recommendation** to enterprise agencies like the PUC.

The Reservoir Project has been made poster child for the Public Lands for Housing Program. But, by law, the City cannot mandate the PUC to do so. Being an enterprise agency, City Ordinance only allows the City to recommend to PUC that the Reservoir be made part of Public Lands for Housing.

AFFORDABLE FOR WHOM? THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING SCAM

The initial legislation and legislative intent regarding surplus City property was for using public land to help provide housing:

- for the **homeless and low-income** populations, and
- built solely by **non-profit community developers**.

In a deceptive advertising campaign, 2015 Proposition K was passed which changed the City's Administrative Code Ch.23A to enable public land to be used:

- for newly defined "affordable housing" extended to "**middle-income**" (**150% Area Median Income**, which is \$124,350 for an individual as of 4/1/2018), even as the State maintains that "moderate-income" and "middle-income" are identical (120% AMI which is \$99,500 for an individual as of April 2018), and
- for sale to, and built by **private developers** instead of just by non-profit developers.

The biggest scam is **privatization of public property by private developers** in the guise of affordable housing.

The Reservoir Project has been skillfully marketed and framed as an affordable housing development. Yet documents reveal otherwise.

The Reservoir Development has been marketed as—from more deceptive to less deceptive-- affordable housing, or 50% affordable housing, or up to 50% affordable housing.

To paint lipstick on a pig, the privatization of the Reservoir has been deceptively marketed as "**affordable housing**" and/or "**50% affordable housing**." Despite the marketing of "50% affordable", the reality is that only 33% affordable housing is guaranteed, while 50% unaffordable housing is guaranteed. The remaining 17% affordable for middle-income of up to 150% AMI (that would bring "affordable" up to 50%) will not be funded by Reservoir Community Partners LLC. The aspirational 17% "additional affordable" would have to be funded by unsourced public funds and is actually a bait- and-switch deception.

The "**affordable**" **definition** scam: "Affordable" has been redefined to include up to 150% Area Median Income (\$124,350 as of 4/1/2018).

The **affordable "in perpetuity"** scam: "In perpetuity" is defined as "throughout the useful lives of the buildings..."

The **Transportation Demand Management (TDM) scam** which wishes and greenwashes away the problem of elimination of 1,000 student parking spaces with a solution of "*reduc[ing] single-occupant vehicle trips by college staff, faculty, students, and neighborhood residents.*"

BYPASSING STATE SURPLUS PROPERTY STATUE

The disposition of public land is governed by the **State Surplus Property Statute**:

The State Surplus Land Statute Section 54222 says:

Any local agency disposing of surplus land shall send, prior to disposing of that property, a written offer to sell or lease the property as follows:

*(c) A written offer to sell or lease land suitable for **school facilities construction or use by a school district for open-space purposes shall be sent to any school district** in whose jurisdiction the land is located.*

Yet there has been no transparent public record or open Board of Trustees Action to show that SFCCD has rejected a written offer to acquire the Reservoir **for school facilities or open space**.

Any evaluation of overriding considerations must evaluate the full range of harms and benefits instead of making an *a priori* unsubstantiated assumption that privatizing public land for **at least 50%** to 67% units that would be unaffordable to those of moderate income (120% of AMI which is \$99,500 for an individual) constitutes the best use of the publicly-owned PUC property.

Please refer to the attached "Affordable Housing Scam of Balboa Reservoir Project".

Submitted for the administrative record on Balboa Reservoir by:

Alvin Ja 11/5/2018

“AFFORDABLE HOUSING” SCAM OF BALBOA RESERVOIR PROJECT (9/4/2018)

The Balboa Reservoir Project has been presented to the community essentially as a done-deal. It has been justified by referencing the Balboa Park Station Area Plan and the Public Land for Housing Program.

However, there has been no fact or evidence-based analysis of the assumptions and premises involved in the Reservoir Project’s so-called affordable housing. The Project has been framed as an affordable housing effort; it has also been framed as providing affordable housing “in perpetuity.” Yet when deeper analysis is made, only 33% of the housing on public land will be Affordable Housing for low to moderate-income populations.

And when you read the fine print, “in perpetuity” only means “for the useful life of the buildings.”

Objective 1.4 of the Balboa Park Station Area Plan called for using the Reservoir for the “best benefit of the neighborhood, the city, and the region as a whole.” Yet the Balboa Reservoir Project has failed to assess the relative harms and benefits of the proposed housing development versus the educational needs of the city and the Bay Area. As envisioned, the Reservoir Project will harm City College of San Francisco which serves the broadest public interest and benefit to the entire Bay Area.

During the course of the public engagement process, much input has been provided to the City Team regarding flaws in the Reservoir Project. However, fundamental questions and concerns regarding the validity of the Project have not been addressed.

Here is an updated digest of critiques have remained unaddressed by the City Team.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: PUBLIC LAND FOR THE PUBLIC GOOD

1. Public land should be used for the public good.
2. Affordable housing for homeless, low-income and moderate-income people contributes to the public good.
3. The California State Surplus Land Statute and the City’s Surplus City Property/Public Lands Ordinance were set up to help address housing targeted for homeless, low-income and moderate-income people.
4. The intent of both State and City laws were not meant to subsidize high-cost housing.
5. As defined by State law, “Affordable Housing” covers moderate-income housing going up to 120% Area Median Income only.
6. Balboa Reservoir Project only requires that 33% of the BR housing to be State-defined “Affordable Housing.” The remaining 67% of housing falls outside the bounds of the original intent of State and City targets of Affordable Housing--as defined by State law--for low-income, and moderate-income people.
7. The result of this 33% Affordable Housing/67% non-Affordable Housing ratio is that public land will be transferred to private interests/higher income owners in the guise of “Affordable Housing.”
8. The Reservoir Project has been deceptively marketed as “affordable housing” and/or “50% affordable housing.” Despite such marketing, the reality is that only 33% is guaranteed to be

affordable while 50% UNaffordable is guaranteed. The remaining 17% (that would bring "affordable" up to 50%) "additional" affordable to City & County –defined "middle-income" (150% AMI--\$124,350 for an individual) people is but aspirational,....and which would have to be financed with public funds, not by the private developer.

9. Using 33% "Affordable Housing" to subsidize the 67% high-cost housing is contrary to the intent of the original legislation.
10. Distorted meaning of "in perpetuity": Affordable units are supposedly going to be deed-restricted "in perpetuity." Yet, contrary to the normal meaning of "in perpetuity", the City/RFQ defines it as follows: "The project's affordable housing units must remain affordable in perpetuity (i.e. throughout the useful lives of the buildings in which those units are located), ..." What this really means is that after 55-75 years, or even sooner--depending on how the developer defines "useful life"-- even the 33% Affordable will no longer be in existence. The entire Reservoir property will be owned free and clear by private interests with no requirements for affordability: It's the pot at the end of the rainbow for private interests that are willing to make a short-term sacrifice in exchange for a long-term bonanza.

11. Best use of PUC Reservoir:

Under Objective 1.4 of the Balboa Park Station Area Plan, Policy 1.3.2 [sic] states "*POLICY 1.3.2 Develop the west basin of the reservoir [for] the greatest benefit of the city as a whole as well as for the surrounding neighborhoods.*"


- There has never been any discussion about what constitutes "greatest benefit." The City/Mayor simply declared by fiat that it would be used for housing.
- It can be legitimately argued that **using the west basin for educational purposes would be the "greatest benefit."**

12. Balboa Station Area Plan does not mandate housing at Reservoir

Proponents of the Reservoir Project refer to the Balboa Park Station Area Plan as calling for housing on the Reservoir. This is inaccurate. The BPS Area Plan actually used the term "consider." It called for housing to be considered. It was not a mandate. In addition to housing, there was something else that the BPS Area Plan asked to be considered: OPEN SPACE.

The BPS Area Plan contains several elements, among which are the Housing Element and the Open Space Element.

The Open Space Element of the BPS Area Plan includes discussion of the western Reservoir as open space and includes this map, yet this section of the BPS Area Plan has been ignored.



And then again, on a broader perspective, the BPS Area Plan has asked that the "best use" be considered for the Reservoir. Instead of "best use" or "open space" as presented by the BPS Area Plan, the City jumped directly to housing as the sole consideration.

STATE SURPLUS PROPERTY STATUTE

The State Surplus Land Statute 54222 says:

Any local agency disposing of surplus land shall send, prior to disposing of that property, a written offer to sell or lease the property as follows:

(c) A written offer to sell or lease land suitable for school facilities construction or use by a school district for open-space purposes shall be sent to any school district in whose jurisdiction the land is located.

PUC's principle of market rate return is not absolute. SF Administrative Code 23 for Real Property Transactions calls for:

SF Administrative Code 23.20 states

Transfers of Real Property pursuant to this Article shall be paid for no less than 100% of the appraised value, except where the Board of Supervisors determines by resolution that a lesser sum will further a proper public purpose, and provided that the Public Utilities Commission shall be paid at least the historical cost of such Real Property.

SF Administrative Code 23.3 for Real Property Transactions calls for:

"... sales price of at least 100% of the appraised value of such Real Property, except where the Board determines either that (a) a lesser sum will further a proper public purpose, or..."

The Balboa Park Station Area Plan had called for developing the Reservoir to "best benefit the Neighborhood, City, Region as a whole." Yet any analysis of what constitutes "best benefit" has been bypassed. Instead, by fiat, the City declared that the Reservoir would be used for housing to be developed by private developers. And despite the teacher shortage, consideration for teacher housing by school districts was negated by City Staff.

CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

1. CEQA requires public agencies to avoid or mitigate significant adverse environmental impacts caused by a project.
2. City College is a critical public service that serves the entire Bay Area. CCSF is the central economic, educational and cultural feature of the Reservoir vicinity. However the Balboa Reservoir Project has failed to acknowledge CCSF's primacy.
3. Housing on Balboa Reservoir is a component of the Balboa Park Station Area Plan, based on an Initial Study conducted in 2006, referenced in the BPS Final EIR.
4. The proposal of 425-500 units in the Reservoir was arbitrary. There was no documentation, evidence, or argumentation presented to support the proposal for 425-500 units in the 2006 BPS Initial Study/BPS Final EIR/BPS Area Plan.
5. The BPS Area Plan, Final EIR/Initial Study determined that, on the BPS Program-Level, that there would be no significant impact to school facilities.
6. The BR Project's 2014 AECOM Study incorrectly extended the Program-Level determination of non-significance to the Balboa Reservoir Project's Plan-Level. This has caused the BR Project to ignore adverse impacts that the Project will have on City College and neighboring schools.
7. The City Team has refused to acknowledge the reality that the use of the Reservoir for student parking is an existing public benefit. It is a benefit that helps provide access to quality education.
8. Instead, the Balboa Park Station Area Plan mischaracterizes the Reservoir as simply being an "unpleasant void in the neighborhood" despite the reality that it serves an important and needed public purpose for students.
9. The Balboa Reservoir Project can be characterized as constituting an **eviction of an important Bay Area-wide public service**--City College. A public good is being eliminated for the benefit of private developer interests.
10. The City Team operates on the unfounded assumption that housing on the Reservoir is of higher importance than the importance of City College to the community.
 - The City Team shifts the burden of mitigation of impending adverse impacts of the Project onto the surrounding neighborhoods and CCSF stakeholders. It addresses the BR Project's adverse impacts by calling for the impacttees to bear the burden by practicing TDM ("*reduce single-occupant vehicle trips by college staff, faculty, students, and neighborhood residents*") and requesting Residential Permit Parking.

11. The City Team argues that it is too expensive to build parking. If the Reservoir were to be left as-is to provide student access to education, there would be no need to build new parking. It's cheaper to keep it as-is.
12. Eviction of CCSF from western Reservoir will harm student access to education.
13. The State Surplus Property Statute (Govt Code 54220) targets use of housing for those of "low" or "moderate" income (up to 120% of Area AMI). It was under this concept that San Francisco's Public Lands for Housing Program was originally formulated. The idea was for surplus public property to be used for the public good to create Affordable Housing (120% AMI).
14. The Development Parameters only require 33% to be State-defined Affordable Housing.
15. In reality 67% will be unaffordable housing. Although the City Team presents the Project as market-rate housing subsidizing affordable housing, this is an inversion of reality. In reality, the 33% affordable housing is cover for the reality that this transfer of public property will benefit private interests at the expense of the public. The reality is that the 33% "affordable housing" will be subsidizing private interests.

PUC LAND USE POLICY

1. The RFQ's section on Applicable Land Use Policies makes no reference to the PUC's own "Framework for Land Use and Management."
2. From the PUC website: By adoption of [the Framework](#), the Commission is seeking to advance the analytical and decision-making process surrounding the administration of real estate assets under the SFPUC's exclusive jurisdiction.
3. PUC's Land Use Framework policy allows sale only if: *"Use of the land sold will not result in creating a nuisance."*
4. Even though the PUC Land Use Framework was formulated to focus on "Land Management Guidance for...Disposition of SFPUC Lands," The City Team has dismissed the importance of this policy document: *"It is not necessary, or feasible, for an RFQ to name all of the City policies and procedures that apply to the project."* [from Staff Response to *"Why doesn't the RFQ discuss the SFPUC Land Use Framework?"*]

Importantly, Staff misstated the essence of the question. **The real question was whether or not the intended disposition of the PUC Reservoir property complies with PUC's policy on "Disposition of SFPUC Lands"; the question was not whether the Land Use Framework policy is "named."**

PARKING vs. TDM

1. The City Team argues that it is too expensive to build parking. If the Reservoir were to be left as-is to provide student access to education, there would be no need to build new parking. If construction cost is the consideration, then the best option is to leave the western Reservoir as-is.

2. TDM is the third component of the City's Transportation Sustainability Program. TDM requires new developments to provide on-site amenities that prioritize sustainable alternatives to driving.
3. The Balboa Reservoir Project will not exist in isolation from the surrounding neighborhoods. The TDM outcomes within the boundaries of the Project itself will probably be highly successful. However, BR Project's internal TDM success will come at the expense of the surrounding neighborhoods when BR residents park their privately-owned vehicles and drive their privately-owned vehicles outside the Reservoir Project's own boundaries.
4. FROM EARLIER SUBMISSION TO CAC REGARDING TDM:
 - Most importantly: TDM Study is not a comprehensive and unbiased assessment of parking and circulation issues in the Reservoir vicinity; and it was never meant to be a comprehensive study. The scope/parameters of Nelson-Nygaard's study were very specific according to SFCTA documentation:
 - *The Planning Department and SFMTA are proposing a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) study in coordination with CCSF Ocean Campus to reduce single-occupant vehicle trips by college staff, faculty, students, and neighborhood residents.*

○ PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BENEFITS

The Balboa Area Transportation Demand Study will develop clear strategies for reducing single-occupant vehicle trips and outline a coordinated framework for future TDM programs and policies between CCSF, the Balboa Reservoir project, and the City of San Francisco. Potential TDM activities will produce a wide-range of benefits to individuals and the transportation system as a whole, from reducing traffic congestion, vehicle emissions, and fuel consumption to supporting physical activity and enhancing safety. Additionally, TDM activities will make existing transportation investments perform better, extending the life of existing infrastructure and improving the outcomes for new transportation investments.

- **TDM Program:** *proposing TDM solutions unique to the area comprising CCSF Ocean campus, Balboa Reservoir and neighborhoods as consistent with emerging TDM policy.*

Bottom-line: TDM solutions, by definition and intent, exclude parking. Within TDM parameters, the issue of parking is given significance only via the TDM solution of making parking "more difficult and expensive." That's why the elimination of student parking is ignored. That's why the City Team promotes 0.5 parking spaces per residential unit.

- Fatuous TDM arguments:
 - "Parking Produces Traffic Congestion--Every parking space is a magnet for cars" and "If you build it.....they will come."
 - In earlier submissions I had written:

As I have pointed out in another e-mail, there are 3 main traffic magnets in our area: schools, freeway entrance/exits, and the BP Station transit hub. If reduction of car traffic in the area is the goal, these magnets need to be removed. Obviously, this is neither an appropriate nor realistic solution.

BP Station and freeway entrance/exits are part of transportation infrastructure. However CCSF is different. CCSF is not transportation infrastructure. People are not just passing through on the way to someplace else. CCSF is a destination in and of itself.

Rather than parking producing congestion, it's the existence of a desired destination that induces traffic. Parking is but a means to accommodate those who want to get to the desired destination.

Case-in-point: When school is not in session, there are very few cars in the Reservoir parking lot and there's very little traffic on Phelan. This demonstrates the falsehood of the "parking produces traffic congestion" premise.

Bottom line: Parking, in and of itself, does not promote congestion. Rather, congestion is the product of people trying to get to a desired destination. Student access to education, which includes driving and parking, should not be subordinate to the Balboa Reservoir Project.

- "Spillover [parking] from City College"
- Both Sunnyside Neighborhood Assn and Westwood Park Assn have made clear that the neighborhood supports CCSF and its students. The Nelson-Nygaard Study calls for preventing "spillover from City College" by making parking for them difficult via RPP and enforcement. Rather than making parking difficult for students, the neighbors have called for the Balboa Reservoir Project to provide adequate on-site parking for student needs.

Bottom line: Instead of shifting the burden of mitigation for the elimination of student parking by the TDM solution of "reducing single-occupant trips by college staff, faculty, students, and neighborhood residents", the Reservoir Project needs to take responsibility for replacing lost student parking.

--aj

From: [Hunter Oatman-Stanford](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I fully support SB50
Date: Thursday, April 4, 2019 2:26:19 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I wanted to write to voice my support for Senator Wiener's bill SB50, joining with many affordable housing advocates and environmental groups who want to end the inequities associated with single-family zoning.

My district (D6) has seen an explosion of expensive new development, partly because it is one of the few neighborhoods in San Francisco to allow new apartment buildings over 40 feet in height. We must allow more homes to be built near jobs and transit, particularly on the exclusionary West and North sides of San Francisco where wealthy homeowners have fought against apartment buildings for generations.

Please do NOT vote in support of Gordon Mar's grandstanding resolution to maintain the failing status quo—decade of blocking new housing construction is **exactly** why we are in this crisis.

thank you,
Hunter Oatman-Stanford

855 Folsom St. #502
SF CA 94107

From: [Louise Bea](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose SB 50
Date: Thursday, April 4, 2019 1:36:04 PM

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

Board of Supervisors,
I oppose SB 50. This bill is ill conceived. Local planning is essential. If this bill is passed, San Francisco will no longer be San Francisco. It will be a low-rise New York. The additional units will strain city services. Traffic will become impossible. Please oppose.
Thank you.
Louise Bea
40 year resident of San Francisco (Telegraph Hill & Cow Hollow)

From: [Elle Soulis](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: I oppose SB-50
Date: Friday, April 5, 2019 1:46:24 PM

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

Dear Supervisors,

I cannot believe that city wants developers to demolish homes to build large luxury apartments. What makes San Francisco special are the lovely and charming homes painted in various colors. We already have hi-tech and their income changing the cultural environment of the city. Now you want to make this magical city like any other generic urban center. Where will the charm of San Francisco be then?

PLEASE DO NOT PUT PROPOSED BILL SB-50 on the ballot.

Sincerely,
Ellen soulis

From: sara@ogilvie.us.com
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: laura@yimbyaction.org
Subject: In Support of SB50
Date: Thursday, April 4, 2019 9:40:57 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please listen to the voice and heed the will of the People, the majority of whom have been polled to tell you they are ready for MORE HOMES in San Francisco and in California, as soon as possible. Senator Wiener told his Committee on Tuesday, his constituents don't care who is responsible for bringing forth more places to live in California, whether they're local or state agencies, they simply care that it happens, soon. SB50 will work in continual dialogue with stakeholders vested in all kinds of housing so that nobody is left behind as we build anywhere from 1.5 - 2 million new units through this new, urgently welcome measure.

There is no time to keep mulling it, something needs to be done and it needs to begin being done now. I urge you to think of everyone who is hurting because of this housing crisis right now and be a part of the solution instead of letting the problem exacerbate any longer than it should. Please refrain from being racist, elitist people who tell others that if they can't afford single family size units they should just disappear, that you won't give them an opportunity through density, that they're not good enough to live here. Try something new like this and I assure you checks and balances along the way will make things right for all San Franciscans. People will be elated to see homes being raised and opportunities to build their lives here unfold. The economy will roar with lots of people filling all the jobs, from tech to service, that aren't being pursued because no one can afford or find a place to live here and traveling here has become too long and too hard. I believe in your hearts you know this city will continue to struggle needlessly unless we build MORE HOMES through SB50.

Thank you for reconsidering your views which go against over 74% of your constituents who voted for you to institute reform expeditiously. Thank you for allowing California to enact and build MORE HOMES for all their people in order for our society and our prospects to improve. This is a beautiful bill and you should be thrilled to be part of the solution.

Very sincerely yours,

Sara Ogilvie

Outreach, The Homeless Church @ Brannan Street Wharf, San Francisco
Member, Yimby Action of San Francisco

From: [David Eldred](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Oppose SB 50
Date: Monday, April 8, 2019 10:25:15 AM

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

I am registering my opposition to SB50 as a San Francisco resident
I am registering my support for Supervisor Mar resolution in opposing SB50

David Eldred
1218 5th Ave San Francisco
Ca. 94122

From: [Richard Frisbie](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Oppose SB 50
Date: Friday, April 5, 2019 12:12:09 PM
Attachments: [SB 50 COMMENTS.docx](#)
[SB 50 New Res Units 1999-2018003.pdf](#)
[SF New Housing Chart 1995-2017.pdf](#)

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

 [SF New Housing Units Drop Year on Year001.pdf](#)

I attended yesterday's Govt. Audit & Oversight Cmtee meeting that addressed SB 50. My thanks to Supervisor Mar for sponsoring the hearing.

As we were limited to one minute, understandable but frustrating, I am attaching my prepare comments, most of which were not presented in the one minute time-frame. If you have any questions please contact me.

Richard Frisbie
415-666-3550

SB 50 COMMENTS

FACT: SBB 50 is a power grab, pure and simple!

As members of the Board of Supervisors you are responsible for protecting the Rights of San Franciscans. Also, the Charter approved by voters in November 1995 lays out specific areas of responsibility for the Board of Supervisors which SB 50 will negate so frankly you are not empowered by your constituents to give away these responsibilities.

Before you hand our Rights over to Sacramento you need to seek the approval of the voters of San Francisco.

FACT: during the 2004-2011 Timeframe SF achieved pretty average housing starts.

WHY is this significant? Gavin Newsom was Mayor.

If you assume a three year lag between application and completion Newsom's regime showed 2,197 new residential units 3 years after becoming mayor and 2,330 units 3 years after leaving the mayor's office. Not Nobel Prize winning progress.

In fact his focus was much more on attracting high tech than housing moderate income families; in essence his overall impact on affordable housing was probably neutral at best.

SO, now a probable contributor to what is now a Housing Crisis is in charge of a Housing Solution-how ironic. One might say a "born again" approach.

FACT: Newsom's policy is now calling for 3.5 million Housing units over the next 7 years-500,000 units per year!

WHY is this significant? **See attachment 1.**

California has NEVER produced 250,000 units in a single year and has averaged approx. 125,000 units over the last 20 years. With the stroke of a pen we are now going to more than triple that number.

Ridiculous sound bites beget bad policy.

SB 50 is the tool by which this bad policy is to be implemented.

SF HOUSING Starts: **See attachment 2.**

If SF averages its highest year ever (2016) we will produce 5,100 housing units a year-a challenging scenario at the very least - we aren't even building what's been approved. We have approx. 50,000 units approved but not being built.

So we already have a 10 year backlog at our highest year ever just waiting to be built!

Why is significantly increasing our annual production of housing units unlikely?

In the recent wildfires in Northern California over the past 2 years over 15,000 homes and 4,000 commercial buildings were destroyed. Then there's Southern California wildfires, then there's flooding.

Do you think these communities will also want to rebuild thereby putting additional pressures on our residential construction resources? Have we seen the last wildfire or flood.

SF competes against all the other communities in California for construction labor and materials and NEWSOM has decreed the state triple its rate of construction. What nonsense.

A vote to oppose SB 50 is a vote to oppose sheer nonsense at the highest levels of our state government.

But wait, California also competes against the rest of the States and the historic and recurring flooding that has occurred; and with global warming is absolutely to re-occur.

For example, Hurricane Harvey destroyed or damaged more than 180,000 homes in the Houston area in 2017, many of which are still not repaired/replaced.

WHY? Because of a shortage of construction labor and materials and this in one of the least expensive parts of the country.

What does this all mean? It means SB 50 is a flawed, deceitful piece of legislation which promises false goals and sets false expectations.

Not only will it not address Housing it will EXACERBATE, by a factor of ten, the AFFORDABILITY Crisis.

There is an cap on how many housing units SF can produce in a year.

Picking an average of 6,000 would be optimistic especially in light of the competition for resources and the construction costs in SF.

So, if Developers can only build 6,000 units in a year, do you really expect Developers will focus on AFFORDABLE housing??

REALLY!

And when challenged they will argue “I can’t get enough construction labor and materials to build more to allow for Affordable housing. What a perfect scam. A vote to NOT oppose SB 50 is a vote to propagate this scam!

SB 50 is a gift, a golden goose, to the Developers.

The Developers didn't support the Wiener/Ting/Chiu Trio-Wiener, Ting, Chiu- and send them to Sacramento to create legislation aimed at addressing the Affordability crisis.

If their intent was to address AFFORDABILITY the language of SB 50 would be drastically different. Over the past 9 months very specific Affordable housing language could have been crafted at the heart of the legislation. It wasn't as Affordable housing wasn't the purpose of the SB 50. Developer profits was the goal.

FOLKS, just follow the MONEY!

Oppose SB 50:


it takes away basic SF Rights;

it worsens the Affordability crisis;

it will NOT produce a significant increase in the rate of housing units much above the present rate-there simply aren't the resources to do so.

New Residential Units / California

1999 - 2019




5151
2016

Ebbs & Flows in SF Housing Construction

New-Construction Housing Units Completed by Year

Per SF Planning Dept.
Housing Inventory Report

444-1
2017



2017

Includes condos, houses, rental apartment units, affordable housing and units in social housing projects. Data from sources deemed reliable, but may contain errors and subject to revision.



PARAGON
REAL ESTATE GROUP

Sent from my iPad

From: [dr_jody](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Oppose SB 50
Date: Monday, April 8, 2019 12:27:31 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please do not allow this sweeping reform to take place. I do understand the need to figure out more affordable housing in San Francisco. However, this radical approach will only give developers the opportunity to run amok in our city. There is no guarantee that it will address the larger issues at hand. It feels like a *gross violation of my constitutional rights* as there will be NO recourse to building anywhere in the city if this SB 50 passes. Seriously! Is there nothing better you all could come up with than this.

Jody Kornberg

415-566-1564
50 Glenbrook Avenue
SF 94114

From: [zrants](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Oppose SB50
Date: Monday, April 8, 2019 12:48:09 PM

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

4/8/19

Mayor London Breed and Board of Supervisors:

re: Opposition to SB50 and support for Supervisors Mar's resolution
opposing SB50

I support Supervisors Mar's resolution # 190319 opposing CB50 and will appreciate your support for this important resolution that proves San Francisco cannot be bought yet.

Sincerely,

Mari Eliza, President EMIA

From: [Lance Carnes](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support Supervisors Mar's resolution opposing SB50
Date: Sunday, April 7, 2019 7:24:10 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please support Supervisors Mar's resolution opposing SB50 at the April 9, 2019 meeting.

Thanks,
Lance Carnes
North Beach

From: [Sarah Boudreau](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SB50 resolution vote tomorrow and navigation center on seawall lot
Date: Monday, April 8, 2019 10:14:12 PM

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

Hello supervisors,

I am a Cow Hollow (D2) resident and wanted to take a few minutes to share some thoughts on SB50 before tomorrow's vote on the resolution against it, and on the Navigation Center proposed at Seawall Lot 330 as it continues to be discussed.

SB50:

I attended Supervisor Stefani's community meeting yesterday (thank you for hosting!) about SB50 and was both encouraged and disheartened by the questions and comments there. Based on Scott Weiner's summary of the bill, it sounds like a no-brainer (yes) vote to me. The bill is not perfect but it will start the right conversation and result in more housing, both market rate and affordable, across the state. California is in a severe housing shortage, so the only way to fix this is building more housing (a LOT more housing). Most bills are not perfect the first time (the constitution! the affordable care act!) and need to be improved upon once they have a good starting point. I thought the bill was especially well written and discussed because it highlighted how it does **not** severely affect many places like San Francisco that **already** have strong dense zoning laws, protection for tenants, and neighborhood design standards. I was frustrated to hear some of my neighbors' concerns that the bill would not build enough affordable housing and some of my neighbors' concerns that it would not build enough market rate housing - seems to me like shooting down a bill to build more housing because it is not building enough housing is counterproductive, considering all the analyses of the bill indicate it would add housing, which we so desperately need. It was tough to hear that the bill would affect San Francisco disproportionately and not encourage our suburban neighbors and Silicon Valley communities to build more housing, after hearing Senator Weiner specifically mention that encouraging and enforcing development-averse suburban communities to build housing for their own workforces is part of its intent, and that much of San Francisco would not even be re-zoned with regard to height limits, setbacks, or demolition requirements and tenant protection controls under the bill. To me, SB50 is written to help **all** of California reduce its shortage on housing, and help all communities share the burden and privilege of housing the state's booming workforce. San Francisco is a progressive leader for the State and the Country, and I would be disappointed to see the BoS align itself with development-resistant exclusive communities and go against a large majority of San Francisco voters to vote for a resolution against SB50, a bill that would help so much of the state create housing for those who need it, especially considering that much of the bill would not apply to places like San Francisco with many of the bill's provisions already in place here.

Embarcadero Navigation Center:

I was not able to attend the community meeting about the navigation center but was shocked and saddened to read reports and speak with friends in attendance describing an angry and aggressive crowd. I stand behind Mayor Breed and support the Navigation Center on the Embarcadero and I think it is important that City Supervisors do the same. In fact, I agree with Supervisor Haney's support of the center and call that each neighborhood should have at least

one Navigation Center. The majority of voters voted in November to fund homelessness programming, even when it could pull from employers of many of those voters' bottom lines. Residents of San Francisco want to help their neighbors get off the street, and the Navigation Centers are a proven success story of how to do this. As someone who works nearby to the Embarcadero I consider myself a neighborhood and community member and find it important to help people in my community in need, and I am also aware that the concerns of residents nearby to the proposed site are misinformed. The existing navigation centers are successfully helping folks experiencing homelessness - vetted by strict entry requirements - transition into more full-time housing, helping folks get off of the street, and cleaning up the neighborhoods where they are sited. In fact, the center would improve the very things the local residents are concerned about - safety and cleanliness! I would be saddened to see City Supervisors and leadership not support this Navigation Center by being swayed by the outcry of a small group of homeowners (not the majority of voters) who are more worried about property values (which are not actually likely to drop if the neighborhood becomes cleaner and safer!) than facts about the existing and proposed Navigation Centers, or the best way to help their own neighbors.

Finally, I wanted to note on both items that as a progressive millennial voter I find it shocking that these items are even in question. My generation and Generation X above me are extremely focused on the cost of living in the city we call home. We continue to vote to spend our own dollars on creating a safe community for our neighbors where everyone has a chance to be housed - a basic human right. We want to stay here and build our lives and families here just as older generations of (now) homeowners moved here and did decades ago, and we want to continue to bring our knowledge and workforce to the area to continue to grow the local economy, which current homeowners also greatly benefit from. If the BoS is swayed by a few voices of longtime residents who do not represent the majority of the electorate and do not understand the actual facts and studies behind what these bills and proposals are designed to do, it will be hard to continue to be elected. It is the responsibility of elected officials to both listen to constituents and make informed decisions based on their knowledge of the impact of laws and policy. I am proud of the city leaders who are vocally supporting SB50 and the Navigation Center and I look to them to lead the way for the Supervisors to listen to constituents who support change, a fair chance toward housing and dignity for everyone, and evidence-based arguments for local laws and policies.

Thanks for reading and I look forward to continuing this dialogue with you,
Sarah

--

Sarah Boudreau

sboudreau@langan.com

boudreau.sarah.m@gmail.com

www.linkedin.com/in/sarahboudreau

From: [Jeanine](#)
To: [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); info@sfmca.org; [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SB50
Date: Monday, April 8, 2019 8:01:59 PM

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

I oppose SB50-I am a homeowner in the Marina. I do not believe in the idea that one law for real estate fits every city in California ie San Francisco and Fresno. I do not believe this SB50 will create enough affordable housing-the developer will expensive housing and give the money for affordable housing to the city for them to build. It is wrong for not allowing for the people of San Francisco to vote on this important issue .We have a beautiful city and if SB50 passes we will be Hong Kong in no time. A few years ago the people of San Francisco voted for a bill that stated if anyone wanted to build a high rise on the waterfront it must be approved by a vote of the people of San Francisco-SB50 eliminates this.What about houses on the Historical register are they to be torn down to build high rises? If this SB50 passes we will no longer be a unique and beautiful city with views-Victorians and neighborhood-we will lose our charm and tourism and look like every other city

From: [Paul Sack](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SB-50
Date: Saturday, April 6, 2019 11:41:07 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

As a former developer and owner of rental apartments in San Francisco, I urge you to oppose SB-50. We need to preserve the character of San Francisco and should not turn it into an unattractive forest of mid-rise apartment buildings.

Paul Sack
psack@sackproperties.com

From: [Janet Pellegrini](#)
To: [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); info@sfmca.org; [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SB50
Date: Monday, April 8, 2019 7:34:14 PM

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

We do not need more congestion, more people, more problems. I urge you to vote NO on SB50
Janet Pellegrini

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Priscilla](#)
To: [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); info@sfmca.org; [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SB50
Date: Monday, April 8, 2019 6:47:48 PM

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

I am against SB50. Supervisor Stefani where do you stand on this bill? Mayor Breed, we understand you're for it. How are you benefiting from this? STOP SB50

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Linda Jaeger](#)
To: [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); info@sfmca.org; [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SB50
Date: Monday, April 8, 2019 6:42:55 PM

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

We are against SB 50

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Mary Smith](#)
To: [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); info@sfmta.org; [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SB50
Date: Monday, April 8, 2019 6:40:15 PM

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

It is unbelievable that my vote does not count nor do the votes of tens of thousands of San Francisco residents count in my city. We have voted many times to limit the height and number of commercial properties (which includes high rise apartment buildings) in our neighborhoods. The infrastructure of the City cannot support the continued increase in population, especially when the increase does not contribute to the quality of life and financial health of the City.

Mary Smith

Sent from my iPhone

From: [NEIL DELLACAVA](#)
To: [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); info@sfmca.org; [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SB50
Date: Monday, April 8, 2019 6:37:32 PM

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

I Vote no on sb 50 .

You will ultimately ruin our neighborhood that we all have worked hard to live in.

Infrastructure is not keeping up with growth and this will add to it. You will add buildings that will be oversized and eyesores

I bet the developers are contributing significantly to your campaigns. The power of money

Lon breed is a wolf in sheep's clothing. What a mistake

Your district two resident of 26 years

Neil dellacava

Neil dellacava

3524 Broderick street

Sent from my iPad

From: [Presynct](#)
To: [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); info@sfmca.org; [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SB50
Date: Monday, April 8, 2019 6:18:38 PM

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

Vote no on sb50

Evelyn graham
3454 pierce st

Sent on the go!

From: [CHARNA BALL](#)
To: [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@sfmca.org](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SB50
Date: Monday, April 8, 2019 5:13:00 PM

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

Please vote NO on SB 50.

We are over building and destroying the characterter of our beloved city.

Charna Ball

SFCA 94123

From: [.](#)
To: [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [info@sfmca.org](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SB50
Date: Monday, April 8, 2019 5:09:09 PM

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

Local zoning regulations are there for a reason and to have the state come in and say they don't matter is outrageous.

SB50 could change the face of San Francisco in a very detrimental way.

I believe it is greed run amok! Why our elected officials aren't fighting it is a mystery to me. Maybe we need new elected officials.

Eileen Connolly
econolly1@aol.com
415.215.5043

From: [William Atkins](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SB50
Date: Saturday, April 6, 2019 1:51:49 PM

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

I am extremely disappointed that the Board of supervisors has decided to side with NIMBY factions in the Bay Area and reject State Senator Scott Wiener's bill, SB50. You should be supporting the construction of new housing and aid residents of that new housing in using public transportation. There is not enough housing, too many people commuting in automobiles clogging our highways and streets and polluting the air. Senator Wiener is trying to help. Please don't stand in his way.

William Atkins
3542 23rd St Apt 5
San Francisco, CA 94110-3065
willwayne@aol.com

From: [Jeanne Barr](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SB50
Date: Friday, April 5, 2019 3:42:25 PM

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

Thanking those of you who are against SB50.
I am strongly opposed and appreciate your wisdom.
It is an ineffective way to gain affordable housing at a great cost to the quality of life in the City.

Thanks
Jeanne Barr
1780 Green Street

From: [Richard Pellegrini](#)
To: [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); info@sfmca.org; [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SB50
Date: Monday, April 8, 2019 9:14:25 PM

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

To: Catherine Stefani and the Board of Supervisors

I am totally opposed to SB 50.

It is the worse legislation possible for our city. It is my opinion that this bill will change San Francisco as we know it and not for the better. Other than greed I can't understand why our city would give up its voice as to what should be built and where. Why don't we start thinking about our lack of infrastructure before we continue to build without any control.

Richard Pellegrini

From: [Patricia Reischl Crahan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SB-50
Date: Sunday, April 7, 2019 6:40:31 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I urge to to vote NO on SB-50. It is a bad bill for California and very bad for San Francisco. We've had enough new development without the benefit of infrastructure and public transportation upgrades. Traffic is toxic and parking is non-existent. We need a break.

San Francisco has already fulfilled high density living, let other cities follow suit.

Thank you,

Patricia Reischl Crahan
Mission District homeowner since 1978

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: BOS Agenda Item 29, 4/9/19: SUPPORT Mar's resolution Opposing SB-50 (Wiener)
Date: Tuesday, April 9, 2019 2:46:00 PM

From: Nancy Wuerfel <nancenum1@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, April 8, 2019 4:04 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: BOS Agenda Item 29, 4/9/19: SUPPORT Mar's resolution Opposing SB-50 (Wiener)

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

Dear Supervisors:

I am delighted to support Supervisor Mar's resolution to oppose Wiener's proposed SB-50. In addition to opposing the extreme land use changes in SB-50, my reason for supporting Mar's resolution is because the bill does *not provide funding for or require the expansion of San Francisco's **Auxiliary Water Supply System*** to protect lives and property citywide from conflagrations following a major earthquake.

The AWSS is an independent system of underground high pressure, high water volume pipelines and hydrants supplied by non-potable water just to fight fires. It was devised and built on the city's eastside after the 1906 earthquake and fire to assist in preventing another catastrophe from happening. *San Francisco is the only city in the United States that has an AWSS*. We need it because of our proximity to four fault lines, AND we can actually suppress fires by accessing the unlimited supply of water on three sides of the city.

Wiener's one-size-fits-all bill ignores the very real jeopardy San Francisco faces from post earthquake fires because the AWSS was never extended to the city's western and southern neighborhoods as was intended. This bill increases density without requiring and financing the expansion of the essential AWSS infrastructure customized to preserving San Francisco.

Our city's fire challenge *and our fire suppression solution* are unique to us. We should not even consider this dramatic increase in housing to be imposed on us before the entire city is fully protected by the AWSS with access to unlimited seawater.

Sincerely,

Nancy Wuerfel

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors; Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: I support SB 50
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 12:21:00 PM

From: Dima Lazerka <dlazerka@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 9, 2019 4:31 PM
To: Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: I support SB 50

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

Thank you for proposition SB 50, I highly support it. Let's end the housing crisis by removing roadblocks to building new apartments!

Best regards, Dzmitry Lazerka, San Francisco resident, tenant
1580 5th Ave #203, San Francisco, CA 94122

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors; Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: On Bill SB 50
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 12:21:00 PM

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

From: bev@beverlymann.com <bev@beverlymann.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 9, 2019 6:33 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: On Bill SB 50

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

I am greatly opposed to SB 50 for the following reasons:

Building these huge luxury apartments would be destructive to our city and residents because we are in need of more affordable housing not less. Building of high rises would destroy the charm and ambiance of San Francisco's original architecture, plus add to unfair evictions, add more congestion, and provide less play area for our children. This action must be stopped.

Yours Truly,
Beverly Mann

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors; Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: SB50
Date: Tuesday, April 9, 2019 10:38:00 AM

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

From: lhelenl99 <lhelenl99@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 9, 2019 9:42 AM
To: Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Brown, Vallie (BOS) <vallie.brown@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; info@sfmca.org; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: SB50

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

I attended Supervisor Stefani's Sunday forum, and am still opposed to SB 50.
PLEASE VOTE NO!

San Francisco is small and overcrowded already. Move more tech/jobs to areas where housing can be built to lessen commutes!!!! Between the tourists and more residents and rideshare services we have gridlock. And little infrastructure to handle it. Attempts to make Muni faster are negligible and make our streets and thoroughfares a nightmare.

Thank you

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors: Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: SB50
Date: Tuesday, April 9, 2019 10:36:00 AM
Importance: High

From: Ashley Wessinger <ashleywessinger@mac.com>

Sent: Tuesday, April 9, 2019 5:17 AM

To: Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Brown, Vallie (BOS) <vallie.brown@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: SB50

Importance: High

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

Dear Board of Supervisor,
I oppose SB 50 for the following reasons.

1. An impact study has not been done.
2. The Housing Accountability Act overrides SB 50 and impacts demolition.
3. Sensitive communities are not properly protected. SF is dealing with displacement and this will be further impacted.
4. No rental registry is in place to protect renters.
5. Does not cater for 100% affordable houses.
6. The State Density Bonus Act and SB 50 allow for extra height. However this is a formula that could prohibit areas that could provide higher height and areas where extra height is misplaced.
7. Geographically SF has a small landmass in comparison to other surrounding cities. SB 50 is too generic a bill to achieve what it needs to achieve without making mistakes: impacting communities, losing neighborhoods that time has created and impedes some areas in SF that could be expanded greater.
8. Historic districts are not protected.
9. It restricts our transit system to improve and expand by attaching zoning laws to it. SF has a poor transit system and a \$22 billion funding gap through 2045. This would indicate that problems could occur if zoning impedes improvements.
10. SF infrastructure cannot support a sudden increase in building. The sewerage system needs

to be restructured before such building is implemented.

11. We do not have the funds to increase our police force and fire fighters.

12. SF is in an earthquake sensitive zone globally, mass housing that doesn't grow with a ratio to services could have untold 'national emergency' consequences.

One issue that has been spoken about by the general public is that the impact Private equity firms and speculators that have bought up SF real estate has not been addressed if this bill should pass.

This bill and all the other bills coming out of Sacramento have to be addressed by SF. We need SF and the surrounding suburbs to take the lead to come up with a master urban plan that addresses the concerns and problems that have occurred over the tech boom. SF has had many booms and busts so you need to look back at history to learn from it to expanding the city into the next century and not to solve the problems with a blanket Band-Aid that SB 50 is.

Best Regards,

Ashley Wessinger

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors; Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: SB50
Date: Friday, April 12, 2019 12:29:00 PM

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

From: Kelly Dyke <thedykestas@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2019 1:42 PM

To: Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Brown, Vallie (BOS) <vallie.brown@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; info@sfmca.org; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Cc: lorimbroke@gmail.com

Subject: SB50

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my vehement opposition to SB 50!!

My husband and I attended that despicable meeting on Sunday at UCSF. I truly feel as though that was a meeting that you had to have and not one designed to collect information or ideas. There were many well informed and articulate people from the city present who are in adamant disagreement with this bill SB50!! We have made the investment in this city! We pay our taxes and have lived by the rules since 1998!! We have raised our children here and have donated time and man power to make this city a better place. We believe that this SB50 is a disaster! Along with all of its misgivings it is irresponsible and outrageous! If I could get my vote back from Scott Weiner I would! We voted him into office because we thought he would do good things for our state! This is not good for our city or our state! We do not have the infrastructure for these kinds of buildings in consideration of our sewage, mass transit and even parking! I beg you as a board to stop this bill immediately! I don't want an 85' structure falling on my 30' marina "bungalow" in an earthquake!!

Please put a stop to SB50!!!

Sincerely,

Kelly Dyke

15 Retiro Way

SF, CA 94123

Sent from my iPhone

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
FROM: Edward McCaffrey, Office of Mayor London N. Breed
RE: State Legislation Committee Bill Positions April 11, 2019 Meeting
DATE: Thursday, April 11, 2019

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2019 APR 11 PM 4:01

Dear Madam Clerk:

Please be advised that the State Legislation Committee approved the following positions on legislation pending before the California State Legislature:

AB/SB	Bill #	Author	Title	Adopted Position
AB	40	Ting	Zero-emission vehicles: comprehensive strategy	Support
AB	133	Quirk-Silva	Property tax postponement: eligibility: income level	Support
AB	364	Calderon	Minimum annual tax: exemption	Support
AB	376	Stone	Student loan servicing	Support
AB	393	Nazarian	Building codes: earthquake safety: functional recovery standard	Support
AB	470	Limón	California Green Business Program	Support
AB	495	Muratsuchi	Cosmetics: safety	Support
AB	531	Friedman	Foster youth: housing	Support
AB	593	Carillo	Unemployment insurance: use of information: public workforce development programs	Sponsor & Support
AB	619	Chiu	Retail food: reusable containers: multiuse utensils.	Support
AB	659	Mullin	Transportation: emerging transportation technologies: California Smart City Challenge Grant Program	Support
AB	715	Wood	Medi-Cal: program for aged and disabled persons.	Support
AB	782	Berman	California Environmental Quality Act: exemption: public agencies: property transfers	Support



AB/SB	Bill #	Author	Title	Adopted Position
AB	792	Ting	Recycling: plastic beverage containers: minimum recycled content.	Support
AB	914	Holden	Medi-Cal: inmates: eligibility	Support
AB	944	Quirk	CalWORKs: sponsored noncitizen: indigence exception	Support
AB	1091	Jones-Sawyer	Child support: suspension	Support
AB	1092	Jones-Sawyer	Child support: enforcement	Support
AB	1112	Friedman	Motorized scooters: local regulation	Oppose
AB	1301	Cooley	Child welfare: adoption	Support
AB	1377	Wicks	CalFresh	Support
AB	1436	Stone	CalWORKs: eligibility: income exemptions	Support
AB	1509	Mullin	Solid waste: lithium-ion batteries	Support
AB	1557	Chiu	Medication-Assisted Treatment Drug Reimbursement Pilot Program	Sponsor & Support
AB	1625	Rivas	Unflavored tobacco list	Support
SB	152	Beall	Active Transportation Program	Support
SB	159	Wiener	HIV: preexposure and postexposure prophylaxis	Support
SB	171	Jackson	Employers: annual report: pay data	Support
SB	337	Skinner	Child support	Support
SB	440	Pan	Cognitive Impairment Safety Net System Task Force	Support
SB	616	Wieckowski	Enforcement of money judgments: exemptions	Support
SB	667	Hueso	Greenhouse gases: recycling infrastructure and facilities	Support



Present at the meeting were representatives from the Mayor's Office, the Office of Board of Supervisors President Norman Yee, Supervisor Sandra Lee Fewer's Office, the City Attorney's Office, and the Treasurer's Office.

In addition, please find attached the approved minutes from the March 13, 2019 meeting.

Should the Board of Supervisors wish to find more information on these matters, they may do so at the following link: <http://sfgov.org/slc/>.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Edward J. McCaffrey".

Edward McCaffrey
Manager of State and Federal Legislative Affairs



**STATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
MINUTES**

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

11:00am – 1:00pm

City Hall, Room 201

MEMBERS:

Mayor's Office (Chair) -- Edward McCaffrey
Board President Norman Yee -- Jen Low
Supervisor Sandra Lee Fewer -- Ian Fregosi
Assessor's Office -- Holly Lung
City Attorney's Office -- Mary Jane Winslow
Controller's Office -- Ben Rosenfield
Treasurer's Office -- Amanda Fried

Meeting commenced at 11:04am.

AGENDA

I. ROLL CALL

Present: Edward McCaffrey, Jen Low, Ian Fregosi, Mary Jane Winslow, Amanda Fried

Absent: Ben Rosenfield (joined at 11:11am), Holly Lung (joined at 11:08am)

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (Action Item). Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes from the meeting of February 13, 2019.

No public comment.

Motion to approve: Amanda Fried

Seconded by: Mary Jane Winslow

Approved: 5-0

III. STATE LOBBYIST OVERVIEW AND UPDATE (Discussion Item). The City's state lobbyist will present to the Committee an update on State legislative matters.

Committee member Holly Lung was noted present at 11:08am.

Committee member Ben Rosenfield was noted present at 11:11am.

IV. PROPOSED LEGISLATION (Discussion and Action). Discussion and possible action item: the Committee with review and discuss state legislation affecting the City and County of San Francisco. Items are listed by Department, then by bill number.

Planning Department

Presenter: Sheila Nickolopoulos

a. AB 68 (Ting) Land Use: Accessory Dwelling Units

Recommended Position: Support

AB 68 would: (1) Decrease the ministerial ADU approval process to 60 days; (2) Prohibit restrictive local requirements pertaining to lot size and parking; (3) Allow more types of units, such as junior ADUs and units in multi-family dwellings, to be approved with less bureaucratic review; and (4) Require jurisdictions to allow junior accessory dwelling units along with one ADU at the single family property.

No public comment.

Motion to **Continue to April meeting:** Jen Low

Seconded by: Ian Fregosi

Approved: 7-0

Treasurer & Tax Collector

Presenter: Amanda Fried

a. AB 539 (Limón) California Financing Law: consumer loans: charges

Recommended Position: Support

AB 539 would cap the annual percentage rate (APR) for all high-dollar consumer loans between \$2,500 and \$10,000 at 36%, plus origination fee.

No public comment.

Motion to approve **Support Position:** Mary Jane Winslow

Seconded by: Ben Rosenfield

Approved: 7-0

b. AB 642 (Limón) California Financing Law

Recommended Position: Support

AB 642 would require online lead generators to be licensed as brokers under the CFL if they provide confidential consumer data to finance lenders for compensation. The bill would also require that lead generators and finance lenders provide disclosures to consumers about how lead generators are compensated for providing leads.

No public comment.

Motion to approve **Support Position:** Jen Low

Seconded by: Ben Rosenfield

Approved: 7-0

- c. SB 455 (Bradford) Financial Empowerment Fund: unbanked and underbanked populations

Recommended Position: Support

SB 455 proposes the establishment of a Financial Empowerment Fund, to be administered by the Department of Business Oversight. The Fund would be funded at a level of \$1M per year and would provide grants to nonprofits of up to \$100,000 for financial education and financial empowerment programs for at-risk populations. The fund would specifically target unbanked and underbanked populations.

No public comment.

Motion to approve **Support Position:** Holly Lung

Seconded by: Ben Rosenfield

Approved: 7-0

- d. SB 482 (Hueso) Consumer and commercial loans: restrictions

Recommended Position: Oppose

SB 482 would address installment loans under the California Financing Law (CFL), creating some new regulations for licensed lenders. These include a limited ability to repay standard, a statement identifying the loan as a high-cost loan, and some notifications related to financial literacy educational materials and repayment due dates.

No public comment.

Motion to approve **Oppose Position:** Mary Jane Winslow

Seconded by: Holly Lung

Approved: 7-0

- e. SB 616 (Wieckowski) Enforcement of money judgments: exemptions

Recommended Position: Support

This bill would allow debtors to protect or exempt funds (up to \$2,000) from bank levy by creditors (debt collectors), in order to support basic living expenses. The amount would be adjusted every three years based on the CA Consumer Price Index for urban consumers, like those in San Francisco.

Public Comment: Lisa Saporito from the Department of Child Support Services noted this bill could affect the City's ability to collect child support payments.

Motion to **Continue to April meeting:** Ben Rosenfield

Seconded by: Amanda Fried

Approved: 7-0

Human Services Agency

Presenter: Susie Smith

- a. AB 980 (Kalra) Department of Motor Vehicles: records: confidentiality

Recommended Position: Support

This bill will require the California Department of Motor Vehicles to add Adult Protective Services (APS) social workers and employees of the Public

Guardian, Public Conservator, and Public Administrator (PG/PC/PA) offices, to the list of workers with heightened confidentiality protection.

No public comment.

Motion to approve **Support Position:** Amanda Fried.

Seconded by: Ben Rosenfield

Approved: 7-0

- b. AB 1005 (Arambula) Foster children and youth: family urgent response system

Recommended Position: Support

AB 1005 would build upon the current Continuum of Care Reform (CCR) implementation effort by creating a statewide hotline and response system to help stabilize foster families and reduce placement disruption. San Francisco is already beginning to pilot this approach, based on best practices in other states.

No public comment.

Motion to approve **Support Position:** Amanda Fried

Seconded by: Mary Jane Winslow

Approved: 7-0

City Attorney's Office

Presenter: Mary Jane Winslow

- a. AB 276 (Friedman) Firearms: storage

Recommended Position: Support

AB 276, if enacted, would impose safe storage requirements when the owner of the firearm is not at home.

No public comment.

Motion to approve **Support Position:** Ian Fregosi

Seconded by: Amanda Fried

Approved: 7-0

Department of Public Health

Presenter: Max Gara

- a. SB 175 & AB 414 (Pan & Bonta) Healthcare coverage: minimum essential coverage

Recommended Position: Support

SB 175 (Pan) and AB 414 (Bonta) - identical bills - would implement a state-level individual insurance mandate and require all state residents to maintain minimum essential health coverage beginning in 2020, or be subject to a financial penalty. Moneys collected through the penalties would be used to improve the affordability of healthcare coverage for residents.

No public comment.

Motion to approve **Support Position:** Ian Fregosi

Seconded by: Eddie McCaffrey
Approved: 7-0

- b. SB 66 (Atkins) Medi-Cal: federally qualified health center and rural health clinic services

Recommended Position: Support

SB 66 would improve access to mental health services by allowing Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHCs) and Rural Health Centers (RHCs) to bill Medi-Cal for two visits if a patient is provided mental health services on the same day they receive other medical services. Through this change, the bill would support community clinics in taking a coordinated approach by better integrating mental health and substance use disorder services into primary care settings.

No public comment.

Motion to approve **Support Position:** Mary Jane Winslow

Seconded by: Amanda Fried

Approved: 7-0

Department of Public Health & Human Services Agency (Joint Submission)

Presenter: Max Gara

- a. SB 29 & AB 4 (Lara & Arambula) Medi-Cal: eligibility

Recommended Position: Support

SB 29/ AB 4 (identical bills) would extend eligibility for full-scope Medi-Cal benefits to undocumented adults age 19 and above who are otherwise eligible for those benefits, but for their immigration status.

No public comment.

Motion to approve **Support Position:** Jen Low

Seconded by: Amanda Fried

Approved: 7-0

Department of the Environment

Presenter: Peter Gallotta

- a. AB 647 (Kalra) Hazardous materials: cosmetics: safety documents

Recommended Position: Support

Manufacturers will be required to post the cosmetic product Safety Data Sheets (SDS) online and translate into languages most commonly used by the beauty care industry.

No public comment.

Motion to approve **Support Position:** Ian Fregosi

Seconded by: Jen Low

Approved: 7-0

- b. SB 54 & AB 1080 (Allen & Gonzalez) California Circular Economy and Plastic Pollution Reduction Act

Recommended Position: Support & Sponsor

These bills would require CalRecycle to adopt regulations to source reduce and recycle 75% of single-use packaging and products sold or distributed in California and require these products distributed or sold in California to be made recyclable or compostable by 2030.

No public comment.

Motion to approve **Sponsor & Support Position:** Jen Low

Seconded by: Ian Fregosi

Approved: 7-0

- c. SB 392 (Allen) Hazardous materials: green chemistry: consumer products

Recommended Position: Sponsor & Support

The Safer Consumer Products Program is an important statewide program to address harmful chemicals in consumer products. This bill provides much needed clarification and clean-up of the original authorizing legislation.

No public comment.

Motion to approve **Sponsor & Support Position:** Ben Rosenfield

Seconded by: Holly Lung

Approved: 7-0

- d. SB 574 (Leyva) Toxic Fragrance Chemicals Right to Know Act of 2019

Recommended Position: Support

This right-to-know bill requires companies selling beauty or personal care products in California to report any fragrance or flavor ingredient to the California Safe Cosmetics Program that appears on one or more of the 27 authoritative hazard lists referenced in the bill. The Safe Cosmetics Program will publish this information on its public database.

No public comment.

Motion to approve **Support Position:** Amanda Fried

Seconded by: Eddie McCaffrey

Approved: 7-0

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Presenter: Amy Chan

- a. AB 1734 (Chiu) Property taxation: welfare exemption: rental housing: moderate income housing

Recommended Position: Support & Amend; Sponsor

AB 1734 would amend Section 214 the Revenue and Taxation Code to extend the welfare tax exemption to all units that are initially occupied by moderate-income households up to 120% AMI in high-cost counties. The units must have a deed restriction and lien date on or after January 1, 2020, be receiving local or state subsidy or tax credit financing, and funds that would have otherwise been used to pay property taxes must be used to maintain the affordability of the units.

No public comment.

Motion to approve **Sponsor, Support & Amend Position:** Ian Fregosi

Seconded by: Holly Lung

Approved: 7-0

Department of the Status of Women

Presenter: Elizabeth Newman

a. SB 233 (Wiener) Immunity from arrest

Recommended Position

Senate Bill 233 prohibits arrest for prostitution or misdemeanor drug offenses when someone is a witness or a victim of a serious crime. These crimes include sexual assault, human trafficking, stalking, robbery, assault, kidnapping, threats, blackmail, extortion, burglary or other violent crime. It also states that the possession of condoms cannot be used as evidence of prostitution and related crimes.

No public comment.

Motion to approve **Support Position:** Mary Jane Winslow

Seconded by: Ian Fregosi

Approved: 7-0

V. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Members of the public may address the Committee on items of interest that are within the Committee's subject matter jurisdiction and that do not appear on the agenda.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting concluded at 12:08pm.

Disability Access

Room 201 of City Hall is located at 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, and is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible Muni lines serving this location are: #47 Van Ness, and the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness, as well as Muni Metro stations at Van Ness and Civic Center. For more information about Muni accessible services, call 923-6142. There is accessible parking at the Civic Center Plaza garage.

Know Your Rights Under the Sunshine Ordinance

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance,

contact the Donna Hall at Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102, by phone at 415-554-7724, by fax at 415-554-7854, or email the Sunshine Ordinance Taskforce Administrator at sotf@sfgov.org. Citizens may obtain a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance by contacting the Task Force, or by printing Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet, at www.sfgov.org/sunshine.htm.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance (San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Sec. 2.100 –2.160) to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the San Francisco Ethics Commission at 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 3900, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone 415-581-2300, fax 415-581-2317, Internet website: www.sfgov.org/ethics.

Cell Phones and Pagers

The ringing and use of cell phones, pagers, and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

Public Comment

Public Comment will be taken on each item on the agenda before or during consideration of that item.

Document Review

Documents that may have been provided to members of the State Legislation Committee in connection with the items on the agenda include proposed state legislation, consultant reports, correspondence and reports from City departments, and public correspondence. These may be inspected by contacting Edward McCaffrey, Manager, State and Federal Affairs, Mayor's Office at: (415) 554-6588.

Health Considerations

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

MEMORANDUM

Date: April 16, 2019
To: Members, Board of Supervisors
From: *ACE* Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Subject: Re-nomination by the Mayor

On April 15, 2019, the Mayor submitted the following complete re-nomination package to the Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors:

- **Amanda Eaken** - term ending March 1, 2023

Pursuant to Charter, Section 8A.102, this nomination is subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors by a majority vote.

The Office of the Clerk of the Board will open a file for this nomination and the hearing will be scheduled.

(Attachments)

c: John Carroll - Acting-Legislative Deputy
Jon Givner - Deputy City Attorney
Kanishka Cheng - Mayor's Legislative Liaison



Notice of Nomination of Reappointment

April 12, 2019

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to Charter Section 8A.102, of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following nomination:

Amanda Eaken, for reappointment to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors for a four year term ending March 1, 2023.

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

I encourage your support and am pleased to advise you of this reappointment nomination. Should you have any question about this reappointment nomination, please contact my Director of Appointments, Kanishka Cheng, at 415.554.6696

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

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2019 APR 15 PM 2:59
OK

Amanda Eaken, MCP

Natural Resources Defense Council

Amanda Eaken is Director of Transportation and Climate in the Healthy People and Thriving Communities Program at the Natural Resources Defense Council. In 2008, Ms. Eaken was instrumental in passage of the nation's first law to connect regional planning and climate change, Senate Bill 375 (Steinberg). She was appointed by the California Air Resources Board to serve on the Regional Targets Advisory Committee to review global data on the potential for land use and transportation planning and policy to reduce vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions, and successfully built consensus among diverse stakeholders to set ambitious GHG targets for Round 1 SB 375 implementation in 2010.

She has worked across the state advising metropolitan planning organizations on the creation of Sustainable Communities Strategies to achieve their GHG targets, as well as continued to advocate for legislative change to eliminate barriers to SCS implementation. One of her most important legislative victories was drafting and passage of Senate Bill 743 (Steinberg, 2013) to eliminate automobile delay, defined as Level of Service (LOS), from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). By prioritizing the movement of automobiles as the primary metric for transportation impact analysis under CEQA, LOS has for decades incentivized road and highway widening, prevented the creation of safe infrastructure for walking, cycling and transit, and promoted auto-dependent, low-density land use patterns, while serving as a barrier to transit-oriented, infill development.

In June 2014, Ms. Eaken was delighted to help secure 35% of the state's cap and trade revenues (~ \$2B/yr.) as a permanent source of revenue to implement SB 375, via funding for affordable housing, transit capital and operations, walking, biking and shared mobility choices.

Ms. Eaken established herself as an early leader in the shared-use mobility sector when she conceptualized *Live.Ride.Share: SoCal's Emerging Mobility Marketplace*, Southern California's first conference to examine shared-use mobility. She is partnering with UC Berkeley's Transportation Sustainability Research Center to lead a first-of-its-kind climate impacts analysis of the Transportation Network Companies Lyft and Uber. The study will document vehicle ownership, VMT/GHG, and mode shift impacts of TNCs in three cities.

In 2017, she was part of a coalition that helped to secure passage of a major affordable housing package in California, including a permanent source of revenue for affordable housing construction. She leads NRDC's advocacy related to land use and transportation planning at the city, state and federal scales.

Relevant Expertise:

- ◆ Transportation Planning and Policy
- ◆ Climate Change Policy
- ◆ Land Use Planning and Policy
- ◆ Regional Planning
- ◆ Shared Use Mobility
- ◆ Affordable Housing

Years of Experience: 18

Education:

Master of City Planning,
College of Environmental
Design, University of
California, Berkeley (2005)
B.A., Environmental and
Evolutionary Biology,
Dartmouth College (1999)

Professional Experience

- Director of Transportation and Climate, Natural Resources Defense Council, SF, CA 2015 – Present
- Deputy Director, Urban Solutions Program, Natural Resources Defense Council, SF, CA 2013-2015
- Transportation Policy Analyst, Natural Resources Defense Council, San Francisco, CA 2007 – 2013
- Affordable Housing Developer, Citizens Housing Corporation, San Francisco, CA 2005 - 2007
- Founder and Steering Committee Member, ClimatePlan, Statewide Coalition of Equity, Land Use, Health, and Transportation Groups working to implement SB 375, 2007-2017
- Research Associate, Innovative Mobility Research, California Partners for Advanced Transit and Highways (PATH), University of California, Berkeley, 2003-2005
- Project Director, Rails-to-Trails Conservancy, San Francisco, CA, 2000-2003

Relevant Awards, Recognition

- Next City Vanguard, Selected one of 40 National Urban Leaders for Urban Design Challenge, 2014
- San Francisco Business Times Forty Under 40 Emerging Bay Area Leaders Award, 2013
- President's Sustainability Leadership Award, Southern California Association of Governments, 2013
- Selected as a TEDx Speaker for Global Cities Day, 2012

CALIFORNIA FORM 700
FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION
A PUBLIC DOCUMENT**STATEMENT OF ECONOMIC INTERESTS**
COVER PAGE

1254081

Please type or print in ink.

NAME OF FILER	(LAST)	(FIRST)	(MIDDLE)
Eaken, Amanda			

1. Office, Agency, or Court

Agency Name (Do not use acronyms)

City and County of San Francisco

Division, Board, Department, District, if applicable

Your Position

Municipal Transportation Agency

Director

► If filing for multiple positions, list below or on an attachment. (Do not use acronyms)

Agency: *SEE ATTACHED FOR ADDITIONAL POSITIONS

Position:

2. Jurisdiction of Office (Check at least one box)☐ State☐ Judge or Court Commissioner (Statewide Jurisdiction)☐ Multi-County☒ County of San Francisco☒ City of San Francisco☐ Other**3. Type of Statement (Check at least one box)**☒ Annual: The period covered is January 1, 2018, through December 31, 2018☐ Leaving Office: Date Left ____/____/____

(Check one circle)

-or-

The period covered is ____/____/____, through December 31, 2018

☐ The period covered is January 1, 2018, through the date of leaving office.☐ Assuming Office: Date assumed ____/____/____☐ The period covered is ____/____/____, through the date of leaving office.☐ Candidate: Date of Election ____ and office sought, if different than Part 1: ____**4. Schedule Summary (must complete)**► Total number of pages including this cover page: 9**Schedules attached**☒ Schedule A-1 - Investments - schedule attached☒ Schedule C - Income, Loans, & Business Positions - schedule attached☐ Schedule A-2 - Investments - schedule attached☐ Schedule D - Income - Gifts - schedule attached☐ Schedule B - Real Property - schedule attached☐ Schedule E - Income - Gifts - Travel Payments - schedule attached

-or-

☐ None - No reportable interests on any schedule**5. Verification**

MAILING ADDRESS	STREET	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
(Business or Agency Address Recommended - Public Document)				

111 Sutter Street

San Francisco

CA

94104

DAYTIME TELEPHONE NUMBER

E-MAIL ADDRESS

(415) 875-6100

aeakensf@gmail.com

I have used all reasonable diligence in preparing this statement. I have reviewed this statement and to the best of my knowledge the information contained herein and in any attached schedules is true and complete. I acknowledge this is a public document.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date Signed 04/02/2019

(month, day, year)

Signature Amanda Eaken

(File the originally signed paper statement with your filing official.)

STATEMENT OF ECONOMIC INTERESTS
COVER PAGE
Expanded Statement Attachment

CALIFORNIA FORM 700 FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION
Name <u>Amanda Eaken</u>

* This table lists all positions including the primary position listed in the Office, Agency, or Court section of the Cover Page.

Agency	Division/Board/Dept/District	Position	Type of Statement
City and County of San Francisco	Municipal Transportation Agency	Director	Annual 1/1/2018 - 12/31/2018
City and County of San Francisco	Municipal Transportation Agency	Director	Annual 1/1/2018 - 12/31/2018

SCHEDULE A-1

Investments

Stocks, Bonds, and Other Interests

(Ownership Interest is Less Than 10%)

Investments must be itemized.

Do not attach brokerage or financial statements.

CALIFORNIA FORM 700

FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Name

Eaken, Amanda

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY
Gilead Sciences

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS
Healthcare

FAIR MARKET VALUE
☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000 ☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000
☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 ☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
☒ Stock ☐ Other _____ (Describe)
☐ Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499
 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
 ____/____/18 ____/____/18
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY
United Healthgroup Inc

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS
Healthcare

FAIR MARKET VALUE
☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000 ☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000
☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 ☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
☒ Stock ☐ Other _____ (Describe)
☐ Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499
 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
 ____/____/18 ____/____/18
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY
Delta Airlines Inc Dela New

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS
Travel

FAIR MARKET VALUE
☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000 ☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000
☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 ☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
☒ Stock ☐ Other _____ (Describe)
☐ Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499
 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
 10 / 12 / 18 ____/____/18
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY
McDonalds

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS
Consumer Cyclical

FAIR MARKET VALUE
☒ \$2,000 - \$10,000 ☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000
☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 ☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
☒ Stock ☐ Other _____ (Describe)
☐ Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499
 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
 ____/____/18 ____/____/18
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY
Alphabet Inc, Class C

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS
Technology

FAIR MARKET VALUE
☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000 ☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000
☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 ☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
☒ Stock ☐ Other _____ (Describe)
☐ Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499
 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
 ____/____/18 ____/____/18
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY
Aptiv Plc

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS
Technology

FAIR MARKET VALUE
☒ \$2,000 - \$10,000 ☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000
☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 ☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
☒ Stock ☐ Other _____ (Describe)
☐ Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499
 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
 ____/____/18 ____/____/18
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

Comments:

SCHEDULE A-1

Investments

Stocks, Bonds, and Other Interests

(Ownership Interest is Less Than 10%)

Investments must be itemized.

Do not attach brokerage or financial statements.

CALIFORNIA FORM 700
FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Name

Eaken, Amanda

► NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

LAM Research Corp

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Technology

FAIR MARKET VALUE

☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000 ☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000
☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 ☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☒ Stock ☐ Other _____ (Describe)
☐ Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499
☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

____/____/18 ____/____/18
ACQUIRED DISPOSED

► NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Microsoft Corp

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Technology

FAIR MARKET VALUE

☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000 ☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000
☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 ☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☒ Stock ☐ Other _____ (Describe)
☐ Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499
☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

____/____/18 ____/____/18
ACQUIRED DISPOSED

► NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Accenture Plc Ireland Cl A

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Technology

FAIR MARKET VALUE

☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000 ☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000
☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 ☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☒ Stock ☐ Other _____ (Describe)
☐ Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499
☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

____/____/18 ____/____/18
ACQUIRED DISPOSED

► NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Applied Materials

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Technology

FAIR MARKET VALUE

☒ \$2,000 - \$10,000 ☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000
☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 ☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☒ Stock ☐ Other _____ (Describe)
☐ Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499
☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

____/____/18 ____/____/18
ACQUIRED DISPOSED

► NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Intel Corp

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Technology

FAIR MARKET VALUE

☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000 ☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000
☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 ☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☒ Stock ☐ Other _____ (Describe)
☐ Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499
☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

____/____/18 ____/____/18
ACQUIRED DISPOSED

► NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Dollar Tree

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Consumer Staples

FAIR MARKET VALUE

☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000 ☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000
☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 ☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☒ Stock ☐ Other _____ (Describe)
☐ Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499
☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

____/____/18 ____/____/18
ACQUIRED DISPOSED

Comments: _____

SCHEDULE A-1**Investments****Stocks, Bonds, and Other Interests**

(Ownership Interest is Less Than 10%)

*Investments must be itemized.**Do not attach brokerage or financial statements.***CALIFORNIA FORM 700**

FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Name

Eaken, Amanda

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Constellation Brands Inc, Cl A

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Consumer Staples

FAIR MARKET VALUE

- ☒ \$2,000 - \$10,000 ☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000
☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 ☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

- ☒ Stock ☐ Other _____ (Describe)
☐ Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499
☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

____/____/18 ____/____/18
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Yum China Holdings Inc

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Consumer Cyclical

FAIR MARKET VALUE

- ☒ \$2,000 - \$10,000 ☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000
☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 ☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

- ☒ Stock ☐ Other _____ (Describe)
☐ Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499
☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

____/____/18 ____/____/18
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Travelers Cos Inc/The

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Financial Services

FAIR MARKET VALUE

- ☒ \$2,000 - \$10,000 ☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000
☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 ☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

- ☒ Stock ☐ Other _____ (Describe)
☐ Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499
☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

____/____/18 ____/____/18
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Healthcare

FAIR MARKET VALUE

- ☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000 ☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000
☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 ☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

- ☒ Stock ☐ Other _____ (Describe)
☐ Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499
☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

____/____/18 ____/____/18
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Broadcom Inc

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Technology

FAIR MARKET VALUE

- ☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000 ☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000
☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 ☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

- ☒ Stock ☐ Other _____ (Describe)
☐ Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499
☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

____/____/18 ____/____/18
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Altaba Inc

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Financial Services

FAIR MARKET VALUE

- ☒ \$2,000 - \$10,000 ☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000
☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 ☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

- ☒ Stock ☐ Other _____ (Describe)
☐ Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499
☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

____/____/18 ____/____/18
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

Comments: _____

SCHEDULE A-1**Investments****Stocks, Bonds, and Other Interests**

(Ownership Interest is Less Than 10%)

*Investments must be itemized.**Do not attach brokerage or financial statements.***CALIFORNIA FORM 700**

FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Name

Eaken, Amanda

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Yum! Brands Inc

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Consumer Cyclical

FAIR MARKET VALUE

☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☒ Stock☐ Other

(Describe)

☐ Partnership☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

 / / 18
ACQUIRED / / 18
DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Coca Cola

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Consumer Staples

FAIR MARKET VALUE

☒ \$2,000 - \$10,000☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☒ Stock☐ Other

(Describe)

☐ Partnership☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

 / / 18
ACQUIRED / / 18
DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

VF Corp

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Consumer Cyclical

FAIR MARKET VALUE

☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☒ Stock☐ Other

(Describe)

☐ Partnership☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

 / / 18
ACQUIRED / / 18
DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Costco Wholesale Corp

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Consumer Staples

FAIR MARKET VALUE

☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☒ Stock☐ Other

(Describe)

☐ Partnership☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

 / / 18
ACQUIRED / / 18
DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Colgate Palmolive

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Consumer Staples

FAIR MARKET VALUE

☒ \$2,000 - \$10,000☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☒ Stock☐ Other

(Describe)

☐ Partnership☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

 / / 18
ACQUIRED / / 18
DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Johnson & Johnson

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Healthcare

FAIR MARKET VALUE

☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☒ Stock☐ Other

(Describe)

☐ Partnership☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

 / / 18
ACQUIRED / / 18
DISPOSED

Comments: _____

SCHEDULE A-1

Investments

Stocks, Bonds, and Other Interests

(Ownership Interest is Less Than 10%)

Investments must be itemized.

Do not attach brokerage or financial statements.

CALIFORNIA FORM **700**

FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Name

Eaken, Amanda

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Cognizant Tech Solutions

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Technology

FAIR MARKET VALUE

☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☒ Stock☐ Other

(Describe)

☐ Partnership☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

 / / **18**
ACQUIRED / / **18**
DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Walt Disney Co (Holding Co) Disney Com

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Consumer Cyclical

FAIR MARKET VALUE

☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☒ Stock☐ Other

(Describe)

☐ Partnership☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

 / / **18**
ACQUIRED / / **18**
DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Illinois Tool Works

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Industrials

FAIR MARKET VALUE

☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☒ Stock☐ Other

(Describe)

☐ Partnership☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

 / / **18**
ACQUIRED / / **18**
DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Pepsico

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Consumer Staples

FAIR MARKET VALUE

☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☒ Stock☐ Other

(Describe)

☐ Partnership☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

 / / **18**
ACQUIRED / / **18**
DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

CVS Health Corp

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Healthcare

FAIR MARKET VALUE

☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☒ Stock☐ Other

(Describe)

☐ Partnership☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

 / / **18**
ACQUIRED / / **18**
DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Alphabet Inc, Class A

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Technology

FAIR MARKET VALUE

☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☒ Stock☐ Other

(Describe)

☐ Partnership☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

 / / **18**
ACQUIRED / / **18**
DISPOSED

Comments:

SCHEDULE A-1**Investments****Stocks, Bonds, and Other Interests**

(Ownership Interest is Less Than 10%)

*Investments must be itemized.**Do not attach brokerage or financial statements.***CALIFORNIA FORM 700**
FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Name

Eaken, Amanda

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Apple

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Technology

FAIR MARKET VALUE

☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☒ Stock☐ Other

(Describe)

☐ Partnership☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

 / / 18
ACQUIRED / / 18
DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Amgen Inc

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Healthcare

FAIR MARKET VALUE

☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☒ Stock☐ Other

(Describe)

☐ Partnership☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

 / / 18
ACQUIRED / / 18
DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Nike Inc Cl B

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Consumer Cyclical

FAIR MARKET VALUE

☒ \$2,000 - \$10,000☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☒ Stock☐ Other

(Describe)

☐ Partnership☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

 / / 18
ACQUIRED / / 18
DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Monster Beverage Corp New Com

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Consumer Staples

FAIR MARKET VALUE

☒ \$2,000 - \$10,000☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☒ Stock☐ Other

(Describe)

☐ Partnership☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

 / / 18
ACQUIRED / / 18
DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

FAIR MARKET VALUE

☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☐ Stock☐ Other

(Describe)

☐ Partnership☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

 / / 18
ACQUIRED / / 18
DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

FAIR MARKET VALUE

☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☐ Stock☐ Other

(Describe)

☐ Partnership☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

 / / 18
ACQUIRED / / 18
DISPOSED

Comments: _____

SCHEDULE C

Income, Loans, & Business Positions

(Other than Gifts and Travel Payments)

CALIFORNIA FORM 700

FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Name

Eaken, Amanda

1. INCOME RECEIVED

NAME OF SOURCE OF INCOME

NRDC

ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)

40 West 20th Street

New York, NY 10011

BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE

Environmental Advocacy Organization

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION

Director of Transportation and Climate

GROSS INCOME RECEIVED

☐ No Income - Business Position Only

☐ \$500 - \$1,000

☐ \$1,001 - \$10,000

☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000

☒ OVER \$100,000

CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH INCOME WAS RECEIVED

☒ Salary ☐ Spouse's or registered domestic partner's income
(For self-employed use Schedule A-2.)

☐ Partnership (Less than 10% ownership. For 10% or greater use
Schedule A-2.)

☐ Sale of _____
(Real property, car, boat, etc.)

☐ Loan repayment

☐ Commission or ☐ Rental Income, list each source of \$10,000 or more

(Describe)

☐ Other _____
(Describe)

1. INCOME RECEIVED

NAME OF SOURCE OF INCOME

EHDD

ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)

500 Treat Ave, #201

San Francisco, CA 94110

BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE

Architectural Services

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION

GROSS INCOME RECEIVED

☐ No Income - Business Position Only

☐ \$500 - \$1,000

☐ \$1,001 - \$10,000

☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000

☒ OVER \$100,000

CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH INCOME WAS RECEIVED

☐ Salary ☒ Spouse's or registered domestic partner's income
(For self-employed use Schedule A-2.)

☐ Partnership (Less than 10% ownership. For 10% or greater use
Schedule A-2.)

☐ Sale of _____
(Real property, car, boat, etc.)

☐ Loan repayment

☐ Commission or ☐ Rental Income, list each source of \$10,000 or more

(Describe)

☐ Other _____
(Describe)

2. LOANS RECEIVED OR OUTSTANDING DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD

* You are not required to report loans from a commercial lending institution, or any indebtedness created as part of a retail installment or credit card transaction, made in the lender's regular course of business on terms available to members of the public without regard to your official status. Personal loans and loans received not in a lender's regular course of business must be disclosed as follows:

NAME OF LENDER*

ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)

BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF LENDER

HIGHEST BALANCE DURING REPORTING PERIOD

☐ \$500 - \$1,000

☐ \$1,001 - \$10,000

☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000

☐ OVER \$100,000

INTEREST RATE

TERM (Months/Years)

 _____% ☐ None

SECURITY FOR LOAN

☐ None

☐ Personal residence

☐ Real Property

Street address

City

☐ Guarantor

☐ Other

(Describe)

Comments:

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2019 APR -8 PM 2:46

BY AK

Resolution in Support of a Fair and Equitable Contract for City and County of San Francisco Employees

Sponsors: F. Hsieh, Gallotta, Baraka, Bryant, Chan, DeJesus, Groth, Gupta, LaCroix, Mahogany

WHEREAS, the middle class is the backbone of any healthy economy, providing a stable tax base that sustains strong budgets, but in San Francisco, the middle class has shrunk from 52% of households to just 45% since 2010, making the City and County of San Francisco the international symbol of "hyper-gentrification" with one of the highest levels of income inequality in the United States; and

WHEREAS, the City and County of San Francisco's accrued budget surplus has swelled to over \$5 billion since 2005 and its annual investment in its workers has shrunk from 44% to just 41% of its annual budget, and since 2012, the City and County of San Francisco has more than tripled its annual spending on outsourcing of public services to private firms who often pay their workers less; and

WHEREAS, the City's middle class workforce is almost two-thirds women and people of color and provides a range of critical services for those who live in or visit San Francisco, all while struggling to live in one of the most expensive cities in the world, (the US Department of Housing and Urban Development defines "low-income" for a family of four in San Francisco at \$117,400 per year); now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the San Francisco Democratic Central Committee stands with the public employee unions of the City and County of San Francisco and call upon the Department of Human Resources (DHR) to negotiate a fair and equitable contract with the 30 public sector unions currently in negotiations; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the San Francisco Democratic Party calls upon the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to reduce inequality and displacement by negotiating a wage proposal that will help City employees live and thrive in the City they serve.

Please see enclosed, a resolution passed by the San Francisco Democratic Party regarding the contract negotiations between City employees and the City and County of San Francisco. Thank you.

Date / Time: 2019-04-10 09:33:22.92

Service Request Number: 10710520

Request for City Services

CUSTOMER CONTACT
INFORMATION:

Name: Gerrie Scott
Phone: 415-336-0386
Address:
Email:

DEPARTMENTS:

Department: * Public Works (DPW)
Sub-Division: * Bureau of Street Use and Mapping (BSM)

Department Service Levels:

If the request is regarding No Parking/Stopping construction zone permit violations, the City's goal is to inspect within 3 business days; all other requests will be responded to in 7-21 days.

PROPERTY ADDRESS:

Point of Interest:
Street Number: 59
Street Name: GILBERT ST
Street Name 2:
City: SAN FRANCISCO
ZIP Code: 94103
X coordinate:
Y coordinate:
Latitude:
Longitude:
CNN:
Unverified Address: ☐

ADDITIONAL LOCATION INFORMATION:

Location Description: BSM wants to rename Gilbert St. to Jeff Adachi Way between Bryant and Brannan.
(e.g. 600-block of Market St. or in front of Main Library entrance)

REQUEST DETAILS:

Nature of Request: * Customer Callback

ADDITIONAL REQUEST DETAILS:

Additional Request Details: * Please don't change the name of the street after a man who was a drug addict and cheated on his wife. If the City wants to honor this man, put a bench with a bronze plaque for him in City Hall or the Attorney's Office. We have a petition to submit. We don't want his name on our street because he isn't a role model. Please call back before the meeting next week! Matt Haney's office is trying to change the name of our street to Jeff Adachi Way.

Provided recap of SR to caller?: * Yes

BACK OFFICE USE
ONLY

Source Agency
Request Number:
Responsible Agency
Request Number:

I am a resident of Cresta Vista Drive. I am writing today to request the elimination of street cleaning on my street. Below are some of the reasons for the request.

- This is a short street on Mount Davidson's with other streets surrounding it, DO NOT have street cleaning. This is the ONLY street which has street cleaning.
- The residents on this street keep their street clean. They take pride in the homes and keep all trash off the street.
- The cleaning truck blows away a few dried leaves on the pavement from the edge of the street, as there is nothing to remove.
- There are NO shops or public transport on Cresta Vista Drive, which would create trash on this street.
- This is a total waste of City Resources, and would be best used for streets where there is a need.

Please look at the map for the streets surrounding CRESTA VISTA DRIVE which do not have street cleaning. Why Cresta Vista Drive, was selected to have street sweeping is unclear to the residents.

Based on the reasons above, along with other residents I am submitting this request to ELIMINATE STREET CLEANING ON CRESTA VISTA DRIVE.

Please honor the request. And I would appreciate a response to your actions in this matter.

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2019 APR 12 PM 2:49
AK

Please sign your name and write the address, to this petition for the elimination of street cleaning.

Salat Jabbar
Abdul Jabbar
221 Cresta Vista Drive

I am a resident of Cresta Vista Drive. I am writing today to request the elimination of street cleaning on my street. Below are some of the reasons for the request.

- This is a short street on Mount Davidson's with other streets surrounding it, DO NOT have street cleaning. This is the ONLY street which has street cleaning.
- The residents on this street keep their street clean. They take pride in the homes and keep all trash off the street.
- The cleaning truck blows away a few dried leaves on the pavement from the edge of the street, as there is nothing to remove.
- There are NO shops or public transport on Cresta Vista Drive, which would create trash on this street.
- This is a total waste of City Resources, and would be best used for streets where there is a need.

Please look at the map for the streets surrounding CRESTA VISTA DRIVE which do not have street cleaning. Why Cresta Vista Drive, was selected to have street sweeping is unclear to the residents.

Based on the reasons above, along with other residents I am submitting this request to ELIMINATE STREET CLEANING ON CRESTA VISTA DRIVE.

Please honor the request. And I would appreciate a response to your actions in this matter.

2019 APR 12 PM 2:43
AK
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

Please sign your name and write the address, to this petition for the elimination of street cleaning.

Timothy Lee
205 Cresta Vista Dr

I am a resident of Cresta Vista Drive. I am writing today to request the elimination of street cleaning on my street. Below are some of the reasons for the request.

- This is a short street on Mount Davidson's with other streets surrounding it, DO NOT have street cleaning. This is the ONLY street which has street cleaning.
- The residents on this street keep their street clean. They take pride in the homes and keep all trash off the street.
- The cleaning truck blows away a few dried leaves on the pavement from the edge of the street, as there is nothing to remove.
- There are NO shops or public transport on Cresta Vista Drive, which would create trash on this street.
- This is a total waste of City Resources, and would be best used for streets where there is a need.

Please look at the map for the streets surrounding CRESTA VISTA DRIVE which do not have street cleaning. Why Cresta Vista Drive, was selected to have street sweeping is unclear to the residents.

Based on the reasons above, along with other residents I am submitting this request to ELIMINATE STREET CLEANING ON CRESTA VISTA DRIVE.

Please honor the request. And I would appreciate a response to your actions in this matter.

Julia T. Dirk Kessler
215 CRESTA VISTA DRIVE
SF CA 94127

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
20 APR 12 PM 2:49
R

Please sign your name and write the address, to this petition for the elimination of street cleaning.

I am a resident of Cresta Vista Drive. I am writing today to request the elimination of street cleaning on my street. Below are some of the reasons for the request.

- This is a short street on Mount Davidson's with other streets surrounding it, DO NOT have street cleaning. This is the ONLY street which has street cleaning.
- The residents on this street keep their street clean. They take pride in the homes and keep all trash off the street.
- The cleaning truck blows away a few dried leaves on the pavement from the edge of the street, as there is nothing to remove.
- There are NO shops or public transport on Cresta Vista Drive, which would create trash on this street.
- This is a total waste of City Resources, and would be best used for streets where there is a need.

Please look at the map for the streets surrounding CRESTA VISTA DRIVE which do not have street cleaning. Why Cresta Vista Drive, was selected to have street sweeping is unclear to the residents.

Based on the reasons above, along with other residents I am submitting this request to ELIMINATE STREET CLEANING ON CRESTA VISTA DRIVE.

Please honor the request. And I would appreciate a response to your actions in this matter.


 175 Cresta Vista Dr.
 San Francisco, CA 94127

RECEIVED
 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
 SAN FRANCISCO
 19 APR 12 PM 2:49
 AK

Please sign your name and write the address, to this petition for the elimination of street cleaning.

305-11



Capital Planning Committee

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2019 APR 10 PM 4:01

Naomi M. Kelly, City Administrator, Chair

BY *SKB*

MEMORANDUM

April 8, 2019

To: Members of the Board of Supervisors
From: Naomi Kelly, City Administrator and Capital Planning Committee Chair
Copy: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Capital Planning Committee
Regarding: (1) San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Revenue Bonds (2) Hall of Justice Exit Projects – Site Acquisition

Naomi Kelly

In accordance with Section 3.21 of the Administrative Code, on April 8, 2019, the Capital Planning Committee (CPC) approved the following action item to be considered by the Board of Supervisors. The CPC's recommendations are set forth below.

1. Board File Number: TBD

Approval of the amending ordinance to increase the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission authorization for water revenue bonds to an amount not to exceed \$514 million.

Approval of the amending appropriation ordinance to increase the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission authorization for power revenue bonds to an amount not to exceed \$200 million.

Approval of the supplemental appropriation ordinance for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission water enterprise in an amount not to exceed \$26.1 million.

Approval of the supplemental appropriation for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Hetch Hetchy Enterprise in an amount not to exceed \$28.0 million.

Recommendation:

Recommend the Board of Supervisors approve these amending ordinances and supplemental appropriations.

Comments:

The CPC recommends approval of this item by a vote of 10-0.

Committee members or representatives in favor include: Naomi Kelly, City Administrator; Marisa Pereira Tully, Mayor's Budget Office; Anna Van Degna, Controller's Office; Mohammed Nuru, Director, Public Works; Kaitlyn Connors, San Francisco International Airport; Toks Ajike, Recreation and Parks; Ed Reiskin, Director, SFMTA; Elaine Forbes, Executive Director, Port of San Francisco; John Rahaim, Director, Planning

Department; and Kathy How, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission.

2. Board File Number: TBD

Approval of the resolution authorizing Certificates of Participation (Hall Of Justice Exit Projects – Site Acquisition) in an amount not to exceed \$16 million and related supplemental appropriation.

Recommendation:

Recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the resolution and related supplemental appropriation.

Comments:

The CPC recommends approval of this item by a vote of 10-0.

Committee members or representatives in favor include: Naomi Kelly, City Administrator; Marisa Pereira Tully, Mayor's Budget Office; Anna Van Degna, Controller's Office; Mohammed Nuru, Director, Public Works; Kaitlyn Connors, San Francisco International Airport; Toks Ajike, Recreation and Parks; Ed Reiskin, Director, SFMTA; Elaine Forbes, Executive Director, Port of San Francisco; John Rahaim, Director, Planning Department; and Kathy How, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission.