

File No: 190462

Petitions and Communications received from April 22, 2019, through April 29, 2019, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on May 7, 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 appointments: Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

Dave Wasserman - Residential Rent and Stabilization Board - term ending August 1, 2022

From the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, submitting their 3rd Quarter FY2018-2019 Reporting on Prioritization on 100% Affordable Housing Project. Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

The Office of Contract Administration, submitting the annual reminder of Final Dates for Receipt of Requisitions for FY2018-2019. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From the Department of Public Health, Shelter Monitoring Committee, pursuant to Ordinance No. 283-04, submitting their 2nd Quarter Report for FY2018-2019. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From the Recreation and Parks Department, pursuant to Resolution No. 157-99, submitting their 3rd Quarter Report for FY2018-2019 on Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From the State of California Fish and Game Commission, submitting notice of proposed regulatory action relating to use of traps to take hagfish. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From the State of California Fish and Game Commission, submitting their Notice of Receipt of Petition to list San Bernardino kangaroo rat as endangered. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From concerned citizens, regarding California State Assembly Bill No. 362 (Eggman, Wiener, Friedman). 2 letters. File No. 190221. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From concerned citizens, regarding protected bike lanes. 2 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From concerned citizens, regarding the proposed Navigation Center. 8 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From concerned citizens, regarding the "Stop Secret Surveillance" ordinance. 34 letters. File No. 190110. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From Allan Jones, submitting a letter of apology. Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From concerned citizens, regarding the issues at SFMTA. 2 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (13)

From Daniela Ponce, regarding Edna, the Station 49 Firehouse cat. Copy: Each Supervisor. (14)

From Jean Perata, regarding Senate Bill No. 50 (Weiner). File No. 190319. Copy: Each Supervisor. (15)

From Nina Bogdan, regarding Arnautoff murals at George Washington High School. Copy: Each Supervisor. (16)

From: [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Nevin, Peggy \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [Karunaratne, Kanishka \(MYR\)](#); [GIVNER, JON \(CAT\)](#)
Subject: TIME SENSITIVE: Mayoral Appointments, Charter 3.100(18)
Date: Wednesday, April 24, 2019 6:02:00 PM
Attachments: [Clerk's Memo 4-24-2019.pdf](#)
[Mayor's Appt. Memo.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 24, 2019
To: Members, Board of Supervisors
From: *mc* Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Subject: Mayoral Appointment

On April 24, 2019, the Mayor submitted the following complete appointment package, pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(18):

- Dave Wasserman - Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board - term ending August 1, 2022

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. on Wednesday, May 1, 2019.**

(Attachments)

c: Alisa Somera - 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 22, 2019

Received 4/23/2019
@ 1:15pm
eu

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

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

Dave Wasserman to the landlord voting seat on the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board, for the term ending August 1, 2022, in the seat formerly held by Calvin Abe.

I am confident that Mr. Wasserman 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

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

London N. Breed
Mayor

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Quarterly Report for File 180547
Date: Monday, April 29, 2019 9:55:00 AM
Attachments: [Q3 FY19 MOHCD 100 Percent AH Report Memo and Exhibit.pdf](#)

From: Chan, Amy (MYR)
Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2019 10:07 AM
To: Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>
Cc: Kittler, Sophia (MYR) <sophia.kittler@sfgov.org>; Beinart, Amy (BOS) <amy.beinart@sfgov.org>
Subject: Quarterly Report for File 180547

Hi,

Please find attached quarterly report on prioritizing 100% affordable housing projects as required by File 180547.

This report covers the period from January through March 2019.

Thanks,
Amy

Amy Chan
Director of Policy and Legislative Affairs
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
1 South Van Ness, 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
tel: [415.701.5508](tel:415.701.5508) fax: [415.701.5501](tel:415.701.5501)
amy.chan@sfgov.org

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
City and County of San Francisco



London N. Breed
Mayor

Kate Hartley
Director

April 10, 2019

To: Mayor London Breed; Board of Supervisors
From: Kate Hartley, Director
Cc: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Re: Q3 FY18-19 Reporting on Prioritization of 100% Affordable Housing Projects (File #180547)

Enclosed please find the third quarterly report on MOHCD's 100% Affordable Housing Projects, as required by City Ordinance, covering the period from January 1, 2019 to March 30, 2019. This report is also submitted as part of OEWD's Executive Directive 17-02 report on all City sponsored housing developments.

Please see attached for further details.

Department Reports:

Project Address & Building Permit No.	# of Units	Target Milestones (Red Bold for Urgent)	Key Milestones/ Deliverables this Quarter	Key Milestones for Next Quarter	Q3 Status: Milestones + Deliverables					
					Department of Building Inspection (DBI)	San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD)	Mayor's Office on Disability (MOD)	Planning Department (Planning)	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC)	Public Works (PW)
95 Laguna Street - 201507060668	79	TCO by 3/31/2019	98% construction complete.	Final Inspections. TCO. Opening and move -ins.	Final Inspections	Final Inspections	Final Inspections not called for at all common areas and 5th floor units; punch-list items from pre-final inspections of mobility units are still pending.	None	Final Inspections	Final Inspections
1101 Connecticut Street - Potrero Block X - 201603172392 (HOPE SF)	72	Full TCO by 4/10/19. The main building inspector amended TCO to include dwelling units on 3/14/19. Project completion per schedule is 8/1/2019 due to sunshades which will not impact tenant move-in.	99% construction complete. Full TCO (common area TCO issued 12/26/18) and move- in. TCO included dwelling units occurred on 3/14/19.	Final Inspections. Full TCO expected by 4/10/19 as backpunch will be done by 4/5/19. Final Certificate of Occupancy expected 8/1/19 due to sunshades.	Final MOD Inspections. TCO granted on 12/26/18 by DBI for corridors, common areas and public areas.	Final Inspections and testing	Final inspections and continued support resolving matrix items. Resolution from inspections expected by 4/1/19. MOD issued updated matrix on 3/22/19 to project team which included 10 units that need countertops cut down.	None	Bridge to confirm SFPUC Water retention plan is complete.	Infrastructure - PW has required Cahill to repave a portion of 25th and Connecticut three times as there was an unforeseen condition (missing water line and non- compliant gas line).
222 Taylor (aka 210 Taylor) 20160217982 2	113	TCO by 4/23/19	90% construction complete.	Water Domestic and Fire Service connections were completed in early March 2019. PG&E final connections to start 4/1/19 and will take 3 weeks. Given TCO is 4/23/19, PG&E will try to start work before 4/1/19 if schedule allows.	None	None	Inspections requested and on schedule for TCO acceptance.	None	Close coordination with PG&E required to closeout final electrical connection work.	Street Improvement Permit obtained. Street and sidewalk improvements on- going.
455 Fell Street - 201605066751	108	TCO by 7/22/19	65% construction complete.	Finish work and final inspections.	Ok to cover in units. Home daycare revision permit approval.	Final Inspections.	All units (except #208) are ok to cover. Re- designing and re- building 5th floor means of egress.	None	Final Inspections.	Final Inspections
1491 Sunnysdale Avenue - Parcel Q - 201612225710	55	TCO by 10/4/19	61.91% construction complete	Green tag from PG&E, ok to cover in all units, transformer install	Ok to cover in some units	None	Ok to cover in some units	None	None	None

Department Reports:

Project Address & Building Permit No.	# of Units	Target Milestones (Red Bold for Urgent)	Key Milestones/ Deliverables this Quarter	Key Milestones for Next Quarter	Q3 Status: Milestones + Deliverables					
					Department of Building Inspection (DBI)	San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD)	Mayor's Office on Disability (MOD)	Planning Department (Planning)	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC)	Public Works (PW)
1296 Shotwell Site Permit: 201810254116	94	TCO by 11/13/19	32.48% construction complete.	Pour columns and walls, level 9 on 4/1/9. Roof Slab and deck to be completed by 4/24/19. Install level 5-7 Windows by 5/20/19. Level 6-9 framing complete by 6/3/19. Level 6-9 MEPS rough in by 6/12/19. Level 3 finishes complete by 7/12. SS & SD lines installed by 6/29/19.	Revised plans were approved by Sagiv SFFD on 1/14/19. CPB 1/18/19 approved Fire Sprinkler approved 1/11/19.	Site Permit approved on 1/14/19 - Fire Sprinkler and Alarm permits received on 1/23/19.	Pre-construction meeting on 1/9/19. Rough in inspections ongoing. Request team for major milestones.	None	SFPUC confirmed they are on track for green tag in July 2019. PGE here as there is no column: PGE confirmed on 1/16/19 meeting with PGE,PUC and team that current mat slab design and planned gas routing is acceptable. Water Service: CCDC submitted main water service extension.	None

Department Reports:

Project Address & Building Permit No.	# of Units	Target Milestones (Red Bold for Urgent)	Key Milestones/ Deliverables this Quarter	Key Milestones for Next Quarter	Q3 Status: Milestones + Deliverables					
					Department of Building Inspection (DBI)	San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD)	Mayor's Office on Disability (MOD)	Planning Department (Planning)	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC)	Public Works (PW)
490 S. Van Ness Site Permit: 201710110918 - issued	82	TCO by 04/15/2020	1) Addenda 2 permit (sponsor to respond to comments.) 2. Temp Power contract by 2/15/19 (PG&E)	Complete temp power installation. Complete tower crane erection and begin structural work. Finalize addenda 2 approval.	1) Addenda 2 approved by MOD 02/22/19 , Failed re-check by DBI due to Horizontal Exiting issue under 2010 CBC. Architect amending plans and trying to confer with MOD on emergency elevator requirements. Resubmit some drawings to MOD for approval and then return to DBI. We expect Addenda 2 approval early April 2019.	1) Waiting for submittal of remaining addendums. - Architectural MEP plans in hold on 03/03/2018_ No sprinkler plans submitted_ No Fire Alarm submitted	1) Addenda 2 approved on 02/22/19. Awaiting revisions reqd. per DBI exiting issue.	1) Awaiting architectural addenda (not yet routed to Planning as of 12.14.18).	1) Waiting for submittal of remaining addendums. 2) Permanent Power application pending.	1) Addenda 2 (Arch/MEP) ready to be signed off on 10/10/18; awaiting re-route. PW permits review ongoing; awaiting applicant. Updates to addenda 2 for MOD and DBI req'd per exiting issue. Currently IP. See MOD notes.
1950 Mission: Site Permit: 201609218371 - issued	157	TCO by 08/20/2020	1) Temp Power Contract (PG&E). 2) Addenda 2 permit (all).	Complete temp power installation. Complete tower crane erection and begin structural work.	2) Approval of the deferred submittals - sprinklers, Fire Alarm Systems, metal stairs, Exterior Bldg Mtc., Solar Hot Water.	Fire Sprinkler, Fire Alarm Systems, Elevator Landing and Two Way Comms have not received yet	3) Addenda 2: approved on 4/25/2018; revisions to approved set approved on 12/7/2018.	2) Reviewing architectural addenda (routed to Planning as of 12.18.18).	3) Need perm power design. Stormwater Addendum approved 01/16/19	None
2060 Folsom Site Permit: 201608054294 - issued SCP Permit: 201901291507 - approved	127	TCO by 10/27/20	1) Temp Power Contract (PG&E). 2) Addenda 2 permit (sponsor to respond to comments.) 3) perm power and gas contracts (PG&E)	1) Design-build permits (Generator, Fire Alarm, Fire Sprinkler)	1) Addenda 1 permit issued 12/28/18. Add. 2 on hold pending comments.	1) Waiting for resubmit of Arch/MEP plans after having met w/ plan checker and initial submittal of design-builds. Fire sprinkler and Fire Alarm have not received yet	1) Addenda 2: comments issued on 1/11/2019; OTC review on 3/13/19 to confirm responses to comments; awaiting resubmittal incorporating outstanding comments.	1) Awaiting addenda 2 (not yet routed to Planning as of 1.28.19).	NA for addenda 1 & 2	2) Addenda 2 on hold pending FD
1990 Folsom Site Permit: 201707051030 - issued SCP: 201811024919 - issued Demo: 201807164652 - issued	143	TCO by 12/11/20	1) Temp Power Contract (PG&E). 2) Demo permit. 3) Addenda 2 permit	1) perm power contact (PG&E)	1) Architect preparing response to Addenda 2 comments	1) Architect /MEP in hold on 01/28/2019 by Harshman.	1) Addenda 2 comments issued on 12/14/18; Awaiting response from Architect.	1) Architectural Addenda not yet routed to Planning as of 1.28.19, but arch in touch on minor revisions to ext.	1) Waiting for routing of addendum 2. 2) Permanent Power application pending.	1) Waiting for routing of addendum 2

Department Reports:

Project Address & Building Permit No.	# of Units	Target Milestones (Red Bold for Urgent)	Key Milestones/ Deliverables this Quarter	Key Milestones for Next Quarter	Q3 Status: Milestones + Deliverables					
					Department of Building Inspection (DBI)	San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD)	Mayor's Office on Disability (MOD)	Planning Department (Planning)	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC)	Public Works (PW)
Post Entitlement: Pre-construction										
88 Broadway (SF Port) Site Permit: 201711154095	125	1) Construction Start Anticipated 5/3/19.	1) Addenda 1 & 2 has been reviewed and ready for SFDBI's Letter of Recommendation for Approval for SF Port, who will subsequently need to review and approve. 2) Temp Power Contract (PG&E). 3) Sidewalk Legislation (DPW)	Addenda 1 & 2 need to be approved by 4/24/19. Letter from Port required upon receipt of DBI plan check approval letter (pending)	1) Addenda 3,4 & 5 submitted. 2) Addendum 3 - "In Hold" for BLDG. 3) Addendum 4 - "In Hold" for BLDG, MECH & MECH-E.	1) Addendum 4 (Arch/ Mep) In Hold, SFFD Comments sent to the developer.	1) Addendum 4 (Arch-MEP) comments issued on 3/10/19; awaiting response from architect.	None	None	1) Addendum 3 & 4 - "In Hold" for BSM.
735 Davis Site Permit: 201711154101	53	1) Construction Start Anticipated 5/3/19.	1) Addendum 1 ready for issuance. Addendum 2 needs structural pile clarification for its issuance and was recently provided. Addendum 2 is expected to be ready for issuance before 4/24/19 deadline. 2) Temp Power Contract (PG&E). 3) Sidewalk Legislation (DPW)	Addenda 1 & 2 need to be approved by 4/24/19.	1) Addenda 3,4 & 5 submitted. 2) Addendum 3 - "In Hold" for BLDG. 3) Addendum 4 - "In Hold" for MECH and MECH-E.	Addendum 4 (Arch/ Mep) In Hold, SFFD Comments sent to the developer.	1) Addendum 4 (Arch-MEP) comments issued on 3/10/19; awaiting response from architect.	None	None	1) Addendum 3 - "Finished" - Need to double-check note indicating "N/A = SF Port Jurisdiction".
Sunnydale Parcel 6 Site Permit: 201806202372 - Issued	167	1) Construction Start Anticipated 9/2/2019	Site permit issued, Addenda 1 and 2 submitted	1) Addenda 1 approved. 2) Submit to MOD	1) Awaiting addenda 1	1) Awaiting addenda 1	Pre-app meeting held on 3/1/19; awaiting addenda 2	None	1) Awaiting addenda 1	1) Awaiting addenda 1
681 Florida (previously dba 2070 Bryant) Site Permit: 201802211851 - issued	130	1) Construction Start Anticipated 12/15/19.	1) Addenda 1 permit by 6/1/19 (all). Currently undergoing geotechnical peer review requested by DBI	Fully bid project.	1) Waiting for submittal of remaining addendums.	1) Arch/ MEP plans have been received on 3/12/19	1) Intake plans on 1/22/2019; comments to be issued on 3/20/19	1) Waiting for submittal of remaining addendums.	1) Waiting for submittal of remaining addendums. 2) Permanent and Temp Power application pending.	1) Waiting for addendum from mech (finished 02/07/19). Ongoing review of PW permits.
500 Turk Site Permit: 201712156628 - issued	122	1) Construction Start Anticipated 12/15/19.	1) Addenda 1 permit by 9/1/19 (all)	Design team completed 35% CDs dated 2/22/2019, (received 3/14/19), which includes MEPS. 100% DDs completed in Nov. 2019.	1) Waiting for submittal of remaining addendums.	1) Waiting for submittal of remaining addendums.	1) Intake plans on 3/1/19. In review.	1) Waiting for submittal of remaining addendums. MOHCD asked for \$400k in planning fees on 10/10. JM went to loan committee on 10/19 to ask for more funds. Planning requires a light brick façade in lieu of dark façade.	1) Waiting for submittal of remaining addendums.	1) Waiting for submittal of remaining addendums. Ongoing review of PW permits.
Maceo May Apartments (Treasure Island C3.2) Site Permit Application: 2018-10-22-3762S	104	1) Construction Start Anticipated January 2020	1) Site Permit issuance. 2) Courtesy Review for MOD complete	1) Courtesy review for DBI complete. 2) Submit for State permit of modular units	1) Site Permit Approved. 2) Round 1 Courtesy Review comments issued, awaiting Architects response	1) Site Permit Approved. 2) Arch Plans have not received yet.	1) Cursory comments issued on 2/20/19; awaiting Architects response	1) Site Permit pending approval	1) Site Permit Approved	1) Site Permit Approved

[illegible]

Department Reports:

Project Address & Building Permit No.	# of Units	Target Milestones (Red Bold for Urgent)	Key Milestones/ Deliverables this Quarter	Key Milestones for Next Quarter	Q3 Status: Milestones + Deliverables					
					Department of Building Inspection (DBI)	San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD)	Mayor's Office on Disability (MOD)	Planning Department (Planning)	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC)	Public Works (PW)
Pre-Entitlement:										
1064-8 Mission Street (Permanent Supportive Housing & Homeless Service Center): - Planning Case #2018-010889PRJ - Building Permit #201810233860 - Map Project ID #9847	256	1) Site Permit by March 30, 2019. 2) Construction Start Anticipated January 2020.	1) Site permit by 3/30/19 (all). Permit Processing Center next stop. 2) New Map approval by 11/1/19 (DPW.)	1) Site permit by 3/30/19	Site Permit "Finish" - 3/7/19	Site Permit "Finish" - 2/19/19	1)Reviewing site permit at meeting on 11/9/2018; page-turn meeting on 12/12/2018. 2) Cursory review comments received 1/9/19.	1) Site Permit approved (11.8.18); NSR can be recorded later following transfer of property. Issued Notice of Final Approval (11.7.18) and hold letter for CEQA (11.27.18 - EEA to be withdrawn on 1/2/19);	Site Permit "Finish" - 3/8/19	Site Permit "Finish" - 1/31/19
1351 42nd Ave (Francis Scott Key Annex, dba 43rd & Judah) - Planning Case #2018-015768PRJ - Building Permit #	130	1) Land Use Approvals Complete by 9/15/20, 2) Construction Start Anticipated 2021	1) Submit Environmental Application (done 3/13/19)	None	None	None	None	EIR Application submitted 3/15/19	None	None
4840 Mission, Planning Case #: 2019-004001PRJ Bldg Permit No. 201903195605	136	Submit Application by 3/30/19	1) Submit Environmental Application (done 3/20/19) 2) Held interagency coordination meeting on 03/05/19 prior to Site Permit submittal	None	Review Site Permit	Review Site Permit	Review Site Permit	EA Submitted 3/20/19	Review Site Permit	Review Site Permit

From: [Leslie, Jessica \(ADM\)](#)
Subject: Memo to Departments Regarding IT Requisition Deadlines
Date: Tuesday, April 23, 2019 11:09:23 AM
Attachments: [Preparing Purchasing Documents for FY 18-19.pdf](#)

Hello Departments-

To meet the Controller's 5/30/2019 deadline for issuing Purchase Orders, OCA set the deadline for submitting IT requisitions to 4/15/2019. Of the 266 requisitions currently pending at OCA, 93 missed this deadline. To the extent OCA can process requests that missed the 4/15/19 deadline before the Controller's deadline, we will do so. However, please be advised that all requests submitted as of Friday 4/26/19 or later will be AUTOMATICALLY rejected and no exceptions can be made.

As a reminder, OCA is now bidding out all requests over \$25,000 on behalf of departments to ensure a more equitable distribution of purchase orders between our resellers. We must also obtain certain terms and conditions information from resellers not previously required. The combined result of these changes is that processing purchase requests now requires significantly more time than previously.

We thank you in advance for your understanding.

Thank you,

Jessica Leslie
Administrative Analyst
Office of Contract Administration
(415) 554-7799 (Direct)
*Schedule – Off every other Friday eff. 3/29/19



London N. Breed
Mayor

Alaric Degrafinried
Purchaser/Director

Date: February 1, 2019

To: All Departments

From: Alaric Degrafinried, Purchaser and Director of the Office of Contract Administration

Subject: Final Dates for Receipt of Requisitions for FY 18-19

This is the annual reminder to departments regarding the schedule of submission for requisitions and contracts in PeopleSoft and any supporting documentation to the Office of Contract Administration - Purchasing (OCA) for this fiscal year. Barring any unforeseen circumstances, if you meet the deadlines outlined below, your request will be fulfilled before the end of the fiscal year. Nevertheless, as always, OCA will make best efforts to process all requisitions submitted after the Submission dates within the current fiscal year.

Commodity/Document Type	Submission to Central Shops by:	Submission to OCA by:
Vehicles & Equipment – <i>Not on a City Contract</i>	02/15/2019	03/01/2019
Vehicles & Equipment – <i>On a City Contract</i>	03/01/2019	03/15/2019
Non-IT Requisitions (other than Vehicles & Equipment referenced above)	N/A	03/15/2019
IT Requisitions	N/A	04/15/2019
Departmental Contracts	N/A	06/01/2019

Finally, with the exception of emergencies, the hard cut-off for new requisitions will be June 15, 2019. Any new requisition submitted after June 15th may be returned back to your department for re-submission in PeopleSoft for FY 19-20 processing.

If you have any questions, please consult with your regular Purchasing contact or call OCA's main office number for further assistance (415-554-6743).

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Shelter Monitoring Committee Quarterly Report - 2nd Quarter FY18-19
Date: Tuesday, April 23, 2019 12:39:00 PM
Attachments: [SMC 2nd Quarter Report FY18-19.pdf](#)

From: Chen, Howard (DPH) <howard.c.chen@sfdph.org>
Sent: Thursday, April 4, 2019 1:50 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Young, Victor (BOS) <victor.young@sfgov.org>; Murdock, Craig (DPH) <craig.murdock@sfdph.org>
Subject: Shelter Monitoring Committee Quarterly Report - 2nd Quarter FY18-19

Good afternoon all,

Pursuant to Ordinance 283-04 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, the Shelter Monitoring Committee would like to submit their 2nd Quarter Report for FY18-19 (reporting period from Oct. 1, 2018 - Dec. 31, 2018) for consideration by the Board of Supervisors.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Howard Chen, MPA

Policy Analyst

Shelter Monitoring Committee

San Francisco Department of Public Health

1380 Howard St.

San Francisco, CA 94103

(415) 255-3653

Confidentiality Notice: The documents accompanying this electronic transmission, or the transmission itself, may contain Confidential or Protected Health Information. This information

belongs to the sender and is legally privileged. The information is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you not disclose, copy, distribute or take action on the information in this/these document(s). All such activities are strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail or electronic copy in error, delete this e-mail immediately and empty your deleted items folder and take any steps necessary to ensure permanent deletion.

SHELTER MONITORING COMMITTEE

2nd Quarter Report

October 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018



2nd Quarter Facts and Figures

SITE VISITS

Completed site visits at 14 of 20 assigned sites

Sites with 0 infractions



Mission Neighborhood Resource Center | MSC South Drop-In
| St. Joseph's

Sites with most infractions:

A Woman's Place Drop In, Bethel AME, First
Friendship (3 total infractions each)

Top 4 Site Visit Infractions

No MUNI tokens or other
transportation available



First aid kits needed to be
restocked



Insufficient phone or TTY
access




Insufficient bedding or linens



CLIENT COMPLAINTS

**44 total complaints filed by
32 unduplicated clients**

Client Complaint Categories



Status of Complaints

3 Satisfied

1 Not Satisfied

39 Closed

0 Open

INTRODUCTION

Who We Are

The Shelter Monitoring Committee (The Committee) is a governmental agency established by the Board of Supervisors to document the conditions and operations of shelters that are publicly funded. Established by Board of Supervisor's Ordinance 283-04, the Committee is composed of thirteen voluntary members drawn from a wide spectrum of stakeholders including shelter providers, formerly homeless individuals, shelter employees and representatives of DSHS, and the Mayor's office. The Committee is supported by two full-time staff from the Department of Public Health.

What We Do

The Committee is responsible for documenting the conditions of San Francisco shelters and resource centers with the aim of providing the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Local Homeless Coordinating Board, the public and other appropriate agencies with accurate, comprehensive information about the conditions and operations of shelters.

The Committee reviews San Francisco's city policies that have an impact on shelter clients or affect shelter operations to recommend changes and/or best practices in the provision of shelter service. Additionally, the Committee monitors shelters to ensure they are complying with the Standards of Care (The Standards), a set of 32 shelter operating standards adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 2008.

How We Do It

Unannounced and announced Site Visits

The Committee conducts four unannounced visits per shelter and/or resource centers (sites) per year to verify compliance with the Standards of Care. During a site visit, Committee teams note and submit Standard of Care infractions to shelter management who are given 7 days to investigate and resolve the infractions. The Committee also makes two announced site visits each year to conduct shelter surveys and provide shelter clients an opportunity to discuss shelter conditions with the Committee.

Investigation of Client complaints

The Committee investigates all Standards of Care violations in the shelters and/or resource center. Clients can submit shelter complaints to Committee staff by email, phone or in person. Committee staff submit client Complaints to shelter management, who have 7 days to investigate the allegations and respond to the client's complaint in writing. Clients not satisfied with the site's response can request an independent investigation by Committee staff. Staff investigate the client's allegations and determines if the site follows the Standards of Care. Committee staff then submit their findings the client, the site and the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing. Committee staff also submit recommendations for corrective action if the investigation determines that the site was not in compliance with the Standards of Care.

Shelter Trainings

The Committee conducts Standard of Care trainings for shelter staff which provide an overview of the Standards of Care as well as how the Committee checks the sites to see if they are in compliance with the Standards of Care through site visits and client complaints.

2nd QUARTER REPORT

I. SITE VISITS

For the quarter starting on July 1 and ending September 30, 2018, the Committee completed unannounced site visits at 14 of 20 assigned sites, 70% of the mandated total. There were four sites that did not receive a single Standard of Care infraction during this quarter's visits, those sites were Hospitality House, Mission Neighborhood Resource Center, MSC South Drop In and St. Joseph's. The infractions that were noted during visits to the other sites this quarter are listed below:

The four Standards that shelters had the most difficulty meeting this quarter were:



Standard 26 (Facility and Access)

Ensure clients receive ADA compliant transportation to attend medical, permanent housing, substance abuse treatment...etc.

4 sites: Bethel AME, Dolores St. Shelter, First Friendship, Lark Inn



Standard 6 (Health)

Ensure that first aid kits, CPR masks, disposable gloves and AEDs are available to staff at all times

3 sites: A Woman's Place Drop In, Lark Inn, First Friendship



Standard 18 (Health and Hygiene)

Provide clients with access to free local calls and TTY

3 sites: Bethel AME, Compass, MSC South



Standard 12 (Facilities and Access)

Provide clients with pillows and pillowcases




2 sites: Bethel AME, MSC South

Summaries of the site visits completed by the Committee this quarter can be found in Appendix B on (pages 3-4 of the Appendices section). The Committee also conducted 6 announced site visits to survey shelter clients. Client survey results are available in Appendix C (Pages 5-7 of the Appendices section).

II. CLIENT COMPLAINTS

The Committee received 44 Standard of Care complaints filed by 32 unduplicated clients during the reporting period. The Standards that came up in the most client complaints this quarter are listed below:

Client Complaints – Top 3 Allegedly Violated Standards

Standard of Care	Category	# of complaints alleging violations of this Standard	# of unduplicated complainants submitting complaints	# sites receiving complaints about this Standard
Standard 1: Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity, including in the application of shelter policies and grievance process	Staff 	35	22	7
Standard 2: Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe and free from physical violence; by ensuring safety protocols are in place that include training to shelter staff regarding de-escalation techniques	Staff 	11	11	6
Standard 15: Provide pest free, secure property storage inside each shelter.	Health and Hygiene 	4	4	2

Please note that each complaint can include alleged violations of more than one Standard or multiple alleged violations of the same Standard.


The table below provides a breakdown of the number of complaints received at each site during the reporting period and the status of the complaints themselves. A complaint can include allegations of non-compliance for one Standard or multiple Standards. The Standards of Care complaints fall into five status categories¹: Open, Pending, Satisfied, Not Satisfied, or Closed.

Standard of Care Complaints Tally 2nd Quarter 2018-2019

Site	Site Capacity	# of Complainants	# of Complaints filed	Status of Complaints	Investigations
A Woman's Place Drop In	63 chairs	2	2	Closed (2)	N/A
Bethel AME	30 mats	5	7	Closed (5) Satisfied (1) Not Satisfied (1)	Pending (1) Completed (3)
Mission Neighborhood Resource Center	75 chairs	1	1	Closed (1)	N/A
MSC South Drop In	70 chairs	2	2	Closed (1) Not Satisfied (1)	Pending (1)
MSC South Shelter	340 beds	7	7	Closed (7)	N/A
Next Door	334 beds	8	14	Satisfied (1) Closed (13)	Completed (2)
Sanctuary	200 beds	8	10	Closed (8) Satisfied (1) Not Satisfied (1)	Pending (1)
United Council	48 chairs	1	1	Closed (1)	N/A
Totals		34 (32 unduplicated clients)	44	Closed (38) Satisfied (3) Not Satisfied (3)	Pending (3) Completed (5)

¹ Complaint Status Categories: Open - Site has not responded to the complaint filed by the client; Satisfied – Client who filed the complaint is satisfied with the response; Not Satisfied – Client did not agree with the site response and has requested an investigation; Pending – Site had responded to the complaint and the Committee is waiting for the client to review the response; Closed – Complaint closed after 45 days of No Contact from the client or if the client was neither satisfied or not satisfied with the response

Standard of Care Complaints: Allegations by Category 2nd Quarter, 2018-2019



The *Standard of Care Complaints: Allegations by Category, 2nd Quarter 2018-2019*, provides an overview of the types of complaints that were filed with the Committee. There are four Standard of Care complaint categories:

Staff

The staff category refers to four Standards [1, 2, 25 & 31] that focus on how the client is treated at the site. This category includes complaints alleging staff being unprofessional, not maintaining a safe shelter environment or not receiving required trainings.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)

The ADA category refers to Standard 8 and the majority of complaints in this category focus on either a lack of or a denial of access through an accommodation request or a facility problem.


Health & Hygiene

This category refers to 11 Standards focusing on meals, access to toiletries, shelter cleanliness and stocked first aid kits. The 11 Standards include Standards 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 19, and 30.

Facility & Access

The sixteen Standards in this category focus on whether shelter facilities are accessible and providing clients with items and services such as property storage, bedding and transportation. The Standards that make up this area are 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 32.

Breakdown of Staff-related allegations in client complaints



Out of the four Standards of Care categories, the Staff category consistently receives the most client complaints and allegations. Chart II breaks down the Staff-related allegations in client complaints into more specific categories.

With 35 allegations this quarter, the most common allegation of staff misconduct listed in client complaints are allegations of unprofessional or disrespectful behavior or language towards shelter clients. This category contains allegations of staff speaking to clients using profanity, disrespectful language or other unprofessional behavior.

The second most common allegation of staff misconduct are allegations of staff not following City or shelter policies. The Committee received 21 allegations of this type this quarter. These allegations involve staff not providing reasonable accommodations, late passes, MUNI tokens or other shelter services to clients.






The third most common allegation of staff misconduct is related allegations of staff failing to provide a safe environment for shelter clients. These include allegations of not properly addressing instances of verbal threats or physical violence taking place inside shelters. The Committee received 15 allegations of this type during the reporting period.

The categories with the fewest allegations of staff misconduct this quarter were complaints about staff showing favoritism to clients. This quarter, the Committee received 5 allegations from clients about staff giving preferential treatment to other clients.

Client Complaint Investigations

Clients who receive unsatisfactory responses to complaints can request a Committee investigation. Committee staff completed one investigation into a complaint submitted about the Next Door shelter.

The following table provides an overview of the investigation that was conducted this quarter including findings and any recommendations for the site:

Site	Alleged Standard Violation	Category	Findings	Recommendations for Site
Bethel AME	<p>Standard 1:</p> <p>Allegation #1: Staff was rude and yelled at a client for an alleged rule violation</p> <p>Allegation #2: Staff purposely gave the client a write-up that was intentionally vague</p>	<p>Staff</p> 	Inconclusive	N/A
Bethel AME	<p>Standard 19:</p> <p>Allegation: Less than 22 inches of space between sleeping mats</p>	<p>Facility and Access</p> 	Inconclusive	N/A
Bethel AME	<p>Standard 1:</p> <p>Allegation: Staff are following shelter procedures to cleaning mats before putting them away for storage for the day</p>	<p>Staff</p> 	Inconclusive	N/A
Next Door	<p>Standard 1:</p> <p>Allegation #1: Staff were rude to the client when they confiscated the cleaning spray she was using</p> <p>Allegation #2: Staff kept the client in the shelter lobby for over two hours as a de-escalation technique</p>	<p>Staff</p> 	Inconclusive	N/A
Next Door	<p>Standard 1:</p> <p>Allegation #1: The police made her leave the shelter after a security officer falsely accused her of using racial slurs</p> <p>Allegation #2: Shelter staff told police that they wanted the client to leave the shelter for 10 minutes but actually kept her outside for several hours</p>	<p>Staff</p> 	Inconclusive	N/A

III. MEMBERSHIP

Member Charlie Morimoto stepped down from Mayor's Seat #3 during the 2nd Quarter of FY18-19. As a result, the Shelter Monitoring Committee had 8 active members and one support staff at the end of the reporting period.

The Committee has been recruiting new members for the remainder of the 2017-2018 Committee term as well as new members for the upcoming 2018-2019 Committee term beginning on January 1st, 2019.

SHELTER MONITORING COMMITTEE COMMITTEE MEMBERS | 2018-2019 Term



Mwangi Mukami, Chair



Jonathan Adler, Member



Loretta Gaines, Member



Lauren Kahn, Member



Traci Watson, Member



Gavin James, Member



Stephen Irwin, Member

Photo Unavailable: Nicholas Kimura, Policy Subcommittee Chair

APPENDICES

The Standards of Care

Standard	Category
1. Treat clients equally, with respect and dignity, including in the application of shelter policies and grievance process	STAFF
2. Provide shelter services in an environment that is safe and free of physical violence; by ensuring safety protocols are in place that include training to shelter staff regarding de-escalation techniques	STAFF
3. Provide, liquid soap with a dispenser permanently mounted on the wall in the restrooms; small individual packets of liquid soap, or small bar soap for use by one individual only, paper/hand towels, hand sanitizers, at least one bath-size (24"x48") towel to shelter clients and staff in each bathroom; if hand-dryers are currently installed they shall be maintained in proper working condition; in addition, shelters shall provide toilet paper in each bathroom stall and hire janitorial staff clean shelters on daily basis	HEALTH
4. Provide feminine hygiene and incontinence supplies	HEALTH
5. Comply with current City policy set forth in the San Francisco Environment Code, including the requirements set forth in Chapter 3 (the Integrated Pest Management Code) and Chapter 2 (the Environmentally Preferable Purchasing Ordinance) to ensure that shelter operators use products that are least harmful to shelter clients, staff, and the environment	HEALTH
6. Ensure that first aid kits, CPR masks, and disposable gloves are available to staff at all times and make Automatic External Defibrillators (AED) available to staff in compliance with all regulatory requirements of state and local law relating to the use and maintenance of AEDs.	HEALTH
7. Supply shelter clients with fresh cold or room temperature drinking water at all times during normal operating hours	HEALTH
8. Provide shelter services in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), including but not limited to: (i) appropriate and secure storage of medication, (ii) the provision of accessible sleeping, bathing and toileting facilities in previously designated as accessible shall comply with federal and state law requiring a minimum of 36 inches between sleeping units and sleeping surface height between 17-19 inches above the finished floor. In consultation with the contracting City department, and based on a history of previous usage, shelter operators shall designate an adequate number of accessible sleeping units to meet the needs of shelter clients requiring such facilities due to a mobility disability; and (iii) reasonable modifications to shelter policies, practices, and procedures; (iv) In addition, shelters shall provide orientation to new shelter clients that includes information on shelter rules and how to access case management services, and shall ensure case management services go to those shelter clients most in need of case management services. This information shall be made accessible to shelter clients with disabilities through the use of appropriate auxiliary aid and/or services, such as large print for clients with visual impairments or ASL interpreting for Deaf clients. The City shall provide equal access to shelter clients with disabilities without regard to whether they accept auxiliary aids.	ADA
9. Engage a nutritionist, who shall develop all meal plans, including meal plans for children and pregnant women; and post menus on a daily basis.	HEALTH
10. Make dietary modifications to accommodate request from clients based on religious beliefs and practices; health or disability reasons	HEALTH
11. Comply with Article 19F of the San Francisco Health Code that prohibits smoking in homeless shelters.	HEALTH
12. Provide shelter clients with one clean blanket; two clean sheets, or, if clean sheets are unavailable, two clean blankets; and one pillow enclosed in a plastic or vinyl sleeve with a clean pillowcase; and to clean all sheets at least once per week and upon client turnover;	FACILITY
13. Make the shelter facility available to shelter clients for sleeping at least 8 hours per night	HEALTH
14. Provide daytime access to beds in all 24-hour shelters	FACILITY
15. Provide shelter clients with pest-free, secure property storage inside each shelter. Shelter staff shall provide closable bags to clients for storage purposes. If storage inside a shelter is unavailable, the shelter operator may provide free, pest-free storage off-site as long as the off-site storage is available to the shelter client up until the time of evening bed check	FACILITY

16. Provide shelter clients with access to electricity for charging cell phones; and other durable medical equipment for clients with disabilities	FACILITY
17. Note in writing and post in a common areas in the shelter when a maintenance problem will be repaired and note the status of the repairs	FACILITY
18. Provide access to free local calls during non-sleeping hours; including TTY access and amplified phones for clients who are deaf and hearing-impaired	FACILITY
19. Provide a minimum of 22 inches between the sides of sleeping units, excluding the designated ADA-accessible sleeping units and sleeping units separated by a wall	HEALTH
20. Provide all printed materials produced by the City and shelters in English and Spanish and other languages upon and ensure that all written communications are provided to clients with sensory disabilities in alternate formats such as large print, Braille, etc., upon request	FACILITY
21. Communicate with each client in the client's primary language or provide professional translation services; including but not limited to American Sign Language interpretation; however, children or other clients may be asked to translate in emergency situations	FACILITY
22. Provide at least one front line staff at each site that is bilingual in English and Spanish	FACILITY
23. Ensure that each shelter has an emergency disaster plan that requires drills on a monthly basis and that, in consultation with the Mayor's Office on Disability, includes specific evacuation devices and procedures for people with disabilities	FACILITY
24. Locate alternate sleeping unit for a client who has been immediately denies services after 5:00 PM, unless the denial was for acts or threats of violence	FACILITY
25. Require all staff to wear a badge that identifies the staff person by name and position badges	STAFF
26. Ensure all clients receive appropriate and ADA-compliant transportation to attend medical, permanent housing, substance abuse treatment, job-search, job interview, mental health, shelter services (etc)	FACILITY
27. Provide public notification at least 24 hours in advance of on-site, community meetings	FACILITY
28. Provide clients with access to free laundry services with hot water and dryer that reaches a temperature between 120-130 degrees Fahrenheit, on or off site	FACILITY
29. To the extent not inconsistent with Proposition N, passed by the voters on November 5, 2002, ensure all single adult shelter reservations be for a minimum of 7 nights.	FACILITY
30. Agree to comply with the California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal-OSHA) General Industry regarding Blood borne Pathogens (8 CCR 5193) and its injury and illness Prevention Program (8CCR 3203), including but not limited to applicable requirements regarding personal protective equipment, universal precautions, and the development of an exposure control plan, as defined therein,	HEALTH
31. Annual all-staff mandatory trainings: (1) hand washing requirements and other communicable disease prevention; (2) proper food handling and storage; (3) emergency procedures in case of disaster, fire, or other urgent health or safety risk, including but not limited to CPR requirements; (4) safe and appropriate intervention with violent or aggressive shelter clients, including training on the harm reduction model in dealing with substance abuse; (5) safe and appropriate interaction with shelter clients who suffer from mental illness or substance abuse; (6) On-the-job burn-out prevention; (7) requirements under the ADA, in collaboration with the Mayor's Office on Disability and the City Attorney's Office; (8) policies and procedures explained in shelter training manuals; (9) cultural humility, including sensitivity training regarding homelessness, the lesbian, bisexual, gay, and transgender communities, people with visible and invisible disabilities, youth, women, and trauma victims	STAFF
31. Maximize the space for sleeping in the shelter to the fullest extent possible.	FACILITY

Site Visit Infractions

The Committee completed 14 total unannounced site visits during the 2nd Quarter of FY18-19. The Committee did not visit A Woman's Place, Next Door, Providence, Sanctuary, United Council or the Interfaith Winter Shelter during the reporting period. Summaries of the completed visits at each site are listed below:

A Woman's Place Drop In

Site Visit Date: 10/11/18

Visit conducted by: G.J. and L.G.

The Committee completed one visit to A Woman's Place Drop In during the reporting period and noted that the showers needed additional cleaning, one shower stall was missing a showerhead, there were no CPR masks available for clients and that it had been more than a month since the last emergency drill. All noted infractions were remedied by the site.

Bethel AME

Site Visit Date: 11/14/18

Visit conducted by: G.J. and L.G.

The Committee completed one visit to Bethel AME and noted that clients were not being given pillows and pillowcases, there were no phones available for clients to use during "Lights On" and that there were no MUNI tokens available for clients. The Committee did note that there was a van service available to transport clients to other Providence Foundation shelters. and were being given four blankets instead and that the site had run out of MUNI tokens. The site has requested additional MUNI tokens and there is an alternate phone for clients to use while the usual phone is being repaired, however the issue with the pillows and pillowcases is ongoing.

Compass

Site Visit Date: 12/6/18

Visit conducted by: N.W. and H.C.

The Committee visited the site once during the reporting period and noted that there was no signage posted noting where clients could access a TTY machine. This issue has been remedied by the site.

Dolores St. Shelter (Santa Marta/Maria/Ana/Jazzie's Place)

Site Visit Date: 12/6/18

Visit conducted by: G.J. and H.C.

The Committee visited the Dolores St. Shelter location once during the 2nd Quarter and noted that not all staff were wearing ID badges and that the site had run out of MUNI tokens. All noted infractions were addressed by the site.

First Friendship

Site Visit Date: 11/26/18

Visit conducted by: S.I. and L.K.

The Committee completed one visit to First Friendship during the reporting period and noted that the site had no MUNI tokens, Language Link or another professional translation service. The Committee also noted that there was no AED on site, which was an ongoing infraction from the 1st Quarter. The site reported that they have replaced the AED and now have MUNI tokens in stock. The site stated that although they have access translators available in a few language, the lack of Language Link is an ongoing issue.

Hamilton Family and Emergency Shelters

Site Visit Date: 10/9/18

Visit conducted by: J.A. and H.C.

The Committee completed one visit to Hamilton Family and Hamilton Emergency shelters and noted that there were no signs stating who the ADA liaison was or where clients could access a TTY machine. All issues have been remedied by the site.

Hospitality House**Site Visit Dates:** 10/30/18, 12/4/18**Visits conducted by:** J.A. and H.C.

The Committee completed two visits to Hospitality House during the second quarter. On the first visit, the Committee noted that there were no bilingual Spanish speaking staff on-duty and the site reported that they are actively recruiting new Spanish speaking staff. There were no infractions noted during the 2nd visit to the site.

Lark Inn**Site Visit Date:** 11/13/18**Visit conducted by:** S.I. and L.K.

The Committee completed one visit to Lark Inn during the reporting period and noted that the AED was not working and that there were no MUNI tokens available. The site stated that they have MUNI tokens located behind the staff desk and that they are actively searching for a replacement AED.

Mission Neighborhood Resource Center**Site Visit Date:** 11/29/18**Visit conducted by:** M.M. and H.C.

The Committee completed one visit to Mission Neighborhood Resource Center during the reporting period and didn't note any SOC infractions.

MSC South**Site Visit Date:** 11/28/18**Visit conducted by:** G.J. and L.G.

The Committee completed one visit to MSC South during the reporting period and noted that not all clients were given pillows and pillowcases and that there was no working TTY machine or signage stating where clients could access a TTY machine. The site reported that all infractions had been remedied.

MSC South Drop In**Site Visit Date:** 10/18/18**Visit conducted by:** J.A. and H.C.

The Committee completed one visit to MSC South Drop In during the reporting period and didn't note any SOC infractions.

St. Joseph's**Site Visit Date:** 11/15/18**Visit conducted by:** J.A. and H.C.

The Committee completed one visit to St. Joseph's during the reporting period and didn't note any SOC infractions.

Client Survey Results:

A Woman's Place Shelter

Survey date: 10/22/18

Clients surveyed: 15

Survey Question	Yes	No	Sometimes
Do staff treat you with respect?	13	1	1
Do you feel discriminated against because of your age, disability, gender, race, religion, sexual orientation or transgender status?	2	12	1
Do you feel safe at this shelter?	12	2	1
Does staff de-escalate arguments and help to break up verbal fights between clients?	11	0	2
Are sleeping areas quiet at night?	11	2	2

Compass

Survey date: 10/2/18

Clients surveyed: 5

Survey Question	Yes	No	Sometimes
Do staff treat you with respect?	4	1	0
Do you feel discriminated against because of your age, disability, gender, race, religion, sexual orientation or transgender status?	1	4	0
Do you feel safe at this shelter?	5	0	0
Does staff de-escalate arguments and help to break up verbal fights between clients?	2	0	0
Is the sleeping area quiet at night?	3	1	0

Dolores St. Shelter (Santa Marta/Maria/Ana/Jazzie's Place)

Survey date: 12/13/18

Clients surveyed: 12

Survey Question	Yes	No	Sometimes
Do staff treat you with respect?	12	0	0
Do you feel discriminated against because of your age, disability, gender, race, religion, sexual orientation or transgender status?	1	11	0
Do you feel safe at this shelter?	12	0	0

Does staff de-escalate arguments and help to break up verbal fights between clients?	7	1	1
Is the sleeping area quiet at night?	9	0	3

MSC South Drop In

Survey date: 11/9/18

Clients surveyed: 13

Survey Question	Yes	No	Sometimes
Do staff treat you with respect?	11	1	1
Do you feel discriminated against because of your age, disability, gender, race, religion, sexual orientation or transgender status?	3	9	1
Do you feel safe at this shelter?	10	1	2
Does staff de-escalate arguments and help to break up verbal fights between clients?	5	0	1

Next Door

Survey date: 11/15/18

Clients surveyed: 26

Survey Question	Yes	No	Sometimes
Do staff treat you with respect?	14	6	6
Do you feel discriminated against because of your age, disability, gender, race, religion, sexual orientation or transgender status?	7	16	2
Do you feel safe at this shelter?	16	7	1
Does staff de-escalate arguments and help to break up verbal fights between clients?	5	11	5
Is the sleeping area quiet at night?	15	10	1

Sanctuary

Survey date: 12/18/18

Clients surveyed: 19

Survey Question	Yes	No	Sometimes
Do staff treat you with respect?	13	3	3
Do you feel discriminated against because of your age, disability, gender, race, religion, sexual orientation or transgender status?	9	10	0
Do you feel safe at this shelter?	12	7	0

Does staff de-escalate arguments and help to break up verbal fights between clients?	10	4	1
Is the sleeping area quiet at night?	10	8	1

FY2018-2019 Unannounced Site Visit Tally

Site	1 st Quarter July – Sept.	2 nd Quarter Oct. – Dec.	Total (FY18-19)
A Woman's Place	2	0	2
A Woman's Place Drop In Center	1	1	2
Bethel AME	1	1	2
Compass	0	1	1
First Friendship	1	1	2
Hamilton Emergency	1	1	3
Hamilton Family	1	1	4
Hospitality House	0	1	1
Interfaith Winter Shelter	*Closed	0	0
Lark Inn	1	1	2
Mission Neighborhood Resource Ctr.	0	1	1
MSC South Shelter	1	1	2
MSC South Drop In Center	1	1	2
Next Door	2	0	2
Providence	1	0	1
Sanctuary	2	0	2
Santa Ana* incorporated into Santa Marta/Maria/Jazzie's Place location in 2 nd Quarter	1	N/A	1
Santa Marta/Maria/Jazzie's Place	1	1	2
St. Joseph's	1	1	2
United Council	1	0	1
Site Visits Completed:	19	14	33
Assigned Site Visits:	19	20	39
Compliance:	100%	75.0%	84.6% (Compliance through 2 nd Quarter FY18- 19 only)

The Shelter Monitoring Committee is required to complete four unannounced visits to each site on an annual basis.

FY2018-2019 Announced Site Visit Tally

Site	1 st Quarter	2 nd Quarter	FY18-19
A Woman's Place	0	1	1
A Woman's Place Drop In Center	1	0	1
Bethel AME	1	0	1
Compass	0	1	1
First Friendship	1	0	1
Hamilton Emergency	1	0	1
Hamilton Family	1	0	1
Hospitality House	1	0	1
Interfaith Winter Shelter	-	0	-
Lark Inn	1	0	1
Mission Neighborhood Resource Ctr.	1	0	1
MSC South Shelter	1	0	1
MSC South Drop In Center	0	1	1
Next Door	0	1	1
Providence	0	0	0
Sanctuary	0	1	1
Santa Ana	0	0	0
Santa Marta/Maria/ Jazzie's Place	0	1	1
St. Joseph's	1	0	1
United Council	0	0	0
Total	10	6	16

The Committee is required to make two announced site visits to each site each year to survey clients.

Client Complaint Process Flowchart

- Committee staff screens complaint, and if valid, complaint is written up and emailed to site director and site manager

- Copy of the complaint given to client

Note: HSH is immediately notified of all allegations involving staff or incidents of violence, fraud, and/or assault



- Sites have 48 hours to acknowledge receipt of complaint
- Sites investigate complaints/allegations and are required to send a formal response to the Committee along with its findings 7 days after complaint is submitted to site



When the Committee receives site's response, the client is notified and is provided with a copy of the site's response for their review



If the client is satisfied with the site's response, the process stops here.



If the client is not satisfied with the site's response, the complaint is investigated by Committee staff. Clients must inform staff that they are not satisfied with the complaint within 45 days of receiving the site's response otherwise the complaint is closed.



Committee staff will investigate the client's allegations at the site and determine whether or not site is in compliance with the Standards of Care.

- If Committee staff are able to verify the client's allegations, then the site is not in compliance
- If Committee staff are unable to verify the client's allegations, then the site is in compliance

Committee staff will compile their findings in an Investigation Report (which includes any recommendations for corrective actions) which will be sent to the client, site management and HSH

Site Visit Infraction Process Flowchart

The Committee notes any Standards of Care infractions during site visits and submits them to shelter management

Note: HSH is immediately notified for all incidents of violence, fraud, and/or assault that take place during a site visit



- Sites have 48 hours to acknowledge receipt of the infractions
- Sites investigate infractions and are required to send a formal response to the Committee along with its findings and corrective actions 7 days after they are submitted to the site



When the Committee receives site's response, Committee staff will review site's response and check for completion of corrective actions



If Committee staff are satisfied with the site's response, the process stops



If Committee staff are not satisfied with the site's response, the infractions will be investigated by Committee staff



Committee staff will conduct an investigation at the site and determine whether or not the site has addressed the infractions.

- If the site has addressed the infractions, the site is now in compliance
- If the site has not addressed the infractions, the site is not in compliance

Committee staff will compile their findings in an Investigation Report (which includes any recommendations for corrective actions) which will be sent to site management and HSH



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

April 16, 2019

Ms. Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, California 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

Please find attached the Recreation and Park Department's report for the 3rd quarter of FY18-19 in response to the requirements of Resolution 157-99 Lead Poisoning Prevention. To date, the Department has completed assessment and clean-up at **189** sites since program inception in 1999.

Since the last report, a survey has been completed at Brewster Rutledge and Noe Beaver Community Gardens. A significant amount of soil must be removed at each site, and we are awaiting bids to do the removal and replacement of the soil. Additionally, we are implementing a program to allow for small-scale, short duration lead work to be done in house by our Structural Maintenance staff. Training is completed, the safe work practice has been finalized, and we are purchasing one more piece of equipment to allow us to do the work.

I hope that you and interested members of the public find that the Department's performance demonstrates our commitment to the health and well-being of the children we serve.


Thank you for your support of this important program. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions, comments or suggestions you have.

Sincerely,


Philip A. Ginsburg
General Manager

Attachments: 1. FY18-19 Implementation Plan, 3rd Quarter Status Report
2. Status Report for All Sites

Copy: H. Ahmad, DPH, Children's Environmental Health Promotion

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2019 APR 18 PM 3:43
BY 

Attachment 1. Implementation Plan Status Report

3rd Quarter Status Report

Plan Item	Status
I. Hazard Identification and Control	
a) Program Revision	Guidelines will be updated as needed.
b) Site Prioritization	<p>Site prioritization has been updated for changes in site information (as reflected in attached Status Report for All Sites).</p> <p>Prioritization is based on verified hazard reports (periodic inspections), documented program use (departmental and day care), estimated participant age, and presence of playgrounds or schoolyards.</p> <p>Sites are selected on a rolling basis; as one site is completed, the next site on the list becomes active.</p>
c) Survey	Brewster Rutledge, and Noe Beaver Community Gardens have been completed.
d) Cleanup	Soil removal and replacement is underway at both Brewster Rutledge and Noe Beaver. We are awaiting bids.
e) Site Posting and Notification	Each site has been or will be posted in advance of clean-up work so that staff and the public may be notified of the work to be performed.
f) Next site	Richmond Recreation Center
II. Facilities Operations and Maintenance	
a) Periodic Inspection	Annual periodic facility inspections are completed by staff, and includes a question pertaining to the condition of paint in a facility (so that paint in poor condition can be addressed by Structural Maintenance).
b) Housekeeping	Staff is reminded of this hazard and the steps to control it through our Lead Safe Work Practice.

c) Staff Training

Under the Department's Injury and Illness Prevention Program, basic lead awareness training is recommended every two years for appropriate staff (e.g. custodians, gardeners, recreation staff, structural maintenance staff, etc.).

Additionally, Structural Maintenance is developing an Operations and Maintenance program to allow small-scale lead work to be conducted in house (including sampling). In November 2018, 24 staff members were trained to become certified Lead Sampling Technicians, and 35 were trained to do small scale, short duration lead work. The Safe Work Practice is now completed, and equipment being purchased. Larger scale work will continue to be completed through DPW-SAR.

Attachment 2. Status Report for RPD Sites

Status Report for RPD Sites

New Priority	Property Name	Location	FY Completed	Notes
144	Brewster-Rutledge Community Garden			
145	Noe-Beaver Community Garden	Noe/Beaver		
28	Richmond Recreation Center	18th Ave./Lake St./Calif.		New facility; do not include painted surfaces
79	Victoria Manalo Draves Park	Folsom & Sherman		New facility; do not include painted surfaces
85	Visitacion Valley Playground	Cora/Leland/Raymond		New facility; do not include painted surfaces
90	Parque Ninos Unidos	23rd and Folsom		New facility; do not include painted surfaces
94	Aptos Playground	Aptos/Ocean Avenue		New facility; do not include painted surfaces
98	Park Presidio Boulevard	Park Presidio Blvd.		
101	Alice Marble Tennis Courts	Greenwich/Hyde		New facility; do not include painted surfaces
103	India Basin Shoreline Park	E. Hunters Pt. Blvd.		New facility; do not include painted surfaces
113	Jefferson Square	Eddy/Gough		
121	In Chan Kaajal Park	17th/Folsom		New facility; do not include painted surfaces
126	Kid Power Park	45 Hoff St.		New facility; do not include painted surfaces
128	Patricia's Green in Hayes Valley	Hayes & Octavia		New facility; do not include painted surfaces
150	Crags Court Community Garden	8 Crags		
151	Esprit Park	Minnesota Street		
152	Fay Park	Chestnut and Leavenworth		
153	Fillmore-Turk Mini Park	Fillmore/Turk		
154	Geneva Avenue Strip	Geneva/Delano		
155	Howard-Langton Mini Park	Howard/Langton		
157	Joseph Conrad Mini Park	Columbus/Beach		
158	Maritime Plaza	Battery/Clay		
161	Ralph D. House Community Park			New facility; do not include painted surfaces
163	Sunnyside Conservatory	Monterey & Baden		
168	SoMa West Skatepark	Duboce/Stevenson		New facility; do not include painted surfaces. Is adjacent to Dog Park which may not need to be done depending on algorithm score (currently 0)
1	Camp Mather	Mather, Tuolumne County	04-05	
2	Hamilton Recreation Center	Geary/Steiner	00-01	Includes Pool
3	Golden Gate Park - Section 1		var	Includes Panhandle, Tennis Courts, Carrousel, Sharon Art, Conservatory, Kezar and Lodge
4	Herz Playground		99-00, 00-01	Includes Pool
5	Garfield Square	25th/Harrison	00-01	

Status Report for RPD Sites

New Priority	Property Name	Location	FY Completed	Notes
6	Joe DiMaggio North Beach Playground	Lombard/Mason	99-00	Includes Pool
7	Duboce Park	Duboce/Scott	99-00, 01-02	Includes Harvey Milk RC
8	Angelo J. Rossi Playground	Arguello Blvd./Anza	00-01	Includes Pool
9	Mission Recreation Center	745 Treat Street	99-00, 02-03, 06-07	Includes both the Harrison (Rec) and Treat St. (Art) sides.
10	Corona Heights	16th/Roosevelt	00-01	Includes Randall Musuem
11	Carl Larsen Park	19th/Wawona	00-01	Includes Pool
12	Sunset Rec Center	28th Avenue/Lawton	99-00	
13	Eureka Valley Recreation Center	Collingwood/18th	99-00	
14	Palega Recreation Center	Felton/Holyoke	99-00	
15	Moscone Recreation Center	Chestnut/Buchanan	00-01	
16	Balboa Park	Ocean/San Jose	00-01	Includes Pool and Matthew Boxer stadium. Note no programming there as site has been closed for major renovation.
17	Glen Park	Chenery/Elk	99-00, 00-01	Includes Silver Tree Day Camp
18	Minnie & Lovie Ward Recreation Center	Capital Avenue/Montana	99-00	
19	St. Mary's Recreation Center	Murray St./JustinDr.	00-01	
20	Golden Gate Park - Section 6		var	Includes Beach Chalet, Golf Course
21	Crocker Amazon Playground	Geneva/Moscow	99-00	
22	Golden Gate Park - Section 5		var	Includes Polo Field, Senior Center, Angler's Lodge, Stables
23	Mission Playground	19th & Linda	99-00	
24	Upper Noe Recreation Center	Day/Sanchez	99-00	
25	Potrero Hill Recreation Center	22nd/Arkansas	99-00	
26	Golden Gate Park - Section 2		var	Includes Big Rec, Bandstand, Bowling Green and Nursery
27	Lake Merced Park	Skyline/Lake Merced	12-13	Includes Harding Park, Flemming Golf, Boat House and other sites. Note that the Sandy Tatum clubhouse and maintenance facilities were built in 2004 and should be excluded from the survey.
29	Betty Ann Ong Chinese Recreation Center	Washington/Mason	00-01	
30	John McLaren Park	Visitation Valley	06-07	
31	Julius Kahn Playground	Jackson/Spruce	01-02	
32	Jackson Playground	17th/Carolina	99-00, 04-05	
33	Sunnyside Playground	Melrose/Edna	00-01	
34	Golden Gate Park - Section 4		var	Includes Stow Lake
35	Raymond Kimbell Playground	Pierce/Ellis	01-02	
36	Sigmund Stern Recreation Grove	19th Avenue/Sloat Blvd.	04-05	
37	J. P. Murphy Playground	1960 9th Avenue	99-00	
38	Excelsior Playground	Russia/Madrid	99-00	

Status Report for RPD Sites

New Priority	Property Name	Location	FY Completed	Notes
39	Bernal Heights Recreation Center	Moultrie/Jarboe	00-01	
40	Margaret S. Hayward Playground	Laguna, Turk	00-01	
41	Mission Dolores Park	18th/Dolores	06-07	
42	Cayuga Playground	Cayuga/Naglee	99-00	
43	Youngblood Coleman Playground	Galvez/Mendell	00-01	
44	Tenderloin Children's Recreation Center	560/570 Ellis Street	00-01	
45	West Sunset Playground	39th Avenue/Ortega	99-00	
46	McCoppin Square	24th Avenue/Taraval	02-03	
47	Golden Gate Park - Section 3		var	Includes County Fair Building
48	James Rolph Jr. Playground	Potrero Ave./Army Street	00-01, 02-03	
49	South Sunset Playground	40th Avenue/Vicente	99-00	
50	West Portal Playground	Ulloa/Lenox Way	00-01	
51	Cabrillo Playground	38th/Cabrillo	99-00	
52	Fulton Playground	27th Avenue/Fulton	00-01	
53	Joseph Lee Recreation Center	Oakdale/Mendell	00-01	
54	Junipero Serra Playground	300 Stonecrest Drive	99-00	
55	Lincoln Park	34th Avenue/Clement	02-03	Includes golf course
56	Gilman Playground	Gilman/Griffiths	00-01	
57	Louis Sutter Playground	University/Wayland	00-01	
58	Lower Great Highway	Sloat to Pt. Lobos	07-08	
59	Silver Terrace Playground	Silver Avenue/Bayshore	99-00	
60	Douglass Playground	Upper/26th Douglass	00-01	
61	Father Alfred E. Boeddeker Park	Ellis/Taylor/Eddy/Jones	00-01	
62	Hayes Valley Playground	Hayes/Buchanan	00-01	
63	Laurel Hill Playground	Euclid & Collins	10-11	
64	Parkside Square	26th Avenue/Vicente	02-03	
65	Yacht Harbor & Marina Green	Marina	06-07, 07-08	Includes Yacht Harbor, Gas House Cover, 2 Yacht Clubs and Marina Green
66	George Christopher Playground	Diamond Hts/Duncan	99-00	
67	Rochambeau Playground	24th Avenue/Lake Street	00-01, 09-10	
68	Argonne Playground	18th/Geary	99-00	
69	Eugene Friend Recreation Center	Folsom/Harriet/6th	99-00	
70	Grattan Playground	Stanyan/Alma	00-01	
71	Helen Wills Playground	Broadway/Larkin	99-00	
72	Holly Park	Holly Circle	02-03	
73	Alice Chalmers Playground	Brunswick/Whittier	99-00	
74	Bay View Playground	3rd/Armstrong	01-02	Includes Pool (which is a new facility and painted surfaces do not have to be tested)

Status Report for RPD Sites

New Priority	Property Name	Location	FY Completed	Notes
75	Merced Heights Playground	Byxbee/Shields	99-00	
76	Mountain Lake Park	12th Avenue/Lake Sreet	02-03	
77	Portsmouth Square	Kearny/Washington	02-03	
78	Richmond Playground	18th Avenue/Lake Street	00-01	
80	Willie Woo Woo Wong Playground	Sacramento/Waverly	01-02, 09-10	
81	Buchanan Street Mall	Buchanan betw. Grove & Turk	01-02	
82	Midtown Terrace Playground	Clarendon/Olympia	00-01	
83	Miraloma Playground	Omar/Sequoia Ways	99-00	
84	Presidio Heights Playground	Clay/Laurel	00-01	
86	Adam Rogers Park	Jennings/Oakdale	01-02	
87	Alta Plaza	Jackson/Steiner	01-02	
88	Jose Coronado Playground	21st/Folsom	02-03	
89	Lafayette Park	Washington/Laguna	01-02	
91	States Street Playground	States St./Museum Way	01-02	
92	Woh Hei Yuen Park	1213 Powell	00-01	
93	Alamo Square	Hayes/Steiner	01-02	
95	Buena Vista Park	Buena Vista/Haight	01-02	
96	DuPont Courts	30th Ave./Clement	07-08	
97	Hilltop Park	La Salle/Whitney Yg. Circle	01-02	
99	Peixotto Playground	Beaver/15th Street	01-02	
100	Potrero del Sol Park	Potrero/Army	02-03	
102	Cow Hollow Playground	Baker/Greenwich	00-01; 09-10	
104	Noe Valley Courts	24th/Douglass	02-03	
105	Pine Lake Park	Crestlake/Vale/Wawon a	07-08, 16-17	
106	Little Hollywood Park	Lathrop-Tocoloma	02-03	
107	McKinley Square	20th/Vermont	02-03	
108	Michelangelo Playground	Greenwich/Jones	01-02	
109	Palace of Fine Arts	3601 Lyon Street	09-10, 13-14	Includes Exploratorium/Theater
110	Washington Square	Filbert/Stockton	02-03	
111	Franklin Square	16th/Bryant	01-02	
112	Golden Gate Heights Park	12th Ave./Rockridge Dr.	01-02	
114	Kelloch-Velasco Mini Park	Kelloch/Velasco	02-03	
115	Koshland Park	Page/Buchanan	02-03	
116	Palou-Phelps Park	Palou at Phelps	02-03	
117	Precita Park	Precita/Folsom	02-03	
118	Selby-Palou Mini Park	Selby & Palou	10-11	

Status Report for RPD Sites

New Priority	Property Name	Location	FY Completed	Notes
119	South Park	64 South Park Avenue	01-02	
120	Walter Haas Playground	Addison/Farnum/Beacon	02-03	
122	Alioto Mini Park	20th/Capp	01-02	
123	Brooks Park	373 Ramsell	01-02	
124	Head-Brotherhood Mini Park	Head/Brotherwood Way	02-03	
125	Jospeh L. Alioto Performing Arts Piazza	Grove/Larkin	01-02	
127	Lessing-Sears Mini Park	Lessing/Sears	10-11	
129	Telegraph Hill/Pioneer Park	Telegraph Hill	09-10	
130	10th Avenue-Clement Mini Park	Richmond Library	10-11	
131	24th Street-York Mini Park	24th/York/Bryant	02-03	
132	Bernal Heights Park	Bernal Heights Blvd.	01-02	
133	Collis P. Huntington Park	California/Taylor	01-02	
134	Juri Commons	San Jose/Guerrero/25th	05-06	
135	Muriel Leff Mini Park	7th Avenue/Anza	10-11	
136	Prentiss Mini Park	Prentiss/Eugenia	10-11	
137	Randolph-Bright Mini Park	Randolph/Bright	02-03	
138	Rolph Nicol Playground	Eucalyptus Dr./25th Avenue	04-05	
139	Seward Mini Park	Seward/Acme Alley	17-18	
140	Sharp Park	Pacifica, San Mateo Co.	06-07	Includes Golf Course
141	St. Mary's Square	California Street/Grant	09-10	
142	Sue Bierman Park	Clay/Embarcadero	17-18	Does not include Emb Plaza/J Herman, but can do survey together
143	Visitation Valley Greenway	Campbell Ave./E.Rutland	02-03	
146	Allyne Park	Gough/Green	06-07	
147	Bush-Broderick Mini Park	Bush/Broderick	01-02	
148	Coleridge Mini Park	Coleridge/Esmeralda	02-03	
149	Cottage Row Mini Park	Sutter/E. Fillmore	01-02	
156	Hyde-Vallejo Mini Park	Hyde/Vallejo	02-03	
159	Page Street Community Garden		17-18	This was done in 2017 as part of another project.
160	Page-Laguna Mini Park	Page/Laguna	04-05	
162	Sgt. John Macaulay Park	Larkin/O'Farrell	02-03	
164	Turk-Hyde Mini Park	Turk & Hyde	10-11	
165	Union Square	Post/Stockton	09-10	
166	Washington-Hyde Mini Park	Washington/Hyde	04-05	
167	Embarcadero Plaza	Embarcadero/Clay	17-18	Includes Embarcadero/J Herman Plaza. Must get approval from Permits before doing to ensure there are no activities there that might interfere with clean up.

Status Report for RPD Sites

New Priority	Property Name	Location	FY Completed	Notes

Commissioners
Eric Sklar, President
 Saint Helena
Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Vice President
 McKinleyville
Russell E. Burns, Member
 Napa
Peter S. Silva, Member
 Jamul
Samantha Murray, Member
 Del Mar

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 Gavin Newsom, Governor

Fish and Game Commission



Wildlife Heritage and Conservation
Since 1870

Melissa Miller-Henson
Acting Executive Director
 P.O. Box 944209
 Sacramento, CA 94244-2090
 (916) 653-4899
 fgc@fgc.ca.gov
 www.fgc.ca.gov

April 26, 2019

TO ALL INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES:

This is to provide you with a copy of the notice of proposed regulatory action relative to Section 180.6, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to the use of traps to take hagfish, published in the California Regulatory Notice Register on April 26, 2019.

Please note the dates of the public hearings related to this matter and associated deadlines for receipt of written comments. Additional information and associated documents may be found on the Fish and Game Commission website at <http://www.fgc.ca.gov/regulations/2019/index.aspx>.

Travis Tanaka, Environmental Scientist, Department of Fish and Wildlife, has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations. Mr. Tanaka can be reached by telephone at (831) 649-2881 or by email at Travis.Tanaka@wildlife.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Craig Castleton

Craig Castleton
 Associate Governmental Program Analyst

Attachment

RECEIVED
 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
 SAN FRANCISCO
 2019 APR 25 PM 3:16
 BY *[Signature]*

TITLE 14. Fish and Game Commission

Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Fish and Game Commission (Commission), pursuant to the authority vested by Sections 8403 and 9022 of the Fish and Game Code and to implement, interpret or make specific Sections 8403, 9001.6, 9001.7, 9006, and 9022 of said Code, proposes to amend Section 180.6, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to the use of traps to take hagfish.

Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

In California, Pacific Hagfish (*Eptatretus stoutii*) (hagfish) is an open access commercial fishery administered by the Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department). Fishing is allowed year-round in all depths of State and federal waters, except in Marine Protected Areas. The hagfish fishery is primarily managed via restrictions on the amount and type of gear allowed. The method for take is by one of three baited trap types: bucket trap, Korean trap, and more recently, barrel traps. Section 9000.5 and subdivision 9001.6(b) of Fish and Game Code (FGC) define and authorize no more than a total of 500 Korean-style traps, or a total of 200, five-gallon bucket traps aboard a vessel, or in the water or combination thereof. The Commission approved the use of 25 barrel traps (40-gallon capacity) as an alternative trap type under subsection (b) of Section 180.6, Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR) effective January 1, 2016. The 25-barrel trap limit was intended to be per vessel, and serve as a volumetric equivalent to the 200 five-gallon bucket trap limit prescribed by subdivision (b) of FGC Section 9001.6.

There are no daily, seasonal, or annual catch limits for the hagfish fishery. Further, the fishery has no reporting requirement, other than a landing receipt, and there is no minimum size limit, landing quota, or seasonal closure. There is no recreational fishery for hagfish. Pursuant to FGC sections 9000.5 and 9001, all participants on a fishing vessel (i.e., vessel crewmembers) are required to have a current general trap permit, and thus serve as "permittees." FGC Section 9005 requires every trap or string of traps to be marked with a buoy, and FGC subdivision 9006(b) requires the buoy identifying traps used to take hagfish to be marked with the operator's (i.e., responsible fisherman's) commercial fishing license identification number only ("L number") with no prescribed lettering.

When Section 180.6, Title 14, CCR was last amended (effective January 1, 2017) to shift from a 40 gallon volume to a dimension-based measurement of barrel trap size, subsection 180.6(b) was amended in an attempt to simplify language regarding trap use by a vessel by stating that "...no permittee may possess more than 25 barrel traps aboard a vessel or in the water or combination thereof." Due to the fact that a permittee can be the vessel operator, and/or any crewmember, the current language allows the use of 25 barrel traps per permittee, which goes against the original intent of the regulation effective January 1, 2016 to allow a maximum of 25 barrel traps per vessel (the volumetric equivalent to the 200 five-gallon bucket trap limit prescribed by subdivision (b) of FGC Section 9001.6).

Proposed Regulation:

The proposed amendment to subsection (b) of Section 180.6, Title 14, CCR re-establishes the number of allowed barrel traps (25) per vessel, regardless of the number of permittees aboard the vessel. In addition to the commercial fishing license identification number, hagfish fishermen will also be required to mark buoys used to mark any hagfish traps with the vessel's California commercial boat registration number.

The following is a summary of the changes proposed for Section 180.6, Title 14, CCR:

- Remove the words "permittee may possess" from subsection (b), thus linking the 25 barrel trap limit to the vessel.
- Add subsection (c) requiring the use of the vessel's California commercial boat registration number to mark the buoy used to mark any hagfish trap (fishermen will continue to mark buoys with all fishermen L numbers operating the vessel, as required by FGC subdivision 9006(b)).

Benefits of the Proposed Regulation:

Linking the maximum number of barrel traps utilized and possessed to the vessel instead of the permittee will limit the fishing capacity of vessels that utilize this gear. Since there are no other management measures that limit hagfish fishing capacity, limiting the number of barrel traps by vessel will help ensure sustainability of the hagfish resource, reduce potential conflicts between fishermen using similar fishing grounds, and limit the number of vertical buoy lines to reduce potential impact to other marine life.

By requiring the use of the vessel's California commercial boat registration number to mark the buoy used to mark any hagfish trap, Law Enforcement Division staff will be able to determine, at sea, how many traps a vessel is utilizing and/or possessing. This requirement would apply to all trap types authorized for the take of hagfish.

Consistency and Compatibility with Existing Regulations:

Section 20, Article IV, of the State Constitution specifies that the Legislature may delegate to the Fish and Game Commission such powers relating to the protection and propagation of fish and game as the Legislature sees fit. The Legislature has delegated to the Commission the power to regulate the commercial take of finfish using traps (FGC sections 8403 and 9022). No other State agency has the authority to promulgate commercial fishing regulations. The Commission has reviewed its own regulations and finds that the proposed regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing State regulations. The Commission has searched the CCR for any regulations regarding the use of traps for the commercial take of hagfish and has found no such regulation; therefore the Commission has concluded that the proposed regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing State regulations.

NOTICE IS GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held in the Red Lion Hotel Redding, 1830 Hilltop Drive, Redding, California 96002, on June 13, 2019, at 8:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard. It is requested, but not required, that written comments be submitted on or before May 30, 2019 at the address given below, or by email to FGC@fgc.ca.gov. All comments (both oral and written) must be received no later than June 13, 2019, either at the Commission office or at the address given below, by email to FGC@fgc.ca.gov, or at the June 13, 2019 hearing in Redding, California. If you would like copies of any modifications to this proposal, please include your name and mailing address.

Mailed comments should be addressed to Fish and Game Commission, P.O. Box 944209, Sacramento, CA 94244-2090.

Availability of Documents

Copies of the Notice of Proposed Action, the Initial Statement of Reasons, and the text of the regulation in underline and strikeout format can be accessed through the Commission website at www.fgc.ca.gov. The regulations as well as all related documents upon which the proposal is based (rulemaking file), are on file and available for public review from the agency representative, Melissa Miller-Henson, Acting Executive Director, Fish and Game Commission, 1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1320, Sacramento, California 95814, phone (916) 653-4899. Please direct requests for the above mentioned documents and inquiries concerning the regulatory process to Melissa Miller-Henson or Craig Castleton at the preceding address or phone number. **Travis Tanaka, Environmental Scientist, Department of Fish and Wildlife, (831) 649-2881 or Travis.Tanaka@wildlife.ca.gov, has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations.**

Availability of Modified Text

If the regulations adopted by the Commission differ from but are sufficiently related to the action proposed, they will be available to the public for at least 15 days prior to the date of adoption. Any person interested may obtain a copy of said regulations prior to the date of adoption by contacting the agency representative named herein.

If the regulatory proposal is adopted, the final statement of reasons may be obtained from the address above when it has been received from the agency program staff.

Impact of Regulatory Action/Results of the Economic Impact Assessment

The potential for significant statewide adverse economic impacts that might result from the proposed regulatory action has been assessed, and the following initial determinations relative to the required statutory categories have been made:

- (a) Significant Statewide Adverse Economic Impact Directly Affecting Business, Including the Ability of California Businesses to Compete with Businesses in Other States:

The proposed action will not have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states. The California hagfish fishery is primarily a live export fishery. Currently, there is increased demand for California-caught hagfish due to the consistency of catch and lower dock price compared to hagfish fisheries in other states.

- (b) Impact on the Creation or Elimination of Jobs Within the State, the Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses, or the Expansion of Businesses in California; Benefits of the Regulation to the Health and Welfare of California Residents, Worker Safety, and the State's Environment:

The Commission does not anticipate any impacts on the creation or elimination of jobs, the creation of new business, the elimination of existing businesses or the expansion of businesses in California. There are no anticipated benefits to the health and welfare of California residents and worker safety. However, clarifying the original intent of the regulation effective January 1, 2016 by limiting the number of barrel traps to 25 per vessel would benefit the environment by promoting sustainability of the hagfish resource, limit the amount of barrel gear on the seafloor, and limit the number of vertical buoy lines in the fishery that could potentially impact other marine life.

- (c) Cost Impacts on a Representative Private Person or Business:

A vessel that may have deployed more than 25 barrel traps in the past could face a reduction in fishing income due to a reduction in the number of traps deployed per vessel. However, the regulation effective January 1, 2016 intended that only 25 barrels be used per vessel, and the majority of fishermen conform to this practice.

- (d) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State: None.

- (e) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies: None.

- (f) Programs Mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts: None.

- (g) Costs Imposed on any Local Agency or School District that is Required to be Reimbursed Under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4, Government Code: None.
- (h) Effect on Housing Costs: None.

Effect on Small Business

It has been determined that the adoption of these regulations may affect small business. The Commission has drafted the regulations in Plain English pursuant to Government Code Sections 11342.580 and 11346.2(a)(1).

Consideration of Alternatives

The Commission must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the Commission, or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Commission, would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed, would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action, or would be more cost effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law.

FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

Dated: April 16, 2019

Melissa Miller-Henson
Acting Executive Director

Commissioners
Eric Sklar, President
 Saint Helena
Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Vice President
 McKinleyville
Russell E. Burns, Member
 Napa
Peter S. Silva, Member
 Jamul
Samantha Murray, Member
 Del Mar

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 Gavin Newsom, Governor

Fish and Game Commission



Wildlife Heritage and Conservation
 Since 1870

Melissa Miller-Henson
Acting Executive Director
 P.O. Box 944209
 Sacramento, CA 94244-2090
 (916) 653-4899
 fgc@fgc.ca.gov
 www.fgc.ca.gov

April 10, 2019

TO ALL AFFECTED AND INTERESTED PARTIES:

This is to provide you with a Notice of Receipt of Petition to list San Bernardino kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys merriami parvus*) as endangered under the California Endangered Species Act. The notice will be published in the California Regulatory Notice Register on April 12, 2019.

Sincerely,

Sheri Tiemann

Sheri Tiemann
 Associate Governmental Program Analyst

Attachment

RECEIVED
 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
 SAN FRANCISCO

2019 APR 15 PM 3:37

BY 

Commissioners
Eric Sklar, President
Saint Helena
Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Vice President
McKinleyville
Russell E. Burns, Member
Napa
Peter S. Silva, Member
Jamul
Samantha Murray, Member
Del Mar

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Gavin Newsom, Governor

Fish and Game Commission



Wildlife Heritage and Conservation
Since 1870

Melissa Miller-Henson
Acting Executive Director
P.O. Box 944209
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090
(916) 653-4899
fgc@fgc.ca.gov
www.fgc.ca.gov

CALIFORNIA FISH AND GAME COMMISSION NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF PETITION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, pursuant to the provisions of Section 2073.3 of the Fish and Game Code, the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission), on March 15, 2019, received a petition from the Endangered Habitats League to list San Bernardino kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys merriami parvus*) as endangered under the California Endangered Species Act.

Necessary habitat characteristics for San Bernardino kangaroo rat include: sandy or gravelly soils and substrates, generally supporting open-structured alluvial fan scrub vegetation, in floodplains with active fluvial processes and nearby upland and/or less frequently inundated terraces.


Pursuant to Section 2073 of Fish and Game Code, on March 22, 2019, the Commission transmitted the petition to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) for review pursuant to Section 2073.5 of said code. The Commission will receive the petition at its April 17, 2019, meeting in the City of Santa Monica Civic Auditorium East Wing, 1855 Main Street, Santa Monica, California. It is anticipated that the Department's evaluation and recommendation relating to the petition will be received by the Commission at its August 7-8, 2019, meeting in Sacramento.

Interested parties may contact Scott Osborn, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, 1812 Ninth Street, Sacramento, CA 95811 or email Scott.Osborn@wildlife.ca.gov, or telephone (916) 324-3564 for information on the petition or to submit information to the Department relating to the petitioned species.

April 2, 2019

Fish and Game Commission

Melissa Miller-Henson
Acting Executive Director

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2019 APR 15 PM 3:37
BY 

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors: Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: San Francisco Travel Association Letter of Support for CA AB362
Date: Tuesday, April 23, 2019 9:54:00 AM
Attachments: [Support for CA State AB 362 - SF Travel.pdf](#)

From: Jessica Lum <jessical@sfttravel.com>
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2019 6:37 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: San Francisco Travel Association Letter of Support for CA AB362

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

Hello,

Please see attached for San Francisco Travel Association's letter of support for California State Assembly Bill No. 362 (Eggman, Wiener, Friedman) - Three-Year Pilot Program for Supervised Drug Consumption.

Thank you!

Jessica Lum | Director, Public Policy & Executive Office Programs
 E jessical@sfttravel.com | T 415.227.2623 | F 415.227.2668
San Francisco Travel | One Front Street, Suite 2900 | San Francisco, CA 94111
sfttravel.com | Follow us on [Facebook](#) + [Twitter](#)

Never the Same. Always San Francisco.
 2018 [NBA Champion Golden State Warriors](#)

Got Meetings? [Check Out Our Pick Two Promotion!](#)



April 22, 2019

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

RE: Support for Resolution Supporting California State Assembly Bill No. 362 (Eggman, Wiener, Friedman) – Three-Year Pilot Program for Supervised Drug Consumption

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

On behalf of San Francisco Travel, I am writing in support of AB 362 to allow the City and County of San Francisco to establish a three-year pilot program for supervised drug consumption, an effective harm reduction program. The bill would give San Francisco the ability to better address drug overdose deaths, link people to substance use disorder treatment, and reduce new HIV and hepatitis infections. I urge you to support AB 362 to help provide proven harm reduction services to make our city healthier and safer.

San Francisco Travel represents over 1,300 businesses in San Francisco and the Bay Area. In 2018, we welcomed 25 million visitors who spent \$10 billion and generated \$770 million in local taxes. Increasingly, visitors are sharing the negative experiences they have while walking down commercial corridors and transit hubs where they and their families see syringe litter and open drug-use. San Francisco has approximately 22,500 injection drug users and nearly 70% are homeless. San Francisco needs innovative programs to keep our streets clean and safe for everyone.

AB 362 provides narrow exemptions to certain controlled substance laws for programs permitted by San Francisco. It would allow the utilization of life-saving public health programs intended to reduce death, disease, or injury related to the use and administration of controlled substances. Supervised drug consumption programs are a common-sense next step to address drug-related harm beyond sterile syringe access, which has been supported by the California legislature since 1999.

For these reasons, San Francisco Travel supports AB 362 to allow San Francisco to offer these innovative, effective, and safe programs.

Respectfully,

Joe D'Alessandro
President and CEO, San Francisco Travel Association

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors: Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: DRUG INJECTION SITES
Date: Tuesday, April 23, 2019 9:57:00 AM

From: Kathleen D Roberts <italirish.roberts825@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, April 19, 2019 2:45 PM

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

Subject: DRUG INJECTION SITES

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

Re: Vote NO on File No. 190221 [Supporting California State Assembly Bill No. 362 (Eggman, Wiener, Friedman) - Three-Year Pilot Program for Supervised Drug Consumption]. Sponsors: Matt Haney , Shamann Walton, Hillary Ronen, Vallie Brown

Thursday, April 9, 2019, 10:00am

Dear Supervisors Mandelman, Stefani, Walton,

Please register my OPPOSITION to the proposed Three-Year Pilot Program for Supervised Drug Consumption. “Drug consumption” is a misnomer – the reality is operation of tax-payer subsidized injection sites for illegal drugs for drug addicts.

Your agenda states “This legislation would create a three-year pilot program allowing San Francisco to implement an overdose prevention program through the operation of safe injection sites.” (Safe injection sites = SIS.)

Your committee is charged with public protection, public health and public safety: “The Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee shall be referred measures related to public works, infrastructure, traffic and parking control, parks and recreation, utilities, PUBLIC PROTECTION, delinquency prevention, PUBLIC HEALTH, emergency services, seniors, the disabled, children and their families, as well as measures related to the City's coordination, strategies, policies, programs, and budgetary actions surrounding PUBLIC SAFETY.”

This resolution is the antithesis (direct opposite) of public protection, public health and public safety. This legislation makes a mockery of public protection, public health and public safety.

My objections are as follows:

Illegal drug use and addiction are increasing because of SF policies

There are about 24,500 drug injection users, aka addicts in San Francisco. (SF Chronicle, 01/30/19, “Addicts outnumber high school students”), and the number has increased since the last study in 2012. This estimate represents 2.45% of the overall daily population of about 1 million people, including residents, tourists, and commuters. According to the article, there is an opioid epidemic, last year there were 193 drug overdose deaths, and the city handed out a record 5.8 million free syringes (about 500,000 more than in 2017), but the Department of Health handed out about 2 million more syringes than it got back, meaning 3.8 syringes were discarded, probably on city streets.

These statistics show that the city’s policies in dealing with drug addicts is not working. The city’s generous and too-liberal policies are encouraging more drug use, and more drug addicts to come to San Francisco, rather than treating and/or discouraging drug use. The city’s policies are clearly enabling illegal drug use and endorsing drug addiction. Further, these policies have led to unintended consequences of visible in-your-face drug use on city streets (so very noticeable at Civic Center especially) and excessive used needle debris throughout all neighborhoods in San Francisco.

Another city bureaucracy, more waste of tax-payer dollars

The proposed pilot program would create another city bureaucracy, with more waste of tax-dollars, while insulting the hard-working tax-paying citizens of San Francisco and their children, who are forced to see addicts shooting up in public, and forced to try to avoid used needles and human filth (urine, feces, vomit) everywhere.

No guarantee addicts will even go to a “safe injection site”

Creating a Safe Injection Site (SIS) is no guarantee that a zonked-out drug addict will actually go there to inject drugs. Drug addicts get their drugs because they need a fix right now, and inject right now, and get high right now, and drop their needle on the street right now – they are not going to go catch MUNI to take them to some drug-injection site run by the city (as if MUNI would even arrive on schedule to do so). In the meantime, the employees will be sitting around for hours with nothing to do, while getting paid a princely sum by the hard-working taxpayers

of San Francisco, and while taxpayers foot the bill for yet another bureaucracy with emergency and health care services available – a total and complete waste of money.

Drug addicts need mandatory in-patient treatment in medical facilities, not coddling and endorsement of their illegal drug use. Use the emergency and health care services available at the many hospitals and clinics in San Francisco.

Public protection, public health and public safety for ALL people in SF, not just addicts

The 4.45 million needles handed out in fiscal year 2015-2016 were at a cost of \$523,363 (SF Chronicle, 05/09/18, “City gives out needles that litter the street”) – paid for by our hard-earned tax-dollars. That article notes that the program originally was billed as a “needle exchange”, i.e, one-for-one, but that there never have been strict rules for returns, and the number has steadily climbed. The city distributes 400,000 needles monthly, retrieves about 246,000 monthly through its “syringe access site” and city crews pick up about 8,000 needles per month, plus 12,640 needles per month when it cleans out homeless hot spots and encampments. The bottom line is that about 150,000 needles per month go uncollected. It is time to institute a strict one-on-one needle exchange immediately and focus on the public protection, public health and public safety of the 1 million people in San Francisco every day.

Health officials maintain that the unlimited syringe access program actually lowers the risk that a used needle on the street carries disease. “When clean needles are available, there is less sharing, less disease transmission, and the discarded needles are less likely to be infectious,” according to Rachel Kagan. (SF Chronicle, 05/09/18, “City gives out needles that litter the street”). Excuse me? A drug addict with an infectious disease who throws a used needle on the sidewalk is still throwing an infectious needle on the sidewalk. There is no logic to saying new clean needles are less infectious – it all depends where the needle was put. And it is ridiculous that the city is more concerned about transmission of diseases between 2.45% of the population rather than transmission of disease to the innocent, unsuspecting 97.5% of the population who risks stepping on and sitting on needles while walking around or taking public transportation.

It is ridiculous that so much attention is being paid to a small percentage of people who have chosen a degenerate lifestyle, while forcing hard-working taxpayers to subsidize a degenerate, dangerous, and filthy habit. And to keep adding insult to injury, tax-payers are now footing the bill for \$750,000 a year to pay the AIDS Foundation to hire 10 people to pick up used needles (SF Chronicle, 05/09/18, “City gives out needles that litter the street”) – that is \$75,000 per year per person to clean up after 2.45% of the population.

There are so many things wrong with this situation.

It is time to focus on the needs of the hard-working tax-paying citizens of San Francisco and their children, and to focus on their public protection, public health and public safety – focus on the 97.5% of the people who just want to go about their daily lives without having to worry about getting stuck by a dirty infected needle or stepping in a puddle of human urine or a pile of human feces or vomit.

Federal crime status

Further, it remains a federal crime to manage and maintain sites where illicit narcotics are used and distributed. Federal law makes it a felony, punishable up to 20 years in prison, fines and forfeitures of the property, to knowingly operate a place for the purpose of unlawfully manufacturing, distributing or using a controlled substance (illegal drug). An “injection site” is no more than a drug den, akin to the opium dens of the 1800's. Drug injection sites normalize illegal drug use and all drug use and facilitate addiction and promotes the idea that government thinks drugs, illegal and legal, can be used safely.

CONCLUSION

Having “safe injection sites” will do nothing to promote Mayor Breed’s desire for a “solution to get people off the streets and into treatment.” “Safe injection sites” will just continue and perpetuate the problem, while the politicians wring their collective hands, and hard-working taxpaying citizens need to fear walking the streets of San Francisco, for what they might step in or on, and fear taking MUNI or BART for what they might sit on. At the same time, Mayor Breed is endorsing developing programs similar to “safe injection sites” where people could smoke or inject methamphetamine in an environment where they have immediate access to care if something goes wrong. (SF Chronicle, 02/08/19, “Answers elusive as meth toll rises.”) Drug addicts should be in in-patient treatment facilities, not on city streets.

Prior Governor Brown vetoed similar legislation last year, saying, “enabling illegal and destructive drug use will never work. The community must have the authority and the laws to require compassionate but effective and mandatory treatment.” (SF Chronicle, 02/05/19, “Renewed push for safe sites for drug injectors.”)

It is time to clean up San Francisco and make it safe, clean and healthy for everyone. Stop helping drug addicts maintain their degenerate, dangerous habit.

Our elected and appointed officials should not be scofflaws. You should respect and uphold the Constitution of the United States. You should set an example for the general populace. VOTE NO!

We do not want our standard of living and our quality of life reduced to the lowest common denominator while San Francisco tries to be “trendy” and “cutting edge.” We do not want to expose our children and families to drugs of any kind. We do not want our communities trafficking in illegal drugs. And we do not want our government supporting and encouraging actions that harm public safety.

No responsible parent or citizen would vote yes on this legislation. It is the height of hypocrisy to make cigarette smokers and soda drinkers pariahs, yet encourage illegal drug use and drug injections to turn the population into drug addicts, sprawled on the streets of San Francisco in pools of filth with their used needles nearby, causing a huge public risk. VOTE NO!

Thank you for your consideration of my letter.

Kathleen Roberts
825 Lincoln Way #107
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: [Donna Quinlan](#)
To: [Reiskin, Ed \(MTA\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); mtaboard@sfmta.com; [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Consideration for Howard Bike Lane
Date: Tuesday, April 23, 2019 9:14:50 PM

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

Dear Mayor Breed, Board of Supervisors and SFMTA,

I recently learned that Tess Rothstein was killed this week after a driver opened their door into her path, forcing her under a truck which ran her over. A protected bike lane on Howard would have saved her life in this situation. I have also learned that Howard St. has been cause for many of these fatalities.

We really need the SFMTA to be proactive and install protected bike lanes on every stretch of the high injury network by the end of this year. Many other cities have taken action and expanded their protected bike lane networks. Why does the SFMTA under Ed Reiskin's leadership only install protected bike lanes after someone is killed?

Please consider extending the protected bike lane on Howard to 3th Street and the Embarcadero by the end of this year. These deaths cannot continue in our city.

Thank you,

Donna Quinlan

--

Donna Quinlan
donnaquinlan@gmail.com
(936) 446-0799

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Another serious bike accident on a dangerous 7th street
Date: Tuesday, April 23, 2019 12:36:00 PM

From: Dylan Harris <teradyl@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2019 1:38 PM
To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Reiskin, Ed (MTA) <Ed.Reiskin@sfmta.com>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; MTABoard@sfmta.com; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>
Cc: Maguire, Tom (MTA) <Tom.Maguire@sfmta.com>; Supawanich, Paul (MYR) <paul.supawanich@sfgov.org>; Charles Deffarges <charles@sfbike.org>; Haneystaff (BOS) <haneystaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: Another serious bike accident on a dangerous 7th street

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

Hello London Breed, MTA Board, & Supervisors (especially district 6/10 supervisors as this street is on the border),

I have read of another serious injury on our streets, and I want to know what is being done to prevent more avoidable accidents like this?

https://www.sfexaminer.com/the-city/bicyclist-struck-by-truck-near-mission-creek-suffers-serious-injuries/?fbclid=IwAR35FaXcJV_KEblAtzW7DkFoLWYFR7fw6F9UUjt9_8xDQfudjcKQFkO9TY

I rode this street just an hour before the injury reported, and I thought "Finally it's been repaved, but this is just a standard small bike lane right in the middle of the street next to all the parked cars." I urge you to make improvements to 7th street south of Townsend all the way to 16th street, which is a main bicycle arterial way and is not getting any of the love that Townsend to Market st is getting. Why is it not getting better infrastructure as it's repaved?

Additionally, I think whatever construction was being done there was unacceptable. I took a picture and filed a 311 (Case ID #10419087 and [photo](#)), and that instead is still in the "opened" state and never looked into. The pavement was practically unrideable. After reporting that 311, one time I had to go into the street to share the lane, I had someone punish pass me just inches from my handlebars because he probably thought what is this biker doing in the middle of the lane with all that space.

When I calmly told him he scared me (his window was open), he started yelling at me so I left to wait at the red light and avoid conflict. When he passed later he yelled "Go buy a fucking car!" I reported him to the police (who mostly said they could do nothing) and reported him in the [close call](#)

[database](#), but his license needs to be revoked and he should have serious consequences. Blue lexus with license plate AZURI. Can't the DMV do something about this!?

Imagine if you had just started to ride your bicycle, and someone does that to you. You would probably never ride a bike again. I bike almost every day, so this was a blip, but even so a horrible experience that still gives me PTSD when I bike down that one block of street (especially when it's been in such unacceptable shape).

I think other than all of these street changes for protected bike lanes (which is very important), enforcement and real repercussions to breaking the law and putting people's lives in danger should be a priority. For example, I heard the the door opener of Tess Rothstein's death may not get any serious punishment. That is "Involuntary Manslaughter" plain and simple!

Thank you for reading, and looking forward to safer streets.

Dylan

Author of www.biketoeverything.com

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: For Review: I Support Homes At Lot 330
Date: Tuesday, April 23, 2019 9:54:00 AM

From: Tyra Fennell <tyrafennellsf@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 23, 2019 9:32 AM
To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Quesada, Amy (PRT) <amy.quesada@sfport.com>
Subject: For Review: I Support Homes At Lot 330

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

Mayor Breed and Members of the Board of Supervisor:

My name is Tyra Fennell, a resident of the Bayview Hunters Point with a business in the Dogpatch.

I want to thank you for moving forward on the proposal for the Navigation Center at Lot 330 and wholeheartedly support the project. Thousands of my neighbors sleep on the street every night, we need to build homes but in the interim need solutions like the Navigation Center as a stop gap. It is unfortunate that many residents neighboring the Center are in opposition with many concerned about their children's exposure to those in the Navigation Center. I grew up three blocks from a homeless shelter, built in a middle-income neighborhood. My parents took the time to take my sister and me to volunteer and support our neighbors in need so I know this is a good thing and I am available to support you and other supervisors who are in support of this in any way possible.

Thanks for fighting the good fight.

Warmest Regards,

Tyra Fennell
 Assembly District 17 Delegate
 Vice President of Membership
 SF Eastern Neighborhoods Democratic Club
 For more information, [CLICK HERE](#)
 Founder: Imprintcity.org

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: I support homes at lot 330
Date: Tuesday, April 23, 2019 9:54:00 AM

From: Melanie Abrams <melanie.b.abrams@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2019 9:14 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: I support homes at lot 330

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

Hi, my name is Melanie Abrams, I live in Berkeley, and I support the proposed Navigation Center at Lot 330. Thousands of my neighbors sleep on the street every night, which is the single worst part of the Bay Area. I hope this real solution will not be drowned out by the voice of a few NIMBYs!

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: I support the SWL 330 Navigation Center
Date: Tuesday, April 23, 2019 9:54:00 AM

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

From: Shelley Carroll <sfshell@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 23, 2019 6:07 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: I support the SWL 330 Navigation Center

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

Hello,

I support the SWL 330 Navigation Center. Homeless people (and feces and needles) are already on our streets, and I don't think that the Center would increase that. In fact, restrooms in the Center will help that. The Safe Zone and the Community Ambassadors will help keep the area needle-free, litter-free, loitering free, and clean. In addition to this Navigation Center, support to the Hummingbird Place Psychiatric Respite and other mental health navigation centers will help with the mental health issues that plague the homeless.

I have been volunteering with Project Homeless Connect since April 2005 and look forward to a decrease in the number of homeless people who need our services.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Shelley Carroll
The Brannan

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Support for Embarcadero Navigation Center
Date: Monday, April 22, 2019 4:09:00 PM

From: Joe <joe.sandillo@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2019 10:00 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Support for Embarcadero Navigation Center

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

Good morning,

In advance of tomorrow's Port Commission Hearing, I wanted to write to register my support for the proposed Navigation Center at the Embarcadero. While this won't be a solution to our housing and homelessness crisis, it's an important step I support as a resident of San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Joseph Sandillo
3965 19th Street
San Francisco CA 94114

From: [Tommaso Sciortino](#)
To: [Quesada, Amy \(PRT\)](#); [DHS \(HOM\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: letters@yimbyaction.org
Subject: I support the Embarcadero Navigation center!
Date: Tuesday, April 23, 2019 3:27:10 PM

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

I work three blocks from the proposed navigation center and think it's very much needed. It's embarrassing that NIMBYs are opposing it. I support Mayor London Breed's proposal to build a SAFE Navigation Center equipped to serve 225 individuals suffering from homelessness on Seawall Lot 330.

Navigation Centers are a proven mechanism to help people transition from homelessness and receive treatment for physical and mental ailments and every person deserves humane support. This Navigation Center and others like it throughout the city are badly needed to address San Francisco's homelessness crisis.

From: [Alexandra Sweet](#)
To: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Quesada, Amy \(PRT\)](#)
Cc: [Cohen, Emily \(DPH\)](#)
Subject: I Support the Navigation Center at Lot 330
Date: Tuesday, April 23, 2019 1:38:48 PM

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

Mayor Breed, Board of Supervisors, Supervisor Haney, and Ms. Quesada,

Hi, my name Alex Sweet. I work at 2 Bryant St, across the street from Lot 330, and I support the proposed Navigation Center at Lot 330. Thousands of my neighbors sleep on the street every night and they deserve shelter, services and support.

Please don't interpret the loudest voices as community consensus - many of us can't take time off to attend this afternoon's Port Hearing.

Thank you for all the work you are doing to help the most vulnerable members of this community.

Alex

--

Alexandra Sweet
C: (630) 947-2624

From: [David Alexander](#)
To: [Quesada, Amy \(PRT\)](#); [DHS \(HOM\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Nav Center in D6
Date: Tuesday, April 23, 2019 2:45:14 PM

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

Good afternoon,

I live in D1 and work in D6. We desperately need this navigation center built despite loud protests from Embarcadero's wealthy elite.

Wealth does not give you direct power to change public policy.

This rings true the last time I checked the definition of a democracy.

From: [Kristin Tieche](#)
To: [Quesada, Amy \(PRT\)](#); [DHS \(HOM\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: letters@yimbyaction.org
Subject: Seawall Lot 330 - SUPPORT
Date: Tuesday, April 23, 2019 2:48:07 PM

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

I support Mayor London Breed's proposal to build a SAFE Navigation Center equipped to serve 225 individuals suffering from homelessness on Seawall Lot 330.

Navigation Centers are a proven mechanism to help people transition from homelessness and receive treatment for physical and mental ailments and every person deserves humane support. This Navigation Center and others like it throughout the city are badly needed to address San Francisco's homelessness crisis.

As a bike courier, I am frequently riding in this area and have noticed a sharp increase of people without homes living on the street. Bike lanes end up being dangerous because of increased trash and debris discarded in them. Also out of empathy for our fellow neighbors, please build the Nav Center on the Embarcadero, and in every District in SF.

Thank you,
Kristin Tieche
D1, 94117

From: [Kevin Burke](#)
To: [Quesada, Amy \(PRT\)](#); [DHS \(HOM\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support proposed navigation center
Date: Tuesday, April 23, 2019 2:44:59 PM

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

We desperately need to help the homeless transition out of homelessness, for their sake and for the city's. All of the other wealthy areas are watching to see what you do here; if you fall down or make accommodations for the NIMBY's you might as well write off a nav center in any new area you want one.

Kevin

--

Kevin Burke
phone: 925-271-7005 | kevin.burke.dev

From: [David Young](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance
Date: Sunday, April 28, 2019 7:40:24 PM

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about the amendment (page 12, lines 8-9) that says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance. The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part of the amendment should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

—dave

From: [Deb Holcomb](#)
To: [Yee, Norman \(BOS\); Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Amend the Video Surveillance Law
Date: Sunday, April 28, 2019 9:37:57 PM

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

Dear Supervisor Yee:

I live in District 7 near the Tiled Steps and not far from Golden Gate Park where I run every morning. I regularly see the smashed glass on the sidewalks due to smash n' grabs in my neighborhood. I take extra precautions whenever I leave my home because of the property crimes in my area. Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

I rely on groups like Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime, to make my neighborhood safer for all its residents. I agree with Stop Crime SF that the Video Surveillance Law legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about the amendment (page 12, lines 8-9) that says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance. The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part of the amendment should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

Thank your work to stop crime in District 7 and keep your residents safe (and feeling safe) in their homes and neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Debra Holcomb
54 Lurline Street

From: [Peter Fortune](#)
To: [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: AMEND the video surveillance law
Date: Monday, April 29, 2019 11:32:02 AM

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

Dear Supervisors:

Many in our residential and commercial neighborhoods have private security cameras whose video footage is readily, and eagerly, available to the SFPD to support their efforts to catch criminals, especially auto burglars and package thieves.

Supporting the SFPD is the primary — if not the only — reason why we have these private video cameras.

So PLEASE AMEND the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance such that it CLEARLY ALLOWS the SFPD to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) says only that police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where the current version says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be UNDULY AND UNNECESSARILY ONEROUS if applied to private citizens and businesses. PLEASE DELETE THIS PART.

EVERN WORSE is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could -- and probably would -- jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

I parrot here the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation.

Peter Fortune
3579 Pierce Street, SF

From: [Calvin Chow](#)
To: [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: Amend video surveillance law
Date: Monday, April 29, 2019 10:40:47 PM

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

San Francisco Police needs private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe. Thank you.

Calvin Chow
Resident of District 8

From: [roger capilos](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fw: please amend video surveillance law
Date: Sunday, April 28, 2019 10:16:39 AM

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

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: roger capilos <rcapilos@yahoo.com>
To: Joe Fitzgerald Rodriguez <joe@sfmediaco.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019, 10:15:29 AM PDT
Subject: Fw: please amend video surveillance law

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: roger capilos <rcapilos@yahoo.com>
To: Hillary Ronen <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2019, 10:13:48 AM PDT
Subject: please amend video surveillance law

Dear Supervisor: Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses. There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video. I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted. Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety. These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe. You the Supervisors have to make a decision... are you more concerned over the rights of thieves, rapists and taggers or are you concerned with the safety of the citizens of San Francisco. We will be watching the end result of this issue closely and we will be supporting candidates that love San Franciscans and not criminals. Roger Capilos Crocker Amazon 318 Allison St. SF Ca. 94112

From: [Stop Crime SF](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: please amend surveillance ordinance
Date: Sunday, April 28, 2019 10:13:10 AM
Attachments: [logo.png](#)

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



April 27, 2019

Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

We're also worried about the amendment (page 12, lines 8-9) that says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance. The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part of the amendment should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. We agree that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But we feel that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Frank Noto, president
Joel Engardio, vice president
Stop Crime SF
www.stopcrimesf.com

From: [EAK](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance
Date: Monday, April 29, 2019 11:55:51 AM

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about the amendment (page 12, lines 8-9) that says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance. The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part of the amendment should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Thanks,

EA Kline
Pac Heights

Sent from an iPhone

From: [CHARNA B](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology"
Date: Monday, April 29, 2019 11:33:02 PM

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about the amendment (page 12, lines 8-9) that says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance. The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part of the amendment should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Thank you,
Charna Ball
Pierce Street
SFCA 94123

From: [BH](#)
To: [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: please amend video surveillance law
Date: Monday, April 29, 2019 8:23:24 AM

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

Dear Supervisor Mandelman:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

Sincerely,
Brian

Brian Higginbotham
616 Sanchez Street
San Francisco, CA 94114-2611

From: [JeNeal Granieri](#)
To: [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: please amend video surveillance law
Date: Monday, April 29, 2019 10:52:22 AM

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

JeNeal Granieri
Golden Gate Heights

SF.

From: [lorrie french](#)
To: [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: please amend video surveillance law
Date: Monday, April 29, 2019 9:48:34 AM

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

Lorraine French
1325 Page Street #4
San Francisco, CA 94117
lorriefrench@gmail.com

From: [Scott Sellman](#)
To: [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: Please amend video surveillance law
Date: Monday, April 29, 2019 9:35:07 AM

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Thanks you for listening,
Scott Sellman
849 Noriega St

From: [Matthew Rivette](#)
To: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [MandelmanStaff. \[BOS\]](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: please amend video surveillance law
Date: Monday, April 29, 2019 8:32:04 AM

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

Dear Supervisor: Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses. There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video. I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted. Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety. These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Thank you,
Matthew Rivette
Corona Heights

From: [Meredith Serra](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please amend video surveillance law
Date: Monday, April 29, 2019 8:20:14 AM

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

Dear Supervisors:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety. This part should be deleted.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Meredith Serra
Westwood Highlands

From: [Karen Crommie](#)
To: [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: please amend video surveillance law
Date: Monday, April 29, 2019 3:23:53 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Karen Crommie
628 Ashbury St
SF94117

Sent from my iPad

From: [james reece](#)
To: [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: please amend video surveillance law
Date: Sunday, April 28, 2019 7:41:33 PM

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [armand der-hacobian](#)
To: [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: please amend video surveillance law
Date: Sunday, April 28, 2019 5:29:28 PM

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

From: [Al H](#)
To: [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: please amend video surveillance law
Date: Sunday, April 28, 2019 2:54:35 PM

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

A Hampel

Sent from my iPhone

From: [John Cranshaw](#)
To: [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: please amend video surveillance law
Date: Sunday, April 28, 2019 2:41:05 PM

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to and appreciate your support.

John and Michelle Cranshaw

From: [Rachel Miller-Garcia](#)
To: [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: please amend video surveillance law
Date: Sunday, April 28, 2019 2:35:51 PM

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

Dear Supervisors:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9).

The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime, of which i am a member and I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Thank you!

Rachel
Rachel Miller-Garcia
415-810-1408 c

From: [Susan Fisch](#)
To: [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: please amend video surveillance law
Date: Sunday, April 28, 2019 1:14:51 PM

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Susan Fisch
Ashbury Heights
SF resident for 29 years

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Devi Joseph](#)
To: [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: please amend video surveillance law
Date: Sunday, April 28, 2019 12:48:38 PM

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Thank you,
Dr. Devorah Joseph
862 39th Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: [Jorge Garcia](#)
To: [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: please amend video surveillance law
Date: Sunday, April 28, 2019 12:35:30 PM

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Sincerely,
Jorge Garcia (District 5 resident)

From: [Gugelmann, Hallam](#)
To: [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: please amend video surveillance law
Date: Sunday, April 28, 2019 11:26:31 AM

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

Dear Supervisors,

As an emergency medicine physician in San Francisco, I have a very special interest in the city's security. I urge you to please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. We have had packages and things stolen out of ours and friends' cars with increasing frequency recently. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Hallam

Hallam Gugelmann, MD MPH
Attending Physician, Emergency Medicine, CPMC Mission Bernal Hospital
Medical Toxicology Attending, University of California at San Francisco
Assistant Medical Director, California Poison Control System, San Francisco Division

From: [Art Wydler](#)
To: [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: please amend video surveillance law
Date: Sunday, April 28, 2019 10:56:09 AM

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Mary Burns](#)
To: [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: please amend video surveillance law
Date: Sunday, April 28, 2019 10:53:43 AM

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

Dear Supervisor: Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses. There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video. I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted. Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety. These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

From: [Miner Lowe](#)
To: [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: please amend video surveillance law
Date: Sunday, April 28, 2019 10:48:16 AM

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Sent from my iPad

From: [Luke Perkocha](#)
To: [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: please amend video surveillance law
Date: Sunday, April 28, 2019 10:19:26 AM

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

Dear Supervisors:

I have been contacted by Stop Crime SF to call your attention to needed amendments to this ordinance. However, I have independently been monitoring this issue and the various supervisors' positions, so am very familiar with the ordinance proposed by Supervisor Peskin, the ballot initiative that it is pursuant to and the issue of property crime in San Francisco. This crime epidemic (there is no other word for it) and the consequent loss of the feeling of safety for residents that it results in, affects far more voting San Franciscans than any hypothetical or actual (and rare) abuses of the technology by our government to date.

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Thank you very much,

Luke Perkocha MD, MBA
Member, Board of Trustees, Golden Gate Heights Neighborhood Association

From: [Donna T](#)
To: [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: please amend video surveillance law
Date: Sunday, April 28, 2019 10:17:22 AM

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Local government should not hinder the only tools residents have that provide us with a sense of security. Without our cameras, we are essentially inviting criminals to our City to commit crimes they cannot get away with anywhere else. It is imperative that you allow video camera surveillance to be used by law enforcement without restriction.

Sincerely,
Donna Turner
1154 Alemany Blvd.
San Francisco, CA 94112
(415) 425-0872

From: [Nancy Panelo](#)
To: [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: please amend video surveillance law
Date: Sunday, April 28, 2019 10:10:26 AM

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Laura Fingal-Surma](#)
To: [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 \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: stopcrimesf@gmail.com
Subject: Please amend video surveillance law
Date: Monday, April 29, 2019 12:46:24 PM

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Thank you,
Laura Fingal-Surma
Noe Valley

From: [Leslie](#)
To: [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: Surveillance Technology
Date: Sunday, April 28, 2019 10:42:32 AM

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

From: [Amy Johnson](#)
To: [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: URGENT: please amend video surveillance law
Date: Sunday, April 28, 2019 10:49:00 AM

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

Dear Supervisor:

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Amy Johnson
Homeowner/resident
District 7, Miraloma Park

From: [Jamie Whitaker](#)
To: [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: Vision Zero goal needs you to please amend video surveillance law
Date: Sunday, April 28, 2019 12:50:36 PM

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

Dear Supervisor:

I want to express my concern over any impediments to video surveillance being used to hold hit and run drivers in addition to property and violent criminals accountable in San Francisco.

Please amend the "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology" ordinance so it clearly allows the police department to use video from security cameras voluntarily provided by private homes and businesses.

There is a property crime epidemic in San Francisco and police need private security video footage to solve crimes. The amendment on page 12 (lines 6-9) only says police can receive private video. It should clearly say police can also use private video.

I'm also worried about where it says police can receive private video only if it complies with all other parts of the ordinance (page 12, lines 8-9). The legislation contains many requirements meant for city departments that would be onerous if applied to private citizens and businesses. This part should be deleted.

Even more troubling is language (Page 10, lines 3-6 and 16-18) that says the police department must get full Board of Supervisors approval before working with a private entity that regularly provides video. This could jeopardize longstanding relationships with non-profits, private businesses and merchant associations that work closely with police. And it could jeopardize public safety.

These are the recommendations of Stop Crime SF, a group of more than 500 San Francisco residents working to reduce crime. I agree with Stop Crime SF that this legislation addresses legitimate concerns about privacy and civil liberties. But I also agree that more needs to be fixed so this law doesn't end up making us less safe.

Sincerely,
Jamie Whitaker
District 6 resident

From: [Allen Jones](#)
To: officeofthemayor@oaklandnet.com; cityclerk@oaklandca.gov; atlarge@oaklandnet.com
Cc: [Board of Supervisors](#); (BOS); [Wilson Walker](#)
Subject: apology on behalf of 97,863 San Francisco voters
Date: Sunday, April 28, 2019 12:48:48 PM
Attachments: [Mayor Libby SchaafApril 29 \(1\).docx](#)

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

To Whom it May Concern,

This letter of apology is intended for the people of Oakland, CA. I have it in a word document and an Open Letter posted to my Medium page. <https://medium.com/@casegame/open-letter-an-apology-on-behalf-of-97-863-san-franciscans-4942389c38c9>

If interested in the 500-word ballot measure I am happy to send it upon request.

Allen Jones
 jones-allen@att.net
 (415) 756-7733
<http://nbadoesntcare.com>
https://www.zazzle.com/philoso_tz/products

The only thing I love more than justice is the freedom to fight for it. -- Allen Jones --

Mayor Libby Schaaf
1 Frank H Ogawa Plaza
3rd Floor
Oakland, CA 94612
officeofthemayor@oaklandnet.com

April 29, 2019

Oakland City Council
Oakland City Hall
1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza
Oakland, CA 94612
cityclerk@oaklandca.gov

RE: Apology on behalf of 97,863 San Franciscans

Dear Oakland Residents,

My name is Allen Jones. I am a long-time resident of San Francisco (1960) and a Golden State Warriors fan since 1975.

I am sending to the entire population of Oakland, a sincere apology on behalf of the San Franciscans who casts nearly, 98,000 "Yes" votes in support of the June 5, 2018 San Francisco election ballot measure, Proposition I, aka "Relocation of Professional Sports Teams."

The ballot measure was Declaration of Policy intended to make it clear, San Franciscans are not down with being co-conspirators with its governing body, in ripping off anyone; let alone our neighbor, Oakland of its beloved professional basketball team.

Unfortunately, 131,000 San Franciscans voted, "No", to apologizing to Oakland for what the evidence suggests was the biggest rip-off of a Black community since the beginning of slavery.

We are sorry for the actions of our elected officials, those who voted against this apology and the San Francisco media that successfully worked to keep this apology from reaching the people of Oakland.

Notwithstanding my belief that any ownership group of a professional sports team should be able to go wherever the owners feel they can make the most on their investment, I draw the line as a sports fan, on how any ownership goes about relocating a team.

The morally reprehensible act by the Joe Lacob ownership group to abandon a Black Oakland community, for a new White San Francisco community reeks of racism as much as it smells of the competing foul odor of greed.

Highlighted by the failed attempt by the owners to walk out on a public debt of \$40 million was brazen and quite nervy. And though an arbitration judge saw right through this attempt to dine and dash, it gives me no comfort to hear both sides of this now resolved dispute acting like, no harm no foul.

The tools used by San Francisco City Hall in this theft from an Oakland community were Racism, greed, covetousness and corruption. This was a classless act by what I still believe to be a, "World-class city."

San Francisco has a \$10 billion a year tourism industry verses Oakland's \$800 million a year tourism industry. In other words, a world-class city helps its neighbor; it does not help itself to its neighbor's jewels.

From the first meeting the late Mayor Ed Lee had with Peter Guber up to waving on the back of a convertible during an Oakland parade celebration of one of the Warriors NBA Championship and to this day, I have felt both ashamed and embarrassed for my favorite city.

And in defense of the late San Francisco mayor, I do not believe Ed Lee, a man who did not want to be mayor of San Francisco acted alone to create a "Legacy project" by theft, especially from a neighboring Black community.

But an interesting admission by a sitting San Francisco member of the Board of Supervisors confirms for me, I am spot-on in my criticism that racism played a major role in making Chase Center possible.

SF Supervisor Aaron Peskin trying to justify his objection to allowing the Oakland Raiders renting the San Francisco Giants stadium for one season. In a San Francisco Examiner report, the supervisor admitted, "We're done ripping off Oakland" as his reason. Read between the line of this racist statement by Mr. Peskin. The same city that had no problem with taking the Warriors from Oakland fans became unwilling to share with other Oakland sports fans.

And the fact that the owners of the Raiders eventually worked out a deal for the final year in Oakland in no way lets the San Francisco's un-neighborly act off the hook.

San Francisco was able to snatch the Warriors from Oakland because the NBA Commissioner Adam Silver allowed this to happen. And the entire league should juxtapose this move with the statements made by former LA Clippers owner Donald Sterling to better get a gage on its level of hypocrisy.

Sincerely,

Allen Jones
P.O. Box 410273
San Francisco, CA 9141
(415) 756-7733
Jones-allen@att.net
<http://NBAdoesntcare.com>

From: [Jamey Frank](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Yee, Norman \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Brown, Vallie \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [ahsha safai](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fund Transit, Stop Driver Torture
Date: Saturday, April 27, 2019 1:34:53 PM

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

Dear Supervisors

SFMTA is a monopoly who's sole mission is to torture drivers into taking unreliable (and dangerous) transit. It's nickname is "*Motorist Torture Authority*."

How about we **stop funding road diets** and street redesign, and instead **fund actual transit**. All that has done is congest our streets and destroy local businesses, not make streets safer or transit better.

Cancel the Red Lane on 16th Street.

Put the money towards *hiring drivers and maintenance*. And to an outside auditor to evaluate SFMTA corruption and incompetence from top to bottom.

Finally, break up the SFMTA to mitigate the damage, lack of oversight, and their agenda that runs contrary to the majority of San Franciscans. (The Bicycle Coalition has infiltrated SFMTA effectively nullifying citizen input.)

We demand a New Transit Vision:

- Break up SFMTA into Muni, Parking and Streets, and Public Works
- Board of Supervisors elect and appoint all board members and directors
- Fund city-wide Subway with a bond *only for subways* (not driver torture projects)
- Cease and reverse smog-producing Road Diets and Red Lanes
- Restore confiscated parking, and eliminate under-use bike lanes
- Eliminate under-utilized routes, increase frequency to high volume routes 24/7
- Partner with Uber/Lyft to serve eliminated routes on demand with UberPool and LyftLine
- Prioritize local neighborhood input, over political activists, lobbyists, and extremists
- Fast-track Highspeed Rail and Caltrain extension

The way things are now has severely negatively impacted quality of life in San Francisco and devastated local merchants.

WE NEED A NEW VISION.

Sincerely,

--Jamey Frank, 370 Church St.

From: [John Miller](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); joe@kpix.cbs.com; christien.kafton@foxtv.com; [Joe Fitzgerald Rodriguez](#); rmarenco@twusf.org; jsamuelsen@twu.org; [Reiskin, Ed \(MTA\)](#); MTABoard@sfmta.com
Subject: Re: HUNDREDS OF MUNI OPERATORS HAVE QUIT... HERE IS WHY...
Date: Monday, April 29, 2019 8:19:47 PM

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

Dear SF BOS,

I sent the below email yesterday. It provides details regarding the biggest problem Muni is facing: Driver shortage.

In that email forgot to explain the background well. Here is the timeline:

- Up until 2014, it took 18 months for a new Muni bus driver to reach top pay.
- In 2014, that period was increased to 5 years. More precisely: Completion of 4 years. So, after completing 4 full years, drivers would receive top pay starting their fifth year in service.
- That change started a dwindling spiral. Muni has lost hundreds of new drivers in the last five years. The pay is not enough for one of the toughest city jobs ever.
- Meantime, San Francisco went from an expensive city to the most expensive in the country to the most expensive city in the world.
- I joined Muni six months ago. I like working for Muni.
- I cover tougher shifts than operators who have higher seniority because I am new.
- It is not fair to me to receive \$22 when another driver receives \$36 for the same exact work.

So, there you have it. Now you know why there is such an unprecedented driver shortage.

The solution is to pay the top rate after a new driver successfully completes his six-month probation.

Sincerely,
John Miller

On Sun, Apr 28, 2019 at 8:19 PM John Miller <johnnybmillersf@gmail.com> wrote:
San Francisco Board of Directors,

Hundreds of MUNI bus drivers have quit in the last few years. Buses are parked in the yard due to lack of drivers. I have been with MUNI for six months and I am seriously considering quitting. Several of my fellow drivers feel the same way. I would like to discuss why so many MUNI bus drivers have quit.

- It is not the hectic San Francisco traffic.
- It is not the tough working conditions such as the hills and the crush loads.
- It is not the long hours or the lack of proper restrooms and breakrooms.
- It is the pay.
- Drivers start at \$22.
- Top pay is \$36.
- It takes four years to get to \$36.

Most Bay Area companies are starting qualified bus drivers around \$30. MUNI is starting drivers at \$22, which is less than what Uber drivers make. This is a joke considering San Francisco is the most expensive city in the world.

San Francisco traffic is heavy. The hills and the crush loads make it hard. Lack of proper restrooms, breakrooms and food options is an additional burden on hardworking drivers. I don't think many people realize this: It takes 5 to 8 times more effort to stop a loaded bus than a regular sedan. It is hard on the knee. And drivers have to stop the bus several hundred times in a single shift. It hurts all day long.

Driving MUNI buses is not the same as driving one of those air-conditioned tech company shuttle buses which stop a few times in the city, interact mainly with well-mannered and highly-educated tech workers, and cruise mostly down the 101 or the beautiful 280.

After all the hard work, MUNI drivers receive a measly paycheck. Most drivers want to be with MUNI but cannot afford to. Solution: Please reduce the time it takes to get to the top pay from 5 years to 6 months.

I want to work for you, just pay me the top pay rate.

I do not know or fully understand most of what the management does. But I respect the fact that they know things I do not know or understand fully. Likewise, the management doesn't know or fully understand how hard my job is.

It is a lifestyle, and it involves a lot of sacrifices.

The MUNI Transit Operator job is harder than most other city jobs. The #1 reason new drivers leave MUNI or go out on disability for long periods is \$. They just don't want to deal with the public and the traffic for the low pay they are receiving.

I have been with MUNI for six months and I do not do anything less than a driver who has been here for 10 or 20 years. In fact, I get tough shifts due to my low seniority. It is not fair to me to receive \$22 for the same work when someone else receives \$36. Am I jealous of veteran operators? Not one bit. I have learned a lot from them and I respect their service to the community. At the same time, I know that it is unfair to pay someone less for the same exact work.

Low pay is the #1 cause of stress among new drivers. There is not much incentive to come to work when you are bringing home a measly paycheck.

The best solution is to reduce the time it takes to get to the top pay from 5 years to 6

months, not 18 months.

Some people say that going back to 18 months would be fine. IT REALLY IS NOT. San Francisco is not the same city it was five years ago. This city is super-expensive now. Five years ago San Francisco was not the most expensive city in the world. It was not even the most expensive in the country. Today, it is considered the most expensive city in the world. It doesn't make any sense for hard working drivers to lose their well-deserved pay for 18 months after performing such hard work.

Many veteran operators have bought houses in the past when they weren't as expensive. Today, I pay \$2900 in rent. I have a young family. I often work seven days a week just to make ends meet.

The other option would be to leave the city and find a different job to avoid a long daily commute. :-(

I don't want to spend two to four hours commuting. I need some family time and personal time as well.

Like I said earlier, low pay is the #1 stressor for the newest drivers. You would agree that driving even a personal vehicle in the city is quite stressful. Driving a MUNI bus and dealing with the public is ultra-stressful. Add financial stress on top of all of that... and you break hardworking drivers.

I want to work for SFMTA. I want to come to work 5 to 7 days a week and serve the public. Just pay me at the top pay rate.

Yours sincerely,
John Miller

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Edna the Cat
Date: Wednesday, April 24, 2019 3:19:00 PM

From: Daniela Ponce <danielaponcepacheco99@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 23, 2019 5:45 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Commission, Fire (FIR) <fire.commission@sfgov.org>; FireAdministration, FIR (FIR) <fireadministration@sfgov.org>
Subject: Edna the Cat

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

Dear Mayor London Breed, Board of Supervisors, and Fire Commission,

I write to you to address the eviction of the beloved cat, Edna, from the San Francisco fire station. On February 12th 2019, it was announced that Edna was to be removed from the facility as a result of an anonymous complaint. The complaint demanded to “get rid of the cat,” and gave a Monday deadline until they called animal control.

An action like such would never take place in an average home. I am certain if a person one day knocked at your doors and demanded you get rid of your pets, you would scoff at their preposterous demand. Understandably, Edna *was* living outside common household conditions. She resided in an upbeat, fast paced, stressful place, where she could have posed a threat of slowing procedures down. Emergency vehicles such as fire trucks do in fact need to get to their location fast. However, why is it that Edna spent 5 years living under these conditions and not once posed harm? Not once was an inconvenience. Not once was in the way of an operation.

If anything, Edna brought calmness, and helped release stress from what is a very stress-inducing environment. I have mass respect for firefighters.; they put their lives on the line every day to help people such as yourself and myself. They rush to scenes that seek their help in a timely fashion, regardless of what the scene may be. It’s a stressful job, and the workers at Station 49 had taken onto a sweet creature that brought them a sense of calmness, that helped them relieve themselves from the pressure and tension of the environment they work at. Research has proven that animals do in fact help reduce stress and bring an ease of mind to people. For 5 years, Edna served this way to the many people that work at the station. Edna has obtained her therapy animal title. Why is it that she is forbidden from helping people? Who is it she is bothering? Does the one person

matter more than the mental health of nearly all the workers at Station 49?

When you considering this issue, you should definitely keep the workers' stand in mind, they want Edna there, but you should also consider what a cruel thing it is to run a cat from its home. Edna was forced to adapt to an entirely new environment, was stripped away from her home and from the people she saw every day. People belittle animals, what would your stance be if they were children? A slightly over the top comparison perhaps, but children are a bigger threat and inconvenience than animals sometimes.

The people in charge of evicting Edna treated her like vermin. The station was sanitized as if some sort of plague had run through it. It's ridiculous. The workers thought it was ridiculous, and over 44.5 thousand people on social media thought it was ridiculous. You are unquestionably painting a poor image of yourselves. The city of San Francisco doesn't care about animals or mental health of fire station workers.

Edna had a lot of support from all over the world. There is no good reason to keep her out. It's been 2 months since her eviction but the public's perception of you lives on. Let Edna return to her home and to her owners, both for her sake and theirs.

I hope you read this email and take action Edna's case, rather than ignore it like the thousand other emails you have chosen to ignore.

Do what is right.

Sincerely,
Daniela Ponce

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors; Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Please support Supervisor Mar's Resolution Opposing SB 50
Date: Tuesday, April 23, 2019 12:38:00 PM

From: Jean Perata <perason4u@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 3, 2019 2:49 PM
To: Brown, Vallie (BOS) <vallie.brown@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>
Cc: Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Please support Supervisor Mar's Resolution Opposing SB 50

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

Dear Supervisors Brown, Mar and Peskin,

Please support Supervisor Mar's resolution opposing SB 50. It's important that land-use management be kept in local hands.

Thanks for your consideration,

Jean Perata
1 Los Palmos Drive, SF, CA 94127

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Subject: FW: Arnautoff mural at GWHS
Date: Tuesday, April 23, 2019 12:38:00 PM
Attachments: [Letter to re Arnautoff mural.pdf](#)

From: Nina Bogdan <translation@ninabogdan.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 3, 2019 1:02 PM
To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; ART-Info <ART-Info@sfgov.org>
Subject: Arnautoff mural at GWHS

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

Honorable Mayor Breed and Members of the Board of Supervisors and Arts Commission:

Please find a copy of my letter sent to the SFUSD regarding the proposed destruction of the Arnautoff mural at George Washington High School.

Nina Bogdan

Nina Bogdan
9353 E Ravine Trl
Tucson AZ 85749

March 26, 2019

Dr. Vincent Matthews, Superintendent
Members of the Board of Education
San Francisco Unified School District
555 Franklin Street
San Francisco, CA

Dear Dr. Matthews and Board Members:

I am writing to you regarding the Victor Arnautoff murals at George Washington High School. The "Reflection and Action Group" appointed by the district has recommended that all thirteen panels be painted out because, in the words of the group's recommendation, "the mural . . . glorifies slavery, genocide, colonization, manifest destiny, white supremacy, oppression."

The premise on which the Action Group made the decision to destroy the mural is both foundationally and fundamentally incorrect. Victor Arnautoff, a Russian émigré, was a member of the Communist Party and painted the mural as a protest of the standard dominant culture narrative of American history in the 1930s. In a time period when no one was openly discussing or portraying the horrors of the genocide of Native Americans, slavery, and Jim Crow laws, that is, the historical oppression of people of color in the United States, Arnautoff created the mural as a counterpoint to that dominant narrative. As such it is a *condemnation* of colonization, manifest destiny, and white supremacy, not a glorification. The letter from Professor Robert Cherny, who recently completed a biography about Arnautoff, explains in detail the content and proper interpretation of this mural.

Destroying this mural would not only be an egregious error in judgment, it would also be an erasure of ethnic Russian history in the city of San Francisco. I was born and raised in San Francisco, am the co-author of *Russian San Francisco*, an "Images of America" photographic history of the Russian community in this city, and am currently a PhD Candidate at the University of Arizona, completing a dissertation titled "Creating a Russian-American Identity in Interwar and Post-War San Francisco: Gender, Space, and Memory in the Negotiated Acculturation Process, 1917-1957." My dissertation speaks to the processes of acculturation and building of community in the urban space of San Francisco in the aforementioned period. The history of that community is embedded in such artistic projects as the mural at George Washington High School. It will be sad commentary on the practices of the San Francisco Board of Education if they choose to go ahead and destroy a historic work of protest art in a school, which is the right place for it.

The depiction of a murdered Native American in the mural, though disturbing, represents what actually happened in the Euro-American march westward – a key aspect of American history which, I might add, remains neglected in most high school curricula. I teach U.S. history classes at the University of Arizona and regularly encounter a lack of knowledge among undergraduates about Native American history in general and the genocide of Native Americans and First Peoples specifically. Removing the mural from the school will de-contextualize it and minimize Arnautoff's efforts to highlight social injustice; it will also contribute to that erasure of history. Should the Board go ahead with this action I will certainly include it in the epilogue of my dissertation as an example of willful cultural erasure.

Sincerely,

Nina Bogdan