

100898

Petitions and Communications received from June 22, 2010, through July 2, 2010, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on July 13, 2010.

From Office of the Controller, regarding proposed Charter Amendment concerning the split appointments to the Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors. File No. 100637, Copy: Rules Committee Members and Clerk (1)

From Office of the Controller, submitting their analysis of the funding recommendations of the Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families for FY2010-2011 through FY2012-2013. Copy: Each Supervisor (2)

From Office of the Controller, regarding transfer tax revenues received by the City and County for FY2009-2010. Copy: Each Supervisor (3)

From Office of the Mayor, submitting opposition to proposed Charter Amendment amending City Charter provisions concerning the Municipal Transportation Agency. File No. 100637, Copy: Each Supervisor, Rules Committee Clerk (4)

From James Chaffee, regarding public comment at the Budget and Finance Committee. (5)

From Clerk of the Board, the following departments have submitted their Sole Source contracts for FY2009-2010: (6)

- Civil Service Commission
- Employees' Retirement System
- Human Services Agency
- Public Health
- Public Library
- Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
- War Memorial and Performing Arts Center

From Clerk of the Board, the following individuals have submitted a Form 700 Statement: (7)

- Bruce Wolfe, assuming, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
- Nicholas Goldman, assuming, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
- David Snyder, assuming, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
- James Knoebber, assuming, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
- Hope Johnson, assuming, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force

From concerned citizens, submitting support for the Neighborhood Emergency Response Team (NERT) program. File No. 100701, Budget and Finance Committee Members and Clerk, 2 letters (8)

From Clerk of the Board, the following departments have submitted their 2010 Local Agency Biennial Notices: (9)

Assessor-Recorder

County Transportation Authority

Department of Human Resources

Health Authority

Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board

Treasurer-Tax Collector

From Department of Public Works, submitting notice that effective July 1, 2010, the cost to file an appeal for a tentative map will increase from \$250.00 to \$280.00. (10)

From Library Users Association, urging the Board to urge the City Librarian to provide full-time, full interim library service while branch libraries are being renovated. (11)

From Mayor's Office of Housing, submitting public notice that their office has completed an Environmental Assessment for the project known as Edward II, located at 3155 Scott Street. (12)

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to expanding parking meter hours/and or Sunday metering. 42 letters (13)

From concerned citizens, regarding the Arizona boycott. (14)

From Department of Public Works, responding to the Findings and Recommendations of the San Francisco County Civil Grand Jury Report entitled Americans with Disabilities Act. (15)

From ClementinaCares, Inc., submitting support for the 900 Folsom Street and 260 Fifth Street projects. File Nos. 100787, 100791 (16)

From Cesar Gomez, regarding McLaren Park Disc Golf Club. (17)

From Ahimsa Porter Sumchai, regarding the Hunter's Point Shipyard/Candlestick Park Environmental Review. (18)

From S.F.Ocean Edge, submitting a request for an Environmental Impact Report scoping session for the Beach Chalet Athletic Fields renovation project in Golden Gate Park. (19)

From Office of the District Attorney, submitting request for waiver of Administrative Code Chapter 12B for Chevron USA, Inc. (20)

From Department of Animal Care and Control, submitting request for waiver of Administrative Code Chapter 12B for ADT Security Service. (21)

From Department of Animal Care and Control, submitting request for waiver of Administrative Code Chapter 12B for Idexx Distribution Corp. (22)

From Department of Animal Care and Control, submitting request for waiver of Administrative Code Chapter 12B for Merial Limited. (23)

From Department of Animal Care and Control, submitting request for waiver of Administrative Code Chapter 12B for Merry X-Ray Chemical Corporation. (24)

From Department of Animal Care and Control, submitting request for waiver of Administrative Code Chapter 12B for Radiation Detection Company. (25)

From Department of Animal Care and Control, submitting request for waiver of Administrative Code Chapter 12B for Safeway, Inc. (26)

From Department of Animal Care and Control, submitting request for waiver of Administrative Code Chapter 12B for TW Medical Vet Supply. (27)

From S.F. Association of Realtors, submitting support for proposed Ordinance to adopt a condominium conversion impact fee applicable to buildings qualifying for but not being selected in the 2010 condominium conversion lottery. File No. 100706 (28)

From Department of Public Health, submitting a status report on the implementation of the San Francisco Health Care Security Ordinance. Copy: Each Supervisor (29)

From State Department of Public Health, regarding the infant healthcare budget revision. Copy: Each Supervisor (30)

From Planning Department, regarding T-Mobile Wireless Telecommunications Facilities at various locations. Copy: Each Supervisor (31)

From San Francisco County Civil Grand Jury, submitting report entitled "Pension Tsunami: The Billion-Dollar Bubble" Copy: Each Supervisor, Government Audit and Oversight Committee Clerk (32)

From S.F. Public Golf Alliance, submitting list of frequently asked questions and answers about Sharp Park Golf Course. Copy: Each Supervisor (33)

From S.F. Public Golf Alliance, urging the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to maintain funding in the FY2010/2012 budget for Sharp Park Golf Course. 113 letters, Copy: Each Supervisor (34)

From Axis of Love, SF, submitting copy of petition sent to the District Attorney regarding the raid on the Axis of Love Medical Cannabis Community Center on June 10, 2010. Approximately 480 signatures. (35)

From Bay Area Rapid Transit District, submitting their Public Participation Plan Report. (36)

From Office of the Controller, submitting copy of letter sent to the KOGAMI Foundation regarding grant funds. (37)

From Office of Citizen Complaints, submitting comments on proposed Charter Amendment transferring Police Department Functions to the Sheriff. Copy: Rules Committee Members and Clerk (38)

From Gail Caswell, urging the Board of Supervisors to close Sharp Park Golf Course and use the money to defray the impacts of the existing fiscal crisis. (39)

From Kimo Crossman, submitting letter from the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board being in compliance with Section 67.16. (40)

From Kimo Crossman, regarding preserving public records. (41)

From concerned citizens, submitting support for the restoration request of \$50,000 for the Japantown Better Neighborhood Plan Organizing Committee. File No. 100701, 9 letters (42)

From Department of Public Works, submitting their yearly report concerning the Monument Preservation Fund. (43)

From Office of the Public Defender, submitting request for waiver for Administrative Code Chapter 12B for Chevron USA, Inc. (44)

From Office of the Mayor, submitting an addendum to Notice of Transfer of Function under Charter Section 4.132. Copy: Each Supervisor (45)

From Office of the Mayor, submitting Notice to Rescind Transfer of Function under Charter Section 4.132. Copy: Each Supervisor (46)

From Office of the Controller, regarding proposed Charter Amendment specifying funding for affordable housing. File No. 100629, Copy: Each Supervisor, City Attorney (47)

From Office of the Controller, regarding proposed Charter Amendment requiring the Mayor to appear personally at one regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Supervisors each month. File No. 100630, Each Supervisor, City Attorney (48)

From Office of the Controller, regarding proposed Charter Amendment establishing the Rent Board in the Charter and dividing the power to nominate members of the Rent Board between the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. File No. 100636, Copy: Each Supervisor, City Attorney (49)

From Office of the Mayor, submitting notice that Mayor Newsom will be out of state from July 2, 2010, until July 5, 2010. Supervisor Bevan Dufty and Supervisor Carmen Chu will serve as Acting-Mayor. Copy: Each Supervisor, City Attorney (50)

From Planning Department, submitting notice of the availability of a draft Environmental Impact Report for the San Francisco 2004 and 2009 Housing Element. (51)

From Lee & Therese Grenchilk, urging the Board of Supervisors to reconsider landmark status for the North Beach Library and allow long-delayed plans to replace the existing building to proceed. (52)

From Bill & Bob Clark, regarding the Street Artist Certificate fee increase. File No. 100710 (53)

From Ivan Pratt, regarding various issues. 2 letters (54)

From Andrew Sullivan, submitting opposition to proposed Charter Amendment amending the City Charter provisions concerning the Municipal Transportation Agency. File No. 100637 (55)

From Daniel Pong, regarding fees and taxes in San Francisco. (56)

From Jennifer Stasch, urging continued funding for behavioral health services delivered to needy veterans by Swords to Plowshares frontline drop-in center. (57)

From Shanon Seaberg, requesting help with Department of Public Works clean up issues. (58)

From John Wirth, regarding City and County administrators that make over two hundred thousand dollars a year. (59)

From W.D. Flient, regarding medical services at the 850 Bryant Street jail. (60)

From Francisco Da Costa, regarding Communities of Opportunity. (61)

From Marcia Flannery, regarding funding for the arts at San Francisco International Airport. (62)

From Bill Quan, submitting opposition to proposed Charter Amendment that changes the composition of the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board. File No. 100636, Rules Committee Members and Clerk (63)



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

File 100637

orig - Kellie Clark
cc: 1013
cpay cc: campos
Alido Pier, Mar

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Monique Zmuda
Deputy Controller
JUN 24 2010
PM 2:40
RECEIVED
SUPERVISORS
OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
SAN FRANCISCO
RW

June 24, 2010

Ms. Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RE: File 100637 - Charter amendment to provide for split appointments to the Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) Board of Directors, allocate property tax revenues to the MTA, and other changes

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Should the proposed Charter amendment be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it will affect the cost of government primarily in that it would set aside funds for the Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) which are currently available for any public purpose. To the extent that funds are shifted to the MTA, other City spending would have to be reduced or new revenues identified.

The amendment specifies that the City appropriate property tax revenues in the amount of 2.5 cents out of the one dollar base property tax collected on every \$100 of assessed valuation beginning in fiscal year 2011-2012 and dedicate those funds to the Municipal Transportation Agency. As of the fiscal year 2010-2011 budget, that amount would be \$37.4 million. The amendment would also continue the City's existing 'baseline' required funding of the MTA. As of the fiscal year 2010-2011 budget, that amount is \$178.3 million.

The amendment provides for changes to the method by which wages are set for the MTA transit operators. Currently, wages for these employees are set through a national survey of comparable transit agencies, averaging the two highest wage levels found in the survey and setting that amount as a floor. In addition, if benefits for the comparable agencies exceed the actuarial value of those provided by the City, a payment is made to a trust fund for transit operator benefits. The proposed charter amendment would instead have wage levels set through collective bargaining and impasse arbitration procedures as are used with other City employee unions, and would eliminate the trust fund. Currently, MTA transit operators' wage rate is set at \$27.92 per hour using the method described above. For the last five years, the City has been required to make deposits averaging \$5 to \$7 million annually to the transit operators benefit trust fund. In addition, the amendment makes special pay now mandated for 'service critical' MTA employees an option within the collective bargaining process. As of fiscal year 2009-2010, the amount of such special pay that could be affected is approximately \$3 million. Overall, negotiation and collective bargaining methods could result in either a decrease or an increase to drivers' wage, pay and benefit levels.



The amendment provides for a new Office of the Inspector General (OIG) reporting to the MTA Board of Directors to provide independent audits, reviews and analyses of the Agency. The amendment specifies that the funding currently dedicated to this same purpose under the Controller's City Services Auditor (Charter Appendix F), which is 2/10ths of 1% of the annual budget, be allocated instead to the OIG. As of the fiscal year 2009-2010 budget, that amount is approximately \$1.5 million. The amendment specifies that the OIG Director be paid at least the average of the salary provided to managers reporting to the MTA General Manager.

Currently, all seven members of the MTA Board are appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. The amendment would provide instead that three members of the Board be appointed by the Mayor, three by the Board of Supervisors, and one jointly by the Mayor and Board President, with all members subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.

Please note that this amendment involves the Controller's office, which has prepared this statement.

Sincerely,



Ben Rosenfield
Controller

Note: This analysis reflects our understanding of the proposal as of the date shown. At times further information is provided to us which may result in revisions being made to this analysis before the final Controller's statement appears in the Voter Information Pamphlet.

City and County of San Francisco

Office of the Controller – City Services Auditor


DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND THEIR FAMILIES:

Review and Analysis of DCYF Funding
Decisions for FY 2010-11 through FY
2012-13

Document is available
at the Clerk's Office
Room 244, City Hall

BY _____ AK

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN 23 PM 3:50



June 23, 2010

(2)

BOS-11
COR



MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor Gavin Newsom
Members of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Ben Rosenfield, Controller
BR

DATE: June 22, 2010

SUBJECT: Property Transfer Tax Revenue Update

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN 22 PM 12:32
BY _____
AK

This memorandum is to advise you of recent news regarding transfer tax revenues received by the City during the current fiscal year, ending June 30th, 2010.

The Mayor's Proposed Budget assumes that the City would receive a total of **\$67.6 million** in transfer tax revenues, or **\$4.5 million** more than had been received by the City on June 1st, 2010 when the Mayor presented his budget to the Board.

Since that time, a number of significant commercial transactions have closed during June. Transfer tax receipts during this month now total **\$14.8 million**, the largest single month of transfer tax revenues received by the City since June 2007. This compares to actual receipts of **\$1.4 million** in the prior month.

While June receipts appear to be the result of a single strong month and not signs of an overall recovery in the local commercial real estate market, total receipts through today now total **\$76.9 million**, or **\$9.3 million** more than assumed in the budget currently pending before the Board. Per the Charter, approximately **\$1.5 million** of these funds are allocated for certain baseline funding requirements and **\$7.8 million** are allocated to the General Fund.

My office will advise each of you on June 30th, 2010 of final receipts for the current fiscal year. Funds received in excess of those previously projected will be available for appropriation in the fiscal year 2010-2011 budget.

3

Office of the Mayor
City & County of San Francisco



File 100637
C: BOS
original - Rules Cle
Gavin Newsom page COB

June 24, 2010

Members, Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94012

Dear Supervisors,

I oppose the Charter Amendment (File Number 100637) amending the City Charter provisions concerning the San Francisco Municipal Transit Agency (SFMTA). This proposal lacks a narrative of true reform and substantially increases the City's General Fund deficit.

First and foremost, this proposal includes an ill-advised \$40 million general fund set-aside for SFMTA operations. A massive new debit against scarce resources will lead directly to layoffs and reductions to other key City services – most notably in the health and human services and public safety arenas. This Charter Amendment reduces the City's already modest discretionary fund, further limiting our ability to make tradeoffs in future budgets.

Second, this proposal erodes the SFMTA's fiscal authority over its own budget, a principle the people of San Francisco have consistently supported, most recently in 2007 when Proposition A passed easily and several years before that with Proposition E. The current proposal rolls back the progress made by these initiatives, a voter-approved narrative of independence and autonomy. By giving the Board of Supervisors a de facto line item veto over the SFMTA's budget and operational decisions, it subjects our transit system to the politics of City Hall.

Third, the creation of an unnecessary Inspector General position for the SFMTA creates a burdensome new level of bureaucracy and undermines the Controller's existing audit functions. An Inspector General's office like this has no precedent in the City and dismisses the value of the objectivity that the Controller's office provides for this agency and all departments across our government. Historically, Inspector General positions exist only for transit agencies that are fully separate governmental agencies – not for those under the umbrella of the City and County. This new post would encourage departments to create duplicative internal offices to do work that the City Controller very ably performs for a wide range of departments and services already.

Fourth, this Charter Amendment politicizes a transportation system that San Franciscans have long fought to secure as independent. This proposal argues that the Board of Supervisors needs more direct control over SFMTA Board appointments, yet another reform in search of a problem. The Board of Supervisors, per Charter Section 8A.102(a), has the power to confirm or reject all of the Mayor's appointments to the SFMTA Board. I disagree that split appointments, when the Supervisors already possess the power to reject appointments, would improve on-time performance or provide cleaner buses. This is simply a power grab like 2005's Proposition D to split SFMTA Board appointments that only 35.6 percent of San Franciscans supported, and a similar idea regarding another commission that only 46.2 percent of voters supported earlier this month.

Finally, this Charter Amendment does not directly confront the most daunting budgetary challenge the SFMTA faces: restrictive driver work rules that cost the agency millions of wasted dollars every year. The Board of Supervisors' own budget analyst found that inefficient

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 200, San Francisco, California 94102-4641
gavin.newsom@sfgov.org • (415) 554-6141

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN 25 AM 9:08
BY [signature]

4



work rules lead to wasteful driver schedules and recommended renegotiated MOU provisions on overtime. This proposed Charter Amendment, however, proposes nothing more than an elimination of a wage floor and implementation of collective bargaining, falling short of addressing head-on the truly restrictive work rules that exacerbated SFMTA's budget deficit and led to a 10 percent service cut this year. The existing MOU includes contractually enshrined past practices and side letters on work rules such as part-time operators and dysfunctional overtime policies; without amendments to rectify this, the SFMTA cannot substantively improve its budget condition. We need real work rule reform, and this proposed Charter Amendment falls frustratingly short.

Faced with unprecedented deficits, caused by over \$220 million in decreased state funding for local transit in the past few years, our existing Muni system has nonetheless improved its performance. Last fiscal year, Muni achieved the highest on-time performance this decade. And in the past year, Muni was the only system that experienced ridership growth of the nation's 29 largest transit agencies. Additionally in December 2009, SFMTA successfully implemented major service changes, bringing efficiency and savings to the system. The SFMTA Board has also pressed for a number of forward-looking policy initiatives including the Transit Effectiveness Project, SFpark, and the citywide Bike Plan.

The SFMTA does not need an Inspector General, split Board appointments, or a massive general fund raid – rather, the SFMTA needs true work rule reform and a united effort by City officials to fight for all the funding from the State, which we are rightfully due. San Franciscans deserve a safe, efficient, and reliable public transportation service. This Charter Amendment does not substantively move us towards accomplishing these goals, and I urge you to table it.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom
Mayor



"h. brown" <h@ludd.net>
06/21/2010 01:52 PM

To h@ludd.net
cc bevan.duffy@sfgov.org, board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org,
carmen.chu@sfgov.org, chris.daly@sfgov.org, "David
Campos" <david.campos@sfgov.org>, "David Chiu"
bcc:

Subject Avalos/Chiu combine to kill Public Comment on Budget

boys and girls,

"Supervisor Elsbernd says we'll be out of here by 10:30pm." That was D-11's Avalos proudly handicapping the bets on just how many people would be cut out of input on losing their homes and health care and jobs & little things like that. The email from James Chaffee says it better than I ever could. In times of great trials the Public needs a relevant chance to vent. The key word there being 'relevant'. Avalos and Chiu have taken that away. Last year Chiu was around 10 hours late starting a final budget meeting because he and the other supes were busy in back rooms sealing deals with no genuine public input.

Chaffee's comments:

> Dear Friends,
>
> It is clear by now that Board President David Chui is making a determined
> effort to gut the standards of sunshine in this city. The trouble is that
> he has undercut sunshine so persistently on so many levels that outrage
> becomes commonplace and it just wears everyone down. I won't go through all
> the previous assaults on public comment. No doubt you know them.
>
> Until just a few years ago, the budget committee during budget season heard
> the departments one by one and if you had a comment to set the record
> straight about the Library or Rec and Park, you got your chance. A few
> years ago, under Peskin they decided that they would have just one public
> comment on a particular day for the entire budget. We knew it was not
> legal, and I was outraged by that too, but it had its practical side.
>
> This year it is different. That one chance at public comment on the San
> Francisco budget is tomorrow's meeting of the Budget and Finance Committee.
> The meeting starts at 10:00 a.m. and in addition to the continuing hearings
> on the individual departments which is item one, and the salary ordinance,
> which item two, there are 26 items in total, including approvals of
> contracts, new patient rates for the Dept. of Public Health, new Food Permit
> Fees, increased street artist certificate fees, and many more, all but one
> proposed by the mayor.
>
> The agenda item states, I quote it verbatim, "Special Order - 4:00 p.m. -
> Public Comment for the 2010/2011 Annual Budget and All Other Items on This
> Agenda. NOTE: This shall constitute the opportunity for public comment
> pursuant to California Government Code Section 54954.3 and San Francisco
> Administrative Code Section 67.15(a) prior to adoption of all items on this
> agenda."
>
> >
> What those sections provide is that public comment shall be taken "before or
> during the committee's consideration of the item." The clear intent of the

5



Elizabeth
Murray/WMPAC/SFGOV
06/24/2010 12:08 PM

To Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV
cc
bcc
Subject Sole Source Contracts for FY 2009-10 - War Memorial

Attached is War Memorial's list of sole source contracts for FY 2009-10.

Elizabeth Murray, Managing Director
War Memorial and Performing Arts Center
(415) 554-6306



solesource 09-10 WAR.doc

(b)

San Francisco War Memorial and Performing Arts Center

Owned and Operated by the
City and County of San Francisco

War Memorial Veterans Building
Herbst Theatre/Green Room
War Memorial Opera House
Louise M. Davies Symphony Hall
Harold L. Zellerbach Rehearsal Hall

401 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 110
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone (415) 621-6600
FAX (415) 621-5091

MEMORANDUM

June 26, 2010

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors


FROM: Elizabeth Murray, Managing Director
War Memorial and Performing Arts Center

SUBJECT: **Sole Source Contracts for Fiscal Year 2009-2010**

In accordance with the Sunshine Ordinance requirement that each City department provide the Board of Supervisors with a list of all sole source contracts entered into during the past fiscal year, listed below are sole source contracts entered into by the War Memorial department during FY 2009-2010.

TERM	VENDOR	AMOUNT	REASON
7/1/09-6/30/10	AIXTEC dba Eaton & Associates	\$20,000.00	Technical support / technology assessment and development of technology plan.
7/1/09-6/30/10	Auditoria California	\$11,485.00	Modify Davies Symphony Hall Terrace seating in row C, including removal & reconfiguration of 44 seats.
7/1/09-6/30/10	Bay City Boiler & Engineering Co.	\$38,959.00	Repair/install 4" flanged earthquake valve on the 4" natural gas pipe header at Davies Symphony Hall.
7/1/098-6/30/10	Gala Theatrical Equipment	\$ 3,850.00	On-site maintenance and inspection of Opera House Gala pit lift.
7/1/09-6/30/10	McClure Electric	\$28,835.00	Supply & installation of Acoustic Canopy House System – Davies Symphony Hall.
7/1/09-6/30/10	Siemens Building Technology	\$ 6,000.00	Emergency repair Opera House fire alarm system; multiple troubles on loop requiring factory & proprietary tools, parts for trouble shooting & repair.
7/1/09-6/30/10	Simonds Machinery	\$11,463.00	Custom duplex control panel for Herbst Theatre. Replace and install Barnes pump and above control panel.
7/1/09-6/30/10	United California Glass	\$11,500.00	Repair and replace broken glass in Veterans Building north side window & entrance glass.
7/1/09-6/30/10	Rocket Science	\$11,850.00	Fabricate materials & make corrections to Acoustic Ceiling Banner Hoist Group – Davies Symphony Hall.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 554-6306.





Anita Sanchez/CSC/SFGOV
06/24/2010 01:05 PM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
<board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
bcc
Subject Civil Service Commission Report on Sole Source Contracts
for Fiscal Year 2009-10

Attached is the Civil Service Commission's submission of its Sole Source Contracts for FY 2009-10.
Please let me know if you have questions.



SoleSrceContrctsRprts 06-24-10.pdf

Anita Sanchez
Executive Officer
Civil Service Commission
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 720
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 252-3250 Direct - (415) 252-3247 Reception
(415) 252-3260 Fax



**CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

GAVIN NEWSOM
MAYOR

June 24, 2010

E. DENNIS NORMANDY
PRESIDENT

DONALD A. CASPER
VICE PRESIDENT

MORGAN R. GORRONO
COMMISSIONER

MARY Y. JUNG
COMMISSIONER

ANITA SANCHEZ
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Ms. Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102 4689

SUBJECT: Sole Source Contracts Report for Fiscal Year 2009-10

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

This is in response to your memo of June 1, 2010, that requires each City department to provide the Board of Supervisors with a list of any sole source contracts the department entered into during Fiscal Year 2009-10.

This report is being submitted in compliance with Section 67.24(e) and 67.29-2 of the Sunshine Ordinance for the Civil Service Commission. The Civil Service Commission entered into a sole source contract with IPMA – International Public Management Association for Human Resources in Fiscal Year 2009-10 and is listed below in the requested format.

Term	Vendor	Amount	Reason
8/01/09 – 7/31/10	IPMA-HR International Public Management Association for Human Resources	\$360.00	Membership Fee Human resources organization providing education and resources for human resources professionals in the Local, State, and Federal government

Please call me at 252-3250, if there are questions or if further information is needed.

Sincerely,

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Anita Sanchez
ANITA SANCHEZ
Executive Officer

Alpha
Chron



"Anna C. Wong"
<annawong@sfpl.org>
06/23/2010 02:17 PM

To "board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org"
<board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc Luis Herrera <lherrera@sfpl.org>, Jay Manglicmot
<jmanglicmot@sfpl.org>
bcc

Subject Library Sole Source Contracts for FY 09-10

1 attachment



Library sole source report.pdf

Hi,

Per your office's memorandum dated June 1, 2010 titled "Sole Source Contracts for Fiscal Year 2009-2010," please find attached a list of sole-source contracts the Library entered into during Fiscal Year 2009-10, plus existing sole-source contracts renewed by the Library in FY 09-10.

Sincerely,

Anna Clara Wong

Contracts Manager
San Francisco Public Library
100 Larkin Street, Room 680
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 557-4214 telephone
(415) 437-4830 fax

Official SFPL use only



San Francisco Public Library
Contract Administration, Finance Division
100 Larkin Street, San Francisco, CA 94102-4733
Tel (415) 557-4214 · Fax (415) 437-4830

MEMORANDUM

June 22, 2010

TO: Clerk of the Board

FROM: Anna Clara Wong, Contracts Manager *Anna Clara Wong*

THROUGH: Luis Herrera, City Librarian *Luis Herrera*

SUBJECT: Sole Source Contracts for Fiscal Year 2009-2010
San Francisco Public Library

Per your memorandum of June 1, 2010, please find attached a list of sole-source contracts entered into during Fiscal Year 2009-10, plus existing sole-source contracts renewed by the Library in FY 09-10.

cc: Luis Herrera
Jay Manglicmot

Attachment: List of Sole Source Contracts

San Francisco Public Library
Sole Source Contracts for Fiscal Year 2009-2010

	Term		Vendor	Amount	Reason
1	4/14/2010	to 6/30/2010	Burgeon Group	\$25,000.00	Interactive furniture for Early Literacy Program
2	10/8/2009	to 6/30/2010	Bay Area Library Info System	\$9,950.00	Delivery of library materials
3	7/1/2007	to 6/30/2010	Califa Group	\$458,688.00	Contract amendment for online content database license for public access
4	5/21/2007	to 12/31/2012	CRS Inc.	\$53,764.00	Contract amendment for software license for Subfinder Program
5	6/1/2007	to 5/31/2013	Dragonsource International Ltd	\$120,000.00	Contract amendment for online content database license for public access
6	2/14/2007	to 2/13/2013	Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.	\$117,192.00	Contract amendment for online content database license for public access
7	7/1/2009	to 6/30/2012	Ebsco Publishing	\$113,445.00	Online content database license for public access
8	7/01/2009	to 6/30/2014	FKI Logistex	\$249,881.00	Library materials sorting equipment maintenance
9	4/01/2009	to 5/31/2011	FM1 Software LLC	\$13,050.00	Software license maintenance
10	12/1/2006	to 6/30/2012	HW Wilson	\$118,330.00	Contract amendment for online content database license for public access
11	1/1/2007	to 12/31/2012	Info USA (Ref USA)	\$330,526.00	Contract amendment for online content database license for public access
12	12/1/2002	to 12/31/2012	Innovative Interfaces	\$3,103,407.00	Contract amendment for software license & maintenance for Integrated Library System
13	1/8/2010	to 6/30/2010	Johnson Controls Inc.	\$103,027.00	Security and video surveillance equipment
14	8/26/2009	to 6/30/2010	Johnson Controls Inc.	\$53,791.65	HVAC chiller system repair
15	1/01/2009	to 12/31/2011	Keystone Systems Inc.	\$100,389.00	Software license and maintenance
16	5/12/2010	to 6/30/2010	Lexisnexis	\$101,524.88	Microfiche data
17	6/1/2007	to 4/30/2013	Mergent Inc.	\$105,477.00	Contract amendment for online content database license for public access
18	7/01/2009	to 6/30/2012	Overdrive, Inc.	\$424,800.00	Web-based e-books for public access
19	2/4/2009	to 11/30/2011	Proquest LLC	\$975,023.00	Online content database license for public access
20	9/1/2006	to 10/01/2012	RR Bowker	\$338,540.69	Contract amendment for online content database license for public access
21	1/1/2007	to 12/31/2012	Scholastic/Grolier	\$372,413.00	Contract amendment for online content database license for public access
22	7/01/2009	to 12/31/2011	The Active Network Inc.	\$68,863.00	Software license and maintenance
23	5/6/2010	to 6/30/2010	The Gale Group	\$36,000.00	Online content database license for public access
24	11/18/2009	to 6/30/2010	Tricor America Inc.	\$60,050.00	Book courier and transportation
25	8/24/2009	to 6/30/2010	Tutor.com	\$80,000.00	Online tutoring for student patrons



**City and County of San Francisco
Employees' Retirement System**

July 1, 2010

Ms. Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Subject: SFERS Sole Source Contracts Fiscal Year 2009-2010

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

The following is a list of all sole source contracts entered into by the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System during the fiscal year 2009-10 as follows. The term of the fiscal year is July 1 through June 30.

<u>Vendor</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Purpose</u>
Hotel Whitcomb 1231 Market Street San Francisco, CA 94103	\$ 28,590.64	Early Retirement Seminars for CCSF employees, requires accommodation for 200-300 employees, ideally close to public transportation, SFERS offices, and employee worksites. The hotels conference facility satisfies all of these needs
Open Text Inc. 275 Frank Tompa Drive Waterloo, Ontario Canada N2L 0A1 CAN	\$ 21,926.39	Proprietary software support and license for electronic storage and retrieval of imaged documents on-line.
Public Storage 90 South Van Ness Ave San Francisco, CA 94103	\$ 4,398.00	Local off-site storage facility to house emergency equipment for SFERS continued operations.
Totals	<u>\$ 54,915.03</u>	

Please contact me should you have further questions.

Very truly yours,

Gary A. Amelio
Executive Director

Gary A. Amelio
Executive Director

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUL - 1 PM 12:16
BY [Signature]

City and County of San Francisco



Gavin Newsom, Mayor


Human Services Agency

Department of Human Services
Department of Aging and Adult Services

Trent Rhorer, Executive Director

MEMORANDUM

TO: Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors

FROM: Trent Rhorer 
Executive Director

DATE: June 29, 2010

RE: Submission of ~~Sole Source Contract Activity~~

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUL -2 AM 10: 59
BY _____ AK

Enclosed please find the listing of sole source contract activity for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010. This submission is in accordance with the Sunshine Ordinance Section 67.24(e)(3)(i). Please note, the list includes new contracts entered into during this period and renewal of existing contracts.

If you have any questions about this information, please contact David Curto, Director of Contracts Management, at 557-5581.

Enclosure: Sole Source Activity Spreadsheet.

Area	Contractor	Description	Effective Date	Exp Date	Total Contract Amount	Procurement #. If Sole Source give reason
			7/1/2007	6/30/2010	\$273,996	Sole Source-Agency provides majority of funding
WTW	Department of Rehabilitation	Vocational Rehabilitation Services	1/1/2009	12/31/2010	\$310,000	Sole Source-as owner of building, responsible for rebating rent overpayments
H	Mercy Housing	Rent Rebate	7/1/2008	6/30/2011	\$662,127	Sole Source/Public Agency
WTW	San Francisco Clean City Coalition	Employment Training	7/1/2008	6/30/2011	\$574,677	Sole Source-Asset for Independence Act (AFIA) grantee
WIW	Earned Assets Resource Network (EARN)	Individual Development Accounts (IDA)	7/1/2004	6/30/2014	\$2,325,840	Sole Source-Software License Agreement
MISC	Panoramic Software, Inc.	Licensing Agreement	2/1/2004	6/30/2010	\$421,600	Sole Source-Long term Care expertise
DAAS	Haskell, Bill	CPOA Grant Activities	7/1/2006	6/30/2012	\$14,109,925	Sole Source, Public Authority Board resolution
DAAS	IHSS Public Authority	IHSS IP Mode Operations	7/1/2006	6/30/2012	\$187,676,192	Sole Source, Public Authority Board resolution
DAAS	IHSS Public Authority	IHSS IP Mode Providers Health & Dental Benefits	8/1/2008	9/30/2011	\$611,000	Sole Source-Ross Grant recipient
DAAS	Northern Calif Presbyterian Homes & Services	Services Connection	7/1/2007	6/30/2010	\$480,000	Sole Source-Board resolution
WTW	Children's Council of San Francisco	ACCESS-Childcare Case Management	7/1/2009	6/30/2012	\$117,512,925	Sole Source-Board resolution
WTW	Children's Council of San Francisco	Subsidies	7/1/2009	6/30/2012	included above	Sole Source-Board resolution
WTW	Children's Council of San Francisco	Wages +	7/1/2009	6/30/2012	included above	Sole Source-Board resolution
WTW	Children's Council of San Francisco	WIA Childcare	7/1/2008	6/30/2010	\$521,954	Sole Source-facility driven
H	Compass Community Services	Clara House	7/1/2009	6/30/2010	\$3,314,198	Sole source/ Only provider
WTW	Low Income Investment Fund	Childcare Facilities Fund	7/1/2007	6/30/2010	\$721,210	Sole Source-facility driven
FCS	Larkin Street Youth Services	Youth Prevention	1/1/2009	6/30/2010	\$100,000	Sole Source-copyrighted programs
FCS	Consortium for Children	Permanency Planning Mediation	7/1/2009	6/30/2012	\$482,248	Sole Source-only provider
FCS	Friends Outside	Incarcerated Parents Services	7/1/2009	6/30/2012	\$281,370	Sole Source-Designated as Child Abuse Council
FCS	San Francisco Child Abuse Prevention Center	Mandatory Reporting	7/1/2009	6/30/2012	\$5,558,000	Sole Source/Public Agency
FCS	San Francisco Community College District	IV-E Training for Foster Family Agencies	7/1/2009	6/30/2010	\$123,800	Sole Source/Public Agency
FCS	San Francisco State University	Foster Parent Training	1/1/2010	6/30/2011	\$1,907,071	Sole Source/Public Agency
FCS	San Francisco State University	Title IV-E Child Welfare Training	7/1/2009	6/30/2010	\$12,250	Sole Source/Public Agency
WTW	San Francisco State University	Work Study	7/1/2008	6/30/2013	\$293,025	Sole Source/Public Agency
FCS	University of California, Regents (UCSF)	Infant Parent Program	7/1/2008	6/30/2010	\$278,101	Sole Source-Software License Agreement
FCS	Natl Council on Crime & Delinquency	SafeMeasures database subscription/Ad hoc reporting	7/1/2009	6/30/2010	\$25,000	Sole source - agency is the only one in SF animated with Feeding America that has the capacity to provide service
H	Episcopal Community Services	Food Pantry (in ECS Hotels)	7/1/2009	6/30/2012	\$74,775	Sole Source-expertise working with State and Counties on TCM and MAA
FCS	Hansine Fisher	TCM consulting	7/1/2009	6/30/2012	\$156,039	Sole source - agency is the only one in SF animated with Feeding America that has the capacity to provide service
DAAS	San Francisco Food Bank	Brown Bag	7/1/2009	6/30/2012	\$150,000	Sole source - agency is the only one in SF animated with Feeding America that has the capacity to provide service
DAAS	San Francisco Food Bank	Groceries for Seniors	7/1/2010	6/30/2012	\$100,000	Sole source - agency is the only one in SF animated with Feeding America that has the capacity to provide service
DAAS	San Francisco Food Bank	Home Delivery Groceries - Arendt	11/1/2009	6/30/2012	\$72,000	Sole source - agency is the only one in SF animated with Feeding America that has the capacity to provide service
DAAS	San Francisco Food Bank	OMI Groceries	7/1/2009	6/30/2012	\$159,831	Sole source - agency is the only one in SF animated with Feeding America that has the capacity to provide service
DAAS	San Francisco Food Bank	SRO Food Outreach	7/1/2009	6/30/2012	\$235,000	Sole source - agency is the only one in SF animated with Feeding America that has the capacity to provide service
H	San Francisco Food Bank	Housing First Food Pantry	7/1/2009	6/30/2012	\$146,493	Sole source - agency is the only one in SF animated with Feeding America that has the capacity to provide service
WTW	San Francisco Food Bank	Emergency Food Box	7/1/2009	6/30/2012	\$1,155,051	Sole source - agency is the only one in SF animated with Feeding America that has the capacity to provide service
WTW	San Francisco Food Bank	Immigrant Food Assistance	7/1/2009	41090	\$31,600	Sole source - agency is the only one in SF animated with Feeding America that has the capacity to provide service
WTW	San Francisco Food Bank	Food Stamp Outreach	7/1/2009	6/30/2012	\$350,014	Sole Source-only program designed for women seeking to leave prostitution
H	San Francisco Network Ministries Hsq Corp	Transitional Housing	7/1/2009	6/30/2011	\$2,437,670	Sole Source/Public Agency
WTW	San Francisco Community College District	Work Study Program- CalWORKS	1/1/2010	6/30/2011	\$30,000	Sole Source-State grant recipients
DAAS	Independent Living Resource Center of SF	ADRC	7/1/2006	12/30/2010	\$397,648	Sole Source-Only agency that provides employment services for disabled individuals
ADMIN	ARC of San Francisco	Clerical/ Janitorial Disabled employment				



Robert Collins/RENT/SFGOV
07/01/2010 03:01 PM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
bcc
Subject: Sole Source Contracts in FY 2009-2010

Pursuant to Sunshine Ordinance Section 67.24(e), the Rent Board **did not** enter into any sole source contracts during the 2009-2010 fiscal year.



MEMORANDUM

Date: July 1, 2010
To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
From: Gregg Sass, Chief Financial Officer
Department of Public Health
Re: Sole Source Contracts for Fiscal Year 2008-098

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUL - 1 PM 12:40
BY *pk*

Please find enclosed our annual list of sole source contracts during the 2009/10 fiscal year.

If you have any questions on this report, please contact me or Jacquie Hale, Director the DPH Office of Contract Management and Compliance (554-2609).

Thank you.

cc: Anne Okubo

Start Date	End Date	Vendor Name	Amount	Service Type
S.F. Administrative Code Chapter 21.5(b): Other Purchases; Commodities or services available only from a sole source				
Medical and Related Services:				
1/1/2009	12/31/2012	Blood Centers of the Pacific	9,950,000	Blood and related products
7/1/2006	6/30/2011	Compumed, Inc.	87,999	ECG machines and ongoing interpretations
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	San Francisco Community Clinic Consortium	201,600	Americorp and Vista interns
Immunization and Related Services:				
7/1/2008	6/30/2011	San Francisco Study Center, Inc.	422,988	FI services for the Immunization Program
Healthy San Francisco:				
6/1/2007	6/30/2012	The Center to Promote Healthcare Access	1,828,341	One-e-App, the web-based eligibility screening and determination system for Healthy San Francisco
7/1/2008	6/30/2010	San Francisco Community Health Authority	30,000,000	Third Party Administrative Services for Healthy SF
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	San Francisco Community Health Authority	45,000,000	Healthy San Francisco
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	San Francisco Community Health Authority	45,000,000	Healthy San Francisco
State of California:				
1/1/2009	6/30/2010	Health Management Associates, Inc.	77,500	MediCaid waiver planning, support services (AB 2968)
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	State of California - Dept. of Health Services	648,000	MediCaid waiver planning, support services (AB 2968)
Regents of the University of California (UCSF):				
7/1/2009	6/30/2010	Regents of the University of California	10,325	Rheumatology Services at LHH
7/1/2009	6/30/2010	Regents of the University of California	10,325	Nephrology services at LHH
7/1/2009	6/30/2010	Regents of the University of California	25,000	Pathology services at LHH
7/1/2009	6/30/2010	Regents of the University of California	25,000	Ob/Gyn services at LHH
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Regents of the University of California	25,000	Perinatal and neonatal consulting
7/1/2009	6/30/2010	Regents of the University of California	41,300	Dermatology services at LHH
7/1/2009	6/30/2010	Regents of the University of California	65,000	Plastic surgery services at LHH
7/1/2009	6/30/2010	Regents of the University of California	80,000	Radiology Services for LHH
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	Regents of the University of California - Center on Deafness	1,272,553	Mental health and substance abuse services
7/1/2007	12/31/2009*	Regents of the University of California - SFGH Psychiatry Department	770,834	Crisis intervention and psychiatric assessment
3/1/2008	6/30/2011*	Regents of the University of California - SFGH Psychiatry Department	540,000	Medical and psychiatric clinical services
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	Regents of the University of California - SFGH Psychiatry Department	676,454	Citywide Case Management
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	Regents of the University of California - SFGH Psychiatry Department	1,223,300	Child and Adolescent Sexual Abuse Resource Center (CASARC)
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	Regents of the University of California - SFGH Psychiatry Department	3,823,264	Trauma Recovery Center (TRC) at SFGH
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	Regents of the University of California - SFGH Psychiatry Department	5,350,285	Mental health consultation for children and their families who have experienced psychological trauma
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	Regents of the University of California - SFGH Psychiatry Department	7,656,858	Methadone Maintenance
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Regents of UC on Behalf of the UCSF Medical Center/Group	60,000	Prenatal and neonatal preceptorships
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Regents of UC on Behalf of the UCSF Medical Center/Group	100,000	SFGH Maternity package plan
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Regents of UC on Behalf of the UCSF Medical Center/Group	3,600,000	Tertiary care services
7/1/2008	6/30/2010*	Regents of UC on behalf of UCSF Med/Ctr	293,046	Pre-vocational and vocational opportunities individuals with severe and persistent mental illness
3/1/2008	6/30/2011	UCSF AIDS Health Project	537,600	HIV health services
3/1/2008	6/30/2011*	UCSF AIDS Health Project	10,758,000	Mental health services
7/1/2008	6/30/2010	UCSF AIDS Health Project	328,000	HIV Prevention Counseling and Testing training
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	UCSF AIDS Health Project	1,930,329	Mental health services
7/1/2009	6/30/2010	UCSF Clinical Practice Group - Community Focus Program	50,000	Emergency Med Svcs/Disaster Medicine Fellowship
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	UCSF Clinical Practice Group - Community Focus Program	5,357,645	Single Point of Responsibility (SPR) program
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	UCSF Clinical Practice Group - Community Focus Program	5,866,372	Crisis Resolution Team (CRT)
7/1/2008	6/30/2011	UCSF Committee on Human Research	150,000	Internal Review Board for Human Rights Research Protocol
7/1/2008	6/30/2011	UCSF Department of Pediatrics	500,000	HIV/AIDS pediatric primary care services
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	UCSF Langley Porter Psychiatric Institute	263,950	Mental health services for Mission Family Center, SE Family Tx Center for children and adolescents

Start Date	End Date	Vendor Name	Amount	Service Type
S.F. Administrative Code Chapter 21.30: Software Licenses, Support, Escrow, Finance, and Equipment Maintenance Agreements				
			30,000	PH Lab license, maintenance for LabBilSys system
7/1/2008	12/31/2013	BAT Technologies	30,000	PH Lab maintenance agreement for MLABEE system
1/1/2009	12/31/2009	Common Cents Systems	104,000	PH Lab software maintenance for the Apollo LEMS
1/1/2010	12/31/2012	Common Cents Systems	1,034,046	IT network support
7/1/2009	6/30/2010	Dataway	522,710	Health at Home maintenance, support, remote server
1/1/2009	12/31/2013	Delta Health Technologies LLC	1,164,101	Software maintenance services
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Echo Consulting Services of California	122,396	DPH Emergency Medical Services Agency: maintenance, support of EM Resource Electronic Inventory and Resource Management System
12/1/2008	12/31/2012	EMS Systems LLC	268,800	CHN Budget Office maintenance services
7/1/2009	6/30/2014	Genisys Decision Corp.	932,541	CBHS maintenance
7/1/2008	6/30/2011	InfoMC	180,000	Jail Health Services maintenance
7/1/2008	6/30/2011	Legacy Systems Solutions	405,000	Healthy SF Care Enhance license, maintenance for Nurse Advice line
2/1/2010	6/30/2015	McKesson	1,953,161	Pathways Material Management System license, maintenance
3/1/2007	6/30/2012	McKesson	165,000	Medical Staff Offices physician credentialing licenses, maintenance, upgrade and support services
4/1/2008	6/30/2011	Morrisey Associates	72,800	SFGH Quality Management Health Commander licenses, technical support, and training
8/1/2008	7/31/2010	Performance Logic	318,300	SFGH Intensive Care and Coronary Care Units maintenance, support
1/1/2009	12/31/2014	Philips Healthcare	441,700	SFGH Critical Care CareVue Chart licenses, upgrade, and support
1/1/2009	12/31/2014	Philips Healthcare	625,000	SFGH Bedside monitors
1/1/2010	12/31/2010	Philips Healthcare	507,026	Medical Records Quantum system
7/1/2005	6/30/2010	Quadramed	2,427,456	LHH community placement SF Get Care
7/1/2009	6/30/2013	RTZ Associates, Inc.	1,200,000	CHN Patient Financial Services database access
1/1/2009	12/31/2015	SearchAmerica, Inc.	8,768,815	Products and professional services contract
7/1/2007	6/30/2012	Siemens Medical Solutions USA	9,858,327	Remote Computing Option
7/1/2007	6/30/2012	Siemens Medical Solutions USA		
S.F. Administrative Code Chapter 21.42: Professional Services Contracts for Health and Behavioral Health Services and Support				
5/1/2008	12/31/2009	A Better Way, Inc.	2,200,800	Outpatient therapeutic visitation services for abused or neglected children and their families
1/1/2010	12/31/2010*	A Better Way, Inc.	1,760,640	Outpatient Therapeutic Visitation Services for children and their families
3/1/2007	2/28/2013	AIDS Community Research Consortium	670,905	Client Advocacy and Treatment Adherence to People of Color
3/1/2007	6/30/2010	AIDS Emergency Fund	2,862,292	Emergency Assistance Grants
3/1/2009	6/30/2013	AIDS Emergency Fund	5,500,000	Emergency Assistance HIV Services
3/1/2007	6/30/2010	AIDS Legal Referral Panel	739,533	HIV Legal Assistance
1/1/2006	12/31/2009	Alta Bates Summit Medical Center	179,000	backup inpatient (emergency 5150 placements) mental health services out of county
7/1/2007	6/30/2011	Alternative Family Services	4,452,000	Outpatient therapeutic visitation services for abused or neglected children and their families
1/1/2010	6/30/2011*	Alternative Family Services	2,352,000	Outpatient Therapeutic Visitation Services .
3/1/2007	6/30/2010	Ark of Refuge, Inc.	905,292	Restoration House
1/1/2011	6/30/2012	Asian American Recovery Services	340,000	Comprehensive Outreach Project for Pacific Islanders and Asian Substance Abusers (COPPASA)
7/1/2007	6/30/2011	Asian Pacific Islander Wellness Center	2,580,000	TRANS program
3/1/2008	6/30/2011	Asian Pacific Islander Wellness Center	336,000	Outreach and Case Management - San Mateo County
3/1/2008	6/30/2010*	Asian Pacific Islander Wellness Center	336,000	Outreach and Case Management - San Mateo County
7/1/2007	6/30/2010*	Asian Pacific Islander Wellness Center	675,000	Integrated Case Management - persons with HIV
11/1/2008	6/30/2010	Asthma Resource Center of San Francisco	30,000	Services in support of the asthma task force
3/1/2007	6/30/2010	Baker Places	3,750,786	Ferguson Place, supportive living and residential subsidies
3/1/2007	6/30/2010	Baker Places	505,413	HIV Detox Services
3/1/2007	6/30/2010	Baker Places	1,721,085	Star Camelot Hotel
3/1/2007	6/30/2010	Baker Places	2,016,000	Integrated Services Network support services
7/1/2007	6/30/2010	Baker Places	1,055,991	Support services for the Empress Hotel
7/1/2007	6/30/2010	Baker Places	4,175,409	Ferguson Place, Supportive living and residential subsidies
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Baker Places	3,750,786	Ferguson Place, Supportive Living and Residential Subsidies
3/1/2007	6/30/2010	Baker Places, Inc.	1,721,085	Star Camelot
3/1/2007	6/30/2010	Baker Places, Inc.	2,016,000	Integrated Services Network support services
7/1/2007	6/30/2010	Baker Places, Inc.	1,055,991	Support services for the Empress Hotel
7/1/2007	6/30/2010	Baker Places, Inc.		

* RFP conducted for contract to begin 7/1/10

Start Date	End Date	Vendor Name	Amount	Service Type
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Baker Places, Inc.	4,175,409	Ferguson Place, Supportive Living and Residential Subsidies
1/1/2006	12/31/2009	BHC Fremont Hospital	268,800	backup inpatient (emergency 5150 placements) mental health services out of county
1/1/2006	12/31/2009	BHC Fremont Hospital	268,800	Mental health inpatient out-of-county hospital services as-needed
3/1/2010	6/1/2013	Black Coalition On AIDS	1,633,902	Rafiki and Brandy Moore
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Boys and Girls Club of San Francisco	94,684	Mental health and substance abuse services for youth
7/1/2007	6/30/2010	Caduceus Outreach Services	1,551,479	Psychiatric services linked to housing
5/1/2008	12/31/2010	California Family Health Council	33,600	Chlamydia Infertility Prevention Activities
12/1/2009	6/30/2013	California Pacific Medical Center	660,000	To provide in-home integrated comprehensive HIV/AIDS case management and direct medical and mental health care services.
1/1/2006	12/31/2009	California Specialty Hospital	-	as-needed, backup inpatient (emergency 5150 placements) mental health services
3/1/2007	6/30/2010	Catholic Charities CYO	2,233,698	Assisted Housing
3/1/2007	6/30/2010	Catholic Charities CYO	1,392,516	Derek Silva Community
3/1/2008	6/30/2013	Catholic Charities CYO	1,254,000	Attendant Care - Leland House and Peter Claver
3/1/2008	6/30/2010*	Catholic Charities CYO	1,254,000	Attendant Care - Leland House and Peter Claver
7/1/2008	6/30/2011	Catholic Charities CYO	336,229	Rita da Cascia housing services
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Catholic Charities CYO	491,731	Assisted Housing
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Catholic Charities CYO	992,136	Peter Claver Community
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Catholic Charities CYO	992,136	Peter Claver Community
7/1/2007	6/30/2013	Catholic Healthcare West dba St. Mary's Medical Center	5,100,000	Integrated Case Management services that include case management, peer advocacy and treatment advocacy services to persons with HIV and Primary Care services.
3/1/2009	6/30/2013	Catholic Healthcare West dba St. Mary's Medical Center	2,200,000	Primary Care Services
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Center for Human Development	333,151	SA primary prevention Services
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Center on Juvenile & Criminal Justice	644,688	BASN, EPSDT
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	Central City Hospitality House	2,309,052	MH Peer Based Services
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	Central City Hospitality House	2,933,168	MH Socialization, Wellness, Housing for community homeless
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	Central City Hospitality House	336,000	Mental Health Services for one Child
7/1/2009	6/30/2014	Children's Health Council	179,424	Direct Access to Housing for chronic alcoholics at William Penn Hotel
7/1/2008	8/31/2011	Chinatown Community Development Corporation	1,158,555	SRO Collaborative in Chinatown and SRO families united
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Chinatown Community Development Corporation	52,954	Supportive Housing at Cambridge Hotel
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Chinatown Community Development Corporation	30,000	Immunization Services
7/1/2009	6/30/2012	Chinese Hospital	200,000	certification services
1/1/2010	12/31/2011*	City College of San Francisco	750,000	Residential Mental Health for AA Women
3/1/2008	6/30/2011	Community Awareness & Treatment Services, Inc.	210,034	Direct Access to Housing for chronic alcoholics at Eddy St. Apts.
7/1/2008	8/31/2011	Community Awareness & Treatment Services, Inc.	210,034	Direct Access to Housing for chronic alcoholics at Eddy St. Apts.
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Community Youth Center of San Francisco	500,864	Adopt and tailor a MultiSystemic Therapy (MST)
3/1/2007	6/30/2013	Dolores Street	1,385,722	Richard Cohen - Nurse Case Management Services
3/1/2007	6/30/2010*	Dolores Street	1,385,722	Richard Cohen - Nurse Case Management Services
7/1/2009	6/30/2015	Eldergivers	160,800	Art Program of residents of LHH
7/1/2007	6/30/2010	Episcopal Community Svcs of S F Inc.	20,160	Lunch Program
7/1/2007	6/30/2010	Episcopal Community Svcs of S F Inc.	4,291,143	Support services for the homeless at the Pacific Bay Inn, LeNain Hotel, Canon Kip and Rose Hotel
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Episcopal Community Svcs of S F Inc.	1,304,822	Substance abuse and mental health services
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Families First Inc.	572,723	Provide Day Rehabilitative and Treatment services
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Fred Finch Youth Center	308,016	Adolescent Services
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	Friendship House Assoc of American Indians	915,640	Substance Abuse Treatment Program
1/1/2010	6/30/2015	Glide Community Housing, Inc.	2,196,000	on site client support services and property management services
3/1/2007	12/31/2010	Glide Foundation	426,255	HIV Counseling, Testing and Linkages (CTL) services
1/1/2010	12/31/2010	Golden Bear Associates	118,020	Technical assistance for children youth and family system of care
7/1/2006	12/31/2010	Haight Ashbury Free Clinic	271,333	Primary healthcare services to individuals living in SF who are low income or have no income
7/1/2009	6/30/2010*	Haight Ashbury Free Clinic	3,805,418	Jail Psychiatric Services
1/1/2009	12/31/2012*	Harm Reduction Coalition	347,460	contract for overdose prevention, education, and support services provided through the Drug Overdose Prevention and Education (DOPE) Project.
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Hearing and Speech Center of Northern California	49,900	Audiology services for LHH residents
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	Homeless Prenatal Program	295,617	Substance abuse and mental health services for homeless pregnant women
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	Huckleberry Youth Programs Inc.	360,416	Mental Health and substance abuse services

* RFP conducted for contract to begin 7/1/10

2009-10 Public Health Sole Source Report

Start Date	End Date	Vendor Name	Amount	Service Type
			900,000	Complementary Therapy Services
3/1/2008	6/30/2011	Immune Enhancement Project	575,000	Out Patient Mental Health Services
3/1/2010	6/30/2014*	Insituto Familiar de la Raza	1,691,023	Asian Youth Prevention Services
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	Japanese Community Youth Council	713,025	Mental Health services
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Jewish Family and Children's Services	778,931	Back up inpatient MH Services
1/1/2006	12/31/2010	John Muir Behavioral Health Center	89,554	Mental Health and Substance Abuse services for survivors of domestic violence in shelters
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	La Casa De Las Madres	1,797,402	Comprehensive Housing and Attendant Care
3/1/2007	6/30/2010	Larkin Street Youth Services	1,467,590	Comprehensive Housing and Attendant Care
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Larkin Street Youth Services	2,329,279	Housing, Peer Based Services
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Larkin Street Youth Services	367,366	Youth Services, Collaboration with other agencies
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	Larkin Street Youth Services	974,188	Residential Substance Abuse Services
3/1/2007	6/30/2010*	Latino Commission	850,000	Substance Abuse Services
3/1/2008	6/30/2011	Latino Commission	196,826	Special Projects Involving Research, Action and Learning (SPIRAL)
9/1/2009	3/31/2010	Lavender Youth and Information Center (LYRIC)	187,750	MH day treatment intensive, mediation support and residential services
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Lincoln Child Center	41,964	Franciscan Towers housing
3/1/2007	6/30/2010	Lutheran Social Services	358,119	Hazel Betsey housing
3/1/2007	6/30/2010	Lutheran Social Services	478,531	La Casa Mariposa transitional housing for women with children
7/1/2007	6/30/2010	Lutheran Social Services	883,623	Support services and rental subsidies at Folsom Dore
3/1/2008	6/30/2011	Lutheran Social Services	1,700,000	HIV Health Services - Financial Services and Assistance
7/1/2008	6/30/2012	Lutheran Social Services	1,528,603	Third party rent payment and money management
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Lutheran Social Services	588,840	Mosaica and Polk supportive housing
3/1/2010	6/30/2014	Lutheran Social Services	1,200,000	HIV/AIDS Client - Money Management - Financial Svcs
7/1/2006	12/31/2010	Lyon Martin Women's Health Center	379,184	Primary Healthcare to un-insured and underinsured lesbian, bisexual and transgender people
3/1/2008	6/30/2011	Maitri AIDS Hospice	4,201,500	Residential Nursing
3/1/2008	6/30/2010*	Maitri AIDS Hospice	4,201,500	Residential Nursing
1/1/2006	12/31/2009	Marin General.	20,000	backup inpatient (emergency 5150 placements) mental health services out of county
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Mission Council on Alcohol Abuse/Spanish	254,615	Substance Abuse
7/1/2007	6/30/2010	Mission Creek Senior Housing	1,350,989	Res. subsidies at Mission Creek Senior Community
7/1/2007	6/30/2010	Mission Neighborhood Health Center	750,000	Integrated Case Management for persons with HIV
3/1/2009	6/30/2013	Mission Neighborhood Health Center	2,500,000	HIV Health Services - Centers of Excellence
7/1/2009	6/30/2012	Mission Neighborhood Health Center	90,000	Immunization Services
1/1/2010	12/31/2010	Mission Neighborhood Health Center	339,000	Primary Health Care Services and prevention measure to eligible patients.
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Morrisania West Inc.	450,834	Therapeutic counseling and supporting services.
1/1/2006	12/31/2009	Mt. Diablo Medical Pavilion	291,200	backup inpatient (emergency 5150 placements) mental health services out of county
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	Mt. St. Joseph-St Elizabeth	1,871,372	SA and MH for Families in recovery OP adult and children
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	National Council on Alcoholism	553,563	Substance abuse services
3/1/2009	6/30/2013	Native American Health Center	680,000	HIV Health Services - Centers of Excellence
3/1/2009	6/30/2010*	Native American Health Center	680,000	HIV Health Services - Centers of Excellence
3/1/2010	6/30/2014	New Leaf	738,000	Out Patient Mental Health Services
3/1/2010	6/30/2010*	New Leaf	738,000	Out Patient Mental Health Services
7/1/2009	6/30/2010*	NICOS Chinese Health Coalition	73,920	Gambling prevention and treatment for the Chinese community
7/1/2009	6/30/2012	North East Medical Services	150,000	Immunization Services
7/1/2006	12/31/2010	North of Market Senior Services dba Curry Senior Services	1,613,965	Comprehensive, integrated primary health care to older adults
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	North of Market Senior Services dba Curry Senior Services	1,568,000	Behavioral health outpatient, case management, supportive housing, outreach services for older adults.
7/1/2007	6/30/2010	North South of Market Adult Day Health	1,130,879	Adult day and tenant supportive housing at Mission Creek
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	Oakes Children's Center	165,747	Mental Health and Substances Abuse services
7/1/2008	6/30/2010	Pacific Institute	376,320	Renovation support at Citizen's Housing Awakenings Project
11/1/2005	6/30/2014	Plaza Apartments Associates LP	5,998,314	res. subsidies for supportive housing units for homeless clients of the Direct Access to Housing (DAH) program
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	Positive Directions Equals Change Inc	1,440,452	Outpatient substance abuse treatment services
3/1/2007	6/30/2010	Positive Health Center	998,960	Benefits Counseling Services
3/1/2009	6/30/2013	Positive Resource Center	270,000	HIV Return to Work - Legal Services
3/1/2007	6/30/2013	Project Open Hand	7,142,177	Delivered Meals Grocery Center
3/1/2010	6/30/2014	Project Open Hand	5,376,000	HIV Primary - Food Services
9/30/2009	9/29/2013	Public Health Foundation Enterprises	450,000	Support for HIV Research projects

Start Date	End Date	Vendor Name	Amount	Service Type
1/1/2009	12/31/2012	Public Health Foundation Enterprises, Inc.	2,400,000	Fiscal intermediary services to support STD-Prevention and Control Programs
1/1/2009	5/31/2014	Public Health Foundation Enterprises, Inc.	6,000,000	Fiscal intermediary services for HIV Prevention
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Rebekah Children's Services	59,669	Inpatient mental health services
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	Richmond Area Multi-Services, Inc.	3,588,293	PAES Counseling, pre-voc. services, SSI Advocacy
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	SAGE Project, Inc.	1,141,181	Behavioral health services for transgender individuals
3/1/2007	6/30/2010	San Francisco AIDS Foundation	9,991,050	Rental Subsidies
7/1/2007	12/31/2009	San Francisco AIDS Foundation	306,757	STD evaluation, screening, testing, diagnosis, and treatment for Men Who Have Sex With Men
7/1/2007	6/30/2010	San Francisco AIDS Foundation	1,010,300	Substance abuse services for men having sex with men (MSM) who use drugs and/or alcohol
7/1/2009	6/30/2012	San Francisco AIDS Foundation	1,325,567	HIV Client Advocacy and Benefits Counseling Services
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	San Francisco AIDS Foundation	7,874,364	Rental Subsidies
1/1/2010	12/31/2012	San Francisco AIDS Foundation - Magnet	360,000	HIV Research - Planning, providing RNA/4th generation EIA testing to confidential clients
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	San Francisco Center For Psychoanalysis	279,222	Mental Health services
3/1/2008	6/30/2011	San Francisco Food Bank	336,000	Food Solicitation, Distribution and Liquid Supplements
7/1/2007	6/30/2010	San Francisco Foundation Community Initiative Funds	268,800	To plan and advocate for food security and sustainable food systems for the City and County of San Francisco.
7/1/2007	6/30/2015	San Francisco Mental Health and Education Fund	2,424,750	To provide staff support for the san Francisco mental health board
7/1/2007	6/30/2010	San Francisco Network Ministries Housing Corp.	195,347	Safe house for women leaving prostitution
3/1/2007	6/30/2010*	San Francisco Suicide Prevention	342,027	Nightline Phone Crisis Hotline
3/1/2009	6/30/2013	San Francisco Suicide Prevention	520,000	Nightline Phone Crisis
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	San Francisco Suicide Prevention	1,051,180	Crisis mental health Services
11/1/2007	12/31/2011	San Francisco Superior Court	1,713,600	Court monitoring and supervision under the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act (SACPA/Prop. 36)
7/1/2007	6/30/2010	Shanti Project	1,215,000	Integrated Case Management - persons with HIV
7/1/2007	6/30/2010*	Shanti Project	1,215,000	Integrated Case Management - persons with HIV
3/1/2008	6/30/2011	Shanti Project	1,300,000	HIV Planning Council Support Services
3/1/2008	6/30/2010*	Shanti Project	1,300,000	HIV Planning Council Support Services
7/1/2008	6/30/2011	Shanti Project	691,615	Services in support of the Lifelines program and Mobile Mammography Van
7/1/2009	6/30/2014	Shanti Project	861,248	HIV/AIDS Emotional and Practical Support Services
1/1/2006	12/31/2009	Sierra Vista Medical Center	240,000	backup inpatient (emergency 5150 placements) mental health services out of county
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	Special Service for Groups	446,880	Cultural and age-appropriate interventions to elementary school-aged children
7/1/2008	8/31/2011	St. Vincent de Paul Society of SF	466,502	Direct Access to Housing for chronic alcoholics at Arlington Hotel
1/1/2006	12/31/2009	Stanislaus County Dept. of Mental Health	40,000	backup inpatient (emergency 5150 placements) mental health services out of county
7/1/2007	6/30/2010	Stop AIDS Project	84,000	Face to Face Outreach Community based STD Education and Research
4/1/2009	12/31/2011	Stop AIDS Project	300,000	Assessing internet users preferences for structural and network interventions
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Sunny Hills Services	568,311	Mental Health and Substance Abuse services
7/1/2006	6/30/2010	Support for Families of Children with Disabilities	623,110	Children with Special Health Care Needs (CSHCN) liaison services and support
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Support for Families of Children with Disabilities	411,702	Support and education to Children Care Svcs, Health Care Providers and Families w Special Needs Children
1/1/2006	12/31/2009	Sutter Health/Mills-Peninsula Health Services.	220,000	backup inpatient (emergency 5150 placements) mental health services out of county
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Swords to Plowshares	1,085,848	Mental Health Services for vets
3/1/2007	6/30/2010	Tenderloin Health	841,707	Emergency Housing
7/1/2007	6/30/2010	Tenderloin Health	1,697,835	Chronically homeless exiting criminal justice institutions
7/1/2008	8/31/2010	Tenderloin Health	1,222,509	Transitional housing at the Kinney Hotel
3/1/2009	6/30/2013	Tenderloin Health	3,600,000	HIV Health Services - Centers of Excellence
9/30/2009	9/29/2013	Tenderloin Health	75,000	HIV Research - Planning, providing RNA/4th generation EIA testing to confidential clients
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Tenderloin Housing Clinic	580,073	Central City SRO Collaborative
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corp	1,200,613	Supportive Housing for Seniors
7/1/2008	6/30/2011	Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corp.	595,224	Property management for supportive housing at Ritz and Dalt Hotels
7/1/2008	8/31/2011	Tenderloin Owners and Developers Community Organization (TODCO)	588,517	Direct Access to Housing for chronic alcoholics at Bayanihan, Knox and Isabel Hotels
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Thunder Road	230,720	Mental health and substance abuse services
3/1/2008	6/30/2012	Tides Center	1,209,600	Needle Exchange Services for Youth


* RFP conducted for contract to begin 7/1/10

2009-10 Public Health Sole Source Report

Start Date	End Date	Vendor Name	Amount	Service Type
7/1/2006	12/31/2010	Tides Center-Women's Community Clinic	1,022,036	preventative and health care services for uninsured women in SF
1/1/2007	12/31/2010	University of Pittsburgh	285,000	Behavioral and Social Consequences of HIV/AIDS Study - behavioral scientist services
3/1/2007	6/30/2010*	University of the Pacific School of Dentistry	1,760,159	HIV CARE - dental services
3/1/2010	6/30/2013	University of the Pacific School of Dentistry	1,905,000	HIV CARE - dental services
3/1/2010	6/30/2010*	University of the Pacific School of Dentistry	1,905,000	HIV CARE - dental services
3/15/2010	6/30/2014	ValueOptions	643,065	Mental Health Services
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Victor Treatment Centers Inc.	618,521	Intensive Day Treatment, Living Skills for Hearing Impaired Youth
7/1/2009	6/30/2011	Volunteer Center Serving San Francisco and San Mateo County	475,576	Mental Health Services
3/1/2007	6/30/2010*	Walden House	4,327,612	Comprehensive Monitored Residential Detox Services
3/1/2007	6/30/2010	Walden House	255,942	Planetree Housing Program
3/1/2008	6/30/2011	Westside Community Center	996,311	Home Care/ Hospice/Attendant Care Services
3/1/2008	6/30/2010*	Westside Community Center	996,311	Home Care/ Hospice/Attendant Care Services
3/1/2009	6/30/2013	Westside Community Center	6,272,000	HIV Health Services - Centers of Excellence
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	Y M C A of San Francisco	1,942,911	MH and SA Svcs for youths under 21 in SF.
7/1/2009	6/30/2011*	Youth Leadership Institute	593,647	SA prevention services for youth and adult.

* RFP conducted for contract to begin 7/1/10

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 544-5227

Date: June 23, 2010

To: Members of the Board of Supervisors

From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board *Angela Calvillo*

Subject: Form 700

This is to inform you that the following individuals have submitted a Form 700 Statement:

Bruce Wolfe - Assuming - SOTF
Nicholas Goldman - Assuming - SOTF
David Snyder - Assuming - SOTF
James Knoebber - Assuming - SOTF
Hope Johnson - Assuming - SOTF

7

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2010 JUN 21 PM 3:59

BY AK

File 100701
BF clerk
BF Comm
Cpage

June 18, 2010

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Supervisors,

I understand that the Board of Supervisors is considering slashing half the budget for the San Francisco Neighborhood Emergency Response Team (NERT) for the coming year. Such a cut will devastate the NERT Program. As a member and supporter of NERT, I urge you not to take this step.

As a transplant from Florida, I have been terrified of earthquakes. The NERT program helped me conquer this fear by instilling a self-reliance and sense of responsibility towards my fellow San Franciscans. The training empowered me to take charge of my personal safety and taught me how best to react in the event of a disaster. I feel that this type of training for citizens living in earthquake hotspots is priceless, especially because of the city's dependence on citizens to help out in the event of a disaster. There is not a day that goes by that I don't use what I've learned in NERT training, and I feel it is especially important to have *informed* residents who can *effectively* react and help out during a disaster, whether it be an earthquake, power outage, flood, fire, etc.

San Francisco needs citizens who are prepared to take care of themselves after a disaster. NERT is the only program in our city that offers free, hands-on disaster preparedness training taught by professional first responders from the San Francisco Fire Department. Given the disasters which have occurred this year (Haiti, Chile), it seems incredibly short-sighted to be cutting funding to such an invaluable program.

Please don't destroy the San Francisco NERT program.

Sincerely,



Katie Baum
NERT Volunteer
San Francisco Resident

(8)

File 100701



harpere28@aol.com
06/28/2010 09:47 PM

To Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org, Sophie.Maxwell@sfgov.org,
Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org, Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org,
Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org,

cc

bcc

Subject NERT

Thank you for your support of NERT. It is good to see right things done from time to time... I keeps the old "give a hoot motor" running and keeps cynicism at bay.

Thanks again,
Stephen Harper
I have a NERT and I vote

2010 Local Agency Biennial Notice

Name of Agency: San Francisco County Transportation Authority
Mailing Address: 100 Van Ness Avenue, Floor 26
Contact Person: Cynthia Fong Office Phone No: (415) 522-4800
E-mail: Cynthia Fong Fax No: (415) 522-4829

This agency has reviewed its conflict-of-interest code and has determined that:

An amendment is required. The following amendments are necessary:
(Check all that apply.)

- Include new positions (including consultants) that must be designated.
- Delete positions that manage public investments from the list of designated positions.
- Revise disclosure categories.
- Revise the titles of existing positions.
- Delete titles of positions that have been abolished.
- Other (describe) _____

Code is currently under review by the code-reviewing body.

No amendment is required.

The agency's code accurately designates all positions that make or participate in the making of governmental decisions; the disclosure categories assigned to those positions accurately require the disclosure of all investments, business positions, interests in real property, and sources of income that may foreseeably be affected materially by the decisions made by those holding the designated positions; and the code includes all other provisions required by Government Code Section 87302.



Signature of Chief Executive Officer

6/25/10

Date

Complete this notice regardless of how recently your code was approved or amended.

Please return this notice no later than **August 1, 2010**, via e-mail (PDF), inter-office mail, or fax to:

Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
ATTN: Peggy Nevin
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Fax: 554-5163

9

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2010 Local Agency Biennial Notice

2010 JUN 23 PM 4:11

Name of Agency: Office of the Assessor-Recorder BY PN
Mailing Address: 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 190
Contact Person: Kimberlee Kimura Office Phone No: 554-7911
E-mail: Kimberlee.kimura@sfgov.org Fax No: 554-7869


This agency has reviewed its conflict-of-interest code and has determined that:

An amendment is required. The following amendments are necessary:
(Check all that apply.)

- Include new positions (including consultants) that must be designated.
- Delete positions that manage public investments from the list of designated positions.
- Revise disclosure categories.
- Revise the titles of existing positions.
- Delete titles of positions that have been abolished.
- Other (describe) _____

Code is currently under review by the code-reviewing body.

No amendment is required.
The agency's code accurately designates all positions that make or participate in the making of governmental decisions; the disclosure categories assigned to those positions accurately require the disclosure of all investments, business positions, interests in real property, and sources of income that may foreseeably be affected materially by the decisions made by those holding the designated positions; and the code includes all other provisions required by Government Code Section 87302.



Signature of Chief Executive Officer

06/22/2010

Date

Complete this notice regardless of how recently your code was approved or amended.

Please return this notice no later than **August 1, 2010**, via e-mail (PDF), inter-office mail, or fax to:

Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
ATTN: Peggy Nevin
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Fax: 554-5163

2010 Local Agency Biennial Notice

Name of Agency: San Francisco Health Authority
Mailing Address: 201 3rd Street, 7th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103
Contact Person: Valerie Huggins Office Phone No: 415-615-4235
E-mail: vhuggins@sflhp.org Fax No: 415-615-6435

This agency has reviewed its conflict-of-interest code and has determined that:


An amendment is required. The following amendments are necessary:
(Check all that apply.)

- Include new positions (including consultants) that must be designated.
- Delete positions that manage public investments from the list of designated positions.
- Revise disclosure categories.
- Revise the titles of existing positions.
- Delete titles of positions that have been abolished.
- Other (describe) _____


Code is currently under review by the code-reviewing body.

No amendment is required.

The agency's code accurately designates all positions that make or participate in the making of governmental decisions; the disclosure categories assigned to those positions accurately require the disclosure of all investments, business positions, interests in real property, and sources of income that may foreseeably be affected materially by the decisions made by those holding the designated positions; and the code includes all other provisions required by Government Code Section 87302.



Signature of Chief Executive Officer



Date

Complete this notice regardless of how recently your code was approved or amended.

Please return this notice no later than August 1, 2010, via e-mail (PDF), inter-office mail, or fax to:

Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
ATTN: Peggy Nevin
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Fax: 554-5163

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2010 Local Agency Biennial Notice

2010 JUN 23 PM 4:59

Name of Agency: Office of Treasurer and Tax Collector _____
Mailing Address: 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 140, San Francisco, CA 94102 _____ BY: PN
Contact Person: David Augustine _____ Office Phone No: 415-554-7601 _____
E-mail: david.augustine@sfgov.org _____ Fax No: 415-554-5507 _____

This agency has reviewed its conflict-of-interest code and has determined that:


An amendment is required. The following amendments are necessary:
(Check all that apply.)

- Include new positions (including consultants) that must be designated.
- Delete positions that manage public investments from the list of designated positions.
- Revise disclosure categories.
- Revise the titles of existing positions.
- Delete titles of positions that have been abolished.
- Other (describe) _____

Code is currently under review by the code-reviewing body.

No amendment is required.

The agency's code accurately designates all positions that make or participate in the making of governmental decisions; the disclosure categories assigned to those positions accurately require the disclosure of all investments, business positions, interests in real property, and sources of income that may foreseeably be affected materially by the decisions made by those holding the designated positions; and the code includes all other provisions required by Government Code Section 87302.



Signature of Chief Executive Officer

6-23-10

Date

Complete this notice regardless of how recently your code was approved or amended.

Please return this notice no later than **August 1, 2010**, via e-mail (PDF), inter-office mail, or fax to:

Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
ATTN: Peggy Nevin
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Fax: 554-5163

CP ✓
AS ✓

Positions to be Added Under Category 2

- Collections Officer
- IS Business Analyst – Senior
- IS Programmer Analyst
- IS Senior Programmer Analyst
- IS Programmer Analyst—Principal

2010 Local Agency Biennial Notice

Name of Agency: Department of Human Resources
 Mailing Address: One South Van Ness Ave., 4th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103
 Contact Person: Patti Martin Office Phone No: (415) 557-4811
 E-mail: patti.martin@sfgov.org Fax No: (415)557-4967

BY _____
 AK _____

RECEIVED
 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
 SAN FRANCISCO
 2010 JUN 28 AM 9:31

This agency has reviewed its conflict-of-interest code and has determined that:

An amendment is required. The following amendments are necessary:
(Check all that apply.)

- Include new positions (including consultants) that must be designated. (See attached.)
- Delete positions that manage public investments from the list of designated positions.
- Revise disclosure categories.
- Revise the titles of existing positions.
- Delete titles of positions that have been abolished. (See attached.)
- Other *(describe)* _____

Code is currently under review by the code-reviewing body.

No amendment is required.
 The agency's code accurately designates all positions that make or participate in the making of governmental decisions; the disclosure categories assigned to those positions accurately require the disclosure of all investments, business positions, interests in real property, and sources of income that may foreseeably be affected materially by the decisions made by those holding the designated positions; and the code includes all other provisions required by Government Code Section 87302.


 Signature of Chief Executive Officer

6/21/10
 Date

Complete this notice regardless of how recently your code was approved or amended.
 Please return this notice no later than **August 1, 2010**, via e-mail (PDF), inter-office mail, or fax to:

Clerk of the Board
 Board of Supervisors
 ATTN: Peggy Nevin
 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
 San Francisco, CA 94102
 Fax: 554-5163

City and County of San Francisco
Gavin Newsom
Mayor



Department of Human Resources
Micki Callahan
Human Resources Director

2 of 2

DATE 6/28/10

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN 28 AM 9:32
BY _____ AK _____

Peggy Nevin
Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Ms. Nevin:

In response to the 2010 Local Agency Notice, the Department of Human Resources would like to include the following new positions:

Classification & Compensation Manager	Category 2
Employee Relations Manager	Category 2
Chief of Policy	Category 2

The Department would like to delete the position of IT Director since via transfer-of-function this position now resides within the Controller's Office.

There are no other changes to our designated positions or disclosure categories.

Please contact Departmental Personnel Officer, Patti Martin at (415) 557-4811 if you have any additional questions.

Sincerely,

Micki Callahan
Human Resources Director

2010 Local Agency Biennial Notice

Name of Agency: San Francisco Rent Board
Mailing Address: 25 Van Ness Ave., Ste. 320, San Francisco, CA 94102
Contact Person: Delene Wolf Office Phone No: 415-252-4650
E-mail: delene.wolf@sfgov.org Fax No: 415-252-4699

This agency has reviewed its conflict-of-interest code and has determined that:

An amendment is required. The following amendments are necessary:
(Check all that apply.)

- Include new positions (including consultants) that must be designated.
- Delete positions that manage public investments from the list of designated positions.
- Revise disclosure categories.
- Revise the titles of existing positions.
- Delete titles of positions that have been abolished.
- Other (describe) _____

Code is currently under review by the code-reviewing body.

No amendment is required.

The agency's code accurately designates all positions that make or participate in the making of governmental decisions; the disclosure categories assigned to those positions accurately require the disclosure of all investments, business positions, interests in real property, and sources of income that may foreseeably be affected materially by the decisions made by those holding the designated positions; and the code includes all other provisions required by Government Code Section 87302.



Signature of Chief Executive Officer


6/30/10

Date

Complete this notice regardless of how recently your code was approved or amended.

Please return this notice no later than **August 1, 2010**, via e-mail (PDF), inter-office mail, or fax to:

Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
ATTN: Peggy Nevin
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Fax: 554-5163



Fw: Conflict of Interest - Response Required
Robert Collins to: Peggy Nevin
Cc: Delene Wolf

06/30/2010 05:23 PM

Hi Peggy,

Please find attached the Rent Board's 2010 Local Agency Biennial Notice. Please don't hesitate to contact me if you need any further information.

Best,
Robert



2010 Local Agency Biennial Notice.PDF

----- Forwarded by Timothy Lee/RENT/SFGOV on 06/02/10 09:08 AM -----



Peggy Nevin/BOS/SFGOV
06/01/10 05:24 PM

To timothy.lee@sfgov.org
cc

Subject Conflict of Interest - Response Required

Please see the attachments below for the biennial Conflict of Interest Review.

The response for your department is due by August 1, 2010.

[attachment "Conflict of Interest Review Memo.DOC" deleted by Robert Collins/RENT/SFGOV]
[attachment "OP-2006-07-13-SEIS.PDF" deleted by Robert Collins/RENT/SFGOV] [attachment
"Residential Rent.PDF" deleted by Robert Collins/RENT/SFGOV] [attachment "Notice.doc"
deleted by Robert Collins/RENT/SFGOV]

PEGGY NEVIN
executive assistant
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
415-554-7703
PEGGY.NEVIN@SFGOV.ORG

Complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Satisfaction form by clicking the link below.
<http://www.sfbos.org/index.aspx?page=104>



To:
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Updated cost of appeal from DPW - BSM

From: "Chan, Cheryl" <Cheryl.Chan@sfdpw.org>
To: "Calvillo, Angela" <Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org>, "Caldeira, Rick" <Rick.Caldeira@sfgov.org>, "Lamug, Joy" <Joy.Lamug@sfgov.org>
Cc: "Storrs, Bruce" <Bruce.Storrs@sfdpw.org>, "Hanley, Robert" <Robert.Hanley@sfdpw.org>, "Lopes, Marilyn" <Marilyn.Lopes@sfdpw.org>, "Tan, Sherry" <Sherry.Tan@sfdpw.org>
Date: 06/23/2010 04:07 PM
Subject: Updated cost of appeal from DPW - BSM

Good afternoon,

The cost of appeal for tentative maps will increase from \$250 to \$280, **effective July 1, 2010**. Please see the attachment from the Controller's Office.

Please update your records accordingly.

Thank you,

Cheryl Chan

Department of Public Works
Bureau of Street-Use and Mapping
875 Stevenson Street, Room 410
San Francisco, CA 94103
Main#: (415) 554-5827
Direct#: (415) 554-4885
Fax#: (415) 554-5324
Email: Cheryl.Chan@sfdpw.org



Copy from Controller 6-22-10.xls Notice of Fee Increase_6-23-10.pdf

10

City and County of San Francisco



Gavin Newsom, Mayor
Edward D. Reiskin, Director
Fuad S. Sweiss, PE, PLS,
City Engineer & Deputy Director of Engineering



Phone: (415) 554-5827
Fax: (415) 554-5324
www.sfgov.org/dpw

Department of Public Works
Bureau of Street-Use and Mapping
875 Stevenson Street, Room 410
San Francisco, CA 94103

Barbara L. Moy, Bureau Manager
Bruce R. Storrs, City and County Surveyor

TO: Surveyors, Engineers, Attorneys, and Title Officers
FROM: Bruce R. Storrs, City and County Surveyor
DATE: June 23, 2010
RE: Notice of Subdivision and Mapping Fee Increase

Effective July 1, 2010, there will be a CPI fee increase for all Subdivision and Mapping applications. Please see the attachment for the updated fee schedule.

Please also note that the cost to appeal a tentative map has increased from \$250 to \$280.

Per the request of the Controller's Office, all checks for application fees should be dated no later than **15 days** from the time of application submittal.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to email us at Subdivision.Mapping@sfdpw.org or call us at 415-554-5827.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bruce R. Storrs".

Bruce R. Storrs, PLS
City and County Surveyor
City and County of San Francisco

IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN SAN FRANCISCO

Customer Service

Teamwork

Continuous Improvement

Department of Public Works - Subdivision Fees

Dept	Code Sections	Fee Description	A					B		C=A x (1+B)		FY 2010-11 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2010-11 Estimated Cost Recovery
			FY 2008-09 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2008-09 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2009-10 CPI	FY 2009-10 Fee with CPI Adjustment	FY 2009-10 Fee (Rounded)	FY 2009-10 Estimated Cost Recovery	FY 2010-11 CPI	FY 2010-11 Fee with CPI Adjustment			
DPW	Subdivision Code Article 3 Sec 1315	Air Space - up to four lots	\$ 9,383.06	\$ 9,383.00	0.02%	\$ 9,384.93	\$ 9,385.00	<100%	2.6%	\$ 9,629.88	\$ 9,630.00		
DPW	Subdivision Code Article 3 Sec 1315	Air Space - each additional lot (5 or more lots)	\$45.65	546.00	0.02%	545.76	546.00	<100%	2.6%	560.01	560.00		
DPW	Subdivision Code Article 3 Sec 1315	Lot Subdivision Final Map	9,207.36	9,207.00	0.02%	9,209.20	9,209.00	<100%	2.6%	9,449.56	9,450.00		
DPW	Subdivision Code Article 3 Sec 1315	Condominium Conversion	9,097.13	9,097.00	0.02%	9,098.95	9,099.00	<100%	2.6%	9,336.44	9,336.00		
DPW	Subdivision Code Article 3 Sec 1315	Parcel Map	8,403.06	8,403.00	0.02%	8,404.74	8,405.00	<100%	2.6%	8,624.11	8,624.00		
DPW	Subdivision Code Article 3 Sec 1315	Lot Merger Re-subdivision	7,578.94	7,577.00	0.02%	7,578.46	7,578.00	<100%	2.6%	7,776.26	7,776.00		
DPW	Subdivision Code Article 3 Sec 1315	Amended Map	2,950.89	2,951.00	0.02%	2,951.48	2,951.00	<100%	2.6%	3,028.52	3,029.00		
DPW	Subdivision Code Article 3 Sec 1315	Lot Line Adjustment	2,950.89	2,951.00	0.02%	2,951.48	2,951.00	<100%	2.6%	3,028.52	3,028.00		
DPW	Subdivision Code Article 3 Sec 1315	Lot Merger Re-subdivision	2,816.66	2,817.00	0.02%	2,817.23	2,817.00	<100%	2.6%	2,890.76	2,891.00		
DPW	Subdivision Code Article 3 Sec 1315	Certificate of Compliance	2,334.31	2,334.00	0.02%	2,334.77	2,335.00	<100%	2.6%	2,395.71	2,395.00		
DPW	Subdivision Code Article 3 Sec 1315	Certificate of Correction	2,334.31	2,334.00	0.02%	2,334.77	2,335.00	<100%	2.6%	2,395.71	2,395.00		
DPW	Subdivision Code Article 3 Sec 1315	Record of Survey	553.29	553.00	0.02%	553.40	553.00	<100%	2.6%	567.85	568.00		
DPW	Subdivision Code Article 3 Sec 1315	Cost of Appeal under Section 1314	272.83	273.00	0.02%	272.88	273.00	<100%	2.6%	280.00	280.00		

Library Users Association

P.O. Box 170544, San Francisco, CA 94117-0544

Tel./Fax (415) 753-2180

June 21, 2010

Board of Supervisors, and
Budget and Finance Committee
City Hall, San Francisco (By email)

Subject: *Please Press Library to Provide Interim Library Service – and – Library's Changing Stories about Full Interim Service for Branches being Renovated, and Expressed Disinterest in Working with you on Providing Interim Service*

Dear Supervisors:

At your June 23 Budget and Finance Committee meeting, please press the Library to provide full-time, full interim service for libraries that are closed for renovations – perhaps by placing money on reserve for a few months.

At Last Wednesday's Budget and Finance Committee meeting, City Librarian Luis Herrera expressed a lack of enthusiasm for providing full-time, full interim library service in a vacant store or other facility such as a Rec. and Parks facility, etc. – *even if the Committee were to re-budget the \$401,000 that it had just taken out of the Library's budget* and returned to the General Fund.

It appeared to be a shocking reluctance to provide core patron services – even with full funding – and it also represented a complete reversal from what Mr. Herrera had told community groups. All last year he was promising to provide interim service if local neighborhood groups could find a "suitable" location – and it was cost-free. See attached email to Library Users from Mr. Herrera.

We have found at least three locations at \$2,500 to \$3,000 per month, or \$30,000 for the entire time Park Branch would be closed for renovations. And we have found that trailers could be used – for approximately \$9,000 - \$10,000 for a year, the full time estimated for Park Branch closure.

To hear Wednesday that he really doesn't want to do it no matter what you are willing to pay, even \$401,000 – appalling. Please press the Library to work on this.

Thank you!

Sincerely yours,

Peter Warfield
Executive Director
Library Users Association

Library Users Association – Page 1 of 2

11

--- On Fri, 2/26/10, Luis Herrera <lherrera@sfpl.org> wrote:

From: Luis Herrera <lherrera@sfpl.org>
Subject: RE: Question Regarding Park Branch Alternate Location Budget - reply
To: "libraryusers2004@yahoo.com" <libraryusers2004@yahoo.com>
Date: Friday, February 26, 2010, 2:41 PM

Hi Peter,

Several members of the Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council, the Cole Valley Improvement association and the Library worked together to identify and alternate location this past year. They looked at numerous locations but were unable to find one that was suitable (ADA, safe, move-in ready, cost effective etc). Had we found a site, the agreement was that the neighborhood would cover any rental expenses and SFPL would cover staff, materials, and any necessary technology. The group ended their search a few months back. We are providing book mobile service and programming while the library is closed.

Regards,

Luis

From: Library Users Association [mailto:libraryusers2004@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2010 3:44 PM
To: Luis Herrera
Subject: Question Regarding Park Branch Alternate Location Budget

Dear Mr. Herrera:

It has been my understanding from various sources that the library has allocated zero dollars (\$0.00) as its budget for obtaining an alternate space for library use while the Park Branch Library is closed for renovation.

In other words, if a neighborhood group or anyone else could find a suitable space for the library for free, the library would be willing to move Park Branch operations there during the estimated year-long closure for renovations.

Is this correct, and what is the library's rationale for whatever the budget might be?

Thank you.

Peter Warfield

Executive Director

Library Users Association

415/753-2180

Official SFPL use only

Library Users Association – Page 2 of 2

PUBLIC NOTICE
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2010 JUN 21 PM 4:01

June 20, 2010
City and County of San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 701-5598

BY AK

The City and County of San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing has completed an Environmental Assessment under the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act and U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development regulations at 24 CFR Part 58 for a project known as Edward II. The City and County of San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing intends to use approximately \$4,416,508 apportioned between Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds under Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 and Home Investment Partnership Program (HOME) grants under Title II of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act of 1990 as amended, for a total project cost of \$9,146,808. The proposal involves the rehabilitation of the existing Edward II Inn in order to accommodate between 22 and 24 units of permanent housing for transition-age youth and to provide a manager's unit. The project site is located at 3155 Scott Street, San Francisco, CA 94123. No further environmental review of the proposal is to be conducted prior to the Request for Release of Funds.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The City and County of San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing has determined that this proposal will have no significant impact on the human environment. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 is not required.

The reasons for the decision not to prepare an EIS are: 1) an ERR prepared for this proposal documents that the project will not have a significant effect on the human environment and that compliance with related federal environmental laws and standards has been achieved; 2) the project size is well below the 2,500 unit EIS threshold level established by Federal regulation at 24 CFR 58.37; 3) the project will have no adverse effects on public health or safety, nor will it have adverse effects on any ecologically sensitive areas; 4) mitigating measures have been identified and are required with respect to air quality, noise, hazardous materials, zoning, and seismic upgrades that adequately address the effects the project is deemed to have or will be exposed to; 5) with the implementation of the identified mitigation measures the project is in compliance with Federal, State and local laws pertaining to the protection of the environment and conforms to the zoning and General Plan of the City and County of San Francisco; and 6) the City and County of San Francisco has performed its responsibilities under the Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act in accordance with the terms of the *Programmatic Agreement by and among the City and County of San Francisco, the California State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding Historic Properties Affected by Use of Revenue from the Department of Housing and Urban Development Part 58 Programs (PA)* and has determined that the Undertaking will not have an effect on historic properties as defined in the PA and in National Historic Preservation Act. Additional project information is contained in the Environmental Review Record (ERR) on file at 1 South Van Ness Avenue - 5th Floor, San Francisco, California 94103, which may be examined or copied weekdays from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Any individual, groups or agency disagreeing with this determination or wishing to comment on the proposal may submit written comments to the City and County of San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing at 1 South Van Ness Avenue – 5th Floor, San Francisco, California 94103, attn: Eugene Flannery. The ERR is also available for viewing and downloading on the World Wide Web at http://www.sfgov.org/site/moh_index.asp?id=101258. All written comments received by 5:00 pm on July 20, 2010 will be considered and the City and County of San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing will not take any action on the proposal prior to this date.

Certifying Officer: Douglas Shoemaker, Director
City and County of San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/23/2010 10:08 AM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject please read



Michelle Sakhai
<michellesakhai@gmail.com>
06/23/2010 01:37 AM

To MTABoard@sfmta.com
cc Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org
Subject please read

Dear Mayor Newsom, Members of the MTA Board and Board of Supervisors -

As a San Francisco resident and voter, I am asking that you do not pass regulations to increase metered parking rates, to extend meter hours, or enforce meters on Sundays. Please take the residents opinions in to consideration. It already is very tough as it is and having the above increased, will force residents to move and no longer support the community.

Thank you.
Michelle Sakhai

13



Anne Chasse
<motivatedexecutive@yahoo.
com>

06/23/2010 09:22 AM

To GavinNewsom@sfgov.org, MTABoard@sfmta.com,
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

cc

bcc

Subject Request to rethink meter price increases

Dear Mayor Newsom, Members of the MTA Board and Board of Supervisors,
As a San Francisco resident and voter, I am asking that you do not pass regulations to
increase metered parking rates, to extend meter hours, enforce meters on Sundays, or add
more meters in residential neighborhoods.

Also, it seems logical to have all San Francisco city employees, contribute to their own
pension plans - if this truly is not currently happening.

Thanks for you consideration.

Best regards.

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/23/2010 10:15 AM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Do not extent parking meter hours



Brenner/Lampert
<babasuse@earthlink.net>
06/22/2010 07:34 PM

To MTABoard@sfmta.com, Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org,
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject Do not extent parking meter hours

Dear City leaders,

I am writing because I am very concerned about the proposal to extend parking meter hours to 10 p.m and expand meter hours to include Sunday parking.

This proposal will have a terrible impact on local businesses, especially those who depend on people who drive to their neighborhoods to dine at a restaurant or visit with friends.

I know the city is strapped for cash. But this proposal will have kill businesses, thus reducing tax revenues.

Don't do it!

Barbara A. Brenner
3781-23rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94114

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/22/2010 11:48 AM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Please do not make us pay even more money to live in this
city



winsf 212
<winsf212@gmail.com>
06/21/2010 07:34 PM

To Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject Please do not make us pay even more money to live in this
city

Dear Mayor Newsom, Members of the MTA Board and Board of Supervisors -

As a San Francisco resident and voter, I am asking that you do not pass regulations to increase metered parking rates, to extend meter hours, or enforce meters on Sundays.

Thank you,
Wendy Leopold

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/22/2010 11:49 AM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Opposition to Parking Meter Changes (2)



Peter Yorke
<pcyorke@hotmail.com>
06/21/2010 07:08 PM

To <mtaboard@sfmta.com>, <gavin.newsom@sfgov.org>,
<board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
Subject Proposed New Parking Regulations

Dear Mayor Newsom, Members of the MTA Board and Board of Supervisors -

As a San Francisco resident and voter, I am asking that you do not pass regulations to increase metered parking rates, to extend meter hours, or enforce meters on Sundays. A large block of the voting public will remember your actions at the next elections.

Regards,

Peter Yorke
2201 Pacific Avenue,
San Francisco, CA 94115

Hotmail has tools for the New Busy. Search, chat and e-mail from your inbox. [Learn more.](#)
----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 06/22/2010 11:53 AM -----



Elizabeth Hosfield
<ehosfield@gmail.com>
06/21/2010 07:09 PM

To MTABoard@sfmta.com, Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org,
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject Parking changes

Dear Mayor Newsom, Members of the MTA Board and Board of Supervisors -

As a San Francisco resident and voter, I am asking that you do not pass regulations to increase metered parking rates, to extend meter hours, or enforce meters on Sundays. Please consider other ways (most importantly, pension reform) as part of your plan to reduce the deficit in the MUNI budget.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Hosfield, M.D.

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 06/23/2010 01:59 PM -----



Zack Gottlieb
<zgottlieb@paclabs.com>
06/23/2010 11:27 AM

To Zack Gottlieb <zgottlieb@paclabs.com>
cc
Subject Please do not pass new Parking Regulations

Dear Mayor Newsom, Members of the MTA Board and Board of Supervisors
As a San Francisco resident and voter, I am asking that you do not
pass regulations to increase metered parking rates, to extend meter
hours, or enforce meters on Sundays.

Sincerely,
Zack Gottlieb

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 06/23/2010 01:59 PM -----



Lynnette Bruno
<lynnette01@gmail.com>
06/23/2010 11:48 AM

To MTABoard@sfmta.com, Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org,
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject Do Not Pass Regulations to Increase Parking Rates or
Extend Meter Hours

Dear Mayor Newsom, Members of the MTA Board and Board of Supervisors,

As a San Francisco resident and voter, I am asking that you do not
pass regulations to increase metered parking rates, to extend meter
hours, or enforce meters on Sundays.

Thank you,
Lynnette Bruno

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 06/23/2010 01:59 PM -----



"Michael J. Donohoe"
<michaeljdonohoe@sbcglob
al.net>
06/23/2010 01:21 PM

To <MTABoard@sfmta.com>, <Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org>,
<Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
Subject Increased and more meter rates !??

Dear Mayor Newsom, Members of the MTA Board and Board of Supervisors -

As a San Francisco resident and voter, I am asking that you do not pass regulations to increase metered parking rates, to extend meter hours, or enforce meters on Sundays.

As a resident and a voter, I am tired of being gouged by bureaucratic morasses and union feather bedding. It has become more and more of a hostile environment to shop or partake of San Francisco's urban activities. It is becoming easier and easier to find the aforementioned outside of the City. Please, also consider that the small, local businesses (City tax bases) need locals and residents to stay in business which in turn supports SF's budgets. The so-called pilot program of extended parking rates is nothing but a Trojan Horse.

Please pay attention to the City's needs so that voter initiatives do not have to replace insensitive and incompetent government.

Sincerely,

Michael Donohoe
1420 36th Ave
SF, Ca

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 06/23/2010 01:59 PM -----



Tarly Manak
<tarlym@frenchamericansf.org>

06/23/2010 01:21 PM

To MTABoard@sfmta.com, Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org,
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

cc

Subject I am opposed to the new Parking Meter Rates

I heard about the proposed increase in parking meters and extending the operational hours to 10pm and Sunday. I oppose these changes because they will cost me even more to park, result in loss of business for our local merchants, and cause congestion in the neighboring residential areas.

In a city like San Francisco, the middle classes already struggle to survive. We are out priced in rent. buying property, restaurants, children's activities..the list is long. This is just another small insult that effectively takes more money out of the pockets of local businesses and local residents.

I support my local merchants and respect our neighborhoods! Do not make these changes!
Regards

--
Mr Tarlochan Manak
Head of Mathematics
French American International School
150 Oak Street

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/23/2010 01:57 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject PLEASE do not pass regulations to increase metered
parking rates, to extend meter



"Brooks Nicole"
<Nicole.Brooks@kohler.com>

06/23/2010 10:39 AM

To <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
Subject PLEASE do not pass regulations to increase metered
parking rates, to extend meter

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Francisco resident and voter of over ten years, I am asking that you do not pass regulations to increase metered parking rates, to extend meter hours, or enforce meters on Sundays.

I work very hard and have chosen to work in my own city of residence in efforts to support my community and am tired of feeling like it's a fight just to find parking! Parking lots are taking advantage of meters and extend ridiculous rates, my employer will not pay for my parking and the public transportation from the Lower Haight to Potrero is unreliable, unsanitary and full of trouble makers, in short I do not feel safe.

Regards,



Nicole Brooks

Sales Associate

Baker Knapp & Tubbs
2 Henry Adams Street Suite 410
San Francisco, California 94103
P 415.861.8866 | F 415.861.0533

Experience gracious living online at www.bakerfurniture.com



Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

Baker

PRICE INCREASE
JULY 1, 2010

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/23/2010 01:59 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Opposition to Parking Meter Changes (7)



Sharon Aretsky
<Sharon_Aretsky@gap.com>

06/23/2010 10:51 AM

To "MTABoard@sfmta.com" <MTABoard@sfmta.com>,
"Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org" <Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org>,
"Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org"
<Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>

cc

Subject SF Parking Proposals

"Dear Mayor Newsom, Members of the MTA Board and Board of Supervisors -

As a San Francisco resident and voter, I am asking that you do not pass regulations to increase metered parking rates, to extend meter hours, or enforce meters on Sundays.

I ride Muni everyday - I'm appalled by the fact that I pay to ride Muni, pay more and more to cross our bridges each year due to bridge toll increases, and pay more in taxes each year - only to help fill a gap in the Muni operating budget.

Fix Muni and stop penalizing the rest of us.

Thank you!
Sharon Aretsky

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 06/23/2010 01:59 PM -----



Andrea Ruotsi
<aruotsi@gmail.com>

06/23/2010 10:56 AM

To MTABoard@sfmta.com, Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org,
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

cc

Subject SF parking

Dear Mayor Newsom, Members of the MTA Board and Board of Supervisors -

As a San Francisco resident and voter, I am asking that you do not pass regulations to increase metered parking rates, to extend meter hours, or enforce meters on Sundays.

Thank you,
Andrea Ruotsi

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/28/2010 11:53 AM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject hiking fees on parking meters and extending meter time to
Sundays



"Judiegeise"
<judiegeise@comcast.net>
06/27/2010 03:57 PM

To <mtaboard@sfmta.com>, <gavin.newsom@sfgov.org>,
<board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
Subject hiking fees on parking meters and extending meter time to
Sundays

I am against the fact that you intend to extend parking meter time to 10pm and are also talking about extending meters to Sundays as well.

This is outrageous---parking in the city is already difficult to find and it is already too expensive.

These actions will cause loss of business and congestion in neighboring residential areas.

Judie Geise



Jim Robbins
<robbins.jim@gmail.com>
06/26/2010 09:38 AM

To "mtaboard@sfmta.com" <mtaboard@sfmta.com>,
"gavin.newsom@sfgov.org" <gavin.newsom@sfgov.org>,
"board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org"

cc

bcc

Subject Parking meter increases

I am writing to object to the proposed increases in meter rates and hours. These changes will be bad for local businesses and residents. Don't pay for your bad governance with yet another stealth tax.

Sincerely,
Jim Robbins
376 Chestnut St
SF, CA 94133

Sent from my phone.

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/28/2010 11:48 AM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Parking Meters



Jim Robbins
<robbsins.jim@gmail.com>
06/26/2010 09:38 AM

To "mtaboard@sfmta.com" <mtaboard@sfmta.com>,
"gavin.newsom@sfgov.org" <gavin.newsom@sfgov.org>,
"board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org"
<board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc

Subject Parking meter increases

I am writing to object to the proposed increases in meter rates and hours. These changes will be bad for local businesses and residents. Don't pay for your bad governance with yet another stealth tax.

Sincerely,
Jim Robbins
376 Chestnut St
SF, CA 94133

Sent from my phone.

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 06/28/2010 11:49 AM -----



Valeria Kholostenko
<valeriak@gmail.com>
06/26/2010 01:31 PM

To MTABoard@sfmta.com
cc Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Subject I do not want meters on Sundays, etc.

Dear Mayor Newsom, Members of the MTA Board and Board of Supervisors -
As a San Francisco resident and voter, I am asking that you do not pass regulations to increase metered parking rates, to extend meter hours, or enforce meters on Sundays.

Regards,
Valeria

--
Valeria Kholostenko
PHONE: 415 407 4875

TWITTER: thevaleriak
SKYPE: valeria.kholostenko

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/22/2010 11:46 AM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject To whom it may concern.....



IROAR883@aol.com
06/21/2010 10:47 PM

To MTABoard@sfmta.com, Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org,
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject To whom it may concern.....

Hi, my name is Jon Stewart.
I'm 45 yrs old and have lived in SF my whole life.
It saddens me to see this city and California so deep in debt.
But I don't agree with some of the methods you are trying to raise money to bail us out.
Extended meters until 10pm? And on Sundays?
Why stick it to us like that?
Isn't it enough that there is now a (so called) processing fee now when you pay a ticket in person at SFMTA?
I hope and pray that there is a special place in Hell reserved for the genius that thought that one up.
Let's get this straight, you wait in line for ever and a day there and pay an astronomical amount in a fine and they tack on a processing fee. PROCESSING FEE?
Thanks Gavin for letting that little lovely/fun experience get even more ridiculous.
It's not your fault? Maybe not. But you let the DMV Czar go nuts sometimes.
It all started for me when they started ticketing motorcycles for parking on the sidewalk.
Yeah, this is a city (like a lot of others) that has way too many cars and not enough parking spaces obviously.
And definitely hardly enough motorcycle parking.
So we all used to park parallel to the curb on the sidewalk as to make room for cars and to not get our bikes knocked over by said cars.
But now for years on end we get these lovely \$100 or so tickets for trying to find safe parking for ourselves and make room for cars.
Thanks guys.
How about this instead?
Unless sticking it to the little guy is how to fix our financial problems, I suggest you have our (sometimes) lazy cops actually do their duty and ticket the idiots that talk on their cell phones while driving.
It is a law right?
So why do I see it everyday, all day, that people all over the Bay area are still doing that?
I've actually seen SF police in their patrol cars doing it while driving also!
Think of how much money SF would be able to collect if the cops we have would actually pull people over and ticket them for that offense!
I've been at stop lights right next to patrol cars, with traffic flowing past in front of us with almost every other driver talking on a cell phone with the damned thing up to their ears.
And the cops turn a blind eye!
Save lives and make the city money Gavin and Co.
Think about it. Act on it!
And No to more meters in residential neighborhoods, extended hours, and Sundays!
What are you people thinking?
-Jon Stewart



Regine Familet
<rfamilet@yahoo.com>
06/23/2010 11:19 AM

To MTABoard@sfmta.com, Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org,
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
bcc
Subject Veto the proposed new parking regulations

Dear Mayor Newsom, Members of the MTA Board and Board of Supervisors -

As a San Francisco resident and voter, I am asking that you do not pass regulations to increase metered parking rates, to extend meter hours, or enforce meters on Sundays.

I am a realtor. Most of my livelihood is done on Sundays. Similarly, I am parking all over the city all of the time and usually shepharding clients. Though I always double the amount of time that I think I will need in the meter, I cannot dictate which properties my clients like and want to stay at for longer.

I am already suffering. Please do not add another level of expense that I cannot afford.

Regine Familet

Regine J. Familet

DRE# 01424425

Mobile: 415-517-2317

McGuire Real Estate

Linked In Profile: www.linkedin.com/in/reginefamilet

San Francisco, 94102

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 06/23/2010 01:59 PM -----



<margaret.pinzuti@clorox.com>

06/23/2010 01:31 PM

To MTABoard@sfmta.com, Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org,
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

cc

Subject

Dear Mayor Newsom, Members of the MTA Board and Board of Supervisors -

As a San Francisco resident and voter, I am asking that you do not pass regulations to increase metered parking rates, to extend meter hours, or enforce meters on Sundays.

Thank you.

Maggie Pinzuti

This e-mail (including any attachments) may contain information confidential to The Clorox Company and is intended only for the use of the intended recipient(s). If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient(s), you are notified that you have received this message in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please delete this message and notify the sender immediately.

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/25/2010 05:05 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Parking meter changes (3)



Alicia Yanow
<petsbestfriend@hotmail.com
>
06/24/2010 07:14 PM

To <mtaboard@sfmta.com>, <gavin.newsom@sfgov.org>,
<board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
Subject NO METER INCREASES PLEASE

Dear Mayor Newsom, Board of Supervisors & MTA Board,

I recently received noticed that DPT is trying to extend meter times until 10:00 PM, have them operational on Sundays and raise the fees to \$6.00 per hour.

As a small business owner, if the above changes are implemented, it will negatively impact my business. I own a pet sitting company and daily drive around the city to get from one job to another. Parking is a daily issue for me. If I have to pay more for meters, I have to pass this increase to my clients or absorb the loss.

Please do not change the meter structure as it will be a huge negative impact my business.

Thank you for letting me voice my opinion. Have a good day.

Alicia Yanow, Founder

Pet's Best Friend - *"When you are away, we are your pet's best friend!"*

415-561-9936 (office) / 415-509-3256 (cell) / www.petsbestfriend.org

* YELP reviews - <http://www.yelp.com/biz/pets-best-friend-san-francisco-2>

* Check out our wonderful clients! -

<http://www.flickr.com/photos/15921486@N05/collections/72157607561281217/>

* Become a Facebook Fan of PBF -

<http://www.facebook.com/album.php?aid=98262&id=112787060981#/pages/San-Francisco-CA/Pets-Best-Friend/112787060981>

* PBF has been nominated as one of the Bay Area's best local business on BayList -
<http://baylist.sfgate.com/pet-s-best-friend/biz/217652>

Hotmail is redefining busy with tools for the New Busy. Get more from your inbox. [See how.](#)
----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 06/25/2010 05:09 PM -----



Pierce Buxton
<piercebuxton@gmail.com>
06/24/2010 11:06 PM

To MTABoard@sfmta.com, Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org,
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject

Bad idea



As a San Francisco resident and voter, I am asking that you do not pass regulations to increase metered parking rates, to extend meter hours, or enforce meters on Sundays."

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 06/25/2010 05:09 PM -----



Sheila Perlite
<skperlite@sbcglobal.net>
06/25/2010 03:10 PM

To Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject Parking on West Portal

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a lifelong resident of the West Portal area, I'm writing to protest the proposed changes to parking on West Portal Avenue. I understand there is a proposal to keep metered parking in effect until 10pm at night, which would impact an area that currently has no metered parking, and this will drive business away and jeopardize local establishments. And if patrons are forced to park several blocks away from their destination, it will also impact the area.

There are also renters who live on West Portal Avenue, who would be forced to either park several blocks away from their destination or pay for parking. I understand there is also a proposal to enforce meters on Sunday, and increase the rate to \$6.00 per hour. This would impact the area around Lakeshore Plaza, which would give even the most loyal customers pause for thought before patronizing their favorite establishments.

Please reconsider this ill-conceived plan. The unique nature of our city is reflected in our neighborhoods, and we should preserve that uniqueness.

Sincerely,

Sheila Perlite

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/24/2010 11:10 AM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Parking Meter Opposition (8)



"John F Sampson"
<johnfsampson@sbcglobal.net>

To <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc

06/23/2010 02:04 PM

Please respond to
<johnfsampson@sbcglobal.net>

Subject Don't mess with parking meter fees and hours

It seems more than sufficient to have parking meter hourly costs of \$3.00 in busy areas and for that to be in effect during business hours only when one can accomplish an errand or grocery shopping in an hour. After business hours, almost all meter uses are for extended periods that are not covered by our meters, including many areas where local residents need to park after work and stores are closed.

For example, how would you like to go to a restaurant for dinner with friends and have everyone at your table either pop out every 55 minutes over the otherwise relaxed 2 or 3 hour meal or pay and additional \$60 parking fine on top of an expensive meal.

The city needs more money—or better yet a much less costly bureaucracy—but raising it by multiple quarter coins is not the way to do it.

The proposed measures would be a deplorable, hostile disgrace to our city, its visitors and our citizens.

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 06/24/2010 11:14 AM -----



Bend Yoga
<bendsf@gmail.com>
06/23/2010 02:17 PM

To MTABoard@sfmta.com, Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org,
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
cc

Subject Regulation protest

Dear Mayor Newsom, Members of the MTA Board and Board of Supervisors -

As a San Francisco resident and voter, I am asking that you do not pass regulations to increase metered parking rates, to extend meter hours, or enforce meters on Sundays.

Sincerely,

Heather Charmatz

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 06/24/2010 11:14 AM -----



"Laura Horton"
<laura@heidisays.com>
06/23/2010 02:30 PM

To <mtaboard@sfmta.com>, <gavin.newsom@sfgov.org>,
<board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc

Subject extended and Sunday meters on Fillmore st.



The idea of creating more income for our broke state is understandable, but please stop punishing us! To ask people to pay the already ridiculous prices to park in this neighborhood, (not to mention the meter Nazis that buzz around and write tickets for not curbing your wheels on a 1 inch grade!) on evenings and Sundays is ludicrous. It will certainly impact all the restaurants in the evenings. And don't we deserve to have at least one day – Sunday – where we can park for free? I mean, come ON. How about the people who want to go to church at Calvary Pres on Fillmore and Jackson? God may strike you all dead!
Please reconsider this selfish and inconsiderate idea and give our neighborhood a break!

Laura Horton Porter
Business Manager, HeidiSays
415.749.0655 x14

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 06/24/2010 11:14 AM -----



Cynthia Tam
<tam.ctam@gmail.com>
06/23/2010 03:04 PM

To MTABoard@sfmta.com, Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org,
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
cc

Subject No parking changes

Dear Mayor Newsom, Members of the MTA Board and Board of Supervisors -

As a San Francisco resident and voter, I am asking that you do not pass regulations to increase metered parking rates, to extend meter hours, or enforce meters on Sundays.

Regards,
Cynthia Tam

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 06/24/2010 11:14 AM -----



Hon Thieu Luu
<hon@pointbonita.com>
06/23/2010 03:05 PM

To MTABoard@sfmta.com, Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org,
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
cc

Subject Concern SF Voter

>>> "Dear Mayor Newsom, Members of the MTA Board and Board of
>>> Supervisors -

>>>
>>> As a San Francisco resident and voter, I am asking that you do not
>>> pass
>>> regulations to increase metered parking rates, to extend meter
>>> hours, or
>>> enforce meters on Sundays."

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 06/24/2010 11:14 AM -----



David Leibsohn
<dleibsohn@gmail.com>
06/23/2010 03:36 PM

To Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject stop new parking regulations please

As a SF resident and voter, I am asking that you do not pass regulations to increase metered parking rates, to extend meter hours, or to enforce meters on Sundays.

Thank you,
David Leibsohn
415-302-4004

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 06/24/2010 11:14 AM -----



"Carl Palladino"
<cpalladino@palladinocomp
any.com>
06/23/2010 07:02 PM

To <MTABoard@sfmta.com>, <Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org>,
<Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
Subject Do NOT pass proposed regulations on parking meters

Dear Mayor Newsom, Members of the MTA Board and Board of Supervisors -

As a San Francisco resident, business owner, and voter, I am asking that you do not pass regulations to increase metered parking rates, to extend meter hours, or enforce meters on Sundays.

Thank you,
Carl

Carl Palladino
The Palladino Company, Inc.
720 Fillmore Street
San Francisco, CA 94117
Office: 415-861-1945
Mobile: 415-336-1556
Fax: 415-869-6625
cpalladino@palladinocompany.com

This e-mail and any attachments are confidential. If you receive this message in error or are not the intended recipient, you should not

retain, distribute, disclose or use any of this information and you should destroy the e-mail and any attachments or copies.

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 06/24/2010 11:14 AM -----



Tiffany Townsend
<tiffany_townsend@hotmail.com>

06/23/2010 07:59 PM

To <mtaboard@sfmta.com>, <gavin.newsom@sfgov.org>, <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

cc.

Subject Attention MTA Board, Board of Supervisors and Mayor Newsom

Dear Mayor Newsom, Members of the MTA Board and Board of Supervisors,

As a San Francisco resident and voter, I am asking that you do not pass regulations to to extend meter hours or enforce meters on Sundays.

Sincerely,

Dr. Tiffany Townsend
2121 26th Street
San Francisco, CA 94107

Hotmail has tools for the New Busy. Search, chat and e-mail from your inbox. [Learn more.](#)



stephanie hanger
<shanger10@yahoo.com>
06/29/2010 11:31 AM

To mtaboard@sfmta.com, gavin.newsom@sfgov.org,
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
bcc
Subject Please do not extend the raise the fees on the parking
meters in San Francisco

Dear Members,

I write as a concerned citizen about the current actions being considered regarding the parking meters in San Francisco. I understand that the city is experiencing a financial deficit and is searching for new ways to alleviate this condition. However I do not agree that increasing parking meter fees and extending meters to include fees for Sundays is the right decision. Already parking is a major issue of discontent here in San Francisco. Rather than increase fees during times when people can enjoy the luxury of not worrying about parking restrictions on Sundays and after 6pm during the remaining days perhaps we could consider issuing an annual city tax for all residents to help balance the difference at the budgetary level and offset some of this financial discrepancy. The issue of needing to raise more funds applies to every resident using city services and not merely visitors and residents with vehicles.

Thank you for your time and consideration.
Best wishes,
Stephanie Hanger

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/29/2010 10:48 AM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Protest against further increases in parking and traffic fees



Christian Essrich
<cessrich@sbcglobal.net>
06/28/2010 05:57 PM

To MTABoard@sfmta.com, Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org,
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject Protest against further increases in parking and traffic fees

June 28, 2010

To
The Mayor of San Francisco
MTA Board
Board of Supervisors

To Whom It May Concern:

As a long-term resident of San Francisco I strongly protest the ever increasing parking and traffic fees in this city, which have reached a completely outrageous level and demonstrate once again the disdain that politicians of this city have for the citizens that (unfortunately) have to pay your salaries. While many of us hard working people find it difficult to get by financially, the city of San Francisco does its best to steal further money from our pockets with parking and traffic fees beyond imagination. Why am I double and triple taxed for the fact that I own a car while the same politicians of San Francisco are incapable to generate a public transport system that comes close to being able to transport people in reasonable amounts of time and for reasonable prices from A to B? Rather than blaming us for using cars and use it as a proxy to steal money from us, you should do your job and generate a functional and worthwhile public transport system.

I once again strongly protest any plans for further increases of parking and traffic fees and the extension of meter times to Sundays and late hours in San Francisco. I demand that my tax money is used appropriately in my interest and the interest of the majority of citizens of this city to improve our living conditions and not to make life harder and yet more expensive in the interest of incompetent and overpaid politicians.



darren ekizian
<darren_ekizian@yahoo.com
>

07/02/2010 11:20 AM

To MTABoard@sfmta.com, gavin.newsom@sfgov.org,
boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org

cc

bcc

Subject no extended parking meters

Please do not extend parking meter hours in SF. Do not charge people on
sunday. Do not increase meter fees.



brenda medina
<chickmedina@gmail.com>
06/30/2010 07:11 PM

To mtaboard@sfmta.com, gavin.newsom@sfgov.org,
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc YaMiLette Genoves <cindy_luck8@hotmail.com>, Andrew
Perez <madamper@yahoo.com>, Marcos Cortez
<pepinero9@yahoo.com>, Adolfo Soto <Adobud@aol.com>,
bcc

Subject

TO all who may concern!

We do NOT want:

Extended meters

Meters on Sunday

Any increases in fees of meters in san francisco

Support drivers!!!



"RECEPTIONIST"
 <RECEPTIONIST@sfcvb.org>
 06/30/2010 04:33 PM

To <fgallah@aol.com>
 cc <gavin.newsom@sfgov.org>, <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>, "Laurie Armstrong" <larmstrong@sanfrancisco.travel>
 bcc
 Subject FW: Arizona Boycott - Frank Gallaher

Thank you for your email. I am sharing your message with the offices of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

To express your concerns directly, please contact the Mayor's Office at gavin.newsom@sfgov.org and the Board of Supervisors at board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org.

The San Francisco Convention & Visitors Bureau opposes travel boycotts in general. As a sales and marketing organization, our role is to market the city as a visitor destination.

Our hope is that this issue will be resolved quickly so that we can continue our work welcoming visitors to one of the world's favorite cities.

I know that this issue is important to you. I hope that, once it is resolved, we can welcome you as well.

Sincerely,



Only in San Francisco
 SAN FRANCISCO CONVENTION & VISITORS BUREAU
 CELEBRATING OUR 100TH YEAR

Laurie Armstrong
 Vice President, Public Affairs
 SAN FRANCISCO CONVENTION & VISITORS BUREAU
 201 Third Street, Suite 900
 San Francisco, CA 94103-3185
 T 415.227.2615 | F 415.227.2602 | M 415.290.6830
larmstrong@sanfrancisco.travel

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Voted #1 U.S. City to Visit by Condé Nast Traveler Readers for 17th Year in a Row

From: fgallah@aol.com [mailto:fgallah@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 29, 2010 1:47 PM
To: SFCVB Tourism Department
Subject: Arizona Boycott


I usually spend from two to three weeks a year in the San Francisco area--primarily in the city itself, in NAPA, and along the Monterey peninsula. I have always thoroughly enjoyed my visits there especially to get away from the August heat in Florida. However, I will not be making my visit this year nor will I visit anywhere in California until the various cities, such as San Francisco, end their misguided boycott of Arizona. I plan to visit Sedona and Flagstaff instead. Based on my conversations with many of my friends

14

who believe as I do, this misguided boycott will do more to hurt California than it will Arizona.

Frank Gallaher
Miramar Beach, Florida

ARIZONA
Sageard, each, unique in the, orange, the, dark images as the sun dips behind the western horizon.



2889

Photo © Bruce Griffin

*Councilmen & Council women,
Just wanted you all to
know that due to your
decision our family
changed our vacation
plans from coming to
your city to going to
Arizona. Beautiful
State & Great people!
Wish you were
here! Ann Jensen*

© Distributed by Smith-Southwestern, Inc. • Printed in U.S.A.
www.smith-southwestern.com • 105478

*City Council
San Francisco City Hall
#1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
Rm. 244
San Francisco, CA.*

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN 25 PM 3:40
94102-4689

ARIZONA



DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE



Gavin Newsom, Mayor
 Edward D. Reiskin, Director

Department of Public Works
 Office of the Director
 City Hall, Room 348
 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
 San Francisco, CA 94102-4645

June 22, 2010

Hon. James J. McBride
 Presiding Judge, County of San Francisco
 Superior Court of California
 400 McAllister St
 San Francisco, CA 94102

*Ref: 2009-2010 San Francisco County Civil Grand Jury Report
 "Americans with Disabilities Act: Is San Francisco in Compliance"*

Dear Judge McBride:

I write to provide response to the Findings and Recommendations of the subject report. I want to thank you and the Grand Jury for your attention to the important matter of providing access to people with disabilities. Provision of access is something that the city and the Department of Public Works consider to be a high priority. We are proud of our efforts and accomplishments in this area and will continue our work to enhance disabled access throughout the City, including the public rights-of-way.


Page 15 of the report identified recommendations 3, 4, and 5 as requiring response from the Department of Public Works. Following are our responses.

	Findings	Recommendations
Civil Grand Jury	3. Currently only issues involved with Title II compliance are handled by the Grievance Process. The likelihood of disabled citizens requiring an alternative for and assistance in filing concerns outside of Title II is extremely high. The only alternative for the aggrieved is litigation at great expense in both time and resources, or filing a complaint with the DOJ. It is estimated to cost about \$750,000 to expand the Grievance Procedure to cover private sector complaints.	3. By January 2011, the MOD in association with City departments' ADA Coordinators should initiate a study to determine the feasibility of the expansion of the grievance procedure to incorporate private sector ADA compliance issues as an alternative to litigation.
DPW response	Partially disagree. The finding is correct that the City receives citizen complaints that fall outside the scope of Title II. However, the City does provide other avenues for citizens that may potentially help them avoid litigation. For example, the Human Rights Commission assists	Will not be implemented. This recommendation falls outside the responsibility of DPW. DPW defers to the responses of MOD and the Mayor's Office.

15



	the public in addressing grievances regarding access issues in public accommodations.	
Civil Grand Jury	4. The Facilities Transition Plan (FTP) is comprehensive and is updated periodically. Over two thirds of the plan has been accomplished, with work on the final portion underway. The capital plan for the City allows for the continued work, especially regarding curb cuts and sidewalk issues, but extends the costs over the next twenty to twenty five years. Current cost estimates total over \$500,000,000 with more than half of the sum originating from public sources. These sources are varied, and come from Federal, State, and local coffers via myriads of programs, many with specific use criteria. Even with all known sources, the expenditures far exceed available funds. Of critical importance is the need to maintain consistent levels of funding, without which experienced staff will be lost with detrimental impact on their programs.	4. San Francisco should obtain and distribute the needed funding through all available and creative means including targeted bond issues to accelerate the achievement of compliance goals in ten years. Consistent funding levels must be maintained in order to retain, develop, and expand the pool of valuable experienced personnel.
DPW Response	Partially Disagree. DPW will focus on the public rights of way in its response to this finding. DPW agrees it is of critical importance to maintain consistent levels of funding in order to maintain experienced staff. In the case of the curb ramp program this is especially true due to the fact that the lion's share of the program cost is professional engineering and skilled labor, not materials.	Already implemented. The recommendation has been implemented in recent years, as the City has consistently allocated significant funds through its Ten Year Capital Plan and annual capital budget process. The City has used numerous funding sources for curb ramps and sidewalks, including general operating funds, sales tax revenues, and debt financing. The City will continue to pursue all viable means to continue funding in a manner that is as consistent from year to year as possible and in conformance with the DPW ADA Transition Plan for Curb Ramps and Sidewalks.
Civil Grand Jury	5. The City incurs significant risk and liability from the insufficient monitoring of incursions into the public right of way and the maintenance of a clear-path-of-travel. The DPW is responsible for the investigation and enforcement of temporary and permanent sidewalk incursions involving the entire City. The majority of infractions are due to temporary barriers incorrectly erected. Over 1000 complaints are on file at any given time, and more	The City should pursue full enforcement and monitoring of incursions to the public rights of way, especially with regards to temporary sidewalk incursions. Staffing levels must be maintained to address and complete inspections and investigations promptly and to eliminate backlogged cases.



	<p>than 400 new complaints are received weekly. The team of inspectors has been unable to keep pace with and process these complaints. Delays in the correction of incursions can lead to lawsuits.</p>	
<p><i>DPW Response</i></p>	<p>Partially disagree. The majority of sidewalks are maintained by the fronting property owner. The regulatory responsibility rests with the City. The City inspects all sidewalks for compliance with applicable maintenance and accessibility on a 25 year cycle. Additionally, the City responds to requests for action to address sidewalk defects, lack of accessibility (either temporary or permanent in nature) and use of the sidewalk. Over 1000 complaints are on file at any given time, and more than 400 new complaints are received weekly. The City is doing an effective job, with the resources available, to monitor incursions in the public right of way. DPW has no information that would confirm the finding that delays in corrections of incursions can lead to lawsuits.</p>	<p>Recommendation requires further analysis. DPW vigorously pursues enforcement and monitoring of the public right of way. However, staffing levels are dictated by many factors and given the current economic climate, the city and DPW must consider their multiple obligations to the public, including critical health and safety issues, when setting staffing levels for sidewalk inspection. Notwithstanding diminishing resources, DPW has in place its Sidewalk Inspection and Repair Program (SIRP) that allows DPW to proactively inspect and repair city sidewalks, in addition to its program for responding to individual complaints. The program is running well and has resulted in 40% to 45% fewer complaints in the areas where SIRP has been implemented.</p>

I hope this information is helpful. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require any further information.

Sincerely,

Edward D. Reiskin
 Director

Cc: Board of Supervisors
 Grand Jury Office

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/28/2010 11:47 AM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc Joy Lamug/BOS/SFGOV,
bcc
Subject File 100790: Support of 900 Folsom Street and 260 Fifth
Street projects from ClementinaCares



"Foster Weeks"
<fweeks@gmwest.com>
06/26/2010 08:58 AM

To <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
Subject Support of 900 Folsom Street and 260 Fifth Street projects
from ClementinaCares

Honorable Board Members -

We are writing to you to express support on behalf of ClementinaCares, Inc. www.clementinacares.com for the proposed projects at 900 Folsom and 260 Fifth Street that will soon be coming before the Board for approval.

We are a mutual benefit neighborhood association in the Yerba Buena district.

The project sponsor has been extremely diligent in community outreach, as is outlined in the attached letters to the Planning Commission supporting the project and, from our point-of-view, has both a realistic and well thought out plan to address the issue of the project size and ensure a positive pedestrian experience at the street level.

Thank you in advance for your endorsement.

Sincerely,

Foster Weeks
Board Member, ClementinaCares, Inc.
www.clementinacares.com
415-345-4375

Confidential: This electronic message and all contents contain information from Guarantee Mortgage Corp which

16

may be privileged, confidential or otherwise protected from disclosure. The information is intended to be for the addressee(s) only. If you have received this electronic message in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and destroy the original message and all copies. Thank you.

Alert: For your protection, we remind you that this is an unsecured email service that is not intended for sending confidential or sensitive information. Please do not include your social security number, account number, or any



other personal or financial information in the content of this email. 900 Folsom Endorsement Letter_FINAL(2).pdf



900 Folsom Endorsement Letter_FINAL(2).docx



cesar gonzo gomez
<cgtstayz@live.com>
06/22/2010 10:52 PM

To <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
bcc
Subject McLaren Park and disc golf?

Dear Board of Supervisors,
First and foremost thank you for your time, my name is Cesar and I and other concerned citizens really need to emphasize the impact that disc golf is going to have on the community. As you already might know a lot of daily joggers, walkers, dog walkers, birds, animals and plant life will definitely be affected in very negative ways and will make most of the local community upset. This park means so much more to certain people that were born and raised near McLaren Park, so please I ask you help out our community and the animals, trees, purified air that San Francisco breathes!! Thank you for your time, I hope to hear a response if that is possible, you can help this community so much in a very special way.

-Cesar

The New Busy think 9 to 5 is a cute idea. Combine multiple calendars with Hotmail. Get busy.

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/28/2010 11:49 AM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject CHALLENGING THE SHIPYARD/CANDLESTICK
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW



Ahimsa Sumchai MD
<asumchai@live.com>
06/26/2010 10:02 PM

To Board Supervisors <board_of_supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us>
cc
Subject CHALLENGING THE SHIPYARD/CANDLESTICK
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

AHIMSA PORTER SUMCHAI, M.D.

To: asumchai@sfbayview.com; editor@sfbayview.com; asumchai@live.com
Date: Sat, 26 Jun 2010 21:59:26 -0700
Subject: CHALLENGING THE SHIPYARD/CANDLESTICK ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
From: asumchai@sfbayview.com

**"I swear by Apollo Physician that I will fulfill this oath and this covenant;
I will keep them from harm and injustice."
Hippocratic Oath**

**CHALLENGING THE SHIPYARD/CANDLESTICK ENVIRONMENTAL
REVIEW**

**"The DEIR fails to quantify and properly mitigate significant fugitive dust
emissions due to construction. The DEIR illegally avoids quantification of toxic air
contaminant impacts from construction."**

Law Offices of James Birkelund representing California State Parks Foundation Response to
Comments Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan Project C&R-637
In April of 2008 the Union of Concerned Scientists issued the results of a
survey sent to 5,419 EPA scientists. Of those who responded, more than half
reported having experienced political interference in their work. 900 scientists
confirmed the White House watered down documents regarding climate change,
inserted industry language into EPA power plant regulations and that scientific

18

advisory panel conclusions about toxic chemicals went unheeded.

The most spectacular example of collusive government interference in the oversight of human health and safety occurred in the aftermath of the Twin Towers destruction on September 11, 2001. Lower Manhattan was choked in dust clouds that rose over 1000 feet subjecting residents, office and rescue workers to a cocktail of toxic gases and airborne particulates.

In the days after September 11, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the Occupational Safety (OSHA) took air samples and reported finding no excessive levels of asbestos, lead or volatile organic compounds in the air around Ground Zero. Contrary to these reports, dust samples taken from Ground Zero showed extremely high levels of asbestos.

In August of 2003 EPA Inspector General Nikki Tinsley admitted public statements issued by the agency were influenced by the National Security Council under the direction of the Bush White House. A 2004 report by the Sierra Club detailed the cover up of the public health hazards of Ground Zero orchestrated to "keep Wall Street rolling!" By June 2004 fifty seven Ground Zero workers had died from exposure to the toxics.

In striking parallel, in 2006 Dr. Mitch Katz, Director of the San Francisco Department of Public Health, issued an unsigned and undated "Fact sheet" about exposure to toxic asbestos and particulate containing construction dust from Lennar's Parcel A development site at the Hunters Point Shipyard. Katz stated, "The type of construction dust generated at the shipyard is common across California and was expected. The area is not contaminated with unsafe levels of chemicals."

According to the EPA Office of Air and Radiation, "Airborne particles, the main ingredient of haze, smoke and airborne dust can cause a number of serious health problems. Small particles less than 10 microns pose the greatest problems and can affect both your lungs and your heart. Numerous studies link particulate exposure to increased hospital admissions and emergency room visits and to death from heart or lung diseases. New studies show exposure to high particle levels to be associated with low birth weight infants, pre-term deliveries and fetal and infant deaths.

Mass grading and earthmoving activities began on Parcel A on April 25, 2006. In 2006 SFDPH issued three Notices of Violation to the developer concerning the generation of visible dust. According to a SFDPH memo dated June 2007, there were complaints about dust from the very beginning of the grading activities.

On August 7, 2008 Lennar CEO Kofi Bonner entered into a settlement agreement with BAAQMD Executive Officer Jack Broadbent to pay \$515,000 in civil penalties for violations of California Health and Safety Code Section 424 at the Hunters Point Shipyard in San Francisco, California.

On June 9, 2010 EPA published a final report on the shipyard toxic dust exposures. The EPA contradicts Katz in stating: "For metals, manganese poses the highest potential risk of exposure for the naturally occurring metals and lead poses the highest potential risk of possible Navy contaminants." For the first time EPA acknowledged it's initial investigations did not specifically address the human impacts of dust exposure separate from exposure to naturally occurring asbestos.

Contradicting DPH claims that low level intermittent exposures to naturally occurring asbestos are safe, in a letter dated 9/10/07, Rick Kreutzer, M.D., Chief Environmental Health Investigations Branch of the California Department of Public Health writes, "There are studies in which long term low level non-occupational exposures in areas of the world where naturally occurring asbestos occurs caused a low but epidemiologically detectable risk of mesothelioma. For example an ecological study in California suggests an association between residential proximity to naturally occurring asbestos and mesothelioma."

Navy Archives document that in 1947 Navy personnel burned 610,000 gallons of radiation contaminated fuel oil in boilers at the shipyards power plants. The Navy acknowledged the fuel contained plutonium, which has a half life of 24,000 years. The radioactive fuel came from three ships towed back to the Hunters Point Shipyard after exposure to two 23 kiloton atom bombs during Operation Crossroads testing in the South Pacific. If inhaled and lodged in the lungs even tiny particles of plutonium can cause cancer.

According to Greenaction for Health and Environmental Justice, more than 80% of San Francisco's industrially zoned land is located in Southeast San Francisco. This area is home to a federal superfund site at the Hunters Point Shipyard, the largest air polluter in San Francisco - the Mirant Potrero Power Plant, a sewage treatment plant which handles 80% of the City's solid wastes, 187 leaking underground fuel tanks and more than 124 hazardous waste handlers regulated by the USEPA.

Cumulative impacts describes the combined effect of adding pollutants to the environment over time. Impacts to health occur as the result of the combined effects of emissions from a variety of small and large pollution sources. A key provision of the California Environmental Quality Act requires that regulatory agencies analyze the impact of toxic emissions from a single source combined with the effects of nearby pollution.

The health of residents in Southeast San Francisco has been impacted by the cumulative contamination of the community's air, soil and water with more than 200 toxic chemicals according to the EPA including particulates, pesticides, petrochemicals, heavy metals, asbestos and radioactive materials.

Health surveys document rates of breast and cervical cancer double the rate found in other city neighborhoods and hospitalization rates for congestive heart failure, hypertension, diabetes and emphysema triple the statewide average. More than half of all infant mortality in San Francisco occurs in Bayview Hunters Point and Potrero Hill. Birth defects for the area was 44.3 per 1000 compared to 33.1 for the county of San Francisco.

Attorney James Birkelund on behalf of the California State Parks Foundation states, "The DEIR fails to adequately analyze cumulative impacts. An EIR must discuss significant cumulative impacts to be legally adequate."

According to Wilma Subra, Ph.D, "The EIR did not evaluate and assess the cumulative impacts of exposure to human and ecological receptors and the environment as a result of exposure to hydrocarbons, volatile organic compounds, PCB's, pesticides, heavy metals, asbestos and radionuclides."

On June 3, 2010 following a contentious hearing and a 4 to 3 split vote by the Planning Commission, the Shipyard/Candlestick Phase II draft EIR was certified as final. The massive project proposes over 10,000 residential units, over 1 million square feet of retail and office space, a 900 foot bridge, a massive transportation infrastructure and development over a 20 year construction period.

The Sierra Club, Golden Gate Audobon Society, San Francisco Tomorrow and The California Native Plant Association Care filed appeals on June 21, 2010 that force the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to vote on the adequacy of the environmental review. That vote is expected to occur on July 13, 2010. Additionally, Attorney Stephen C. Volker filed an appeal of the FEIR on behalf of Californians for Renewable Energy, an organization in the forefront of environmental justice actions in Bayview Hunters Point. The appeals prevent the city from seeking further approvals of the project from a roster of agencies, boards and commissions.

The Sierra Club Yodler calls on San Francisco Supervisors to stop the , "Hunters Point Disaster." A plan that would irreparably damage a state park by erecting a

six lane road and bridge through Candlestick Point with a noise level equivalent to being 50 feet away from a freeway. Additionally, the Bayview community would continue to face the on-going threat of pollution from the U.S. Navy "dump" at the shipyard.

On June 2, 2010 the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, for the first time since 1999, approved new and more stringent thresholds of significance for air quality violations that make the negative and unmitigated violations documented in the DEIR even more egregious. The updated CEQA guidelines seek to better protect the health and well being of Bay Area residents by addressing new health protective air quality standards, exposure to toxic air contaminants (TACS) and adverse effects from global climate disruption. The Air District adopted new air quality standards for ozone and particulate matter.

Under the new BAAQMD CEQA guidelines, the development projects construction related emissions of greenhouse gases and nitrogen oxides will be significant and unavoidable. Additionally, the environmental review failed to quantify the cancer risk associated with toxic air contaminants generated during construction but acknowledged that " due to the scale of the project the impacts from TACS bound to soil PM 10 would likely be above the BAAQMD's significance thresholds. "

Despite a new direction pioneered by the Obama Whitehouse vocalized by Lisa Jackson, the first African American administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in her presentation to the Commonwealth Club of California on September, 29, 2009, the EPA continues to demonstrate politically influenced environmental health and justice decision making at the Hunters Point Shipyard.

Driving clearly "under the influence" of political pressure, on June 9, 2010 USEPA issued a final report titled Review of Dust and Naturally Occurring Asbestos Control Measures and Air Monitoring at the Hunters Point Shipyard. It concludes that proper safeguards for management of toxic dust exposures at the shipyard are in place. The timing of the release of the EPA final report on the heels of the certification of the Shipyard/Candlestick environmental review by Planning on June 3rd cannot be overlooked.

Ahimsa Porter Sumchai, M.D.

The New Busy is not the too busy. Combine all your e-mail accounts with Hotmail. [Get busy.](#)

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/28/2010 11:54 AM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Beach Chalet Athletic Fields - request for EIR Scoping
Session



"SF Ocean Edge"
<sfoceanedge@earthlink.net
>
06/27/2010 08:51 PM

To <sfoceanedge@earthlink.net>
cc
Subject Beach Chalet Athletic Fields - request for EIR Scoping
Session

Dear Supervisor,

Attached please find the EIR Scoping Letter for the Beach Chalet Athletic Fields renovation project in Golden Gate Park, requesting a scoping session and describing some of the topics that SF Ocean Edge feels should be included in the EIR.

Thank you for your support for the EIR for this project and for full public outreach and disclosure. SF Ocean Edge believes that this project will have a major negative impact on the western end of Golden Gate Park and that the issues outlined in this letter should be thoroughly reviewed before any further action is taken on this project.

SF Ocean Edge



Request_for_a_scoping_session_-_6-25-10.pdf

19



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

S.F. ADMINISTRATIVE CODE CHAPTERS 12B and 14B WAIVER REQUEST FORM (HRC Form 201)

FOR HRC USE ONLY
Request Number: _____

► Section 1. Department Information

Department Head Signature: _____

Name of Department: D.A.

Department Address: 850 Bryant Street, Suite 322, San Francisco, CA 94103

Contact Person: Rey Salonga

Phone Number: 415-553-1024

Fax Number: 415-553-9700

► Section 2. Contractor Information

Contractor Name: Chevron USA Inc.

Contact Person: Cecilia - Station 41

Contractor Address: P. O. Box 2001, Concord, CA 94529

Vendor Number (if known): 04876

Contact Phone No.: 800-554-1376

► Section 3. Transaction Information

Date Waiver Request Submitted: 4/28/10

Type of Contract: Fuel-Credit Card

Contract Start Date: 7-1-10

End Date: 6-30-11

Dollar Amount of Contract: \$10000

► Section 4. Administrative Code Chapter to be Waived (please check all that apply)

- Chapter 12B
- Chapter 14B *Note: Employment and LBE subcontracting requirements may still be in force even when a 14B waiver (type A or B) is granted.*

► Section 5. Waiver Type (Letter of Justification *must* be attached, see Check List on back of page.)

- A. Sole Source
- B. Emergency (pursuant to Administrative Code §6.60 or 21.15)
- C. Public Entity
- D. No Potential Contractors Comply – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on:
- E. Government Bulk Purchasing Arrangement – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on:
- F. Sham/Shell Entity – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on:
- G. Local Business Enterprise (LBE) (for contracts in excess of \$5 million; see Admin. Code §14B.7.1.3)
- H. Subcontracting Goals

HRC ACTION	
12B Waiver Granted: _____	14B Waiver Granted: _____
12B Waiver Denied: _____	14B Waiver Denied: _____
Reason for Action: _____	
HRC Staff: _____	Date: _____
HRC Staff: _____	Date: _____
HRC Director: _____	Date: _____
DEPARTMENT ACTION – This section must be completed and returned to HRC for waiver types D, E & F.	
Date Waiver Granted: _____	Contract Dollar Amount: _____

20

Rey Salonga/DA/SFGOV
06/25/2010 03:37 PM

To Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV
cc Tamra Winchester/HRC/SFGOV@SFGOV
bcc
Subject CHEVRON 12B Sole source waiver

Hello,

Please approve the 12B sole source waiver request for CHEVRON.



Chevron 12b waiver.doc

Thank you.

Rey Salonga
San Francisco District Attorney's Office
850 Bryant Street, Room 322
Phone no. (415) 553-1024
Fax no. (415) 553-9700



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

S.F. ADMINISTRATIVE CODE CHAPTERS 12B and 14B WAIVER REQUEST FORM (HRC Form 201)

FOR HRC USE ONLY
Request Number: _____
RECEIVED BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SAN FRANCISCO 2010 JUN 24 AM 11:28 BY _____ AK

Section 1. Department Information

Department Head Signature: X [Signature]
 Name of Department: Animal Care & Control
 Department Address: 1200 15th Street, San Francisco, CA 94103
 Contact Person: Harold Powell
 Phone Number: 554-6914 Fax Number: 554-6156

Section 2. Contractor Information

Contractor Name: A D T Security Service Contact Person: Customer Service
 Contractor Address: P.O. Box 371956 Pittsburgh, PA 15250-7956
 Vendor Number (if known): C03996 Contact Phone No.: 1-800-238-2455

Section 3. Transaction Information

Date Waiver Request Submitted: 06/23/2010 Type of Contract: Dept. Purchase Orders
 Contract Start Date: 07/01/2010 End Date: 06/30/2011 Dollar Amount of Contract: \$3,800.

Section 4. Administrative Code Chapter to be Waived (please check all that apply)

- Chapter 12B
- Chapter 14B *Note: Employment and LBE subcontracting requirements may still be in force even when a 14B waiver (type A or B) is granted.*

Section 5. Waiver Type (Letter of Justification *must* be attached, see Check List on back of page.)

- A. Sole Source
- B. Emergency (pursuant to Administrative Code §6.60 or 21.15)
- C. Public Entity
- D. No Potential Contractors Comply – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: _____
- E. Government Bulk Purchasing Arrangement – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: 6/24/2010
- F. Sham/Shell Entity – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: _____
- G. Local Business Enterprise (LBE) (for contracts in excess of \$5 million; see Admin. Code §14B.7.1.3)
- H. Subcontracting Goals

HRC ACTION	
12B Waiver Granted: _____	14B Waiver Granted: _____
12B Waiver Denied: _____	14B Waiver Denied: _____
Reason for Action: _____	
HRC Staff: _____	Date: _____
HRC Staff: _____	Date: _____
HRC Director: _____	Date: _____

DEPARTMENT ACTION – This section must be completed and returned to HRC for waiver types D, E & F.
 Date Waiver Granted: _____ Contract Dollar Amount: _____

(21)



ANIMAL CARE AND CONTROL DEPARTMENT

REBECCA KATZ
Acting Director

1200 15th STREET
SAN FRANCISCO
CALIFORNIA 94103
(415) 554-6364
FAX (415) 557-9950
TDD (415) 554-9704

May 4th, 2010

To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to request a waiver for ADT Security Service who monitors our internal and external security.

Our security system was installed in 1989-1990 by ADT and has been operative since that time. Our premises are 1200 15th Street @ Harrison in the industrial outskirts of the Mission District. We know that prostitution, drug dealing and petty theft occur here on a regular basis. Our employees' cars have been broken into periodically.

Since we are a 24/7 operation, we need a security system that will monitor our campus all day and all night. To protect the safety of the animals under our care as well as the safety of the employees and volunteers working here, security is essential.

To replace the security system at this point would be cost-prohibitive. I urge you to approve the waiver for ADT Security so that the personnel and property at the city animal shelter will be safeguarded.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Kathleen Brown".

Kathleen Brown
Deputy Director



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

S.F. ADMINISTRATIVE CODE CHAPTERS 12B and 14B WAIVER REQUEST FORM (HRC Form 201)

FOR HRC USE ONLY
Request Number: _____
BY _____ AK
2010 JUN 24 AM 11:28
RECEIVED BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SAN FRANCISCO

Section 1. Department Information

Department Head Signature: [Signature]
 Name of Department: Animal Care & Control
 Department Address: 1200 15th Street, San Francisco, CA 94103
 Contact Person: Harold Powell
 Phone Number: 554-6914 Fax Number: 554-6156

Section 2. Contractor Information

Contractor Name: Idexx Distribution Corp. Contact Person: Peter Larsen
 Contractor Address: One Idexx Drive Westbrook, ME 04092
 Vendor Number (if known): 32502 Contact Phone No.: 800-551-0998

Section 3. Transaction Information

Date Waiver Request Submitted: 06/23/2010 Type of Contract: Dept. Purchase Orders
 Contract Start Date: 07/01/2010 End Date: 06/30/2011 Dollar Amount of Contract: \$2,000.

Section 4. Administrative Code Chapter to be Waived (please check all that apply)

- Chapter 12B
- Chapter 14B *Note: Employment and LBE subcontracting requirements may still be in force even when a 14B waiver (type A or B) is granted.*

Section 5. Waiver Type (Letter of Justification *must* be attached, see Check List on back of page.)

- A. Sole Source
- B. Emergency (pursuant to Administrative Code §6.60 or 21.15)
- C. Public Entity
- D. No Potential Contractors Comply – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: 6/24/2010
- E. Government Bulk Purchasing Arrangement – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: _____
- F. Sham/Shell Entity – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: _____
- G. Local Business Enterprise (LBE) (for contracts in excess of \$5 million; see Admin. Code §14B.7.1.3)
- H. Subcontracting Goals

HRC ACTION	
12B Waiver Granted: _____	14B Waiver Granted: _____
12B Waiver Denied: _____	14B Waiver Denied: _____
Reason for Action: _____	
HRC Staff: _____ Date: _____	
HRC Staff: _____ Date: _____	
HRC Director: _____ Date: _____	
DEPARTMENT ACTION – This section must be completed and returned to HRC for waiver types D, E & F.	
Date Waiver Granted: _____	Contract Dollar Amount: _____

22



ANIMAL CARE AND CONTROL DEPARTMENT

REBECCA KATZ
Acting Director

1200 15th STREET
SAN FRANCISCO
CALIFORNIA 94103
(415) 554-6364
FAX (415) 557-9950
TDD (415) 554-9704

May 4th, 2010

To Whom It May Concern ,

I am writing this letter to request a purchasing waiver for IDEXX Laboratories. This Lab provides tissue and poison testing we need in the course of conducting criminal cases involving animals. Timely and accurate data from an accredited laboratory is essential to the successful prosecution of criminal cases. Without the ability to provide good evidence in a criminal trial, the continued success of the San Francisco Animal Care & Control in our nationally recognized animal shelter program is at risk.

No potential contractor is in compliance with the City requirements at this time. Therefore, we respectfully request that you permit a purchasing waiver for IDEXX Laboratories.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Kathleen Brown" followed by a horizontal line.

Kathleen Brown
Deputy Director



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

S.F. ADMINISTRATIVE CODE CHAPTERS 12B and 14B WAIVER REQUEST FORM (HRC Form 201)

FOR HRC USE ONLY	
Request Number: _____	
BY _____	AR _____
2010 JUN 24 AM 11:27	
RECEIVED BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SAN FRANCISCO	

Section 1. Department Information

Department Head Signature: X. Rebecca Katz
 Name of Department: Animal Care & Control
 Department Address: 1200 15th Street, San Francisco, CA 94103
 Contact Person: Harold Powell
 Phone Number: 554-6914 Fax Number: 554-6156

Section 2. Contractor Information

Contractor Name: Merial Limited Contact Person: Customer Service
 Contractor Address: 3239 Staelite Blvd. Duluth GA, 30096
 Vendor Number (if known): 29169 Contact Phone No.: 888-637-4251

Section 3. Transaction Information

Date Waiver Request Submitted: 06/23/2010 Type of Contract: Dept Blanket
 Contract Start Date: 07/01/2010 End Date: 06/30/2011 Dollar Amount of Contract:
 \$25,000.00

Section 4. Administrative Code Chapter to be Waived (please check all that apply)

- Chapter 12B
- Chapter 14B *Note: Employment and LBE subcontracting requirements may still be in force even when a 14B waiver (type A or B) is granted.*

Section 5. Waiver Type (Letter of Justification *must* be attached, see Check List on back of page.)

- A. Sole Source
- B. Emergency (pursuant to Administrative Code §6.60 or 21.15)
- C. Public Entity
- D. No Potential Contractors Comply – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: 6/24/2010
- E. Government Bulk Purchasing Arrangement – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: _____
- F. Sham/Shell Entity – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: _____
- G. Local Business Enterprise (LBE) (for contracts in excess of \$5 million; see Admin. Code §14B.7.1.3)
- H. Subcontracting Goals

HRC ACTION	
12B Waiver Granted: _____	14B Waiver Granted: _____
12B Waiver Denied: _____	14B Waiver Denied: _____
Reason for Action: _____	
HRC Staff: _____ Date: _____	
HRC Staff: _____ Date: _____	
HRC Director: _____ Date: _____	
DEPARTMENT ACTION – This section must be completed and returned to HRC for waiver types D, E & F.	
Date Waiver Granted: _____	Contract Dollar Amount: _____

2



SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF
ANIMAL CARE AND
CONTROL

Rebecca Katz
Interim Director

Kathleen Brown
Deputy Director

Judy Choy
Shelter Office
Supervisor

Deb Campbell
Community Affairs
Coordinator

R. Bing Dilts, D.V.M.
Shelter Veterinarian

Vicky Guildbech
Operations Manager

Eric Zuercher
Animal Care
Supervisor

1200 15th Street
(at Harrison Street)
San Francisco
CA 94103

(415) 554-6364
Fax (415) 557-9950
TDD (415) 554-9704

www.animalshelter.sfgov.org

4/29/10


Ms. Tammy Winchester
Human Rights Commission
25 Van Ness Av. Suite 800
San Francisco, CA. 94102-6033

Re: Waiver Request for Merial

Dear Ms. Winchester,

I would like to request a sole source waiver for Merial. They supply our Rabies vaccine. I am requesting a waiver for Merial on the grounds that they are sole source for these vaccines. We have found that these vaccines work best for our animals and keep the incidence of contagious disease very low in the shelter. It is vital that the city's stray and surrendered animals receive medical care and to do this, I must have vaccines that prevent disease. I will continue to try to find other companies who will comply with the law, but in the interim, I will need to be able to give the animals at ACC vaccines. Please consider my request for Sole Source waiver for Merial.

Sincerely,


R. Bing Dilts D.V.M.



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

S.F. ADMINISTRATIVE CODE CHAPTERS 12B and 14B WAIVER REQUEST FORM (HRC Form 201)

FOR HRC USE ONLY	
Request Number: _____	
BY _____	AK _____
2010 JUN 24 AM 11:27	
RECEIVED BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SAN FRANCISCO	

Section 1. Department Information

Department Head Signature: [Signature]
 Name of Department: Animal Care & Control
 Department Address: 1200 15th Street, San Francisco, CA 94103
 Contact Person: Harold Powell
 Phone Number: 554-6914
 Fax Number: 554-6156

Section 2. Contractor Information

Contractor Name: Merry X-Ray Chem. Corp. Contact Person: Georgia R Bucoy
 Contractor Address: 3239 Staelite Blvd. GA, 30096
 Vendor Number (if known): 12360 Contact Phone No.: 650-742-66301

Section 3. Transaction Information

Date Waiver Request Submitted: 6/23/2010 Type of Contract: Dept. Purchase Order
 Contract Start Date: 07/01/2010 End Date: 06/30/2011 Dollar Amount of Contract:
 \$5,500.00

Section 4. Administrative Code Chapter to be Waived (please check all that apply)

- Chapter 12B
- Chapter 14B Note: Employment and LBE subcontracting requirements may still be in force even when a 14B waiver (type A or B) is granted.

Section 5. Waiver Type (Letter of Justification must be attached, see Check List on back of page.)

- A. Sole Source
- B. Emergency (pursuant to Administrative Code §6.60 or 21.15)
- C. Public Entity
- D. No Potential Contractors Comply – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: 6/24/2010
- E. Government Bulk Purchasing Arrangement – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: _____
- F. Sham/Shell Entity – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: _____
- G. Local Business Enterprise (LBE) (for contracts in excess of \$5 million; see Admin. Code §14B.7.1.3)
- H. Subcontracting Goals

HRC ACTION	
12B Waiver Granted: _____	14B Waiver Granted: _____
12B Waiver Denied: _____	14B Waiver Denied: _____
Reason for Action: _____	
HRC Staff: _____	Date: _____
HRC Staff: _____	Date: _____
HRC Director: _____	Date: _____
DEPARTMENT ACTION – This section must be completed and returned to HRC for waiver types D, E & F.	
Date Waiver Granted: _____	Contract Dollar Amount: _____

2



**SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF
ANIMAL CARE AND
CONTROL**

**Rebecca Katz
Interim Director**

**Kathleen Brown
Deputy Director**

**Judy Choy
Shelter Office
Supervisor**

**Deb Campbell
Community Affairs
Coordinator**

**R. Bing Dilts, D.V.M.
Shelter Veterinarian**

**Vicky Guldbach
Operations Manager**

**Eric Zuercher
Animal Care
Supervisor**

1200 15th Street
(at Harrison Street)
San Francisco
CA 94103

(415) 554-6364
Fax (415) 557-9950
TDD (415) 554-9704

www.animalshelter.sfgov.org

4/29/10


Ms. Tammy Winchester
Human Rights Commission
25 Van Ness Av. Suite 800
San Francisco, CA. 94102-6033

Re: Waiver Request for Merry X-Ray

Dear Ms. Winchester,

I would like to request a waiver (of the equal benefits law) for Merry X-ray (formerly SourceOne Healthcare Technologies.) They service our radiographic equipment (X-rays) and provide our X-ray film. I would like to request a waiver for SourceOne Healthcare Technologies on the grounds that no other company will comply with the City's domestic partner's law. It is vital that the city's stray and surrendered animals receive medical care and to do this, I must be able to have diagnostic radiographic equipment available. I will continue to try to find other companies who will comply with the law, but in the interim, I will need to be able to take X-rays of animals to diagnose fractures, impactions and other problems. Please approve a wavier of SourceOne Healthcare Technologies.

Sincerely,


R. Bing Dilts D.V.M.



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

S.F. ADMINISTRATIVE CODE CHAPTERS 12B and 14B WAIVER REQUEST FORM (HRC Form 201)

FOR HRC USE ONLY	
Request Number: _____	
BY _____	AK _____
2010 JUN 24 AM 11:27	
RECEIVED BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SAN FRANCISCO	

Section 1. Department Information

Department Head Signature: [Signature]
 Name of Department: Animal Care & Control
 Department Address: 1200 15th Street, San Francisco, CA 94103
 Contact Person: Harold Powell
 Phone Number: 554-6914 Fax Number: 554-6156

Section 2. Contractor Information

Contractor Name: Radition Detection Co. Contact Person: Richard H. Holden
 Contractor Address: 8095 Camino Arroyo Gilroy CA 95020
 Vendor Number (if known): 15288 Contact Phone No.: 408-842-2700

Section 3. Transaction Information

Date Waiver Request Submitted: 06/23/2010 Type of Contract: Dept. Purchase Order
 Contract Start Date: 07/01/2010 End Date: 06/30/2011 Dollar Amount of Contract:
 \$1,500.00

Section 4. Administrative Code Chapter to be Waived (please check all that apply)

- Chapter 12B
- Chapter 14B *Note: Employment and LBE subcontracting requirements may still be in force even when a 14B waiver (type A or B) is granted.*

Section 5. Waiver Type (Letter of Justification *must* be attached, see Check List on back of page.)

- A. Sole Source
- B. Emergency (pursuant to Administrative Code §6.60 or 21.15)
- C. Public Entity
- D. No Potential Contractors Comply – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: _____
- E. Government Bulk Purchasing Arrangement – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: 6/24/2010
- F. Sham/Shell Entity – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: _____
- G. Local Business Enterprise (LBE) (for contracts in excess of \$5 million; see Admin. Code §14B.7.1.3)
- H. Subcontracting Goals

HRC ACTION	
12B Waiver Granted: _____	14B Waiver Granted: _____
12B Waiver Denied: _____	14B Waiver Denied: _____
Reason for Action: _____	
HRC Staff: _____	Date: _____
HRC Staff: _____	Date: _____
HRC Director: _____	Date: _____
DEPARTMENT ACTION – This section must be completed and returned to HRC for waiver types D, E & F.	
Date Waiver Granted: _____	Contract Dollar Amount: _____

2



**SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF
ANIMAL CARE AND
CONTROL**

Rebecca Katz
Interim Director

Kathleen Brown
Deputy Director

Judy Choy
Shelter Office
Supervisor

Deb Campbell
Community Affairs
Coordinator

R. Bing Dilts, D.V.M.
Shelter Veterinarian

Vicky Guldbach
Operations Manager

Eric Zuercher
Animal Care
Supervisor

1200 15th Street
(at Harrison Street)
San Francisco
CA 94103

(415) 554-6364
Fax (415) 557-9950
TDD (415) 554-9704

www.animalshelter.sfgov.org

4/29/10

Ms. Tammy Winchester.
Human Rights Commission
25 Van Ness Av. Suite 800
San Francisco, CA. 94102-6033

Re: Waiver Request for Radiation Detection Company

Dear Ms. Winchester,

I would like to request a waiver for Radiation Detection Company. By law, Animal Care and Control must have radiation detection badges (for employees that perform radiographs) if we utilize radiographic (X-ray) equipment. I would like to request a waiver for Radiation Detection Company on the grounds that no other company will comply with the City's domestic partner's law. Also, I have found out that S.F. General Hospital also uses this company. It is vital that the city's stray and surrendered animals receive medical care and to do this, I must be able to perform radiographs. I will continue to try to find other companies who will comply with the law, but in the interim, I will need to be able to perform radiographs to diagnose the animals at Animal Care and Control.

Sincerely,


R. Bing Dilts D.V.M.



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

S.F. ADMINISTRATIVE CODE CHAPTERS 12B and 14B WAIVER REQUEST FORM (HRC Form 201)

FOR HRC USE ONLY	
Request Number: _____	
BY _____	AK _____
2010 JUN 24 AM 11:27	
RECEIVED BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SAN FRANCISCO	

Section 1. Department Information

Department Head Signature: [Signature]
 Name of Department: Animal Care & Control
 Department Address: 1200 15th Street, San Francisco, CA 94103
 Contact Person: Harold Powell
 Phone Number: 554-6914 Fax Number: 554-6156

Section 2. Contractor Information

Contractor Name: Safeway Inc Contact Person: Customer Service
 Contractor Address: 5918 Stoneridge Mall Road Pleasanton CA, 94588
 Vendor Number (if known): 16135 Contact Phone No.: 925-467-3000

Section 3. Transaction Information

Date Waiver Request Submitted: 06/23/2010 Type of Contract: Dept. Purchase Orders
 Contract Start Date: 07/01/2010 End Date: 06/30/2011 Dollar Amount of Contract: \$2,000.

Section 4. Administrative Code Chapter to be Waived (please check all that apply)

- Chapter 12B
- Chapter 14B Note: Employment and LBE subcontracting requirements may still be in force even when a 14B waiver (type A or B) is granted.

Section 5. Waiver Type (Letter of Justification *must* be attached, see Check List on back of page.)

- A. Sole Source
- B. Emergency (pursuant to Administrative Code §6.60 or 21.15)
- C. Public Entity
- D. No Potential Contractors Comply – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: 6/24/2010
- E. Government Bulk Purchasing Arrangement – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: _____
- F. Sham/Shell Entity – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: _____
- G. Local Business Enterprise (LBE) (for contracts in excess of \$5 million; see Admin. Code §14B.7.1.3)
- H. Subcontracting Goals

HRC ACTION	
12B Waiver Granted: _____	14B Waiver Granted: _____
12B Waiver Denied: _____	14B Waiver Denied: _____
Reason for Action: _____	
HRC Staff: _____	Date: _____
HRC Staff: _____	Date: _____
HRC Director: _____	Date: _____
DEPARTMENT ACTION – This section must be completed and returned to HRC for waiver types D, E & F.	
Date Waiver Granted: _____	Contract Dollar Amount: _____

2



ANIMAL CARE AND CONTROL DEPARTMENT

REBECCA KATZ
Acting Director

1200 15th STREET
SAN FRANCISCO
CALIFORNIA 94103
(415) 554-6364
FAX (415) 557-9950
TDD (415) 554-9704

May 4th, 2010

To Whom It May Concern ,

I am writing this letter to request a purchasing waiver for Safeway Corporation. Safeway Stores carry many of the essential groceries that the Animal Care Supervisor needs on a biweekly basis for the care of animals that come to our shelter. We do not have the luxury of planning for them because we are an open door shelter. Animals are brought in by citizens and we are mandated to care for them appropriately and humanely by City ordinance and by state law.

In reviewing the current City vendor list, we find that the status of all grocery-type stores available to us (except for Albertsons located on the other side of town and is exempt) are problematic. Some carry one or the other of the products but not all of the products we need. We buy some emergency fresh produce for reptiles and exotic birds, baby food for small mammals and Pedialyte for feeding underage animals. This service is essential to the continued success of the San Francisco Animal Care & Control in our nationally recognized animal shelter program.

No potential contractor is in compliance with the City requirements at this time. However, we are continuing to be vigilant for an alternative to Safeway.

I respectfully request that you permit a purchasing waiver for Safeway Corporation.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Brown
Deputy Director



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

S.F. ADMINISTRATIVE CODE CHAPTERS 12B and 14B WAIVER REQUEST FORM (HRC Form 201)

FOR HRC USE ONLY	
Request Number:	
BY _____	

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2010 JUN 24 AM 10:58

Section 1. Department Information

Department Head Signature: [Signature]
 Name of Department: Animal Care & Control
 Department Address: 1200 15th Street, San Francisco, CA 94103
 Contact Person: Harold Powell
 Phone Number: 554-6914 Fax Number: 554-6156

Section 2. Contractor Information

Contractor Name: TW Medical Vet Supply Contact Person: Customer Service
 Contractor Address: ;3610 Lohman Ford Lago Vista TX, 78645
 Vendor Number (if known): 57364 Contact Phone No.:512-867-8800

Section 3. Transaction Information

Date Waiver Request Submitted: 6/23/2010 Type of Contract: Dept. Blanket
 Contract Start Date: 07/01/2010 End Date: 06/30/2011 Dollar Amount of Contract:
 \$35,000

Section 4. Administrative Code Chapter to be Waived (please check all that apply)

- Chapter 12B
- Chapter 14B *Note: Employment and LBE subcontracting requirements may still be in force even when a 14B waiver (type A or B) is granted.*

Section 5. Waiver Type (Letter of Justification *must* be attached, see Check List on back of page.)

- A. Sole Source
- B. Emergency (pursuant to Administrative Code §6.60 or 21.15)
- C. Public Entity
- D. No Potential Contractors Comply – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: 6/24/2010
- E. Government Bulk Purchasing Arrangement – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on:
- F. Sham/Shell Entity – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on:
- G. Local Business Enterprise (LBE) (for contracts in excess of \$5 million; see Admin. Code §14B.7.1.3)
- H. Subcontracting Goals

HRC ACTION	
12B Waiver Granted: _____	14B Waiver Granted: _____
12B Waiver Denied: _____	14B Waiver Denied: _____
Reason for Action: _____	
HRC Staff: _____	Date: _____
HRC Staff: _____	Date: _____
HRC Director: _____	Date: _____

DEPARTMENT ACTION – This section must be completed and returned to HRC for waiver types D, E & F.

27



**SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF
ANIMAL CARE AND
CONTROL**

**Rebecca Katz
Interim Director**

**Kathleen Brown
Deputy Director**

**Judy Choy
Shelter Office
Supervisor**

**Deb Campbell
Community Affairs
Coordinator**

**R. Bing Dilts, D.V.M.
Shelter Veterinarian**

**Vicky Guldbeck
Operations Manager**

**Eric Zuercher
Animal Care
Supervisor**

1200 15th Street
(at Harrison Street)
San Francisco
CA 94103

(415) 554-6364
Fax (415) 557-9950
TDD (415) 554-9704

www.animalshelter.sfgov.org

4/29/10


Ms. Tammy Winchester.
Human Rights Commission
25 Van Ness Av. Suite 800
San Francisco, CA. 94102-6033

Re: Waiver Request for T.W. Medical


Dear Ms. Winchester,

I would like to request a waiver for T.W. Medical Supply Company. Since T.W. Medical is our only source of general veterinary pharmaceuticals and supplies that had been approved by the City of San Francisco, this has left us in quite a bind. I would like to request a waiver for T. W. Medical Supply Company on the grounds that no other distributorship will comply with the City's domestic partner's law. It is vital that the city's stray and surrendered animals receive medical care and to do this, I must have supplies. I will continue to try to find other suppliers who will comply with the law, but in the interim, I will need supplies in order to treat the City's animals.

Sincerely,


R. Bing Dilts D.V.M.

Opening the Door
to Your Success



San Francisco
Association of
REALTORS

June 21, 2010

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
JUN 22 AM 8:00

Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, California 94102

Dear Supervisors:

Mayor Gavin Newsom is proposing amendments to the city's condominium conversion ordinance to provide that any building that participated in the 2010 condominium lottery but was not selected for conversion may bypass the annual lottery limitation if the building owners comply with applicable conversion rules and pay a conversion fee of \$20,000 per unit for the entire building no later than February 1, 2011. The fee would be reduced for each year the building has participated in the condominium conversion lottery up to and including the 2010 lottery according to a stated formula.

301 Grove Street
San Francisco
CA 94102

P: 415.431.8500
F: 415.553.3968

Under the proposed amendments, the Department of Public Works would determine whether an applicant's condominium subdivision application is complete or the application is deemed complete by operation of law by July 31, 2011. The applicant would have to obtain final and effective approval of the condominium subdivision or parcel map no later than December 31, 2011.

Tenant activists who oppose the amendments argue that they will diminish the stock of rental housing in the city and cause speculators to buy up properties and evict tenants. None of these scenarios are possible under the amendments for the following reasons:

- Virtually all of the buildings in the 2010 lottery are tenancies-in-common and 100 percent owner-occupied. It is impossible for the amendments to cause a diminution of the stock of rental housing in the city since the only buildings that would qualify for conversion are buildings that participated in the 2010 lottery.
- The 2010 lottery already has been held. Consequently, it would be impossible for the amendments to cause speculators to buy up properties and evict tenants because they would not be able to take advantage of the amendments. Additionally, there are provisions in the Subdivision Code that virtually prohibit building owners from evicting tenants and then participating in the lottery.

www.sfrealtors.com

28

June 21, 2010
Page 2


Tenancies-in-common have become popular in San Francisco because of the huge unmet demand for affordable ownership housing in the city and the fact that the city has adopted a policy of virtually disallowing conversions.

As you probably know, a tenancy-in-common (TIC) is a form of real property ownership where two or more persons are owners of undivided interests in the property. Unlike condominiums, residential property owned as a TIC is not subdivided. For that reason, there is no ownership of a particular unit as is the case with a condominium. Instead, with TIC ownership there usually is an unrecorded written agreement signed by all of the co-owners that assigns the exclusive use and occupancy of a particular part of the property, commonly known by a unit number or address, to a particular owner.

TIC ownership is far from an ideal form of real property ownership. It involves the risks of sharing the use of a property with others and relying on them to fulfill their obligations to each other. Owners of TIC interests share major obligations such as mortgages, property taxes, and building maintenance and management. If an owner of a TIC interest fails to make a monthly payment due to unemployment, divorce or other reason and a mortgage default results, the lender could foreclose on the entire property.

The amendments proposed by Mayor Gavin Newsom will have no adverse effects and only improve the situation in which a defined group of TIC owners find themselves. In addition, they are likely to generate millions of dollars in revenue for the city to help erase part of the city's projected budget deficit for Fiscal Year 2010-11. There are compelling reasons to approve the amendments and we urge the full board to do so.

Sincerely yours,



James C. Fabris
Chief Executive Officer

cc: Supervisor Michela Alioto-Pier
Supervisor David Campos
Supervisor David Chiu
Supervisor Carmen Chu
Supervisor Bevan Dufty
Supervisor Chris Daly
Supervisor Sean Elsbernd
Supervisor Eric Mar
Supervisor Sophie Maxwell
Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi
Mayor Gavin Newsom

City and County of San Francisco



Gavin Newsom
Mayor

Department of Public Health
¹⁰⁰⁻¹¹⁻¹⁹⁰
COB
Tangerine M. Brigham
Deputy Director of Health
Director of Healthy San Francisco

June 30, 2010

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: San Francisco Health Care Security Ordinance

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

Enclosed please find a status report on the above-referenced matter as required by Section 14.4(f) of the San Francisco Health Care Security Ordinance. The report provides an update on the development and implementation of the Employer Spending Requirement and the Healthy San Francisco Program.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please do not hesitate to contact either Ms. Donna Mandel at 554.4791 for aspects concerning the Employer Spending Requirement or myself at 554.2779 for aspects concerning the Healthy San Francisco Program.

Sincerely,

Tangerine Brigham
Deputy Director of Health
Director of Healthy San Francisco

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN 30 AM 8:34
BY le

20

**STATUS REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
SAN FRANCISCO
HEALTH CARE SECURITY ORDINANCE**

**A Report of
the Department of Public Health and
the Office of Labor Standards Enforcement**

**Submitted to the
San Francisco Board of Supervisors**

June 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	3
I. Introduction	5
II. Golden Gate Restaurant Association Lawsuit	6
III. Employer Spending Requirement	8
IV. Healthy San Francisco	11
V. Federal Health Reform and Health Care Security Ordinance	18

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In July 2006, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted the San Francisco Health Care Security Ordinance (Ordinance No. 218-06) and further amended it in April 2007 (Ordinance No. 69-07). The Ordinance created two City and County programs, the Employer Spending Requirement (ESR) and Healthy San Francisco (HSF). Both program components of the Ordinance work in tandem and are designed to address the health needs of San Francisco's uninsured residents and workers. The Office of Labor Standards Enforcement (OLSE) oversees enforcement of the ESR while the Department of Public Health (DPH) oversees HSF.

The Ordinance requires regular reporting to the Board of Supervisors on the status of both programs (ESR and HSF) from July 2007 to June 2010. Quarterly reports were required during the period from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008 and semi-annual reports from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2010. The last report was submitted in January 2010 and this report provides an update on the implementation and operation of the Ordinance since that time. This report meets the mandated reporting requirement and constitutes the final report based on Section 14.4(f) of the Ordinance.

Golden Gate Restaurant Association Lawsuit

Since the filing of the last status report, the most significant event to occur with respect to the Ordinance is that on June 28, 2010, the U.S. Supreme Court declined to hear the Golden Gate Restaurant Association's (GGRA) federal lawsuit challenging the validity of the ESR. As a result of denying GGRA's petition for review, the U.S. Supreme Court effectively sustained the September 30, 2008 U.S. Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruling upholding the legality of the City's employer spending requirement for health care. The ESR remains in effect for all covered businesses.

In October 2009, the Supreme Court had invited the U.S. Solicitor General to file a brief expressing the federal government's views on the GGRA case. On May 28, 2010, U. S. Solicitor General filed its brief which urged the Supreme Court not to take the case. The Solicitor General stated that the U.S. Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal's ruling in favor of the City and County did not conflict with any prior ERISA preemption decision of the Supreme Court. The Solicitor General also noted that passage of federal health care reform had dramatically changed the landscape regarding health coverage, making it much less likely that state and local governments would seek to enact programs like San Francisco's, thereby rendering the ERISA preemption question presented in the GGRA case much less important.

OLSE and DPH Activities

Specifically, the following activities have occurred:

- The Office of Labor Standards Enforcement (OLSE):
 - As of June 23, 2010, OLSE had opened 330 cases regarding employer compliance with the Employer Spending Requirement. Of those, 123 have been closed and 207 are still open.

- OLSE has assessed penalties in a total amount of approximately \$20,000.
- OLSE worked with a student from UC Berkeley's Goldman School of Public Policy to determine whether Health Spending Accounts, one of the options employers may choose to satisfy the Employer Spending Requirement, adequately meet the goal of providing reasonable access to health care to those who work in San Francisco. OLSE anticipates releasing the report shortly.
- OLSE completed its analysis of the 2008 HCSO Annual Reporting Forms and the data indicates:
 - ❖ When sorted by employer size, all categories of employers (500+ employees, 100-499 employees, 50-99 employees, 20-49 employees) report their primary method of making health care expenditures to be group health insurance (84% of all employers).
 - ❖ There is a correlation between employer size and participation in the City Option (Healthy San Francisco): the larger the employer, the more likely it will enroll employees in the City Option.
 - ❖ When sorted by industry sectors, Construction was most likely to use health insurance (92%), the Administrative, Support, Waste Management, and Remediation Services was most likely use the City Option (21%) and the Accommodation and Food Services was most likely use health spending account administered by a third-party administrator (42%).
 - ❖ Of employers who chose to use health spending accounts administered by third parties, 80% reported reimbursing 50% or less of the minimum expenditure required under the law. Fifty-seven percent reported reimbursing 10% or less than the minimum expenditure.
- The Department of Public Health (DPH):
 - Reached enrollment of 53,294 uninsured San Francisco adult residents in Healthy San Francisco (88% of estimated 60,000 uninsured adults).
 - Completed components of an independent program evaluation.
 - Developed new program materials in response to data revealed by the 2009 *Survey of Healthy San Francisco Participants*.
 - Collaborated with the San Francisco Health Plan and St. Francis Hospital to launch a Patient Navigator Pilot.
 - Retained a graduate student to develop and write a policy brief on lessons learned from the development, planning and implementation of Healthy San Francisco as technical assistance tool for other localities contemplating similar health care delivery systems.

I. INTRODUCTION

An estimated 60,000 adult San Francisco residents are uninsured.¹ These residents have limited access to routine preventative care, delay seeking treatment when ill, suffer from poorer health outcomes and ultimately rely on more costly episodic or emergency care for health conditions that could have been treated in primary care settings.

In July 2006, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted the San Francisco Health Care Security Ordinance (Ordinance No. 218-06) which created two new City and County programs, the Employer Spending Requirement (ESR) and Healthy San Francisco (HSF). The programs work in tandem and are designed to address the health needs of San Francisco's uninsured residents and workers.

The ESR requires medium and large businesses to spend a minimum amount on health care for their employees. Employers have flexibility in how they make their required expenditure, as long as it is used for health care for their employees. In order to provide affordable health care options, the Ordinance also created HSF. HSF provides universal, comprehensive, affordable health care to uninsured adults irrespective of the person's income level, employment status, immigration status or pre-existing medical conditions. It integrates public and private providers into a single system to provide universal care without relying on health insurance.

HSF became operational on July 2, 2007. The ESR went into effect on January 9, 2008 for San Francisco employers with 50 or more employees and on April 1, 2008 for for-profit employers with 20-49 employees.

The Ordinance specifies the roles and responsibilities of various City and County agencies in the development and maintenance of this Ordinance. They are:

- Office of Labor Standards Enforcement (OLSE) – Enforces the ESR provisions.
- Department of Public Health (DPH) – Administers the HSF program.
- Controller's Office – Ensures that any required health care expenditures made by an employer to the City are kept separate and apart from general funds and limits use of these funds to HSF.
- Office of Treasurer and Tax Collector – Provides to OLSE all non-financial information necessary for OLSE to fulfill its responsibilities.

¹ Estimate is based on the 2007 California Health Interview Survey (CHIS) which is the nation's largest state health survey. CHIS provides detailed data on the health and health care needs of California residents. It is conducted by the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research.

II. GOLDEN GATE RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION LAWSUIT

In November 2006, the Golden Gate Restaurant Association filed a lawsuit against the City and County of San Francisco challenging the Employer Spending Requirement ("ESR") of the Health Care Security Ordinance ("Ordinance") on the grounds that it conflicted with the federal Employee Retirement Income Security Act ("ERISA"). The lawsuit did not challenge the legality of the Healthy San Francisco program.

On December 26, 2007, the United States District Court ("Court") issued an order granting the motion for summary judgment filed by the Golden Gate Restaurant Association. The Court ruled that the City and County San Francisco could not implement the ESR provisions of the Ordinance because of federal ERISA preemption.

On December 27, 2007, the San Francisco City Attorney filed a petition with the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit ("Ninth Circuit") asking for an emergency stay pending appeal of the lower court's decision.

On January 9, 2008, the Ninth Circuit granted the City Attorney's petition which allowed the Health Care Security Ordinance to go into effect on January 9, 2008, pending the City and County's appeal of the Court's decision. As a result of the Ninth Circuit ruling, the ESR became effective on January 9, 2008 for employers with 50 or more employees. The effective date for for-profit employers with 20-49 employees was April 1, 2008.

On February 7, 2008, the Golden Gate Restaurant Association (GGRA) filed an application to the U. S. Supreme Court, seeking to lift the Court of Appeals' ruling.

On February 21, 2008, United States Supreme Court denied the GGRA's application.

On April 17, 2008, Ninth Circuit heard oral arguments on the appeal. On September 30, 2008, a three-judge panel of the Ninth Circuit issued a unanimous ruling that the ESR enacted under the Ordinance was not pre-empted by federal law. The decision overturned the December 26, 2007 United States District Court decision and allowed for continued operation of the ESR.

On October 21, 2008, the GGRA filed a petition with the Ninth Circuit for "Rehearing En Banc." The petition asks the full panel of judges in the Ninth Circuit to review the decision of the three-judge panel.

On March 9, 2009, the Ninth Circuit denied GGRA's request for a rehearing of the three-judge panel decision that the ESR was not pre-empted by federal law.

On March 18, 2009, GGRA filed an emergency application to the U.S. Supreme Court, seeking to prevent the City and County from continuing to implement the ESR while GGRA prepared its appeal, which was due June 8, 2009.

On March 30, 2009, U.S. Supreme Court Justice Kennedy denied GGRA's emergency application and the ESR continued to be in effect.

On June 8, 2009, GGRA filed a petition with the U.S. Supreme Court requesting that the Supreme Court rule on the legality of the ESR of the Health Care Security Ordinance.

On October 5, 2009, the Supreme Court invited the U.S. Solicitor General to file a brief expressing the federal government's views on the case.

On May 28, 2010, the United States Solicitor General filed its brief to the United States Supreme Court urging the Supreme Court not to take the case. The Solicitor General stated that the U.S. Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal's ruling in favor of the City and County did not conflict with any prior ERISA preemption decision of the Supreme Court. The Solicitor General also noted that passage of federal health care reform has dramatically changed the landscape regarding health coverage, making it much less likely that state and local governments will seek to enact programs like San Francisco's, thereby rendering the ERISA preemption question presented by this case much less important:

On June 7, 2010, GGRA filed a reply to the United States Solicitor General's brief.

On June 9, 2010, the City and County of San Francisco Attorney General filed a supplemental brief in response to the United States Solicitor General's brief.

On June 28, 2010, the U.S. Supreme Court announced that it would not hear GGRA's petition. As a result, the U.S. Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal's September 30, 2008 decision upholding the Employer Spending Requirement remains in effect for all covered businesses.

III. EMPLOYER SPENDING REQUIREMENT

Pursuant to Section 14.4(h) of the Ordinance, this section provides an update on the enforcement and administration of the employer obligations under the Health Care Security Ordinance (HCSO).

The OLSE continues to respond to public inquiries regarding the Employer Spending Requirement and to review employer compliance with the ESR. The extreme uptick in the number of telephone calls and emails in April was the result of the annual mailing to employers of the Annual Reporting Forms.

Month (2010)	HCSO E-mails	HCSO Calls*
January	122	106
February	120	114
March	116	160
April	221	895
May	29	234
June (as of 6/15/10)	10	59
Total	618	1,568

*Note: Reflects unduplicated (new) calls only

As of June 23, 2010, the OLSE had opened 330 cases. One hundred and twenty-three (123) HCSO cases (37% of total cases) have been resolved/closed by the OLSE and 207 (63% of total cases) are open. While the percentage of closed cases has increased, the number of open cases has continued to grow. Of the 207 open cases, 92 cases (44%) were initiated by worker complaints and 16 cases (8%) were audits initiated by the OLSE, after the agency received evidence that the business was either not in compliance or experiencing difficulties coming into compliance. The remaining 99 cases (48%) were initiated by employers who voluntarily contacted the OLSE to seek assistance in coming into ESR compliance.

	12/19/08	1/22/09	6/12/09	12/10/09	6/23/10
Total Cases Ever Opened	115	138	230	278	330
Closed Cases	21 (18%)	24 (17%)	43 (19%)	73 (26%)	123 (37%)
Open Cases/Backlog	94 (82%)	114 (83%)	187 (81%)	205 (74%)	207 (63%)
Source of Open Cases	94	114	187	205	207
Initiated by Worker Complaint	58 (62%)	69 (61%)	76 (41%)	80 (39%)	92 (44%)
Initiated by OLSE Audit	14 (15%)	14 (12%)	13 (7%)	17 (8%)	16 (8%)
Initiated by Voluntary Compliance	22 (23%)	31 (27%)	98 (52%)	108 (53%)	99 (48%)

OLSE has instituted efficiencies that allow the office to resolve cases where employers have requested assistance with coming into compliance with the HCSO. OLSE has also developed a standardized methodology for assessing penalties against employers that are found in violation of the law. To date OLSE has assessed penalties in a total amount of approximately \$20,000.

The following are highlights of OLSE's analysis of the 2008 Annual Reporting Forms:

- When sorted by employer size, all categories of employers (500+ employees, 100-499 employees, 50-99 employees, 20-49 employees) report their primary method of making health care expenditures to be group health insurance. Eight-four percent of all employers report group health insurance or self-insured plans to be their primary method of making health care expenditures.
- There is a correlation between employer size and participation in the City Option (Healthy San Francisco): the larger the employer, the more likely it will enroll employees in the City Option.

Primary Expenditure Type by Business Size
(counts each employer once, in the category that they used for most employees)

Employer Size (# of employees)	Group Health Insurance	Self-Insured Plan	Health Spending Account (administered by TPA)	Direct Reimbursement by Covered Employer	City Option
Medium Employers	83%	3%	8%	3%	4%
20-49	83%	3%	8%	3%	4%
50-99	80%	2%	10%	2%	6%
Large Employers	78%	9%	6%	1%	6%
100-499	78%	9%	6%	1%	6%
500+	44%	38%	5%	1%	12%
Total	72%	12%	7%	2%	7%

- When sorted by industry, Construction was the sector most likely to make health care expenditures through health insurance (92%). Administrative, Support, Waste Management, and Remediation Services was the sector most likely to make health care expenditures through the City Option (21%). Accommodation and Food Services was the sector most likely to make health care expenditures through a health spending account administered by a third-party administrator (42%).

Expenditure Type, by Industry
(counts each employer once, in the category that they used for most employees)

NAICS Industry Code	No. of Businesses	Group Health Insurance	Self-Insured Plan	Health Spending Acct (administered by TPA)	Direct Reimbursement by Employer	City Option
Accommodation and Food Services	152	38%	1%	42%	5%	14%
Admin, Support, Waste Management and Remediation Services	97	59%	9%	9%	2%	21%
Retail Trade	145	61%	15%	11%	5%	8%
N/A (industry code not available)	986	67%	15%	8%	1%	9%
Other	115	72%	10%	9%	3%	7%
Manufacturing	83	76%	16%	2%	6%	n/a
Wholesale Trade	73	80%	16%	n/a	n/a	4%

NAICS Industry Code	No. of Businesses	Group Health Insurance	Self-Insured Plan	Health Spending Acct (administered by TPA)	Direct Reimbursement by Employer	City Option
Information	115	80%	14%	2%	0%	4%
Finance and Insurance	92	82%	16%	1%	0%	1%
Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services	390	83%	10%	2%	2%	3%
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	68	84%	9%	4%	2%	2%
Construction	198	92%	3%	2%	1%	2%

- Of employers who chose to use health spending accounts administered by third parties, 80 percent reported reimbursing 50 percent or less of the minimum expenditure required under the law. Fifty-seven percent reported reimbursing 10 percent or less than the minimum expenditure required under the law.

OLSE is currently processing the 2009 Annual Reporting Forms, which were recently submitted by employers to the office. With data from the 2008 and 2009 reporting, an analysis of trends among employer cohorts will be possible, shedding further light on employer health care spending.

In March 2010, OLSE's lead (and only full time) staffperson for HCSO education and enforcement began a one-year leave of absence. OLSE shifted staff resources and a newly hired compliance officer has been assigned to HCSO enforcement. OLSE has also received approval to backfill the vacant HCSO supervisor position. The entire OLSE staff is teaming up again this year, with the help of a summer intern from UC Berkeley, to process and analyze the annual reporting forms.

In the academic spring semester (January to May 2010), the OLSE worked with a student from UC Berkeley's Goldman School of Public Policy to determine whether Health Reimbursement Accounts (HRAs), one of the options employers may choose to satisfy the Employer Spending Requirement, adequately meet the goal of providing reasonable access to health care to those who work in San Francisco. OLSE anticipates that this report will be released shortly.

IV. HEALTHY SAN FRANCISCO

This section provides a summary of Healthy San Francisco and Medical Reimbursement Account components of the Health Care Security Ordinance. The Department of Public Health (DPH) is responsible for implementing and administering these components.

A. Major Activities since Submission of July 2009 Status Report

Since the January 2010 status report to the Board of Supervisors, DPH has:

1. Reached enrollment of over 53,000 uninsured San Francisco adult residents into Healthy San Francisco. Based on an estimated 60,000 uninsured adults, to date, the program has enrolled 88% of the population.
2. Entered into discussions and negotiations with other non-profit providers for their potential participation in the Healthy San Francisco provider network.
3. Completed several secondary and primary data gathering components of an independent program evaluation.
4. Developed, issued and distributed new program materials in response to data revealed by the August 2009 Kaiser Family Foundation independent *Survey of Healthy San Francisco Participants*.
5. Collaborated with the San Francisco Health Plan and St. Francis Hospital to launch a Patient Navigator Pilot.
6. Retained the assistance of a graduate student from the University of California at Berkeley, Goldman School for Public Policy to develop a policy brief on lessons learned from the development, planning and implementation of Healthy San Francisco.

B. Healthy San Francisco Enrollment

As of late June 2010, there were 53,294 participant residents enrolled in HSF. This represents 89% of the estimated number of uninsured adults (60,000). The estimated number of uninsured is taken from data in the 2007 California Health Interview Survey which estimated 60,000 uninsured adults residing in San Francisco. Because HSF is a voluntary program, it is not anticipated that all uninsured residents will elect to enroll. As a result, the number of participants will be less than the number of uninsured adults.

The following chart provides basic demographic information based on the participants:

Age	10% are 18 - 24; 42% are 25 - 44; 24% are 45 - 54; 24% are 55 - 64
Ethnicity	38% Asian/Pacific Islander; 24% Latino; 20% Caucasian; 9% African-American, 3% Other; less than 1% Native American; 5% Not Provided
Gender	47% female; 53% male
Income	69% at/below 100% FPL; 23% between 101 - 200% FPL; 7% between 201 - 300% FPL; 1% at/above 301% FPL
Language	53% English; 26% Cantonese/Mandarin; 18% Spanish; 1% Filipino (Tagalog and Ilocano); 2% Other

Twenty-six percent (26%) of Healthy San Francisco participants reside in the Excelsior or Mission districts. Homeless individuals comprise 14% of all HSF participants.

The HSF program has expanded access to care. The program routinely collects information on whether participants are existing clients or are new to the health care delivery system. Obtaining this information has been helpful in ascertaining the extent to which HSF serves an uninsured population that previously did not seek or receive services. To date, 20% of all those enrolled were not previous users of the health care delivery system (i.e., "new" -- defined as an individual who indicates that they have not received clinical services from the primary care medical home they selected within the last two years). The remaining 80% of program participants are existing patients.

Providing program participants with a primary care medical home is a principal feature of HSF. The program is premised on the notion that primary care settings provide a more efficient mechanism to deliver preventive and primary care services, conduct disease management, and coordinate care across providers and service settings. HSF has five primary care medical home delivery systems. As of late June 2010, the distribution of participants across these systems is as follows:

- Chinese Community Health Care Association – 2.01% (1,072 participants)
- Department of Public Health – 48.30% (25,737 participants)
- Kaiser Permanente – 5.09% (2,712 participants)
- San Francisco Community Clinic Consortium – 42.83% (21,139 participants)
- Sister Mary Phillipa Health Center – 2.22% (1,184 participants)

The Department regularly monitors and analyzes participant disenrollments from HSF. Disenrollments can occur because participants no longer meet the program eligibility criteria, no longer choose to remain in the program and voluntarily disenroll, do not pay the required quarterly participation fee, etc. Individuals who are disenrolled from the program have the option to re-enroll at any time.

In the area of disenrollment, DPH continues to focus its efforts on reducing the number of HSF participants who fail to renew in the program before their annual eligibility period ends. In late June 2010, 64% of all disenrollments were due to incomplete annual renewals. Approximately 77% of the individuals disenrolled for not completing the annual renewal process had annual incomes at or below 100% of the Federal Poverty Level. Individuals at this income level pay no participation fees or point-of-service fees (with the exception of fees for emergency care, when appropriate). As a result, there should be no financial barriers to their program renewal. This fiscal year, DPH augmented its renewal activities by: (1) instituting an automated telephone call reminding participants to renew on time, (2) including renewal reminders in each issue of Heart Beat, the HSF participant newsletter and (3) launching a renewal lottery incentive program. These activities are done in addition to the mailed renewal notices (90, 60, and 30 days prior to the end of their annual term) that participants receive.

Individuals who are disenrolled from the program can re-enroll at any time, if eligible. The Department tracks the enrollment history of participants to determine enrollment patterns. Re-enrollment into the program can be viewed as an indicator of continued interest in and value of the program to participants. As of late June 2010, there were 11,964 individuals who had voluntarily elected to re-enroll in the program after being disenrolled and were current HSF participants again. The data notes that the majority of the re-enrollments (81%) occur for those individuals who were originally disenrolled because they did not complete their annual renewal on time.

C. Provider Network Expansion

The Department continues to engage with private (non-profit and for-profit) providers about participating in the Healthy San Francisco provider network. Interest has been expressed by some of these providers and the Department is working with each to determine the scope of Healthy San Francisco services that would be provided by any one of the delivery systems. It is anticipated that expansion of the provider network will occur during fiscal year 2010-11.

The Department views expansion of the network as a two-pronged strategy. First, it helps ensure continued appropriate access to care as the number of participants in the program increases. Second, it will offer those private (non-profit and for-profit) providers with limited experience serving low-income and moderate income uninsured individuals more of an opportunity to serve this population which will be beneficial to them as the nation prepares to expand health insurance to uninsured residents under federal Health Reform.

D. Evaluation

As noted in the July 2009 report, DPH selected Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. to conduct the independent program evaluation. Since the January 2010 report, the following evaluation activities have occurred:

- Mathematica conducted the second round of in-depth stakeholder interviews in February 2010 with Department and non-profit providers, funders and other key entities.
- Mathematica developed and fielded the Healthy San Francisco provider survey designed to obtain valuable feedback from those of you delivering services to HSF participants in the medical home setting. The survey was in the field during the months of May and June 2010.

E. Survey of Healthy San Francisco Participants

As reported in the January 2010 report, results from the by Kaiser Family Foundation funded and administered Healthy San Francisco participant survey were released. While the survey findings were quite promising, at the same time, because HSF was still relatively new at the time the survey was administered, there were some challenges that survey respondents identified which are more reflective of the start-up nature of the program. Specifically:

- Some program awareness/education challenges (e.g., not health insurance, services only in San Francisco, annual program renewal) for those in fair or poor health and those with lower levels of education.
- Non-English speakers report slightly more challenges with the enrollment process and written materials.
- Participants made recommendations on program improvements, most notably streamlining the medical appointment process to further ensure access to care.

To help address issues related to program awareness and understanding of the program among participants, the Department developed a Healthy San Francisco "Next Steps" tool for both application assistors and participants. The purpose of the "Next Steps" document is to improve understanding of the program among newly enrolled participants as it relates service coverage, payments, included services, and other key information. The document is distributed to all new, renewing, re-enrolling participants. Assistors explain the document's content to participants and note the medical home and re-enrollment date prior to handing it to the newly enrolled participant. The document is in three languages: English, Chinese and Spanish.

F. Patient Navigator Pilot

The Patient Navigator Pilot is a partnership between the Department of Public Health, St. Francis Hospital, participating Healthy San Francisco medical homes and San Francisco Health Plan to conduct on-site patient navigation (non-medical) at St. Francis Hospital. The goals of the program include reducing avoidable emergency services use and linking patients with a medical home provider upon hospital discharge. The pilot launched in May 2010.

G. Policy Brief: Lessons from Healthy San Francisco

The Department retained a graduate student from the University of California at Berkeley, Goldman School for Public Policy to develop a policy brief on lessons learned from the development, planning and implementation of Healthy San Francisco. The policy brief components were to:

- Describe key implementation and design features that have contributed to the program's success.
- Outline key features of the political and fiscal environment in the City and County of San Francisco that have contributed to the program's success.
- Understand the smart practices and transferability literature
- Determine which program components (e.g., eligibility, policies, scope of services, structure, etc.) were transferable to other communities.

The policy brief notes that Healthy San Francisco offers a model for improving access and the delivery of care to low-income uninsured individuals through the health care safety net. San Francisco's experience illuminates three important ways of strengthening the local health system:

- the program created a simpler, more transparent system of care to reduce barriers to needed services ("patient-centered reform"),

- the program restructured the county indigent health system to emphasize preventive care and continuity in primary care, rather than costly episodic and emergency care (“delivery system reform”) and
- the program expanded access to care to all uninsured adult residents of San Francisco (“coverage expansion”).

The policy brief notes that policymakers will need to decide which of these health reforms is most important to pursue based on the local health needs, political will and resources of their communities. It describes the essential design functions and features of Healthy San Francisco that achieve each type of reform:

Patient-centered reform

1. *By providing information and materials to facilitate program participation, communities can reduce difficulties patients experience in accessing services and create a sense of membership in an organized health care program that is less likely be perceived as charity care by participants. Program materials may take a variety of forms, including a program website, enrollment identification cards, a participant handbook, preventive health care mailers, educational materials, newsletters, renewal reminder notices, etc.*
2. *Offering customer service for personal inquiries and complaints is a simple but important way to help safety net users navigate the health delivery system. Similarly, health insurance exchanges will be required to maintain a call center for customer service under the new health reform law.*
3. *Participation fees should be both predictable and affordable to reduce anxiety about the cost of care and to provide incentives for appropriate utilization of primary and preventive health care services. The fee structure should be within recognized health care affordability standards, and it should be evaluated regularly to ensure individual contributions do not impede access to care for the near-poor population.*
4. *A single, streamlined eligibility determination and enrollment system for multiple health programs simplifies the screening and enrollment process, maximizes access to public funding streams and creates a comprehensive database for planning and evaluation. This is also a stated goal of the reform legislation.*

Delivery system reform

5. *Although insurance coverage is preferable, an access model provides an affordable alternative to health insurance and allows counties to continue to leverage state and federal funds to support the uninsured.*
6. *Assigning participants to a primary care medical home reduces duplication and improves care coordination. As opposed to a crisis delivery approach, the medical home model provides a more appropriate setting for delivering routine*

primary and preventive care services, managing chronic conditions and coordinating access to care across providers and service settings.

7. *Cooperation between public and private providers maximizes available resources to care for the uninsured.* To start, communities should integrate existing public and non-profit/private providers serving the safety net population into a coordinated health network. Bringing relevant entities, including public hospitals and clinics, community-based groups, charitable hospitals, physicians organizations and others, into the program's planning process increases buy-in.
8. *An organized health delivery system provides a better framework for monitoring patterns of care and identifying opportunities for improving access and quality.* To assess areas for clinical and administrative improvement, safety net programs should examine utilization patterns, access and clinical data for participants and compare performance to recognized quality standards.

Coverage expansion

9. *Through a shared responsibility approach, communities can achieve a sustainable funding base for expanding access to care.*

The policy brief further notes that underlying San Francisco's health reforms is a set of conditions and circumstances, which made reform achievable at the local level. In addition to the political support for comprehensive reform, San Francisco had the advantages of a strong existing public health infrastructure, a unified local government and critical administrative partners. These factors both shaped and supported the policy development of the city's health care law. Finally, it notes that while many of San Francisco's reforms can be adopted in other jurisdictions, each policy will necessarily look different depending on the local context.

The report was finalized in May 2010 and was posted on the HSF website at:
[http://healthysanfrancisco.org/files/PDF/Lessons From Healthy San Francisco.pdf](http://healthysanfrancisco.org/files/PDF/Lessons%20From%20Healthy%20San%20Francisco.pdf).

H. Employer Selection of City Option to Meet Employer Spending Requirement
San Francisco employers are selecting the City Option to meet the Employer Spending Requirement (ESR) of the Health Care Security Ordinance. When an employer chooses the City Option, their employees will receive either Healthy San Francisco or a Medical Reimbursement Account depending upon the employee's eligibility.

If the employee is eligible for HSF, the employee will be notified and must complete the HSF application process to get enrolled in the program. An employer does not enroll an employee into HSF. If the employee is ineligible for HSF, then they will be given a Medical Reimbursement Account (MRA). All funds contributed on the employee's behalf by the employer are deposited into this account and the employee can access these funds to reimburse for out-of-pocket health care expenses.

Since implementation of the ESR (January 2008) to end of May 2010, 1,118 employers had elected to use the City Option. These employers have committed \$79,560 million on behalf of 55,125 employees (eligible for either HSF or MRA). Of that amount, roughly half (46%) is for employees are potentially eligible for HSF (\$36,762 million) and the other half (54%) are potentially eligible for MRA (\$42,798 million). Of the total funds committed by employers, \$78,923 million in health care expenditures (99%) have been collected to date.

Employer payments are submitted to the HSF Third-Party Administrator (the San Francisco Health Plan) for processing. The Third-Party Administrator transfers the Healthy San Francisco component of the employer payments to DPH on a periodic basis. DPH then submits these funds to the City Controller's Office for processing and deposit. In accordance with the Health Care Security Ordinance, those funds are used for the HSF program. To date, \$38.58 million in funds have been transferred from the Third-Party Administrator to the City and County of San Francisco. The amount transferred includes any employer contributions and HSF program participation fees paid by enrollees on a quarterly basis.

Employer health care expenditures designated for a Medical Reimbursement Account are not transferred to the City and County of San Francisco. Participant eligibility and contribution information is forwarded to the Medical Reimbursement Account vendor and accounts are created for each employee to use for reimbursable health care expenses. Funds are transferred weekly to the MRA vendor for claims and monthly for administrative fees.

V. FEDERAL HEALTH REFORM AND HEALTH CARE SECURITY ORDINANCE

In March 2010, President Obama signed H.R. 3590, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and H.R. 4872, the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010. These bills make historic changes to the U.S. health care system and are referred to herein together as "Health Reform."

Health Reform is projected to insure 32 million people who are uninsured today, of which 7.3 million are uninsured Californians. Ultimately, 92 percent of U.S. residents will have health insurance by 2016.

U.S. citizens and legal residents will be required to have health insurance. To help individuals meet that requirement, Health Reform expands eligibility for Medicaid, creates health insurance exchanges to allow individuals and small businesses to purchase coverage, and creates new requirements for private health insurance providers to make health insurance more accessible and affordable. Health Reform makes a number of tax changes and includes cost containment measures as well as provisions to improve quality and performance. In addition, Health Reform makes investments in public health, including prevention and wellness programs, and the healthcare workforce.

Within the framework for Health Reform, there lies ahead a significant amount of work on interpretation and implementation that must be accomplished at the federal and state levels. For that reason, it is too early to state with any certainty or specificity what impact these reforms will have on San Francisco. However, Health Reform will have a potential impact on aspects of the Health Care Security Ordinance. But, the impact would likely not occur until 2014 when the major components of Health Reform become effective.

A. Employer Spending Requirement (ESR)

The Employer Spending Requirement (ESR) and Health Reform share a similar objective; namely, to ensure that employers provide health benefits to their employees. However, each provision approaches this common goal differently with respect to employer obligation, business size, covered employee and employer expenditure.

Health Reform is narrower in its intent and impact than ESR. The significant differences between Health Reform and ESR are:

1. Health Reform does not create an employer mandate, while ESR is an employer mandate.
2. Health Reform applies to a smaller number of employers (i.e., size of business based on number of employees) and employees (i.e., eligible employees based on hours worked) than ESR.

The chart on the following page provides a side-by-side comparison of both pieces of legislation.

Health Reform and ESR -- Side-By-Side Comparison of Major Provisions

Legislation	Employer Mandate	Business Size	Eligible Employees	Employer Expenditure/Penalty
CCSF Employer Spending Requirement	Yes. Mandated provision to make health care expenditures.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All for-profit businesses with 20+ employees All non-profit businesses with 50+ employees 	At least 8 hours per week (after 90 days of work); includes seasonal workers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amount based on formula (size of employer and annual expenditure rate). For 2010, \$1.31 for medium sized (20 -99) and \$1.96 for large sized (100+). Adjusted annually.
Federal Health Care and Education Reconciliation of 2010	<p>No. Provision of health coverage or payment of assessed fee.</p> <p>Note: Employers with 200 or more employees must automatically enroll employee into insurance plan.</p>	All businesses with 50+ employees	Full-time employees (30 hours a week; excludes seasonal workers)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If employer does not offer health insurance and at least one employee is in Exchange, annual penalty is \$2,000 per full-time employee (excluding first 30 employees). If employer does offer health insurance and at least one employee is in Exchange, pay lesser of \$3,000 per employee in Exchange or \$2,000 per full-time employee. Employees with 50 or fewer employees are exempt from penalties. Penalty limit Penalty amounts indexed after 2014.

The assessment to date is that the ESR will remain in effect under Health Reform. The City and County (City Attorney Office, Office of Labor Standard Enforcement or Department of Public Health) is aware of no language in Health Reform which suggests an intent by the federal government to interfere with San Francisco's ESR. Although the City Attorney's Office is analyzing Health Reform in more detail, the City and County will operate under the assumption that it remains fully authorized to operate the ESR. As noted above, the federal employer requirement does not take effect until 2014. To the extent any inconsistency may arise in the implementation of Health Reform and ESR, these can presumably be addressed with federal or local regulation between now and 2014.

B. Healthy San Francisco (HSF)

Full implementation of the Health Reform (after 2014) will decrease the number of adults San Francisco residents eligible for and enrolled in HSF by an estimated 60%. However, because the major health insurance expansion components of the Health Reform do not take effect until January 2014, DPH does not anticipate an immediate or significant reduction in HSF enrollment or HSF General Fund expenditures at this time.

In addition, the HSF program will still be needed after Health Reform is fully implemented.

Health Reform is beneficial to San Francisco on two fronts:

1. Health Reform provides health insurance opportunities for uninsured some HSF participants. Health insurance is preferable to HSF.
2. Some health care services costs now incurred by the City and County's General Fund for the HSF program will be funded by federal/state funds post 2014.

At the same time, full implementation of Health Reform (post 2014) will not dismantle HSF. The City and County will still need to maintain and operate the HSF program, albeit serving fewer people. The HSF program will continue because:

1. Health Reform does not cover all uninsured individuals (e.g., those with exemptions).
2. While Health Reform creates an individual mandate for health insurance, it is unlikely that all uninsured individuals will comply with this mandate. Some uninsured individuals may elect not to enroll in the subsidized health insurance exchanges or purchase private insurance for various reasons (e.g., financial, inability to complete paperwork, etc.). Financially, some may decide that the cost of getting health insurance through the exchange is more than the combined cost of participating in HSF and paying the penalty for not having health insurance.
3. Some individuals may be unable to provide sufficient documentation of public health insurance eligibility, etc.

Because HSF is not health insurance, it could not be a health insurance product in any health exchange established by the State nor does enrollment in HSF meet the individual health insurance mandate. The Department of Public Health is not recommending that HSF be converted to a health insurance plan or product. Over the course of next three years, the Department will re-examine key features of the HSF program (eligibility, fee/subsidy structure, network, etc.) to determine if changes are needed as components of the Health Reform legislation are implemented.

In many respects, implementation of Healthy San Francisco and the Department's participation in the Health Care Coverage Initiative will help prepare San Francisco's uninsured residents and providers for Health Reform. For example through HSF, the Department has:

- Created a single, streamlined eligibility determination and enrollment for multiple health programs – a stated goal in the Health Reform legislation
- Expanded the network of providers serving uninsured residents – this has been critical to ensuring access and combating preconceived notions related to serving uninsured persons
- Promoted the use of primary care medical homes – critical to reducing episodic care
- Data identifying uninsured adults that are potentially eligible for Medi-Cal – this will enable the City and County to work effectively and efficiently to assist individuals in the Medi-Cal application process.



State of California—Health and Human Services Agency
California Department of Public Health

305-11
epage



RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
JUN 24 PM 12:31
ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER
Governor

June 1, 2010

Ms. Twila Brown, RN, MPH
MCAH Director
San Francisco County
30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 260
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Ms. Brown:

APPROVAL OF BUDGET REVISION FOR BLACK INFANT HEALTH (BIH)
SUBCONTRACT (POLARIS) OF AGREEMENT #2009-38 FY 09/10

Your budget revision request # 1 for the BIH Polaris subcontract for \$297,690, dated May 25, 2010, has been received.

Based upon our review, your budget revision has been approved as submitted. We have enclosed a copy of your approved budget for your files. Please ensure that all necessary staff are aware of these revisions and are using this approved budget for future invoicing. The effective date of this revision is July 1, 2009.

Please retain a copy of this letter in your files for audit and administrative purposes. If you have any questions related to this letter, please contact your Contract Manager, O. B. Ray at (916) 650-0411 or by e-mail at ob.ray@cdph.ca.gov

Sincerely,

O. B. Ray
Contract Manager
Allocation and Matched Funding
Maternal, Child and Adolescent Health Division

Enclosure(s)

30

I. BUDGET SUMMARY PAGE		FY: 2009 - 2010		Title V Balance		SGF Balance		Total Balance		Base MCF		% Personnel Matched					
Budget Revision Number: <u>Original</u>										73.5	13.40%						
Program:		UNMATCHED FUNDING						NON - ENHANCED MATCHING (50/50)			ENHANCED MATCHING (75/25)						
Agency:		BIH-TV		BIH-GF		AGENCY		BIH-N		CNTY-N	BIH-E		CNTY-E		(16)	(17)	
Agreement No.:		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	
EXPENSE CATEGORY		TOTAL FUNDING	%	Federal	%	State General Funds	%	Local * Revenue	%	Combined Fed/State	%	Combined * Fed/Agency	%	Combined Fed/State	%	Combined* Fed/Agency	
(I) PERSONNEL		277,546	72.28%	200,615			14.43%	40,047			13.29%	36,884					100%
(II) OPERATING EXPENSES		92,369	55.76%	51,504			30.38%	28,066			13.86%	12,799					100%
(III) CAPITAL EXPENDITURES																	
(IV) OTHER COSTS																	
(V) INDIRECT COSTS		(10% MAX) 22,204	86.71%	19,253					0.00%		13.29%	2,951					100%
TOTALS*		392,119	69.21%	271,372			17.37%	68,113			13.42%	52,634					100%

Maximum Amount Payable from State and Federal resources: **297,690**

	State Funding	Budgeted	Balances	% of Budget
Total Title V	271,372	271,372		69%
Total State General Fund				
Total Agency General Fund		94,430	n/a	24%
Total Matching Title XIX		26,317	n/a	7%
Totals	271,372	392,119		100%

WE CERTIFY THAT THIS BUDGET HAS BEEN CONSTRUCTED IN COMPLIANCE WITH ALL MCAH ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROGRAM POLICIES.




MCAH/PROJECT DIRECTOR'S SIGNATURE DATE: 05/25/2010 AGENCY FISCAL AGENT'S SIGNATURE DATE: 5/25/10

* These amounts contain local revenue submitted for information and matching purposes. MCAH does not reimburse Agency contributions.

State Use Only		BIH-TV	BIH-GF		BIH-N	BIH/ CNTY-N	BIH-E	BIH/ CNTY-E
(I) PERSONNEL		200,615				18,442		
(II) OPERATING COSTS		51,504				6,400		
(III) CAPITAL EXPENDITURES								
(IV) OTHER COSTS								
(V) INDIRECT COSTS		19,253				1,476		
Totals for PCA Codes **	297,690	271,372				26,318		

Program: BIH Black infant Health		UNMATCHED FUNDING					NON - ENHANCED MATCHING (50/50)			ENHANCED MATCHING (75/25)								
Agency:	San Francisco BIH -Polans	BIH-TV		BIH-GF		AGENCY		BIH-N		CNTY-N		BIH-E		CNTY-E				
Agreement No.:	200938	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)
EXPENSE CATEGORY	TOTAL FUNDING	%	Federal	%	State General Funds	%	Local * Revenue	%	Combined Fed/State	%	Combined * Fed/Agency	%	Combined Fed/State	%	Combined * Fed/Agency			

II. OPERATING EXPENSES DETAIL PAGE

II. OPERATING EXPENSES DETAIL PAGE															Match		
TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES	92,369		51,604				28,066				12,799					Used	Avail.
TRAVEL	3,582	47.60%	1,705				19.40%	695			33.00%	1,182				33.00%	
TRAINING	5,375	27.00%	1,451				25.00%	1,344			48.00%	2,580				48.00%	
1 Space Rental, Phone, and Internet access	55,809	42.50%	23,719				44.10%	24,612			13.40%	7,478				13.40%	0.00%
2 Reproduction and Printing	3,500	47.70%	1,670				38.90%	1,362			13.40%	469				13.40%	0.00%
3 Community Awareness/Events	5,000	100.00%	5,000														13.40%
4 Educational Materials	2,018	100.00%	2,018														13.40%
5 Technical Services and Marketing	8,130	86.60%	7,041								13.40%	1,089				13.40%	0.00%
6 Materials and Supplies	8,955	99.40%	8,901				0.60%	54									13.40%
7																	13.40%
8																	13.40%
9																	13.40%
10																	13.40%
11																	13.40%
12																	13.40%
13																	13.40%
14																	13.40%
15																	13.40%

IV. OTHER COSTS DETAIL PAGE

IV. OTHER COSTS DETAIL PAGE															Match		
TOTAL OTHER COSTS																Used	Avail.
SUBCONTRACTS																	13.40%
1																	13.40%
2																	13.40%
3																	13.40%
4																	13.40%
5																	13.40%
6																	13.40%
7																	13.40%
8																	13.40%
OTHER CHARGES																	
AGENCY'S TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS																	13.40%
AGENCY'S OTHER INDIRECT COSTS																	13.40%
1																	13.40%
2																	13.40%
3																	13.40%
4																	13.40%
5																	13.40%
6																	13.40%
7																	13.40%

Program: BIH Black Infant Health		UNMATCHED FUNDING						NON - ENHANCED MATCHING (50/50)				ENHANCED MATCHING (75/25)						
Agency:	San Francisco BIH -Polaris	BIH-TV		BIH-GF		AGENCY		BIH-N		CNTY-N		BIH-E		CNTY-E				
Agreement No.:	200938	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)
EXPENSE CATEGORY	TOTAL FUNDING	%	Federal	%	State General Funds	%	Local * Revenue	%	Combined Fed/State	%	Combined * Fed/Agency	%	Combined Fed/State	%	Combined * Fed/Agency			

I. PERSONNEL DETAIL PAGE

TOTAL PERSONNEL COSTS				277,646	200,615		40,047		36,884									
BENEFIT RATE																		
ACTUAL BENEFITS				55,509	40,123		8,009		7,377									
TOTAL WAGES				222,037	160,492		32,037		29,507									
INITIALS	TITLE OR CLASS.	% FTE	ANNUAL SALARY														MCF Per Staff	Staff (X) Travelling
1 DO	Support Ctr Mgr	100.00%	50,000	50,000	50.00%	25,000		30.00%	15,000		20.00%	10,000					81.49	x
2 YC	Sr. Comm Hlth Wkr	100.00%	42,640	42,640	68.00%	28,995		18.00%	7,675		14.00%	5,970					73.50	x
3 CM	Comm Hlth Outreach W	83.58%	39,000	32,596	80.00%	26,077		10.00%	3,260		10.00%	3,260					73.50	x
4 A C	Comm Hlth Aide	83.42%	39,000	32,534	80.00%	26,027		5.00%	1,627		15.00%	4,880					73.50	x
5 TW	Comm Hlth Aide	100.00%	37,500	37,500	80.00%	30,000		10.00%	3,750		10.00%	3,750					73.50	x
6 CM	Contractor Liason/Monit	11.28%	91,520	10,322	86.56%	8,934		5.44%	561		8.00%	826					73.50	x
7 RO	Chief Financial Officer	20.27%	81,120	16,445	94.00%	15,458		1.00%	164		5.00%	822					73.50	x
8																		
9																		
10																		
11																		
12																		
13																		
14																		
15																		
16																		
17																		
18																		
19																		
20																		
21																		
22																		
23																		
24																		
25																		
26																		
27																		
28																		
29																		
30																		
31																		
32																		

B65-11
cpage



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Certificate of Determination EXEMPTION FROM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Case No.: 2010.0274E
Project Title: T-Mobile Wireless Telecommunications Facilities
Block/Lot: Multiple Locations
Project Sponsor: Corey Alvin, T-Mobile, (415) 760-9763
Staff Contact: Don Lewis, (415) 575-9095, don.lewis@sfgov.org

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

T-Mobile proposes to install up to 25 wireless telecommunications facilities (WTFs) onto existing utility poles in the public right-of-way in San Francisco. Each WTF facility would consist of two equipment cabinets, one power meter, associated cables, and three panel antennas mounted together at the top, and all of these components would be attached to an existing utility pole (this equipment is described in further detail below). T-Mobile has provided a list of these new 25 locations at which antennas would be added as part of the proposed WTF project. The locations are distributed throughout the city and are not concentrated in one particular area. Each existing utility pole would be extended by up to approximately ten feet in height, to a total height ranging from 36 feet to 52 feet. No equipment would be installed on the ground or on buildings. The proposed WTFs would operate on both Personal Communication Services

(Continued on next page.)

EXEMPT STATUS:

Categorical Exemption, Class 3 [State CEQA Guidelines Section 15303(d)]

REMARKS:

See next page.

DETERMINATION:

I do hereby certify that the above determination has been made pursuant to State and Local requirements.

BILL WYCKO
Environmental Review Officer

June 23, 2010
Date

cc: Corey Alvin, Project Contact
Historical Preservation List
Board of Supervisors

Jonas Ionin, Neighborhood Planning
Bulletin Board, M.D.F.
Ranjit Parhar, Department of Public Works

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
JUN 29 PM 3:36
ke

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (CONTINUED):

(PCS) and cellular frequencies for the sole purpose of providing telecommunication service to wireless customers.

The proposed panel antennas would be 26.1 inches in height, 6.1 inches in width, and 2.7 inches in depth; the proposed equipment cabinets would be 24 inches in height, 17 inches in width, and 11 inches in depth; and the proposed power meter would be 10.88 inches in height, 8 inches in width, and 3.5 inches in depth.

The panel antenna type would be Kathrein Model 742-211 and the total effective radiated power from the three antennas would be a total of 86 watts per site. Ground disturbance is not required for any of the proposed WTF installations. The antennas would be mounted with up to 6 degrees of downtilt at an effective height of at least 36 feet above ground and would be oriented at about 120 degrees in spacing to provide service in all directions.

T-Mobile is required to obtain a Personal Wireless Service Facilities Site Permit (Site Permit) from the Department of Public Works (DPW).¹ Pursuant to DPW's Site Permit, the Planning Department must complete its California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review for the proposed project. In addition, the Department of Public Health must also first make a determination on each individual WTF to ensure compliance with the prevailing FCC-adopted health and safety standards limiting human exposure to radio frequency radiation.

T-Mobile previously submitted 40 WTF locations on March 31, 2009, and on November 12, 2009, the Planning Department issued a Certificate of Determination.²

REMARKS (continued):**Public Views and Aesthetics**

In evaluating whether the proposed wireless telecommunications facilities would be exempt from environmental review, the Planning Department determined that they would not result in a significant impact to public views and aesthetics. Visual quality, by its nature, is highly subjective and different viewers may have varying opinions as to whether the proposed wireless facility contributes negatively to the visual landscape of the City and its neighborhoods. It should be noted that CEQA's primary focus regarding visual impact is on scenic vistas within the public realm and the impact of the project on the existing scenic environment. The CEQA Guidelines provide an Initial Study Checklist (Appendix G)

¹ Regulations for Issuing Personal Wireless Service Facilities Site Permits, City and County of San Francisco Department of Public Works Order No. 177,163. These regulations are available for review at the Planning Department, at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of case file No. 2009.0292E.

² Thirty-nine of the 40 WTF locations have already been installed. This determination is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA as part of Case File No. 2009.0292E.

which indicates that assessments of significant impacts on visual resources should consider whether the project would result in: (1) a substantial, demonstrable negative aesthetic effect; (2) a substantial degradation or obstruction of any scenic view or vista now observed from public areas; or (3) generation of obtrusive light or glare substantially impacting other properties. The proposed project would not result in any of these conditions for the reasons described below.

The project sponsor proposes to deploy 25 wireless facilities onto existing utility poles within the public right-of-way. Based on a review of the submitted locations, no views of more than one affected utility pole would be available from any location. One location would be two blocks from Buena Vista Park, one location would be one block from Buena Vista Park, one location would be one block from Sutro Heights Park, one location borders John McLaren Park, one location borders the Golden Gate Park, one location would be one block from Mission Dolores Park, one location would be two blocks from Lafayette Park, and one location would be one block from the Presidio. Each facility would consist of two brown boxes the size of suitcases and one power meter the size of a shoebox affixed to an existing utility pole. In addition, three antennas would be "stealthed" inside the approximately 10-foot pole extension, which would be the same diameter of the existing utility pole. The antennas would be installed at least 36 feet above the ground level. The proposed wireless facilities would be visible to passersby and observers from nearby buildings but would not be so visually prominent that they would necessarily be noticed. The equipment would be viewed within the immediate context of existing street poles, overhead wires used to provide utility services (e.g., electricity, telephone, and cable television), and the overhead wires that power Muni's electric bus and streetcar fleet. The visual impacts of these wireless facilities would be confined to the immediate areas in which the equipment are located. Utility-related facilities in the public right-of-way are common throughout the City's urbanized environment, and thus the incremental visual effect of the proposed facilities would be minimal. In addition, the proposed wireless facilities would not generate any obtrusive light or glare. The Planning Department reviewed computer-generated photosimulations³ from the project sponsor of the proposed wireless facility which support the Department's conclusion that the proposed project would have a negligible effect on public views and aesthetics.

In reviewing aesthetics under CEQA generally, consideration of the existing context in which a project is proposed is required and evaluation must be based on the impact on the existing environment. That some people may not find them attractive does not mean that they create a significant aesthetic environmental impact. For the proposed project, the context is urban right-of-way that already supports similar utility structures dispersed throughout the City. The proposed wireless facilities are thus consistent with the existing, developed environment. The aesthetics of these facilities are similar to other structures in public right-of-way and therefore cannot be deemed an "unusual circumstance." For those same reasons, the "unusual circumstance" exception to the categorical exemptions is not applicable to aesthetic impacts that are similar to existing or potential comparable structures. These wireless facilities would not be unusual and would not create adverse aesthetic impacts on the environment.

³ Photosimulations of past sites were prepared by the project sponsor and they are available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA as part of Case File No. 2009.0292E.

For all the above reasons, installation of the proposed project would not result in a significant adverse effect on public views or aesthetics.

Historic Resources

In evaluating whether the proposed project would be exempt from environmental review under the CEQA, the Planning Department determined that the proposed project would not result in a significant adverse effect to a historic resource as defined by CEQA. As described in the attached Historic Resource Evaluation Response (HREER) Memorandum, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact to historic resources.⁴ The analysis and conclusions of the HREER are summarized below.

Antennas would be added to existing utility poles within the City and County of San Francisco. As proposed, of the 25 locations for antenna installation, four locations are within areas that have been reviewed in conjunction with adopted or endorsed historic resource surveys, and may be located in areas that are designated or potential historic districts. Antennas have been proposed on utility poles in front of 1102 Anza Street, 200 10th Avenue, 600 Chestnut Street, and 1300 Page Street. Each of these four locations is in close proximity to a parcel that has been identified as a potential historic resource for the purposes of CEQA through the Inner Richmond Survey, the North Beach Survey, the Buena Vista Survey, and/or the 1976 Architectural Survey. However, it is possible that a number of the proposed new wireless facilities would be located in undocumented, potential historic districts. It is possible that some of the proposed new wireless facilities would be located in close proximity to buildings and sites that have been individually designated as local, California, or National historic landmarks. It is also possible that some of the proposed new wireless facilities would be located in close proximity to structures or sites that have not yet been documented, but may be individually eligible for the California Register.

The Department has evaluated the proposed new antennas for existing utility poles that could be located within undocumented potential historic districts within the San Francisco. Based on the size and location of the proposed wireless telecommunications equipment, the Department has determined that the project would conform with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historical Properties (Secretary's Standards)* for any installation proposed within a historic district. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable *Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation*, including but not limited to Standards 9 and 10. Equipment proposed for utility poles within undocumented, potential historic districts would be clearly differentiated from historic streetscapes, and would not destroy historic materials or spatial relationships that characterize the potential districts. The proposed new equipment may be removed in the future without impairing the essential form and integrity of the historic resource, in those cases in which equipment is placed on utility poles located within undocumented potential historic districts. The proposed project calls for the installation of equipment in a manner that will allow it to be completely removed without affecting the essential form or integrity of the streetscape of the potential historic district. The installation of the proposed equipment would not destroy historic building fabric and would be completely reversible. If the equipment is removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the potential historic district and its environment would be unimpaired.

⁴ Historic Resource Evaluation Response Memorandum from Sophie Hayward, Preservation Technical Specialist, to Don Lewis, Planner, Major Environmental Analysis, June 21, 2010. This memorandum is attached.

As noted above, the Department's analysis applies to designated historic districts, designated historic structures, potential historic districts, and potential historic structures. The Department's determination is based on an analysis of the impact of the proposed wireless facilities; it does not appear that a proposed wireless facility would impact the setting of historic resources in a manner that is considered a significant impact and would not significantly impact the character-defining features of a district, nor would a proposed wireless facility negatively impact the integrity of a potential historic district. It is unlikely that the existence of a proposed wireless facility within the public right-of-way would prevent undocumented, potential historic districts or structures from conveying significance.

For the reasons described above, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact to historic resources.

Exempt Status

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) State Guidelines Section 15303, or Class 3, provides for an exemption from environmental review for construction and location of limited numbers of new, small facilities or structures; installation of small new equipment and facilities in small structures; and the conversion of existing small structures from one use to another where only minor modifications are made in the exterior of the structure. CEQA State Guidelines Section 15303(d) specifically applies to utility extensions. The proposed wireless facilities are smaller and less noticeable than many of the examples of structures given in Section 15303 as being categorically exempt under CEQA. Thus, the proposed installations are covered by the range of activities properly exempted pursuant to Class 3.

Exceptions to Exemptions/Exclusions from Environmental Review

CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2 lists exceptions to the use of categorical exemptions. The exceptions include that an exemption shall not be used where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity would have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances (Section 15300.2(c)), where the project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource (Section 15300.2(f)), and where the project would result in a significant cumulative impact (Section 15300.2(b)). As described below, there are no conditions associated with the proposed project that would suggest the possibility of a significant environmental effect.

Radiofrequency Radiation

The proposed equipment would generate radiofrequency (RF) radiation. The applicant submitted a report evaluating the RF emissions that would be generated by the proposed project.⁵ The report concludes that the wireless telecommunications facilities, as proposed, comply with the prevailing FCC-

⁵ Statement by the Consulting Engineers of Hammett & Edison, Inc. on Base Stations on JPA Poles in San Francisco, June 14, 2010. This document is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA as part of Case File No. 2010.0274E.

adopted health and safety standards limiting human exposure to RF energy, and would not for this reason cause a significant effect on the environment. Pursuant to DPW Order No. 177,163, prior to approval of a Personal Wireless-Service Facilities Permit, the Department of Public Health (DPH) ensures that proposed project's RF emissions comply with FCC-adopted public exposure limits.

For the reasons described above, the operation of the proposed wireless telecommunications facilities would not pose a health hazard to the general public. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant effect with regard to RF emissions, and this issue would not trigger an exception to the use of a categorical exemption.

Structural Integrity

The proposed project would involve installation of equipment on existing utility pole structures. The proposed project would have no impact on the PUC's existing obligations to conduct its normal street lighting and traffic signal functions. The structural soundness of the proposed wireless facilities would be ensured by Department of Building Inspection procedures outlined within the Building Code. As such, there are no structural integrity issues that would pose potential significant environmental effects under CEQA, and this issue would not trigger an exception to the use of a categorical exemption.

Historical Resources

As described above, the Planning Department concluded that the proposed project would not cause a significant impact to a historic resource. Therefore, this issue would not trigger an exception to the use of a categorical exemption.

No Cumulative Impacts

CEQA State Guidelines Section 15300.2(b) provides that a categorical exemption shall not apply if significant impacts would result over time from successive projects of the same type in the same place. The proposed project involves the installation of 25 wireless facilities within the public right-of-way throughout the City. By their minimal nature and widely dispersed locations that would not create significant environmental impacts on historic, visual, or other resources, the impacts of the equipment would not aggregate under CEQA to a degree where the project, by itself, would have cumulative impacts.

There are a few competing vendors providing similar service in San Francisco, but since all of the existing and proposed project locations have and would proceed separately at different locations, there would be no foreseeable cumulative impacts due to the proposed project. For the reasons set forth above, this project combined with other ongoing utility and infrastructure work on the public right-of-way would not contribute to cumulative impacts.

Conclusion

As described above, the proposed project would not have a significant effect on historic or visual resources. Also, there are no cumulative impacts or unusual circumstances surrounding the current proposal, including the issues of RF radiation and structural integrity, that would trigger an exception to the application of an exemption. Therefore, the installations would be categorically exempt under Class 3. For all of the above reasons, the proposed project is appropriately exempt from environmental review.



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

Historic Resource Evaluation Response

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

MEA Planner: Don Lewis
Project Address: T-Mobile Wireless Telecommunications Facilities - Various Locations
Block/Lot: Multiple Locations
Case No.: 2010.0274E
Date of Review: June 21, 2010
Planning Dept. Reviewer: Sophie Hayward
 (415) 558-6372 | sophie.hayward@sfgov.org

Reception:
415.558.6378
 Fax:
415.558.6409
 Planning
 Information:
415.558.6377

PROPOSED PROJECT Demolition Alteration

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

T-Mobile proposes to install up to 25 wireless telecommunications facilities (WTF) onto existing utility poles in the public right-of-way in San Francisco. Each WTF facility would consist of two equipment cabinets, one power meter, associated cables, and three panel antennas mounted together at the top, and all of these components would be attached to an existing utility pole (this equipment is described in further detail below). Each utility pole would be extended by up to approximately ten feet in height. No equipment would be installed on the ground or on buildings.

The proposed WTF facility would operate on both Personal Communication Services (PCS) and cellular frequencies for the sole purpose of providing telecommunication service to wireless customers

The proposed panel antennas would be 26.1 inches in height, 6.1 inches in width, and 2.7 inches in depth, the proposed equipment cabinets would be 24 inches in height, 17 inches in width, and 11 inches in depth, and the proposed power meter would be 10.88 inches in height, 8 inches in width, and 3.5 inches in depth.

PRE-EXISTING HISTORIC RATING / SURVEY

T-Mobile has provided a list of the 25 locations at which antennas would be added as part of the proposed WTF project. Antennas would be added to existing utility poles within the City and County of San Francisco. As proposed, of the 25 locations for antenna installation, there are four locations that are within areas that have been reviewed in conjunction with adopted or endorsed historic resource surveys, and may be located in areas that are designated or potential historic districts. Antennas have been proposed on utility poles in front of 1102 Anza Street, 200 10th Avenue, 600 Chestnut Street, and 1300 Page Street. Each of these four locations is in close proximity to a parcel that has been identified as a potential historic resource for the purposes of CEQA through the Inner Richmond Survey, the Northbeach Survey, the Buena Vista Survey, and/or the 1976 Architectural Survey.

The proposed new equipment may also be located on utility poles located within undocumented potential historic districts for the purposes of CEQA.

The proposed new equipment will be located only on existing utility poles and will not be located on individual buildings.

HISTORIC DISTRICT / NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT

As noted above, a number of the existing utility poles selected for use may be located in the public right-of-way within potential historic districts.

1. **California Register Criteria of Significance:** Note, a building may be an historical resource if it meets any of the California Register criteria listed below. If more information is needed to make such a determination please specify what information is needed. *(This determination for California Register Eligibility is made based on existing data and research provided to the Planning Department by the above named preparer / consultant and other parties. Key pages of report and a photograph of the subject building are attached.)*

- Event: or Yes No Unable to determine
Persons: or Yes No Unable to determine
Architecture: or Yes No Unable to determine
Information Potential: Further investigation recommended.
District or Context: Yes, may contribute to a potential district or significant context

If Yes; Period of significance:

Notes: As noted above, of the proposed new equipment to be added to existing utility poles, a number may be located within potential historic districts for the purposes of CEQA.

It is possible that a number of the proposed new equipment will be located in close proximity to buildings and sites that have been individually designated as local, California, or National historic landmarks. It is also possible that a number of the proposed new equipment will be located in close proximity to structures or sites that have not yet been documented, but that may be individually eligible for the California Register.

2. **Integrity** is the ability of a property to convey its significance. To be a resource for the purposes of CEQA, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the California Register criteria, but it also must have integrity. To retain historic integrity a property will always possess several, and usually most, of the aspects. The subject property has retained or lacks integrity from the period of significance noted above:

- Location: Retains Lacks Setting: Retains Lacks
Association: Retains Lacks Feeling: Retains Lacks
Design: Retains Lacks Materials: Retains Lacks
Workmanship: Retains Lacks

Notes: As noted above, a number of the proposed new equipment may be located in undocumented potential historic districts for the purposes of CEQA.

It does not appear that the addition of the proposed new equipment will impact the integrity of any potential historic districts. Based on the submitted information, it appears that any equipment proposed for existing utility poles within an undocumented potential historic district will be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards and Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.

The Department has considered the potential of the proposed new equipment to impair the ability of historical resources, including undocumented potential historic districts, to convey their significance.

The Department has determined the proposed project would be consistent with the applicable *Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation*, including but not limited to Standards 9 and 10, as discussed in Section 4 below.

Pursuant to the submitted project proposal, T-Mobile will locate the new equipment on existing utility poles such that:

- Utility poles selected for use are located outside of the boundaries of designated historic districts;
- Utility poles selected for use are not located adjacent to designated historic sites.

3. Determination Whether the property is an "historical resource" for purposes of CEQA

- No Resource Present (*Go to 6. below*) Historical Resource Present (*Continue to 4.*)

Note: As discussed above, the equipment may be placed on utility poles located within potential historic districts.

4. If the property appears to be an historical resource, whether the proposed project is consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards or if any proposed modifications would materially impair the resource (i.e. alter in an adverse manner those physical characteristics which justify the property's inclusion in any registry to which it belongs).

- The project appears to meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. (*Go to 6. below*)
Optional: See attached explanation of how the project meets standards.

- The project is NOT consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and is a significant impact as proposed. (*Continue to 5. if the project is an alteration*)

Note: Based on information submitted by the project sponsor, it appears that the project proposed by T-Mobile will conform to the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards and Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.

The Department has evaluated the proposed new equipment on existing utility poles on four sites that are located within potential historic districts within the City and County of San Francisco, and

their potential impact to historical resources. The Department has determined that the proposed project is consistent with the *Standards*, including but not limited to Standards 9 and 10 of the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation*.

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Equipment proposed for utility poles within undocumented potential historic districts will be clearly differentiated from historic streetscapes, and will not destroy historic materials or spatial relationships that characterize the potential districts.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

The proposed new equipment may be removed in the future without impairing the essential form and integrity of the historic resource, in those cases in which equipment is placed on utility poles located within undocumented potential historic districts. The proposed project calls for the installation of equipment in a manner that will allow it to be completely removed without affecting the essential form or integrity of the streetscape of the potential historic district. The installation of the proposed equipment will not destroy historic building fabric, and will be completely reversible. If the equipment is removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the potential historic district and its environment would be unimpaired.

As noted above, the Department's analysis applies to designated historic districts, designated historic structures, potential historic districts, and potential historic structures. The Department's determination is based on an analysis of the impact of the proposed equipment; it does not appear that the proposed equipment will impact the setting of historic resources in a manner that is considered a significant impact. It is unlikely that the existence of the proposed equipment within the public rights of way will prevent future as yet undocumented historic districts or structures from conveying significance.

-
5. Character-defining features of the building to be retained or respected in order to avoid a significant adverse effect by the project, presently or cumulatively, as modifications to the project to reduce or avoid impacts. Please recommend conditions of approval that may be desirable to mitigate the project's adverse effects.

Note: As proposed, the project will ensure compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards and Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.


-
6. Whether the proposed project may have an adverse effect on off-site historical resources, such as adjacent historic properties.

Yes No Unable to determine

Notes: As noted above, the proposed new equipment, if located on existing utility poles within undocumented potential historic districts, will not significantly impact the character-defining features of the district, nor will the proposed new equipment negatively impact the integrity of the potential historic districts.

Visual quality, by nature, is highly subjective and different viewers may have varying opinions as to whether a proposed wireless facility makes for a negative impact to the setting of the City and its neighborhoods. The Department's determination is that the impact of the proposed equipment to the setting of existing and potential historic sites, structures, and districts is not significant, and would not impair the ability of historic resources to convey their significance.

PRESERVATION COORDINATOR REVIEW

Signature: 

Tim Frye, Acting Preservation Coordinator

Date: 6/21/10

CC:

Linda Avery, *Commission Secretary*, Historic Preservation Commission
Vimaliza Byrd, Historic Resource Impact Review File

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GRAND JURY

BDS-11 on 6/24/11

Joy, GAO clerk
COB, Pres. Chiu

OFFICE
400 MCALLISTER ST., ROOM 008
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
TELEPHONE: (415) 551-3605

Document is available
at the Clerk's Office
Room 244, City Hall

June 22, 2010

Supervisor David Chiu, President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
#1 Dr. Carleton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94122

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN 22 AM 10:19
BY _____
PC

Dear Supervisor Chiu:

The 2009-2010 San Francisco County Civil Grand Jury will release its report to the public entitled, "PENSION TSUNAMI: The Billion-Dollar Bubble" on Thursday, June 24, 2010. Enclosed is an advance copy of this report. Please note that by order of the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, James J. McBride, this report is to be kept confidential until the date of release.

California Penal Coded Section 933.05 requires the responding party or entity identified in the report to respond to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, within a specified number of days. You may find the specific day the response is due in the last paragraph of this letter.

For each Finding of the Civil Grand Jury, the response must either:

- (1) agree with the finding; or
- (2) disagree with it, wholly or partially, and explain why.

Further as to each recommendation made by the Civil Grand Jury, the responding party must report either:

- (1) that the recommendation has been implemented, with a summary explanation of how it was implemented;
- (2) the recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a time frame for the implementation;
- (3) the recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation of the scope of that analysis and a time frame for the officer or agency head to be prepared to discuss it (less than six months from the release of the report); or

32

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC GOLF ALLIANCE



235 Montgomery St., #400, San Francisco, CA. 94104 * 415-392-5431, ext. 203 * info@sfpublicgolf.com

June 7, 2010

Mayor Gavin Newsom
City Hall, Room
One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94102

Board of Supervisors
David Chiu, President
City Hall, Room 244
One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94102

BY _____
AK _____

2010 JUN 25 AM 11:06

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT SHARP PARK GOLF COURSE

1. **QUESTION:** DOES SHARP PARK GOLF COURSE "LOSE MONEY"?
- ANSWER:** NO. IN FACT, IT SUBSIDIZES OTHER REC & PARK DEPARTMENT OPERATIONS.

The annual number of rounds, and hence revenue, varies from year to year, principally due to weather. But the most recent figures (for FY 2008-2009) show 54,073 rounds, and positive operating income of \$99,142; this is even after Rec & Park bookkeepers assessed an "overhead" charge of \$245,816, an intra-departmental transfer payment which subsidized general administrative expenses of the Rec & Park Department, Mayor's Office, and other city-wide services.¹ There have been substantial "overhead" payments every fiscal year since 2005, when course-specific figures first became available.² Even in years where the "overhead"

¹ Rec & Park Department, Sharp Park Financials presented to PROSAC public meeting, November 4, 2009 (first page): <http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=43298>

² San Francisco Controller Ben Rosenfeld's Memorandum to Supervisor Sean Elsbernd, et al., regarding Golf Fund, etc., December 17, 2008, at pp. 2-3: <http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=40189>

33

results in a small paper "loss," such losses would be eliminated by a modest increase in greens fees. Sharp Park's fees are among the very lowest in the Bay Area³; a fee increase of \$1 per round would generate an additional \$50,000 income, while still leaving Sharp Park's greens fees among the Bay Area's lowest. **SHARP PARK IS IN MOST YEARS A POSITIVE REVENUE-SOURCE FOR THE DEPARTMENT, AND IT HAS THE POTENTIAL FOR SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASED REVENUE. SO TO CLOSE THE GOLF COURSE WOULD ACTUALLY TAKE AWAY MONEY FROM THE REC & PARK DEPARTMENT AND ITS OTHER PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES.**

2. QUESTION: WILL SIGNIFICANT NEW CAPITAL EXPENDITURES BE REQUIRED AT THE GOLF COURSE?

ANSWER: NOT AS IT IS BEING OPERATED TODAY.

There are three possible new capital projects that are being discussed for Sharp Park: (1) a new recycled water irrigation system; (2) habitat restoration for frogs and snakes; and (3) repairs to the sea wall. However, all of them are optional, none of them appear in the proposed 2010-2012 Rec & Park Department budget, and none are immediately needed to continue operating the golf course. Each of these possible capital projects have benefits extending far beyond the golf course; and each project would have revenue sources broader than the golf course and broader than the City and County of San Francisco. Details of planning, permitting, cost-sharing, and financing for these projects are in the discussion phase.

3. QUESTION: DOES THE SEA WALL NEED TO BE REPAIRED TO PROTECT THE GOLF COURSE? IF SO, WHO PAYS, AND HOW MUCH?

ANSWER: THE SEA WALL NEEDS TO BE REPAIRED TO PROTECT EVERYTHING BEHIND IT, INCLUDING PACIFICA RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS, FRESHWATER FROG/SNAKE HABITAT, THE FREEWAY, SEWER AND WATER LINES, AND THE GOLF COURSE.

Karen Swaim, the Rec & Park's frog/snake consultant, in her December, 2009 testimony to the Board of Supervisors GAO Committee, strongly rejected arguments that the sea wall

³ Rec & Park Department, Sharp Park Financials (*supra*, fn. 1), chart captioned "Regional Golf Course Comparison," at page 5.

should be removed.⁴ She said this would kill the frogs and snakes at Laguna Salada and Horse Stable Pond, and would set back the GGNRA's snake habitat-restoration project at Mori Point. The frogs and snakes need freshwater, and an intact seawall is the only way to protect that, she said.

The Rec & Park Department's engineering consultant, ARUP Engineers, in a study published in December, 2009, recommended \$8.5 million in seawall repairs. A seawall repair of this size would require permits from the Army Corps of Engineers, which in turn would require extensive studies. Congresswoman Jackie Speier's office has applied for federal water agency funding to study the matter. The grant is pending.⁵

4. QUESTION: WILL A SNAKE-AND-FROG HABITAT RESTORATION PROJECT BE MORE EXPENSIVE—OR LESS, IF THE 18-HOLE GOLF COURSE IS KEPT OPEN?
- ANSWER: IF HABITAT IS RESTORED FOR THE FROG AND SNAKE AT SHARP PARK, IT WOULD BE FAR MORE EXPENSIVE TO CLOSE THE GOLF COURSE THAN TO KEEP IT OPEN.

This was a key finding of the Rec & Park Department's 6-month study in 2009, authored by the Department's principal consultant, TetraTech, Inc. Earthmoving and other costs to substantially repurpose the site for a no-golf solution would significantly exceed the expense of leaving the golf course generally as it is (with relatively minor modification), and restoring frog/snake habitat in the area of the lagoons at the western side of the property.⁶

⁴ Karen Swaim, public testimony (initial remarks) to San Francisco Rec & Park Commission at Commission hearing, November 19, 2009: http://www.parks.sfgov.org/site/recpark_page.asp?id=115334

⁵ <http://www.speier.house.gov/uploads/WRDA%20-%20Sharp%20Park%20Seawall.pdf>

⁶ *Sharp Park Conceptual Restoration Alternatives Report*, November, 2009, Tetra Tech, Inc., at pp. 3-5, 52-55, and Tables 4 and 5. <http://www.parks.sfgov.org/wcm/recpark/SharpParkGC/Tetrattechfinalrpt110609.pdf>

5. QUESTION: DO GOLF COURSE OPERATIONS "KILL SNAKES" AT SHARP PARK?

ANSWER: SNAKES DIE FROM MANY CAUSES AT SHARP PARK: BIRDS; REPTILE-COLLECTORS; DOGS AND CATS; SMALL PREDATORS SUCH AS RATS AND RACCOONS. THERE HAS BEEN ONLY ONE REPORTED INCIDENT OF A GOLF-RELATED SNAKE KILL IN COURSE HISTORY. THE MOST RECENT REPORTED SNAKE KILL AT SHARP PARK WAS BY A DOMESTIC CAT FROM THE RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD.

Karen Swaim, the Rec & Park Department's snake consultant, who is also the consultant to the GGNRA on its San Francisco Garter Snake habitat-restoration project at the adjoining Mori Point property, testified at length to the Rec & Park Commission and to the Board of Supervisors' Government Audit and Oversight Committee in December, 2009, that the golf course has a net beneficial effect on the snakes at Laguna Salada and Horse Stable Pond, because the golf course and the presence of golfers keeps wild and domestic small mammal predators under control, and discourages bicycle traffic, which is known to kill snakes. By contrast, she said, golf is a relatively benign and easily-regulated activity, which explains why the snakes and frogs have survived on the golf course over the course's 78-year life.⁷

6. QUESTION: WHICH CAME FIRST AT SHARP PARK: THE GOLF COURSE, OR THE FROGS AND SNAKES?
ANSWER: BEFORE THE GOLF COURSE WAS BUILT, THE PROPERTY WAS AN ARTICHOKE FARM, AND THE LAGOON WAS OPEN TO THE OCEAN. BECAUSE THE FROGS AND SNAKES ARE FRESHWATER SPECIES, SCIENTISTS SAY THAT THEY WERE "UNLIKELY" TO HAVE BEEN AT LAGUNA SALADA BEFORE THE GOLF COURSE.

Historic photos show that before the golf course was built, the property was an artichoke farm. The name of the big pond at Sharp Park is Laguna Salada, which means "salty lake" in Spanish. The historic name of the valley, on US Geological Survey maps going back at least to 1892 is "Salt Valley". Before the golf course was built, the lagoon was

⁷ Karen Swaim, public testimony (concluding remarks) to San Francisco Rec & Park Commission at Commission hearing, November 19, 2009: http://www.parks.sfgov.org/site/recpark_page.asp?id=115334

open to the ocean. The red-legged frog in its larval state is highly saltwater-intolerant. For these reasons, the scientific studies say that the presence of the frog and snake at Sharp Park was "unlikely" before the golf course.⁸ The first scientific reports of the snake at Sharp Park are from the mid-1940s, after the original sea wall was built to separate the golf course from the ocean, and 15 years after the golf course was built.

7. QUESTION: COULD SAN FRANCISCO OBTAIN INCOME FROM A WILDLIFE SANCTUARY AT SHARP PARK BY CREATING A "MITIGATION BANK" THERE?

ANSWER: NO.

Center for Biological Diversity spokesman Brent Plater told the PROSAC in July, 2009, that the city could expect to earn a \$300 Million profit by converting Sharp Park into a "mitigation bank". However, the city's mitigation bank consultant, Westervelt Environmental Services, which consulted on the mitigation bank at the San Francisco Airport, said that a mitigation bank at Sharp Park would not have good prospects: the costs would be high, the benefits uncertain, and a mitigation bank would preclude all public recreational use of the property.^{9, 10}

8. QUESTION: HAS THE GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA AGREED TO ACCEPT A TRANSFER OF SHARP PARK?

ANSWER: NO.

The GGNRA will not accept a transfer of Sharp Park with its current environmental problems.¹¹ According to Howard

⁸ Laguna Salada Resource Enhancement Plan, Philip Williams & Associates, June, 1992, at pp. 2-3, and Fig. 2:
http://www.biologicaldiversity.org/campaigns/restoring_sharp_park_california/pdfs/PWALagunaSaladaResourceEnhancementPlan.pdf

⁹ Westervelt Ecological Services, "Financial Viability and Analysis, Sharp Park Mitigation Bank", etc., November 6, 2009:
<http://www.parks.sfgov.org/wcm/recpark/SharpParkGC/Westerveltfinalrpt110609.pdf>

¹⁰ Lucy Triffleman, public testimony at Rec & Park Commission public hearing, November 19, 2009:
http://www.parks.sfgov.org/site/recpark_page.asp?id=115334

¹¹ Testimony of Amy Meyer, People for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, to Board of Supervisors' Govt. Audit & Oversight

Levit, Chief of Communications and Partner Stewardship at GGNRA, it would not be reasonable to expect the GGNRA to assume responsibility for environmental remediation on its own.¹² And the Hon. Jackie Speier, the United States Congresswoman for the Twelfth District (including southwestern San Francisco and northern San Mateo counties), where the property is located, has publicly stated her opposition to closing the golf course.^{13, 14}

10. QUESTION: WHAT IS THE SIERRA CLUB'S POSITION ON SHARP PARK?

ANSWER: THE POSITIONS OF THE LOCAL CHAPTERS DIFFER.

The Sierra Club's Loma Prieta Chapter, which includes Santa Clara, San Benito, and San Mateo County--where the golf course is located--supports the Rec & Park Department's plan to simultaneously restore habitat and keep the 18-hole golf course at Sharp Park.¹⁵ The Sierra Club's San Francisco Bay chapter (including Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, and San Francisco counties) appears to take a different position.

Committee, Dec. 16, 2009, S.F. Govt. TV, at 2:48:10-2:49:0.
http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=11

¹² Mr. Levit told this writer, in a June 11, 2010 phone conversation, that Levit's predecessor Christine Powell had been misquoted on this point in a news story that appeared in the June 2, 2010 *SF Weekly*.

¹³ KQED Radio, "Forum" program, "The Future of Sharp Park," November 9, 2009, 10:00 a.m., at 13:00-15:12 and 20:57-21:32:
<http://www.kqed.org/epArchive/R911091000>

¹⁴ Congresswoman Jackie Speier, 12th U.S. Congressional District, Press Release, November 9, 2009:
<http://speier.house.gov/index.cfm?sectionid=48&parentid=46§iontree=46,48&itemid=330>

¹⁵ Testimony of Merrill Bobele, co-chair, Coastal Issues Committee, Loma Prieta Chapter, Sierra Club, to Board of Supervisors' Govt. Audit & Oversight Committee, Dec. 16, 2009, S.F. Govt. TV, at 3:11:37:
http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=11

11. QUESTION: WHAT IS ORGANIZED LABOR'S POSITION?

ANSWER: THE GOLF COURSE IS SUPPORTED BY
LABORERS LOCAL 261.
NO LABOR ORGANIZATION HAS ANNOUNCED
SUPPORT FOR CLOSING THE GOLF COURSE.

Laborers Local 261, whose members include the golf course gardeners, announced its support for keeping the 18-hole golf course at the Board of Supervisors' GAO Committee hearing in December, 2009.¹⁶

12. QUESTION: WHAT IS THE RECOMMENDATION OF
SAN FRANCISCO'S PARK, RECREATION,
AND OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE?

ANSWER: AFTER A SIX-MONTH STUDY, AND
BY A 14-1 VOTE, PROSAC RECOMMENDED
TO KEEP THE GOLF COURSE OPEN.

San Francisco's Park, Recreation and Open Space Advisory Committee, appointed by the Board of Supervisors, conducted a series of public hearings on all aspects of Sharp Park at monthly meetings July through December, 2009. On December 1, 2009, PROSAC voted, 14-1, in favor of the Rec & Park Department's plan to restore habitat, while keeping the Sharp Park Golf Course open; PROSAC also voted in favor of pursuing cooperation with the City of Pacifica and San Mateo County (but not the GGNRA) about Sharp Park.¹⁷

¹⁶ Testimony of Zac Salem, Chair, Golf Committee, Laborers' Local 261, to Board of Supervisors' Govt. Audit & Oversight Committee, Dec. 16, 2009, S.F. Govt. TV, at 2:17:30:

<http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view id=11>

¹⁷ PROSAC, Resolutions [Nos. 1 and 2], adopted Dec. 1, 2009, submitted to Rec & Park Commission on Dec. 3, 2009:

<http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=44912>

13. QUESTION: WHAT ARE THE POSITIONS OF THE SAN MATEO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND THE PACIFICA CITY COUNCIL?

ANSWER: BOTH THE PACIFICA CITY COUNCIL¹⁸ AND THE SAN MATEO COUNTY SUPERVISORS¹⁹ HAVE ADOPTED UNANIMOUS RESOLUTIONS TO KEEP SHARP PARK GOLF COURSE OPEN.

14. QUESTION: IS SHARP PARK GOLF COURSE JUDGED "INFERIOR" BY GOLF EXPERTS?

ANSWER: ABSOLUTELY NOT. SHARP PARK IS REVERED BY GOLFERS AS AN HISTORIC TREASURE, AND IS DESIGNATED A NATIONALLY-SIGNIFICANT AT-RISK CULTURAL LANDSCAPE, BY THE CULTURAL LANDSCAPE FOUNDATION.

Opened in 1932, Sharp Park was built by Dr. Alister MacKenzie, one of history's greatest golf architects. It is one of Dr. MacKenzie's few public courses. Local, state, national, and international golf organizations calling for its preservation include the World Golf Foundation²⁰, California Alliance for Golf (whose members include the Northern California Golf Association)²¹, and the Alister MacKenzie Society²². The Washington D.C.-based Cultural Landscape Foundation has designated Sharp Park Golf Course as a nationally-significant, at-risk cultural landscape.²³

¹⁸ City of Pacifica, Resolution of City Council, December 10, 2007:
http://sharppark.savegolf.net/data/cop_res.pdf

¹⁹ County of San Mateo, Resolution of Board of Supervisors, December 18, 2007: http://sharppark.savegolf.net/data/smbos_res.pdf

²⁰ World Golf Foundation, letter, July 23, 2009:
<http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=43233>

²¹ California Alliance for Golf, letter, September 28, 2009:
<http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=43245>

²² Alister MacKenzie Society letter, April 28, 2009:
<http://www.pacificariptide.com/.a/6a00d8341c795b53ef01156f6f286c970c-pi>

²³ Cultural Landscape Foundation, Washington, D.C., July, 2009:
<http://www.tclf.org/landslides/sharp-park-golf-course-threatened-closure>

Those who want to close Sharp Park Golf Course misleadingly cite golf author Daniel Wexler's book, *The Missing Links*, in support of their argument that Sharp Park is an "inferior" course. However, Mr. Wexler has publicly and in writing defended Sharp Park's historic value, called for restoration of the golf course, and stated that Sharp Park's critics are misrepresenting both the spirit and intent of his work.²⁴

16. **QUESTION: ARE SHARP PARK GOLFERS "ELITES"?**
ANSWER: EMPHATICALLY NOT.
GOLF IS "THE PEOPLE'S SPORT" AT SHARP PARK: JUNIORS, SENIORS, WOMEN, RETIRED, AND ALL RACIAL, CULTURAL, AND ETHNIC GROUPS MAKE UP SHARP PARK'S CLIENTELE.

Racial, ethnic, gender, age, and socio-economic diversity define the golfing public at Sharp Park. See the U-Tube videos of Sharp Park golfers speaking-out for their course: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6roUnaxvKxY>

17. **QUESTION: IS GOLF A POPULAR RECREATIONAL ACTIVITY IN SAN FRANCISCO?**
ANSWER: YES.


A 2004 "Recreational Assessment Report," conducted for the Rec & Park Department by PROS Consulting, found that when San Francisco residents were asked to designate the single most important recreational facility to their households (out of 19 different types of facilities), golf courses were tied with dog-play areas as the fourth-most important type of recreational facility, trailing only children's playgrounds, swimming pools, and walking and biking trails.²⁵ This is consistent with consultant reports in 2007 and again in 2008 to the Rec & Park Department from the National Golf

²⁴ Dan Wexler, letter, July 19, 2009:
[http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/recpark/meetings/Park Recreation and Open Space Advisory Committee %28PROSAC%29/supporting/2009/SFPGA.PDF](http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/recpark/meetings/Park%20Recreation%20and%20Open%20Space%20Advisory%20Committee%28PROSAC%29/supporting/2009/SFPGA.PDF)

²⁵ Leon Younger & PROS, LLC, *Recreation Assessment Report*, August, 2004, at p. 14, Figure 6:
[http://www.parks.sfgov.org/wcm/recpark/Notice/SFRP Summary Report.pdf](http://www.parks.sfgov.org/wcm/recpark/Notice/SFRP%20Summary%20Report.pdf)

Foundation²⁶ and Leon Younger and PROS Consulting²⁷, respectively, both of which found that the San Francisco/San Mateo County area has too few courses to serve the market demand for public golf.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard Harris
San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

²⁶ National Golf Foundation, "Operational Review and Recommendations for City of San Francisco Golf Operations, February, 2007, at page 23: http://www.parks.sfgov.org/wcm_recpark/Golf/NGF/NGFFinal.pdf

²⁷ Leon Younger & PROS Consulting, "San Francisco Recreational Opportunities Study Summary Report," August, 2008, at pages 7-8: [http://www.parks.sfgov.org/wcm_recpark/Golf/Taskforce/Final report August 26 2008.pdf](http://www.parks.sfgov.org/wcm_recpark/Golf/Taskforce/Final_report_August_26_2008.pdf)

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC GOLF ALLIANCE



235 Montgomery St., #400, San Francisco, CA. 94104 * 415-392-5431, ext. 203 * info@sfpublicgolf.com

June 24, 2010

Mayor Gavin Newsom
City Hall, Room 200
One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94102

**Document is available
at the Clerk's Office
Room 244, City Hall**

Board of Supervisors
David Chiu, President
City Hall, Room 244
One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94102

Re: SAVE SHARP PARK GOLF COURSE / 113 CONSTITUENT LETTERS

Dear Mayor Newsom and Supervisors,

Enclosed are copies of original, non-form letters from 108 San Francisco residents, plus an additional five from Pacifica and Daly City, urging the Mayor and the Supervisors to maintain funding in the 2010-2012 San Francisco budget for the Sharp Park Golf Course.

These letters come from all corners of San Francisco, and all supervisorial districts. Over one-quarter of the letters are from women, and over one-quarter of the writers have Asian surnames. For the Supervisors' convenience in finding letters from their constituents, we have arranged the letters by zip code. We delivered copies of these letters to the Supervisors' Budget Committee at its June 21 public testimony meeting.

Like the letter-writers, we urge the Mayor and Supervisors to keep the beautiful and historic Sharp Park Golf Course open.

Very truly yours,

Richard Harris
San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

encls.

34

805-11
RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN 25 PM 1:20
BY RC

June 21, 2010

Document is available
at the Clerk's Office
Room 244, City Hall

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN 25 PM 3:27
BY

OFFICE OF THE
SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT ATTORNEY
ATTN: Kamala Harris, District Attorney
850 Bryant Street
San Francisco, CA

Dear District Attorney Harris;

Our collective garden was raided on June 10, 2010.

Axis of Love SF is the only full service Medical Cannabis Community Center in San Francisco, serving disabled and seriously ill low income and no-income patients. We provide free medicine, a daily meal, support groups and services. We are a satellite of Hopenet's Compassionate Programs.

Included here is a petition with hundreds of signatures from patients and supporters.

Our first and foremost concern is returning the medicine to the patients. It's unlawful per Article 33, the personal use guidelines. When the garden was raided, both medicine and sweet leaf were seized and weighed. There is no other way SFPD could have come up with the amount they are claiming to have seized.

SFPD was not aligned with Attorney General Brown's guidelines per collectives versus traditional caregiver status. As requested by the Police Commission at our recent action. SFPD should know the law. In a discovered interdepartmental bulletin, it clearly states the same thing as the Sanctuary Ordinance, to wit-when an organization attempted full compliance, the patients' medicine should not be seized.

We were (and still are) in the process of our annual updating of records and files, sending out renewal reminders, making things ready for the new web-based membership program. Some patients' files may be presently awaiting renewal, but they are, most assuredly, still under the care of their physicians. This case should not only be dismissed, but also should help to build a template to stop the raids.

I have, for the last ten years, created compassionate policy. I have created a working group on Medical Cannabis with three deputy chiefs including Commander Loftus. I built the oversight committee for Lowest

35



Anna Pfeiffer
<APfeiff@bart.gov>
06/24/2010 03:20 PM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
bcc

Subject BART's Final Public Participant Plan

1 attachment



BART Final PPP 5-21-10-for_submittalF.pdf

**Document is available
at the Clerk's Office
Room 244, City Hall**

Attached is BART's Final Public Participant Plan in English. Please advise if other languages are needed. Thank you.

Anna Pfeiffer
Government and Community Relations
510-874-7317

36



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

Ben Rosenfield
Controller

Monique Zmuda
Deputy Controller

June 30, 2010

Tony Litwak
KOGAMI Foundation
43 Montecito #3
Pacifica, CA 94044

Dear Mr. Litwak,

Based on our recent correspondence, you have informed us that we will not receive the required documentation from your organization to allow us to distribute a grant award of \$50,000 to the KOGAMI Foundation as approved by Board of Supervisors Ordinance number 221-09.

Since the fiscal year is closing today, June 30, 2010, we are closing this grant and returning the funds to the City and County's general fund. These funds will not be available in the new fiscal year beginning July 1, 2010.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 415-554-6609.

Sincerely,

Alan Pavkovic
Controller's Office – Accounting Operations Manager

Cc: Ben Rosenfield, Controller
Monique Zmuda, Deputy Controller
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Chris Daly

OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

*orig Rules Clerk
c: Rules Members
cpage*

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

2010 JUL -1 PM 4:12



BY AK

Joyce M. Hicks
Executive Director

July 1, 2010

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall
1 Dr Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: File No. 100235
Office of Citizen Complaints' Comments on Proposed Charter Amendment
Transferring Police Department Functions to Sheriff

Dear Supervisors:

This letter supplements the Office of Citizen Complaints' written comments of March 22, 2010 on the Proposed Charter Amendment Transferring Police Department Functions to the Sheriff.

The City Charter currently establishes civilian oversight for the Police Department through the Police Commission and the Office of Citizen Complaints. Under the proposed amendment, the Sheriff's Department and the Police Department would merge under the Sheriff's command; the Police Commission would be eliminated.

Addressing a similar Sheriff-Police Department merger proposal in 2003, the Legislative Analyst noted that the Police Commission and the Office of Citizen Complaints provide "strong oversight measures for Police Department accountability". The Legislative Analyst emphasized that the merger proposal would "necessitate a review of these citizen protections to ensure that department accountability is not eroded." (Legislative Analyst Report, OLA#:009-03, "Merger of the Police and Sheriff's Departments, p.9.)

The proposed charter amendment authorizes a committee to study the merger and make recommendations regarding its implementation. To ensure civilian oversight representation, the Office of Citizen Complaints should serve as a non-voting, ex officio member of this committee.

Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

Joyce M. Hicks
Executive Director

38



Brent Plater
<bplater@yahoo.com>
06/30/2010 03:20 PM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
bcc
Subject Fwd: Sharp Park

From: Gail Caswell <sunshine4kid@yahoo.com>

Date: June 29, 2010 5:23:49 PM PDT

To: info@wildequity.org

Subject: Sharp Park

I am writing to request that the Board close Sharp Park Golf Course and redirect the money to our neighborhood parks and community services, where the money rightfully belongs.

A recent report in the SF Weekly found that Sharp Park loses up to \$300,000 annually and will require a \$17 million investment to stay operational. If we invested that money in our neighborhoods and communities, we could build a stronger, healthier City while aiding those most at risk from the ongoing recession.

It's no surprise that Sharp Park golfers want to keep their golf paid for by taxpayers. But can we really justify subsidizing suburban golf in San Mateo County when our neighborhood parks and community services are in dire shape?

Please create a better budget by closing Sharp Park and using the money to defray the impacts of the existing fiscal crisis.

Thank you,

Gail Caswell
San Francisco

39

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
07/01/2010 04:07 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Transparency - Can we require the Rent Board to live stream
and digitally record their meetings even though they do not
occur in City Hall?



Kimo Crossman
<kimo@webnetic.net>
Sent by:
kimocrossman@gmail.com

06/30/2010 01:58 PM

Please respond to
kimo@webnetic.net

To ted@sftu.org, David Campos <David.Campos@sfgov.org>,
Board of Supervisors <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>,
Ray Hartz SF Open Government BS
<sfopengovbs@sbcglobal.net>, RentBoard.311@sfgov.org,
Richard Knee <rak0408@earthlink.net>, "Bruce Wolfe,
MSW" <sotf@brucewolfe.net>, Rohan Lane
<RohanLane@sfgov.org>, Ross Mirkarimi
<Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org>, Rick Galbreath
<Rick.Galbreath@sfgov.org>

cc

Subject Transparency - Can we require the Rent Board to live stream
and digitally record their meetings even though they do
not occur in City Hall?

COB Clerk - Please forward this to all supervisors and make part of the Public Communications
file

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Kimo Crossman** <kimo@webnetic.net>

Date: Thu, Jun 17, 2010 at 2:54 PM

Subject: Fwd: Letter Re: Rent Board Compliance with Section 67.16 is attached

To: RentBoard.311@sfgov.org, SFOPENGOVERNMENTBS@sbcglobal.net, "Johnson, Hope"
<hopeannette@earthlink.net>, Pro-SF <home@prosf.org>, rwhartzjr <rwhartzjr@sbcglobal.net>

Please forward this to all Rent Board members:

Thank you for including me on this letter - While you mention consulting A/V Media Services,
Please be reminded once again that any available laptop or desktop, many smartphones and \$30
digital voice recorders all allow you to record meetings digitally and then post online (hopefully
by next business day) the audio. Also free video live streaming can occur with a webcam/laptop
or smartphone using ustream.tv

If you need help - I suggest you speak with the Ethics Commission which does this regularly or
staff from the Clerk of the Board who are converting all analog recording to digital.

Please let me know how you plan to move forward on this matter

thanks

Kimo Crossman

40

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **RentBoard 311** <RentBoard.311@sfgov.org>

Date: Thu, Jun 17, 2010 at 2:47 PM

Subject: Letter Re: Rent Board Compliance with Section 67.16 is attached

To: SOTF <sotf@sfgov.org>

Cc: kimo@webnetic.net, SFOOPENGOVERNMENTBS@sbcglobal.net



Rent Board Compliance with Section 67.16.PDF



June 17, 2010

Richard Knee, Chair
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689


Re: Rent Board Compliance with Section 67.16

Dear Mr. Knee,

At the May 25, 2010 meeting of the SOTF, it was suggested that the Rent Board allow members of the public to submit a written summary of their comments to be appended to the Board's minutes even if the Board is not legally required to do so since it is not a Charter Commission subject to Section 67.16. This is to inform the SOTF the Rent Board has decided to voluntarily comply with Section 67.16 and has agreed to append such brief written summary in the Board's minutes.

It was also suggested that the Board record its meetings and post the recording on the Board's website even if the Board is not legally required to do so since it is not a Charter Commission subject to Section 67.14(b) and does not hold its meetings "in a City Hall hearing room that is equipped with audio or video recording facilities" under Section 67.14(c). This is to inform the SOTF that the Board has contacted the City Hall Media Services Manager about audio digital equipment and is looking into the budgetary and technological feasibility of voluntarily complying with Section 67.14. We appreciate the Task Force's interest in ensuring as much public access to Board meetings as possible.

Sincerely,


Delene Wolf
Executive Director

Cc: Kimo Crossman
Ray Hartz

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
07/01/2010 04:40 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject When will SF DT preserve Electronic Records? and WH in
trouble on personal email use



Kimo Crossman
<kimo@webnetic.net>
Sent by:
kimocrossman@gmail.com

07/01/2010 09:54 AM

Please respond to
kimo@webnetic.net

To Chris Vein <chris.vein@sfgov.org>, Ron Vinson
<Ron.Vinson@sfgov.org>, "Bruce Wolfe, MSW"
<soff@brucewolfe.net>, SOTF <soff@sfgov.org>, Richard
Knee <rak0408@earthlink.net>, rwhartzjr
<rwhartzjr@sbcglobal.net>, "Johnson, Hope"
<hopeannette@earthlink.net>, Board of Supervisors
<Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, Allen Grossman
<grossman356@mac.com>, Doug Comstock
<dougcomz@mac.com>, Tenants 769NorthPoint
<tenants769np@yahoo.com>, Peter Warfield
<libraryusers2004@yahoo.com>, James Chaffee
<chaffeej@pacbell.net>, Marc Salomon <marc@cybre.net>,
amwashburn <amwashburn@comcast.net>, David Snyder
<DSnyder@sheppardmullin.com>, Brian Roberts
<brian.roberts@sfgov.org>, Barry Fraser
<Barry.Fraser@sfgov.org>, Joshua Arce
<josh@brightlinedefense.org>, Steve Jones
<steve@sfbg.com>, Tim Redmond <tr@sfbg.com>, "Becky
O'Malley" <becky.omalley2@gmail.com>, doylegenie
<doylegenie@gmail.com>

cc

Subject When will SF DT preserve Electronic Records? and WH in
trouble on personal email use

*COB please send a copy of this to every Supervisor and make part of BOS Public
Communications*

When will SF SOTF take an active role here?

Tuesday, June 29, 2010

Public Records Files: When in Doubt, Toss 'em Out

OPEN GOVERNMENT -- "California cities and counties have destroyed millions of public records over the past decade with almost no oversight," reports Tracy Wood for the Voice of OC. "And most of the shredding happens because of policies designed to protect local governments from lawsuits."

Never before has it been so easy to store the history and inner workings of local governments. Computer technology is doing away with the need for paper files and storage rooms. Nonetheless, cities, counties and other agencies continue to push documents through the shredder, leaving the public with just the broad outlines of how its officials have acted.

41

"It's history," said Terry Francke, Voice of OC's open government consultant, of the hole in California records. "It's the memory of what the government has said and done."

The millions of shredded documents include handwritten notes that help explain why a contract was approved or an outside firm was hired. Letters, expense accounts, audits, employee grievances, studies and statistics, meeting agendas, press releases, speeches, and government travel records all have headed to the shredder. Even the authorizations to destroy records have been destroyed.

On the state level, some destroyed records have carried the potential of life-and-death consequences. This year, after the murder of 17-year-old Chelsea King in San Diego, Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger ordered the state to stop destroying the parole records of convicted sex offenders. Until the murder, no one outside of corrections department officials knew the department saved such records for just a year after the convict completed parole. King's killer turned out to be a paroled sex offender. Not all records can be eliminated. State laws require local agencies to keep records for at least two years and to permanently preserve critical documents like child adoption records, criminal convictions, property title documents, minutes of meetings, ordinances and general court documents.

Fear of Lawsuits

Most of the time, records are shredded in accordance with state guidelines written to protect cities, counties and public agencies from lawsuits. "A court cannot demand an agency produce documents that have been destroyed in accordance with accepted and documented ... industry practices," the California Secretary of State's 2006 Local Government Records Management Guidelines reminds local officials. Government employees who weren't authorized to speak to a reporter but who worked directly with records and destruction policies spelled it out. "It's the legal issue. It's about not having records if you get sued," explained one worker who spoke on condition that her name not be used. UC Berkeley law professor Jason Schultz said government lawyers who approve requests to shred are simply doing their job, which is to protect their clients. "City attorneys are hired to protect the liability of cities. ... It's not that it's ill-willed or bad faith."

Suzanne J. Piotrowski, Rutgers University records specialist, said it's unrealistic to ask government agencies to hang onto every scrap of paper. But, she cautioned, it's important to ask: "Where's the safeguard that people aren't destroying records that they shouldn't be?"

And overall, "It seems to me there's an awful lot of history that's being destroyed," said Bob Stern, president of the Center for Governmental Studies in Los Angeles. He noted that 40 years ago, he helped include in state law a requirement that all politicians' campaign contribution statements have to be kept forever. "Somebody running for governor right now," he joked, referring to former Gov. Jerry Brown, "was filing campaign records in 1970." That was the year Brown was elected California Secretary of State. In 1975, Brown was elected governor. Today, Stern noted, anyone, including Meg Whitman, Brown's GOP opponent in this year's race for governor, can go back and read those

old records.

California's local government records guidelines law, adopted in 1999, acknowledges the need to keep items of historical importance or those useful for scientific and genealogical research and suggests cities contact local historical societies and public libraries for advice. And cities are required by state law to publicly announce which records are going to be destroyed by putting the issue on city council agendas. But there is no one checking on cities to see if they are following state guidelines regarding what stays and what goes.

Francke, who is also general counsel for Californians Aware, said most often the announcement is wrapped in with many other items on the consent calendar and the vote to destroy records is done without discussion. "I would not expect that members of the council would methodically comb through those lists" and ask questions, he said. Instead, he said, council members rely on staff. What ultimately is destroyed, he said, "depends on the alertness and energy of the people who make the decisions."

That alertness varies significantly depending on the city, according to interviews with employees of Orange County cities who asked to remain anonymous in order to protect their jobs. In one city, an employee said that before a list of records appears on the council agenda, the city clerk checks the guidelines to make sure the boxes of paper qualify. Then the list of records proposed for shredding is sent to the city attorney's office for approval. But, she said, staff goes by labels on the boxes and doesn't inspect the contents of each file to make sure no unauthorized records are destroyed. However, in another city, a staffer said she and colleagues go through every single piece of paper before files are approved by the clerk and city attorney for shredding.

The Storage Issue

Years ago, the main argument for destroying records was space. Boxes and boxes of paper overwhelmed cities. However, technology is reaching the point, according to government and industry representatives who deal with record preservation, where it's possible to create tamper-safe electronic documents that will last indefinitely and eliminate storage as a financial issue.

Most local governments and state officials haven't decided whether to use new formats to keep records of the daily life of government that now are shredded after a few years, or retain whole files for future historians and researchers. The secretary of state's office is developing technology guidelines to be followed by local governments that want to keep electronic versions of records for the long term. The guidelines are intended to ensure documents aren't altered. Those guidelines could go into effect by next year.

The trustworthiness of digital documents, if the right procedures are followed, is sound, said Betsy Fanning, director of standards and member services for AIIM, the Association for Information and Image Management. The goal, Fanning said, is to make sure "nobody can tamper with it." Even with such advances, cities may be reluctant to keep their records longer than guidelines recommend. The current minimum is two years for records like news releases, four to seven for

expense reports and only as long as they are active for city policies and procedures.

One argument against keeping records longer is that it takes staff time to scan paper into a computer. But it also takes staff time to read through files before they are shredded. "If somebody has the time to shred, they have the time to scan it into a computer," the Sacramento Bee quoted Assemblyman Ted Lieu, D-Torrance, after the disclosure that parole workers shredded the records of sex offenders.

California Aware's Francke agrees. Most government records, he noted, are created on computers and don't need to be scanned. It may be time to start moving the minimum time a record must be kept from the current two years to four or maybe six, or 10 years to keep pace with technology, he said.

And some communities, like Villa Park, are new enough and small enough that they can destroy minor records but keep more of what they see as useful. Jarad Hillenbrand, assistant city manager and city clerk, said they have records going back to the city's incorporation in 1962 that they could have shredded under the state guidelines but didn't. They did recently shred about 20 boxes of "unimportant" records, he said, including 1978's reports on weed abatement. "We have plenty of room (for records) here," he said.

Posted at 05:23 PM in [Open Government](#) | [Permalink](#)

CREW Calls for House Investigation into Obama Staffers' Use of Personal Email, Meetings with Lobbyists

June 30, 2010 12:44 PM

[PrintRSS](#)

SHARE:

[Email](#)

[More](#)

ABC News' Karen Travers reports:

On Monday good-government group Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington (CREW) asked a House committee to look into whether the Obama White House violated federal laws regarding electronic records by using private email accounts to communicate with lobbyists and meeting with lobbyists outside the White House.

CREW wrote a letter to the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform asking it to investigate and hold hearings to determine any violations of the Presidential Records Act (PRA) and Federal Records Act (FRA).

The group's letter is in response to an article in The New York Times on June 25 that said Obama White House officials have met "hundreds of times" over the last 18 months with prominent Washington lobbyists.

"But because the discussions are not taking place at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, they are not subject to disclosure on the visitors' log that the White House releases as part of its pledge to be the "most transparent presidential administration in history," the **New York Times reported.**

The Times also reported that lobbyists said they "routinely" get emails from White House staff members' personal accounts, not their White House emails which are subject to public records review.

The White House declined to comment on the CREW letter calling for the investigation. As a candidate and as president, Obama has been sharply critical of lobbyists and their influence in the political process. He pledged to institute greater transparency and to close the revolving lobby door in Washington.

"It is outrageous that White House staff are deliberately using personal email accounts - in violation of the law - to hide the fact that they are in touch with lobbyists," CREW Executive Director Melanie Sloan said in a paper statement. "This is what all the administration's anti-lobbyist rhetoric gets you - less transparency. Rather than being open and clear about who is influencing White House policy, the White House is trying to hide who it's really talking to. Even worse, the public is being suckered with lofty rhetoric about the evils of the same lobbyists White House officials are meeting with."

This isn't the first time CREW has called the Obama White House out for transparency.

After CREW filed a lawsuit last summer to force the President Obama to share White House visitors logs with the public, the White House on September 4 announced its new **disclosure policy** to regularly make public most of the names of visitors to the White House.

-Karen Travers

160701

June 28, 2010

The Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: Restoration Request – Japantown Organizing Committee

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We sincerely appreciate your favorable consideration and support for the Restoration Request of \$50,000 for the Japantown Better Neighborhood Plan Organizing Committee.

Japantown residents, merchants and property owners have worked with the San Francisco Planning Department since 2006 on the development of a Better Neighborhoods Plan. A first draft of this community-based plan was published in 2009. All but minimal Planning Department staffing and support efforts have been eliminated from the FT10-11 budget. Completion and adoption of this community plan still requires an evaluation of alternatives and recommendations to the current City/Private ownership and management of the parking garages, Peace Plaza and commercial malls that comprise the cultural core of Japantown.

This critical study, to determine if there is a means to operate these properties with enhanced community/city control, is still needed. With this essential analysis and associated recommendations for alternative ownership/management configurations of the parking garage, public plaza and commercial mall complex, options will be defined that can retain and assure the historic character of one of the three surviving Japantowns in the USA.

With best regards

Hennie Wisniewski
1960 Pierce St #1
San Francisco, Ca 94115

42

File 100701



Dawn Shalhoup
<dawn@prpotion.com>
06/29/2010 04:47 PM

To "Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org"
<Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
bcc
Subject Japantown Restoration

1 attachment



RestorationRequestSupportLetter062810.doc

Dear Board,

Attached, please find a formal letter of gratitude for your favorable consideration and support for the Restoration Request of \$50,000 for the Japantown Better Neighborhood Plan Organizing Committee.

I'm not only a fan and supporter of Japantown, but a firm believer that San Francisco can be very proud to call itself home to one of the three remaining Japantown neighborhoods of this nation. Japantown is a wonderful contribution to the eclectic collection of cultural experiences that San Francisco offers. Let's keep it intact and vibrant!

Thanks,

-Dawn

Dawn Shalhoup
Potion Public Relations
254 Miller Avenue
Mill Valley, CA 94941
415.370.8515

File 100701

June 29, 2010

The Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: Restoration Request – Japantown Organizing Committee

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We sincerely appreciate your favorable consideration and support for the Restoration Request of \$50,000 for the Japantown Better Neighborhood Plan Organizing Committee.

Japantown residents, merchants and property owners have worked with the San Francisco Planning Department since 2006 on the development of a Better Neighborhoods Plan. A first draft of this community-based plan was published in 2009. All but minimal Planning Department staffing and support efforts have been eliminated from the FT10-11 budget. Completion and adoption of this community plan still requires an evaluation of alternatives and recommendations to the current City/Private ownership and management of the parking garages, Peace Plaza and commercial malls that comprise the cultural core of Japantown.

This critical study, to determine if there is a means to operate these properties with enhanced community/city control, is still needed. With this essential analysis and associated recommendations for alternative ownership/management configurations of the parking garage, public plaza and commercial mall complex, options will be defined that can retain and assure the historic character of one of the three surviving Japantowns in the USA.

With best regards,

Dawn Shalhoup

File 100701

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/28/2010 05:40 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Fw: Restoration Request - Japantown Organizing Committee



Clint Taura
<ctaura@gmail.com>
06/28/2010 03:49 PM

To Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject Restoration Request - Japantown Organizing Committee

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We sincerely appreciate your favorable consideration and support for the Restoration Request of \$50,000 for the Japantown Better Neighborhood Plan Organizing Committee.

Japantown residents, merchants and property owners have worked with the San Francisco Planning Department since 2006 on the development of a Better Neighborhoods Plan. A first draft of this community-based plan was published in 2009. All but minimal Planning Department staffing and support efforts have been eliminated from the FT10-11 budget. Completion and adoption of this community plan still requires an evaluation of alternatives and recommendations to the current City/Private ownership and management of the parking garages, Peace Plaza and commercial malls that comprise the cultural core of Japantown.

This critical study, to determine if there is a means to operate these properties with enhanced community/city control, is still needed. With this essential analysis and associated recommendations for alternative ownership/management configurations of the parking garage, public plaza and commercial mall complex, options will be defined that can retain and assure the historic character of one of the three surviving Japantowns in the USA.

With best regards,

Clint K. Taura
nihonmachiROOTS

File 100701



Nihonmachi Little Friends
<nlfchildcare@yahoo.com>
06/29/2010 07:54 PM

To Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
bcc
Subject Support Restoration Request for Japantown BNP Organizing
Committee

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We sincerely appreciate your favorable consideration and support for the Restoration
Request of \$50,000 for the Japantown Better Neighborhood Plan Organizing Committee.

Japantown residents, merchants and property owners have worked with the
San Francisco Planning Department since 2006 on the development of a Better
Neighborhoods Plan. A first draft of this community-based plan was published in
2009. All but minimal Planning Department staffing and support efforts have been
eliminated from the FT10-11 budget. Completion and adoption of this community
plan still requires an evaluation of alternatives and recommendations to the current
City/Private ownership and management of the parking garages, Peace Plaza and
commercial malls that comprise the cultural core of Japantown.

This critical study, to determine if there is a means to operate these properties
with enhanced community/city control, is still needed. With this essential analysis
and associated recommendations for alternative ownership/management
configurations of the parking garage, public plaza and commercial mall complex,
options will be defined that can retain and assure the historic character of one
of the three surviving Japantowns in the USA.

Sincerely,

Cathy Inamasu
Executive Director
Nihonmachi Little Friends
2031 Bush Street
San Francisco, CA 94115
(415) 922-8898

File 100701

2309 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94115

June 30, 2010

The Board of Supervisors Via Fax 415-554-5163
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: Restoration Request – Japantown Organizing Committee


Dear Board of Supervisors,

I ask for your support for the Restoration Request of \$50,000 for the Japantown Better Neighborhood Plan Organizing Committee. While it is hard to ask for funds in the current environment, we are at a point where failure to fund this Japantown planning activity now may well mean that Japantown will lose its cultural center, the existing small businesses that occupy the Japan Center, and many of the small businesses on the surrounding area.

Japantown residents, merchants and property owners have worked with the San Francisco Planning Department since 2006 on the development of a Better Neighborhoods Plan. A first draft of this community-based plan was published in 2009. All but minimal Planning Department staffing and support efforts have been eliminated from the FT10-11 budget. Completion and adoption of this community plan still requires an evaluation of alternatives and recommendations to the current City/Private ownership and management of the parking garages, Peace Plaza and commercial malls that comprise the cultural core of Japantown.

This critical study, to determine if there is a means to operate these properties with enhanced community/city control, is still needed. With this essential analysis and associated recommendations for alternative ownership/management configurations of the parking garage, public plaza and commercial mall complex, options will be defined that can retain and assure the historic character of one of the three surviving Japantowns in the USA.

Sincerely,



Paul H. Wermer

Via Facsimile 415-554-5163

File 100701

June 29, 2010

The Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: Restoration Request – Japantown Organizing Committee


Dear Board of Supervisors,

We sincerely appreciate your favorable consideration and support for the Restoration Request of \$50,000 for the Japantown Better Neighborhood Plan Organizing Committee.

Japantown residents, merchants and property owners have worked with the San Francisco Planning Department since 2006 on the development of a Better Neighborhoods Plan. A first draft of this community-based plan was published in 2009. All but minimal Planning Department staffing and support efforts have been eliminated from the FT10-11 budget. Completion and adoption of this community plan still requires an evaluation of alternatives and recommendations to the current City/Private ownership and management of the parking garages, Peace Plaza and commercial malls that comprise the cultural core of Japantown.

This critical study, to determine if there is a means to operate these properties with enhanced community/city control, is still needed. With this essential analysis and associated recommendations for alternative ownership/management configurations of the parking garage, public plaza and commercial mall complex, options will be defined that can retain and assure the historic character of one of the three surviving Japantowns in the USA.

With best regards



Richard W. Matsuno
Kinokuniya Building
Property Manager

Via Facsimile 415-554-5163

File 100701

June 29, 2010

The Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: Restoration Request – Japantown Organizing Committee


Dear Board of Supervisors,

We sincerely appreciate your favorable consideration and support for the Restoration Request of \$50,000 for the Japantown Better Neighborhood Plan Organizing Committee.

Japantown residents, merchants and property owners have worked with the San Francisco Planning Department since 2006 on the development of a Better Neighborhoods Plan. A first draft of this community-based plan was published in 2009. All but minimal Planning Department staffing and support efforts have been eliminated from the FT10-11 budget. Completion and adoption of this community plan still requires an evaluation of alternatives and recommendations to the current City/Private ownership and management of the parking garages, Peace Plaza and commercial malls that comprise the cultural core of Japantown.

This critical study, to determine if there is a means to operate these properties with enhanced community/city control, is still needed. With this essential analysis and associated recommendations for alternative ownership/management configurations of the parking garage, public plaza and commercial mall complex, options will be defined that can retain and assure the historic character of one of the three surviving Japantowns in the USA.

With best regards



Ko Asakura
Kinokuniya Book Stores of America Co., Ltd
Executive Vice President

*BOS-11
page
BF CLK*

NJAHS



National Japanese American Historical Society

1684 Post Street
San Francisco, CA 94115-3604
PHONE (415) 921-5007
FAX (415) 921-5087
EMAIL njahs@njahs.org
WEB www.njahs.org

Via Facsimile 415-554-5163

June 28, 2010

The Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: Restoration Request – Japantown Organizing Committee

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We, at the National Japanese American Historical Society, Inc. sincerely appreciate your favorable consideration and support for the Restoration Request of \$50,000 for the Japantown Better Neighborhood Plan Organizing Committee.

Japantown residents, merchants and property owners have worked with the San Francisco Planning Department since 2006 on the development of a Better Neighborhoods Plan. A first draft of this community-based plan was published in 2009. All but minimal Planning Department staffing and support efforts have been eliminated from the FT10-11 budget. Completion and adoption of this community plan still requires an evaluation of alternatives and recommendations to the current City/Private ownership and management of the parking garages, Peace Plaza and commercial malls that comprise the cultural core of Japantown.

This critical study, to determine if there is a means to operate these properties with enhanced community/city control, is still needed. With this essential analysis and associated recommendations for alternative ownership/management configurations of the parking garage, public plaza and commercial mall complex, options will be defined that can retain and assure the historic character of one of the three surviving Japantowns in the USA.

Sincerely yours,

Rosalyn Tonai
Executive Director, NJAHS
BNP Coordinating Committee



Gavin Newsom, Mayor
Edward D. Reiskin, Director



Phone: (415) 554-5827
Fax: (415) 554-5324
www.sfgov.org/dpw

Department of Public Works
Bureau of Street-Use and Mapping
875 Stevenson Street, Room 410
San Francisco, CA 94103

Fuad S. Sweiss, PE, PLS
City Engineer & Deputy Director of Engineering
Barbara L. Moy, Bureau Manager
Bruce R. Storrs, City and County Surveyor

July 1, 2010

Ms. Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlet Place
City Hall – Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Monument Preservation Fund annual report

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

Enclosed is the yearly report concerning the Monument Preservation Fund, as required by the San Francisco Administrative Code Section 10.100-50(c).

If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Mr. Javier Rivera of my staff at 554-5864.

Sincerely

Bruce R. Storrs
City & County Surveyor

BY _____
AK

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUL -2 AM 9:45

IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN SAN FRANCISCO

Customer Service

Teamwork

Continuous Improvement

43



Gavin Newsom, Mayor
Edward D. Reiskin, Director

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2010 JUL -2 AM 9:45

BY AK



Phone: (415) 554-5810
Fax: (415) 554-5843
www.sfgov.org/dpw

Department of Public Works
Bureau of Street-Use and Mapping
875 Stevenson Street, Room 410
San Francisco, CA 94103

Fuad S. Sweiss, PE, PLS
City Engineer & Deputy Director of Engineering
Barbara L. Moy, Bureau Manager
Bruce R. Storrs, City and County Surveyor

Department of Public Works
Monument Preservation Fund
Annual Report
June 30, 2010

For the 2008-2009 fiscal year our primary task was to systematically verify which monuments were still in existence and which had been destroyed over the years. While verifying the status of the City and County of San Francisco's survey monuments will be an ongoing task we have shifted our monument preservation efforts for the 2009-2010 fiscal year to focus on safeguarding monuments that are located in areas that will be under construction.

Although the permits for this type of work require the contractors to take the necessary measures to protect all survey monuments in the proposed work area, this requirement is often overlooked and we lose many of our monuments as a consequence of this. By means of the monument database that was created and updated during the previous fiscal years, using the monument preservation fund, we work in cooperation with the DPW Street-Permit staff to find locations where construction will take place within ten feet of a City Monument. Once these locations are determined we then contact the contractor or city agency responsible for the construction and make arrangements for proper Pre and Post construction referencing of the affected monument(s) as required by state law (Business and Professions Code Section 8771).

By following the change in procedures mentioned above a total of \$13,480.15 were spent from the monument preservation fund. This is a reduction of \$91,478.23 from the 08-09 fiscal year. The ultimate goal behind this is to continue to protect our survey monument while at the same time allowing the monument preservation fund to grow. In a year or two of allowing the monument preservation fund to increase we will be able to make a massive push to reference and log all of the existing monuments using upgraded equipment, such as a new survey scanner and GPS units. By referencing the entire set of monuments together as one group they will essentially be tied together to one coordinate system reducing the chance of field errors.

IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN SAN FRANCISCO

Monument referencing or reestablishment work was performed at the following locations:

Geneva St. & Howth St
San Jose Ave. & Guerrero St.
Persia Ave. & Athens St.
18th St. & Douglas St.
Noriega St. & 36th Ave.
Noriega St. & 38th Ave.
Noriega St. & 40th Ave.
Noriega St. & 42nd Ave.
Noriega St. & 44th Ave.
Noriega St. & 46th Ave.
Noriega St. & 48th Ave.
Noriega St. & Great Highway
Geary Blvd. & Divisadero St.
Felton St. & Dartmouth St.
Turk St. & Divisadero St.
Clement St. & 02nd Ave.
Clement St. & 04th Ave.
Avalon St & Athens St.
Fillmore St. & Waller St.
Clement St. & 06th Ave.
Clement St. & 10th Ave.
Clement St. & 12th Ave.
Rutland St. & Leland Ave.
Anderson St. & Cortland Ave.

LD FY854 QUERY-JOB-ORDER-COSTS/REMAINING-BALANCE 7/01/10 09:27:01
 Type a Bureau and Job Order number or RC, then press ENTER JRIVERA...

Perf Bur: 0014 Mod#: 005 Next Option: D08
 Job Order: 0068D MONUMENT-PRESERVATION-FUND...
 RC (*RC=all): _____ Proj/Fund Dtl Line? (Y/N): N
 Fund: _____ Display overruns only? (Y/N): N
 Project: _____ Date - From: 07/01/2009 To: 06/30/2010

			Labor	Remaining
X RC	Act	Act Description	Expend	Balance
- DSM..	SUB	SUBDIVISION-& MA	165,555.02-	343,312.02.
- DSM..	SVM	SURVEYS-& MONUME	179,035.17-	108,134.39-
		TOTAL:	13,480.15	235,177.63
		G-TOTAL:	13,480.15	235,177.63

Bottom

. For Labor Trans, place an X in selection column (X) and press ENTER
 F3=Exit F4=More/Less F10=Print F12=Previous F18=Bottom PAGEUP PAGEDOWN



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

S.F. ADMINISTRATIVE CODE CHAPTERS 12B, 12C and 12D.A

WAIVER REQUEST FORM (HRC Form 201)

➤ **Section 1. Department Information**

Department Head Signature: _____
 Name of Department: Office of the Public Defender
 Department Address: 555 Seventh Street, San Francisco, CA 94103
 Contact Person: YUko Osaka
 Phone Number: (415) 558-2494 Fax Number: (415) 553-1607

FOR HRC USE ONLY	
Request Number: _____	
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> <div style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg); font-weight: bold;">RECEIVED</div> <div style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg); font-weight: bold;">BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SAN FRANCISCO</div> <div style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg); font-weight: bold;">2010 JUL -1 PM 3:11</div> <div style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg); font-weight: bold;">BY _____</div> </div>	

➤ **Section 2. Contractor Information**

Contractor Name: Chevron USA, Inc. Contact Person: _____
 Contractor Address: P. O. Box 2001 Concord, CA 94529-0001
 Vendor Number (if known): 04876 Contact Phone No.: 1(800) 243-8785

➤ **Section 3. Transaction Information**

Date Waiver Request Submitted: 6/30/10 Type of Contract: Gasoline unleaded
 Contract Start Date: 7/1/10 End Date: 6/30/11 Dollar Amount of Contract: \$6,000.00
 ADPICS Document Number: _____

➤ **Section 4. Administrative Code Chapter to be Waived (please check all that apply)**

Chapters 12B and 12C
 Chapter 12D.A Note: Employment and MBE/WBE subcontracting requirements may still be in force even when a 12D.A waiver (type A or B) is granted.

➤ **Section 5. Waiver Type (Letter of Justification *must* be attached, see Check List on back of page.)**

- A. Sole Source
- B. Emergency (pursuant to Admin. Code Section 6.30)
- C. Local Business Enterprise (LBE)
- D. Subcontracting Goals
- E. Public Entity
- F. No Potential Contractors Comply – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: 6/30/10
- G. Gov't Bulk Purchasing Arrangement – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: _____
- H. Sham/Shell Entity – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: _____

HRC ACTION	
12B & 12C Waiver Granted: _____	12D.A Waiver Granted: _____
12B & 12C Waiver Denied: _____	12D.A Waiver Denied: _____
Reason for Action: _____	
HRC Staff: _____	Date: _____
HRC Staff: _____	Date: _____
HRC Director: _____	Date: _____

DEPARTMENT ACTION – This section must be completed and returned to HRC for waiver types F, G & H.	
Date Waiver Granted: _____	Contract Dollar Amount: _____

44



C:\BOS-11, Leg Def
COB, page

June 24, 2010

Ms. Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN 30 PM 3:20
BY _____

Re: Addendum to Notice of Transfer of Function under Charter Section 4.132

Dear Madam Clerk:

This letter constitutes an addendum to the initial notice to the Board of Supervisors under Charter Section 4.132 of a transfer of function between departments within the Executive including:

- One position (1.0 FTE 9774) will transfer from the Department of Children, Youth and Their Families to the Department of Public Health to provide early child mental health consultation services.
- One position (1.0 FTE 7334) will transfer from the General Services Agency Real Estate Division to the Public Utilities Commission to provide maintenance support at a PUC facility.
- One position (1.0 FTE 7345) will transfer from the Department of Public Works to the General Services Agency Real Estate Division to provide services to the Hall of Justice.
- One position (1.0 7347) will transfer from the Department of Public Works to the General Services Agency Real Estate Division to provide services to the Hall of Justice.

If you have any questions, please contact my Budget Director Greg Wagner at 554-6486.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom
Mayor

cc: Members of the Budget and Finance Committee
Harvey Rose
Controller

45

copy sent
c: BOSTH, COB, Leg Dep Clay

Office of the Mayor
City & County of San Francisco



Gavin Newsom

June 28, 2010

Ms. Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN 30 PM 3:20
BY [signature]

Re: Notice to Rescind Transfer of Function under Charter Section 4.132

Dear Madam Clerk:

This letter constitutes a notice to the Board of Supervisors that the Mayor's Office will rescind the following transfer of function between departments within the Executive Branch, which had been proposed in a previous letter dated June 1, 2010:

- Four positions (1.0 FTE 9772, 1.0 FTE 2917, 1.0 FTE 1842) will transfer on October 1, 2010 from the Department of Children, Youth and Their Families to the Human Services Agency (HSA) to create the Office of Child Care and Early Learning (OCCEL). This new office will consolidate Early Care and Education (ECE) services to improve management over the child care subsidy system as well as child care provider supports and workforce investments.

I look forward to working with you on this matter in the future.

Sincerely,

Greg Wagner
Mayor's Budget Director

cc: Members of the Budget and Finance Committee
Harvey Rose
Controller

46



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

has Dep Cheryl' page
File 100629

Ben Rosenfield
Controller

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
JUN 30 PM 2:50
Monique Zmuda
Deputy Controller
W

June 30, 2010

Ms. Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RE: File 100629 (Second Draft) – Charter Amendment specifying funding for affordable housing

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Should the proposed charter amendment be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government for a fifteen year period beginning in fiscal year 2011-2012 in that it would set aside funds for affordable housing which are currently available for any public purpose. To the extent that funds are shifted to these programs, other City spending would have to be reduced or new revenues identified.

The amendment specifies that the City create an Affordable Housing Fund and appropriate to it the equivalent of the General Fund surplus from the previous fiscal year. The City typically controls spending, and makes budget reductions in order to create a General Fund surplus. Some City revenue sources such as the transfer tax paid on the purchase of large commercial properties vary greatly and therefore make the General Fund surplus amount in any one year highly variable. Over the last twelve years, had this amendment been in place, the amount that would have been appropriated under the proposed amendment would have ranged between \$16 million and \$66.3 million, with an average of \$40.0 million over that period.

The amendment would also set a "baseline" amount as of fiscal year 2010-2011 City appropriations for certain types of affordable housing, shelter and other emergency housing programs and require that the City not reduce its appropriations for those programs during the 15-year period of the set-aside. Based on our analysis, that baseline amount is estimated at \$135.6 million; however please note that this number may change pending further review of the City's housing and shelter program appropriations.

Sincerely,

Ben Rosenfield
Controller

Note: This analysis reflects our understanding of the proposal as of the date shown. At times further information is provided to us which may result in revisions being made to this analysis before the final Controller's statement appears in the Voter Information Pamphlet.

47



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

Rules Clerk
Bos-11, COB
File 100630
Leg. Dep
Cheryl
Cpage

Ben Rosenfield
Controller

Monique Zmuda
Deputy Controller

June 30, 2010

Ms. Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN 30 PM 2:50
BY [Signature]

RE: File 100630 – Charter Amendment requiring the Mayor to appear personally at one regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Supervisors each month

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Should the proposed charter amendment be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.

Sincerely,

Ben Rosenfield
Controller

Note: This analysis reflects our understanding of the proposal as of the date shown. At times further information is provided to us which may result in revisions being made to this analysis before the final Controller's statement appears in the Voter Information Pamphlet.

48



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

File 100636
Rules Clk. BOS-11, COB, Leg Dep Cheryl
cpage
Ben Rosenfield
Controller

Monique Zmuda
Deputy Controller

June 30, 2010

Ms. Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RE: File 100636 – Charter amendment establishing the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board (Rent Board) in the Charter and dividing the power to nominate members of the Rent Board between the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN 30 PM 2:50
BY MR

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Should the proposed charter amendment be approved by the voters, in my opinion, there would be a minimal impact on the cost of government.

The Rent Board is currently established under the Administrative Code and consists of five members appointed by the Mayor. The amendment would establish the Rent Board as a Charter Board and provide for seven members, with three members appointed by the Mayor, three by the Board of Supervisors, and one jointly by the Mayor and Board President. All members would be subject to qualification requirements providing for a mix of landlord and tenant representatives and a neutral representative.

Sincerely,

Ben Rosenfield
Controller

Note: This analysis reflects our understanding of the proposal as of the date shown. At times further information is provided to us which may result in revisions being made to this analysis before the final Controller's statement appears in the Voter Information Pamphlet.

Office of the Mayor
City & County of San Francisco



Orig: Cpage
c: BOS-11, COB, Leg Dep.
Cheryl, PN
Gavin Newsom

July 1, 2010

Ms. Angela Calvillo
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94109

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
-2010 JUL -1 PM 12:14
BY [Signature]

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Pursuant to Charter Section 3.100, I hereby designate Supervisor Bevan Dufty as Acting-Mayor from the time I leave the state of California at 8:26 AM on Friday, July 2, 2010, until 11:59 PM Saturday, July 3, 2010.

I hereby designate Supervisor Carmen Chu as Acting-Mayor from 12:00AM on Sunday, July 4, 2010, until 1:21 PM Monday, July 5, 2010. In the event I am delayed, I designate Supervisor Chu to continue to be the Acting-Mayor until my return to California.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Gavin Newsom
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

cc: Mr. Dennis Herrera, City Attorney

50



SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2010 JUL -1 PM 3:01

PUBLIC NOTICE

BY Ak

Availability of Draft Environmental Impact Report for the
San Francisco 2004 and 2009 Housing Element
Planning Department Case No. 2007.1275E
State Clearinghouse No. 2008102033

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

A Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared by the San Francisco Planning Department in connection with this project. A copy of the report is available for public review and comment at the Planning Department offices at 1660 Mission Street, 1st Floor Planning Information Counter. Referenced materials are available for review by appointment at the Planning Department's office at 1650 Mission Street, 4th Floor. (Call 575-9018)

Project Description: The subject of this EIR is the proposed revision of the Housing Element of the San Francisco General Plan (General Plan). The Housing Element is a policy document that consists of goals and policies to guide the City and private and non-profit developers in providing housing for existing and future residents to meet projected housing demand, as required under Government Code section 65580 *et seq.* State law requires the housing element to be updated periodically, usually every five years. The City adopted a Housing Element in 2004, updating the 1990 Residence Element. Subsequent to adoption of the 2004 Housing Element, the California Court of Appeal determined the Negative Declaration prepared for the 2004 Housing Element inadequate, and directed the City to prepare an EIR for the 2004 Housing Element. Meanwhile, the City has undertaken a subsequent planning process and prepared the next update of the housing element, the 2009 Housing Element. This EIR is intended to satisfy the City's legal requirements for preparing an EIR on the 2004 Housing Element and also analyzes the environmental effects of the 2009 Housing Element.

A **public hearing** on this Draft EIR and other matters has been scheduled by the City Planning Commission for August 5, 2010, in Room 400, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place. (Call 558-6422 the week of the hearing for a recorded message giving a more specific time.)

Public comments will be accepted from June 30, 2010 to 5:00 p.m. on August 16, 2010. Written comments should be addressed to Bill Wycko, Environmental Review Officer, San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103. Comments received at the public hearing and in writing will be responded to in a Summary of Comments and Responses document.

If you have any questions about the **environmental review** of the proposed project, please call Jessica Range at (415) 575-9018.

51

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/28/2010 02:43 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Fw: North Beach Library



" "
<lgoodin1@mindspring.com>
06/28/2010 02:16 PM

Please respond to
lgoodin1@mindspring.com

To "awmartinez" <awmartinez@earthlink.net>,
andrew.wolfram@perkinswill.com, "c.chase"
<c.chase@argsf.com>, "jmbuckley9"
<jmbuckley9@comcast.net>, cdamkroger@hotmail.com,
karlhasz@gmail.com, diane@johnburtonfoundation.org
cc "cwnevius" <cwnevius@sfchronicle.com>, "kgarcia"
<kgarcia@sfexaminer.com>, "board.of.supervisors"
<board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject North Beach Library

Commissioners,

I am writing in support of the San Francisco Public Library's plan to demolish the North Beach branch library and replace it with a new building designed by an award-winning architectural firm. The new building would be sixty percent larger, brighter, airy, seismically safe and state-of-the-art. This project has been approved by the Library Commission, the Recreation and Parks Commission and has the support of over 300 residents of North Beach as indicated by their signatures on a petition circulated by the Friends of Joe DiMaggio Playground. A Master Plan has been created with the new library sited on the triangle formed by Columbus, Mason and Lombard streets. The plan creates more open space, provides a safer environment, and will serve as a neighborhood gathering place.

In 1957, when then Mayor George Christopher was hastening to build branch libraries, he went against the wishes of the North Beach community and the Telegraph Hill Dwellers neighborhood association who wanted to site the library on the triangle. Instead Mayor Christopher, in his haste, pushed through the lesser choice and sited the building on its present location – which, by the way, is on Recreation and Park property. It was a badly conceived and constrained site from the beginning. To continue to build on a flawed concept and wasting scarce recreation space will not be good for the entire project as delineated in the Master Plan.

It has already been acknowledged that the current building presents severe problems – especially ADA issues. It has been asserted that reasonable alteration is possible without compromising the historical integrity of the building. Perhaps not, but it would certainly compromise the entire project which has enormous support in the neighborhood.

The two likely preservation options would not only take away open space but block circulation between the triangle and the rest of the playground. A south addition would eliminate the children's play ground – a north addition would take out the bocce courts.

Six of eight Appleton-Wolford libraries are already being preserved making the firm and the 1950's style well-represented. The North Beach Library is arguably the worst example of the firm's designs.

Preserving the existing building with an addition would not result in a spacious, modern, fully functional and state-of-the-art branch library. Considering the resulting usable space and functionality, renovating the existing building would not be cost effective compared with replacing it. Preserving the existing building would require too many compromises, with a result that would please no one. Please reconsider landmark status for the North Beach Library and allow long-delayed plans to replace the existing building to proceed.

Thank you,

Lee Goodin
Therese Grenchik
600 Chestnut Street #408
North Beach
S.F. CA 94133

File 100710

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
07/01/2010 04:42 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Legislation # 100710 Street Artist Certificate fee increase



Bill and Bob Clark
<billandbobclark@access4less.net>

To Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
cc

07/01/2010 11:08 AM

Subject Legislation # 100710 Street Artist Certificate fee increase

Please respond to
Bill and Bob Clark
<billandbobclark@access4less.net>

To the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors,

We are sending you this communication to ask you to place it in the file for the legislation #100710 regarding the proposal to increase the Street Artist Certificate fee that the Board of Supervisors will be voting on for second passage at the their next meeting.

William J. Clark

Robert J. Clark

Dear Supervisors,

We are contacting you to ask you to vote against the legislation to increase the Street Artist Certificate fee.

We hope you had an opportunity to read the emails we sent you last week explaining the reasons why we think the Street Artist Certificate fee should not be increased.

However, in case you haven't had the opportunity to read our emails we will explain the two reasons why the Street Artist Certificate fee should not be increased.

1) There is presently approximately \$70,000 in surplus in the Street Artist Special Fund which can be used to pay for the cost of the administration and enforcement of the Street Artist Program in the 2010-2011 fiscal year.

In December of 2009, Leo Levenson from the Controller's Office explained to the Arts Commission and their accountant that the figures Mr. Lazar was using to calculate how much revenue there was in the Street Artist Special Fund were wrong. Mr. Levenson also informed the Arts Commission at that time that there was \$30,000 in the Street Artist Special Fund which the Arts Commission was unaware of.

53

We are including copies of the emails Mr. Levinson sent to the Arts Commission providing them with that information at the end of this email.

The Arts Commission approved the proposed Street Artists Certificate fee increase legislation at their February 1, 2010 meeting and a week later on February 9, 2010 one of the two staff members of the Street Artist Program quit her job and as of this date the Arts Commission has not hired anyone to replace her.

As a result of there only being one Street Artist Program staff member instead of two there is approximately an additional \$40,000 in unpaid salary and benefits that has remained unused in the Street Artist Special Fund.

2) The proposed Street Artist Certificate fee increase is specifically for the sole purpose of paying the cost of the Street Artist Program's and City Attorney's staffs time to process public documents requested by Street Artists pursuant to the Sunshine Ordinance.

This was stated by Mr. Luis Cancel, the Director of the Arts Commission, at the June 21, 2010 special meeting of the Budget and Finance Committee and Mr. Howard Lazar at the January 13, 2010 Street Artist program meeting, the January 25, 2010 Executive Committee meeting of the Arts Commission and the February 1, 2010 Arts Commission meeting.

The Sunshine Ordinance is a ballot measure which contains specific language in Sections 67.26 and Section 67.28 that no one can be charged a fee for the processing of any public document request and that it is to be considered the normal job function of every City employee to process any public document request pursuant to the Sunshine Ordinance.

Since the Sunshine Ordinance is a ballot measure the Board of Supervisors does not have the lawful authority to enact any legislation that would even have the effect of amending the Sunshine Ordinance.

We assert that the Board of Supervisors does not have the authority to enact the proposed Street Artist Certificate fee increase which is for the purpose of charging Street Artists a fee to process requests for public documents pursuant to the Sunshine Ordinance because it would be an illegal amendment of the Sunshine Ordinance for the Board of Supervisors to do so.

For the above two reasons we respectfully request that you change your previous vote on the proposed Street Artist Certificate fee increase legislation and instead vote against the proposed legislation to increase the Street Artist Certification fee.

William J. Clark

Robert J. Clark

Michale:

As you requested, my latest e-mail on this subject,

-Leo

Leo Levenson
Budget and Analysis Director
City and County of San Francisco Controller's Office
City Hall Room 312

San Francisco, CA 94102

Leo.Levenson@sfgov.org

(415) 554-4809 work, (415) 760-0579 cell

----- Forwarded by Leo Levenson/CON/SFGOV on 01/29/2010 02:58 PM -----

Leo

Levenson/CON/SFGO

V

01/29/2010 11:54

AM

Kan Htun/ARTSCOM/SFGOV

To

cc

Howard Lazar/ARTSCOM/SFGOV@SFGOV,
Wing Leung/CON/SFGOV

Subject

Fw: Street Artist Program, FY 08_
09 closing financial

Kan: As you requested, see the e-mails below for a reminder of what we did after our review of inactive projects. The net result in JECO10027510 was \$42,622.53 cash transfer in to project PAR102 from inactive projects PAR1A1 and PAR561.

-Leo

Leo Levenson

Budget and Analysis Director

City and County of San Francisco Controller's Office

City Hall Room 312

San Francisco, CA 94102

Leo.Levenson@sfgov.org

(415) 554-4809 work, (415) 760-0579 cell

----- Forwarded by Leo Levenson/CON/SFGOV on 01/29/2010 11:46 AM -----

Wing

Leung/CON/SFGOV

12/18/2009 09:04

AM

Kan Htun/ARTSCOM/SFGOV@SFGOV

To

cc

Howard Lazar/ARTSCOM/SFGOV@SFGOV,
Leo Levenson/CON/SFGOV@SFGOV

Subject

Re: Fw: Street Artist Program, FY
08_09 closing financial (Document
link: Leo Levenson)

Hello,

Project PAR102 has been adjusted via JECO10027510. Please review result.

Thanks,
Wing

Kan
Htun/ARTSCOM/SFGO
V
12/16/2009 04:15
PM

Leo Levenson/CON/SFGOV@SFGOV
Howard Lazar/ARTSCOM/SFGOV@SFGOV,
Wing Leung/CON/SFGOV@SFGOV

To
cc
Subject
Re: Fw: Street Artist Program, FY
08_09 closing financial(Document
link: Wing Leung)

Hi Leo,

I fully understand your situation like us to get quick response on this matter. Here are my comments:

1. We both agree on the FY08-09 operating surplus \$10,112.
2. It may be a misinterpretation for - \$2,210.63. When I was asked to give him an answer on the closing Street Artist Fund balance, I consulted Wing Leung's section (that time he was out and since we needed to reply quickly), I got the formula for calculating the closing fund balance from the screen 6420 Project Trail Balance. Assets less Liabilities = Equity Fund . With that formula, I got the answer (-) 2,210.63. That is the figure we gave him.
3. PAR561 is in different fund 2SCRFACA, it does not belong to the Street Artist Fund. So, please leave it in this action.
4. I agree to transfer \$30,102.14 in PAR1A1 to PAR102, being the same fund.
5. Also agree to take action as stated in step 2 and 3 of your email, as these were in the same fund to be consolidated and beyond my access to these transaction code.

I want to take this opportunity to thank you and Wing Leung and his staff to always guide us whenever this same matter pops up time ti time and we are ready to provide any feed back from us to answer and follow your office lead in respect to future fund balance and interest calculation matter on this particular fund, Kan.

Kan Htun, CPA
Director of Finance
Arts Commission
Tel: (415) 252-4604
Fax: (415) 252-2595

Leo
Levenson/CON/SFGO
V

12/16/2009 11:01
AM

To
Kan Htun/ARTSCOM/SFGOV@SFGOV,
Howard Lazar/ARTSCOM/SFGOV@SFGOV

cc
Wing Leung/CON/SFGOV

Subject
Fw: Street Artist Program, FY 08_
09 closing financials

Kan and Howard: Please see the inquiry we received below. Can you help me respond?

When I look at project PAR102 at year-end FY 2008/09, I currently see an operating surplus of \$10,112, as noted by Howard Lazar below. But I don't see the -\$2,210.63 net shortfall number.

Instead, the project shows that it started the year with a -\$142,669 negative fund balance. When I look at the GL 399 available fund balance at the end of the year (FAMIS screen 6420, FM 14/09), it is an abnormal \$169,646.06. This is largely due to \$162,995.36 unspent appropriation. Even if you were to close out that \$162,995.36 carryforward appropriation (which has not happened yet), that would still leave an abnormal fund balance of -\$6,690.70.

Meanwhile, I see that the subfund 2S/CRF/ACB does has inactive positive cash balances of \$42,622.53 in other projects, made up of:

PAR1A1 "Missing Project Title": \$30,102.14 (after \$239,373.31 of PAR1A1 was transferred in JEAR09000019 on 3/4/09 to close other various negative balances in 2S/CRF), and

PAR561 "Civic Collection Rec/Exp": \$12,520.39.

Do you think it proper for the total \$42,622.53 in the other 2S/CRF/ACB subfund projects to be transferred to PAR102, since this is the only active project? This would reduce the year-end abnormal fund balance to \$127,023.53.

If yes, the 3 steps that would be necessary are:

1. Transfer the \$30,102.14 remaining in PAR1A1 and \$12,520.39 remaining in

PAR561, 2S/CRF/ACB to PAR102. (this would need to be initiated by the Controller's office since we would use a transaction code Departments can't use).

2. Close \$127,023.53 of the \$159,370 carryforward appropriation sitting in 06B00 in project PAR102 to fund balance.

3. I notice there is also a \$4,491 carryforward reserve appropriation in 09799 created by YECO00646616/04 on 11/15/00. Do you know the reason for this sitting in subobject 09799? If the reason for this reserve no longer holds, we could transfer this appropriation to 06B00 to make it available for future programming.

Please let Wing know if you concur, and we can proceed with these steps. I'd appreciate your thoughts/answer as soon as possible so we can respond to Mr. Addario with the full picture.

-Leo

Leo Levenson
Budget and Analysis Director
City and County of San Francisco Controller's Office
City Hall Room 312
San Francisco, CA 94102
Leo.Levenson@sfgov.org
(415) 554-4809 work, (415) 760-0579 cell

----- Forwarded by Leo Levenson/CON/SFGOV on 12/16/2009 10:35 AM -----

"addariophotograp
hy"
<addariophotograp
hy@myastound.net>

Leo.Levenson@sfgov.org

To
cc

12/16/2009 10:08
AM

Subject
Street Artist Program, FY 08_09
closing financials

Dear Leo,

Leo.Levenson@sfgov.org

Re: San Francisco Street Artist Program (SFSA) closing financial figures for FY 2008/2009

Recently, I requested from the SFSA Program Director Mr. Howard Lazar the SFSA 2008/2009 closing financial figures. On Nov 9, 2009 I received the email below. I would like to know if Mr. Lazar is correct when he states:

"While a surplus is shown of \$ 10,112.00, our understanding from the Controller is that the surplus has been absorbed in covering the Program's deficit from previous years, leaving a negative balance (- \$

2,210.63) to carry forward into FY 2009-10."

Also, I am including the Project Summary Inquiry for the San Francisco Street Artist License Administration, PAR 102, which was run on 7/8/2009 before the close of books for the 2008/2009 fiscal year. I would like to thank you in advance for looking into this matter. And in addition, if you have any questions you may reach me on my cell @ 415 850 7337.

Thank you,

Michael Addario
Member of the San Francisco Street Artist Program
Chairperson, San Francisco Street Artist Program Liaison Committee

Enc: Attachment, Project Summary Inquiry for PAR 102 SFSA

.....

From: Howard Lazar <Howard.Lazar@sfgov.org>
Subject: Closing figures for FY 2008-09
Date: Mon, 9 Nov 2009 09:42:38 -0800
To: addariophotography@myastound.net

Mr. Michael Addario

Dear Mr. Addario:

As I had mentioned several months ago, the Arts Commission's accounting staff has to wait until the end of October, when the Controller's office closes its books on the previous fiscal year, to learn from the Controller's office the figures of actual revenue and expenses of the Street Artists Program for the previous year. Accordingly, we recently learned from the Controller's office the following figures for FY 2008-09:

Total Revenue: \$ 205,350.00
Total Expenses: \$ 195,238.00
Surplus: \$ 10,112.00
Year-end Fund Balance: (- \$ 2,210.63)

While a surplus is shown of \$ 10,112.00, our understanding from the Controller is that the surplus has been absorbed in covering the Program's deficit from previous years, leaving a negative balance (- \$ 2,210.63) to carry forward into FY 2009-10.

Sincerely,

Howard Lazar
Street Artists Program Director

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/25/2010 05:04 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Get Ready for the Gulf Dead Zone June 24, 2010



Ivan E Pratt
<prattbuddhahood@gmail.com>
06/24/2010 04:14 PM

To Brody Tucker <Brody.Tucker@sfdph.org>, IVAN E PRATT
<IEP55@juno.com>, Michael Pacheco III
<hoikeikeala@yahoo.com>, vince@elainezamora.com,
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org, Chughes@ymcasf.org,
membership.services@sierraclub.org,
rfreeman@peralta.edu, sgiangel@earthlink.net, Gavin
Newsom <gavin@gavinnewsom.com>,
AlexanderTenantsAssociation-owner@yahoogroups.com,
Michael Nulty <sf_district6@yahoo.com>, Chi Wolf
<chiwolf@hotmail.com>, ehuerta@parksconservancy.org,
david_villalobos@sbcglobal.net, mhann@tndc.org,
FoodFairy@aol.com, chris.daly@sfgov.org,
chico.garza@sbcglobal.net, heidi@studycenter.org,
christopher.nguyen@dph.sf.ca.us, sro@thclinic.org,
goldoor5@yahoo.com, ecomerritt@peralta.edu,
elaine@elainezamora.com, Steven Andrew Kacsmar
<stevenandrew@earthlink.net>, Mark Kaplan
<rockwellproperties@gmail.com>

cc

Subject Get Ready for the Gulf Dead Zone June 24, 2010

GET READY FOR THE GULF DEAD ZONE June 24 2010

Government Insiders: Get Ready for the Gulf "Dead Zone"
PDF Print E-mail
Written by Wayne Madsen
Wednesday, 23 June 2010 22:50

Bad news concerning the Gulf oil disaster continues to come from WMR's federal government sources in the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the US Army Corps of Engineers. Emergency planners are dealing with a prospective "dead zone" within a 200 mile radius from the Deepwater Horizon disaster datum in the Gulf.

A looming environmental and population displacement disaster is brewing in the Gulf. The oil dispersant used by BP, Corexit 9500, is seen by FEMA sources as mixing with evaporated water from the Gulf and absorbed by rain clouds producing toxic precipitation that threatens to continue killing marine and land animals, plant life, and humans within a 200-mile radius of the Deepwater Horizon disaster site in the Gulf.

Adding to the worries of FEMA and the Corps of Engineers is the large amounts of methane that are escaping from the cavernous grotto of oil underneath the Macondo drilling area of Gulf of Mexico.

On a recent visit to the Gulf coast, President Obama vowed that the

Gulf coast will "return to normal." However, federal officials dealing with the short- and long-term impact of the oil disaster report that the "dead zone" created by a combination of methane gas and Corexit toxic rain will force the evacuation and long-term abandonment of cities and towns within the 200-mile radius of the oil volcano. Plans are being put in place for the mandatory evacuation of New Orleans, Baton Rouge, Mandeville, Hammond, Houma, Belle Chase, Chalmette, Slidell, Biloxi, Gulfport, Pensacola, Hattiesburg, Mobile, Bay Minette, Fort Walton Beach, Panama City, Crestview, and Pascagoula.

The toxic rain from the Gulf is expected to poison fresh water reservoirs and lakes, streams, and rivers, which will also have a disastrous impact on agriculture and livestock, as well as drinking water, in the affected region.

FREE Breaking Investment & Geopolitical Intelligence - Previously only available to Governments, Intelligence Agencies & selected Hedge Funds. Click here for more information on our Free Weekly Intelligence Report

FEMA officials also claim that the \$20 billion compensation fund set aside by BP is not nearly enough to offset the costs of the disaster. The FEMA sources say the disaster will cost well in excess of \$1 trillion, and likely closer to \$2-3 trillion.

IVAN EDGAR PRATT, "XERISCAPE / BUDDHA, INC." IEP55@juno.com, Internet direct quote and paraphrase transcription "Get Ready for the Gulf Dead Zone June 24, 2010" information, Sustainable Systems Environmental Ecology, WebPage:

http://www.brookscoble.com/cgi-brookscoble/course_products_bc.pl?fid=M20b&product_isbn_issn=0534376975&discipline_number=22

Merritt College Ecology Department & Matriculations, WebPage:
<http://www.ecomerritt.org/> Sierra Club Membership, WebPage:
<http://www.sierraclub.org>, NAM MYOHO RENGE KYO,
WebPage: <http://www.sgi-usa.org>

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/28/2010 11:57 AM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Birth of a Garden



Ivan E Pratt
<prattbuddhahood@gmail.com>
06/28/2010 11:21 AM

To Brody Tucker <Brody.Tucker@sfdph.org>, IVAN E PRATT
<IEP55@juno.com>, masmith@php.ucsf.edu,
asha@sfdigifilm.com, membership@parksconservancy.org,
Michael Pacheco III <hoikeikeala@yahoo.com>,
vince@elainezamora.com, board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org,
rfreeman@peralta.edu, Chughes@ymcasf.org,
membership.services@sierraclub.org, sgiangel
<sgiangel@earthlink.net>, Edward Evans
<edwevans@gmail.com>, Gavin Newsom
<gavin@gavinnewsom.com>, cwatros@ggsf.com, Michael
Nulty <sf_district6@yahoo.com>,
AlexanderTenantsAssociation-owner@yahoogroups.com,
Chi Wolf <chiwolf@hotmail.com>, mhann
<mhann@tndc.org>, david_villalobos@sbcglobal.net,
ehuerta <ehuerta@parksconservancy.org>, "Ho, Alice"
<Alice.Ho@ropesgray.com>, FoodFairy@aol.com,
chris.daly@sfgov.org, "chico.garza"
<chico.garza@sbcglobal.net>, heidi@studycenter.org,
sro@thclinic.org, christopher.nguyen@dph.sf.ca.us,
regimeadows@ymail.com, goldoor5@yahoo.com,
richard.montantes@sfdph.org, ecomerritt@peralta.edu,
elaine <elaine@elainezamora.com>, Steven Andrew
Kacsmar <stevenandrew@earthlink.net>,
volunteer@parksconservancy.org, PBCA@cahi-oakland.org,
Mark Kaplan <rockwellproperties@gmail.com>

cc

Subject Birth of a Garden

BIRTH OF A GARDEN June 28 2010

SEARCHING FOR SAN FRANCISCO'S URBAN VEGETABLE GARDEN

Even though 'Sunshine Garden' is not in California, it may have become San Francisco's sister garden. It is certainly the nature of horticulturalist and agriculturalist to share and support each other in the cultivation of plants for production - it is the nature of the profession, and why the plant cultivation profession is a success in America. Certainly recently in President O'Bama's speech address on 'The Gulf of Mexico Ecological Disaster' he more than just implied that we as individuals in a community must work together to attempt to begin, to give this more than just an idea of green living, a real premise in actual manifestation and practice, in our individual communities - what better place to start than just not merely giving the idea of 'San Francisco's Community Urban Vegetable Garden' more than just a vogue political agenda, to make some politician look good

so they can attain votes for what usually is a self centered constituency for industrial profit agenda motivation. The idea of a garden that it be a complete program that educates on the values of ecological preservation of the community, create food for the disenfranchised and disabled, and create individual community family perspective (getting people away from their cable television and seeing the real world and how it truly works on the basis of motheratures real plan) - a garden gives an individual a real personal worth and the realization of being part of the universe itself, a sense of essential pride and accomplishment that reflects on the immediate community in a very nurturing manner - such a sense of pride is what the Tenderloin is in dire need of, which is a sense of pride badly needed in the entire United States that has been badly abused by corrupt government policy.

Master Gardeners Programs,
WebPage: http://vric.ucdavis.edu/main/veg_info.htm
AND

San Francisco Master Gardeners (Master Gardeners of San Mateo & San Francisco Counties - Home Page:
WebPage: <http://groups.ucanr.org/sanmateo/>

Hey Ivan, Master Gardeners would definitely be of help to you.

All the best,

b

At 12:27 AM 6/28/2010, you wrote:

SAN FRANCISCO URBAN GARDENING ACTIVITY June 27 2010
Sunshine Farms, mailings@sunfarm.com,
Ihve been looking for Urban Farming Activities in San Francisco for a long time, and no one seems to know anything, so I am asking Sunshine Farms if they know anything concerning Urban Gardening in San Francisco. It would be nice to participate in such activities, and I am beginning to wonder if this Urban Farm Activity is some sought of well kept secret to an exclusive hegemony.
I thought about asking Master Gardeners, but it seems that San Francisco is excluded for some reason from Master Gardeners activitys.
Does Sunshine Farms know of any activities in this regard in San Francisco?
Thankyou,
IVAN, IEP55@juno.com
June 27, 2010

Get Free Email with Video Mail & Video Chat!
<http://www.juno.com/freeemail?refcd=JUTAGOUT1FREM0210>

Barry
Happy Gardening,
Barry Glick aka Glicksterus maximus aka The Cyber-Plantsman
Sunshine Farm & Gardens
HC 67 Box 539 B
Renick WV 24966 USA
304-497-2208
EMAIL - barry@sunfarm.com

Altitude 3650 feet * Latitude 38.04.00 N * Longitude 80.26.13 W * USDA Zone 5

100637



andrew sullivan
<suldrew371@gmail.com>
06/25/2010 03:46 PM

To Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
cc Daniel Murphy <daniel@sictransit.com>
bcc
Subject Comments on SFMTA Amendment

To the Board -

I was going to submit this at Rules Committee today but ran out of time. If the amendment was sent to the full board this still applies.

Thanks
Andrew Sullivan
Chair, Rescue Muni

To: Rules Committee
Re: Campos Amendment regarding SFMTA Board

This amendment really misses the mark on the critical issues facing the MTA. The MTA is facing severe cuts in funding and serious problems regarding work rules, but the way to address this is not to give the Supervisors additional power over the MTA.

The voters have voted twice to establish, and maintain, this balance of power between the Mayor and Supervisors that was set in 1999 Prop E. This has, in our opinion, served the MTA well over the years, in particular giving the MTA some distance from political interference allowing it to take many transit-first policy positions, including raising parking fees and fines and establishing more transit-only lanes. Changing the balance would be bad for transit service to the extent that it increases interference by this board or some future board - consider the recent issues concerning the proposed Fort Mason streetcar and the previous debates about Geary stop consolidation in the Tenderloin.

If this were to be approved, this would put the Board of Supervisors fully in control of the SFMTA - as was the case prior to 1999. We submit that the quality of service was far worse at that time, not least because there was a severe lack of clarity about who was in charge, and the detailed, often line by line edits to the budget that led to (for example) major cuts being made in maintenance to maintain the fiction of "no service cuts." We fear that, if not this Board, future supervisors will not be able to resist the temptation to cut everything but service hours in order to pretend that service has not been cut.

We do agree that it makes sense to reform work rules, but the way to do that is to advance the Elsbernd "Fix Muni Now" amendment before the public now. Likewise, we do agree that additional funding is appropriate for MTA, but the way to do this is via new revenue sources (e.g. parking tax) rather than reallocating already programmed general fund money for a short term revenue boost, itself likely to cause more problems with the work orders that are now causing SFMTA budget shortfalls.

Remember that this is not about THIS board or THIS mayor. It's about the right policy choices and the structure most likely to lead to them - transit priority, safety and service reliability. We think this amendment is a big step back in that regard. So we urge this committee (and by extension the Board) NOT to move this measure forward.

55

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/28/2010 11:43 AM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject fees & taxes



daniel pong
<dannyde684@live.com>
06/25/2010 06:13 PM

To <boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
Subject fees & taxes

slowly and surely, the board is going to tax and fee us to death. all to help pay the overpaid city employees. you have

got to reduce the city staff otherwise this will go on forever. the next tax will be where we walk or how we talk.

The New Busy is not the old busy. Search, chat and e-mail from your inbox. [Get started.](#)

56

Bill Barnes/BOS/SFGOV
07/01/2010 05:11 PM

To Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV
cc
bcc
Subject Fw: Save Critical Funding for Homeless and At Risk Veterans

For correspondence file.

----- Forwarded by Bill Barnes/BOS/SFGOV on 07/01/2010 05:15 PM -----



Jennifer Stasch
<jstasch@stp-sf.org>
07/01/2010 02:08 PM

To michela.alioto-pier@sfgov.org, john.avalos@sfgov.org,
david.campos@sfgov.org, david.chiu@sfgov.org,
carmen.chu@sfgov.org, chris.daly@sfgov.org,
bevin.dufty@sfgov.org, sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org,
eric.l.mar@sfgov.org, sophie.maxwell@sfgov.org,
ross.mirkarimi@sfgov.org
cc Michael Blecker <mblecker@stp-sf.org>, Leon Winston
<ldw@stp-sf.org>
Subject Save Critical Funding for Homeless and At Risk Veterans

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to inform you of the Department of Public Health's decision to cut funding for behavioral health services delivered to needy veterans by Swords to Plowshares Frontline Drop-In Center. DPH proposes a 40% cut in funding to Frontline Services totally over \$170,000. While DPH's funding allocation was technically rendered during the Behavioral Health Services Mega RFP process, this decision will effectively disrupt services for the more than 2,000 homeless and at-risk veterans who come to our offices annually, 80 each day. These critical services save the City of San Francisco hundreds of thousands per year by preventing hospital visits, incarceration, and emergency services. Since 1974 Swords to Plowshares has operated a multi-service resource center for veterans that provides legal services, vocational training, employment services, and counseling regarding mental health services including case management. The Frontline Drop-In Center has a specialized focus of services for homeless veterans. Our interventions, particularly in the area of discharge planning with hospital, jail and prison liaisons, saves many hundreds of thousands of dollars for the City and County of San Francisco each year. During the past twelve (12) months, 200 San Francisco General Hospital days were made unnecessary as a result of our interventions. In addition, 1000 emergency room visits were prevented due to effective risk assessment, suitable placement, and relapse prevention strategies. During a recent year, eight of the ten most frequent visitors in the emergency hospital system were veterans. They were older veterans suffering from chronic alcoholism, other drug use and chronic mental illness. We provided sufficient services to seven of the eight so that they no longer cycle through local emergency rooms.

Of the 2100 unduplicated veterans that Swords to Plowshares served last year:

- Over 55% were African American who were homeless and over the age of 55
- Over 51 % were disabled
- Over 88% were unemployed

Frontline staff members have long established a bond of trust with homeless and needy veterans with many having instances of incarceration in their background. Since August 2009 Frontline staff members have partnered and collaborated with the San Francisco Sheriff's Department's Community of Veterans Engaged in Restoration (COVER) project. We recently delivered our Combat to Community Training to the Sheriff's Department, where it was highly regarded and commended by Sheriff Hennessey, Undersheriff Cunnie and Sonnie Schwartz. Frontline staff members also currently provide direct services

57

to the COVER project by visiting the "veterans pod" weekly to provide case management to new and remaining veterans and assist those nearing their release date with preparing for reentry. In addition, our Frontline staff members deliver relapse prevention services to released veterans. We know that this is a vital service that prevents homelessness and reduces recidivism.

Our services are cost-effective, are very beneficial to the City and County of San Francisco, and we appeal for the continuation of this critical program. An average of 80 veterans come to our offices each day. The DPH funding is what makes it possible for us to have intake staff and case managers available daily to help veterans and provide them access to not only our continuum of services, but to those of the VA Medical Center and Veterans Benefits Administration. Additionally, they improve our ability to attract significant federal and state funds that directly benefit the San Francisco system of care.

In DPH's own words according to our recent *Monitoring Report Summary* of the Frontline Drop-In Center, "*Swords to Plowshares is to be commended. They exceeded standards in areas of outcomes objectives, delivery of units of service, compliance and client satisfaction. The program continues to provide services to veterans who prefer to be served in a community based agency rather than the larger VA system. The program has also focused services on homeless veterans, they collaborate with the VA, other community programs and are active participants at Project Homeless Connect.*"

We are grateful for our partnership with DPH that has set Swords to Plowshares, and San Francisco, apart from the rest of the nation in providing services to needy veterans and in making significant reductions in veteran homelessness. Our partnership makes San Francisco a truly patriotic city in the most meaningful way to veterans. We hope to continue our partnership in providing vital services to our veterans.

Thank you for your commitment to our veterans. I would greatly appreciate a chance to meet in person to discuss our partnership with DPH and the City of San Francisco further. Please contact me directly anytime at (415) 655-7246 or jstasch@stp-sf.org.

Sincerely yours,

Jennifer Stasch

--

Jennifer Stasch, JD, MPH
Director of Resource Development and Communications
Swords to Plowshares
VETS HELPING VETS SINCE 1974
1060 Howard Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 655-7246, Direct
(415) 518-6119, Cell
(415) 252-4790, Fax
www.stp-sf.org



Shannon Seaberg
<sseaberg@yahoo.com>
07/02/2010 08:58 AM

To Board of Supervisors <board_of_supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us>
cc
bcc
Subject DPW Cleanup Issues

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Every day I take the 22nd Street Caltrain back and forth to work. Since mid-winter (October/November 2009), the hillside at the corner of 23rd Street and Iowa Street has washed out and covered the sidewalk with 2-3 inches of mud. I have previously reported this to the DPW using 311 and have been assured that action would be taken with 48 hours or six weeks, depending on who I speak with. However, it is now July and there are no signs of a cleanup effort.

There is a chain link fence along which rolls of grass/barricades were set to prevent the muddy runoff from overtaking the sidewalk. One of these is completely destroyed and is slowing composting all over the sidewalk. Others are in disarray. It's unsightly and requires pedestrians to walk in the street when the sidewalk and mud are wet.

I hope that you can help me get this cleaned up, as I have had absolutely no response through regular channels.

Regards,

Shannon Seaberg
1410 South Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94110
cell (415) 596-7752

58

March 24, 2010

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN 29 AM 8:16
BY

Dear Mayor and Supervisors:

After reading the attached flyer is it any **WONDER WE ARE BROKE AND SUFFERING** from an indifferent self serving administration. The total of the listing of administrators is approximately \$12,500,000.00. While the rest of us have minimum police protection, highly paid Muni police at \$40 per hour to catch free Muni riders, we live in jeopardy from riding over crowded buses while paying more to the Muni system. **WE ARE NOT ANIMALS TO BE TREATED LIKE WE ARE WHILE RIDING ON THE OVERCROWDED BUSES.** It is outrageous for us to sanction the kind of salaries these administrators are paid while we common workers are taxed to death and we seniors are having our food programs jeopardize.


We are all aware of the fact that management and the local union do not support and could care less about our MUNI DRIVERS, hence their poor attitude with the public It also shows in the disgraceful Building on Presidio avenue which is supposed to be headquarters. The building has not been maintained for years and is a disgrace to the city. It is an example of the lack of support and the daily indifference the Muni bus drivers have to deal with.

We are going to be polling riders as to how the overcrowded bus rider are affected by the time they reach their daily work or play areas. You have no idea of how the long-range will effect the normal bus riders. Our poor (rotten) Muni system has ill effects on the feelings of the common workers. By the time they reach their jobs they are depressed, if not pick pocketed, or knocked around from angry bus riders or experience altercations of various sorts.

Believe you me when we are finished with the November election you won't find any of the same candidates being renewed for another term unless something is done about these salaries. They could each have a 10% cut and still be highly overpaid.

You and the supervisors are supposed to be balancing the budget not confiscating monies for your overpaid salaries. We intend on taking these ridiculous overpaid administrator's salaries and other issues to ever senior in the city. We are going to fight the cut backs unless these administrators receive pay cuts like all of us to balance the budget

Sincerely,



John Wirth
890 Beach Street
San Francisco, CA

Cc: New candidates and current supervisors

59

Director
Golden Gate Park Senior Center
6101 Fulton Street,
San Francisco, CA 94121-3460
(415) 666-7015

Director
Aquatic Park Senior Center 890 Beach Street
San Francisco, CA 94109
In the Maritime Museum,
at the base of Polk Street
(415) 775-1866

Director
Downtown Senior Center
481 O'Farrell St.
San Francisco, CA
94102
(415) 771-7950

Director
Richmond Senior Center
6221 Geary Boulevard, 3rd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94121

Director
Castro Senior Center
110 Diamond Street
San Francisco, CA 94114

Director
Kimochi, Inc.
Administration
1715 Buchanan Street
San Francisco, CA 94115
Telephone: 415-931-2294

Director
Rhoda Goldman Plaza
2180 Post Street
San Francisco, CA 94115

Supervisor Elsbernd wants to cut bus drivers pay. What about overpaid administrators and managers?

SF Pay Rank	Name / Nombre	Title / Titulo	Dept.	Total 2009 pay / Salario Total 2009 W/O benefits / Sin incluir beneficios
1	CHARLES KEOHANE	DEPUTY CHIEF	POLICE	\$516,118.49
2	MORRIS TABAK	DEPUTY CHIEF	POLICE	\$425,558.26
3	NATHANIEL FORD	MANAGER	MTA	\$354,760.50
4	GREGORY SUHR	CAPTAIN III	POLICE	\$345,698.43
5	SYLVIA HARPER	CAPTAIN III	POLICE	\$345,004.56
6	ANTONIO PARRA	CAPTAIN III	POLICE	\$304,767.12
7	JOHNNY LO	BATTALION CHIEF	FIRE Dpt	\$294,123.24
8	JOANNE HAYES-WHITE	CHIEF	FIRE Dpt	\$293,869.93
9	EDWARD HARRINGTON	CONTRACT EMPLOYEE	PUC	\$291,209.42
10	DAVID KUSHNER	DIRECTOR RETIREMENT SYSTEM		\$290,653.24
11	KEVIN CASHMAN	CHIEF III	POLICE	\$290,399.69
12	JAMES LYNCH	ASSISTANT CHIEF	POLICE	\$287,818.50
13	KATHRYN BROWN	COMMANDER III	POLICE	\$284,993.44
14	AMY HART	DEPARTMENT HEAD	ADMIN.	\$282,449.80
15	AARON STEVENSON	ASSISTANT CHIEF	FIRE Dpt	\$275,973.43
16	VENUS AZAR	MEDICAL EXAMINER	ADMIN.	\$274,700.67
17	ELLEN MOFFATT	MEDICAL EXAMINER	ADMIN.	\$271,908.62
18	STEPHEN TACCHINI	CAPTAIN III	POLICE	\$266,668.74
19	GARY MASSETANI	DPT CHIEF	FIRE Dpt	\$266,355.27
20	JUDY MELINEK	MEDICAL EXAMINER	ADMIN.	\$265,648.30
21	JOSEPH DRISCOLL	CAPTAIN	FIRE Dpt	\$264,694.19
22	YUHUM DIGDIGAN	NURSING SUP	DPH	\$263,221.89
23	DAVID SHINN	DEPUTY CHIEF III	POLICE	\$262,236.93
24	PATRICK GARDNER	DPT CHIEF	FIRE Dpt	\$259,295.34
25	JOHN MARTIN	DPT HEAD V	AIRPORT	\$257,754.43
26	MITCHELL KATZ	DEPARTMENT HEAD V	DPH	\$257,741.69
27	MICHAEL MORRIS	BATTALION CHIEF	FIRE Dpt	\$255,884.26
28	JON SMITH	AST MED EXAMINER	ADMIN.	\$255,313.14
29	GAVIN NEWSOM	MAYOR	MAYOR	\$250,903.30
30	TRENT RHORER	DEPARTMENT HEAD V	HMN SRVCS	\$249,411.18
31	EDWIN LEE	DEPARTMENT HEAD V	ADMIN	\$249,411.09
32	ARTHUR KENNEY	ASSISTANT CHIEF	FIRE Dpt	\$248,739.98
33	ANITA ENRIQUEZ	NURSING SUPERVISOR	DPH	\$248,529.52
34	ROBERT SERRANO	BATTALION CHIEF	FIRE Dpt	\$247,975.99
35	THOMAS SIRAGUSA	BATTALION CHIEF	FIRE Dpt	\$247,580.31
36	GERALD DARCY	SERGEANT III	POLICE	\$246,980.08
37	MICHAEL KEARNEY	BATTALION CHIEF	FIRE Dpt	\$245,832.25
38	JAMES BARDEN	BATTALION CHIEF	FIRE Dpt	\$241,081.57
39	MICHAEL ROLOVICH	CAPTAIN	FIRE Dpt	\$239,721.72
40	RONNY TSUJIMOTO	FIREFIGHTER	FIRE Dpt	\$239,270.02
41	ALSON LEE	BATTALION CHIEF	FIRE Dpt	\$239,198.40
42	AUDRY LEE	BATTALION CHIEF	FIRE Dpt	\$238,607.50
43	LOUIS CASSANEGO	LIEUTENANT III	POLICE	\$236,597.34
44	GERALD SCULLION	BATTALION CHIEF	FIRE Dpt	\$236,372.96
45	HARRY PEARSON	LIEUTENANT III	POLICE	\$235,960.20

5161
4255
2,586,028
~~25,860,790~~

12454175
~~12545~~

Why was Muni billed \$60 million from other agencies?
Supervisor Elsbernd isn't worried about that.
Maybe the bus drivers aren't the problem.

MOREpublictransit.net

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/29/2010 10:57 AM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject JAIL MEDICAL SERVICES



WDFLIENT2@aol.com
06/29/2010 04:29 AM

To Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject JAIL MEDICAL SERVICES

Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

I am W.D. Flient, and I have worked on the 7th floor jail of the hall of justice at 850 Bryant Street for the last 11 years. I am assigned to Jail Medical Services.

I am the last African American nurse in this unit, and although I do not want to lose my job, I do wish to come forward with the following critical information regarding the entity known as Jail Medical Services;

!. I have collected evidence and witness information for 10 years regarding blatant and overt racial discrimination, workplace / sexual harrassment, unfair suspension procedures, mail theft, falsification of official documents and the cover-up of a wrongful death by Jail Medical Services nurse managers and supervisors. I have filed many documents urging investigation of facts and evidence which have all been "stonewalled" within the city system.

60

2. Minority employees appear to be hardest hit and constantly targeted by these offenses and often receive superficial if any support by the union Seiu in defending themselves against well known false allegations that also present a distinct harrassive and racial pattern.

These targeted individuals usually are subjected to a form of "discipline overkill," in that often the severest of penalties are applied for minor infractions, despite a lack of complete evidence and falsified statements by the same employees utilized consistently, to provide testimonials in various disciplinary actions.

3. There is an over-abundance of nepotism that exists within Jail Medical Services, and a specific racial group of individuals have utilized their huge numbers to monopolize extra shifts (overtime) often through illicit means. It is commonly known that certain well favored individuals within this racial group employed by Jail Medical Services have achieved incomes as high as 900,000.00 per year. (as illustrated in the San Francisco Chronicle)

This is accomplished often by accomplished by "stealing shifts" from another worker that is appropriate to receive the vacant shift as per union and ccsf guidelines.

There are some members of this racial group that for many years have performed double shifts daily, generally positioning themselves at locations where they can sleep during the long work hours...some commonly spend the

night on the worksite.

4.Cronyism, within Jail Medical Services plays a major part in the promotional process as well, in that recently a Nurse Manager "was appointed" with jurisdiction over all the San Francisco Jails, and this person did not even meet the minimal requirements for that position. This position required a Masters Degree and this individual did not even possess a Baccalaureate Degree.

Once appointed this individual participated in escalated disciplinary actions against African American nurses, seemingly pseudo-protected from intense scrutiny in that she is herself African American.

As public attention has become more focused on the current budget crisis, the above mentioned individual was quietly removed by Jail Medical Services administrative personnel and placed in another jail facility with lesser nurse manager responsibilities, more appropriate to her level of education....But why were the employment regulations waived for this person?

I, personally have been illegally suspended twice, for 30 days, through the falsified misrepresentations of unethical supervisors..and I am currently able through witnesses and documents to unquestionably prove my allegations in that these offenses have been brazenly perpetrated...because the offenders here-to-fore had little to fear of appropriate prosecution.

There is much mismanagement within the Jail Medical Services system, that has been blanketed for many years.

5. The misuse of the CCSF Municipal Computer system is a felony and a mandate is in place to prosecute offenders. This mandate has been skirted many times in favor of specific individuals and appropriate charges were never filed by Jail Medical Services administration.

In fact these same individuals somehow managed to evade the disciplinary process entirely.

The one predominate instance of this type of abuse is when a Registered Nurse obtained the passcode of another employee and utilized it to send malicious and slanderous e-mails throughout the Jail Medical Services system, in effort to sway the possible appointment of an African American union steward.

The passcode-victimized employee, in less than adequate health, upon finding that she was being accused of a felony, died of cardiac complications within 72 hours of this event.

The offending individual, a Registered Nurse, was escorted off the worksite by Sheriff's

Deputies and clandestinely kept on the payroll in "vacation" status...and later was placed

in another jail facility, where he is slated for a supervisor's position....and many of us that

witnessed this legal abomination have long been quieted for fear of a multitude of reprisals and losing our much needed jobs.

6. Kudo's and appreciation for work well done are seldom afforded African American

and minority employees, within Jail Medical Services. Generally these accolades are reserved for a select few...and minority efforts are often conveniently overlooked.

On November 9, 2006, when Sheriff's Deputy Young, (badge #780) came to the clinic complaining of slight chest pain and dizziness. I

examined him and almost immediately recognized a dangerous cardiac rhythm!

I contacted the Watch Commander, Sergeant Heuer, and notified him that Deputy Young needed to be transported to the hospital without delay! Within one hour of admission to the Francisco General Hospital Deputy Young, generated a Code Blue alarm, indicating a life threatening emergency. After being stabilized, Deputy Young was informed by the attending Cardiologist that if he had been 20 minutes later in arriving, he would have died in transport.

With the exception of Deputy Young and members of the Sheriff's Department, I have received no recognition of any of my efforts for that evening. Prior to working for Jail Medical Services, I was previously trained for 5 years in Critical Care Procedures at Marin General Hospital, where I was employed in the Cardiac Specialty Unit, (CSU). (I have published newspaper articles citing my skills)

I am trained in recognizing dangerous cardiac rhythms and related critical symptoms, that are initially detected through the use of a stethoscope.

7. I am a Vietnam era disabled veteran of the U.S. Air Force

Military Police that has sustained high frequency hearing loss through my service to the United States.

But, since I have a degenerative hearing loss, I now need special equipment to continue to perform my job efficiently. I was supplied with hearing aids by the Veterans Administration

and an appropriate request was made for the City of San Francisco, as a co;operative entity to also supply an electronic stethoscope to supplement my hearing so that I could continue to perform my vocation.....yet this Official Veterans Request was denied by my current nurse manager. I was denied the mandated benefits afforded to all honorably discharged military veterans!!!

This narrative represents only the "tip of the iceberg" of existent abuses currently within Jail Medical Services.

I represent many employees that are indeed willing to testify as to the litany of Civil Rights abuses present, ie, I, and others have often heard information in the workplace conveyed openly in a foreign language and little has been done to remedy these ills.

There currently exists many employees and former employees that are now willing to come forward to expose the illegal nature in operation of Jail Medical Services.

I would at this juncture suggest, that the City Board of Supervisors and the Official Budget

Committee initiate an investigation into the viability of continuing this entity in its current form.

Jail Medical Services is a Civil Rights Nightmare!

I will be providing supportive documents to the offices of CCSF Supervisors; Ross Mirikarimi, Sophie Maxwell and Eric Mar.

I apologize for not being able to supply the entire Board, but I have prepared these documents for Federal Distribution with my own funds and I was unable to afford more copies.

**Respectfully,
W.D. Flient**

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/28/2010 05:41 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Communities of Opportunity



Francisco Da Costa
<fdc1947@gmail.com>
06/28/2010 05:25 PM

To Angelo King <apkbayview@yahoo.com>, "Dwayne. Jones"
<dwayne.jones@sfgov.org>, Fred Blackwell
<fred.blackwell@sfgov.org>, Michael Cohen
<michael.cohen@sfgov.org>, "Gavin. Newsom"
<gavin.newsom@sfgov.org>, Dennis Herrera
<CityAttorney@sfgov.org>, Leland Yee
<leland.yee@sen.ca.gov>, Mark Leno
<mark.leno@sen.ca.gov>, Tom Ammiano
<tom.ammiano@asm.ca.gov>, "Ma, Fiona"
<fiona.ma@asm.ca.gov>, Dan Bernal
<Dan.Bernal@mail.house.gov>

cc

Subject Communities of Opportunity

Communities of Opportunity is a JOKE.

The recent newsletter sent speaks of ideas in general and in all the time COO has been operating it has wasted millions of dollars in the Bayview and in other parts with its dubious ploys and machinations.

COO has divided the community - mainly the Black community. So, now with Blacks representing 18% of the community in the Bayview - the real GENTRIFICATION has begun.

Dwayne Jones is jumping ship. Other crones will try to keep the sinking ship afloat. You guys are pathetic and what is most pathetic is when some of you working for COO feel you represent the community. As of today Dwayne Jones is history - he has resigned without any accountability and less transparency. " No good ever comes from Dwayne Jones" I said this years ago.

The majority of the Asians, the Samoans, the Latinos, the Whites have not heard about COO. They have heard the doves cooing - but not about COO's dubious operations.

61

The SF Chronicle article exposed COO for what it is. COO has chosen to work in poor communities - because it is fertile ground - where ignorance prevails and those that can tell lies - can get away with murder. Folks like Dwayne Jones and Angelo King have worked for COO. But, these two do not represent the community nor will they, ever.

How can the community take charge of their destiny when none of them known about the SF Housing Element, did not comment on the Environmental Impact Report to the Shipyard and Candlestick Point, have no clue about Cumulative Pollution, have no idea that Blacks are now only 18 % of the Bayview population and dwindling.

In the interim our children are dying. Our Elders suffering and health and safety of those in the Bayview worsening daily.

Under Mayor Gavin Newsom the Bayview Community has been decimated and the lies he spews are much more toxic then any Superfund site.

Dwayne Jones and Gavin Newsom have done more harm then good to the Bayview community - and some of you know about this and those of that do not - you all are put on notice.

Francisco Da Costa

26 June 2010

Dear S.F. Board of Supervisors —

Reason for writing: funding for the arts in SFO.

we need food + shelter
clean air + clean water are a plus
and then there is music.

I cannot imagine my life without music (all sorts)
it is my best friend + trustworthy companion

the men + women (not to forget the sometimes very amazingly young
men + women) who compose + make music, embody, literally one of
the greatest mysteries on earth.

How do they do it?

I am 70 years old.

I would like not only to be able to listen to music but to be able to make it.
I am trying to learn to play the piano.

the joy: sound, rhythm, connections, discipline
the physicality on the outside
the emotions hiding inside

this world would not exist without music
somebody somewhere will always be creating it + playing it.

I would like to conclude by quoting Dr. José Antonio Abreu, a retired
economist, trained musician + social reformer who founded
El Sistema in Venezuela:

"Music has to be recognized as an agent of social development
in the highest sense, because it transmits the highest values —
solidarity, harmony, mutual compassion. And it has the
ability to unite an entire community + to express sublime
feelings"

I rest my case.

marcia flannery
363-40th St.

Oakland, CA. 94609-2608

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN 29 PM 3:34
BX _____

(62)

Rules Clerk + Members
File 100636
Cpage

June 29, 2010

Members of the SF Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA. 94102

RE: Proposed Charter Amendment for November 2010 ballot to Change the Composition of the SF Rent Board

Dear Honorable Supervisors:

It is my understanding that the proposed composition for the rent board would be three tenant, two neutral, and two landlord commissioners. This proposal will make it very difficult for the landlord to prevail in any close decision. This would only be justifiable if it is shown that the lone neutral on the board has been/is biased against the tenant, but there has been no evidence that has emerged to support that argument that I know of. In fact, if one looks at the close decisions of the board in the last year and a half, the 3-2 decisions, the neutral commissioner voted in favor of the tenant 75% of the time. Thus, I am urging you to vote against this proposal because I believe it is unnecessary and it would be unfair. Since the board is the end of the administrative process they, I believe, should be fair in deciding cases. Finally, it appears that the proposed composition is very different in comparison to other rent boards.

Sincerely,
Bill Quan
Bill Quan

SFRentBdProposedCompositionChangeUrgeANoVote.wps

63