FILE NO: 200236

Petitions and Communications received from February 17, 2020, through February 24, 2020, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on March 3, 2020.

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.

Petitions and Communications received from February 17, 2020, through February 24, 2020, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on March 3, 2020.

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 Contract Monitoring Division of the City Administrator's Office, pursuant to Administrative Code, Chapter 14B.15(A), submitting the Local Business Enterprise (LBE) Participation Quarterly Report for Quarter 1, Fiscal Year 2019-2020. Copy: Each Supervisor. (1)

From Christina Tom, regarding safety in Cow Hollow. Copy: Each Supervisor. (2)

From concerned citizens, regarding housing, homelessness, and up zoning. Copy: Each Supervisor. 2 letters. (3)

From concerned citizens, regarding Police staffing levels. 6 letters. File No. 200036. Copy: Each Supervisor. (4)

From Beatriz Kajt, regarding the torture and illegal dog and cat meat trade in Seoul, South Korea. Copy: Each Supervisor. (5)

From Junko Shimizu, regarding current parking laws in San Francisco. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

From Jay Cabalquinto, regarding proposal to move the Flower Mart to Potrero Hill. Copy: Each Supervisor. (7)

From Katherine Howard, Co-Chair Friends of the Music Concourse, regarding proposed additions to lighting and sound systems for the Bandshell in the Music Concourse. Copy: Each Supervisor. (8)

From Aaron Goodman, regarding the cleanliness on some of the Muni busses. Copy: Each Supervisor. (9)

From Anonymous, regarding a request to require all San Francisco public records to be retained for at least two years. 2 letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (10)

From Aaron Goodman, regarding adjusting the curve of carbon impacts globally and locally. Copy: Each Supervisor. (11)

From the Office of the Mayor, pursuant to Charter, Section 3.100(13), and Administrative Code, Chapter 7, submitting a proclamation declaring the existence of a local emergency, in preparation for a potential ensuing emergency in connection to COVID-19, and to qualify for State and Federal relief. Copy: Each Supervisor. (12)

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Subject:	FW: CMD LBE Participation Report for FY 2019/20 Q1
Date:	Thursday, February 27, 2020 3:04:00 PM
Attachments:	image001.png LBE Participation Q1FY19-20 Cover letter-signed.pdf CMD FY1920 Q1 Report.pdf

From: Fretty, Rochelle (ADM) <rochelle.fretty@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2020 10:17 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Asenloo, Romulus (ADM) <romulus.asenloo@sfgov.org>; Camua, Maria-Zenaida (ADM) <maria-zenaida.camua@sfgov.org>
Subject: CMD LBE Participation Report for FY 2019/20 Q1

To the Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to Chapter 14B.15(A) of the San Francisco Administrative Code, attached please find the Local Business Enterprise (“LBE”) Contracting Report for Fiscal Year 2019/20 Q1.

Should you have any questions, require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me at this email address.

Thank you,

Rochelle Fretty, Clerk

Contract Monitoring Division (CMD)
30 Van Ness Avenue | Suite 200 | San Francisco | CA | 94102
Direct 415-581-2314 | Main 415-581-2310
Rochelle.Fretty@sfgov.org
Visit us at sfgov.org/cmd

CONTRACT MONITORING DIVISION
CITY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE

London N. Breed, Mayor
Naomi M. Kelly, City Administrator

Romulus Asenloo, Director

February 20, 2020

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall
1 Dr. Calrton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Pursuant to Chapter 14B.15 (A) of the San Francisco Administrative Code, please find the Local Business Enterprise ("LBE") Participation Quarterly Report for Q1FY 2019-20. The LBE Participation Report documents the LBE contract award statistics on work covered by Chapter 14B for the Airport, Public Works, Port, Public Utilities Commission, Recreation & Parks Department and Controller's Office.

Thank you for your continued support of CMD and the LBE Program. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (415) 581-2320.

Sincerely,

Romulus Asenloo

Romulus Asenloo
Contract Monitoring Division
Director

Office of the Controller (Data Source – F$P)

Total Number of Contracts for FY 19/20 Q1: 4

Contract Type Description	Number of Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Percent of Total Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Number of Contracts to Date	Percent of Total Contracts to Date
Professional Services - Chapter 21	4	100.0%	18	100.0%
Grand Total	**4**	**100.0%**	**18**	**100.0%**

Contract Type Description	Amount Awarded FY 19/20 Q1	LBE Amount Awarded FY 19/20 Q1	Amount Awarded to Date	LBE Amount Awarded to Date
Professional Services - Chapter 21	$3,495,400	$478,385	$18,985,454	$4,189,470
Grand Total	**$3,495,400**	**$478,385**	**$18,985,454**	**$4,189,470**

Prime LBE Status	Number of Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Percent of Total Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Number of Contracts to Date	Percent of Total Contracts to Date
LBE	1	25.0%	3	16.7%
Non-LBE	3	75.0%	15	83.3%
Grand Total	**4**	**100.0%**	**18**	**100.0%**

Prime Owner Type	Number of Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Percent of Total Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Number of Contracts to Date	Percent of Total Contracts to Date
Other Business Enterprise	1	25.0%	3	16.7%
Non-LBE	3	75.0%	15	83.3%
Grand Total	**4**	**100.0%**	**18**	**100.0%**



San Francisco International Airport (Data Source – F$P)

Total Number of Contracts for FY 19/20 Q1: 9

Contract Type Description	Number of Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Percent of Total Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Number of Contracts to Date	Percent of Total Contracts to Date
Construction Contracts	4	44.4%	100	49.3%
Professional Services - Chapter 6	2	22.2%	81	39.9%
Professional Services - Chapter 21	3	33.3%	22	10.8%
Grand Total	**9**	**100.0%**	**203**	**100.0%**

Contract Type Description	Amount Awarded FY 19/20 Q1	LBE Amount Awarded FY 19/20 Q1	Amount Awarded to Date	LBE Amount Awarded to Date
Construction Contracts	$17,997,137	$6,598,626	$7,146,900,754	$1,559,022,429
Professional Services - Chapter 6	$7,560,000	$7,485,000	$589,394,485	$231,092,631
Professional Services - Chapter 21	$222,197,808	$11,094,803	$262,398,748	$20,096,093
Grand Total	**$247,754,945**	**$25,178,429**	**$7,998,693,987**	**$1,810,211,153**

Prime LBE Status	Number of Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Percent of Total Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Number of Contracts to Date	Percent of Total Contracts to Date
LBE	4	44.4%	80	39.4%
Non-LBE	5	55.6%	123	60.6%
Grand Total	**9**	**100.0%**	**203**	**100.0%**

Prime Owner Type	Number of Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Percent of Total Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Number of Contracts to Date	Percent of Total Contracts to Date
Minority Business Enterprise	1	11.1%	15	7.4%
Other Business Enterprise	1	11.1%	26	12.8%
Women Business Enterprise	1	11.1%	33	16.3%
Non-LBE	6	66.7%	129	63.5%
Grand Total	**9**	**100.0%**	**203**	**100.0%**



Notes: 1) all column headings are defined as per CMD (e.g. "to Date" refers to active contracts with term start date of 7/1/13 or later)

2) Due to FAMIS to PeopleSoft conversion, not all original award amounts may have been captured

Public Works (Data Source – F$P)

Total Number of Contracts FY 19/20 Q1: 4

Contract Type Description	Number of Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Percent of Total Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Number of Contracts to Date	Percent of Total Contracts to Date
Construction Contracts	2	50.0%	304	89.4%
Professional Services - Chapter 6	2	50.0%	31	9.1%
Professional Services – Chapter 21	0	0.0%	5	1.5%
Grand Total	**4**	**100.0%**	**340**	**100.0%**

Contract Type Description	Amount Awarded FY 19/20 Q1	LBE Amount Awarded FY 19/20 Q1	Amount Awarded to Date	LBE Amount Awarded to Date
Construction Contracts	$13,733,168	$13,683,078	$1,046,427,233	$706,000,300
Professional Services - Chapter 6	$1,800,000	$999,000	$64,050,698	$55,359,604
Professional Services – Chapter 21	$0	$0	$5,000,000	$5,000,000
Grand Total	**$15,533,168**	**$14,682,078**	**$1,115,477,932**	**$766,359,903**

Prime LBE Status	Number of Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Percent of Total Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Number of Contracts to Date	Percent of Total Contracts to Date
LBE	3	75.0%	190	55.9%
Non-LBE	1	25.0%	150	44.1%
Grand Total	**4**	**100.0%**	**340**	**100.0%**

Prime Owner Type	Number of Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Percent of Total Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Number of Contracts to Date	Percent of Total Contracts to Date
Minority Business Enterprise	1	25.0%	88	25.9%
Other Business Enterprise	1	25.0%	64	18.8%
Women Business Enterprise	0	0.0%	29	8.5%
Non-LBE	2	50.0%	159	46.8%
Grand Total	**4**	**100.0%**	**340**	**100.0%**



Port of San Francisco (Data Source – F$P)

Total Number of Contracts FY 19/20 Q1: 4

Contract Type Description	Number of Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Percent of Total Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Number of Contracts to Date	Percent of Total Contracts to Date
Construction Contracts	0	0.0%	5	15.6%
Professional Services - Chapter 6	2	50.0%	14	43.8%
Professional Services - Chapter 21	2	50.0%	13	40.6%
Grand Total	**4**	**100.0%**	**32**	**100.0%**

Contract Type Description	Amount Awarded FY 19/20 Q1	LBE Amount Awarded FY 19/20 Q1	Amount Awarded to Date	LBE Amount Awarded to Date
Construction Contracts	$0	$0	$26,246,748	$12,056,243
Professional Services - Chapter 6	$3,750,000	$2,568,750	$30,439,396	$18,514,458
Professional Services - Chapter 21	$1,500,000	$776,250	$44,942,945	$14,277,454
Grand Total	**$5,250,000**	**$3,345,000**	**$101,629,089**	**$44,848,154**

Prime LBE Status	Number of Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Percent of Total Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Number of Contracts to Date	Percent of Total Contracts to Date
LBE	2	50.0%	19	59.4%
Non-LBE	2	50.0%	13	40.6%
Grand Total	**4**	**100.0%**	**32**	**100.0%**

Prime Owner Type	Number of Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Percent of Total Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Number of Contracts to Date	Percent of Total Contracts to Date
Minority Business Enterprise	0	0.0%	4	12.5%
Other Business Enterprise	1	25.0%	5	15.6%
Women Business Enterprise	0	0.0%	6	18.8%
Non-LBE	3	75.0%	17	53.1%
Grand Total	**4**	**100.0%**	**32**	**100.0%**



Public Utilities Commission (Data Source – SOLIS 3)

Total Number of Contracts for FY 19/20 Q1: 15

Contract Type Description	Number of Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Percent of Total Contracts FY 18/19 Q1	Number of Contracts to Date	Percent of Total Contracts to Date
Construction Contracts	5	35.7	190	31.3%
Professional Services - Chapter 6	6	42.9%	238	39.2%
Professional Services - Chapter 21	3	21.4%	179	29.5%
Grand Total	**14**	**100%**	**607**	**100.00%**

Contract Type Description	Amount Awarded FY 19/20 Q1	LBE Amount Awarded FY 19/20 Q1	Amount Awarded to Date	LBE Amount Awarded to Date
Construction Contracts	$12,952,255	$5,834,351	$2,704,174,643	$744,581,092
Professional Services - Chapter 6	$5,850,000	$2,700,000	$1,238,714,118	$232,841,429
Professional Services - Chapter 21	$4,330,000	$770,660	$369,532,815	$90,840,419
Grand Total	**$23,132,255**	**$9,305,011**	**$4,312,421,576**	**$1,068,262,940**

Prime LBE Status	Number of Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Percent of Total Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Number of Contracts to Date	Percent of Total Contracts to Date
LBE	2	14.3%	163	26.5%
Non LBE	12	85.7%	453	73.5%
Grand Total	**14**	**100.0%**	**616**	**100.0%**



Recreation and Parks Department (Data Source – F$P)

Total Number of Contracts for FY 19/20 Q1: 4

Contract Type Description	Number of Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Percent of Total Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Number of Contracts to Date	Percent of Total Contracts to Date
Construction Contracts	0	0.0%	3	30.0%
Professional Services - Chapter 6	4	100.0%	7	70.0%
Grand Total	**4**	**100.0%**	**10**	**100.0%**

Contract Type Description	Amount Awarded FY 19/20 Q1	LBE Amount Awarded FY 19/20 Q1	Amount Awarded to Date	LBE Amount Awarded to Date
Construction Contracts	$0	$0	$11,479,508	$8,996,915
Professional Services - Chapter 6	$5,000,000	$3,406,250	$6,800,000	$3,886,250
Grand Total	**$5,000,000**	**$3,406,250**	**$18,279,508**	**$12,883,165**

Prime LBE Status	Number of Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Percent of Total FY 19/20 Q1	Number of Contracts to Date	Percent of Total Contracts to Date
LBE	3	75.0%	6	60.0%
Non-LBE	1	25.0%	4	40.0%
Grand Total	**4**	**100.0%**	**10**	**100.0%**

Prime Owner Type	Number of Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Percent of Total Contracts FY 19/20 Q1	Number of Contracts to Date	Percent of Total Contracts to Date
Minority Business Enterprise	2	50.0%	4	40.0%
Other Business Enterprise	1	25.0%	2	20.0%
Women Business Enterprise	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Non-LBE	1	25.0%	4	40.0%
Grand Total	**4**	**100.0%**	**10**	**100.0%**



From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: FW: Concerned about safety in Cow Hollow
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2020 6:19:00 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Christina Tom <christinawtom@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 6:51 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Concerned about safety in Cow Hollow

Hello!

My husband and I moved to Cow Hollow last year hoping to reside in a safer neighborhood.

I wanted to share with you my recent concerns regarding safety. During the last year, we've seen an increasing number of homeless wandering the streets, trash and drug paraphernalia. This is not the San Francisco we once loved.

A few weeks ago, I was walking my dog down Lombard street and was chased by a homeless man pushing a shopping cart. Last weekend, while walking my dog on chestnut street at 7am, a homeless man had his pants down and yelled derogatory slurs at me. Just this afternoon, another homeless man yelled at me from across the street on Steiner.

We wake up each morning and see trash littered all over the streets. The homeless are destroying our community and they're moving into this neighborhood on a daily basis.

Let's come up with a solution to keep our community safe! More police. Moving the homeless to navigation centers where they can get help. Let's actively move towards a clean, safe neighborhood.

Thank you!

Christina

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Subject:	FW: Housing, homelessness, and upzoning
Date:	Thursday, February 20, 2020 6:19:00 PM

From: Avinash Kar <avinashkar2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 9:48 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Housing, homelessness, and upzoning

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a homeowner and parent and 20-year resident of the city and I write to you to ask you support and work to ensure upzoning in the city and state around transit corridors to address one of the most pressing issues we face today in the city and the state.

The Governor's speech today and the failure of SB 50 puts a fine point on California's failure to address its housing and affordability crisis. The world's fifth largest economy and progressive capital of the US accounting for a half of the US homeless is shameful. And San Francisco is a microcosm of the state in this respect. The homelessness and conditions on the streets of our city are an indictment of our collective conscience.

SB 50 might not have been the ideal bill; it would likely benefit from more provisions to ensure affordable housing and protect sensitive neighborhoods, but the core idea of upzoning near transit lines is an essential one for a city as constrained as ours and as rife with single family homes. The ethos of arrive, then pull up the ladder, is antithetical to San Francisco's spirit. The Board's failure to grapple with this issue, and to allow NIMBYism and scares about "shadows" and blocked views rule the day, undermines our collective high-minded arguments in other spheres--who are we to take the moral high ground when we allow this to happen in our city? I urge you to collectively work to allow upzoning with appropriate provisions and safeguards for low-income populations both in the city and at the state level, and not simply to oppose what seems like an essential part of an overall solution. The city can do much of this on its own within its boundaries--it doesn't need to wait for the state, and you can ensure that the city's efforts avoid many of the problems with SB 50 that some of you pointed out. But simply criticizing SB 50 for missing certain elements is not enough. The Board must step up and deliver a better version of that bill locally.

I love this city and what it stands for, and think this is a necessary part of our future. I know it will be a critical part of my thinking as I look to future elections in the city.

With thanks for all you do and for your consideration of my input,

Sincerely,
Avinash Kar
141 Dorado Terrace
San Francisco, CA 94112

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors
Cc: BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject: FW: Comment re 3pm Feb 25 Special Item: Police Staffing Levels
Date: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 2:13:00 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Paul Wermer <pw-sc_paul@sonic.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 2:10 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>
Subject: Comment re 3pm Feb 25 Special Item: Police Staffing Levels

Dear Supervisors,

I am a San Francisco resident, living in D2. For most of my trips in San Francisco, I walk or take public transit.

While there is a great deal of concern about the homeless, I am threatened by something else entirely: Dangerous behaviors by operators of wheeled vehicles.

Several years back, the then Captain of the Northern Station stated the biggest threat to my safety was crossing the street - and the situation has only gotten worse.

For some reason the Vision Zero project is happy to tout engineering changes, but they seem to have traffic code enforcement at the bottom of the priority list.

Rarely do I see a police vehicle on my walks, and even more rarely do I see a traffic stop. On the other hand, I frequently see serious traffic violations that put pedestrians, bicyclists and other drivers at risk

Stop signs behave more like a well obeyed "5 MPH" speed limit. Drivers (especially Uber and Lyft) are using, and looking at the screens of cell phones while driving, often turning corners without paying attention to pedestrians with right of way already in the cross walk.

I regularly observe electric scooters on sidewalks and in cross walks, passing very close to pedestrians in a crowded environment. I have seen scooters pass between 2 pedestrians who are chatting with each other.
on more than one occasion.

And I regularly see pedestrians violating the codes as well - and so often slowing traffic by obstructing turning vehicles, etc.

My point: We need many more officers assigned to traffic detail, enforcing the myriad violations occurring hourly - by drivers, bicyclists, scooter riders and pedestrians.

Thank you for your consideration,

Sincerely,
Paul

Paul Wermer
2309 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94115

+1 415 929 1680
paul@pw-sc.com

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Subject:	FW: File No. 200033
Date:	Thursday, February 27, 2020 3:06:00 PM

From: Stephen Poulios <s_poulios@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2020 10:30 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: File No. 200033

To the Board of Supervisors:

I've lived and worked in San Francisco for the past 19 years, and I love this city. However, my affinity is being tested because of the ever devolving homeless situation. And with each passing day, I grow less empathetic. I know that these are real people who are struggling; people who have / had parents that love / loved them, siblings who would do anything for them and friends who would support them. But those realizations and feelings are quickly forgotten when I see piles of trash left behind in doorways, needles at bus stops or people defecating in front of a school during school hours (SVDP - 2/21/2020). The lack of response from City Hall is creating a divide between the have's and the have nots. This is on you. You're our elected leaders who are supposed to look after the citizens of this city, and we've given you the checkbook to look after those that need help. You're failing them and you're failing us.

Do something about it or we'll elect someone who will.

Stephen Poulios
District 2

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: FW: Police Staffing Levels Pacific Heights
Date: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 2:14:00 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: LINDSAY BOLTON <lindsaybolton@mac.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 12:41 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Police Staffing Levels Pacific Heights

There needs to be a major increase in Police Staffing levels in Pacific Heights.
The crime spike is evident and there should be more police patrolling for the safety of the children, elderly and everyone.
There is a spike in drug addicts and mentally unsound individuals walking around and sleeping in Pacific Heights.
There are people shooting up on the stairs at Calvary which holds a preschool.
There are too many schools in the vicinity not to have more police presence.
Thank you,
Lindsay Bolton

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Cc:	BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject:	FW: Police Staffing Levels
Date:	Thursday, February 20, 2020 4:30:00 PM

From: hashagenfive@gmail.com <hashagenfive@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2020 3:05 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Police Staffing Levels

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I understand that you will hear a report next week on police staffing levels. I'm not yet sure if I can attend that meeting, so am sending my thoughts now. I do believe that San Francisco needs more police officers. I've lived in the City since 1982, and don't remember ever seeing the volume of problems on the street. I'm so sad to have to explain to visitors what is going on in San Francisco. Just a few of the incidents I've seen in recent months:

- While walking home from a hearing at City Hall around 7pm one evening last November, I encountered a man seemingly not in his right mind, crossing Bush St. against the light and in front of oncoming traffic. He then attacked three parked cars on Pierce St. with a golf club. At one point he turned and veered toward me from across the intersection, and I was truly afraid of physical harm.
- While on a walk last Saturday afternoon (to the post office at Geary/Steiner and then north on Fillmore St.), I encountered three separate individuals who were clearly under some undue influence – two of them scary enough that I crossed the street to avoid them. All that in a 25 minute walk.
- While waiting for a bus on Geary St. in front of Japan Center I watched a man strip naked and then defecate in the bus shelter.
- Homeless encampments popping up throughout my neighborhood (Western Addition).
- Squatters moving into two homes in my neighborhood – at least twice in each home, and with one resulting in a fire that did serious property damage and threatened other homes.
- Watched an obvious car theft ring casing cars on my block of Broderick St.

I report almost all of what I see, and when the police have been called, they do usually respond, but they seem overwhelmed by the volume of criminal activity, major and minor, that they have to deal with. I have loved living in the City, but my youngest children have just graduated from college and as I plan to down-size my home, I am for the first time considering moving out of the City. It's getting harder and harder not to encounter serious quality of life issues on a daily basis.

Please take measures – such as increasing police staffing – while San Francisco can still be saved.

With regards,

Carla Hashagen
1713 Broderick St.

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: FW: Police Staffing Levels
Date: Thursday, February 27, 2020 2:51:00 PM

From: Guido Saveri <Guido@saveri.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 2:39 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Police Staffing Levels

There should be enough police to make the streets safe and to protect the police while they are doing their job..

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Subject:	FW: REQUEST FOR MORE POLICE STAFF! Man "doing his business" in front of SVDP school (Resolved)
Date:	Thursday, February 27, 2020 2:57:00 PM
Attachments:	IMG_8415-1.MOV

From: Debbie MacLeod <d.macleod@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 3:20 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Debbie MacLeod <d.macleod@yahoo.com>
Subject: REQUEST FOR MORE POLICE STAFF! Man "doing his business" in front of SVDP school (Resolved)

SF board of supervisors:
This is an urgent plea for more police staff to make our city (and specifically my neighborhood Cow Hollow/Marina) more safe.

The below email describes an incident that happened yesterday which was reported to 311. (See attachments)

It was resolved in a timely fashion (thankfully), but I wanted to bring it to your attention because it happened in front of a K-8 Catholic school that was in session. Clearly the man was out of his mind on drugs, but it was so disturbing and obviously unacceptable behavior. More funding to recruit / retain and staff police in the streets will help to prevent these situations from happening.

Hopefully this story can be recounted in your hearing next week (Re: File No. 200033)

Thank you for anything you can do.
Debbie MacLeod

From: Debbie MacLeod <d.macleod@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 3:00 PM
To: Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>
Subject: man "doing his business" in front of SVDP school (Resolved)

I was *HORRIFIED* today to see out my front window on Green street (between Pierce/Steiner) to see a homeless and clearly very drugged out man who was laying on the

sidewalk fully masterbating (pants half down) in front of St. Vincent de Paul **SCHOOL** this afternoon at approximately 1pm for all the world to see. Attached evidence.

I alerted the school (where my son also attends) and called 311 immediately. FORTUNATELY, the situation was resolved within the hour before kids came out for pickup, but the school had to hose down the sidewalk (the man had scabies). The policeman, who called an ambulance to pick up the man, said to me "There's a bad batch of drugs out there right now - this is about the 8th one of these calls today".

I am just utterly disgusted by what is NOT being done in this city to combat this problem and get help to those that need it and clean up our neighborhoods - it's becoming an everyday occurrence that our neighbors (and beyond) are outraged by. This is my first letter but it won't be my last because after 30 years living here, I just can't even believe how far the city has fallen. It is absolutely disgusting. I was AFRAID walking home from a show the other day up Van Ness with my 13 year old in broad daylight. I now run fast to my apartment if I happen to have to park around the corner at night and get anxiety just going to Safeway in the Marina given all that's going on down there. It's insanity.

Please help.

Debbie deCordova MacLeod
415-699-4749

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: FW: Sister City – Seoul, South Korea
Date: Thursday, February 27, 2020 2:49:00 PM

From: Beatriz Kajt <beatriz_kajt@yahoo.com.ar>
Sent: Saturday, February 15, 2020 11:18 AM
To: Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Brown, Vallie (BOS) <vallie.brown@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Malia (BOS) <malia.cohen@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Kim, Jane (BOS) <jane.kim@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: nglish@seoul.go.kr; dhk2233@hanmail.net; kanglaw83@daum.net; polbkk@naver.com; james@cargosolution.co.kr; zutty@hanmail.net; ksstc@hanmail.net; muse201@hotmail.com; comsam00@naver.com; kyungwoo1231@gmail.com; 0101ilove@hanmail.net; kkd7792@hanmail.net; kkd3344@hanmail.net; chondaejang@hanmail.net; 5221dong@hanmail.net; junghee6029@hanmail.net; ksw3400@naver.com; ararechang@naver.com; soyoungkim812@gmail.com; ksk0580@hanmail.net; goldds2@naver.com; kkyyyy0929@daum.net; ij7857@gmail.com; kiminhoseoul@naver.com; oktica@gmail.com; jerry5931@hanmail.net; kjongmu@naver.com; loving-jinsoo@hanmail.net; chun52@hanmail.net; kcwon@hanmail.net; tskim57@hanmail.net; kpn7885@naver.com; ropeon@naver.com; rucia112@naver.com; mister44@hanmail.net
Subject: Sister City – Seoul, South Korea

Dear Mayor Breed and the members of the Board of Supervisors,

We ask you to please watch these documentaries of South Korea's dog meat industry:
https://youtu.be/cCdTceduKcY
https://koreandogs.org/horrible-reality-of-meat-dog-farms-you-did-not-know/
https://koreandogs.org/companion-animals-for-consumption/.

Do you think that San Francisco should be a Sister city to any city that allows dogs and cats to be tortured and eaten? Dog meat consumption in South Korea is not legal (https://koreandogs.org/kara-publishes-legal-information-booklet-ending-dog-meat-consumption/). Yet their government and general public basically ignore its presence and allow it to continue.

The United States House of Representatives has formally passed H.Res. 401, "Calls for an end to the dog and cat meat industry and urges all nations to outlaw the dog and cat meat trade." (https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-resolution/401)

Please urge Seoul Mayor Park Won-Soon to close down all those illegal dog farms and slaughterhouses, markets,

truckers, and restaurants that serve these animal products. An online petition calling for your support in ending the horrendous South Korean dog and cat meat cruelty is in progress: https://www.change.org/p/tell-sister-city-seoul-s-korea-that-we-re-opposed-to-the-torture-and-consumption-of-dogs-and-cats
The favor of your reply is requested.
Thank you,

Beatriz Kajt
Buenos Aires
Argentina

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: FW: Parking change
Date: Thursday, February 27, 2020 2:50:00 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: JUNKO SHIMIZU <junko1tui2@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 12:23 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Parking change

Submitting formal objection to current parking laws. The suggestion must come from who has designated parking & is being paid by the residents whom s/he is strangling by making life harder and more expensive. I have previously submitted comments of parking covered to mini eating patios, loading zones.
The police state you create will fail at the public's expense in funds for admin costs & equipment (repair-I point to muni arrival electronic system which does not work: oh you wouldn't know, you have car & designated parking)).
Let's focus on nepotism type hiring & none hanky pansy existing at the top of our local & national "leaders".
I request that my concerns be voiced in today's meeting.
I appreciate your assistance. Thank you.

J. Shimizu

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Subject:	FW: DO NOT MOVE THE FLOWER MARKET TO POTRERO HILL
Date:	Thursday, February 27, 2020 2:50:00 PM

From: Jay Cabalquinto <jaycabalquinto@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 12:33 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: DO NOT MOVE THE FLOWER MARKET TO POTRERO HILL

Hello Board of Supervisors

I've been a SF resident for over 20 years and a resident of Potrero Hill for most of those years. I am saddened of the news that a proposed housing development on 16th & Missisippi was shut down and instead there are plans to move the Flower Market to a thriving residential community, especially a the housing project also included 42 affordable housing units. The increased traffic and delivery trucks that will descend upon this area does not make any sense. The Mariposa street exit from HW 280 is already often congested. There are more suitable sites for the Flower Market to relocate to.

PLEASE DO NOT LET THIS HAPPEN TO POTRERO HILL

A concerned citizen of Potrero Hill
Jay Cabalquinto

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Subject:	FW: Proposal to add lighting and amplified
Date:	Thursday, February 27, 2020 2:51:00 PM
Attachments:	Friends of the Music Concourse - Bandshell sound and lighting.pdf

From: Kathy Howard <kathyhoward@earthlink.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 2:20 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Proposal to add lighting and amplified

Dear Supervisors,

Friends of the Music Concourse is very concerned about the second proposal to add lighting and amplified sound to the Bandshell in Golden Gate Park.

Attached please find our letter outlining our concerns about the negative impacts on the historic Music Concourse and on Golden Gate Park as a historic landscape park.

Sincerely,

Katherine Howard, ASLA

Co-Chair

Friends of the Music Concourse

Friends of the Music Concourse (c)
Dedicated to the Preservation
of the Historic Golden Gate Park
Music Concourse

February 18, 2020

Historic Preservation Commission
Planning Department, City and County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103

Subject: 55 Hagiwara Tea Garden Drive - Proposed additions to lighting and sound systems for the Bandshell in the Music Concourse

Commission President Aaron Jon Hyland and Commissioners,

Friends of the Music Concourse would like to add some additional comments to our letter of January 14, 2020.

First of all, we appreciate that the proposed spotlights have been removed from top of the Bandshell. Certainly this type of lighting was not appropriate in any way to this elegant structure, and it would have had a negative impact on the character of this remarkable cultural landscape.

Secondly, we are still concerned about the other additional lighting and sound that is being proposed for the Bandshell. Without repeating all of the points in our prior letter, here are our main concerns:

Two years is one year too long

The ostensible reason for the 'temporary' lighting and sound is the Department of Recreation and Parks' (RPD) one-year-long 150th Golden Gate Park Anniversary Celebration. However, both the 'temporary' lighting and the 'temporary' sound system are being proposed for TWO years.

- Upon inquiry to RPD about the reason for this extension, we were informed that the performers needed time to get used to the equipment. This can be taken care of by RPD staff holding a short training session at the beginning of the celebration for all those who are interested in using the space.
- If the equipment is intrusive enough on the historic architecture that RPD feels it should be removed after two years, then it does not belong there beyond the celebration.
- We are concerned that the two years is being used as a reason for everyone to get used to seeing and hearing the equipment at the Bandshell and might lead to an extension of the intrusive equipment.
- We do not know the impact that adding night lighting and sound will have on the surrounding areas. Although RPD has stated that the Park Rangers will be monitoring the use of the equipment, the fact is that the Park Rangers do not interfere will sound levels during concerts -- as have been evidenced in the larger Park concerts, during which neighborhoods vibrate with the over-amplified music.

(musicconcourse@earthlink.net)

In the Department of Recreation and Park's own planning guide, the Golden Gate Park Master Plan, lighting is intended to be limited in Golden Gate Park overall and in the Music Concourse specifically.

- Lighting of Golden Gate Park, including the Music Concourse, is intended to be primarily for "use and safety considerations." [1] It is not intended to increase night use. This map from the Golden Gate Park Master Plan (1998) shows the only areas that may be lighted under the Recreation and Park Department's own guidelines. In the Music Concourse area specifically, the de Young Museum and the California Academy of Sciences are the only areas that are designated as "night use areas." The rest of the Music Concourse and the Bandshell are not even designated as "potential night use areas." [2]



Legend

- Night use areas
- Potential night use areas
- Important intersections (medium priority)
- Primary access roads and adjacent paths to night use areas (highest priority)
- Path access to night use areas (highest priority)
- MUNI stops serving night use areas

9-5

Lighting Plan, GGPMP [3]

Conclusion

Friends of the Music Concourse urges you to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness for the new lighting and sound for the Bandshell or at a minimum to limit the time period to one year for the Anniversary Celebration.

Sincerely,

Katherine Howard

Katherine Howard, ASLA, Co-Chair

[1] Lighting Plan, Golden Gate Park Master Plan, 1998. Page 9-5.
[2] Lighting Plan, Golden Gate Park Master Plan, 1998. Page 9-5.
[3] Lighting Plan, Golden Gate Park Master Plan, 1998. Page 9-5.

* * * * *

(musicconcourse@earthlink.net)

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Subject:	FW: Cleaning buses ?? Coronavirus ?? Incubator bus???
Date:	Thursday, February 27, 2020 2:52:00 PM

From: Aaron Goodman <amgodman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 6:41 PM
To: cac@sfmta.com
Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Cleaning buses ?? Coronavirus ?? Incubator bus???

Seems the bus interiors could use some sanitization daily.. have not seen a clean bus in some time?

Ag D11

Sent from my iPhone

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: FW: Supervisors, Please Require Retention of all SF Public Records for at least 2 years
Date: Thursday, February 27, 2020 3:02:00 PM
Attachments: Supervisors Please Require Retention of all SF Public Records for at least 2 years.msg

---

-----Original Message-----
From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2020 8:58 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>; Cityattorney <Cityattorney@sfcityatty.org>
Subject: Supervisors, Please Require Retention of all SF Public Records for at least 2 years

From:	Anonymous
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc:	SOTF, (BOS); Cityattorney
Subject:	Supervisors, Please Require Retention of all SF Public Records for at least 2 years
Date:	Thursday, February 20, 2020 8:58:24 PM
Attachments:	signature.asc

Honorable Supervisors,
[cc: City Attorney and SOTF - as public communications for agendas]

Some of you have discussed recently in the media how important transparency is to you. It is time to put your words into action.
Please consider creating an ordinance amending SF Admin Code Chapter 8 to create a lower limit of retention for ***all*** San Francisco "public records" of at least 2 years (not just "records" as defined under SF Admin Code Section 8.1, which is quite restrictive).

Many agencies and officials currently claim the right to destroy "general correspondence" at any time, without any retention.
For example, in a recent SOTF case (not brought by me) against Sean Elsbernd and the Office of the Mayor, the Office claimed a right to discard Elsbernd's calendars every two weeks. Apparently nothing in the current law stops this.

In another case, SFPD disclosed text messages between Chief Scott and the Mayor to me as public records. But when I requested those records from the Mayor, I did not get them. If they are following the Sunshine and CPRA laws correctly, that likely means the Mayor had already discarded them before receiving my request.

No government officials should ever be allowed to destroy records related to public business in a way that thwarts public disclosure.
Destroying records serves no legitimate governmental purpose and is antithetical to the public interest.
Knowing what the government does is fundamental to the protection of democracy.

Please, take action now.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

From:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To:	BOS-Supervisors
Subject:	FW: Supervisors, Please Require Retention of all SF Public Records for at least 2 years
Date:	Thursday, February 27, 2020 3:02:00 PM
Attachments:	Supervisors Please Require Retention of all SF Public Records for at least 2 years.msg

---

-----Original Message-----
From: Anonymous <arecordsrequestor@protonmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2020 9:51 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: SOTF, (BOS) <sotf@sfgov.org>; Cityattorney <Cityattorney@sfcityatty.org>
Subject: Supervisors, Please Require Retention of all SF Public Records for at least 2 years

From:	Anonymous
To:	Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Cc:	SOTF, (BOS); Cityattorney
Subject:	Supervisors, Please Require Retention of all SF Public Records for at least 2 years
Date:	Thursday, February 20, 2020 9:50:50 PM
Attachments:	signature.asc

Honorable Supervisors,
[cc: City Attorney and SOTF - as public communications for agendas]

Some of you have discussed recently in the media how important transparency is to you. It is time to put your words into action.
Please consider creating an ordinance amending SF Admin Code Chapter 8 to create a lower limit of retention for ***all*** San Francisco "public records" of at least 2 years (not just "records" as defined under SF Admin Code Section 8.1, which is quite restrictive).

Many agencies and officials currently claim the right to destroy "general correspondence" at any time, without any retention.
For example, in a recent SOTF case (not brought by me) against Sean Elsbernd and the Office of the Mayor, the Office claimed a right to discard Elsbernd's calendars every two weeks. Apparently nothing in the current law stops this.

In another case, SFPD disclosed text messages between Chief Scott and the Mayor to me as public records. But when I requested those records from the Mayor, I did not get them. If they are following the Sunshine and CPRA laws correctly, that likely means the Mayor had already discarded them before receiving my request.

No government officials should ever be allowed to destroy records related to public business in a way that thwarts public disclosure.
Destroying records serves no legitimate governmental purpose and is antithetical to the public interest.
Knowing what the government does is fundamental to the protection of democracy.

Please, take action now.

NOTE: Nothing herein is legal, IT, or professional advice of any kind. The author disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to all warranties of merchantability or fitness. In no event shall the author be liable for any special, direct, indirect, consequential, or any other damages whatsoever. The digital signature (signature.asc attachment), if any, in this email is not an indication of a binding agreement or offer; it merely authenticates the sender. Please do not include any confidential information, as I intend that these communications with the government all be disclosable public records.

Sincerely,

Anonymous

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: FW: Embodied Carbon in Construction Calculator hopes to tackle emissions
Date: Thursday, February 27, 2020 3:03:00 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Aaron Goodman <amgodman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2020 7:11 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Embodied Carbon in Construction Calculator hopes to tackle emissions

Important to realize that demolition of sound housing is NOT the most green solution....

Regardless of past decisions on projects it's about adjusting the curve of carbon impacts globally and locally.

Obsolescence and proving it prior to proposals to demolish must become the new norm in architecture and solutions that attach amend and compliment existing structures must be taken as priority to reduce global carbon impacts.

Green building certification means nix if we ignore total carbon impacts....

Agoodman D11

https://www.dezeen.com/2020/02/21/embodied-carbon-in-construction-calculator/

Sent from my iPhone

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO

LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

PROCLAMATION BY THE MAYOR DECLARING THE EXISTENCE OF A LOCAL EMERGENCY

WHEREAS, California Government Code Sections 8550 et seq., San Francisco Charter Section 3.100(13) and Chapter 7 of the San Francisco Administrative Code empower the Mayor to proclaim the existence of a local emergency, subject to concurrence by the Board of Supervisors as provided in the Charter, in the case of an emergency threatening the lives, property or welfare of the City and County or its citizens; and

WHEREAS, The United States has confirmed cases of individuals who have a severe acute respiratory illness caused by a novel (new) coronavirus ("COVID-19" or "the virus") first detected in Wuhan, Hubei Province, People's Republic of China ("China"). The virus was first reported in China on December 31, 2019. As of February 24, 2020, the World Health Organization ("WHO") has reported approximately 77,262 confirmed cases of COVID-19 in China, more than the number of confirmed cases of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) during its 2003 outbreak. An additional 2,069 cases have been confirmed across 29 other countries; in many of these cases, the infected individuals had not visited China. More than 2,500 people have died from the virus, including 23 outside of China. The number of confirmed cases has continued to escalate dramatically over a short period of time; and

WHEREAS, WHO officials now report that sustained human-to-human transmission of the virus is occurring. Transmission from an asymptomatic individual has been documented. Although the majority of individuals infected with COVID-19 recover from the disease without special treatment, approximately 1 in 6 may become seriously ill. Manifestations of severe disease have included severe pneumonia, acute respiratory distress syndrome, septic shock, and multi-organ failure. Approximately 2% of the people confirmed infected with COVID-19 have died; and

WHEREAS, On January 30, 2020, WHO declared the COVID-19 outbreak a public health emergency of international concern, and on January 31, 2020, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services declared a Public Health Emergency for the United States; and

WHEREAS, The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention ("CDC") has determined that the virus presents a serious public health threat, requiring coordination among state

and local health departments to ensure readiness for potential health threats associated with the virus; and

WHEREAS, The CDC has issued guidance to local and State health departments, including San Francisco's Department of Public Health ("DPH"), concerning risk assessment and public health management of persons with potential exposure to COVID-19. These guidelines require DPH to make extraordinary efforts to monitor ongoing communicable disease threats and prepare for management of individuals who may have been exposed to COVID-19; and

WHEREAS, DPH, the Department of Emergency Management, and other City partners have been working successfully and diligently to implement CDC guidelines, but now require additional tools and resources to protect the public health given the current state of the epidemic and the need for a sustained response; and

WHEREAS, The City's Director of Public Health has determined that DPH cannot comply with the CDC's guidance without immediate action beyond the City's ordinary response capabilities, including directing personnel and resources from other City departments to assist with the ongoing and developing threat of COVID-19; and

WHEREAS, Conditions of extreme peril to the safety of persons and property have arisen; and

WHEREAS, The Mayor does hereby proclaim that the aforesaid conditions of extreme peril warrant and necessitate the proclamation of the existence of a local emergency,

NOW, THEREFORE,

I, London N. Breed, Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco, proclaim the existence, effective immediately on February 25, 2020, of an emergency within the City and County threatening the lives, property or welfare of the City and County and its citizens;

It is further ordered that:

(1) All City and County officers and employees take all steps requested by the Director of Public Health to prevent the spread of COVID-19 and to prevent or alleviate illness or death due to the virus; and

(2) All City and County officers and employees take all steps requested by the Director of Public Health to qualify the City for reimbursement from the Federal Emergency Management Agency and for other state and federal relief as may be available to reimburse the City for the expenses it incurs in addressing this emergency; and

I further proclaim and order that:

By the terms of this emergency declaration the government of the City and County of San Francisco is organized under the provisions of the Incident Command System (ICS), which system forms an essential part of the City's Emergency Operations Plan. The head of each City department and agency shall observe his or her proper relationship in the command structure outlined by the system and shall respond to the orders and requests of the Lead Department designated to exercise supervision over his or her department during the course of this emergency;

Because of the extreme peril to its residents and visitors, the Governor of the State of California is hereby requested to include the area of the City and County of San Francisco in any emergency declaration by the State, and is further requested to ensure that the City and County is included in any emergency declaration that may be issued by the President of the United States.

And I further proclaim and order that:

This declaration of a local emergency shall continue to exist until it is terminated by the Mayor or the Board of Supervisors. All departments of the City and County of San Francisco are strictly ordered to cooperate with the requests for material and personnel resources that may emanate from the Incident Command Staff of the City and County which is located in the Emergency Command Center of the City and County of San Francisco.

DATED: 2/25/2020

London N. Breed
Mayor of San Francisco

n:\govern\as2020\9690082\01430676.doc