

From: hulse@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Francisco Hulse
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Let's keep bribery illegal, shall we?
Date: Friday, January 9, 2026 12:55:09 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,
Francisco Hulse
2754 B Folsom St San Francisco, CA 94110-3311
hulse@pipeline.com

From: Todd
To: aflorez@cooley.com; yaman@salahilaw.com; dtsai4@usfca.edu
Cc: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#); [Ford, Patrick \(ETH\)](#); [Canning, Michael \(ETH\)](#); [D"Amico, Zach \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Oppose Ordinance No. 250947
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 8:16:01 PM

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

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.

Thank you,
Todd Snyder
1941 Turk street
SF, CA 94115

From: johnnimac4@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John MacDevitt
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Friday, January 9, 2026 8:40:32 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,
John MacDevitt
2045 Anza St Apt 1 San Francisco, CA 94118-3648
johnnimac4@yahoo.com

From: diannrose@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diann Rose
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Friday, January 9, 2026 8:33:21 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,
Diann Rose
830 Post St Apt 8 San Francisco, CA 94109-6061
diannrose@yahoo.com

From: joelmesserer@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joel Messerer
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Friday, January 9, 2026 8:12:40 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,
Joel Messerer
1627 Jackson St San Francisco, CA 94109-3036
joelmesserer@yahoo.com

From: hans@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Hans Larsen
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Friday, January 9, 2026 7:31:18 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,
Hans Larsen
440 Davis Ct Apt 1309 San Francisco, CA 94111-2438
hans@hjlarsen.com

From: mhogerty@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Megan Hogerty
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Friday, January 9, 2026 5:21:32 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,
Megan Hogerty
2250 Bay St Apt 318 San Francisco, CA 94123-1850
mhogerty@gmail.com

From: biancamsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bianca Molgora
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Friday, January 9, 2026 5:14:03 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,
Bianca Molgora
3976 Folsom St San Francisco, CA 94110-6138
biancamsf@yahoo.com

From: leila@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leila and Ronjon Sen
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Friday, January 9, 2026 3:53:52 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,
Leila and Ronjon Sen
1855 Filbert St San Francisco, CA 94123-3607
leila@leilasen.com

From: ldl_61@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lynn Laupheimer
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Friday, January 9, 2026 12:55:48 AM

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

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.

I think we've had enough corruption to deal with. We need to discourage any thoughts of or anything that even looks like corruption.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Lynn Laupheimer
45 Ashbury Ter San Francisco, CA 94117-4501
ldl_61@yahoo.com

From: jandjoda@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Oda
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Friday, January 9, 2026 12:46:24 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,
John Oda
2000 Post St Apt 431 San Francisco, CA 94115-3577
jandjoda@aol.com

From: mellac22@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Melvin Cheitlin
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Friday, January 9, 2026 12:05:35 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,
Melvin Cheitlin
1661 Pine St Apt 1145 San Francisco, CA 94109-0427
mellac22@outlook.com

From: askalice@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Alice Polesky
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Friday, January 9, 2026 12:03:20 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,
Alice Polesky
890 Kansas St Apt 4 San Francisco, CA 94107-2664
askalice@pacbell.net

From: rgeorgulas@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Therese Georgulas
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Friday, January 9, 2026 12:00:34 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,
Therese Georgulas
5214 Diamond Heights Blvd San Francisco, CA 94131-2118
rgeorgulas@yahoo.com

From: sfnm@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Glenda Hope
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 10:04:19 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,
Glenda Hope
249 Niagara Ave San Francisco, CA 94112-3338
sfnm@pacbell.net

From: marlon01@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Marlon Perez
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:31:04 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,
Marlon Perez
755 Le Conte Ave San Francisco, CA 94124-3566
marlon01@sbcglobal.net

From: bykrsf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of James Loughran
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:15:34 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,
James Loughran
46 Rausch St San Francisco, CA 94103-3918
bykrsf@gmail.com

From: gurdin@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of J Gurdin
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 9:12:33 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,
J Gurdin
247 Ortega St San Francisco, CA 94122-4617
gurdin@hotmail.com

From: joyce.lavey@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Joyce M Lavey
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 8:45:31 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,
Joyce M Lavey
593 Potrero Ave San Francisco, CA 94110-7412
joyce.lavey@sonic.net

From: bsoky@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Sokol
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 8:33:12 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,
Barbara Sokol
2787 38th Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-2859
bsoky@pacbell.net

From: mail@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Josie Brown
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 8:20:50 PM

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

When it comes to San Francisco politics, it's all too obvious who is paid, and by whom.

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,
Josie Brown
1761 Vallejo St Apt 204 San Francisco, CA 94123-5029
mail@josiebrown.com

From: jeff@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jeff Whittington
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 8:18:49 PM

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

Please don't weaken our campaign reform laws.

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,
Jeff Whittington
1301 14th Ave Apt 5 San Francisco, CA 94122-2137
jeff@codecology.com

From: tolsaunders@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Laura Saunders
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 8:02:51 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,
Laura Saunders
170 King St Unit 809 San Francisco, CA 94107-4912
tolsaunders@yahoo.com

From: carobikam@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Robert Heisler
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 8:00:45 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.

This proposal is a blatant, trumpian maneuver that gives billionaire developers even more leverage over the increasingly corrupt board of supervisors.

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 Heisler
1908 14th Ave San Francisco, CA 94116-1335
carobikam@duck.com

From: todd.clark.snyder@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Todd Snyder
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 7:55:24 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,
Todd Snyder
1941 Turk St Apt 4 San Francisco, CA 94115-4396
todd.clark.snyder@gmail.com

From: spamicidalmanic@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ashley Harwood
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 7:49:58 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,
Ashley Harwood
972 Harrison St # A San Francisco, CA 94107-1000
spamicidalmanic@gmail.com

From: malih2000@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Mali Henigman
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 7:45:27 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,
Mali Henigman
494 27th Ave Apt 26 San Francisco, CA 94121-1807
malih2000@yahoo.com

From: sandydmiller@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sandra Miller
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 7:12:49 PM

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

Fighting corruption should be a major priority of the Board of Supervisors. 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,
Sandra Miller
882 Lombard St San Francisco, CA 94133-2216
sandydmiller@gmail.com

From: pamelasanfrancisco@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of pamela smith
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 6:58:16 PM

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

Hello,

I have lived in SF D5 since 1983, PLEASE

REJECT the proposa 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 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 Pamela and family

Sincerely,
pamela smith
PAGE St San Francisco, CA 94117
pamelasanfrancisco@yahoo.com

From: joringer67@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jason Oringer
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 6:23:02 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,
Jason Oringer
246 22nd Ave San Francisco, CA 94121-2116
joringer67@gmail.com

From: davidnaturesf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of david schmidt
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 6:16:23 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,
david schmidt
342 Princeton St San Francisco, CA 94134-1614
davidnaturesf@gmail.com

From: edithabrown@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Edith Brown
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 6:11:44 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,
Edith Brown
58 Dedman Ct San Francisco, CA 94124-2425
edithabrown@yahoo.com

From: ruthwwenzel@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ruth W. Wenzel
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 6:08:10 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,
Ruth W. Wenzel
739 Clayton St San Francisco, CA 94117-4019
ruthwwenzel@gmail.com

From: jdcandela@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Candela
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 5:55:27 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,
John Candela
744 44th Ave San Francisco, CA 94121-3306
jdcandela@gmail.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 5:50:59 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,
Justin Truong
33 Junior Ter San Francisco, CA 94112-3245
justintruong56@gmail.com

From: carolbadger@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Caroline Badger
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 5:46:24 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,
Caroline Badger
2090 Pacific Ave Apt 201 San Francisco, CA 94109-2248
carolbadger@mac.com

From: nathanlang@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Nathan Lang
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 5:42:13 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,
Nathan Lang
4444 Balboa St Apt 302 San Francisco, CA 94121-2403
nathanlang@comcast.net

From: tizianasfcasting@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Tiziana Perinotti
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 5:39:03 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,
Tiziana Perinotti
1111 Jones St Apt 8 San Francisco, CA 94109-4233
tizianasfcasting@gmail.com

From: don.hodge.delamancha@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donald Hodge
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 5:39:01 PM

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

Dear Ethics Commission Public Comments,

I, a San Francisco resident, 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 obvious opportunity for corruption.

Post hoc reporting is not enough. Voters did not vote for exemptions to the prohibition; 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, leaving the City vulnerable to potentially costly legal action. Please reject it.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Donald Hodge
2875 Jackson St Apt 2 San Francisco, CA 94115-1153
don.hodge.delamancha@gmail.com

From: agirlandherdonkey@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Leila P
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 5:15:57 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,
Leila P
909 Hyde St San Francisco, CA 94109-4822
agirlandherdonkey@gmail.com

From: Mhrichak@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Maryann Hrichak
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 5:11:19 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,
Maryann Hrichak
1355 Willard St Apt 27 San Francisco, CA 94117-3729
Mhrichak@gmail.com

From: larry.sf@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Laurence Brenner
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 5:00:21 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,
Laurence Brenner
366 Roosevelt Way San Francisco, CA 94114-1434
larry.sf@comcast.net

From: dancinggiraffe@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Deborah Brooks
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Reject Item 5 Behested Payments Waivers even with amendments
Date: Friday, January 9, 2026 10:21:32 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,
Deborah Brooks
453 Holly Park Cir San Francisco, CA 94110-5905
dancinggiraffe@yahoo.com

From: Jeff Whittington
To: [Ethics Commission, \(ETH\)](#)
Subject: Today's agenda item #5
Date: Friday, January 9, 2026 9:00:16 AM

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

Dear Ethics Commissioners,

The reason Prop E (2022) banned behested payments is because they were found to be a major source of corruption at the Board of Supervisors. Since they were banned, 41 “exceptions” have already been granted; now Supes are essentially asking to do away with the ban altogether. This is not acceptable and the reason we have an Ethics Commission is to thwart efforts like this.

Thank you for your stand against corruption,

Jeff Whittington
1301 14th Avenue #5
San Francisco, CA. 94122