

**From:** Wandralee Lindtzie  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:43:35 PM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Wandralee Lindtzie  
wandralee@sbcglobal.net  
4629 18th St  
San Francisco, California 94114

<[https://click.actionnetwork.org/ss/o/u001.ZbNyqOfLYPaP-d23SgKjnQ/4n4/5fZRPw61Syu5YYe2\\_ER\\_Pg/ho.gif](https://click.actionnetwork.org/ss/o/u001.ZbNyqOfLYPaP-d23SgKjnQ/4n4/5fZRPw61Syu5YYe2_ER_Pg/ho.gif)>

**From:** Robin Allen  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:38:48 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Robin Allen  
slimallen@live.com  
460B Carl Street  
San Francisco, California 94117

<<https://click.actionnetwork.org/ss/o/u001.ZbNyqOfLYPaP-d23SgKjnQ/4n4/XUcWgeHYRgue4WtdB3-0GA/ho.gif>>

**From:** Jane Field  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:47:41 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Jane Field  
janefield@earthlink.net  
780 Funston Avenue  
San Francisco, California 94118

<<https://click.actionnetwork.org/ss/o/u001.ZbNyqOfLYPaP-d23SgKjnQ/4n4/XqC-yTtPSrGI4BqMzFU-OA/ho.gif>>

**From:** Sharon Steuer  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:03:01 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Sharon Steuer  
s@ssteuer.com  
Highland Ave  
San Francisco, California 94110

<[https://click.actionnetwork.org/ss/o/u001.ZbNyqOfLYPaP-d23SgKjnQ/4n4/RicUxCOIS8OvP7piw\\_X0tA/ho.gif](https://click.actionnetwork.org/ss/o/u001.ZbNyqOfLYPaP-d23SgKjnQ/4n4/RicUxCOIS8OvP7piw_X0tA/ho.gif)>

**From:** Mike Kappus  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:46:16 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Mike Kappus  
mikek@rosebudus.com  
2328 12th Ave  
San Francisco, California 94116-1908

<<https://click.actionnetwork.org/ss/o/u001.ZbNyqOfLYPaP-d23SgKjnQ/4n4/5PkBM0pWRUitC0hydIBdOA/ho.gif>>

**From:** Bradford Pollock  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:42:42 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Bradford Pollock  
bpollock@mindspring.com  
823 Mason Street  
San Francisco, California 94108

<<https://click.actionnetwork.org/ss/o/u001.ZbNyqOfLYPaP-d23SgKjnQ/4n4/T4HGaKIJQxOqqMvSnu5CfQ/ho.gif>>

**From:** Betty Traynor  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 2:57:51 PM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Betty Traynor  
btraynor@att.net  
25 Western Shore Lane #6  
San Francisco, California 94115

<[https://click.actionnetwork.org/ss/o/u001.ZbNyqOfLYPaP-d23SgKjnQ/4n4/fAst9TdWQOeSy-5PSie\\_Jg/ho.gif](https://click.actionnetwork.org/ss/o/u001.ZbNyqOfLYPaP-d23SgKjnQ/4n4/fAst9TdWQOeSy-5PSie_Jg/ho.gif)>

**From:** L Chow  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:29:41 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

L Chow  
designangles@oylilyo.com  
43 Genoa Pl  
San Francisco, California CA

<[https://click.actionnetwork.org/ss/o/u001.ZbNyqOfLYPaP-d23SgKjnQ/4n4/9bIP-9sKT\\_afe6\\_S1AbV8w/ho.gif](https://click.actionnetwork.org/ss/o/u001.ZbNyqOfLYPaP-d23SgKjnQ/4n4/9bIP-9sKT_afe6_S1AbV8w/ho.gif)>

**From:** scodanphil@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Scott Phillips  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Please!!! Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:58:46 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Scott Phillips  
424 Anderson St San Francisco, CA 94110-6003  
scodanphil@gmail.com

**From:** slapshoe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leonard Tremmel  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 4:17:13 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Leonard Tremmel  
800 Lyon St # 2 San Francisco, CA 94115-4317  
slapshoe@sbcglobal.net

**From:** robertrinauro@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Rinauro  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 4:11:54 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Robert Rinauro  
3861 26th St San Francisco, CA 94131-2007  
robertrinauro@gmail.com

**From:** ritakell@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marguerite Fahrner  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 3:12:44 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Marguerite Fahrner  
271 Gates St San Francisco, CA 94110-5659  
ritakell@comcast.net

**From:** terryoertel@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Terence Oertel  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 3:11:45 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Terence Oertel  
422 Bayview Cir San Francisco, CA 94124-2271  
terryoertel@gmail.com

**From:** regina.islas@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Regina Islas  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 2:51:50 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

We haven't changed our minds from the original vote!

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Regina Islas  
105 Lake St San Francisco, CA 94118-1493  
[regina.islas@gmail.com](mailto:regina.islas@gmail.com)

**From:** townsendsw@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Townsend Wright  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 2:50:26 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Townsend Wright  
422 Flood Ave San Francisco, CA 94112-1335  
townsendsw@att.net

**From:** mariongourlay@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marion Gourlay  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 2:31:57 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Marion Gourlay  
1729 Dolores St None San Francisco, CA 94110-5440  
[mariongourlay@hotmail.com](mailto:mariongourlay@hotmail.com)

**From:** donnaglorysunset@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donna Castelli  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 2:23:49 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Donna Castelli  
1201 8th Ave Apt 2 San Francisco, CA 94122-2424  
donnaglorysunset@aol.com

**From:** jodafo@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jon Fong  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 2:05:17 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Jon Fong  
1495 Valencia St Apt 6 San Francisco, CA 94110-6432  
[jodafo@yahoo.com](mailto:jodafo@yahoo.com)

**From:** nicktuttle@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nicholas Tuttle  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 1:48:44 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Nicholas Tuttle  
2643 22nd Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-3031  
[nicktuttle@sonic.net](mailto:nicktuttle@sonic.net)

**From:** ivan.rhudick@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ivan Rhudick  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 1:47:40 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Ivan Rhudick  
251 5th Ave San Francisco, CA 94118-2307  
[ivan.rhudick@gmail.com](mailto:ivan.rhudick@gmail.com)

**From:** gerry@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gerald Moore  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 1:45:10 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Gerald Moore  
2447 Folsom St San Francisco, CA 94110-2619  
[gerry@geraldrmoore.com](mailto:gerry@geraldrmoore.com)

**From:** zv75@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Stine  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 1:42:58 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Robert Stine  
29 Rivoli St # A San Francisco, CA 94117-4353  
zv75@yahoo.com

**From:** dutta13@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Debolina Dutta  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 1:34:44 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Debolina Dutta  
37 Grafton Ave San Francisco, CA 94112-2325  
dutta13@gmail.com

**From:** bluelynn@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lynne Preston  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 1:31:00 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Lynne Preston  
344 Highland Ave Apt A San Francisco, CA 94110-5813  
[bluelynn@sbcglobal.net](mailto:bluelynn@sbcglobal.net)

**From:** cwhenson@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ward Henson  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 1:26:10 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Ward Henson  
2925 Lincoln Way San Francisco, CA 94122-1416  
cwhenson@gmail.com

**From:** bhermannsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Birgit Hermann  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 1:20:39 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Birgit Hermann  
627 Page St Apt 7 San Francisco, CA 94117-2594  
bhermannsf@aol.com

**From:** karenleight1960@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Leight  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 1:19:08 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Karen Leight  
1901 Noriega St San Francisco, CA 94122-4252  
karenleight1960@yahoo.com

**From:** toluene\_witting\_7f@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Velma Parness  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 1:18:34 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Velma Parness  
1754 Sanchez St San Francisco, CA 94131-2741  
toluene\_witting\_7f@icloud.com

**From:** dangmai7@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Dang Mai  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 1:16:47 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Dang Mai  
151 Joice St San Francisco, CA 94108-2000  
[dangmai7@aol.com](mailto:dangmai7@aol.com)

**From:** rascribe1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Richard Adhikari  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 1:16:39 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Richard Adhikari  
474 Victoria St San Francisco, CA 94132-2740  
rascribe1@icloud.com

**From:** paulagiants@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Paula Katz  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 1:01:05 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Paula Katz  
2233 44th Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-1534  
[paulagiants@gmail.com](mailto:paulagiants@gmail.com)

**From:** schenone13@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Schenone  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:58:59 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
John Schenone  
1295 Bay Shore Blvd San Francisco, CA 94124-2509  
[schenone13@sbcglobal.net](mailto:schenone13@sbcglobal.net)

**From:** milomatthews@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Milo Matthews  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:54:08 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Milo Matthews  
1424 36th Ave San Francisco, CA 94122-3122  
milomatthews@aol.com

**From:** peterboothlee@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Peter Lee  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:49:42 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Peter Lee  
3910 Fulton St Apt 4 San Francisco, CA 94118-3548  
[peterboothlee@hotmail.com](mailto:peterboothlee@hotmail.com)

**From:** gail.macgowan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gail MacGowan  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:41:00 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Gail MacGowan  
2645 Sacramento St Apt 1A San Francisco, CA 94115-2247  
[gail.macgowan@sbcglobal.net](mailto:gail.macgowan@sbcglobal.net)

**From:** grrlfriday@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Katherine Roberts  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:38:56 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Katherine Roberts  
136 Beulah St Apt 1 San Francisco, CA 94117-2741  
grrlfriday@mac.com

**From:** witkasf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Witka  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:35:40 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Susan Witka  
824 43rd Ave San Francisco, CA 94121-3304  
witkasf@gmail.com

**From:** wilson.philipdrew@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Philip Wilson  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:32:04 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Philip Wilson  
1 Daniel Burnham Ct San Francisco, CA 94109-5455  
wilson.philipdrew@gmail.com

**From:** susanalex@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Alexander  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:11:52 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Susan Alexander  
1800 Broadway Apt 301 San Francisco, CA 94109-2242  
[susanalex@gmail.com](mailto:susanalex@gmail.com)

**From:** plgbrown132@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Pam Brown  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:04:27 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Pam Brown  
132 Southwood Dr San Francisco, CA 94112-1218  
plgbrown132@gmail.com

**From:** m.bacchetti@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marina Bacchetti  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:03:01 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Marina Bacchetti  
119 Rousseau St San Francisco, CA 94112-1433  
m.bacchetti@comcast.net

**From:** jbpomies@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jackie Pomies  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:00:44 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Jackie Pomies  
1271 38th Ave San Francisco, CA 94122-1334  
jbpomies@yahoo.com

**From:** cdbrownson@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carol Brownson  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:00:42 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a long time San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Carol Brownson  
2309 California St San Francisco, CA 94115-2704  
cdbrownson@gmail.com

**From:** jredmond500@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jane Redmond  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:00:26 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Jane Redmond  
436 Clementina St San Francisco, CA 94103-6300  
jredmond500@yahoo.com

**From:** awilson630@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Allen Wilson  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:59:25 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Allen Wilson  
482 23rd Ave San Francisco, CA 94121-3018  
awilson630@aol.com

**From:** tullyclaymor@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sheila R. Tully  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:56:58 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to implore you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption. The voters will must be respected ESPECIALLY when issues involve elected officials.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Sheila R. Tully  
1419 Balboa St San Francisco, CA 94118-3516  
tullyclaymor@sonic.net

**From:** rgalgoul@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Rachel Galgoul  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:55:37 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Rachel Galgoul  
1019 Cole St Apt 1 San Francisco, CA 94117-4351  
rgalgoul@yahoo.com

**From:** justintruong56@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Justin Truong  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:54:30 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Justin Truong  
33 Junior Ter San Francisco, CA 94112-3245  
justintruong56@gmail.com

**From:** janielucas@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Janie Lucas  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:52:57 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Janie Lucas  
827 Capp St San Francisco, CA 94110-3224  
[janielucas@att.net](mailto:janielucas@att.net)

**From:** donc4496@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Don Climent  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:44:47 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Don Climent  
4135 17th St Apt 103 San Francisco, CA 94114-1963  
donc4496@sbcglobal.net

**From:** nowired@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Gambale  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:44:19 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Michael Gambale  
1373 12th Ave San Francisco, CA 94122-2213  
nowired@sonic.net

**From:** lisa@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lisa Crosina  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:43:57 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Lisa Crosina  
2169 Folsom St Apt M303 San Francisco, CA 94110-7302  
[lisa@gotomedia.com](mailto:lisa@gotomedia.com)

**From:** patmike@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Gambale  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:43:46 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Patricia Gambale  
1373 12th Ave San Francisco, CA 94122-2213  
patmike@sonic.net

**From:** werdna39@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Andrew Robin  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:39:33 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Cmon folks. Really!

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Andrew Robin  
200 Brannan St Apt 143 San Francisco, CA 94107-6005  
werdna39@icloud.com

**From:** stinkeyes@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Fern Schneiderman  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:39:30 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Fern Schneiderman  
49 Thor Ave San Francisco, CA 94131-2964  
[stinkeyes@sbcglobal.net](mailto:stinkeyes@sbcglobal.net)

**From:** dfroche@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Roche  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:38:45 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
David Roche  
165 Broderick St San Francisco, CA 94117-3104  
dfroche@juno.com

**From:** gnhgcs@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Grace Huenemann  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:37:53 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Grace Huenemann  
670 De Haro St Apt 3 San Francisco, CA 94107-2750  
[gnhgcs@gmail.com](mailto:gnhgcs@gmail.com)

**From:** sharon@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sharon Camhi  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:37:42 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Sharon Camhi  
895 24th Ave San Francisco, CA 94121-3728  
[sharon@stare.com](mailto:sharon@stare.com)

**From:** jeyre1976@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Janet Eyre  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:36:47 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Janet Eyre  
49 6th Ave San Francisco, CA 94118-1323  
jeyre1976@yahoo.com

**From:** davidwolf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Wolf  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:35:54 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to strongly urge you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

We voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to BAR SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
David Wolf  
3063 25th St San Francisco, CA 94110-4140  
[davidwolf@sonic.net](mailto:davidwolf@sonic.net)

**From:** wmcfsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Warren McCarthy  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:35:33 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a former San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Warren McCarthy  
800 NE 29th St Oklahoma City, OK 73105-7923  
wmcfsf@aol.com

**From:** afolger@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alexandra Folger  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:33:09 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Alexandra Folger  
587 Burnett Ave Apt 4 San Francisco, CA 94131-1531  
afolger@me.com

**From:** gcchung@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gay Chung  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:32:30 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Gay Chung  
1517 Waller St Apt 6 San Francisco, CA 94117-2836  
[gcchung@yahoo.com](mailto:gcchung@yahoo.com)

**From:** paulnla2@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Paul Brunsting  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:32:19 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Paul Brunsting  
294 Carl St San Francisco, CA 94117-3818  
paulnla2@aim.com

**From:** parkladydi1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diane Palacio  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:31:20 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Diane Palacio  
44 Ellington Ave San Francisco, CA 94112-3621  
[parkladydi1@sbcglobal.net](mailto:parkladydi1@sbcglobal.net)

**From:** sebraleaves@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sebra Leaves  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:30:21 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Sebra Leaves  
499 Alabama St San Francisco, CA 94110-1380  
[sebraleaves@gmail.com](mailto:sebraleaves@gmail.com)

**From:** ewidthner1000@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Eric Wallner  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:24:09 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Eric Wallner  
2 Guerrero St Apt 108 San Francisco, CA 94103-1150  
ewidthner1000@gmail.com

**From:** shashacooks@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Anastasia Yovanopoulos  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:21:48 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

Dear Ethics Commissioners,

Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,  
Anastasia Yovanopoulos  
3718 24th St San Francisco, CA 94114-3942

Sincerely,  
Anastasia Yovanopoulos  
3718 24th St San Francisco, CA 94114-3942  
[shashacooks@yahoo.com](mailto:shashacooks@yahoo.com)

**From:** bilgepump100@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Hall  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:19:55 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Robert Hall  
1946 Grove St Apt 6 San Francisco, CA 94117-1149  
bilgepump100@sbcglobal.net

**From:** heiser@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Shawn Heiser  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:15:24 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Shawn Heiser  
1600 Holloway Ave San Francisco, CA 94132-1722  
[heiser@sfsu.edu](mailto:heiser@sfsu.edu)

**From:** nicollette.brannan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nicolette Brannan  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:15:17 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Nicolette Brannan  
1354 Florida St San Francisco, CA 94110-4115  
[nicollette.brannan@gmail.com](mailto:nicollette.brannan@gmail.com)

**From:** mnowicki45@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Maria Nowicki  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:13:10 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Maria Nowicki  
2324 14th Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-2517  
mnowicki45@yahoo.com

**From:** sfbigcelt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Timothy Dobbins  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:12:30 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Timothy Dobbins  
1255 Page St Apt 7 San Francisco, CA 94117-3048  
[sfbigcelt@sbcglobal.net](mailto:sfbigcelt@sbcglobal.net)

**From:** karolinade@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Maia De Raat  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:11:07 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Maia De Raat  
105 Julian Ave Apt 4 San Francisco, CA 94103-5906  
karolinade@yahoo.com

**From:** edie\_schaffer@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Edie Schaffer  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:10:51 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Edie Schaffer  
26 Jules Ave San Francisco, CA 94112-2230  
[edie\\_schaffer@yahoo.com](mailto:edie_schaffer@yahoo.com)

**From:** judydoane@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Judith Doane  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:10:21 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Judith Doane  
3101 California St San Francisco, CA 94115-2409  
[judydoane@aol.com](mailto:judydoane@aol.com)

**From:** shannonmccarthy1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Shannon McCarthy  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:10:03 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Shannon McCarthy  
1941 Leavenworth St San Francisco, CA 94133-2503  
shannonmccarthy1@sbcglobal.net

**From:** tuttgen@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Vera Genkin  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:09:59 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Vera Genkin  
2643 22nd Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-3031  
[tuttgen@sonic.net](mailto:tuttgen@sonic.net)

**From:** gilmore930@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Timothy Gilmore  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:09:07 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Timothy Gilmore  
1240 Fillmore St Apt 711 San Francisco, CA 94115-4101  
gilmore930@comcast.net

**From:** greglpennington@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Greg Pennington  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:07:16 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Greg Pennington  
798 Post St Apt 500 San Francisco, CA 94109-6119  
greglpennington@aol.com

**From:** mikefann@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Fanning  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:07:15 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Michael Fanning  
1236 Rhode Island St Unit 10 San Francisco, CA 94107-4403  
mikefann@sbcglobal.net

**From:** stephanie\_ellis@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stephanie Ellis  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:06:42 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Stephanie Ellis  
870 Church St Apt 1 San Francisco, CA 94114-3072  
[stephanie\\_ellis@me.com](mailto:stephanie_ellis@me.com)

**From:** s-sage@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lisa Kellman  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:05:13 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Lisa Kellman  
474 Day St San Francisco, CA 94131-2229  
s-sage@sonic.net

**From:** mzuckerm@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Zuckerman  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:04:19 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Michael Zuckerman  
540 Howard St Fl 2 San Francisco, CA 94105-3012  
mzuckerm@history.upenn.edu

**From:** davonl.terry@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Davon Terry  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:04:17 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Davon Terry  
4445 3rd St Ste 305 San Francisco, CA 94124-4501  
davonl.terry@gmail.com

**From:** martin7ahorwitz@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Martin Horwitz  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:02:18 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Martin Horwitz  
1326 23rd Ave San Francisco, CA 94122-1608  
martin7ahorwitz@yahoo.com

**From:** konradj@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jessica Krakow  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:01:21 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Jessica Krakow  
62 Joost Ave San Francisco, CA 94131-3239  
konradj@sonic.net

**From:** fujifuji8kamo6@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Genevieve Fujimoto  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:01:15 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Genevieve Fujimoto  
9 Landers St San Francisco, CA 94114-1312  
fujifuji8kamo6@sonic.net

**From:** charity@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christopher Aycock  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:01:07 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Christopher Aycock  
2663 24th Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-3039  
[charity@aycock.org](mailto:charity@aycock.org)

**From:** mckemper66@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michael Kemper  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:57:45 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Michael Kemper  
1388 California St Apt 404A San Francisco, CA 94109-4915  
mckemper66@gmail.com

**From:** cpc94118@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christina Cundari  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:57:10 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Christina Cundari  
131 22nd Ave San Francisco, CA 94121-1216  
cpc94118@yahoo.com

**From:** levyconnie@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Corinne Levy  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:57:09 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Corinne Levy  
777 Cayuga Ave San Francisco, CA 94112-2507  
levyconnie@sonic.net

**From:** catherine.ashworth@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Catherine Ashworth  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:22:14 AM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties, even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that other officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar Supervisors from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,  
Catherine Ashworth  
2440 Van Ness Ave Apt 21 San Francisco, CA 94109-1835  
[catherine.ashworth@caclean.org](mailto:catherine.ashworth@caclean.org)

**From:** krf.1sf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Karen Franklin  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 4:40:53 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Karen Franklin  
631 Ofarrell St Apt 908 San Francisco, CA 94109-7428  
krf.1sf@gmail.com

**From:** obispa@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Elizabeth Bell  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** Urgent: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:53:25 PM

---

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

As a San Francisco resident, I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposal in Item 5 that would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant themselves waivers to the City's prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties even with the new proposed amendment to Section 3.620(g).

Staff's proposed amendment requiring waiver recipients to report back on how they used their waivers is a good idea for the waivers that OTHER officials may receive under current law.

However, voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition E in 2022 to bar SUPERVISORS from soliciting donations from contractors whose contracts they approve because of the inherent appearance of corruption.

Transparency alone is not enough when the proposal would allow Supervisors to exempt themselves and their colleagues from the voter-approved ban. Voters did not vote for loopholes with transparency; they voted for a prohibition.

Approving this change would reverse the Ethics Commission's longstanding leadership on preventing potentially corruptive behested payments and would disregard the clear will of the voters. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,  
Elizabeth Bell  
3390 24th St San Francisco, CA 94110-3823  
obispa@sbcglobal.net

**From:** [James Roe](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 2:46:45 PM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

James Roe  
cherroe6@gmail.com  
138 Hearst Ave  
San Francisco, California 94131-3136

**From:** [Julie Connery](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 2:40:43 PM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Julie Connery  
jconnerysf@gmail.com  
1850 Sacramento St.  
San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** [Carmen Chow](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 1:44:35 PM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Carmen Chow  
carmen.chow531@gmail.com  
2350 44th Avenue  
San Francisco, California 94116

**From:** [Debolina Dutta](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 1:35:37 PM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Debolina Dutta  
dutta13@gmail.com  
37 Grafton Ave  
San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** [Anne Batmale](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 1:22:58 PM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Anne Batmale  
annebatmale@gmail.com  
220 Rutledge Street 220 Rutledge St  
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** [Karen Kirschling](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 1:16:45 PM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Karen Kirschling  
kumasong@icloud.com  
633 Oak  
San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** [Jamie Pearlstein](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 1:11:09 PM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Jamie Pearlstein  
jhpearlstein@hotmail.com  
650 Diamond St. #7  
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** [Anna Asebedo](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:54:42 PM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Anna Asebedo  
anna.asebedo@gmail.com  
20 Sussex Street  
San Francisco, California 94131

**From:** [Maureen Gonzalez](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:51:25 PM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Maureen Gonzalez  
maureen51846@gmail.com  
74 Arnold Ave  
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** [Alex Weisshaus](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:50:48 PM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Alex Weisshaus  
alexweisshaus@gmx.com  
520 South Van Ness Avenue Apartment 222  
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** [Alexei Folger](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:31:59 PM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Alexei Folger  
afolger@me.com  
587 Burnett Ave. #4  
San Francisco, California 94131

**From:** [John Tansley](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:27:29 PM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

John Tansley  
jtansley39@gmail.com  
PO Box 330351  
San Francisco, California 94133

**From:** [Sharon Piansay](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 12:26:04 PM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Sharon Piansay  
sfpiansay@gmail.com  
351 Ney Street  
San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** [James Devereaux](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:52:12 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

James Devereaux  
devereauxj45@gmail.com  
3 Montague Place  
San Francisco, California 94133

**From:** [Teresa Wong](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:45:47 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Teresa Wong  
berniemom@gmail.com  
75 Vienna Street  
San Francisco, California 94112

**From:** [Melanie Grossman](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:34:08 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Melanie Grossman  
melaniedgrossman@gmail.com  
1001 Van Ness Avenue, 804  
San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** [Diane Winer](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:10:11 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Diane Winer  
dwiner45@gmail.com  
833 26th Avenue  
San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** [Molly Lazarus](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:00:37 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Molly Lazarus  
molly.lazarus@gmail.com  
554 Kansas Street  
San Francisco, California 94107

**From:** [Andrew Kong](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:00:29 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Andrew Kong  
kingkong0086@yahoo.com  
555 main st  
San Francisco, California 94134

**From:** [Barbara Handler](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:59:33 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Barbara Handler  
crumpet.ailing-8n@icloud.com  
177 Coleridge Street  
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** [Howard Gelman](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:48:15 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Howard Gelman  
hgelman@yahoo.com  
223 Bonview  
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** [Steve Fike](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:42:14 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Steve Fike  
fikest@aol.com  
2121 Broadway Street #6  
San Francisco, California 94115

**From:** [Robert Ryan](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:41:20 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Robert Ryan  
bobgryan@gmail.com  
1604 Sanchez Street, 3  
San Francisco, California 94131-2371

**From:** [Thomas Baker](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:39:03 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Thomas Baker  
aallc.architects@gmail.com  
1679 Church Street  
San Francisco, California 94131

**From:** [David Hoffman](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:35:27 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

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

**From:** [Mj Pramik](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:30:43 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Mj Pramik  
mjpramik@gmail.com  
1940 Baker St  
San Francisco, California 94115

**From:** [ruthkasle@mac.com](mailto:ruthkasle@mac.com)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:29:27 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

ruthkasle@mac.com  
1400 Geary Blvd Apt 1609  
San Francisco , California 94109

**From:** [Betty Kissilove](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:16:48 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I'm calling on the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials CANNOT CREDIBLY police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to DENY Ordinance No. 250947 and UPHOLD the voters' will.

Betty Kissilove  
cacaogal@gmail.com  
1401 10th Avenue Apartment 303  
San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** [Leila P](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:12:14 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Leila P  
agirlandherdonkey@gmail.com  
909 Hyde Street  
San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** [Rachel Grant](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:10:47 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Rachel Grant  
rgrant06@gmail.com  
1386 La Playa Street  
San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** [Patricia Taber](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:10:10 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Patricia Taber  
villaterr@gmail.com  
40 Villa Terrace  
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** [Lawrence Klein](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:07:02 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Lawrence Klein  
larryk42@gmail.com  
750 Clipper Streer  
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94114

**From:** [Ruth Wenzel](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:01:42 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will. Keep Proposition E EXACTLY as it is!

Ruth Wenzel  
ruthwenzel@gmail.com  
739 Clayton St.  
San Francisco, California 94117

**From:** [Tiziana Perinotti](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:59:05 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Tiziana Perinotti  
tizianasfcasting@gmail.com  
1111 Jones Street Apartment 8  
San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** [Janice Kursky](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:58:39 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Janice Kursky  
jemkursky@verizon.net  
152 Lombard Street Apartment 304  
San Francisco, California 94111

**From:** [Tara Liu](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:56:57 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Tara Liu  
tliu07029@gmail.com  
2655 Bryant Street  
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** [Martin Horwitz](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:53:48 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Martin Horwitz  
martin7ahorwitz@yahoo.com  
1326 23rd Ave  
San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** [Susan Ford](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:52:10 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Susan Ford  
susan.ford103@gmail.com  
1070 Green St 103  
San Francisco, California 94133-3677

**From:** [Melissa Yu](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:49:38 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Melissa Yu  
myu1750@gmail.com  
1750 Franklin St  
San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** [Margaret Fowler](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:49:31 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Margaret Fowler  
megfowler808@gmail.com  
1646 48th Avenue  
San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** [Michael Degtyarev](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:43:39 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Michael Degtyarev  
mdegtyarev@yahoo.com  
3386 Market St  
San Francisco, California 94114

**From:** [John Flanagan](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:42:46 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

John Flanagan  
friscoflan@gmail.com  
494 27th Avenue  
San Francisco, California 94121

**From:** [Linda Weiner](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:42:31 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Linda Weiner  
lwsf72@gmail.com  
72 Gates St  
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** [Andrew Staffen](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:40:55 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Andrew Staffen  
drew.staffen@gmail.com  
957 Hayes St  
San Francisco , California 94117

**From:** [Jackie Pomies](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:38:17 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Jackie Pomies  
jbpomies@yahoo.com  
1271 38th Avenue  
San Francisco, California 94122

**From:** [Stuart Silberman](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:36:27 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Stuart Silberman  
stuart@silbermandesign.com  
3602 25th st  
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** [Mark Jeffries](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:35:09 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Mark Jeffries  
markjef@mac.com  
71 28th Street  
San Francisco, California 94110-4908

**From:** [Josephine Bellacomo](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:34:55 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Josephine Bellacomo  
jo@movethemessage.com  
1649 Treat Avenue  
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** [Timothy Johnston](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:34:46 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Timothy Johnston  
tjohnst@hotmail.com  
555 Bartlett Street Apartment 223  
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** [Kathryn Savage](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:33:14 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Kathryn Savage  
klynnsavage@gmail.com  
2773 Bush Street  
San Francisco, California 94115

**From:** [Susan Alexander](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:33:11 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I STRONGLY URGE the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

THANK YOU!

Susan Alexander  
susanalex@gmail.com  
1800 Broadway Apartment 301  
San Francisco, California 94109

**From:** [Sara Winslow](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:31:52 AM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Sara Winslow  
sarawinslow@hotmail.com  
538 Peralta Ave  
San Francisco, California 94110

**From:** [Kathie Piccagli](#)  
**To:** [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)  
**Subject:** I Oppose Ordinance No. 250947  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 4:41:55 PM

---

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

Chair Florez Feng,

Dear Chair Feng and Commissioners,

I urge the Ethics Commission to oppose Ordinance No. 250947, which would allow the Board of Supervisors to grant itself waivers from San Francisco's voter-approved prohibition on soliciting behested payments from interested parties.

Voters adopted this safeguard through Proposition E in 2022 with nearly 70% support to prevent pay-to-play risks when officials solicit donations from those doing business with or seeking approvals from the City. Allowing self-granted waivers would further undermine that protection, create an inherent conflict of interest, and directly contradict voter intent. While staff's proposed amendments may improve transparency, disclosure does not solve the core problem: behested payments from interested parties create real and perceived quid pro quo risks that erode public trust, and elected officials cannot credibly police one another through reciprocal waiver votes. The law is narrowly tailored, remains sound, and compliance concerns can be addressed without waivers.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Commission to deny Ordinance No. 250947 and uphold the voters' will.

Kathie Piccagli  
kpiccagli@gmail.com  
1450 Post Street  
San Francisco, California 94109