

From: [Erica Zweig](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: 11/14/25 Meeting/Item 8 Public Comment
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 10:41:03 PM
Attachments: [111325 Behested Payments letter.docx](#)

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

Please distribute to the members of the Ethics Commission for 11/14/25 meeting Item 8.

From: [Mary Scheib](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Item #8 Ordinance No. 250947: Behested Payment Waiver-Oppose.
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 9:24:14 AM

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

PUBLIC COMMENT: SF ETHICS COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING Friday,
November 14, 2025 10:00AM

ITEM 8. Discussion and possible action re: Behested Payment Waiver.

My name is Mary Scheib. Thank you for holding this meeting and for taking my testimony. I hope to give comment remotely at the meeting and am also submitting in writing. I'm a member of Indivisible SF Local and State Action team. We are joining in coalition with California Clean Money Campaign and California Common Cause to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, item #8 on the Agenda.

Indivisible's mission is to hold our local officials accountable to extend democracy, fairness, transparency and progress towards a political culture that serves the will of all the people. As our democratic process is under threat nationally, it is especially important to hold on to and cherish it locally, as the Ethics Commission has done in the past.

Therefore, ISF opposes the Behested Payment Waiver, ordinance allowing the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the San Francisco's prohibition on soliciting payments from parties who have business with the City. San Francisco voters passed Proposition E by nearly 70% in 2022 expressly to prohibit this kind of corruption. Even if unintentional or for worthy causes, the waiver of Behested Payments would nullify the will of the voters, be a conflict of interest and return to a past culture of corruption, ripe for Pay to Play and distrust.

As stated in our letter to the SF Ethics Commission, as the Board of Supervisors conducts the people's business, they can adopt simple rules and practices to help them comply with the law, support transparency and the public's right to know, as we've suggested.

I was struck by the discussion, in your agenda document, of the City's Sunshine ordinance assuring that deliberations of the all of government are conducted before the people and open to their review. I also appreciate your past leadership in behested payment restrictions. In that light, I urge the Ethics Commission to stand firm and deny ordinance No.250947.

Thank you again.

From: [Robert Thomas](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 5:32:05 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Robert Thomas
apollonos@me.com
78 Sanchez St Apt 1
San Francisco, California 94114

From: [Steve Bloom](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 5:34:56 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Steve Bloom
bloomsheimer@me.com
1417 7th Ave.
San Francisco, California 94122

From: [Tom Baker](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 5:35:49 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Tom Baker
aallc.architects@gmail.com
1679 Church St
San Francisco, California 94131

From: [Ann Clegg](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 6:01:31 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Ann Clegg
ann.clegg@gmail.com
49 Linda St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Claudia Haas](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 6:07:50 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Claudia Haas
claudiabhaas@gmail.com
669 University St.
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94134

From: [Jacob Dresdale](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 6:40:30 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Jacob Dresdale
dresdale.jacob@gmail.com
200 Brannan St Apt 124
San Francisco, United States, California 94107

From: [Martha Goldin](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 6:54:03 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Martha Goldin
honmgret@gmail.com
701 4th Ave
San Francisco , California 94118

From: [Martha Goldin](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 7:16:37 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Martha Goldin
honmgret@gmail.com
701 4th Ave
San Francisco , California 94118

From: [Patrice Thompson](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 7:45:23 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Patrice Thompson
patricia_inez@yahoo.com
443 40th Ave
San Francisco, California 94121

From: [Allan Paisley](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 8:08:04 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Allan Paisley
mallan05@gmail.com
47 Natoma St.
San Francisco, California 94103

From: [Timothy Dobbins](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 8:10:18 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Timothy Dobbins
sfbigcelt@sbcglobal.net
1255 Page Street Apt 7
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94117-3048

From: [Sharon Hefke](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 8:11:59 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Sharon Hefke
slhefke@icloud.com
1550 Bay St
San Francisco, California 94123

From: davericus@gmail.com
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 8:27:58 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Sincerely,
David Avery

davericus@gmail.com
585 Prentiss St.
San Francisco, California 94110-6127

From: [John Candela](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 8:31:27 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

John Candela
jdcandela@gmail.com
744 44th avenue
san francisco, California 94121

From: [Lorraine Sanchez](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 8:37:42 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Lorraine Sanchez
ms.sanchez.lorraine@gmail.com
1550 Sutter st.
San Francisco, California 94109

From: [Michael Tomczyszyn](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 9:08:29 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Michael Tomczyszyn
mtomczyszyn@hotmail.com
243 Ramsell St
San Francisco, California 94132

From: [David Levy](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 9:38:06 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

David Levy
david@meanwhile.org
2018 Taylor St
San Francisco, California 94133

From: [Hiu Kwan](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 9:49:33 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Hiu Kwan
kwandawn@gmail.com
742 Natoma Streer
San Francisco, California 94103

From: [Paula Katz](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 11:06:47 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Paula Katz
paulagiants@gmail.com
2233 44th Ave
San Francisco, California 94116

From: [Austin Shelton](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 11:10:38 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Austin Shelton
ashelton3@gmail.com
835 McAllister St Apt F
San Francisco, California 94102

From: [Karen Haunert](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 2:43:15 AM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Karen Haunert
haunertk@yahoo.com
1137 Hyde Strret, Apt E
San Francisco, California 94109

From: [Yves Averous](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 3:59:34 AM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Yves Averous
yvaverous@gmail.com
854 Prague Street
San Francisco, California 94112

From: [Joel Messerer](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 4:27:27 AM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Joel Messerer
joelmesserer@yahoo.com
1627 Jackson St
San Francisco, California 94109

From: [Paula McNamee](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 4:45:45 AM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Paula McNamee
123paumc@gmail.com
1001 Van Ness Ave #512
San Francisco , California 94109

From: [Kathryn Bender](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 7:46:42 AM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Kathryn Bender
biofeedbackkath@gmail.com
90 Gates St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [J. Barry Gurdin](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 7:53:59 AM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

J. Barry Gurdin
gurdin@hotmail.com
247 Ortega Street
San Francisco, California 94122

From: [David Hoffman](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 9:48:47 AM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

David Hoffman
david.hoffman.sf@gmail.com
1652 Fulton St
San Francisco, California 94117-1319

From: [Sayuri Falconer](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 9:57:21 AM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Sayuri Falconer
sayuri.anya@gmail.com
38 Tacoma St.
San Francisco, California 94118

From: [Patricia Avery](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 10:25:10 AM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Patricia Avery
pavetheway22@gmail.com
585 Prentiss St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Elizabeth Darr](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 10:31:57 AM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Elizabeth Darr
betdarr@gmail.com
22nd avenue
san Francisco, California 94121

From: [Dyan Garza](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 10:34:52 AM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Dyan Garza
dyangarza60@gmail.com
855 Waller St Apt 5
San Francisco, California 94117

From: [Patricia Hinds Curren](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 12:18:28 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Patricia Hinds Curren
msthang94109@yahoo.com
1777 PINE ST APT 403
San Francisco, California 94109

From: [Ronda Calef](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 12:54:09 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Ronda Calef
rondacalef@weekendenespanol.com
1998 Bush St
San Francisco, California 94115

From: [Nicolette Brannan](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 1:05:39 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Nicolette Brannan
nicolette.brannan@gmail.com
1354 Florida St
San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Harriet Leff](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please REJECT Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 9:01:26 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a HIGH RISK of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning REVERSAL of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please REJECT it.

Harriet Leff
777ashley77@gmail.com
1365 Taylor St Apt 3
San Francisco, California 94108

From: [Barbara Epremian](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Please reject the odious Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 10:26:59 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Barbara Epremian
beezzbeezz@yahoo.com
3838 California St Rm 816
San Francisco, California 94118

From: [Todd](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 8 behested payment waiver
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 7:52:22 AM

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

As a stakeholder and resident of San Francisco, I strongly oppose ordinance # 250947 allowing Pay to Play conditions on the Board of Supervisors.

From: [Leon Van Steen](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject the Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Friday, November 14, 2025 12:34:06 AM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will.

Reject this regression to potential corruption,

Leon Van Steen
leonvansteen@gmail.com
154 Dwight St
San Francisco , California 94134

From: [Linda Howard](#)
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: The people have voted - please reject Behested Payments Waivers Ordinance – Item 8, File No. 250947
Date: Thursday, November 13, 2025 6:22:24 PM

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

San Francisco Ethics Commission,

Do not allow pay-to-play payments to be looped in. Now more than ever we need accountability and transparency.

In 2021, the Ethics Commission led the way in establishing restrictions that bar city officials from soliciting behested payments from interested parties. The following year, voters overwhelmingly extended this safeguard to the Board of Supervisors by approving Proposition E with 69.4% support.

Sincerely,

As the official ballot argument for Prop E warned: “In 2020, the City Controller produced a Public Integrity Review of pay-to-play politics in San Francisco, and found that so-called ‘behested payments’ presented a high risk of corruption... When behested payments occur, regular San Franciscans stand to lose.”

The proposed amendments in File No. 250947 would effectively nullify Prop E by allowing Supervisors to grant waivers for themselves whenever they choose — with the public never knowing which interested parties were solicited or who actually made behests under those waivers.

Passing it would be a stunning reversal of your own leadership in establishing protections against potentially corruptive behested payments and a betrayal of the voters’ will. Please reject it.

Linda Howard
cr0wgrl@hotmail.com
611 Baker St # A
San Francisco, California 94117

