



City and County of San Francisco

Daniel Lurie, Mayor

Minutes for Street Artists Committee, June 23, 2026



Draft Minutes

Chair Ferras called the meeting to order at 1:04pm.

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Agenda Changes, Land Acknowledgment (00:00:01)

Commissioners Present

Suzie Ferras, Acting Chair

Debra Walker

Al Perez

Marcus Shelby

Nabiel Musleh

Commissioners Absent

Janine Shiota

Seth Brenzel

Staff Present

Ebon Glenn, Deputy Director of Programs

Denise Pate, Director of Community Investments

Anne Trickey, Senior Program Officer

Jonell Molina, Senior Program Officer

Jennifer Atwood, Program Officer

Jennifer Chu, Program Officer

Coco Duhon-Kelley, Program Officer

Jax Blaska, Program Associate

Kingsley Sun, Program Associate

Natalia Perez, Program Associate

No agenda changes were made.

Chair Ferras announced the public meeting instructions.

Program Associate, Natalia Perez, announced the public comment instructions.

Chair Ferras began the meeting by reading the Arts Commission's land acknowledgement statement.

2. General Public Comment

(00:06:25)

Public Comment

Tad Sky, Street Artist Vendor

Tad Sky gave public comment about the upcoming changes to the Embarcadero Plaza, art vendor participation in the community outreach process conducted by the Recreation and Parks Department and the inclusion of artist spaces in the final design. Tad stated that around 50 art vendors continue to sell at Embarcadero Plaza.

There was no additional public comment.

3. Overview of Art Vendor Disciplinary Procedures (00:09:19)

Senior Program Officer Anne Trickey provided an overview of the disciplinary process, outlining the investigation process, noting that the Arts Commission is responsible for investigating violations under Article 24 of the Police Code but has limited authority, as staff cannot subpoena evidence or compel witness participation. Trickey reviewed the governing documents, including the Notice to Artists and the Artist Code of Conduct, and described the hearing procedures, including staff presentations, opportunities for involved parties to present evidence and rebuttals, commissioner deliberation, and voting options ranging from no action to suspension or revocation. Trickey also explained the rehearing and appeals processes.

4. Hearing and possible motion to approve revocation of art vendor license for art vendor Yingzhi Ge (10088) for: • **Violence against art vendor ZhongYu Wang (9021)** **(00:20:36)**

Program Officer Jennifer Atwood presented the staff recommendation to permanently revoke the art vendor license of Yingzhi Ge (License No. 10088) following an investigation into a physical altercation that occurred at Embarcadero Plaza on November 28, 2025. Atwood presented the contents of the report and noted that under Article 24 of the Police Code and the Art Vendor Program Code of Conduct, staff's role is to investigate violations—not determine fault or criminal intent—and that the evidence supported findings that Yingzhi Ge violated multiple provisions requiring artists to treat others respectfully, refrain from physical or verbal assault, and respect fellow artists' spaces. Citing the program's zero-tolerance policy for violence, staff recommended permanent revocation of Yingzhi Ge's license. Atwood also noted that all interviews and hearing notifications were provided with

Mandarin interpretation and translation support.

Director of Community Investment Dennise Pate restated staff's recommendation for license revocation for Yingzhi Ge (License No. 10088) due to the violation of Program Code of Conduct.

The accused vendor, Yingzhi Ge, provided a rebuttal and asked the Committee to consider the following factors in its decision:

- Ge sustained injuries during the incident.
- Ge voluntarily moved away from Wang to avoid further escalation.
- According to Ge, SFAC staff indicated that witness statements were conflicting.
- During the appeal of the February 24 decision, the Board of Appeals determined there was insufficient evidence to support the suspension of her vendor license.

Program Associate Natalia Perez made a correction to Ge's license number (10088) on one slide of the presentation.

In response to Ge's claims, Crisostomo Ibarra, the attorney for Zhongyu Wang, presented Wang's account of the November 24, 2025 incident. Ibarra also referenced a letter of support signed by 32 licensed vendors attesting to Wang's peaceful character and argued that Wang did not violate the Market rules prohibiting abusive conduct or entering another vendor's assigned space.

In rebuttal to Ibarra's statement, Ge presented the Board of Appeals' Notice of Decision dated April 29, noting that the Board found insufficient evidence to support the suspension of her vendor license. Ge emphasized that the physical altercation was initiated by both parties.

In counter-rebuttal to Ge's rebuttal, Ibarra disputed Ge's claim that she voluntarily relocated her tent, asserting instead that other vendors intervened and told Ge to move her tent away from Wang's booth to prevent further

confrontation. Ibarra argued that the video submitted by Ge intentionally highlighted Wang's son's reaction while omitting a preceding verbal confrontation, and maintained that Wang did not participate in the exchange.

Following the parties' presentations, the Committee entered into discussion. Commissioner Walker sought clarification regarding the Board of Appeals' April 29 decision, asking whether it addressed the merits of the case or only the disciplinary process. Trickey explained that the Board of Appeals' decision was based on procedural concerns, specifically that Ge and her mother were out of the country during the February Committee hearing and that the Committee had heard only one party's account. Trickey clarified that the Board did not make findings regarding the underlying facts of the incident. Committee Chair Ferras requested clarification on several disputed facts, including who initiated physical contact, where the altercation occurred, and which party moved their tent during the incident. Staff responded that the available evidence did not conclusively resolve those issues and advised the Committee that it could recall any party or witness to provide additional testimony. The Committee agreed to hear testimony from Wang. Commissioner Musleh also clarified that the November date referenced during testimony was the date of the incident.

Chair Ferras called upon Wang to testify before the Committee. Wang stated that she had no prior interactions with Ge before the incident. In response to Chair Ferras's questions, Wang confirmed that the physical altercation occurred within her assigned booth space.

Commissioner Al Perez asked staff whether Commissioners could call additional witnesses. Staff confirmed that Commissioners could invite any party or witness to testify. Perez then called upon Ge to testify. Ge stated that she had no prior incidents. In response to further questioning, Ge testified that she initially asked Wang calmly why her tent had been pushed. Ge also stated that Wang's husband was present throughout the incident, that she was outnumbered, and that it was therefore not possible for her to have

initiated the physical altercation. Ge further asserted that conflicting witness accounts prevented a determination that she struck Wang first.

Commissioner Marcus Shelby revisited Chair Ferras's earlier question regarding who initiated physical contact and asked whether Ge disputed Wang's testimony. Ge responded that she had consistently maintained since her initial interview with SFAC staff that Wang touched her first and asserted that any physical contact on her part was in self-defense.

Commissioner Nabel Musleh asked staff whether there were any witnesses to the incident. Staff explained that they interviewed all individuals willing to cooperate and that the only cooperating witness was Xiu Hua Shi, who reported seeing Ge strike Wang. Staff noted that no other witnesses willing to cooperate were able to corroborate the events. Commissioner Walker then called upon Shi to testify. Xiu testified that she urged both parties to stop fighting and observed injuries only to Wang. In response to questions from Commissioner Musleh and other Commissioners, Shi stated that the physical altercation had already begun when she arrived, that she did not witness who initiated the physical contact, and could testify only to what she observed after reaching the scene.

During deliberations, Commissioner Walker noted that, under the Committee's rules, engaging in a physical altercation constitutes a violation regardless of whether a party claims self-defense, distinguishing the Committee's standards from criminal proceedings. Walker emphasized that the Committee's message should be that physical violence is not tolerated in the program. Commissioner Musleh agreed. Deputy Director Ebon Glenn reminded the Committee that its deliberations were limited to the disciplinary action against Ge. In response to Commissioner Perez's questions, staff clarified that the recommended action was revocation of Ge's vendor license but that the Committee could instead impose a suspension. Staff explained that the recommendation for revocation reflected the seriousness of violence within the program. In response to additional questions from Commissioner Shelby and Commissioner Walker, staff confirmed that revocation is

permanent within the SFAC program but does not affect participation in other City programs. Staff further explained that vendors suspended for more than two years would be required to reapply for the program.

Chair Ferras then requested a motion on staff's recommendation to revoke Ge's vendor license or any proposed amendment. Commissioner Shelby moved to amend the proposed action to a two-year suspension, and Commissioner Walker seconded the motion. Chair Ferras expressed reservations about reducing the penalty given the violence involved. Commissioner Walker stated that, because the evidence regarding who initiated the altercation was inconclusive and the testimony conflicted, a two-year suspension was a more appropriate sanction while still conveying that violence would not be tolerated. Commissioner Musleh agreed with Walker's reasoning.

Program Associate Natalia Perez restated Commissioner Shelby's proposed amendment to impose a two-year suspension of Yingzhi Ge's vendor license in lieu of revocation. Chair Ferras called for a motion to approve the amendment. Commissioner Al Perez moved to approve the amendment, and Commissioner Walker seconded the motion. Chair Ferras then called for a final vote on the motion. The motion passed by a vote of 4–1, with Chair Ferras voting no.

There was no additional public comment.

5. Hearing and possible motion to approve revocation of art vendor license for art vendor Jie Yin (10086) for:

- **Attempting violence against art vendor ZhongYu Wang (9021) (01:48:17)**

Program Officer Jennifer Atwood presented staff's recommendation to permanently revoke Jie Yin's Art Vendor Program license based on alleged violations of the Program Code of Conduct arising from the same November

28, 2025 incident previously discussed by the Committee. Atwood noted that Yin and Yingzhi Ge are members of the same licensed family unit, along with Yin's other daughter, Yazhi Ge, and provided an overview of how family unit licenses operate. Atwood clarified that any suspension or revocation of Yin's or Yingzhi Ge's license would not affect Yazhi Ge's license. Atwood further explained that, because Embarcadero Plaza is a public space, the Arts Commission cannot restrict an individual's presence there; however, a suspended or revoked license would prohibit that individual from selling artwork, accepting payment, participating in the vendor lottery, or setting up a booth.

Atwood then summarized the investigation specific to Yin. Based on the investigation, Atwood stated that staff concluded Yin violated Rules 2, 3, and 20 of the Art Vendor Program Code of Conduct and, consistent with the program's zero-tolerance policy on violence, recommended permanent revocation of Yin's vendor license.

Director of Community Investment Dennise Pate restated staff's recommendation for license revocation for Jie Yin (License No. 10086) due to the violation of Program Code of Conduct.

The accused vendor, Jie Yin, presented her account of the November 24, 2025 incident. She also referenced the Board of Appeals' decision regarding the February 24 disciplinary action, noting that the Board found insufficient evidence to support the suspension of her vendor license. Yin urged the Committee to consider that her actions were motivated by concern for her daughter's safety, that she sought to de-escalate the situation by helping Ge leave the area, and that there was insufficient evidence to support the allegation that she attempted to attack Wang. Following Yin's testimony, Yingzhi Ge stated that her mother witnessed the altercation involving Ge, Wang, and Wang's husband and confirmed that Yin helped move her away from the area after the incident.

In response to Yin's testimony, Wang disputed Yin's account of the incident. According to Wang, other vendors warned Yin that becoming physically

involved could result in the revocation of her vendor license, but Yin responded that she did not care about the consequences. Wang stated that the incident left her fearful and emotionally distressed and that she continued to experience emotional trauma from the event. Wang also questioned why she was being blamed when Wang considered herself the victim of the assault. Wang further stated that evidence submitted by Ge in December 2025 had not been discussed during the February 2026 hearing despite Ge's and Yin's absence. Finally, Wang noted that another witness, Peter, was present at the hearing and requested that he be allowed to testify regarding the incident. Art vendor Gohar Yepremyan (License No. 8964) then appeared in support of Wang and submitted a letter of support to the Committee.

In rebuttal, Yin acknowledged the Committee's concerns but asked the Committee to consider her actions in the context of seeing her daughter involved in a physical altercation. Yin stated that, as a single mother, she reacted instinctively to protect her daughter and emphasized that her livelihood depends on her work as an art vendor. Ge then stated that she understood the Board of Appeals' April decision to have identified procedural issues with the February hearing. Ge further asserted that she had submitted evidence, including videos, to staff in December 2025, but that the evidence was not presented during the February 2026 hearing.

In response, Wang called witness Xiu Hua Shi to testify. Xiu stated that she did not observe Wang's husband physically strike anyone and did not see a spray bottle used during the altercation. Wang also referenced a letter of support signed by multiple art vendors, including witness Peter, and urged the Committee to consider it as evidence of her character.

During deliberations, Commissioner Shelby asked staff how they determined that Yin's actions constituted attempted violence. Staff responded that Yin's act of running toward the altercation, coupled with being physically restrained by another vendor, reasonably indicated an intent to become physically involved. Commissioner Walker noted that the Program Code of Conduct prohibits threats of violence and questioned whether Yin's actions

constituted a threat rather than attempted violence. Staff responded that running toward an active physical altercation to the extent that another vendor intervened to restrain an individual constituted a threat of violence under the Program Code. Commissioners Walker and Musleh observed that determining Yin's intent was difficult and distinguished her case from Ge's, noting that Yin appeared to be reacting to her daughter's involvement in the altercation. Deputy Director Ebon Glenn similarly acknowledged that Yin appeared motivated by concern for her daughter but reiterated that violence has no place in the marketplace and that the Committee's role was to determine whether the Program Code had been violated. Staff reminded the Committee that its focus was whether a violation had occurred and reviewed the available disciplinary options.

At Chair Ferras's request, witness Peter O'Loughlin testified and stated that he recalled restraining an individual during the incident but could not remember whether it was Yin. He recalled observing a significant commotion and hair-pulling but could not provide additional details. Following the discussion, Chair Ferras agreed that Yin's case differed from Ge's and invited amendments to staff's recommendation. Commissioner Walker moved to amend the proposed action from permanent revocation to a six-month suspension of Yin's vendor license. Commissioners Musleh and Shelby expressed support for the amendment. Program Associate Natalia Perez restated the amended motion, and Chair Ferras called for a motion to approve it. Commissioner Al Perez moved to approve the amendment, and Commissioner Walker seconded the motion. After public comments, Chair Ferras then called for a final vote on the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Pubic Comments

Yingzhi Ge stated that, during the Board of Appeals hearing in April, her mother, Jie Yin, testified that Peter O'Loughlin had restrained her during the incident. Ge interpreted the Board's decision as finding insufficient evidence to support disciplinary action and asserted that Wang's husband had also

been restrained but was not subject to discipline. Ge urged the Committee to ensure a fair process based on the available evidence.

Xiu Hua Shi noted that she restrained Jie Yin during the altercation. Xiu also stated that Wang's husband remained occupied setting up their booth throughout the incident and was not physically involved in the altercation.

Peter O'Loughlin commented that the livelihoods of those involved depended on their ability to participate in the Art Vendor Program and that suspension or revocation of a vendor license could have significant consequences. While affirming that violence should not be tolerated, O'Loughlin stated that individuals also have the right to defend themselves. O'Loughlin further commented that the evidence presented did not conclusively establish what occurred and expressed the view that permanent revocation would be an excessively severe penalty.

Maria Sky commented that vendors routinely assist one another with setting up booths at Embarcadero Plaza and that accidental contact between booths is common. She stated that such incidents typically do not result in violence and that accidental contact does not justify a physical altercation.

Yin reiterated that, as a single mother, her sole intention was to protect her daughter and that she had no intention of harming anyone. Yin stated that she participated in the Program to earn a living and believed conflicts should be resolved through communication rather than violence. Yin also stated that she and her daughter were relatively new to the program, did not know the other vendors, and did not believe they would challenge Wang and her husband. Yin again emphasized that her actions were motivated by concern for her daughter's safety.

In response, Wang stated that Yin's status as a single mother did not excuse her actions or relieve her of responsibility for attempting to become involved in the altercation. Wang emphasized that both Yin and Ge are adults and should be held accountable for their conduct. Wang further argued that Yin's

actions were inconsistent with her claim that she was attempting to de-escalate the situation.

6. Hearing and possible motion to approve revocation of art vendor license for art vendor Jianfu Wei (8970) for:

- **Physically restraining art vendor ZhongYu Wang (9021)
(02:59:12)**

Program Officer Jen Atwood presented staff's recommendation to permanently revoke Jianfu Wei's Art Vendor Program license for alleged violations of the Program Code of Conduct arising from the November 28, 2025 incident. Atwood summarized that Zhongyu Wang reported Wei physically restrained her during the altercation while Yingzhi Ge struck her, preventing Wang from defending herself. During his interview, Wei acknowledged attempting to intervene to stop the fight but denied physically restraining anyone. Atwood acknowledged that Wei appeared to have intended to stop the fight rather than cause harm but stated that the Committee's role was to determine whether the Program Code of Conduct had been violated, not to assess intent. Based on the investigation, staff concluded that Wei violated Rules 2, 3, and 20 of the Art Vendor Program Code of Conduct and, consistent with the program's zero-tolerance policy on violence, recommended permanent revocation of Wei's vendor license.

Director of Community Investment Dennise Pate restated staff's recommendation for license revocation for Jianfu Wei (License No. 8970) due to the violation of Program Code of Conduct.

The accused vendor Jianfu Wei stated that he respected the Committee's process and decision-making and would provide truthful testimony and accept responsibility for his actions. Wei testified that he was not involved in the initial altercation and arrived after hearing the disturbance while speaking with another vendor, Zi Jian Mei. According to Wei, the altercation had already escalated by the time he arrived, and he intervened solely to prevent further escalation. Wei denied physically restraining Wang, stating that his actions

had been misunderstood and that his intent was only to separate the parties. He further stated that witnesses could confirm he arrived near the end of the incident and did not restrain Wang.

In response, Zhongyu Wang stated that she did not fight back and considered herself the victim of the assault. She asserted that photographs previously submitted to the Committee documented bruising caused by Wei restraining her arms. Wang further testified that she asked Wei twice after the incident whether she had struck anyone, and he responded that she had not. Wang's husband testified that, after the incident, Wei told him he had restrained Wang in an effort to de-escalate the situation and later apologized for his actions.

In rebuttal, Wei clarified that he had described the incident as a conflict rather than a mutual fight. He denied ever speaking with Wang's husband after the incident or making physical contact with Wang. Wei testified that he merely stood between the parties with his arms extended to separate them and identified vendor Zi Jian Mei as a witness who could corroborate his account.

In response, Wang questioned the credibility of Mei's testimony, stating that Mei is Wei's friend and had previously acknowledged arriving after the altercation had begun. Wang also asserted that Mei's statements contained inconsistencies. Additionally, Wang alleged that Mei's wife, who is not an art vendor, repeatedly confronted her after the incident despite not witnessing the altercation. Wang further alleged that Mei and his wife later coordinated with Wei in an effort to seek disciplinary action against her.

During deliberations, Chair Ferras stated that Wei's case was distinguishable from the previous two cases and recommended that no disciplinary action be taken. Commissioners Musleh and Shelby agreed. Chair Ferras called for a motion to approve staff's recommendation for disciplinary action. Commissioner Al Perez moved the motion, and Commissioner Musleh seconded it. Following public comment, Chair Ferras called for a vote. The motion was denied by the Committee, thereby rejecting staff's

recommendation and imposing no disciplinary action against Wei. Commissioner Walker was absent for the deliberation and vote.

Public Comments

Due to time constraints, each public comment was limited to two minutes.

Crisostomo Ibarra, attorney for Zhongyu Wang, argued that Wang's injuries resulted from Jianfu Wei's actions in physically restraining her and asserted that Wei's conduct violated the Art Vendor Program Code of Conduct.

Wei disputed Wang's account, stating that her allegations were untrue. He acknowledged that Zi Jian Mei was his friend but maintained that this did not undermine the credibility of Mei's testimony. Wei also stated that other witnesses who were not his friends supported his account and reiterated that his sole intention was to de-escalate the situation.

An unnamed street artist and art vendor Frankie Law both spoke in support of Wang's character. Law stated that he had known Wang for more than ten years and had never previously observed her involved in any similar incident.

Zi Jian Mei testified that he followed Wei to the scene after hearing a disturbance. Mei stated that he initially believed someone was attempting to steal from Wei's booth but realized there was a physical altercation upon arriving. Mei testified that both he and Wei attempted to de-escalate the situation and prevent it from worsening.

In response, Wang reiterated that her injuries were directly caused by Wei physically restraining her. She stated that she asked Wei twice after the incident whether he had seen her strike anyone, and he responded that he had not. Wang urged Wei to acknowledge that his actions caused her injuries, regardless of his intent, and emphasized that her concerns were directed at his conduct rather than him personally.

Mei's wife stated that she occasionally visited the market, denied ever verbally confronting Wang, and testified that Wei was attempting to de-

escalate the altercation. She further stated that Wei was positioned behind Mei during the incident and could not have physically touched Wang.

7. Hearing and possible motion to approve revocation of art vendor license for art vendor ZhongYu Wang (9021):

- **Participating in a violent altercation, threats against art vendor Jianfu Wei (8970) and disrupting the business of the market.**

Due to time constraints, the Committee did not complete consideration of this agenda item. The item was continued to a future meeting for further discussion and action.

**8. Adjournment
(03:51:45)**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

Draft Minutes posted 7/8/2026, 11:00 am, KS

Policies

Accessibility Meeting Policy

Per the American Disabilities Act and the Language Access Ordinance, Chinese, Spanish, Tagalog, and/or American Sign Language interpreters will be available upon request. Additionally, every effort will be made to provide a sound enhancement system, meeting materials in alternative formats, and/or a reader. Minutes may be translated after they have been adopted by the Commission. For all these requests, please contact Commission Secretary Manraj Dhaliwal at least 48 hours before the meeting at 415-252-2247, manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org. Late requests will be honored if possible. The meeting room is wheelchair accessible.

利便參與會議的相關規定

根據美國殘疾人士法案和語言服務條例，中文、西班牙語、和/或美國手語翻譯人員在收到要求後將會提供翻譯服務。另外，我們將盡力提供擴音設備。同時也將會提供不同格式的會議資料，和/或者提供閱讀器。此外，翻譯版本的會議記錄可在委員會通過後提供。上述的要求，請於會議前最少 48 小時致電 415-252-2247 向 Manraj Dhaliwal, manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org 提出。逾期提出的請求，若可能的話，亦會被考慮接納。聽證室設有輪椅通道。

POLITICA DE ACCESO A LA REUNIÓN

De acuerdo con la Ley sobre Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (American Disabilities Act) y la Ordenanza de Acceso a Idiomas (Language Access Ordinance) intérpretes de chino, español, y lenguaje de señas estarán disponibles de ser requeridos. En adición, se hará todo el esfuerzo posible para proveer un sistema mejoramiento de sonido, materiales de la reunión en formatos alternativos, y/o proveer un leedor. Las minutas podrán ser traducidas luego de ser aprobadas por la Comisión. Para solicitar estos servicios, favor contactar a Commission Secretary, Manraj Dhaliwal, por lo menos 48 horas antes de la reunión al 415-252-2247, manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org. Las solicitudes tardías serán consideradas de ser posible. La sala de audiencia es accesible a silla de ruedas.

Patakaran para sa pag-access ng mga Miting

Ayon sa batas ng American Disabilities Act at ng Language Access Ordinance, maaring mag-request ng mga tagapagsalin wika sa salitang Tsino, Espanyol at/o sa may kapansanan pandinig sa American Sign Language. Bukod pa dito, sisikapin gawan ng paraan na makapaglaan ng gami t upang lalong pabutihin ang inyong pakikinig, maibahagi ang mga kaganapan ng miting sa iba't ibang anyo, at/o isang tagapagbasa. Ang mga kaganapan ng miting ay maaring isalin sa ibang wika matapos ito ay aprobahan ng komisyon. Sa mga ganitong uri ng kahilingan, mangyari po lamang makipag ugnayan kay

Commission Secretary Manraj Dhaliwal sa 415-252-2247, manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org. Magbigay po lamang ng hindi bababa sa 48 oras na abiso bago ng miting. Kung maari, ang mga late na hiling ay posibleng tanggapin. Ang silid ng pagpupulungan ay accessible sa mga naka wheelchair.

Agenda Item Information/Materials Available

Each item on the agenda may include the following documents:

- 1) Department or Agency or report;
- 2) Public correspondence;
- 3) Other explanatory documents.

Explanatory documents listed above, as well as documents created or distributed after the posting of this agenda to the Arts Commission will be available only electronically, please contact: Commission Secretary Manraj Dhaliwal at manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org or 415-252-2247. PLEASE NOTE: The Arts Commission often receives documents created or submitted by other City officials, agencies or departments after the posting of the Arts Commission agenda. For such documents or presentations, members of the public may wish to contact the originating agency if they seek documents not yet provided to the Arts Commission.

Archives Available

A recording of this meeting will be available online, 48 hours after the meeting.

Cell Phone Or other Electronic Device Use at Hearings

Please silence all cell phones, pagers, and other sound-producing devices before the meeting begins.

If a device does go off during the meeting, please note that the Chair or President may ask the person responsible to step out of the room.

Disability Access

To obtain a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to participate in the meeting, please contact Manraj Dhaliwal at manraj.dhaliwal@sfgov.org or 415-252-2247, at least 48 hours before the meeting, except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline is 4:00 p.m. the previous Friday.

- Wheelchair accessible entrance is at Van Ness Avenue and Grove Street.
- There are elevators and accessible restrooms located on every floor.

Lobbyist Ordinance

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance (San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code sections 2.100-2.160) to register and report lobbying activity.

For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, contact the [Ethics Commission](#).

- 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102
- (415) 252-3100
- Ethics.Commission@sfgov.org

Meeting Procedures

1. Agenda items will normally be heard in order. Please note, that on occasion a special circumstance may necessitate that an agenda item be taken out of order. To ensure that an agenda item is not missed, it is advised to arrive at the beginning of the meeting. All agenda changes will be announced by the Chair at the top of the meeting.

2. Public comment will be taken before or during the Committee's consideration of each agenda item. Each speaker will be allowed to speak for

the time allotted by the Chair at the top of the meeting or up to three (3) minutes.

3. During General Public Comment, members of the public may address the Commissioners on matters that are within the Arts Commission's jurisdiction and are not on the agenda.

4. Persons who spoke during the public comment period at a meeting of the Arts Commission may supply a brief written summary of the comments to be included in the minutes if it is 150 words or less. The Arts Commission may reject the summary if it exceeds the prescribed word limit or is not an accurate summary of the speaker's public comment.

5. Persons unable to attend an Arts Commission meeting may submit correspondence to the Arts Commission in connection with an agenda item. The Commission Secretary will post these documents adjacent to the agenda if they are one page in length. If they are longer than one page, the Arts Commission will make such documents available for public inspection and copying. Please note, correspondence submitted to the Arts Commission will NOT be read aloud during the meeting. Names and addresses included in these submittals will be public. Submittals may be made anonymously. Written comments pertaining to this meeting should be submitted to art-info@sfgov.org.

Public Comment

Public comment in regard to specific agenda items will be taken before or during consideration of the item. Each speaker may speak for up to three minutes per agenda item, unless the Chair has announced a different length of time at the beginning of the meeting. Speakers may not transfer their time to another person. Any person speaking during a public comment period may supply a written summary of their comments to be included in the minutes if it is 150 words or less.

NOTE: The San Francisco Arts Commission is discontinuing remote public comment for all public meetings starting in December 2023. Public comment will be taken in-person, with remote access provided for those who require an ADA accommodation. Requests for accommodation must be made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting, pursuant to Administrative Code Section 97.7. Late requests will be honored if possible. Please reach out to art-info@sfgov.org or by calling 415-252-2255 with any questions or to make an accommodation request

Sensitivity to chemical-based products

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity, or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.

Sunshine Ordinance

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decision in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review.

Citizens interested in obtaining a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance can request a copy from by printing Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet, <http://www.sfgov.org/sunshine/>

For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact by mail to Administrator, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

- 1 Dr. Carlton b. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102
- (415) 554-7724

June 23, 2026, Street Artists Committee

- By fax at 415-554 7854
- sotf@sfgov.org