

For additional information pertaining to this meeting or matter, please see the complete agenda or packet at the following link: https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/bfc012826_agenda.pdf

CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPER SERVICE BUREAU

DAILY JOURNAL CORPORATION

Mailing Address : 915 E 1ST ST, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
Telephone (800) 788-7840 / Fax (800) 464-2839
Visit us @ www.LegalAdstore.com

BRENT JALIPA
CCSF BD OF SUPERVISORS (OFFICIAL NOTICES)
1 DR CARLTON B GOODLETT PL #244
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

COPY OF NOTICE

Notice Type: GPN GOVT PUBLIC NOTICE

Ad Description

BJJ - Budget & Finance Committee Meeting - 1/28/26

To the right is a copy of the notice you sent to us for publication in the SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER. Thank you for using our newspaper. Please read this notice carefully and call us with ny corrections. The Proof of Publication will be filed with the County Clerk, if required, and mailed to you after the last date below. Publication date(s) for this notice is (are):

01/25/2026

The charge(s) for this order is as follows. An invoice will be sent after the last date of publication. If you prepaid this order in full, you will not receive an invoice.

Publication	\$132.30
Set aside for CCSF Outreach Fund	\$14.70
Total	\$147.00

EXM# 4006749
NOTICE OF REGULAR
MEETING
SAN FRANCISCO BOARD
OF SUPERVISORS
BUDGET AND FINANCE
COMMITTEE
CITY HALL, LEGISLATIVE
CHAMBER, ROOM 250
1 DR. CARLTON B.
GOODLETT PLACE, SAN
FRANCISCO, CA 94102
JANUARY 28, 2026 - 10:00
AM
The agenda packet and
legislative files are available
for review at
[https://sfbos.org/legislative-
research-center-irc](https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-irc) in Room
244 at City Hall, or by calling
(415) 554-5184.
EXM-4006749#



* A 0 0 0 0 0 7 3 0 2 5 5 3 *

SAFETY

Continued from page A1

How governments strike that balance could be crucial to San Francisco companies and residents. The City has become the epicenter of AI development, home to OpenAI and Anthropic — the two best-funded and most highly valued venture-backed companies in the sector — and numerous other startups. Much of San Francisco’s economic rebound, particularly the gradual filling of vacant office space, is being driven by the AI sector.

At the same time, city residents — and people elsewhere — have had to contend with harm caused by the technology, including AI-related delusions. And some technology experts worry such harm will only get worse, potentially risking catastrophes, such as aiding the development of weapons of mass destruction.

Such large-scale harm is what SB 53 is intended to avert. Although the law, which took effect Jan. 1, has other provisions, it’s mainly focused on transparency, shining a light on what developers are doing — or not — to prevent those dangers.

The measure requires developers of cutting-edge AI models to create and make public a “framework” discussing how they assess whether the systems pose threats of catastrophic risk, the steps they’ve taken to prevent such risks, and whether they’ve had third parties evaluate their risk assessments and mitigation steps.

Under the law, a catastrophic risk is one that could lead to the death or serious injury of more than 50 people, or property damage in excess of \$1 billion, thanks to an AI model helping develop or deploy a chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear weapon; the model launching on its own a cyberattack or engaging in a serious crime like murder or theft; or the model evading developer or user control.

The law also requires developers to report to state authorities “critical safety incidents,” such as if a model causes a catastrophe or if deaths or injuries have occurred due to loss of control of an AI system.

SB 53 was the result of a long process that started with the prior year’s Senate Bill 1047, which Wiener also wrote. That bill would have required developers of cutting-edge models to safety test them and would have barred them from releasing models that had an “unreasonable risk” of leading to a catastrophe.

Although the California Legislature overwhelmingly passed SB 1047, it drew widespread opposition from the tech industry, venture investors such as Andreessen Horowitz, and AI researchers such as Stanford’s Fei-Fei Li. Newsom ended up vetoing the bill — but in doing



CRAIG LEE/THE EXAMINER

State Sen. Scott Wiener spent more than a year working to craft SB 53 and get it enacted after SB 1047, his first AI safety bill, was vetoed.

so, he put together an advisory panel that included Li and charged it with making recommendations about AI safety.

That panel encouraged the state to focus on transparency, and Wiener — who was not available for comment — made that the centerpiece of SB 53, which won the approval of both the Legislature and Newsom.

The RAISE Act originally started out as something of a hybrid between SB 1047 and SB 53 — it emphasized transparency but also barred developers from releasing unsafe models. New York has a process in which governors essentially make their signing of bills contingent on the legislature agreeing to certain changes to them, and that’s what happened with the RAISE Act.

As amended by Hochul, the bill no longer includes the prohibition on releasing unsafe models and instead has much the same transparency language as SB 53. But unlike the California measure, it creates a new office in the New York’s Department of Financial Services that will have the authority to make additional rules to enhance reporting and transparency requirements. It also requires developers to report critical safety incidents within 72 hours, rather than within 15, as under SB 53.

While he was disappointed that the bar on unsafe models wasn’t included in the final version, New York Assemblymember Alex Bore — the RAISE Act’s author — said he was excited the bill passed and built on SB 53 in “meaningful ways.”

It’s now “the strongest AI safety law in the country,” he said.

“It pierces the myth that states have no role in regulating AI or that SB 53 is the ceiling of what is required,” Bore said.

The passage of the two bills came as the tech industry has been fighting hard against AI regulation, particularly at the state level. Last month, spurred on by tech industry figures, President Donald Trump signed an executive order seeking to block states from enacting laws governing the technology.

Meanwhile, a super PAC backed by Andreessen Horowitz, San Francisco investor Ron Conway and other tech and venture-industry figures has targeted Bore in particular, aiming to undermine his run for Congress due to his advocacy of the RAISE Act.

In the face of such headwinds, Michael Kleinman — the head of U.S. policy for the Future of Life Institute, an advocacy group that pushes for legislation to protect against large-scale AI risks — said he was “thrilled” to see the RAISE Act pass.

The enactment of SB 53 and the New York bill “shows not only that we can pass AI safety regulation, but that there’s political will and momentum to do so,” Kleinman said.

And those measures might only be the start. Not only are other states working on their own AI transparency bills, some — such as Utah and Nebraska — are including extra provisions in them that are focused on protecting kids.

Those provisions in the Utah and Nebraska bills would require developers to not only disclose how they test for and

mitigate catastrophic risks but also — if they offer AI chatbots — risks to child safety. The measures define child-safety risks as those that would, if done by a person, be considered to have recklessly or intentionally caused death, severe emotional distress or injury to a child, including self-harm.

Both Fiefa and Nebraska state Sen. Tanya Storer, the author of Legislative Bill 1083, cited the case of Southern California teen Adam Raine in explaining why they included the child-safety provisions in their bills.

Raine died by suicide in April, allegedly after being talked into it and given instructions by OpenAI’s ChatGPT. Raine is one of several teens and even adults whose suicides were allegedly encouraged by ChatGPT or other chatbots.

Such dangers have led child-advocacy group Common Sense Media to advise parents to not allow their children to use chatbots for companionship or emotional or mental-health support.

“As tragic cases like the death of sixteen-year-old Adam Raine show, damage is being done today,” Storer said in an email. “We cannot afford to make the mistake we made with social media by leaving tech companies to govern themselves.”

Tech-industry representatives remain opposed to state-level regulations and advocate a federal solution. States that overregulate AI could thwart innovation within their borders, said Megan Stokes, state director of the Computer & Communications Industry Association, a trade group. And companies could find it a challenge to comply with different regulations in different states, she said.

“CCIA is incredibly concerned with the possibility of a company being in compliance in one state, which then requires them to be out of compliance in another state,” Stokes said.

But advocates for AI safety legislation said there’s a need for states to step in because Congress hasn’t done so. The idea that other states are building on SB 53 should put to rest the idea that companies will have to contend with conflicting statutes in different states, said Sunny Gandhi, vice president of public affairs at Encode, an AI advocacy group that sponsored Wiener’s measure and is sponsoring Fiefa’s bill in Utah.

Even if the bills vary a bit from state to state, that’s actually a good thing, Fiefa said. States should respond to the needs and concerns of their own citizens, he said.

“This isn’t a ‘one size fits all,’” Fiefa said.

If you have a tip about tech, startups or the venture industry, contact Troy Wolverton at twolverton@sfxaminer.com or via text or Signal at (415) 515-5594.

San Francisco Examiner PUBLIC NOTICES

SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER • DAILY CITY INDEPENDENT • SAN MATEO WEEKLY • REDWOOD CITY TRIBUNE • ENQUIRER • BULLETIN • FOSTER CITY PROGRESS • MILLBRAE • SAN BRUNO SUN • BOUTIQUE & VILLAGER • EXAMINER - SO. SAN FRANCISCO • EXAMINER - SAN BRUNO

GOVERNMENT

NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE CITY HALL, LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER, ROOM 250 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102 JANUARY 28, 2026 - 10:00 AM

The agenda packet and legislative files are available for review at <https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-irc> in Room 244 at City Hall, or by calling (415) 554-5184. **EXM-4006749#**

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2026 - 10:00 AM LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER, ROOM 250, CITY HALL 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco’s Budget and Finance Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard: **File No. 250967.** Ordinance amending the Health and Business and Tax Regulations Codes to revise the definition of a mobile food facility permit and add definitions for compact mobile food operations, mobile support unit, and permitted auxiliary conveyance permits to reflect recent amendments to the California Retail Food Code, and revise existing definitions of various other terms to reflect State law definitions in that Code; establish annual permit and plan check fees for auxiliary conveyance, compact mobile food operation, and mobile support unit permits; and remove annual food facility surcharge fees; amending the Public Works Code to include a definition for compact mobile food operations and to expand the Department of Public Works’ street vending authority to include regulation of compact mobile food operations, and require that Department to consult with the Department of Public Health and Fire Department when issuing rules and regulations that regulate street vendors. If this legislation passes, Business and Tax Regulations Code, Section 249.1, will be amended to create a new Class R for Compact Mobile Food Operations establishing annual license fees of \$188 for low-risk operations (R-1),

\$377 for moderate-risk (R-2), \$502 for high-risk (R-3), and \$188 for permitted auxiliary conveyances (R-4). The fee for Class H-1 Mobile Food Facility 1 will increase from \$195 to \$893. Class H-2 Mobile Food Facility 2 from \$292 to \$893, and H-3 Mobile Support Unit (formerly Mobile Food Facility 3) from \$195 to \$781. Business and Tax Regulations Code, Section 249.23, will be amended to increase plan check fees for each person filing an application for an initial Mobile Food Facility permit from \$181 to \$251 per hour. Plan check fees will be established for each person filing an application for an Auxiliary Conveyance and initial Compact Mobile Food Operation - Low Risk at \$188, Moderate Risk at \$377, and High Risk or a Mobile Support Unit at \$502. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors’ Legislative Research Center (<https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-irc>). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, January 30, 2026. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Budget and Finance Committee: Brent Jalipa (Brent.Jalipa@sfgov.org) - (415) 554-7712; Angela Calvillo - Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco. **EXM-4006748#**

NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CITY HALL, LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER, ROOM 250, 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102 JANUARY 27, 2026 - 10:00 PM

The agenda packet and legislative files are available for review at <https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-irc>, in Room 244 at City Hall, or by calling (415) 554-5184. **EXM-4006405#**

Invitation to Bid # 2026-095 John Adams Allied Health Relocation
Bids Due Tuesday, February 17th, 2026 at 1:00 PM
IFB #2026-095 John Adams Allied Health Relocation. City College of San Francisco is soliciting bids for **John Adams Allied Health**

Relocation. Scope includes Partial tenant improvement (TI) for basement, 1st, 2nd & 3rd floors for relocating the Allied Health program to John Adams Center. The program includes registered nursing, diagnostic medical imaging, and dental assisting program from Ocean Campus Cloud Hall to John Adams Center. Associated modifications to structural, electrical, mechanical & plumbing as needed. Restroom accessibility upgrade as needed. IFB documents will be available on **1/26/2026** from: <https://www.ccsf.edu/about-ccsf/administration/finance-and-administration/office-facilities-and-capital-planning/bid-opportunities>. Mandatory Pre-bid walk on **1/28/2026 at 10:00am** or **2/3/2026 at 10:00am** by appointment only, see bid documents for scheduling information. Attendance to at least one pre-bid walk is required. For questions, email CCSF.Facilities@ccsf.edu. Submit sealed bids at District Facilities Office, B606, 50 Frida Kahlo Way to facilities@ccsf.edu. Bids due **2/17/26 at 1:00 PM. Required License - "B". Project Estimate: \$5,000,000.** Small/local businesses welcome. District reserves right to reject any/all bids. Advertising dates: **1/25/26 and 2/1/26.** **EXM-4005735#**

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MONDAY February 2, 2026 - 1:30 PM Legislative Chamber, Room 250, City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco’s Land Use and Transportation Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard: **File No. 250814.** Ordinance ordering the summary street vacation of City property on unimproved street areas of Moraga and Noriega Avenues; finding the street vacation area is not necessary for the City’s use; reserving easements related to support for the City-owned retaining wall from the street vacation properties and including other conditions to the street vacation; amending the Planning Code and Zoning Map to rezone the City property identified as Assessor’s Parcel Block No. 2042, Lot Nos. 039-041 from P (Public)/OS (Open Space) to RH-2 (Residential Housing Two-family/40-X), and to rezone parcels on Kensington Way adjacent to Vasquez Avenue shown on Assessor’s

Parcel Block No. 2923, Lot Nos. 010A and 024-027 from RH-1(D)/40-X to Public/Open Space; affirming the Planning Commission’s determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of the Planning Code, Section 101.1 and adopting findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments. These comments will be added to the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (bos@sfgov.org). Information relating to this matter is available with the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors’ Legislative Research Center (<https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-irc>). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, January 30, 2026. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Land Use and Transportation Committee: John Carroll (john.carroll@sfgov.org) - (415) 554-4445. **EXM-4004401#**

GOVERNMENT

City of Daly City NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS
Notice is hereby given that the Planning Commission of the City of Daly City will hold a Meeting on Tuesday, **February 3, 2026**, at the hour of 7:00 p.m., in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 333-90th Street, Daly City, California, to consider the following proposed project:
1. Zone Change ZC 04-24-16507. Request by the City of Daly City to rezone certain parcels on Mission Street and Geneva Avenue into the CC-Commercial Cannabis Combining District (overlay zone), permitting the non-retail sale of commercial cannabis “by-right” without the requirement for additional public hearings. The parcels proposed for rezoning are those parcels with Mission Street frontage between Crocker Avenue and Templeton Avenue, with Geneva Avenue frontage between Talbert Street and Baysshore Boulevard, and with Geneva Avenue frontage

between Castillo Street and Calgary Street. Said sales would occur in accord with Chapter 5.104 of the Daly City Municipal Code - Commercial Cannabis. The proposed regulations are exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15061 - Review for Exemption. At said time and place, the Planning Commission will receive all material evidence and will hear all interested persons concerning the item. Questions may be addressed to the Planning Division office at (650) 991-8033. Tatum Mothershead, Director, Department of Economic and Community Development. PUBLISHED: Sunday, January 25, 2026. **SPEN-4006471# EXAMINER - DALY CITY INDEPENDENT**

PROBATE

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF JANICE MARIE MACLAREN CASE NO. 26-PRO-00077

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both, of: **JANICE MARIE MACLAREN** A Petition for Probate has been filed by **KATHLEEN MACLAREN** in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN MATEO. The Petition for Probate requests that **KATHLEEN MACLAREN** be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent. The Petition requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice

to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held in this court on **2/20/2026 at 9:00 A.M.** in Dept. PROBATE Room N/A located at 400 COUNTY CENTER, REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063. If you object to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. If you are a creditor or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. You may examine the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Attorney for Petitioner: **SALLY BERGMAN**, 1900 S. NORFOLK STREET, SUITE 350, SAN MATEO, CA 94403, Telephone: 650-242-9800 1/23, 1/25, 2/1/26 **SPEN-4005596# EXAMINER - REDWOOD CITY TRIBUNE**

interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held in this court on **2/17/2026 at 9:00 A.M.** in Dept. N/A located at 800 NORTH HUMBOLDT STREET, SAN MATEO, CA 94401. If you object to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. If you are a creditor or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. You may examine the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Attorney for Petitioner: **MARK A. HOMEN**, 1728 B STREET, HAYWARD, CA 94541, Telephone: 510-247-0400 1/16, 1/18, 1/25/26 **SPEN-4003867# EXAMINER - REDWOOD CITY TRIBUNE**

Attorney for Petitioner: **SALLY BERGMAN**, 1900 S. NORFOLK STREET, SUITE 350, SAN MATEO, CA 94403, Telephone: 650-242-9800 1/23, 1/25, 2/1/26 **SPEN-4005596# EXAMINER - REDWOOD CITY TRIBUNE**

SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER

This space for filing stamp only

465 CALIFORNIA ST, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94101
Telephone (415) 314-1835 / Fax (510) 743-4178

BRENT JALIPA
CCSF BD OF SUPERVISORS (OFFICIAL NOTICES)
1 DR CARLTON B GOODLETT PL #244
SAN FRANCISCO, CA - 94102

EXM#: 4006749

**NOTICE OF REGULAR
MEETING
SAN FRANCISCO BOARD
OF SUPERVISORS
BUDGET AND FINANCE
COMMITTEE
CITY HALL, LEGISLATIVE
CHAMBER, ROOM 250
1 DR. CARLTON B.
GOODLETT PLACE, SAN
FRANCISCO, CA 94102
JANUARY 28, 2026 - 10:00
AM**

PROOF OF PUBLICATION

(2015.5 C.C.P.)

The agenda packet and legislative files are available for review at <https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc> in Room 244 at City Hall, or by calling (415) 554-5184.
EXM-4006749#

State of California)
County of SAN FRANCISCO) ss

Notice Type: GPN - GOVT PUBLIC NOTICE

Ad Description:
BJJ - Budget & Finance Committee Meeting - 1/28/26

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the State of California; I am over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to or interested in the above entitled matter. I am the principal clerk of the printer and publisher of the SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER, a newspaper published in the English language in the city of SAN FRANCISCO, county of SAN FRANCISCO, and adjudged a newspaper of general circulation as defined by the laws of the State of California by the Superior Court of the County of SAN FRANCISCO, State of California, under date 10/18/1951, Case No. 410667. That the notice, of which the annexed is a printed copy, has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to-wit:

01/25/2026

Executed on: 01/26/2026
At Los Angeles, California

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.



Signature



Email