

Petitions and Communications received from May 17, 2011, through May 27, 2011, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on June 7 2011.

Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted.

From San Francisco People First, regarding budget cuts in public transportation. (1)

From Department of Elections, submitting Certification of Initiative Ordinance "Male Circumcision". (2)

From Office of the Controller, submitting notification of access line tax annual rate adjustment. (3)

From Clerk of the Board, submitting Notice of Receipt of Form 700. (4)

From Clerk of the Board, submitting Notice of Receipt of 9 appointments by the Mayor. (5)

From Anmarie Mabbutt, regarding an amendment of the City Charter allowing a former appointed Mayor to obtain City employment. File No. 110023, Copy: Each Supervisor (6)

*From concerned citizens, urging the Board of Supervisors to end the sidewalk Sit-Lie Ordinance. 35 letters (7)

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to the proposed Charter Amendment allowing amendments to or repeals of initiative ordinances and declarations of policy. File No. 110401, 9 letters (8)

From concerned citizens, submitting support for the delivery truck easement agreement. File No. 110599, Copy: Each Supervisor, 14 letters (9)

From concerned citizen, submitting opposition to legislation directing constituents. (10)

From Ruth Snow, submitting public safety questions in regards to cell phone towers. Copy: Each Supervisor (11)

From Christopher Pederson, submitting support for proposed Charter Amendment allowing amendments to or repeals of initiative ordinances and declarations of policy. File No. 110401 (12)

*From concerned citizens, submitting support for AT&T network upgrades. File 110344, Approximately 100 letters. (13)

*From concerned citizens, submitting support for eliminating the \$2,000,000 in service fees charged to City College. Approximately 2,000 letters (14)

From Tim Giangioffe, regarding Greg Suhrs' camera idea for the Police Department. (15)

From Teck Chia, submitting support for proposed stock option legislation. File 110462, 14 letters (16)

From concerned citizens, regarding saving the Sharp Park Wetlands. 16 letters (17)

From Bernard Choden, regarding the City's need to absorb the regions' population growth. (18)

From concerned citizens, regarding the 2009 Housing Element. File No. 110397, 10 letters (19)

From Martin William Reed, submitting an article on performance bonds and commissions on education. (20)

From Parkmerced Residents' Organization, LLC, submitting support for the current Parkmerced Project. Copy: Each Supervisor (21)

From Abdalla Megahed, submitting a letter on the investigation of a service provider working for In-Home Supportive Service. 2 letters (22)

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to AT&T network upgrades. File No. 110344, 11 letters (23)

From Jean Barish, submitting opposition to the Parkmerced Project, the AT&T network upgrade and the 2009 Housing Element Update. Copy: Each Supervisor (24)

From James Chaffee, regarding Ethics Commission Complaint No. 01-100115. Copy: Each Supervisor (25)

*From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to the current Parkmerced Project. Copy: Each Supervisor, 25 letters and a petition with over 150 signatures (26)

From Office of the Sheriff, submitting request for waiver of Administrative Code Chapter 14B for Recology Peninsula Services. (27)

From Office of the Sheriff, submitting request for waiver of Administrative Code Chapter 12B for Rapid Notify, Inc. (28)

From Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector, submitting the 2010 Payroll Expense Tax Credit - Enterprise Zone Annual Report. Copy: Each Supervisor (29)

From Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector, submitting the 2010 Payroll Expense Tax Exclusion - Clean Technology Business Annual Report. Copy: Each Supervisor (30)

From Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector, submitting the 2010 Payroll Expense Tax Biotechnology Exclusion Annual Report. Copy: Each Supervisor (31)

From Office of the Controller, submitting a cost analysis of the MOU between the City and County of San Francisco and the Committee of Interns and Residents. Copy: Each Supervisor (32)

From Office of the Controller, submitting an economic impact report on the Parkmerced Redevelopment Project. File No. 110300, Copy: Each Supervisor (33)

From Round the Diamond, urging the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to support a sports management center pathway academy/field study classroom, as an integral component within the proposed construction of a basketball arena on the Port of San Francisco Seawall Lot No. 338. Copy: Each Supervisor (34)

From T-Mobile, submitting notification of six cellular antennas to be installed at 982 Market Street. (35)

From T-Mobile, submitting notification of eight cellular antennas to be installed at 650 5th Street. (36)

From T-Mobile, submitting notification of five cellular antennas to be installed at 3438 Mission Street. (37)

From T-Mobile, submitting notification of one cellular antenna to be installed at 501 Greenwich Street. (38)

From State Department of Historic Preservation, submitting notice that the Doolan Building was placed on the National Register of Historic Places. Copy: Each Supervisor (39)

From State Fish and Game Commission, submitting notice of proposed regulatory action relative to upland game hunting. Copy: Each Supervisor (40)

From State Fish and Game Commission, submitting notice of proposed regulatory action relative to waterfowl hunting. Copy: Each Supervisor (41)

From State Public Utilities Commission, submitting notice that PG&E has filed an application for approval of energy savings assistance/care programs and budget. Copy: Each Supervisor (42)

*From Office of the Controller, submitting the Street and Sidewalk Perception Study Report. (43)

From Entertainment Commission, regarding issues related to 1787 Union Street. (44)

From United Taxicab Workers, submitting opposition to proposed resolution that opposes a taxi fare increase without improved taxi service. File No. 110669, Copy: Each Supervisor (45)

From Office of the Mayor, submitting notice that Mayor Lee will submit his balanced budget on June 1, 2011, to the Board of Supervisors and deliver an address regarding the FY2011-2012 Budget. Copy: Each Supervisor (46)

From concerned citizens, submitting support for the GGNRA's draft dog management plan. File No. 110196, Copy: Each Supervisor, Land Use Committee Clerk, 2 letters (47)

From Niki Beecher, submitting opposition to the GGNRA's draft dog management plan. File No. 110196, Copy: Each Supervisor (48)

From State Fish and Game Commission, submitting notice of proposed regulatory action relative to the American pika. Copy: Each Supervisor (49)

From Tim Giangioffe, regarding a homeless baby boomer. (50)

From Richard Skaff, regarding bus shelters. (51)

From Jack Barry, regarding pedestrian and motorist laws. Copy: Each Supervisor (52)

From Carla Ward, regarding various issues. (53)

*(An asterisked item represents the cover sheet to a document that exceeds 25 pages. The complete document is available at the Clerk's Office, Room 244, City Hall.)

San Francisco People First
We are people first - our disabilities are second.

Lupita Martin **President** - Mark Gnosca **Vice President** - Veronica Moreno **Secretary** -
Sandra Gibson **Treasurer** - Mark Gnosca **Sergeant At Arms** - Jennifer Walsh **Advisor**

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2011 MAY 16 PM 3:16

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Carlton B Goodlett Pl
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

May 13, 2011

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

We are San Francisco People First and we believe we are people first and our disabilities are second. Government funded programs helps this belief to be true. We use public transportation; go to school, work and volunteer in our communities. It is hard enough when one government service is being cut in one part of our lives but this year everything is being cut which affects our entire lives. Having government funded programs helps to be equal in the community.

We know your job is to balance the budget but the budget purpose is to balance people in the community. Thank you for taking the time to read this

Sincerely,

San Francisco People First
1242 Market St 1st Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

SIDNEY

Mark Gnosca

Lupita


Andrew Bixler

Joseph J. Sanagan

VERONICA

Sandra Gibson

DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS
City and County of San Francisco
www.sfelections.org



JOHN ARNTZ
Director

BOS-11, COB
Cpage, Leg De
RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAY 17 PM 1:28
BY [Signature]

HAND DELIVERED

May 17, 2011

ANGELA CALVILLO, CLERK OF THE BOARD

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


Re: CERTIFICATION OF THE INITIATIVE ORDINANCE "**MALE CIRCUMCISION**"

Enclosed is a copy of the letter sent to the proponent of the above named petition, certifying that the petition did contain sufficient valid signatures to qualify for the next general municipal or statewide election occurring at any time after 90 days from the date of the certificate in the City and County of San Francisco.


If you should have any questions or need additional information, please contact Deborah Brown, Manager, Voter Services Division, at (415) 554-5665.

Sincerely,

John Arntz
Director of Elections

By: 

Deborah Brown
Voter Services Manager



Encl.: Copy of Certified letter to Proponent

Cc: Honorable Edwin Lee, Mayor
John Arntz, Director of Elections
Dennis Herrera, City Attorney

DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS
City and County of San Francisco
www.sfelections.org



JOHN ARNTZ
Director

CERTIFIED MAIL: 7001 1940 0001 0678 3528

May 17, 2011

Lloyd Schofield
154 Delmar Street
San Francisco, CA 94117

Re: CERTIFICATION OF THE INITIATIVE ORDINANCE "**MALE CIRCUMCISION**"

Dear Mr. Schofield,


The Department of Elections has completed its review of the initiative petition "**MALE CIRCUMCISION**" that submitted to this office on April 26, 2011. After reviewing all of the signatures attached to the petition, we have determined that the number of valid signatures on the petition is 7,743 out the 12,271 signatures submitted with the petition. The minimum number of valid signatures required to place this initiative measure on the ballot for the November 8, 2011 Municipal Election is 7,168.

I hereby certify that the "**Male Circumcision; Initiative Ordinance**" qualifies for the next general municipal or statewide election occurring at any time after 90 days from the date of the certificate in the City and County of San Francisco.


If you should have any questions or need additional information, please contact Deborah Brown, Manager, Voter Services Division, at (415) 554-5665.

Sincerely,

John Arntz
Director of Elections

By: 

Deborah Brown
Voter Services Manager



cc: Honorable Edwin Lee; Mayor
John Arntz, Director of Elections
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Dennis Herrera, City Attorney



BUS-11, 100, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000

BTF Clerk

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

FROM: Ben Rosenfield *[Signature]*

DATE: May 17, 2011

SUBJECT: Notification of Access Line Tax Annual Rate Adjustment

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAY 17 PM 12:42
AK

In November 2008, San Francisco voters approved Proposition O to replace the Emergency Response Fee with the Access Line Tax. Prop O allows for annual inflationary adjustments to the per line tax rates, codified in San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 784 as follows:

The amount of the tax shall be \$2.75 per month per access line, \$20.62 per month per trunk line and \$371.15 per month per high capacity line. These amounts shall be adjusted annually in accordance with the increase in the Consumer Price Index: All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco/Oakland/San Jose Area for All Items as reported by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, or any successor to that index, as of December 31st of each year, beginning with December 31, 2009.

In May 2011, the Controller's Office calculated the inflationary increase on fees effective July 1, 2011 to be 1.52%. Source data are from the US Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics website using the "Consumer Price Index (CPI) - All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco - Oakland-San Jose CA Area," using December factors from the end of the prior year. The website is: http://data.bls.gov/PDO/servlet/SurveyOutputServlet?data_tool=dropmap&series_id=CUURA422SA0,CUUSA422SA0. The difference between the inflation index for December 2009 (224.239) and December 2010 (227.658) is 3.419, or 1.52%.

When applied to current rates per line, the new rates are as follows:

Rate Adjustment for July 1, 2011			
Line Type	Current Rate Per Line	Adjustment Factor	New Rate Per Line
Access line	\$ 2.82	1.52%	\$ 2.86
Trunk line	\$ 21.16	1.52%	\$ 21.48
High capacity line	\$ 380.84	1.52%	\$ 386.63

Please contact me or Michelle Allersma, Citywide Revenue Manager, Controller's Office Budget and Analysis Division, at 554-4792 if you have any questions regarding this information.

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: May 17, 2011

To: Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors


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

Subject: Form 700

This is to inform you that the following individual has submitted a Form 700 Statement:

Una Fannon – Legislative Aide – Leaving

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. 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: May 25, 2011
To: Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors
From: *ACC* Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Subject: APPOINTMENTS BY THE MAYOR

The Mayor has submitted the following appointments:

- Leo Chow, Arts Commission, term ending January 15, 2015
- Anderson Pugash, Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority, March 25, 2015

Under the Board's Rules of Order Section 2.24, a Supervisor can request a hearing on an appointment by notifying the Clerk in writing.

Upon receipt of such notice, the Clerk shall refer the appointment to the Rules Committee so that the Board may consider the appointment and act within thirty days of the appointment as provided in Section 3.100(18) of the Charter.

Please notify me in writing by 12:00 p.m., Thursday, June 2, 2011, if you wish any appointment to be scheduled.

Attachments

5

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



Rules Clerk
COB, Leg. Dep.
EDWIN M. LEE
MAYOR

May 24, 2011

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

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

I am pleased to advise you of the following reappointments, pursuant to Charter Section 3.100 (18):

Leo Chow to the Arts Commission for a four year term ending January 15, 2015

Anderson Pugash to the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority for a four year term ending March 25, 2015.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Edwin M. Lee".

Edwin M. Lee
Mayor

CC: Linda Wong, Clerk, Rules Committee

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAY 24 PM 4:10
BY *LB*

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



EDWIN M. LEE
MAYOR

Notice of Appointment

May 24, 2011

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to the Charter Section 3.100(18), I hereby make the following appointments:


Leo Chow to the Arts Commission for a four year term ending January 15, 2015


Anderson Pugash to the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority for a four year term ending March 25, 2015.

I am confident that Mr. Chow and Mr. Pugash will continue to serve our community well. Attached are their qualifications to serve, which demonstrate how their appointments represent the communities of interest, neighborhoods and diverse populations of the City and County of San Francisco.

I encourage your support and am pleased to advise you of these appointments.

Sincerely,


Edwin M. Lee
Mayor

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAY 24 PM 4:10
BY 

Anderson T. Pugash

1764 North Point, San Francisco CA 94123-415.847.2826 - apugash@gmail.com

EDUCATION

The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

December 2008

Bachelor of Science in Economics

Concentration:

Real Estate- Concentration GPA 3.59, Cumulative GPA 3.15

Relevant Coursework:

Real Estate Design and Development, Urban Real Estate Economics, Advanced Real Estate Finance, Financial Accounting, Corporate Finance, Real Estate Law, Operations & Information Management, Economics, Marketing

EXPERIENCE

SIMEON Commercial Properties, San Francisco, CA

March 2009- Present

Associate

- Primarily responsible for underwriting and analysis of potential acquisitions across various property types with a focus on commercial and retail mid-market deals.
- Other responsibilities include entitlement research, portfolio cash flow analysis and due diligence.

Rockwood Capital, San Francisco, CA

Summer 2008

Analyst

- Underwrote numerous property types with a focus on mid-market commercial acquisition and re-positioning.
- Compiled and created market reports on Las Vegas, San Francisco and Seattle.
- Created a model to analyze DSCR and compliance with debt covenants on a \$37 MM mixed-use loan.

Linneman Associates, Philadelphia, PA

Fall 2005 - Spring 2006

Research Analyst

- Conducted research for Dr. Peter Linneman's quarterly economic and real estate publication, *The Linneman Letter*.
- Contributed market focus pieces and created graphs of numerous macroeconomic indicators, such as GDP, office absorption, inflation and other indicators for publication.

Pacific Coast Capital Partners, San Francisco, CA

Summer 2005

Investment Intern

- Conducted market research and deal analysis.
- Financial underwriting on commercial, residential, and industrial properties.
- Underwrote a \$20.5 MM, 71,000 SF mixed-use conversion in Redmond, WA, including office, retail and residential development.

Obsidian Properties, LLC, Philadelphia, PA

Fall 2004 - Present

Co-Founder, President

- Acquire, renovate and reposition undervalued residential properties in Philadelphia.
- In charge of all aspects of development including acquisition, due diligence, renovation, leasing and property management.
- Initial acquisition fully renovated and leased within six months, currently providing positive cash flow.
- Performed financial analysis and pro-forma modeling for prospective investments.

CHARITABLE GIVING

The San Francisco Social

2006- Present

- Created, envisioned and executed the San Francisco Social, an annual fundraiser that supports local bay area charities. The event has raised funds for the Sonoma Jazz+ Festival (www.sonomajazz.org) as well as the de Young and Legion of Honor (www.famsf.org). The event is in its 5th year.
- Responsible for all aspects of planning, including: marketing, venue selection and negotiations, booking talent, catering, public relations, soliciting sponsorship and website (www.thesanfranciscosocial.com).
- The event has garnered media coverage in San Francisco Magazine, SF Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner, Marin Magazine, 7X7 Magazine, Nob Hill Gazette, the Marin IJ and Benefit Magazine since inception.
- Have raised over \$59,000 before expenses, over four annual events, with all proceeds going to charity.

Mercy Housing and American Cancer Society

- Part time volunteer at Mercy Housing during the summer of 2006.

SKILLS & INTERESTS

- Park, Recreation and Open Space Advisory Committee Member Representing District 2
- Co-Founder of "Anderson & Nick" a special events production company with 6,000 person mailing list and regular event attendance ranging from 300-500 people.

- Hobbies include reading, guitar, mountain & road biking, sculling, yoga.
- Construction and renovation experience.
- Vice President of Wharton Real Estate Club, 2004-05

Leo Chow, AIA

Associate Director, Design
Skidmore, Owings & Merrill LLP



ON
of Architecture,
University; Special Program:
Paris, France and Veneto, Italy

Architecture, Harvard University,
School of Design

IONAL REGISTRATIONS
d Architect: California, New York

IONAL AFFILIATION
Institute of Architects

3 POSITIONS
prehensive Design Studio-2001
aculty

prehensive Design Studio-2005
aculty

University
-Integrated Design Studio-2008

1 POSITIONS
ilver, Boston, MA

ssociates, Princeton, NJ

esign Office, Princeton, NJ

ects, Ithaca, NY

Leo Chow is a senior designer with more than 20 years of experience designing mixed-use complexes, commercial office buildings, residential towers, laboratories, and resorts in the United States and abroad. Leo has participated in a series of successful major international design competitions, beginning with the Shenzhen International Trade Center in China and including the California Civic Center Complex, Sofitel, and the UCSF Campus at Mission Bay Neurosciences Laboratory and Clinical Research Building 19A.

SELECTED PROJECTS

*Wuxi Times Square,
Wuxi, China.*
A 3.8 million-sf vertical city of mixed-uses featuring 1 million sf of offices, a 400-key, five-star hotel, 360 luxury service apartments, and retail.

*Harvard University Northwest Science Building,
Cambridge, Massachusetts.*
Multi-disciplinary research building for neurosciences, bio-engineering, systems, biology, and computational analysis that will be located on the university's historic north campus. Project is 530,000 sf (above- and below-grade), including below-grade state of the art pedagogical facilities at the B1 level, herbaria and anthropological collections at B2, and two further below-grade levels of high performance, specially research support facilities.

*St. Regis Hotel & Residences;
San Francisco, California.*
Architectural and engineering services for a new 42-story, multi-use tower that includes residential, hotel, parking, and retail spaces.

*The Beacon,
San Francisco, California.*
1.3-million sf "superblock" containing 643 units of mid- and upper-market housing with retail ringing the ground- and second-floor perimeters.

*Beijing Poly Plaza
Beijing, China.*
Iconic triangular design structure that provides both Class-A speculative office space and a destination spot. Office design maximizes leaseability through optimal natural light and passive climate control. Plaza has become a landmark building at an important crossroads in the city.

*UCSF Campus at Mission Bay Neurosciences Laboratory and Clinical Research Building 19A,
San Francisco, California.*
238,000 gsf, 5-story research and instruction building at the UCSF Mission Bay campus site. The project will support multidisciplinary research dedicated to development of treatments, cures, and preventions for diseases of the nervous system.

*Electronic Arts Corporate Campus,
Redwood City, California.*
45 acre corporate campus including two office buildings (six- and eight-stories), a parking structure, and a commons building containing a fitness center, restaurant, sports facility, and company store.

*U.S. Court of Appeals Renovation,
San Francisco, California.*
Renovation, expansion, and retrofit of 350,000-sf building and 50,000 sf of expansion. SOM updated the program and building performance, while maintaining a vigorous standard of historic preservation. Addition provides five levels of lab library in daylight setting.

*Civic Center Complex, State Office Building
San Francisco, California.*
Renovation of 200,000-sf historical building and addition of 800,000-sf new office tower in the heart of the San Francisco Civic Center Complex.

*International Terminal San Francisco
International Airport; San Francisco, California.*
Terminal whose iconic structure creates tremendously powerful identity for both the airport and the city of San Francisco. Contains 26 new arrival and departure gates.

AWARDS

*The New Beijing Poly Plaza,
Beijing, China*
Chicago Athenaeum American Architecture Award; 2008
Chicago Athenaeum International Architecture Award; 2008
Structural Engineers Association of California Award of Excellence: Landmark Structures Category; 2007
National Council of Structural Engineers Association Excellence in Structural Engineering; 2007
Institution of Structural Engineers Award for Commercial or Retail Structure; 2007
Structural Engineers Association of Northern California, Award of Excellence: New Construction; 2007
Structural Engineers Association of Illinois, Excellence in Structural Engineering; Most Innovative Structure; 2007
General Electric Company, Edison Award for Excellence in Lighting Design; 2006
Beijing Quality Project Evaluation Committee, Great Wall Cup: Gold Metal; 2005

*Harvard University Northwest Science Building,
Cambridge, Massachusetts*
Chicago Athenaeum American Architecture Award; 2008

*St. Regis Hotel and Residences,
San Francisco, California*
Precast/Prestressed Concrete Institute Best Mixed-Use Building; 2007
Structural Engineers Association of Northern California, Award of Merit; 2005
American Concrete Institute Award; 2005
American Concrete Institute-Northern California and Western Nevada Chapter, Construction Award: Construction Category-Architect, Structural/Civil Engineer; 2004
American Concrete Institute-Northern California and Western Nevada Chapter, Construction Award: Structural Category-Architect, Structural Engineer, and Structural/Civil Engineer; 2004

*The Beacon,
San Francisco, California*
San Francisco Business Times, Best Mixed Used Project in San Francisco; 2003

International Terminal, San Francisco International Airport
AIA National Honor Award for Architecture; 2002
AIA National Honor Award for Interior Architecture; 2002
AIA San Francisco, Best of the Bay and Beyond, Best of Show Award for Architecture; 2002
Graphics International Design Annual: The International Annual of Design & Illustration; 2002
AIA California Council, Honor Award; 2001
AIA San Francisco, Best of the Bay and Beyond, Best of Show for Interior Architecture; 2001
British Art Directors Award for Environmental Design; 2001

Sofitel Hotel Competition
AIA San Francisco Unbuilt Design Award; 2003

U.S. Court of Appeals, San Francisco, California
National Endowment for the Arts, Federal Design Achievement Award; Historic Preservation; 2000
AIA National Honor Award for Architecture; 1998
AIA Chicago Interior Architecture Award: Honor Award; 1998
AIA California Council Honor Award for Design: Historic Preservation, Adaptive Reuse, Renovation; 1997
California Preservation Foundation, Preservation Design Award: Rehabilitation/Adaptive Reuse; 1997
AIA San Francisco, Interior Design Honor Award; 1996
U.S. General Services Administration, Design Award: Historic Preservation and Restoration; 1996
Structural Engineers Association of California, Excellence in Structural Engineering; 1996
U.S. General Services Administration, National Award for Engineering Technology and Innovation; 1995
Structural Engineers Association of Illinois, Most Innovative Structure Award: Award of Merit; 1995

PUBLICATIONS

*Harvard University - Northwest Science Building,
Cambridge, Massachusetts*
The Harvard Crimson, "Science Building Goes North By North"
Harvard Builds New Building by Skidmore, Owings and Merrill
October 3, 2008
*Wallpaper**, "Architecture Overview: Education," September 10,
Interior Design, "SOM Process: The Social Sciences," November

The New Beijing Poly Plaza, Beijing, China
MondoArc, "New Poly Plaza Benefits from the GE Treatment,"
August/September 2008
Domus, "New Beijing Poly Plaza," May 2008
San Francisco Business Times, September 2007
Hinge Magazine, March 2007
The Experiment of SOM, Electa, Nicholas Adams, 2006

Sofitel Hotel, San Francisco, California
Surface Magazine, "Best of the Bay AIA SF," 2003
SOM Journal 2, 2003
Architecture, "On the Boards," 2002

San Francisco Digital City Model
San Francisco In Maps and Views, Sally Woodbridge
San Francisco Magazine, February 2007

EXHIBITIONS


1st Architectural Beijing Biennial—National Art Museum,
Beijing, China; The New Beijing Poly Plaza
September 16—October 2, 2004
San Francisco 100 Years—Palace Hotel

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. 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: May 17, 2011
To: Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors
From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board 
Subject: APPOINTMENT BY THE MAYOR

The Mayor has submitted an appointment to the following Commission:

- Jon Rubin, Film Commission, term ending March 14, 2015

Under the Board's Rules of Order Section 2.24, a Supervisor can request a hearing on an appointment by notifying the Clerk in writing.

Upon receipt of such notice, the Clerk shall refer the appointment to the Rules Committee so that the Board may consider the appointment and act within thirty days of the appointment as provided in Section 3.100(18) of the Charter.

Please notify me in writing by 12:00 p.m., Tuesday, May 24, 2011, if you wish this appointment to be scheduled.

Attachments

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



EDWIN M. LEE
MAYOR

Notice of Appointment

May 17, 2011

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:


Pursuant to the Charter Section 3.100 (17), I hereby make the following appointment:

Jon Rubin to the Film Commission, filling the seat formerly held by Lorrae Rominger,
for a four-year term ending March 14, 2015.

I am confident that Mr. Rubin will serve our community well. Attached are his qualifications to serve, which demonstrate how his appointment represents the communities of interest, neighborhoods and diverse populations of the City and County of San Francisco.

I encourage your support and am pleased to advise you of this appointment.

Sincerely,


Edwin M. Lee
Mayor

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAY 17 PM 1:29
AY

Jon Rubin Bio, Film Commission

Jon Rubin is a political professional, documentarian and world traveler with more than 30 years experience in the public relations, political and legislative process. He has worked in 3 Presidential campaigns and many state and local campaigns. As a public relations consultant Jon has represented public and private sector clients that include municipalities, transportation agencies, hospitality and retail groups, energy and development corporations.

His work covers many areas with a focus on legislative strategy, press outreach and community relations.

As a writer and designer, Jon is responsible for award winning public relations and advertising campaigns for local, state and national clients, ranging from the San Mateo County Community College District to Radisson Hotels and Costco.

Jon served as Political Director of the California Democratic Party, from 1978-1980, where he oversaw all aspects of press, political outreach and campaign coordination.

From 1988 to 1991 Jon served as Chief of Staff for State Senator Quentin Kopp, Chair of the Senate Transportation Committee.

In 1992 Jon was appointed by San Francisco Mayor Frank Jordan to the Joint Powers Board for CalTrain, the tri-county governing body for the San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara County railway system.

In 1995, Jon was appointed to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) as the Mayor of San Francisco's representative. In 1997 Jon was appointed to the Bay Bridge Design Task Force. He also served on the Trans Bay Terminal Design Panel, the Bay Area Tolling Authority and the Trans Bay Crossing Study Committee. In 1996, Jon was awarded the Silver spike Award for contributions to Public transit.

In 2004, Jon became President/CEO of The Peninsula Coalition, a non profit corporation made up of Business, labor and community leaders working together to focus on sustainable growth, intelligent transit solutions and balanced community development. (www.pencoalition.com)

In Feb. 2005 Jon was elected chairman of MTC and The Bay Area Tolling Authority (BATA) for a two year term. In Jan. 2006, he became chairman of the Joint Policy Committee for regional governance -made up of MTC, The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and The Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

Jon is a recipient of "POLLIE" awards (the American Association of Political Consultants' Oscar) for best in the nation in local mail and non-mail public information campaigns and The Crystal Award of Excellence from the Communicator Awards International Design Competition. Most recently he was honored by the National Council for Marketing and Public Relations with a Silver Medallion award for video creation and production.

Jon is also a video documentarian having produced documentary histories of various hi tech pioneers, labor and business groups, and serving as the documentary producer for the San Mateo County Historical Association Museum. At present Jon is producing a full length documentary history of San Mateo County, commissioned by the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors.

As an international traveler and tour leader, Jon has led groups of political and journalistic professionals on trips to Italy, The UK, Northern Ireland and The Republic of Ireland, Germany, Turkey and in 2006, Japan. These trips have focused on meetings with domestic politicians, diplomats and journalists in an effort to better understand our world and Americas' place in it.

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. 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: May 19, 2011
To: Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors
From: *AC* Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Subject: APPOINTMENT BY THE MAYOR

The Mayor has submitted an appointment to the following Commission:

- Lorrae Rominger, Film Commission, term ending March 19, 2012


Under the Board's Rules of Order Section 2.24, a Supervisor can request a hearing on an appointment by notifying the Clerk in writing.

Upon receipt of such notice, the Clerk shall refer the appointment to the Rules Committee so that the Board may consider the appointment and act within thirty days of the appointment as provided in Section 3.100(18) of the Charter.

Please notify me in writing by 12:00 p.m., Wednesday, May 25, 2011, if you wish this appointment to be scheduled.

Attachments

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



*Orig: Kuller
COB, Leg. Dep.*

EDWIN M. LEE
MAYOR

Notice of Appointment

May 19, 2011

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAY 19 AM 11:20
BY Lee

Honorable Board of Supervisors:


Pursuant to the Charter Section 3.100 (17), I hereby make the following appointment:

Lorrae Rominger to the Film Commission, assuming the seat formerly held by Joan Chen, for a term ending March 19, 2012.

I am confident that Ms. Rominger will continue to serve our community well. Attached are her qualifications to serve, which demonstrate how her appointment represents the communities of interest, neighborhoods and diverse populations of the City and County of San Francisco.

I encourage your support and am pleased to advise you of this appointment.

Sincerely,


Edwin M. Lee
Mayor

LORRAE ROMINGER

965 Folsom Street, # 305, San Francisco, CA 94107

(415)979-9648 home (415)307-8872 cell Email LRproducer@aol.com

Energetic, customer-focused producer with extensive experience in special events and project management, public relations, sales and marketing. Innovative leader, creative strategist and problem solver with a wide variety of skills.

Special Events/Projects

- Direct and coordinate private and corporate events for as many as 3,500 guests with celebrity appearances.
- Procured complete sponsorship for industry functions in film and television on an annual basis.
- Responsible for all fundraising efforts, including individual and corporate sponsorships, special events and membership drive for a regional sports foundation.
- Produce television programming, videos and documentaries, securing high-profile actors and sports figures.
- Negotiated with government agencies to establish the first city re-use of military base closure property in the State of California on Treasure Island Naval Base.
- Manage all special projects for a well-established, family foundation.

Management

- Direct day-to-day operations, manage staff and oversee budget for the world's largest grassroots environmental award.
- Coordinated guest services for the world tour of a major rock star.
- Produced consistent increase in revenue through the development of new business.
- Developed new operating systems, designed and implemented follow-up procedures, resulting in more efficient and profitable work flow.
- Managed community outreach efforts geared to youth for an education through sports program.

Sales & Marketing

- Developed and initiated new marketing plan, advertising campaign and promotional efforts that resulted in a 35% increase in yearly film activity over a four year period.
- Successfully negotiated with producers, directors, unions, neighborhood groups and leaders of major city industries resulting in increased economic development.
- Responsible for design and layout of company brochure, print media, direct mail campaign, promotional merchandise and radio and television spots.
- Instrumental in the branding and marketing of an Internet startup.
- Oversaw and managed all donor and sponsor contract benefits for a regional sports foundation.

Public Relations & Promotions

- Direct all media and public relations, including print, video and television, for an international environmental foundation.
- Developed cooperative relationships with columnists, writers and reporters resulting in successful coverage of events.
- Experienced in high profile, business to business public relations and as a traditional entertainment publicist.
- Created and coordinated promotional activities which increased visibility and awareness.
- Directed press, industry and public relations for an Internet startup geared to the production of features on-line.
- Conducted workshops, narrated panels, delivered speeches and made presentations for a variety of clients.
- Through strong personal and communications skills, improved and enhanced image of business in various industries; ability to adapt concepts to the environment.

Employment History

<i>Deputy Director, Goldman Environmental Prize, San Francisco</i>	2003-present
<i>Director of Development, Sacramento Sports Commission, Sacramento</i>	2001 - 2002
<i>Director, Industry & Public Relations, production451.com, New York</i>	1998 - 2000
<i>Executive Producer, Special Events, Television & Film, San Francisco & New York</i>	1997 - 1998
<i>Director of Sales & Marketing, Independent Television News, San Francisco</i>	1996 - 1997
<i>Executive Director, Mayor's Office of Film & Video, San Francisco</i>	1992 - 1996
<i>Manager of Programming, Sports Channel Pacific, San Francisco</i>	1990 - 1992
<i>Executive Assistant to the Chairman of the Board, Columbia Pictures, Los Angeles</i>	1989 - 1990
<i>Personal Manager, CRF Entertainment Management, Los Angeles</i>	1985 - 1989

Education


Bachelor of Arts Degree – California State University, Sacramento, California

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. 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: May 24, 2011
To: Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors
From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board 
Subject: APPOINTMENTS BY THE MAYOR

The Mayor has submitted appointments to the following bodies:

- Heather Stephenson; Commission on the Environment, term ending April 20, 2015
- Peter Bratt, Film Commission, term ending March 14, 2015
- Mel Lee, Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority, term ending March 25, 2015
- Nancy Conner, Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority, term ending March 25, 2015
- Lily Chan, Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority, term ending March 25, 2015

Under the Board's Rules of Order Section 2.24, a Supervisor can request a hearing on an appointment by notifying the Clerk in writing.

Upon receipt of such notice, the Clerk shall refer the appointment to the Rules Committee so that the Board may consider the appointment and act within thirty days of the appointment as provided in Section 3.100(18) of the Charter.

Please notify me in writing by 12:00 p.m., Tuesday, May 31, 2011, if you wish any appointment to be scheduled.

Attachments

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



EDWIN M. LEE
MAYOR

Notice of Appointment

May 23, 2011

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

I am pleased to advise you of the following appointments and reappointments, pursuant to the Charter Section 3.100 (17):

Heather Stephenson to the Commission on the Environment, filling the seat formerly held by Jason Elliott, for a four year term ending April 20, 2015

Peter Bratt to the Film Commission for a four year term ending March 14, 2015

Mel Lee to the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority for a four year term ending March 25, 2015


Nancy Conner to the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority for a four year term ending March 25, 2015

Lily Chan to the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority for a four year term ending March 25, 2015

I am confident that the aforementioned appointees will serve our community well. Attached are their qualifications to serve, which demonstrate how the appointments represent the communities of interest, neighborhoods and diverse populations of the City and County of San Francisco.

I encourage your support and am pleased to advise you of these appointments.

Sincerely,


Edwin M. Lee
Mayor

1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, ROOM 200
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102-4681
TELEPHONE: (415) 554-6141

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAY 23 PM 4:33
AK

HEATHER STEPHENSON

MOBILE: +1-917-586-8159 E-MAIL: HJSTEPHENSON@ME.COM
3988 20TH STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114

Heather Stephenson has spent 20 years building expertise around why citizens make the lifestyle and spending decisions that they do. Specifically in the environmental arena, she has founded two companies that use the tools of digital media to encourage and inform citizens as they make day-to-day choices regarding sustainable and healthy living in a way that doesn't require them to compromise their quality of life.

ACHIEVEMENTS RELEVANT TO THE ENVIRONMENT COMMISSION

Founder and CEO

Lensfest, Inc. San Francisco, CA (2011-present)

Mobile health and wellness application company, providing insights into personal health and wellness efforts, launching first mobile app (YogaLens) in June 2011.

Co-Founder and CEO

Ideal Bite, Inc., New York, NY (2005-2006) and San Francisco, CA (2006-2010)

Co-founded immensely successful green media startup – a daily email publication that entertained and informed subscribers on day-to-day green and sustainability lifestyle issues.

- **Grew company to 500,000+ subscribers and 8 editions.** Led eventual team of 24 to incredible subscriber and revenue growth while expanding to 8 editions.
- **Successfully led sale of business to The Walt Disney Company in 2008.** The Walt Disney Company purchased Ideal Bite to add to its Family.com internet properties in February of 2008.
- **Awards and Press.** As green living expert, a selection of some key press/awards.
 - Elle Magazine's Green Awards 2007
 - Glamour Magazine's 70 Women in Green 2009
 - Winner of Green America's 1st People's Choice Award, 2006
 - Vanity Fair, "The E-Gitators" 1st Green Issue 2006
 - 7x7 Magazine
 - O Magazine
 - The San Francisco Chronicle
 - USA Today
 - The New York Times
- Multiple appearances on: **The Today Show, Good Morning America, The Martha Stewart Show, Donny Deutsch's Big Idea, CNBC Power Lunch, MSNBC, ABC News.**

Landscape Designer/Owner

UrbanSage. London, UK and Brooklyn, NY (2000-2005)

Created sole-proprietorship; designing, landscaping, and maintaining sustainable rooftop gardens in the urban settings of London, San Francisco and New York.

- Interviewed clients to determine client need and desires, intention for use of space, and maintenance wishes; conceiving, drafting, purchasing, planting and maintaining small-scale landscape projects
- Created purchaser relationships with area suppliers, including greenmarket and greenhouse owners, prefabricated materials suppliers and designers working to spec
- Sourced organic, sustainable and locally grown materials, educating clients on sustainable garden maintenance in highly "inorganic" environments

Consultant

Earth Pledge, The Green Roofs Initiative. (www.greeninggotham.org). New York, NY (2003-2005)

Consulted with sustainability non-profit to promote adoption, policy creation and practices of green roof implementation in New York City.

- Wrote and collaborated on design for the Green Roof ToolKit – an online educational resource funded by the EPA that teaches individuals and businesses every step of the green roof implementation process (launching late 2004)
- Researched and assisted on a training curriculum to foster competition amongst landscape contractors, thereby reducing green roof costs and increasing adoption (launched 2005)

Landscape Design Certificate Program

The New York Botanical Gardens, Bronx, NY (2003-2005)

OTHER MEDIA, TECHNOLOGY AND BUSINESS ACHIEVEMENTS

Consultant/Owner

Stephenson Consulting, New York, NY (2002-2005)

Opened private consulting business, securing contracts and assisting online media and technology providers in their sales, strategic planning, product development and marketing efforts

- **Trafficmac, Inc.** New York, 2004-2005. (www.trafficmac.com). Revised sales structure for software and business consulting company and rewrote sales and marketing materials, resulting in a 500% increase in monthly sales revenues.
- **Mediabrokers, Inc.** London and New York, 2003-2004. (www.mediabrokers.net). Consulted with UK-based online ad sales network on their proposed expansion to the US market, creating partner relationships, and writing recommendations for corporate board.
- **I-20 Events**. Los Angeles, 2004-2005. Served as conference advisor and moderator for series of Internet marketing mini-conferences at 16 London advertising agencies.
- **Hotbar, Inc.** New York, 2002-2003. (www.hotbar.com). Completely restructured and retrained the fledgling sales team for a web search widget company, creating all company sales processes, introducing new sales products, and consulting on the creation of a new adserver, resulting in a 250% increase in monthly sales revenues.

Vice President of European Sales and Operations, Managing Director for Europe
L90, Inc. (www.l90.com), London, UK (2000 – 2002)

Founded European sales headquarters for leading media and technology sales company, creating the first profitable L90 division more than six months before profitability goal, creating a sellable asset for the company

- Managed all operational responsibilities/divisions in European office, including budget P&L, payroll, foreign taxes, hiring, local office space, contract creation and negotiation
- Negotiated more than €20 million in international contracts and individual client contracts of up to €5 million with clients in UK, Ireland, Germany, France, Spain, Netherlands and Italy
- Initiated, developed, maintained and upsold solid client service relationships with more than 100 clients, including major European media players such as Vivendi-Universal, Tiscali and BBC
- Hired and developed a team of 20 individuals across support, sales, client management, business development and marketing divisions

Regional Sales Director, Western US
L90, Inc., Los Angeles, CA (1998-2000)

Played a key role in the start-up of a successful Internet advertising sales and technology enterprise.

- Hired and supervised local sales team of 14, achieving the highest sales output in the company in 1999 and 2000
- Exceeded yearly regional goal of \$10 million in revenues, negotiating and servicing large-scale individual sales contracts for more than \$2.2 million each
- Facilitated in the startup and strategic positioning of the privately held company, serving as key sales contact for investors and bankers during lead-up to IPO

Account Executive

Anderson & Lembke – McCann-Erickson, San Francisco, CA (1996-1998)

Served as main online client relationship manager for Microsoft, working closely with client marketing divisions to establish communication, advertising and media strategies.

- Managed on- and offline creative, media and planning teams for Microsoft MSN, Expedia, Microsoft Investor (now Microsoft Money), Microsoft HomeAdvisor and Slate Magazine, accounting for 15% of total worldwide FY96 and FY97 advertising spending
- Developed and wrote communications strategy for new product launch, successfully introducing Microsoft HomeAdvisor into four key markets; creating a profit-center in the then-struggling MSN division

EDUCATION / PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. **Master of Arts Degree (1996)** – *English Literature and Critical Theory* Summa cum laude. Master's Thesis: "Reading, Race and Representation: the OJ Simpson Verdict"

Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. **Bachelor of Arts Degree (1995)** – *Government and English Literature*. Graduated cum laude

Yoga Alliance, Reading, PA. **RYT200** (Registered Yoga Teacher degree, Feb 2005) – *Vinyasa Yoga Certification*.

SPEAKOUT!

SPEAKERS • ARTISTS • EXHIBITS • FILMS
INSTITUTE FOR DEMOCRATIC EDUCATION AND CULTURE

P.O. Box 99096 Emeryville, CA 94662
phone 510.601.0182 fax 510.601.0183
info@speakoutnow.org

speakers & artists

Peter Bratt and "Follow Me Home" A Cinematic Exploration of Race & Identity

Peter Bratt, of South American Indian ancestry, wrote and directed "Follow Me Home," a defiant, humorous, poetic tale exploring race and identity. Weaving together traditions of Native, African and Latin cultures, the film tells the story of four artists and their journey across the American landscape. Tudee (Jesse Borrego), Abel (Peter's brother Benjamin Bratt), Kaz (Calvin Levels) and Freddy (Steve Reevis) are joined by Evey (Alfre Woodard) an enigmatic African American woman on a journey of her own. The film, called "a work of genius" by Alice Walker, earned Bratt the Best Director award at the 1996 American Indian Film Festival and the Best Feature Film Audience Award at the 1996 San Francisco International Film Festival. It was also an Official Selection in the 1996 Sundance Film Festival.



Bratt screens the film (1 hour, 40 minutes) and afterwards leads a lively discussion.

"This is an incredible movie: The first American film emerging direct from the heart and the headset of the New American Majority."
— June Jordan, award-winning African American poet, essayist and political activist

"Follow Me Home is a ceremony of memory, justice, reclamation, and creation - a new, and simultaneously very old, vision of home."
— Jane Caputi, Professor of American Studies, University of New Mexico

"The collision of race, identity, history, and culture affects all Americans....'Follow Me Home' provides a point of entry to a long-overdue discussion."
— Jill Nelson, "The Nation"

"This is a film for reflection, discussion and revelation. Do not miss it!"
— Dr. Claudia Highbaugh, Chaplain, Harvard Divinity School

"Follow Me Home is a dazzling film that not only confronts the nightmare of today's dehumanized, racist society, but also suggests how we might build a different world."
— Elizabeth Martinez, award-winning Chicana writer and activist

NOTE: FOLLOW ME HOME IS NOT AVAILABLE FOR PURCHASE. WHAT IS AVAILABLE IS THE FILM'S SOUNDTRACK CD. FOR MORE INFO ON THIS GO TO THE SOAPBOX PAGE.

Topics

- African Americans
- Alliance-Building
- Art & Politics

Melvin D. Lee
1998 Broadway #1103
San Francisco, CA 94109
(415) 637-3220 (415) 776-1800
January 2008

California State Wide:

Member, Board of Governors
State Bar of California. 2004 – 2007

San Francisco Wide:

Center for the Arts at Yerba Buena Gardens. Board Member and its
President 1990 – 1994
City College Blue Ribbon Committee. 1994
Veterans Affairs Council. 1989 – 1991
SF Redevelopment Agency, Commissioner & President. 1977 – 1989.
Board Member, S.F. Senior Centers 2006 – present.

Chinese Community Organizations:

Board Member, Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association. 1969 –
Present.
Board of Trustees, Chinese Hospital. 2007 – present.
Board Member, Ning Yung Benevolent Association. 1969 – present.

Professional:

Professional Licenses: Fire Protection Engineer
Private Development: The Avenue Assisted Living. 125-unit senior care
center. General Partner.

Nancy Rowe Conner
2698 Vallejo Street
San Francisco, CA 94123
415 346-5702
conner5@earthlink.net

Current Affiliations:

San Francisco Parks Trust, formerly Friends of Recreation and Parks,
Board member, 1980 to present, (President, 1985-88, 2004 - 2007)
Garden Conservancy West Cost Council, 2005 - present
Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority, (President, 1999 - 2006)
San Francisco Symphony, Board member, 2002 to present

Past Affiliations:

Achenbach Graphic Arts Council, Fine Arts Museum, Board member
Bothin Foundation, Board member, 1998-2004
Conservatory of Flowers Capital Campaign, Steering Committee, 1999-2003
Presidio Trust, Board member 2005-2010
San Francisco Art Institute, Women's Board member
San Francisco Boys' Chorus, Board member
San Francisco Flower & Garden Show, formerly San Francisco Landscape Garden Show,
Co-Founder and Steering Committee member, 1986-1997, Seminar Coordinator, 1999-2003
San Francisco University High School, Parents' Association President
San Francisco Botanical Garden, docent, 1970s, Strategic Directions Committee member, 2002-4
UC Berkeley Environmental Design Archives Advisory Board, 1994 to present (Co-Chair 1994-2001)

Education:

Wellesley College B.A. 1964
Stanford University M.A. 1967

Publication:

"Where on Earth: a Guide to Specialty Nurseries in California", 4th ed., Heyday Books, 1999

Personal Information:

Born in Cincinnati, Ohio. Resident of San Francisco, California for 40 years. Married 38 years to Edward J. Conner. Three grown sons.

Lily Chan
3134 Geary Boulevard,
San Francisco, CA 94118

Office: 415-933-6388
Home: 415-566-5555
Cell: 415-271-8887
Fax: 415-933-7088

Summary: Extensive experience and well established international contacts in the real estate, investment, and video/film industry, especially in China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong. Fluent in English, Mandarin, Cantonese, Shanghaiese, and Japanese. Born in Guilin, China, resided in Hong Kong until immigrating to the U.S. in 1967.

Experience:

1976 – Present

- Grand Pacific International, Ltd. (Real Estate Firm), Co-Owner
- Responsible for selling commercial and residential properties.
 - Arrange international investments in the U.S. and Asia.
 - Assist in managing and training office, administrative and sales staff.

2005 – 2009

City and County of San Francisco. Member of Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board.

1996 – 2004

- City and County of San Francisco. Commissioner of Film and Video Arts.
- Actively promote use of San Francisco by foreign filmmakers.
 - Represent San Francisco at foreign trade fairs, conventions and international film festivals – including those in Taipei, Hong Kong, Beijing, Shanghai, Guangzhou, Seoul and Berlin.

Business contacts through extensive travel and participation in international business conferences in China, Taipei, Hong Kong, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, Cambodia, Holland, France, Spain, Portugal, Germany, Italy and Austria.

1969 – 76

- Kaiser Hospital – Medical Assistant in General Clinic
- Managing office for six doctors.

1963 – 67

- Shaw's Brothers Movie Company, Hong Kong
- Actress in Chinese movies.

Education:

DeAnza College, Cupertino
Bay City College, San Francisco – Medical Assistant Certificate
Chu Hai Chinese University, Hong Kong – B.A. in Business Management
Studied Japanese at Wasada University, Tokyo, Japan.

Volunteer:

Third Vice President, Lions Club, Chinatown, San Francisco
Board of Directors, Democratic Women's Forum of San Francisco
Member, League of Women Voters
Board of Directors, Asian Women's Resource Center

Former Member, Board of Directors, Chinese Chamber of Commerce
Organized international conventions in Asia and fund-raising events for
various charities and diplomats.

permatue consideration by Board of Supervisors and Rules Committee of File #110023

Anmarie Mabbutt

to:

board.of.supervisors

05/17/2011 02:52 PM

Cc:

david.chiu, angela.calvillo, ross.mirkarimi, sean.elsbernd, john.avalos, eric.l.mar, mark.farrell,
scott.wiener, jane.kim, david.campos, carmen.chu

Show Details

Dear Board President Chiu and members of the Board of Supervisors,

For any Board sponsored amendment to the City Charter, the amendment must meet the specific requirements of Government Conduct Code Section 3.204 including making the amendment available for public review at least thirty days prior to any consideration by the Board or any committee thereof. **The amended version of File #110023 that is scheduled before you today was only drafted by the City Attorney on April 21 and submitted to the Rules Committee on 4/26/2011. Thus, there is no way the current version of File #110023 amending the City Charter, that is scheduled for approval today, has meet the 30 days prior requirement of Section 3.204.**

I respectfully request you remove this item from today's calendar and not recalendar the item until the Amendment to the Charter contained in File #110023 has been avaiable for public review for at least thirty days.

Thank you for your time.

Anmarie Mabbutt

please remove File #110023 from today's calendar - consideration today violates Governmental Conduct Code 3.204

Anmarie Mabbutt

to:

board.of.supervisors

05/17/2011 04:06 PM

Cc:

david.chiu, angela.calvillo, ross.mirkarimi, john.avalos, david.campos, jane.kim, malia.cohen, scott.wiener, mark.farrell, carmen.chu, eric.l.mar

Show Details

file 110023

Dear Board President Chiu and members of the Board of Supervisors,

Please remove File #110023 from today's calendar. **The current version of File #110023 was introduced on April 26, 2011 and has not been available for public review at least thirty days prior to its consideration by the Board as required by Governmental Conduct Code Section 3.204.**

Please remove File #110023 and recalendar it only after it has been available for public review at least thirty days prior to its consideration by the Board or any committee thereof as clearly required by Section 3.204. Why do you all insist on conducting yourselves in this manner? **What is so difficult or offensive about providing the public the prior notice and information they are entitled to under state and local law?**

Please remove File #110023 from today's calendar. Thank you for your time.

Anmarie Mabbutt



End the Sidewalk Sit-Lie Ordinance
John Shay Jr to: Board of Supervisors
Please respond to John Shay Jr

05/16/2011 04:30 PM

View: (Mail Threads)

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

Greetings,

It has been a year after the prohibition against sitting or lying on San Francisco sidewalks and police officers have begun enforcing the law known as Sit/Lie. Being that the Board of Supervisors mission is to "respond to the needs of the people of the City and County of San Francisco..." it is very contradicting that this law is even in place.

It is extremely important to emphasize on the real needs of many of the residents in San Francisco. This law is targeting the innocent act of sitting or lying and it happens that the population that is being targeted is primarily homeless individuals. Many of the individuals whom are homeless are recent immigrants, seniors, mentally ill, addictively ill, veterans, and working poor. Many of them are poor and homeless who are trying to adapt to a new language and environment, live off the little income they receive, lack the appropriate health care services, and/or barely make it through with their wages. Taking that into consideration it is very conflicting and irrational that fining \$50 to \$500 and possibly even jail time is going to address the needs of the community.

Having police officers give out warnings and citations is not helping address the real problem. Please consider an attempt to end the discriminatory sidewalk sit-lie ordinance and focus on the outreach and provide services for those who chronically sit or lie on public sidewalks.

John Shay Jr
Hagerstown, MD

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at www.change.org/petitions/end-the-sidewalk-sit-lie-ordinance. To respond, email responses@change.org and include a link to this petition.

C: BOS-11
orig- File #110401
! COB

FROM:
Mary Miles (SB #230395)
Attorney at Law
for Coalition for Adequate Review
364 Page St., #36
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 863-2310

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAY 18 PM 12:11
PC

TO:
Angela Calvillo, Clerk, President David Chiu, and
Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, #1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA 94102

DATE: May 18, 2011

BY HAND DELIVERY and by e-mail to: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org; ;
John.Avalos@sfgov.org; David.Campos@sfgov.org; David.Chiu@sfgov.org;
Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org; Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org; Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org;
Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org; Jane.Kim@sfgov.org; Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org;
Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org; scott.wiener@sfgov.org; angela.calvillo@sfgov.org
and Attn: Rules Committee Members, Sean Elsbernd, Mark Farrell, and Jane Kim

**Re: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS File No. 110401 [Charter Amendment – Allowing
Amendments to or Repeals of Initiative Ordinances and Declarations of Policy]
Rules Committee Agenda of May 19, 2011, Item No. 6**

PUBLIC COMMENT

This is public comment on the proposed Charter amendment allowing the Board of Supervisors and/or Mayor to amend or repeal initiative ordinances and declarations of policy passed by voters. The proposed Charter Amendment is scheduled for hearing before the Rules Committee on May 19, 2011, Item No. 6.

The proposed Charter amendment claims that the constitutional right to voter initiatives is a “cumbersome system” that only “encourages more and more initiatives” and should be removed from the voters by enabling the Board of Supervisors and/or Mayor to repeal and amend voter-approved initiatives and to legislate expiration dates for voter-approved initiative measures.

The proposed amendment violates the spirit and letter of the California Constitution, which states: “All political power is inherent in the people. Government is instituted for their protection, security, and benefit, and they have the right to alter or reform it when the public good may require.” (Cal. Const. art. II, §1) This power is not a right *granted* to the people, but is a “power *reserved by them.*” (*DeVita v. County of Napa* [“*DeVita*”] (1995) 9 Cal.4th 763,775-776, emphasis added; and *see*, United States Constitution, Preamble) Courts liberally construe this power to protect the right of the people to local initiative or referendum. (*DeVita, supra*, 9 Cal.4th at p. 776)

No authority permits the Board of Supervisors and/or the Mayor to repeal, amend, or place time-based expirations on ballot initiatives passed by the voters. To do so would negate the powers vested in the people by the Constitution.


In fact, the California Elections Code section 9125 expressly provides that no initiative measure can be repealed "except by a vote of the people, unless provision is otherwise made in the original [initiative] ordinance." In affirming the force of this provision, the California Supreme Court has explained that Elections Code section 9125 "has its roots in the constitutional right of the electorate to initiative, ensuring that successful initiatives will not be undone by subsequent hostile boards of supervisors." (*DeVita, supra*, 9 Cal. 4th at p. 788, 797) The Court emphatically declined to place limitations on the right to voter initiative, even though "all initiatives place limits on a government body's capacity to legislate in areas that are otherwise statutorily authorized, some of those limitations quite severe." (*Id.*, emphasis in original)

The proposed Charter Amendment is also preempted under the California Constitution article XI section 7, since it conflicts with state law, the California Constitution, and the United States Constitution. Both proposing this Charter Amendment and voting for it are violations of ethical duties that subject a public official to discipline and/or removal from office for willful misconduct, including failure to perform duties in compliance with the law. (SF Charter §15.105)

The Board should decisively reject the proposed Charter amendment as an unprincipled attempt to usurp the fundamental rights of the electorate that are the foundation of democratic government.

Please place a copy of this Comment in all applicable files.

DATED: May 18, 2011



Mary Miles



To: Sean Elsbernd/BOS/SFGOV, Mark Farrell/BOS/SFGOV, Jane Kim/BOS/SFGOV, Linda Wong/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File No. 110401: Oppose Charter Amendment That Allows Voter-approved Initiatives

From: ".\)" <gumby5@att.net>
To: "Sean Elsbernd" <Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org>, "Mark Farrell" <Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org>, "Jane Kim" <Jane.Kim@sfgov.org>
Cc: <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Date: 05/18/2011 05:16 PM
Subject: File No. 110401: Oppose Charter Amendment That Allows Voter-approved Initiatives

Dear Supervisors Elsbernd, Farrell and Kim,
It is with regret that I will not be able to attend the May 19, 2011, 1:30pm, hearing on Supervisor Wiener's legislation introduced on April 5, 2011.
In its current draft, I cannot support this very general piece of legislation.
The purpose of this legislation is not clear except that the digest states that we have a "cumbersome system" of voter-approved initiatives which "encourages more and more initiatives to address technical glitches, unforeseen consequences..."
I think the very specificity that is lacking in Supervisor Wiener's proposed legislation will lead to the very "unforeseen" consequences it is looking to avoid.
And, having what's been passed by the voters be amended or overturned seems like a bad form of government by the people and for the people.
Please oppose this legislation.
Thank you.
Rose Hillson
Member, Jordan Park Improvement Association



Oppose Charter Amendment Allowing BOS Repeal of Voter-Approved Initiatives [BOS File No. 110401]

05/18/2011 01:05 PM

Kathy Howard to: boardofsupervisors

Board.of.Supervisors, David.Campos, David.Chiu, Eric.L.Mar,
Cc: John.Avalos, "Ross Mirkarimi", "Supervisor Jane Kim", "Supervisor
Malia Cohen", "Carmen Chu", Sean.Elsbernd, "Supervisor Mark
Please respond to kathyhoward

View: (Mail Threads)

Supervisor,

I oppose this charter amendment.

Paid lobbyists are in City Hall every day, working to influence legislation and other decisions. Most people do not have the time or resources to do that kind of lobbying. The inability to find a sponsor (or a group of sponsors) on the BOS results in citizens going directly to the ballot. However, putting a measure on the ballot is extremely difficult for the average citizen. After it is on the ballot, supporting the measure and getting the word out about it can be both challenging and expensive. If the issue is important to a lot of people, then it is worth it. It gives the average citizen the opportunity to put issues before the people, who can then vote 'yes' or 'no'.

Most people cannot go through this process every few years. Giving the BOS the right to undo all of that work is really stacking the deck in favor of the more powerful and well-financed groups in our City. The citizen's power is in our vote. Please do not take that away.

Katherine Howard

SF, CA



To: Linda Wong/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Oppose Charter Amendment Allowing BOS Repeal of Voter-Approved Initiatives [BOS File No. 110401]

From: "Kathy Howard" <kathyhoward@earthlink.net>
To: <Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org>
Cc: <boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org>, <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, "Carmen Chu" <Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org>, <David.Campos@sfgov.org>, <David.Chiu@sfgov.org>, <Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org>, "Supervisor Jane Kim" <Jane.Kim@sfgov.org>, <John.Avalos@sfgov.org>, "Supervisor Malia Cohen" <Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org>, "Supervisor Mark Farrell" <Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org>, "Ross Mirkarimi" <Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org>, <Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org>
Date: 05/19/2011 12:35 PM
Subject: RE: Oppose Charter Amendment Allowing BOS Repeal of Voter-Approved Initiatives [BOS File No. 110401]

Supervisor Wiener:

Thank you for taking the time to write your reply to my concerns. I appreciate the clarification that you provided for me (and, I just noticed, the entire BOS), and I now understand that your legislation will not affect Charter Amendments, bonds, or taxes. That is good news.

I am obviously not a constitutional – or even a City Charter – scholar. I try to read the Voter Pamphlets and the arguments and understand issues. But I have a few other concerns, which I hope you (or your staff, as I expect you are a bit busy today) can answer:

I am not sure how the public is going to be protected by this legislation when an approved initiative can be changed to meet the desires of a new BOS. The legislation states: (2)(iv) Any amendments made under subsection (ii) or (iii) must further the purposes of the initiative, and any ordinance amending an initiative shall include findings identifying those purposes and stating how the amendments further the purposes of the initiative. This seems like an area which allows for a lot of variation in interpretations. What recourse is there for the public if they do not agree with the "findings" and the statement of how the amendments "further the purpose of the initiative?" Do we then have to introduce and pass another initiative?

The legislation states that "The proposed Charter amendment would apply to all ordinances and declarations of policy previously approved by the voters, including those adopted before November 8, 2011." This is very broad. Who could possibly review all of the legislation covered by this statement and understand the implications? How do we evaluate the impact of this change?

Thank you again for your reply.

Katherine Howard
San Francisco

From: Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org [mailto:Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org]
Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2011 4:41 PM
To: kathyhoward@earthlink.net
Cc: boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org; Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org; Carmen Chu; David.Campos@sfgov.org; David.Chiu@sfgov.org; Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org; Supervisor Jane Kim; John.Avalos@sfgov.org; Supervisor Malia Cohen; Supervisor Mark Farrell; Ross Mirkarimi; Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org
Subject: Re: Oppose Charter Amendment Allowing BOS Repeal of Voter-Approved Initiatives [BOS File No. 110401]

Ms. Howard, the proposed charter amendment would not allow the Board to repeal ordinances that were placed on the ballot by signature petition. Repeal (with a super-majority after 3 years and with a majority after 7 years) would be permitted only for ordinances placed on the ballot by the Board or Mayor. The rules on amendments would be the same for regardless of how placed on the ballot. This is a limited measure that will not impact most ballot measures, given that most ballot measures are charter

amendments, bonds, or taxes. It's a modest first step toward addressing one of the major challenges facing our state (and city), namely, the lack of flexibility of elected officials to govern in an increasingly complex world.

Scott Wiener
Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
District 8
(415) 554-6968

***If you would like to receive my monthly email newsletter and periodic email announcements, please email Adam Taylor (adam.taylor@sfgov.org) and request that he add you. I do not provide my email list to anyone else, and I rarely send out more than 1-2 emails a month.

***To receive more regular updates, you can follow me on Facebook by "liking" my fan page. You can also follow me on Twitter @sdwiener.

From: "Kathy Howard" <kathyhoward@earthlink.net>
To: <boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, <David.Campos@sfgov.org>, <David.Chiu@sfgov.org>, <Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org>, <John.Avalos@sfgov.org>, "Ross Mirkarimi" <Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org>, "Supervisor Jane Kim" <Jane.Kim@sfgov.org>, "Supervisor Malia Cohen" <Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org>, "Carmen Chu" <Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org>, <Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org>, "Supervisor Mark Farrell" <Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org>, <Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org>
Date: 05/18/2011 01:05 PM
Subject: Oppose Charter Amendment Allowing BOS Repeal of Voter-Approved Initiatives [BOS File No. 110401]

Supervisor,

I oppose this charter amendment.

Paid lobbyists are in City Hall every day, working to influence legislation and other decisions. Most people do not have the time or resources to do that kind of lobbying. The inability to find a sponsor (or a group of sponsors) on the BOS results in citizens going directly to the ballot. However, putting a measure on the ballot is extremely difficult for the average citizen. After it is on the ballot, supporting the measure and getting the word out about it can be both challenging and expensive. If the issue is important to a lot of people, then it is worth it. It gives the average citizen the opportunity to put issues before the people, who can then vote 'yes' or 'no'.

Most people cannot go through this process every few years. Giving the BOS the right to undo all of that work is really stacking the deck in favor of the more powerful and well-financed groups in our City. The citizen's power is in our vote. Please do not take that away.

Katherine Howard

SF, CA



To: Linda Wong/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110401 Please vote NO to Wiener's Charter Amendment to dilute voter initiatives

From: David Tornheim <DavidTornheim@hotmail.com>
To: Scott Wiener <Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org>, Sean Elsbernd <Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org>, "Jane Kim (D6 Supervisor)" <Jane.Kim@sfgov.org>, Maila Cohen <Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org>, Carmen Chu <Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org>, Clerk BoardofSupervisors <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>, David Campos <David.Campos@sfgov.org>, David Chiu <David.Chiu@sfgov.org>, Eric Mar <Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org>, John Avalos <John.Avalos@sfgov.org>, Mark Farrell <Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org>, Ross Mirkarimi <Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org>
Date: 05/18/2011 07:17 PM
Subject: Please vote NO to Wiener's Charter Amendment to dilute voter initiatives
Sent by: <dat_room@hotmail.com>

Dear Supervisors:

I am strongly OPPOSED to Supervisor Wiener's Legislation to curb ballot initiatives and thereby democracy. The whole purpose of ballot initiatives is to address the problems of elected officials who are unduly influenced by lobbying and campaign contributions and not directly accountable to voters after election. I'm sorry if Supervisor Wiener finds that obtaining permission from voters before changing what the voters have insisted upon is "cumbersome." Disregarding ballot initiatives under the guise that the voters' wishes are "outdated" is a ruse to cover Supervisors' alternative agenda shifting the decision-making to them and is an unacceptable usurpation of power. Please vote NO.

-David Tornheim
1890 Grove St. #5
San Francisco, CA 94117-1249
(415) 668-2353



To: Linda Wong/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File No. 110401 -- Vote NO on Supervisor Wiener's Charter Amendment on Voter Initiatives...Rose Hillson (Jordan Park Impvt Assn.)-EOM

From: ":\)" <gumby5@att.net>
To: "Supervisor David Campos" <David.Campos@sfgov.org>, "Carmen Chu" <Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org>, "David Chiu" <David.Chiu@sfgov.org>, "Jane Kim" <Jane.Kim@sfgov.org>, "John Avalos" <John.Avalos@sfgov.org>, "Malia Cohen" <Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org>, "Mark Farrell" <Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org>, "Sean Elsbernd" <Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org>, "Supervisor Eric Mar" <Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org>, "Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi" <Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org>
Cc: "Scott Wiener" <Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org>, <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
Date: 05/26/2011 10:42 AM
Subject: File No. 110401 -- Vote NO on Supervisor Wiener's Charter Amendment on Voter Initiatives...Rose Hillson (Jordan Park Impvt Assn.)-EOM



To: Linda Wong/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110401: proposed Charter amendment (file number 110401)

From: "gary noguera" <garynoguera@earthlink.net>
To: "Carmen Chu" <Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org>, "David Campos" <David.Campos@sfgov.org>, "David Chiu" <David.Chiu@sfgov.org>, "entire board" <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, "ERIC MAR" <Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org>, "Jane Kim" <Jane.Kim@sfgov.org>, "John Avalos" <John.Avalos@sfgov.org>, "Malia Cohen" <Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org>, "mark farrell" <Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org>, "Ross Mirkarimi" <Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org>, "Scott Weiner" <Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org>, "Sean Elsbernd" <Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org>
Date: 05/26/2011 11:27 AM
Subject: proposed Charter amendment (file number 110401)

Dear Supervisors,

I am strongly opposed to Supervisor Weiner's proposed legislation [file 110401] that would effectively limit the duration of initiative to three years.

This is an unforgivable abridgement of the rights of the people.

Please reject this bad legislation, especially subdivision (b).

Thanks

gary noguera
942 teresita bv
sf 94127

BDS-11
C-page
Rules
Committee



Miraloma Park Improvement Club (MPIC) Urges You to Oppose Supervisor Wiener's proposed Charter amendment (file number 110401)
Miraloma Park Improvement Club

to:
Eric Mar, Mark Farrell, David Chiu, Carmen Chu, Ross Mirkarimi, Jane Kim, Sean Elsbernd, Scott Weiner, David Campos, Malia Cohen, John Avalos, Angela Calvillo, Rick Caldeira

05/27/2011 10:32 AM
Show Details

File # (110401)

Security:

To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images

1 Attachment



wiener proposal.doc

Dear Supervisors:

The Miraloma Park Improvement Club (MPIC) urges you to oppose Supervisor Wiener's proposed Charter amendment (file number 110401) that would limit to three years the effective duration of ordinances placed on the ballot by initiatives. Please reference the attached letter detailing our reasons for opposing this proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

Dan Liberthson, Corresponding Secretary



(Handwritten signature)

2011

Ocean Avenue Revitalization Collaborative

4702 Mission Street
San Francisco, CA 94112

office: (415) 375-2265
fax: (415) 585-0170
www.oceanave-oarc.org



May 19, 2011

Hon. David Chiu, President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca. 94102-4689

File 110599
BOS - 11
C pg

Re: Delivery Truck Easement Agreement - Phelan Bus Loop File No. 110599 For All Members of the Board

Dear President Chiu:

The Ocean Avenue Revitalization Collaborative supports the Grocery store and residential project under construction by Avalon Bay Communities at 1150 Ocean Avenue. The community has been asking for a grocery store as part of the Balboa Better Neighborhood plan for 10 plus years. Avalon promised that they would try to deliver a grocery store as part of their residential project and they are doing so.

Without this easement, there is no way to operate a grocery store at 1150 Ocean Ave. The geometry is such that the easement is required for any grocer to make deliveries that are required on a daily basis.

Please support this easement legislation as it is necessary to build the long awaited grocery store and for the revitalization of the Ocean Avenue retail district.

Sincerely,

Dolly Sithounnolat, Program Manager
Ocean Avenue Revitalization Collaborative

cc: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Hon. John Avalos
Hon. David Campos
Hon. Malia Cohen
Hon. David Chiu
Hon. Carmen Chu
Hon. Sean Elsbernd
Hon. Mark Farrell
Hon. Jane Kim
Hon. Eric Mar
Hon. Ross Mirkarimi
Hon. Scott Wiener

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAY 23 PM 3:47
rc

9

File 110599

File No. 110599 For All Members of the Board
dolly sithounnolat
to:
Board.of.Supervisors
05/19/2011 04:35 PM
Cc:
Meg Spriggs, Dan Weaver
Show Details


To the Clerk of the Board,

The Ocean Avenue Revitalization would like to submit a letter of support to all board members for file 110599. Please see the attached pdf. The original copy with 10 copies have been mailed to your office.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me by phone vial email.

Thank you,
Dolly Sithounnolat

--
Dolly Sithounnolat
Project Manager
Ocean Avenue Revitalization Collaborative
4702 Mission Street
San Francisco, CA 94112
Cellular: 415.375-2265
Fax: 415.585-0170
www.oceanave-oarc.org
Add us on [Facebook](#)



TUCKER
engineering

Lic No 877171A □ Lic 877181 A Haz

37 South 4th Street □ Campbell CA 95008
telephone 408 395 0802 □ fax 408 395 0808

BOS-11 File 110599
Land Use Cont
page

May 19, 2011

David Chiu, President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca. 94102-4689

Re: Support for Delivery Truck Easement Agreement – Avalon Ocean L.P.

Dear President Chiu and Members of the Board:

We are writing this letter to voice support for Avalon Bay Communities and the Delivery Truck Easement Agreement at the 1150 Ocean Avenue Project. We have worked with Avalon Bay for over 5 years.

We have worked on other San Francisco projects with them, Mission Bay II, as well as projects from San Jose, Union City, Walnut Creek, and others. These Avalon projects have provided employment for many members of the Local 3, 270 and 261 Union.

We have always been impressed with their attention to detail, respect for subcontractors, the community and Public Right of ways.

Tucker Engineering is a Union contractor.

Sincerely,

TUCKER ENGINEERING, INC.

David Rossi
CEO

cc:

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Hon. Eric Mar

Hon. Mark Farrell
Hon. David Chiu
Hon. Carmen Chu
Hon. Ross Mirkarimi
Hon. Jane Kim
Hon. Sean Elsbernd
Hon. Scott Wiener
Hon. David Campos
Hon. Malia Cohen
Hon. John Avalos
AvalonBay Communities



RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2011 MAY 20 PM 3:07

BY AK

BOS-11
Land Use Clerk
cpage
File 110599

May 19, 2011

Hon. David Chiu, President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RE: Delivery Truck Easement Agreement - Avalon Ocean L.P. - Phelan Bus Loop

Dear President Chiu and Members of the Board:

A & B Construction is writing in support of the easement for the Delivery Truck easement for 1150 Ocean Avenue and Avalon Bay. We are a contractor on the project employing members of the Operating Engineers and Laborers Unions.

Sincerely,

A & B CONSTRUCTION

Andrew M. Jordan
President

cc: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Hon. Eric Mar
Hon. Mark Farrell
Hon. Carmen Chu
Hon. Ross Mirkarimi
Hon. Jane Kim
Hon. Sean Elsbernd
Hon. Scott Wiener
Hon. David Campos
Hon. Malia Cohen
Hon. John Avalos
Avalon Bay Communities

712 SANSOME ST.
SAN FRANCISCO, CA
94111-1704

TEL 415 362 2266
FAX 415 362 2244

CA LICENSE A #636514



RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2011 MAY 20 PM 3:08

BY AK

BOS-11
Land Use Com
Cpage
File 110599

May 19, 2011

Hon. David Chiu, President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RE: Delivery Truck Easement Agreement - Avalon Ocean L.P. - Phelan Bus Loop

Dear President Chiu and Members of the Board:

Proven Management, Inc., is writing in support of the easement for the Delivery Truck easement for 1150 Ocean Avenue and Avalon Bay. We are the contractor on the project employing members of the Operating Engineers, Laborers, and Carpenters Unions.

Sincerely,

PROVEN MANAGEMENT, INC.

Alan Varela
President

AV/mm

cc: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Hon. Eric Mar
Hon. Mark Farrell
Hon. Carmen Chu
Hon. Ross Mirkarimi
Hon. Jane Kim
Hon. Sean Elsbernd
Hon. Scott Wiener
Hon. David Campos
Hon. Malia Cohen
Hon. John Avalos
Avalon Bay Communities



May 19, 2011

Hon. David Chiu, President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAY 23 PM 3:38


Re: Delivery Truck Easement Agreement - Avalon Ocean L.P. - Phelan Bus Loop

Dear President Chiu and Members of the Board:

We at Alamillo Rebar, Inc. are writing in support of the easement for the for the Delivery Truck easement for 1150 Ocean Avenue and AvalonBay. We are the reinforcing steel contractor on the project employing members of the Local 377 with an estimated 7,840 man hours devoted to this project.

Sincerely,

Alamillo Rebar, Inc.

By: 
Larry Alamillo
President

LA:lvb

- cc: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
- Hon. Eric Mar
- Hon. Mark Farrell
- Hon. David Chiu
- Hon. Carmen Chu
- Hon. Ross Mirkarimi
- Hon. Jane Kim
- Hon. Sean Elsbernd
- Hon. Scott Wiener
- Hon. David Campos
- Hon. Malia Cohen
- Hon. John Avalos
- AvalonBay Communities



Pacific Structures

5/17/2011

David Chiu, President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca. 94102-4689

File 110599
page
BY
2011 MAY 19 AM 11:43
RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

Re: **Delivery Truck Easement Agreement - Avalon Ocean L.P. - Phelan Bus Loop**

Dear President Chiu and Members of the Board:

I am writing in support of the easement for the for the Delivery Truck easement for 1150 Ocean Avenue and AvalonBay. Pacific Structures is the concrete contractor on the project, employing members of the Local 22 and Local 261.

For our company this project means the creation of over 23,000 manhours of union work for us in our home city – work that simply would not have been there if Avalon had not gone ahead with the project in expectation of receiving the Delivery Truck easement.

We ask that you grant the easement.

Sincerely,

Dave Williams
President
Pacific Structures

- cc: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
- Hon. Eric Mar
- Hon. Mark Farrell
- Hon. David Chiu
- Hon. Carmen Chu
- Hon. Ross Mirkarimi
- Hon. Jane Kim
- Hon. Sean Elsbernd
- Hon. Scott Wiener
- Hon. David Campos
- Hon. Malia Cohen
- Hon. John Avalos
- AvalonBay Communities



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,

Cc:

Bcc:

Subject: File 110599: Support for Delivery Truck Easement Agreement - Phelan Bus Loop; May 24, 2011 meeting

From: Kate Favetti <kfavetts@yahoo.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, Eric.Mar@sfgov.org, Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org,
David.Chiu@sfgov.org, Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org, Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org, Jane.Kim@sfgov.org,
Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org, Scott.Weiner@sfgov.org, David.Campos@sfgov.org,
Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org, John.Avalos@sfgov.org
Date: 05/19/2011 11:07 AM
Subject: Support for Delivery Truck Easement Agreement - Phelan Bus Loop; May 24, 2011 meeting

Attached is a letter of support for the Westwood Park Homeowners Association for the Delivery Truck Easement awaited grocery store and for the revitalization of the Ocean Avenue retail district.

Thank you,
Kate Favetti, President



Letter of Support Grocery Store easement BOS 5-19-11.pdf

WESTWOOD PARK



May 19, 2011

Honorable David Chiu, President
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

ATTN: Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

**RE: Delivery Truck Easement Agreement - Phelan Bus Loop
Board of Supervisors Meeting May 24, 2011**

Dear President Chiu:

On behalf of the Westwood Park Association, I am writing to express our strong support for the grocery store and residential project under construction by Avalon Bay Communities at 1150 Ocean Avenue. Our neighborhood and the entire community along the Ocean Avenue - Ingleside corridor has had a great need for a grocery store. The concept of a grocery store was also conceived as part of the Balboa Better Neighborhood plan for 10 plus years.

Avalon Bay Communities promised that they would try to deliver a grocery store as part of their residential project and they are coming though on that promise.

Without this easement, there is no way to operate a grocery store at 1150 Ocean Ave. The geometry is such that the easement is required for any grocer to make deliveries that are required on a daily basis.

I strongly urge you to pass this easement legislation as it is necessary to build the long awaited grocery store and for the revitalization of the Ocean Avenue retail district.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Kate Favetti', written in dark ink.

Kate Favetti
President

c: Honorable Eric Mar
Honorable Mark Farrell
Honorable David Chiu
Honorable Carmen Chu
Honorable Ross Mirkarimi
Honorable Jane Kim
Honorable Sean Elsbernd
Honorable Scott Wiener
Honorable David Campos
Honorable Malia Cohen
Honorable John Avalos

The Westwood Park Association, P.O. Box 27901 #770, San Francisco, California 94127
(415) 333-1125 www.westwoodpark.com email: board@westwoodpark.com



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Letter regarding File No. 110599 - For All Members of the Board

From: Meg_Spriggs@AVALONBAY.COM
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Cc: "Steve Vettel" <SVettel@fbm.com>
Date: 05/19/2011 10:00 AM
Subject: Letter regarding File No. 110599 - For All Members of the Board

Please see attached letter concerning File No. 110599: "Grant Easement to, and acceptance of Easement Purchase and Sale Agreement and Delivery Truck Easement Agreement - Avalon Ocean L.P. - Phelan Bus Loop and 1150 Ocean Avenue" to be reviewed at the May 24 Board meeting.

Sincerely,
Meg

Meg Spriggs
Vice President of Development
Avalon Bay Communities
185 Berry Street, Suite 3500
San Francisco, CA 94107
Tel (415) 284-9087



Fax (415) 546-4138 FileNo110599_LettertoBoS.pdf

May 17, 2011

Hon. David Chiu, President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca. 94102-4689

Re: File No. 110599: Grant Easement to, and acceptance of Easement Purchase and Sale Agreement and Delivery Truck Easement Agreement - Avalon Ocean L.P. - Phelan Bus Loop and 1150 Ocean Avenue

Dear President Chiu and Members of the Board:

I am writing in regards to the above requested easement from the City of San Francisco. This resolution will be before the Board on May 24 without recommendation from the Land Use and Economic Development Committee.

AvalonBay Communities, Inc. (managing member of Avalon Ocean L.P.) is seven months into construction on 1150 Ocean Avenue, a mixed-use project including 173 apartments and a grocery store on the ground floor. We expect to begin leasing our first apartments in the summer of 2012 with the grocery store opening by the end of the year. The completion of the 1150 Ocean Avenue project and new grocery store will represent the first major development within the Balboa Park Station Area Plan and will contribute significantly to the revitalization of Ocean Avenue. I want to provide you with additional information that I hope the Board will consider in its deliberations.

- AvalonBay is committed to San Francisco and to delivering 173 apartment units (15% affordable on site) and a 26,000 sf Whole Foods market (under an executed lease agreement spanning 50 years) at 1150 Ocean Avenue per our Planning Commission Motion No 17885, May 21, 2009. The delivery truck easement was contemplated in Condition of Approval #30, *"To accommodate a grocery store use in the east block, a loading dock capable of accommodating 65-foot trucks as shown in Exhibit B may be provided with access from the Lee Avenue Extension. The Project Sponsor may seek an easement, license or other accommodation from the appropriate City agency permitting trucks up to 65 feet in length to use a turn-around at the rear of the current Phelan Loop perpendicular to the Lee Avenue Extension to maneuver trucks so that they can back into the loading dock."*
- The community has actively requested a full-service grocery store on Ocean Avenue for over 10 years. The Balboa Park Station Area Plan and Master EIR contemplate a grocery store for the site as well.

- **Due to the restricted geometry of the site and the public street pattern around the site, the easement is necessary for any full-service grocery store to receive grocery deliveries. Without the easement, there will be no grocery store at 1150 Ocean Avenue.** Further, should the easement not be granted, given the ongoing struggling economy there will likely not be a replacement retailer to take the 26,000 sf shell designed and built for the grocery store. Therefore, the Ocean Avenue facing retail space will sit empty.
- The easement fair market purchase price including land and capitalized operating expense is \$878,192 paid in cash to the City and County of San Francisco upon closing or execution of the Easement Purchase and Sale Agreement.
- We reached agreement with the Mayor's Office of Housing, Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center, the non-profit housing developer on the Phelan Loop, and Whole Foods Market to restrict truck deliveries using the easement to between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m.

I would also like to address directly the comments received by representatives of two members of construction trade unions at the Land Use and Economic Development Committee hearing on May 14. AvalonBay acts as a General Contractor on all of our development projects. We have built four high rises in San Francisco over the last 12 years. All of these projects were built with union labor. For 1150 Ocean Avenue we have solicited subcontractor bids from a long list of subs, including subs referred to us by the trades. As a result, the 1150 Ocean Avenue project is a mix of union and non-union subcontractors. Today 40% of the total value or approximately \$8 million of our contracts are union. Further, 100% of the truck delivery easement work has been contracted to a union contractor. All of our contractors employ experienced construction journeyman who are well-compensated. Although the project is not a public project, journeyman on the project earn from \$25-\$60 per hour depending on the craft. The construction workers on the project come from all over the Bay Area, including San Francisco.

I am sure you can appreciate that our investors' decision to move forward with construction during these challenging economic times came with significant scrutiny on the project's budget. Therefore we have been managing our subcontractor buy out to meet a fixed budget. We were one of only two market rate multifamily new construction projects to start within San Francisco in 2010.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide you with this information. A representative of AvalonBay Communities will attend the hearing on May 24 and be available to answer any follow-up questions you may have. I would also respectfully request that the Board separate the two issues of the easement resolution, which is on a separate parcel and necessary for a grocery store to open at 1150 Ocean, from the issue of the subcontracting goals we have been compelled to employ to make this a feasible development project.

The easement represents the final milestone in bringing the Balboa Park area neighborhood a grocery store, a true catalyst to the revitalization of the neighborhood's commercial district and sustainability as an urban, transit-oriented community. Without it we will not be able to fulfill that promise to the community and the city.

Please contact me if I can provide you with any other information prior to the May 24 Board meeting.
I can be reached at 415-284-9087.

Sincerely,



Meg Spriggs,
VP of Development, AvalonBay Communities

cc: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Hon. Eric Mar
Hon. Mark Farrell
Hon. David Chiu
Hon. Carmen Chu
Hon. Ross Mirkarimi
Hon. Jane Kim
Hon. Sean Elsbernd
Hon. Scott Wiener
Hon. David Campos
Hon. Malia Cohen
Hon. John Avalos
Steve Vettel, Farella, Braun, & Martel



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File No. 110599 For All Members of the Board

From: Lisa Van Brusselen <lisa@alamillorebar.com>
To: "Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org" <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: "Meg_Spriggs@AVALONBAY.COM" <Meg_Spriggs@AVALONBAY.COM>,
"Bryan_Moore@AVALONBAY.COM" <Bryan_Moore@AVALONBAY.COM>
Date: 05/19/2011 11:06 AM
Subject: File No. 110599 For All Members of the Board

To whom it may concern,

Please see attached letter regarding the Whole Foods Loading Easement.

Thank you,

Lisa M. Van Brusselen
Alamillo Rebar, Inc.
1101 Nimitz Avenue - Mare Island
Vallejo, CA 94592
C: 707-980-5944
P: 707-551-7007
F: 707-643-1435
lisa@alamillorebar.com



Easement Ltr 05-19-11.pdf



May 19, 2011

Hon. David Chiu, President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: Delivery Truck Easement Agreement - Avalon Ocean L.P. - Phelan Bus Loop


Dear President Chiu and Members of the Board:

We at Alamillo Rebar, Inc. are writing in support of the easement for the for the Delivery Truck easement for 1150 Ocean Avenue and AvalonBay. We are the reinforcing steel contractor on the project employing members of the Local 377 with an estimated 7,840 man hours devoted to this project.

Sincerely,

Alamillo Rebar, Inc.

By:



Larry Alamillo
President

LA:lvb

cc: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Hon. Eric Mar
Hon. Mark Farrell
Hon. David Chiu
Hon. Carmen Chu
Hon. Ross Mirkarimi
Hon. Jane Kim
Hon. Sean Elsbernd
Hon. Scott Wiener
Hon. David Campos
Hon. Malia Cohen
Hon. John Avalos
AvalonBay Communities

AvalonBay

COMMUNITIES, INC.

185 Berry Street, Suite 3500

San Francisco, CA 94107

Tel (415) 284-9096

Fax (415) 546-4138

File 110599

BOS-11, page

May 19, 2011

Office of the Clerk of the Board
Attn: Angela Calvillo
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca 94102-4689
(415) 554-5184


Dear Clerk of the Board Ms. Calvillo,

The enclosed letters are for distribution to the members of the Board of Supervisors prior to the Board meeting of Tuesday May 24th. It pertains to File No. 110599, the Grant Easement to, and acceptance of Easement Purchase and Sale Agreement and Delivery Truck Easement Agreement - Avalon Ocean L.P. - Phelan Bus Loop and 1150 Ocean Avenue.

If you have any questions, please contact Meg Spriggs, V.P. Development for AvalonBay Communities at 415-284-9087.

Thank you for your assistance with this matter.

Sincerely,



Charles Hardy
Administrative Assistant

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAY 20 AM 10:35
BY: *ABC*



File 10599

May 18, 2011

Hon. David, Chiu, President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: Delivery Truck Easement Agreement – Avalon Ocean L.P. – Phelan Bus Loop

Dear President Chiu and Members of the Board:

AVAR Construction Systems, Inc. is a subcontractor to Avalon Bay Communities on the 1150 Ocean Avenue project in San Francisco. AVAR, as a union contractor, has worked with Avalon on previous projects and has enjoyed a positive working relationship.

AVAR Construction Systems, Inc. is writing in support of the Delivery Truck easement for 1150 Ocean Avenue and Avalon Bay. We are the shoring contractor on the project employing members of the Northern California Laborers Union and Operating Engineers Local 3.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Michael A. Pagano".

Michael A. Pagano, President
AVAR Construction Systems, Inc.

CC:

Angela Calivillo, Clerk of the Board
Hon. Eric Mar
Hon. Mark Farrell
Hon. David Chiu
Hon. Carmen Chu
Hon. Ross Mirkarimi
Hon. Jane Kim
Hon. Sean Elsbernd
Hon. Scott Wiener
Hon. David Campos
Hon. Malla Cohen
Hon. John Avalos
Avalon Bay Communities

AVAR - Support Letter for Avalon Bay Communities

Jessica Wasch

to:

board.of.supervisors

05/18/2011 04:24 PM

Cc:

Bryan_Moore, Meg_Spriggs

Show Details

Please see attached. Thank you.

Jessica Wasch

Bid Coordinator



(work) 510-354-2000 Ext. 229

(fax) 510-354-2010

(email) jw@avarconstruction.com

NOTICE: This E-mail (including attachments) is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. 2510-2521, is confidential and may be legally privileged. Information contained in this e-mail message is intended only for the individual to whom it is addressed and is private and confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, please kindly destroy it and notify the sender immediately by reply e-mail. Please take standard precautions to mitigate virus issues. Thank you for your cooperation.



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Skin Legislations

From: "geiser100" <geiser100@gmail.com>
To: <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
Date: 05/19/2011 09:21 AM
Subject: Skin Legislations

I hope my comments below will be shared with the entire Board.

You people are off your rockers, really! What business does government have telling a constituent how much skin he has, or does not have on their person. This is a private matter, period!

This council is a complete disgrace to even be involved in such a debate. What's next, legislating hair length, foot size, eye color? Shame on all of you for not squashing such legislation...it's totally ridiculous. This is AMERICA people-the land of the free! I am thankful I do not live in San Francisco. Moreover, there must be more important issues this council has to work on. I am sure the news of your pending legislation made it around the world this morning. Aren't you embarrassed?

Joe

Bos-11
C-page



Public Safety/AT&T
Ruth Snow
to:
board.of.supervisors
05/24/2011 08:35 AM
Cc:
districattorney
Show Details

1 Attachment



Public Safety Questions in Regards to Cell Phone Towers.docx

--- On Tue, 5/24/11, Ruth Snow <mysilversun@yahoo.com> wrote:

From: Ruth Snow <mysilversun@yahoo.com>
Subject: AT&T
To: mysilversun@yahoo.com
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2011, 8:26 AM

11

Public Safety Questions in Regards to Cell Phone Towers: AT&T

Objective: It is our intent to put into place a public safety board to evaluate & monitor the public safety standards for **All Cell Phone Companies** to answer to.

We as registered voters request to have this board re-evaluate the standards that are in place and create a yearly check in to assure public safety. It has come to our attention that no such office exists & that the cell companies themselves are the only ones providing the standards.

This is obviously a conflict of interest and trust that this public safety concern be addressed immediately.

Questions from the Residence of the District 6:

- 1.) **What office is responsible to maintain public safety standards for the placement of cell phone towers in a public area?**
- 2.) **What does the cell phone company have in place to hire as a qualified location scout for new towers?**
- 3.) **Does the scout have to walk the area before pursuing a new site location?**

During the public meeting by AT&T the young ladies hosting the meeting admitted to not walking the area before approaching locations. They did not know that a hospital (across the street), an elementary school & a elderly home were within the 500 ft radius of the towers.

- 4.) **What potential health risks to people living around cell phone tower & the power boxes that supply the signals.**

Fatigue? Headaches? Birth Defects? Hospitals? Schools? Elderly? Birds? Bats? Bees?

- 5.) **Animal affects: Bird migration patterns, Bats, Bees etc.**



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,

Cc:

Bcc:

Subject: Support Charter Amendment Allowing BOS Repeal of Voter-Approved Initiatives [BOS File No. 110401]

From: Christopher Pederson <chpederson@yahoo.com>

To: boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org

Date: 05/18/2011 08:09 AM

Subject: Support Charter Amendment Allowing BOS Repeal of Voter-Approved Initiatives [BOS File No. 110401]

I urge you to support Supervisor Wiener's proposed charter amendment to allow the board of supervisors to amend voter-approved initiative ordinances after a reasonable period of time has passed. This proposal preserves the electorate's right to enact initiatives, but allows for modifications over time without having to go through the burdensome and expensive initiative process all over again. Thank you.

Christopher Pederson
201 Laguna St. # 9
SF, CA 94102



Choices mean a better experience for consumers in San Francisco
email2day8 to: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

05/23/2011 09:28 AM

View: (Mail Threads)

1005-11
File 110344

page

May 23, 2011
Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

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

Dear Angela Calvillo,

Soon, the Board of Supervisors will have the opportunity to allow AT&T to upgrade their networks here in San Francisco. It behooves the board to allow AT&T to invest as much money as they can into our city.

As one of the most technologically advanced cities in the nation, we should have the most advanced technological infrastructure possible. Allowing AT&T to invest freely in our city will bring higher quality service, benefitting all of our citizens.

Sincerely,

JAMES WONG
175-12TH AVE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94118-1110



Invest in City College!
Ananda Destefano to: Board.of.Supervisors

05/19/2011 12:10 PM

View: (Mail Threads)

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

To Mayor Lee and Supervisors:
City College provides critical educational opportunities to 100,000 working students every year. Our future depends on quality, affordable education. Students have it hard enough as it is -- let's give students a break by eliminating the \$2 million in service fees charged to City College.

Don't send us back to the stone age. California has always been a leader in Education, don't let us fall farther behind! Stand up for Education and for our State and eliminate the service fees.

Sincerely,
A. Destefano

Sincerely,

Ananda Destefano
San Francisco, 94122

14



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Greg Suhrs Camera Idea For The SFPD is Practical and Harm Red...

From: TimGiangiobbe <TimGiangiobbe@cheerful.com>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 05/19/2011 10:56 AM
Subject: [Dog Eat Dogma] Greg Suhrs Camera Idea For The SFPD is Practical and Harm Red...

Greg Suhr Has a great idea to equip the SFPD with cameras. Be assured the cops will be moaning and groaning and many of us would moan too if subjected to such scrutiny. !!. OH WELL they are cops and too many allegations of misconduct has the city wondering what can be done and this is it! The Recordings will be the truth and that can't be beat. This is already being done in Cook county Illinois and the Chicago area as well as Fayetteville NC Recently and San Francisco is next.

The Cops will learn to like the camera. The Citizens can see the dark side of arrests. The Violent Thugs that these cops deal with are incredible.

The Camera will aid in Harm Reduction !!

Let's review a recent crime. The Party where Gunshots and violence erupted in the projects. Being an Army veteran I can understand the adrenaline level these cops deal with when they arrive at the scene of a shooting. Seriously now do you want to be the one who responds to a call where guns are blazing.?

That is what makes these guys HELLA BRAVE or Crazy. Maybe a little of Both !!! They train for situations but when it happens that may go to the wayside quickly if the situation deems it necessary. Survival comes first.

Of course the bad apples will have to change !

The cops job is hard and long hours. Willing to bet many cops will think it over and embrace the idea. The cameras will save San Francisco money in the long haul. It will boost credibility of the Police Department and encourage cops to DO THEIR BEST.

AFTER ALL YOUR ON CIVIC DUTY CAMERA.

**YEP You Have The Look Greg !!
AND THE LOCAL EXPERIENCE
AND A DA THAT WILL WORK WITH YOU**

With all the budget CRAP and the fact that less cops will be available soon is a good reason to make sure something petty doesn't take a cop off line.

This Idea as Well as The DAs Plan will be welcomed by many San Francisco citizens EVEN LIBERALS. Give them a chance San Franciscans.

George Gascons idea to not charge drug sales arrests with a felony and handle the arrest in Certain Police Stations will need cameras too. The Entire Operation. That is another Great

idea. George Gascon isn't playing the Conservative Hard ass card. He is thinking more simple. The fact that the Prisons are going to send low level convictions back to the counties is another big factor of course.

ABOUT TIME !!!

This all is a start to **LESS PRISONERS** and **More PUBLIC SERVICE** that connects citizens to the community. **THUS THE DESPERATE** Need for less recidivism and job creation like the CCC for the youth but the unions would fight a new CCC calling it slavery and it is not!!

FDR Hear plenty from unions when he created the CCC and he still did it. FDR also Respected Unions need in many cases to curtail corporate greed.

Plus FDR got the youth off the **URBAN STREETS** in the Countryside looking at life differently.

Something needs to be done to get the youth working responsible and happy.

Simple Employment that may lead to bigger and better things while saving is the Antidote to the drug war. As well as keeping charges simple the first round. **THUS A NON POLITICAL CHANCE BEING GIVEN.** A get out of Jail Free Card just quit slinging drugs on the corner. Simple Misdemeanor Sales charges for many substances.

Cannabis charges will be hard to catch unless someone is ignorant enough to continue selling the herb in public creating a dangerous and sometimes deadly situation.

Many times a citizen is arrested and can end up with a felony easily. **The DRUG WAR** is Lost and the Ghettos are paying the Price.

The Latest **GROW ROOM** arrests in San Francisco that shut down an illegal cannabis ring made sure they mentioned the **SPIDER MITES** and **FACT** that they did not sell any to clubs as well as the **GUNS**. These Vietnamese Gangsters are **THUGS** They will be Broken off a few years.

GUNS are not a requirement to get cannabis to grow..

They did not have an electrical permit and some of the electrical looked shoddy in the pictures.

Not safe and Not good for any neighborhood unless **SAFETY IS ADDRESSED.**

The Sad Part is More citizens on Probation or Parole. **LET'S HOPE THEY MAKE A DEAL.**

How will these hard heads ever get ahead when they are always on Probation or Parole ?

Many of these hard headed youths are no different than any other kid.

The Black Market **SPURS** Illegal Activity and **GUNS.**

Harm Reduction Sales of Cannabis and Grows that are **LEGAL** exist in Oakland.

If a "Patient" gets all necessary electrical permits and ensures the grow is safe they need only worry about the **FEDS.** When **ELECTRICITY** is taken they will be charged all around.

San Francisco would benefit from a campaign that tries to get growers **LEGAL** and **SAFE.**

Have Inspectors just ensure the house will not burn down and plumbing is proper as well as any other hazards. **THEN LEAVE !!**

San Francisco needs to be creative in ending the drug war safely.

LEADING THE WAY OF COURSE.

IN HARM REDUCTION

Like Harm Reduction Sales of Cannabis out of **501C3** Outlets.

PEACE

--

Posted By TimGiangiobbe to Dog Eat Dogma at 5/19/2011 10:56:00 AM



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110462 Stock Option Legislation

File 110462

From: Teck Chia <teck@openappmkt.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org
Date: 05/13/2011 12:07 AM
Subject: Support for Supervisor Mark Farrell's stock option legislation

Dear Mayor Lee and Supervisors,

We are excited that City Hall is focusing on creating a solution to the stock options issue.

As a member of the technology community in San Francisco, I strongly urge you to support Supervisor Mark Farrell's stock option legislation!

We support Supervisor Farrell's proposal for a number of reasons:

1. City Hall must solve this problem permanently, or tech companies (and they jobs they create) will continue to leave San Francisco. A temporary solution sends the message that San Francisco is not interested in creating long-term solutions for the local economy. I assume that after 6 years San Francisco won't start taxing stock options again, so why not create a permanent solution now?
2. Private and public companies should be treated equally—it is the only common-sense solution. Supervisor Farrell's legislation ensures that both private and public companies benefit—not only are private companies thinking about leaving San Francisco, but larger, public companies (which employ thousands of San Franciscans) are strategically growing their employees outside of San Francisco to avoid the tax. I want these jobs to stay in San Francisco—Supervisor Farrell's legislation will do just that.
3. Supervisor Farrell's legislation insures that San Francisco's general fund will not face any additional budget deficit. City Hall won't collect more taxes on stock options, but his legislation is designed so that current levels of tax revenue from stock options will stay constant.

Supervisor Farrell's legislation strikes the right balance in creating incentives to keep tech companies in San Francisco, while protecting the City from adverse budget impacts. Our local economy is at stake—please focus on the long-term, and support Supervisor Farrell's legislation!!

Sincerely,
Teck Chia
OpenAppMkt, Inc.
665 3rd St., Suite 150,
San Francisco, CA 94107

From: Guadalupe Tofalo-Davtchev <guadalupe@townhog.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org
Date: 05/13/2011 04:12 PM
Subject: Support Supervisor Mark Farrell's stock option legislation!

Dear Mayor Lee and Supervisors,

We are excited that City Hall is focusing on creating a solution to the stock options issue

as a member of the technology community in San Francisco, I strongly urge you to support Supervisor Mark Farrell's stock option legislation!

We support Supervisor Farrell's proposal for a number of reasons:

1. City Hall has to create a permanent solution to the problem, or tech companies (and the jobs they create) will continue to evaluate leaving San Francisco. A temporary solution sends the message that San Francisco is not interested in creating long-term solutions for the local economy. I assume that after 6 years San Francisco won't start taxing stock options again, so why not create a permanent solution?

2. Private and public companies should both be treated equally - it is the only common-sense solution. Supervisor Farrell's legislation ensures that both private and public companies benefit - not only are private companies thinking about leaving San Francisco, but larger, public companies (which employ thousands of San Franciscans) are growing their employees outside of San Francisco. I want these jobs to stay in San Francisco - and Supervisor Farrell's legislation will do just that.

3. Supervisor Farrell's legislation insures that San Francisco's general fund will not face any additional budget deficit. City Hall won't collect more taxes on stock options, but his legislation is designed so that current levels of tax revenue from stock options will stay constant.

Supervisor Farrell's legislation strikes the right balance in creating incentives to keep tech companies in San Francisco, while protecting the City from adverse budget impacts. Our local economy is at stake - please focus on the long-term, and support Supervisor Farrell's legislation!!

Sincerely,

--

Guadalupe Tofalo-Davtchev | Marketing Manager
guadalupe@townhog.com - Dotblu Inc
343 Sansome Street, Suite 510
San Francisco, CA 94104
www.townhog.com

From: Patrick Breitenbach <pb@pricetack.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org
Date: 05/13/2011 05:35 PM
Subject: Payroll Tax Legislation

Dear Mayor Lee and Supervisors,

We are excited that City Hall is focusing on creating a solution to the stock options issue.

As a member of the technology community in San Francisco, I strongly urge you to support Supervisor Mark Farrell's stock option legislation!

We support Supervisor Farrell's proposal for a number of reasons:

1. City Hall must solve this problem permanently, or tech companies (and the jobs they create) will continue to leave San Francisco. A temporary solution sends the message that San Francisco is not interested in creating long-term solutions for the local economy. I assume that after 6 years San Francisco won't start taxing stock options again, so why not create a permanent solution now?
2. Private and public companies should be treated equally—it is the only common-sense solution. Supervisor Farrell's legislation ensures that both private and public companies benefit—not only are private companies thinking about leaving San Francisco, but larger, public companies (which employ thousands of San Franciscans) are strategically growing their employees outside of San Francisco to avoid the tax. I want these jobs to stay in San Francisco—Supervisor Farrell's legislation will do just that.
3. Supervisor Farrell's legislation insures that San Francisco's general fund will not face any additional budget deficit. City Hall won't collect more taxes on stock options, but his legislation is designed so that current levels of tax revenue from stock options will stay constant.

Supervisor Farrell's legislation strikes the right balance in creating incentives to keep tech companies in San Francisco, while protecting the City from adverse budget impacts. Our local economy is at stake—please focus on the long-term, and support Supervisor Farrell's legislation!!

Sincerely,

-pb-

Patrick Breitenbach
Pricetack.com
665 Third St
Suite 150
San Francisco, CA 94107

From: Scott Levokove <info@levokove.com>
To: mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@SFGov.org, info@plancsf.org
Date: 05/13/2011 06:31 PM
Subject: Please support Supervisor Mark Farrell's stock option legislation.

Dear Mayor Lee and Supervisors,

I strongly urge you to support Supervisor Mark Farrell's stock option legislation.

Technology job growth has been the only bright spot in San Francisco's recent history. San Francisco has an opportunity to become a major technology center - but the City's tax on stock options threatens to throw this trend into reverse. We need a permanent solution to the problem, to send the message that San Francisco wants to be a long-term home for rapidly growing technology companies.

In fixing the stock option tax problem, private and public companies should both be treated equally - it is the only fair solution. Supervisor Farrell's legislation ensures that both private and public companies benefit - which is important, because stock option taxation is also causing public companies to relocate employees outside of San Francisco.

Supervisor Farrell's legislation will not aggravate San Francisco's budget deficit. City Hall won't collect more taxes on stock options, but his legislation will maintain current levels of tax revenue from stock options.

Supervisor Farrell's legislation strikes the right balance in creating incentives for tech companies in San Francisco, while protecting the City from adverse budget impacts. Our local economy is at stake - please focus on the long-term, and support Supervisor Farrell's legislation!

Sincerely,

Scott Levokove
1307 Church Street
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: "Mike Moylan" <mikemoysf@yahoo.com>
To: <mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org>, <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Date: 05/14/2011 07:49 PM
Subject: Mark Farrell stock option legislation

Dear Mayor Lee and Supervisors,

I strongly urge you to support Supervisor Mark Farrell's stock option legislation.

Technology job growth has been the only bright spot in San Francisco's recent history. San Francisco has an opportunity to become a major technology center - but the City's tax on stock options threatens to throw this trend into reverse. We need a permanent solution to the problem, to send the message that San Francisco wants to be a long-term home for rapidly growing technology companies.

In fixing the stock option tax problem, private and public companies should both be treated equally - it is the only fair solution. Supervisor Farrell's legislation ensures that both private and public companies benefit - which is important, because stock option taxation is also causing public companies to relocate employees outside of San Francisco.

Supervisor Farrell's legislation will not aggravate San Francisco's budget deficit. City Hall won't collect more taxes on stock options, but his legislation will maintain current levels of tax revenue from stock options.

Supervisor Farrell's legislation strikes the right balance in creating incentives for tech companies in San Francisco, while protecting the City from adverse budget impacts. Our local economy is at stake - please focus on the long-term, and support Supervisor Farrell's legislation!

Sincerely,
Mike Moylan
896 Green St, SF

From: Michael Jimenez <mike.jimenez@gmail.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org

Date: 05/16/2011 01:00 PM
Subject: SF Stock Option Tax

Dear Mayor Lee and Supervisors,

We are excited that City Hall is focusing on creating a solution to the stock options issue.

As a member of the technology community in San Francisco, I strongly urge you to support Supervisor Mark Farrell's stock option legislation!

We support Supervisor Farrell's proposal for a number of reasons:

1. City Hall must solve this problem permanently, or tech companies (and the jobs they create) will continue to leave San Francisco. A temporary solution sends the message that San Francisco is not interested in creating long-term solutions for the local economy. I assume that after 6 years San Francisco won't start taxing stock options again, so why not create a permanent solution now?
2. Private and public companies should be treated equally—it is the only common-sense solution. Supervisor Farrell's legislation ensures that both private and public companies benefit—not only are private companies thinking about leaving San Francisco, but larger, public companies (which employ thousands of San Franciscans) are strategically growing their employees outside of San Francisco to avoid the tax. I want these jobs to stay in San Francisco—Supervisor Farrell's legislation will do just that.
3. Supervisor Farrell's legislation insures that San Francisco's general fund will not face any additional budget deficit. City Hall won't collect more taxes on stock options, but his legislation is designed so that current levels of tax revenue from stock options will stay constant.

Supervisor Farrell's legislation strikes the right balance in creating incentives to keep tech companies in San Francisco, while protecting the City from adverse budget impacts. Our local economy is at stake—please focus on the long-term, and support Supervisor Farrell's legislation!!

Sincerely,

Michael Jimenez
Bionic Panda Games, Inc.
665 Third Street Suite 150, San Francisco, CA 94107

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 05/18/2011 06:00 PM -----

From: Nicolette Lea <nicolette@topsy.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org
Cc: sfstartups@votizen.com
Date: 05/18/2011 04:52 PM
Subject: Stock Option Tax

Dear Mayor Lee and Supervisors,

We are excited that City Hall is focusing on creating a solution to the stock options issue.

As a member of the technology community in San Francisco, I strongly urge you to support Supervisor Mark Farrell's stock option legislation!

We support Supervisor Farrell's proposal for a number of reasons:

1. City Hall has to create a permanent solution to the problem, or tech

companies (and the jobs they create) will continue to evaluate leaving San Francisco. A temporary solution sends the message that San Francisco is not interested in creating long-term solutions for the local economy. I assume that after 6 years San Francisco won't start taxing stock options again, so why not create a permanent solution?

2. Private and public companies should both be treated equally - it is the only common-sense solution. Supervisor Farrell's legislation ensures that both private and public companies benefit - not only are private companies thinking about leaving San Francisco, but larger, public companies (which employ thousands of San Franciscans) are growing their employees outside of San Francisco. I want these jobs to stay in San Francisco - and Supervisor Farrell's legislation will do just that.

3. Supervisor Farrell's legislation insures that San Francisco's general fund will not face any additional budget deficit. City Hall won't collect more taxes on stock options, but his legislation is designed so that current levels of tax revenue from stock options will stay constant.

Supervisor Farrell's legislation strikes the right balance in creating incentives to keep tech companies in San Francisco, while protecting the City from adverse budget impacts. Our local economy is at stake - please focus on the long-term, and support Supervisor Farrell's legislation!!

Sincerely,
Nicolette Lea

Topsy Labs, Inc.
140 2nd St. 6th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110462 Stock Option Legislation

From: Teck Chia <teck@openappmkt.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org
Date: 05/13/2011 12:07 AM
Subject: Support for Supervisor Mark Farrell's stock option legislation

Dear Mayor Lee and Supervisors,

We are excited that City Hall is focusing on creating a solution to the stock options issue.

As a member of the technology community in San Francisco, I strongly urge you to support Supervisor Mark Farrell's stock option legislation!

We support Supervisor Farrell's proposal for a number of reasons:

1. City Hall must solve this problem permanently, or tech companies (and the jobs they create) will continue to leave San Francisco. A temporary solution sends the message that San Francisco is not interested in creating long-term solutions for the local economy. I assume that after 6 years San Francisco won't start taxing stock options again, so why not create a permanent solution now?
2. Private and public companies should be treated equally—it is the only common-sense solution. Supervisor Farrell's legislation ensures that both private and public companies benefit—not only are private companies thinking about leaving San Francisco, but larger, public companies (which employ thousands of San Franciscans) are strategically growing their employees outside of San Francisco to avoid the tax. I want these jobs to stay in San Francisco—Supervisor Farrell's legislation will do just that.
3. Supervisor Farrell's legislation insures that San Francisco's general fund will not face any additional budget deficit. City Hall won't collect more taxes on stock options, but his legislation is designed so that current levels of tax revenue from stock options will stay constant.

Supervisor Farrell's legislation strikes the right balance in creating incentives to keep tech companies in San Francisco, while protecting the City from adverse budget impacts. Our local economy is at stake—please focus on the long-term, and support Supervisor Farrell's legislation!!

Sincerely,
Teck Chia
OpenAppMkt, Inc.
665 3rd St., Suite 150,
San Francisco, CA 94107

From: Guadalupe Tofalo-Davtchev <guadalupe@townhog.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org
Date: 05/13/2011 04:12 PM
Subject: Support Supervisor Mark Farrell's stock option legislation!

Dear Mayor Lee and Supervisors,

We are excited that City Hall is focusing on creating a solution to the stock options issue

as a member of the technology community in San Francisco, I strongly urge you to support Supervisor Mark Farrell's stock option legislation!

We support Supervisor Farrell's proposal for a number of reasons:

1. City Hall has to create a permanent solution to the problem, or tech companies (and they jobs they create) will continue to evaluate leaving San Francisco. A temporary solution sends the message that San Francisco is not interested in creating long-term solutions for the local economy. I assume that after 6 years San Francisco won't start taxing stock options again, so why not create a permanent solution?

2. Private and public companies should both be treated equally - it is the only common-sense solution. Supervisor Farrell's legislation ensures that both private and public companies benefit - not only are private companies thinking about leaving San Francisco, but larger, public companies (which employ thousands of San Franciscans) are growing their employees outside of San Francisco. I want these jobs to stay in San Francisco - and Supervisor Farrell's legislation will do just that.

3. Supervisor Farrell's legislation Insures that San Francisco's general fund will not face any additional budget deficit. City Hall won't collect more taxes on stock options, but his legislation is designed so that current levels of tax revenue from stock options will stay constant.

Supervisor Farrell's legislation strikes the right balance in creating incentives to keep tech companies in San Francisco, while protecting the City from adverse budget impacts. Our local economy is at stake - please focus on the long-term, and support Supervisor Farrell's legislation!!

Sincerely,

--

Guadalupe Tofalo-Davtchev | Marketing Manager
guadalupe@townhog.com - Dotblu Inc
343 Sansome Street, Suite 510
San Francisco, CA 94104
www.townhog.com

From: Patrick Breitenbach <pb@pricetack.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org
Date: 05/13/2011 05:35 PM
Subject: Payroll Tax Legislation

Dear Mayor Lee and Supervisors,

We are excited that City Hall is focusing on creating a solution to the stock options issue.

As a member of the technology community in San Francisco, I strongly urge you to support Supervisor Mark Farrell's stock option legislation!

We support Supervisor Farrell's proposal for a number of reasons:

1. City Hall must solve this problem permanently, or tech companies (and the jobs they create) will continue to leave San Francisco. A temporary solution sends the message that San Francisco is not interested in creating long-term solutions for the local economy. I assume that after 6 years San Francisco won't start taxing stock options again, so why not create a permanent solution now?

2. Private and public companies should be treated equally—it is the only common-sense solution. Supervisor Farrell's legislation ensures that both private and public companies benefit—not only are private companies thinking about leaving San Francisco, but larger, public companies (which employ thousands of San Franciscans) are strategically growing their employees outside of San Francisco to avoid the tax. I want these jobs to stay in San Francisco—Supervisor Farrell's legislation will do just that.

3. Supervisor Farrell's legislation insures that San Francisco's general fund will not face any additional budget deficit. City Hall won't collect more taxes on stock options, but his legislation is designed so that current levels of tax revenue from stock options will stay constant.

Supervisor Farrell's legislation strikes the right balance in creating incentives to keep tech companies in San Francisco, while protecting the City from adverse budget impacts. Our local economy is at stake—please focus on the long-term, and support Supervisor Farrell's legislation!!

Sincerely,

-pb-

Patrick Breitenbach
Pricetack.com
665 Third St
Suite 150
San Francisco, CA 94107

From: Scott Levokove <info@levokove.com>
To: mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@SFGov.org, info@plancsf.org
Date: 05/13/2011 06:31 PM
Subject: Please support Supervisor Mark Farrell's stock option legislation.

Dear Mayor Lee and Supervisors,

I strongly urge you to support Supervisor Mark Farrell's stock option legislation:

Technology job growth has been the only bright spot in San Francisco's recent history. San Francisco has an opportunity to become a major technology center - but the City's tax on stock options threatens to throw this trend into reverse. We need a permanent solution to the problem, to send the message that San Francisco wants to be a long-term home for rapidly growing technology companies.

In fixing the stock option tax problem, private and public companies should both be treated equally - it is the only fair solution. Supervisor Farrell's legislation ensures that both private and public companies benefit - which is important, because stock option taxation is also causing public companies to relocate employees outside of San Francisco.

Supervisor Farrell's legislation will not aggravate San Francisco's budget deficit. City Hall won't collect more taxes on stock options, but his legislation will maintain current levels of tax revenue from stock options.

Supervisor Farrell's legislation strikes the right balance in creating incentives for tech companies in San Francisco, while protecting the City from adverse budget impacts. Our local economy is at stake - please focus on the long-term, and support Supervisor Farrell's legislation!

Sincerely,

Scott Levokove
1307 Church Street
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: "Mike Moylan" <mikemoysf@yahoo.com>
To: <mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org>, <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Date: 05/14/2011 07:49 PM
Subject: Mark Farrell stock option legislation

Dear Mayor Lee and Supervisors,

I strongly urge you to support Supervisor Mark Farrell's stock option legislation.

Technology job growth has been the only bright spot in San Francisco's recent history. San Francisco has an opportunity to become a major technology center - but the City's tax on stock options threatens to throw this trend into reverse. We need a permanent solution to the problem, to send the message that San Francisco wants to be a long-term home for rapidly growing technology companies.

In fixing the stock option tax problem, private and public companies should both be treated equally - it is the only fair solution. Supervisor Farrell's legislation ensures that both private and public companies benefit - which is important, because stock option taxation is also causing public companies to relocate employees outside of San Francisco.

Supervisor Farrell's legislation will not aggravate San Francisco's budget deficit. City Hall won't collect more taxes on stock options, but his legislation will maintain current levels of tax revenue from stock options.

Supervisor Farrell's legislation strikes the right balance in creating incentives for tech companies in San Francisco, while protecting the City from adverse budget impacts. Our local economy is at stake - please focus on the long-term, and support Supervisor Farrell's legislation!

Sincerely,
Mike Moylan
896 Green St, SF

From: Michael Jimenez <mike.jimenez@gmail.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org

Date: 05/16/2011 01:00 PM
Subject: SF Stock Option Tax

Dear Mayor Lee and Supervisors,

We are excited that City Hall is focusing on creating a solution to the stock options issue.

As a member of the technology community in San Francisco, I strongly urge you to support Supervisor Mark Farrell's stock option legislation!

We support Supervisor Farrell's proposal for a number of reasons:

1. City Hall must solve this problem permanently, or tech companies (and the jobs they create) will continue to leave San Francisco. A temporary solution sends the message that San Francisco is not interested in creating long-term solutions for the local economy. I assume that after 6 years San Francisco won't start taxing stock options again, so why not create a permanent solution now?
2. Private and public companies should be treated equally—it is the only common-sense solution. Supervisor Farrell's legislation ensures that both private and public companies benefit—not only are private companies thinking about leaving San Francisco, but larger, public companies (which employ thousands of San Franciscans) are strategically growing their employees outside of San Francisco to avoid the tax. I want these jobs to stay in San Francisco—Supervisor Farrell's legislation will do just that.
3. Supervisor Farrell's legislation insures that San Francisco's general fund will not face any additional budget deficit. City Hall won't collect more taxes on stock options, but his legislation is designed so that current levels of tax revenue from stock options will stay constant.

Supervisor Farrell's legislation strikes the right balance in creating incentives to keep tech companies in San Francisco, while protecting the City from adverse budget impacts. Our local economy is at stake—please focus on the long-term, and support Supervisor Farrell's legislation!!

Sincerely,

Michael Jimenez
Bionic Panda Games, Inc.
665 Third Street Suite 150, San Francisco, CA 94107

--- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 05/18/2011 06:00 PM ---

From: Nicolette Lea <nicolette@topsy.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org
Cc: sfstartups@votizen.com
Date: 05/18/2011 04:52 PM
Subject: Stock Option Tax

Dear Mayor Lee and Supervisors,

We are excited that City Hall is focusing on creating a solution to the stock options issue.

As a member of the technology community in San Francisco, I strongly urge you to support Supervisor Mark Farrell's stock option legislation!

We support Supervisor Farrell's proposal for a number of reasons:

1. City Hall has to create a permanent solution to the problem, or tech

companies (and the jobs they create) will continue to evaluate leaving San Francisco. A temporary solution sends the message that San Francisco is not interested in creating long-term solutions for the local economy. I assume that after 6 years San Francisco won't start taxing stock options again, so why not create a permanent solution?

2. Private and public companies should both be treated equally - it is the only common-sense solution. Supervisor Farrell's legislation ensures that both private and public companies benefit - not only are private companies thinking about leaving San Francisco, but larger, public companies (which employ thousands of San Franciscans) are growing their employees outside of San Francisco. I want these jobs to stay in San Francisco - and Supervisor Farrell's legislation will do just that.

3. Supervisor Farrell's legislation insures that San Francisco's general fund will not face any additional budget deficit. City Hall won't collect more taxes on stock options, but his legislation is designed so that current levels of tax revenue from stock options will stay constant.

Supervisor Farrell's legislation strikes the right balance in creating incentives to keep tech companies in San Francisco, while protecting the City from adverse budget impacts. Our local economy is at stake - please focus on the long-term, and support Supervisor Farrell's legislation!!

Sincerely,
Nicolette Lea

Topsy Labs, Inc.
140 2nd St. 6th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110462: Stock Option Legislation

From: Todd Pringle <todd@stitcher.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org
Date: 05/19/2011 03:04 PM
Subject: Stock Option Legislation

Dear Mayor Lee and Supervisors,

We are excited that City Hall is focusing on creating a solution to the stock options issue. As a member of the technology community in San Francisco, I strongly urge you to support Supervisor Mark Farrell's stock option legislation!

We support Supervisor Farrell's proposal for a number of reasons:

1. City Hall has to create a permanent solution to the problem, or tech companies (and they jobs they create) will continue to evaluate leaving San Francisco. A temporary solution sends the message that San Francisco is not interested in creating long-term solutions for the local economy. I assume that after 6 years San Francisco won't start taxing stock options again, so why not create a permanent solution?
2. Private and public companies should both be treated equally - it is the only common-sense solution. Supervisor Farrell's legislation ensures that both private and public companies benefit - not only are private companies thinking about leaving San Francisco, but larger, public companies (which employ thousands of San Franciscans) are growing their employees outside of San Francisco. I want these jobs to stay in San Francisco - and Supervisor Farrell's legislation will do just that.
3. Supervisor Farrell's legislation insures that San Francisco's general fund will not face any additional budget deficit. City Hall won't collect more taxes on stock options, but his legislation is designed so that current levels of tax revenue from stock options will stay constant.

Supervisor Farrell's legislation strikes the right balance in creating incentives to keep tech companies in San Francisco, while protecting the City from adverse budget impacts. Our local economy is at stake - please focus on the long-term, and support Supervisor Farrell's legislation!!

Sincerely,
Todd Pringle
Stitcher, Inc
121 2nd Street, 6th floor
San Francisco, CA 94105

C-page
BDS-1.1



Sharp Park Golf Course
Edgar Ortega to: Board.of.Supervisors
Please respond to edgarandtami

05/24/2011 10:23 AM

Dear Board of Supervisors

I am writing to urge the City of San Francisco to turn the Sharp Park Golf Course over to its next door neighbor, the National Park Service. The Sharp Park Wetlands provide critical habitat for the endangered California Red-Legged Frog and a variety of other wildlife. Both frogs and wetlands are rapidly disappearing in California and worldwide, so it is disconcerting that the City of San Francisco is currently using taxpayer dollars to pump the Sharp Park Wetlands dry, killing endangered frogs in the process, and violating state and federal laws.

The Sharp Park Golf Course has a long history of environmental and economic troubles, and the time has clearly come for the City of San Francisco to change course. By closing the golf course and handing the land over to the National Park Service, the City of San Francisco would relieve itself of its current financial, legal and environmental burden, and it would also clearly mark itself as a world leader in environmental protection efforts.

The restored Sharp Park Wetlands would be a safe haven for threatened wildlife and would provide valuable recreational opportunities to San Francisco residents and tourists alike. This would not only improve the quality of life for San Francisco's residents, it would increase the long-term economic value of the property.

On behalf of all those who enjoy nature and wildlife, thanks for your consideration.

Edgar Ortega

Manteca, CA 95337
US

C page



Please Save The Sharp Park Wetlands
Jacob Kalichman to: Board of Supervisors
Please respond to jacobk1

05/24/2011 01:52 PM

Dear Board of Supervisors

I am writing to urge the City of San Francisco to turn the Sharp Park Golf Course over to its next door neighbor, the National Park Service. The Sharp Park Wetlands provide critical habitat for the endangered California Red-Legged Frog and a variety of other wildlife. Both frogs and wetlands are rapidly disappearing in California and worldwide, so it is disconcerting that the City of San Francisco is currently using taxpayer dollars to pump the Sharp Park Wetlands dry, killing endangered frogs in the process, and violating state and federal laws.

The Sharp Park Golf Course has a long history of environmental and economic troubles, and the time has clearly come for the City of San Francisco to change course. By closing the golf course and handing the land over to the National Park Service, the City of San Francisco would relieve itself of its current financial, legal and environmental burden, and it would also clearly mark itself as a world leader in environmental protection efforts.

The restored Sharp Park Wetlands would be a safe haven for threatened wildlife and would provide valuable recreational opportunities to San Francisco residents and tourists alike. This would not only improve the quality of life for San Francisco's residents, it would increase the long-term economic value of the property.

On behalf of all those who enjoy nature and wildlife, thanks for your consideration.

Jacob Kalichman

Stanford, CA 94305
US

e-page



Please Save The Sharp Park Wetlands
Kiley Skaggs to: Board.of.Supervisors
Please respond to uakats

05/23/2011 10:20 PM

Dear Board of Supervisors

I am writing to urge the City of San Francisco to turn the Sharp Park Golf Course over to its next door neighbor, the National Park Service. The Sharp Park Wetlands provide critical habitat for the endangered California Red-Legged Frog and a variety of other wildlife. Both frogs and wetlands are rapidly disappearing in California and worldwide, so it is disconcerting that the City of San Francisco is currently using taxpayer dollars to pump the Sharp Park Wetlands dry, killing endangered frogs in the process, and violating state and federal laws.

The Sharp Park Golf Course has a long history of environmental and economic troubles, and the time has clearly come for the City of San Francisco to change course. By closing the golf course and handing the land over to the National Park Service, the City of San Francisco would relieve itself of its current financial, legal and environmental burden, and it would also clearly mark itself as a world leader in environmental protection efforts.

The restored Sharp Park Wetlands would be a safe haven for threatened wildlife and would provide valuable recreational opportunities to San Francisco residents and tourists alike. This would not only improve the quality of life for San Francisco's residents, it would increase the long-term economic value of the property.

On behalf of all those who enjoy nature and wildlife, thanks for your consideration.

Kiley Skaggs

Tucson, AZ 85641
US

C-page
BDS-11



Please Save The Sharp Park Wetlands
Zech Endsley to: Board of Supervisors
Please respond to zechariah95

05/24/2011 05:41 PM

Dear Board of Supervisors

I am writing to urge the City of San Francisco to turn the Sharp Park Golf Course over to its next door neighbor, the National Park Service. The Sharp Park Wetlands provide critical habitat for the endangered California Red-Legged Frog and a variety of other wildlife. Both frogs and wetlands are rapidly disappearing in California and worldwide, so it is disconcerting that the City of San Francisco is currently using taxpayer dollars to pump the Sharp Park Wetlands dry, killing endangered frogs in the process, and violating state and federal laws.

The Sharp Park Golf Course has a long history of environmental and economic troubles, and the time has clearly come for the City of San Francisco to change course. By closing the golf course and handing the land over to the National Park Service, the City of San Francisco would relieve itself of its current financial, legal and environmental burden, and it would also clearly mark itself as a world leader in environmental protection efforts.

The restored Sharp Park Wetlands would be a safe haven for threatened wildlife and would provide valuable recreational opportunities to San Francisco residents and tourists alike. This would not only improve the quality of life for San Francisco's residents, it would increase the long-term economic value of the property.

On behalf of all those who enjoy nature and wildlife, thanks for your consideration.

Zech Endsley

Albion, IL 62806
US



Please Save The Sharp Park Wetlands
Ricky Ortiz to: Board.of.Supervisors
Please respond to rickyortiz84

05/24/2011 03:00 PM

BOS-11
✓ e-page

Dear Board of Supervisors

I am writing to urge the City of San Francisco to turn the Sharp Park Golf Course over to its next door neighbor, the National Park Service. The Sharp Park Wetlands provide critical habitat for the endangered California Red-Legged Frog and a variety of other wildlife. Both frogs and wetlands are rapidly disappearing in California and worldwide, so it is disconcerting that the City of San Francisco is currently using taxpayer dollars to pump the Sharp Park Wetlands dry, killing endangered frogs in the process, and violating state and federal laws.

The Sharp Park Golf Course has a long history of environmental and economic troubles, and the time has clearly come for the City of San Francisco to change course. By closing the golf course and handing the land over to the National Park Service, the City of San Francisco would relieve itself of its current financial, legal and environmental burden, and it would also clearly mark itself as a world leader in environmental protection efforts.

The restored Sharp Park Wetlands would be a safe haven for threatened wildlife and would provide valuable recreational opportunities to San Francisco residents and tourists alike. This would not only improve the quality of life for San Francisco's residents, it would increase the long-term economic value of the property.

On behalf of all those who enjoy nature and wildlife, thanks for your consideration.

Ricky Ortiz

stockton, CA 95210
US



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Please Save The Sharp Park Wetlands

From: Nadine Zimmer <fornzimmer@yahoo.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 05/17/2011 05:49 PM
Subject: Please Save The Sharp Park Wetlands

Dear Board of Supervisors

I am writing to urge the City of San Francisco to turn the Sharp Park Golf Course over to its next door neighbor, the National Park Service. The Sharp Park Wetlands provide critical habitat for the endangered California Red-Legged Frog and a variety of other wildlife. Both frogs and wetlands are rapidly disappearing in California and worldwide, so it is disconcerting that the City of San Francisco is currently using taxpayer dollars to pump the Sharp Park Wetlands dry, killing endangered frogs in the process, and violating state and federal laws.

The Sharp Park Golf Course has a long history of environmental and economic troubles, and the time has clearly come for the City of San Francisco to change course. By closing the golf course and handing the land over to the National Park Service, the City of San Francisco would relieve itself of its current financial, legal and environmental burden, and it would also clearly mark itself as a world leader in environmental protection efforts.

The restored Sharp Park Wetlands would be a safe haven for threatened wildlife and would provide valuable recreational opportunities to San Francisco residents and tourists alike. This would not only improve the quality of life for San Francisco's residents, it would increase the long-term economic value of the property.

On behalf of all those who enjoy nature and wildlife, thanks for your consideration.

Nadine Zimmer

Portland, OR 97232
US



To: BOS: Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Please Protect Sharp Park

From: sara shaw <sarashaw20@hotmail.com>
To: Board of Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 05/16/2011 02:14 PM
Subject: Please Protect Sharp Park
Sent by: National Parks Conservation Association <takeaction@npca.org>

May 16, 2011

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to ask that you take action to restore wetlands at Sharp Park Golf Course and that you create a better public park in partnership with the National Park Service. Closing the Pacifica-based, but San Francisco-owned golf course--which is also located within the boundary of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area--will best protect endangered species, provide more diverse recreational activities, provide flood control for adjacent neighborhoods, and is the least expensive option for San Francisco. Restoration would also allow money spent on the failing course to be reinvested into parks and other golf courses actually located within San Francisco.

Sharp Park Golf Course loses up to hundreds of thousands of dollars each year and continues to kill endangered species. We can do better. Please help build a better public park at Sharp Park that everyone can enjoy!

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Ms. sara shaw
1095 Rio Vista Dr
Pacifica, CA 94044-4127



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Please Protect Sharp Park

The Clerk's Office received 7 form emails like the one below.

Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
(415) 554-5163 fax
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

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

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 05/25/2011 06:10 PM -----

From: Jeremy Austin <bilbo3d@msh.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 05/23/2011 01:19 AM
Subject: Please Protect Sharp Park
Sent by: National Parks Conservation Association <takeaction@npca.org>

May 23, 2011

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to ask that you take action to restore wetlands at Sharp Park Golf Course and that you create a better public park in partnership with the National Park Service. Closing the Pacifica-based, but San Francisco-owned golf course--which is also located within the boundary of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area--will best protect endangered species, provide more diverse recreational activities, provide flood control for adjacent neighborhoods, and is the least expensive option for San Francisco. Restoration would also allow money spent on the failing course to be reinvested into parks and other golf courses actually located within San Francisco.

Sharp Park Golf Course loses up to hundreds of thousands of dollars each year and continues to kill endangered species. We can do better. Please help build a better public park at Sharp Park that everyone can enjoy!

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mr. Jeremy Austin
1916 Cooper Dr
Santa Rosa, CA 95404-5633



Please Protect Sharp Park
Kimyn Braithwaite to: Board.of.Supervisors
Sent by: National Parks Conservation Association
<takeaction@npca.org>
Please respond to Kimyn Braithwaite

05/19/2011 02:56 PM

View: (Mail Threads)

May 19, 2011

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to ask that you take action to restore wetlands at Sharp Park Golf Course and that you create a better public park in partnership with the National Park Service. Closing the Pacifica-based, but San Francisco-owned golf course--which is also located within the boundary of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area--will best protect endangered species, provide more diverse recreational activities, provide flood control for adjacent neighborhoods, and is the least expensive option for San Francisco. Restoration would also allow money spent on the failing course to be reinvested into parks and other golf courses actually located within San Francisco.

Sharp Park Golf Course loses up to hundreds of thousands of dollars each year and continues to kill endangered species. We can do better. Please help build a better public park at Sharp Park that everyone can enjoy!

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Ms. Kimyn Braithwaite
80 Sanchez St
San Francisco, CA 94114-1165



Please Protect Sharp Park
Janice Gloe to: Board of Supervisors
Sent by: National Parks Conservation Association
<takeaction@npca.org>
Please respond to Janice Gloe

05/19/2011 02:56 PM

View: (Mail Threads)

May 19, 2011

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to ask that you take action to restore wetlands at Sharp Park Golf Course and that you create a better public park in partnership with the National Park Service. Closing the Pacifica-based, but San Francisco-owned golf course--which is also located within the boundary of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area--will best protect endangered species, provide more diverse recreational activities, provide flood control for adjacent neighborhoods, and is the least expensive option for San Francisco. Restoration would also allow money spent on the failing course to be reinvested into parks and other golf courses actually located within San Francisco.

Sharp Park Golf Course loses up to hundreds of thousands of dollars each year and continues to kill endangered species. We can do better. Please help build a better public park at Sharp Park that everyone can enjoy!

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Ms. Janice Gloe
3100 Guido St
Oakland, CA 94602-3521



Please Protect Sharp Park
Ray Rossi to: Board.of.Supervisors
Sent by: National Parks Conservation Association
<takeaction@npca.org>
Please respond to Ray Rossi

05/19/2011 09:36 PM

View: (Mail Threads)

May 19, 2011

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to ask that you take action to restore wetlands at Sharp Park Golf Course and that you create a better public park in partnership with the National Park Service. Closing the Pacifica-based, but San Francisco-owned golf course--which is also located within the boundary of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area--will best protect endangered species, provide more diverse recreational activities, provide flood control for adjacent neighborhoods, and is the least expensive option for San Francisco. Restoration would also allow money spent on the failing course to be reinvested into parks and other golf courses actually located within San Francisco.

Sharp Park Golf Course loses up to hundreds of thousands of dollars each year and continues to kill endangered species. We can do better. Please help build a better public park at Sharp Park that everyone can enjoy!

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mr. Ray Rossi
10763 Keith St
Santee, CA 92071-1161



Please Protect Sharp Park
David Neiberger to: Board.of.Supervisors
Sent by: National Parks Conservation Association
<takeaction@npca.org>
Please respond to David Neiberger

05/20/2011 08:44 PM

View: (Mail Threads)

May 20, 2011

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to ask that you take action to restore wetlands at Sharp Park Golf Course and that you create a better public park in partnership with the National Park Service. Closing the Pacifica-based, but San Francisco-owned golf course--which is also located within the boundary of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area--will best protect endangered species, provide more diverse recreational activities, provide flood control for adjacent neighborhoods, and is the least expensive option for San Francisco. Restoration would also allow money spent on the failing course to be reinvested into parks and other golf courses actually located within San Francisco.

Sharp Park Golf Course loses up to hundreds of thousands of dollars each year and continues to kill endangered species. We can do better. Please help build a better public park at Sharp Park that everyone can enjoy!

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mr. David Neiberger
PO Box 6549
Carmel By The, CA 93921-6549



Please Protect Sharp Park
pEGGY holmes to: Board.of.Supervisors
Sent by: National Parks Conservation Association
<takeaction@npca.org>
Please respond to pEGGY holmes

05/20/2011 09:14 PM

View: (Mail Threads)

May 20, 2011

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to ask that you take action to restore wetlands at Sharp Park Golf Course and that you create a better public park in partnership with the National Park Service. Closing the Pacifica-based, but San Francisco-owned golf course--which is also located within the boundary of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area--will best protect endangered species, provide more diverse recreational activities, provide flood control for adjacent neighborhoods, and is the least expensive option for San Francisco. Restoration would also allow money spent on the failing course to be reinvested into parks and other golf courses actually located within San Francisco.

Sharp Park Golf Course loses up to hundreds of thousands of dollars each year and continues to kill endangered species. We can do better. Please help build a better public park at Sharp Park that everyone can enjoy!

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Ms. pEGGY holmes
2367 Plum St
Apt A
Pinole, CA 94564-1715



Please Protect Sharp Park
Kim Pendergrass to: Board.of.Supervisors
Sent by: National Parks Conservation Association
<takeaction@npca.org>
Please respond to Kim Pendergrass

05/21/2011 03:16 PM

View: (Mail Threads)

May 21, 2011

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to ask that you take action to restore wetlands at Sharp Park Golf Course and that you create a better public park in partnership with the National Park Service. Closing the Pacifica-based, but San Francisco-owned golf course--which is also located within the boundary of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area--will best protect endangered species, provide more diverse recreational activities, provide flood control for adjacent neighborhoods, and is the least expensive option for San Francisco. Restoration would also allow money spent on the failing course to be reinvested into parks and other golf courses actually located within San Francisco.

Sharp Park Golf Course loses up to hundreds of thousands of dollars each year and continues to kill endangered species. We can do better. Please help build a better public park at Sharp Park that everyone can enjoy!

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Ms. Kim Pendergrass
12216 10th Ave S
Seattle, WA 98168-2216



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Please Save The Sharp Park Wetlands

From: Lance Michel <nabalom007@comcast.net>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 05/23/2011 01:27 AM
Subject: Please Save The Sharp Park Wetlands

Dear Board of Supervisors

I am writing to urge the City of San Francisco to turn the Sharp Park Golf Course over to its next door neighbor, the National Park Service. The Sharp Park Wetlands provide critical habitat for the endangered California Red-Legged Frog and a variety of other wildlife. Both frogs and wetlands are rapidly disappearing in California and worldwide, so it is disconcerting that the City of San Francisco is currently using taxpayer dollars to pump the Sharp Park Wetlands dry, killing endangered frogs in the process, and violating state and federal laws.

The Sharp Park Golf Course has a long history of environmental and economic troubles, and the time has clearly come for the City of San Francisco to change course. By closing the golf course and handing the land over to the National Park Service, the City of San Francisco would relieve itself of its current financial, legal and environmental burden, and it would also clearly mark itself as a world leader in environmental protection efforts.

The restored Sharp Park Wetlands would be a safe haven for threatened wildlife and would provide valuable recreational opportunities to San Francisco residents and tourists alike. This would not only improve the quality of life for San Francisco's residents, it would increase the long-term economic value of the property.

On behalf of all those who enjoy nature and wildlife, thanks for your consideration.

Lance Michel

Jersey City, NJ 07302
US



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Please Save The Sharp Park Wetlands

From: JAMES MAUGHN <JAMAUGHN@CABRILLO.EDU>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 05/25/2011 11:32 PM
Subject: Please Save The Sharp Park Wetlands

Dear Board of Supervisors

I am writing to urge the City of San Francisco to turn the Sharp Park Golf Course over to its next door neighbor, the National Park Service. The Sharp Park Wetlands provide critical habitat for the endangered California Red-Legged Frog and a variety of other wildlife. Both frogs and wetlands are rapidly disappearing in California and worldwide, so it is disconcerting that the City of San Francisco is currently using taxpayer dollars to pump the Sharp Park Wetlands dry, killing endangered frogs in the process, and violating state and federal laws.

The Sharp Park Golf Course has a long history of environmental and economic troubles, and the time has clearly come for the City of San Francisco to change course. By closing the golf course and handing the land over to the National Park Service, the City of San Francisco would relieve itself of its current financial, legal and environmental burden, and it would also clearly mark itself as a world leader in environmental protection efforts.

The restored Sharp Park Wetlands would be a safe haven for threatened wildlife and would provide valuable recreational opportunities to San Francisco residents and tourists alike. This would not only improve the quality of life for San Francisco's residents, it would increase the long-term economic value of the property.

On behalf of all those who enjoy nature and wildlife, thanks for your consideration.

JAMES MAUGHN

SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060
US



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: THE REGION NEEDS TO BE PART OF THE SOLUTION

From: BERNARD CHODEN <choden@sbcglobal.net>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, sft-board-list@sonic.net, Aaron Goodman <amgodman@yahoo.com>, Calvin Welch <SFIC98@pacbell.net>, Debra Walker <dw@debrawalker.com>, Judy Berkowitz <sfjberk@mac.com>, Cynthia Servetnick <cynthia.servetnick@gmail.com>, "Bruce B. Brugmann" <bruce@sfbg.com>, Alicia Schwartz <alicia@peopleorganized.org>, "Gray Brechin PhD." <gbrechin@berkeley.edu>, Hiroshi Fukuda <NINERSAM@aol.com>, Kathryn Rose Devincenzi <krdevincenzi@gmail.com>, Stuart Flashman <stu@stufash.com>, Charles Marsteller <cm_marsteller@hotmail.com>
Date: 05/17/2011 04:33 PM
Subject: THE REGION NEEDS TO BE PART OF THE SOLUTION

This is a reprise of and response to issues advanced at the BOS Land Use hearing by the Supervisors. The most prominent issue was premised by Sup. Wiener. That premise is, to wit, that the city needs to absorb the regions' population growth in order to protect the regions' farms and green areas. It is manifested in his claim that "density equity" in the western portion of the city and such increased density in the financial district is essential to meet this new population. The main vehicles for this now is Park Merced's enormous growth advocacy, housing along presumptive transit lines and improved transit access in the financial district and newly established BNP areas for the Eastern Neighborhoods financed in part by MTC's \$ 200 millions in transportation funds. The local administration's battle to save state redevelopment law as now loosely enforced is also assumed to be linked to these adventures.

1. Regional intrusions into the "green" agricultural lands continues as low density citification is promoted by the regions' county governments as exemplified by development intrusions into the Delta and the outer areas of Walnut Creek, Tracy and Pacifica without adequate attention to the underpinnings of employment, services, infrastructure and environment protections investments.

It is not San Francisco's responsibility to take responsibility for mal-administrative of the open space environment by county governments. Yet the region's advise agencies, ABAG and MTC, suggest, with political prompting by the San Francisco government, that our city take on 80% of the regions' population growth without the necessary population underpinnings of supportive and mutually interdependent, services, economic endeavors, affordable housing and capital investments.

Further, the city has passed ordinances based upon state legislation AB 375 and SB 626 that promote high-density housing along transit lines. The city's ordinances do not conform to the objectives and the allowances of those state laws nor are they circumscribed by a need to provide substantial affordable housing that also meets the diversity of housing needs as well as conformance to an adequate General Plan.

As a result, there is a politically inspired advocacy for a city of 2 million people that cannot sustain needs for health, welfare and safety including the hazard of likely substantial earthquakes.

2. Among the remedies for such pernicious proposals would be:

a. Regional government with aegis for environmental protections, major infrastructure approvals and certain joint authority development such as use of the state New Communities Act. An Urban Development Corporation modeled on New York and Boston might be examples. Also, the Los Angeles region association of governments has an authority with more comprehensive powers including research and transportation than AMAG and MTC together.

b. Regional public ownership of such utilities as electric power, water and waste management. The model of Seattle, Wash. exists.

c. Expansion of the Williamson Act to require full development rights for agricultural lands to be irrevocably in public ownership trust. Abatement of property taxes would be the base for

development rights payments.

d. Creation of an "anti-speculation" land transfer tax would lessen the effects of "inelasticity" for pricing land values and provide for some public controls and revenues.

Perhaps the above might lead to more introspection and thought as to what needs to be done.

Bernie Choden



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Alisa Somera/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110397 Housing Element - please send back to the Planning Department for revisions.

From: "Kathy Howard" <kathyhoward@earthlink.net>
To: <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
Date: 05/16/2011 12:32 PM
Subject: Housing Element - please send back to the Planning Department for revisions.

Dear Supervisor,

The revised Housing Element will reduce drastically the current open space and back yard space requirements. This is an unfortunate decision by planners. These days, the City of San Francisco is urging people to grow their own food and to plan native plants, to help support our wildlife. In addition, the City is sponsoring the Pavement to Parks program, which often removes concrete for new plantings. The Housing Element is going in the opposite direction. If everything is paved and built on in the City, there will be much less habitat potential and certainly less room to grow food.

Please ask the Planning Department to take another look at this document; it does not meet the concerns of many San Franciscans.

Thank you for your consideration.
Katherine Howard
1243 42nd Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94122



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Housing vote

From: Michael Russom <michaelrussom@sbcglobal.net>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 05/17/2011 09:22 AM
Subject: Housing vote

Did you read the analysis of the high gas price problem in the Chronicle yesterday? The price is not high because not enough exploration or production is being done; it is high due to the billions of dollars in profits from hedge fund speculators that buy up oil, drive the price up and profit enormously. You are allowing the hedge fund billionaires to buy up affordable housing in San Francisco, UNDER YOUR WATCH, and driving the middle class and families out. Read about Stellar and Fortress on the internet and see how angry and frustrated are the tenants who have lived through their "rehabilitation" schemes--affordable, responsible housing is gone. The profiteers move on and leave a disaster behind. It will be up to you and your "legacy" to live this same scenario out here, and I will hold you personally responsible for the consequences. Michael Russom



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Alisa Somera/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110397

From: Pam Hemphill <pam.hemphill@gmail.com>
To: Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org, Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org, Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org
Cc: Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org, boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org, Rick.Caldeira@sfgov.org
Date: 05/16/2011 12:27 PM
Subject: The 2009 Housing Element should not be the housing element in the SF General Plan

Supervisors:

I would like to express my lack of support for having the 2009 Housing Element be the housing element of the SF General Plan. Density limits are important and do protect our neighborhoods. Tall buildings shadow and create wind tunnels in an already windy city. Neighborhoods should be able to participate in decision making about where they live.

This 2009 Housing Element, which reduces protection for our green open spaces and rear yards and allows building oversize buildings, will turn San Francisco into simply a collection of buildings and roads and no vegetation. San Francisco calls itself a green city, but, in reality we are not with going green with the policies of the present Planning Department. Building into available yard spaces is encouraged with no thought for the end result of this policy, which is no greenery and hence no habitat for birds, bees, and butterflies. There has long been talk of creating wildlife corridors across our city with plantings in yards connecting the Presidio to our park spaces. This clearly will not be possible as the yards are disappearing.

My neighborhood, Dolores Heights, has a special use district which is codified under Section 241. Section 241 requires a 45% rear yard setback, but the Planning Department does not honor this now. I can only imagine what would happen if the 2009 Housing Element entered the SF General Plan. Please do not support this.

Respectfully,
Pam Hemphill MD

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 05/18/2011 05:52 PM -----

From: Janet Pellegrini <pell2@sbcglobal.net>
To: Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org, Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org, Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org
Cc: Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org, board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org, rick.caldeira@sfgov.org
Date: 05/16/2011 04:45 PM
Subject: Housing Element

To all Concerned:

I am a native San Franciscan and very concerned about keeping San Francisco a city full of neighborhoods. Adding 8 story buildings along buslines that pass through neighborhoods is not a smart future plan. Densifying and building up will only take away views, light, privacy, and create traffic havoc. What happened to the open space policies and the move to keep San Francisco green? Do you remember we are a city hit by earthquakes. Many areas like the Marina and perhaps Treasure Island should not even be considered for adding population because more lives would be at risk when the next natural disaster comes. We do not want to live like rats-people upon people. We want to keep San Francisco alive with character and space. Keep the tall buildings for downtown and the commercial areas.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet Pellegrini
222 Cervantes Blvd.
SF, CA 94123



May 24, 2011 - 2009 Housing Element
:) to: Sean Elsbernd, Carmen Chu, Mark Farrell
Cc: board.of.supervisors
Please respond to gumby5

C-page

#10397

05/23/2011 04:29 PM

Dear Supervisors Elsbernd, Chu and Farrell:
I urge you to stand firm and vote against the adoption of the 2009 Housing Element in its last iteration of Draft 3 as you had when you voted against the certification of the EIR.
Thank you very much.
Rose Hillson
Member, Jordan Park Improvement Association



File No. 110397: Item No. 17 - 2009 HE GP Amendments - May 24 '11

Eric.L.Mar, Mark.Farrell, David.Chiu, Carmen.Chu,

to: Ross.Mirkarimi, Jane.Kim, Sean.Elsbernd, Scott.Wiener,

David.Campos, Malia.Cohen, John.Avalos,

Please respond to gumby5

05/24/2011 08:41 AM

✓ U-ynge
Bos-11

Dear Supervisors,

I urge you to oppose BOS Agenda Item #17 - General Plan Amendments -
2009 Housing Element Update (File #110397).

Rose Hillson

Member, Jordan Park Improvement Association

File #110397

BOS-11

✓ 1 page



ITEM ON CALENDAR TODAY

gary noguera

to:

Eric.L.Mar, Mark.Farrell, David.Chiu, Carmen.Chu, Ross.Mirkarimi, Jane.Kim,
Sean.Elsbernd, Scott.Wiener, David.Campos, Malia.Cohen, John.Avalos,

Board.of.Supervisors

05/24/2011 06:47 AM

Show Details

Dear Supervisors,

#110397

I urge you to oppose BOS agenda item #17 - General Plan Amendments -
2009 Housing Element Update (File #110397).

Thanks

gary noguera
942 teresita blvd
sf 94127



May 24, 2011, Item 17, General Plan Amendments - 2009 Housing Element Update [BOS File No. 110397]

Supervisor David Chiu, jane.kim,
Cynthia Servetnick to: Sean.Elsbernd, Mark.Farrell, Supervisor 05/24/2011 12:54 AM
David Campos, Carmen.Chu, Supervisor
Cc: "john.rahaim", bill.wycko, Kearstin Dischinger, Tim Frye, SF
Preservation Consortium

Honorable President Chiu and Members of the Board:

In amending the San Francisco General Plan by adopting the 2009 Housing Element and making environmental findings and findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of the Planning Code Section 101.1, please bear the following issues in mind:

- 1) The General Plan lacks an Historic Preservation Element.
- 2) Articles 10 and 11 of the Planning Code have not yet been updated for consistency with Proposition J of 2008 which amended the City Charter to create the Historic Preservation Commission.
- 3) San Francisco has not yet undertaken a comprehensive citywide historical resources survey--similar SurveyLA--to identify significant historical resources throughout the City.
- 4) Many areas of the City have not been subject to survey activity, but contain properties that are likely to be considered historical resources under CEQA.
- 5) The implementation of the SB 375 Sustainable Communities Strategy will impact historical resources by creating incentives to redevelop infill sites.

While the Planning Department has determined that the 2009 Housing Element Update is consistent with Planning Code Section 101.1(b), Priority Policy 7, "That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved," and concluded, "The 2009 Housing Element would not have a negative effect on the preservation of landmarks and historic buildings, and that the 2009 Housing Element includes policies that recognize that landmarks and historic buildings should be preserved," the above-listed issues raise concerns about policies and activities that could adversely impact or impair the significance of historical resources.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Servetnick
845 Sutter Street, No. 512
San Francisco, CA 94109



To: Alisa Somera/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110397: Urging Opposition to BOS Agenda Item #17 - General Plan Amendments - 2009 Housing Element Update (File #110397)

From: AEBOKEN Boken <aeboken@msn.com>
To: <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>, <david.campos@sfgov.org>, <david.chiu@sfgov.org>, <eric.l.mar@sfgov.org>, <jane.kim@sfgov.org>, <john.avalos@sfgov.org>, <malia.cohen@sfgov.org>, <mark.farrell@sfgov.org>, <rick.caldeira@sfgov.org>, <ross.mirkarimi@sfgov.org>, <scott.weiner@sfgov.org>, <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>
Cc: <nancenumber1@aol.com>, <sfjberk@mac.com>
Date: 05/22/2011 06:32 AM
Subject: Urging Opposition to BOS Agenda Item #17 - General Plan Amendments - 2009 Housing Element Update (File #110397)

TO: San Francisco Board of Supervisors

I am urging you to oppose BOS agenda item #17 - General Plan Amendments - 2009 Housing Element Update (File #110397) for the following reasons:

1. Substantial changes were made to the new Housing Element AFTER it was circulated for public comment, that could adversely impact our neighborhood.
2. Eliminates density limits from RH-1 and RH-2 neighborhoods to meet the City's goal of equalizing density across the City.
3. Reduces drastically the current open space and back yard space requirements - a major risk to residential loss of view, light and air.
4. Limits your right to have a say in your neighborhood's appearance and character and may put these decisions into the hands of unelected City Planning personnel and/or other outside interests.

Eileen Boken
District 4 resident

BOS-11
E-page



Please oppose the General Plan Amendments in the 2009 Housing Element Update
Pam Hemphill
to:
Eric.L.Mar, Mark.Farrell, David.Chiu, Carmen.Chu, Ross.Mirkarimi, Jane.Kim,
Sean.Elsbernd, Scott.Wiener, David.Campos, Malia.Cohen, John.Avalos,
Board.of.Supervisors
05/24/2011 10:45 AM
Show Details

Supervisor,

Please oppose BOS agenda item #17 - General Plan Amendments -
2009 Housing Element Update (File #110397). Protect our neighborhood character, so much a part of
what makes San Francisco a wonderful place to live.

Thank you!

Pam Hemphill
423 Hill Street
San Francisco, CA 94114
415 824-2346

BOS-11
C page



The Housing Element change
nancenumbr1

to:

Eric.L.Mar, Mark.Farrell, David.Chiu, Carmen.Chu, Ross.Mirkarimi, Jane.Kim,
Sean.Elsbernd, Scott.Wiener, David.Campos, Malia.Cohen, John.Avalos,

Board.of.Supervisors

05/24/2011 11:42 AM

Show Details

Dear Supervisors:

I urge you to oppose BOS agenda item #17 - General Plan Amendments - 2009 Housing
Element Update (File #110397).

Some things the government thinks up are wrong, just plain wrong. This is one of
the worst changes to General Plan ever. This proposal will destroy our
neighborhoods, our communities, our way of life. Please vote NO.

Sincerely,

Nancy Wuerfel
San Francisco

Lacey T. Edwards

Commission on Education

Due to recent events within the poor communities in the city and county of San Francisco, and based on the Human Rights Commission investigation of the African American community in general warrant the need for a Commission on Education. Based on the finding of the Unfinished Agenda, The Parity Report by the Human Rights commission, it found that the average grade was a C- for the African Americans here in the city and county of San Francisco, this was over 15 years ago, it is no wonder we have children killing children.

The Commission on Education must find ways and means in creating a curriculum that will meet the very unique needs of twenty first century children. For better or worse every able body citizen of sound mind has a responsibility not only to ourselves, but to the children of this great nation to pass the seeds of the very roots of this country – higher learning! In order to reach into the essence of destiny is to feed posterity, the fruits of the richness of our history of growth and development that made this country great; we must cultivate the seed of education with all deliberate speed, let no ideological, political, social, economic or otherwise hinder our life change.

Education is the fodder of the entire world in so our Commission on Education must be structured on principle. The number one principle being in order to create a better world we have to ensure that all people receive the same high level of education that we all want and need for our own children.

In creating ways and means the Commission on Education must be structured in a fundamental way in which it will have the longitude, and latitude to define a curriculum that will hold the power to reach, teach and literally allow an enlightenment period. For our children to awaken from this period of darkness that has brought society to the point that we invest more in prison than school.

Also the Commission on Education must find ways and means to instill that precious is life in the chaos of this world... We have come much, much too far in our growth and development as human beings for our children to have very little or no value at all for human life. In every city state in this country African American youth are killing one another at a pace never before seen, and is why it is vital that the Commission on Education have a national survey of the murder rate of African Americans that are killing one another.

To raise consciousness to the inherent need for solidarity and strength reaching the descendant of slaves to evoke the courage, tenacity and determination to overcome the greatest adversity African American people have faced since we came to the shores of North America!

K-12 is the most important years in the development of a child's life. This again is why it is vital for the Commission on Education to formulate available, coherent, and economically sustainable, program that will give our children the ingenuity and creativity to be a bright shining light productively in this world. We cannot afford to produce another generation of non-productive human being, the American economy is very reflective of the level of education, and the majority of the American people receive in today's society. In so our Commission on Education must find ways and means in setting forth an outline for the correct approach to the child rearing, fundamentally we have to set a standard level a child must have at a set point in the first five years of the child's life. In other words all children theoretically should possess-the same high level of knowledge based on the outline for the correct approach in child rearing in the first five years as a foundation for the education process to be the most effective

Also the Commission on Education must find ways and means in putting stronger safeguards on digital video games with excessive violence which could give children the wrong idea about the nature of violence in the real world. Unfortunately violence has become the very fabric of American Society and for the most part we have knowingly accepted this as our way of life. The sale of these digital violent video games is evidence there are very real issues with these video games that must be addressed for the Commission on Education to be the most efficient and effective. Words hold very little or no sway whatsoever over human experience, this is the example of the influence that these video games have over our children.

Another example where children used a video game to make a real life street gang in the Los Angeles area they have turned a video game into a real life experience so the killing and dying will just continue because no one is taking in consideration the way these violent digital video games are playing in our children's lives. We must find ways and means in this crisis situation before it gets completely out of control!!!!

Also the Commission on Education must find ways and means in getting control of the class room and take the fear out, so that children can learn, and the teacher can teach. This may be the most difficult task the Commission on Education will face, yet we must find ways and means in finding peace and harmony in the class room. And is another reason why the Commission on Education is absolutely necessary in resurrecting the institution of Education here in the city and county of San Francisco. In so we can be shining example of what our educational institution should be structured to look like nationally.

This is a very small step in our amazingly large issue that involves everyone; yes each and every one of us has a stake in this issue because we all need education!!! Yet it is a fact not everyone understands the power and force the knowledge that education will afford you. This is where the misunderstanding in the world exist, truth be told only by education can our creative force be

unlocked. There is no better time than the here and now to release the creative force then now with the state of the world in chaos.

Also the Commission on Education must find ways and means to define policy with the power and authority to give teachers the means to execute their duty with the passion and professionalism that inspired them to their title. The Classroom is just as sacred as the church in the sense of purpose for finding the correct path in each individual's life and is why there is no words to convey the vital need of this principle. These principles can only bring the institution of education back into the harmony in which it was born of in which man can find the completion of self... or at least attain to it!

The Commission on Education must be the cornerstone of our time in order to give the American people the greatest opportunities for productive growth in a changing world. Time is now to take the correct approach in changing the way the American people see the world so we can continue our great legacy of beneficence and goodwill throughout the world as the living example of democracy!

At this point I would like to give you an account of one of the main reason I am writing this document one of my close associates got killed. One of the two I'm now speaking of was very close and the other has special meaning because of the nature in which I was made aware of the situation. A woman that has given her life in service of her sworn duty lost her only son to this vicious cycle of children killing children! With this having been said I would like to dedicate the Commission on Education to the loving memory of her son, so that his life and the many lives of all victims of the children killing children will not be forgotten in the chaos of this world!

Respectfully Submitted,

Martin W. Reed
Martin William Reed

Performance bonds

Who succeeds gets paid

NEW YORK

Barack Obama imports a big idea from Britain


BURIED in the detail of Barack Obama's proposed 2012 budget is a rule change that could have a big impact on how America tackles its thorniest social problems. The new rule would allow various government agencies to issue "pay for success bonds". These would be bought by private investors and the money used to finance projects run by charities or businesses. But the investors would only be repaid, or make a profit, if the projects achieve certain results agreed in advance, such as reducing youth crime or getting students from poor areas into higher education.

Mr Obama proposes that up to \$100m be freed up to run pilot schemes to test the idea. The rule changes are needed so that money can be committed over longer periods than is usual in public contracts, and repayment be made contingent on performance. They would also allow for much less detailed terms on the methods to be used, rather than on the outcomes, than is typical. Public money can be set aside for evaluation of whether the targets have been met.

The Pay for Success Bond is a catchier name for its British inspiration, the Social Impact Bond, the first of which was launched last year by David Cameron's coalition government. (Social Finance, a sort of investment bank for the social sector, which designed the Social Impact Bond in Britain, this week launched a sister organisation in America, to find suitable candidates for Pay for Success Bonds.) These raised money from private investors to fund the expansion of

schemes run by charities to reduce the reoffending rate among certain categories of criminal after their release from jail. If the recidivism rate falls far enough, investors can earn up to a 13.5% annual rate of return. If there is no improvement, investors could lose all their money.

The search is now on to find suitable pilot projects. The mayors of New York City and Baltimore are said to be keen to apply. Another possible candidate is the National Guard Youth Challenge, overseen by the Defence Department, which applies military discipline to provide skills training to at-risk youth. All this is a lot more inspiring than arguing over which bits of public spending to cut.



Fancy a flutter?

BOS-11
✓ e-page



Parkmerced
Daniel W. Phillips, President, The Board of Directors, The Parkmerced Residents' Organization

to:
Eric.L.Mar, Mark.Farrell, David.Chiu, Carmen.Chu, Ross.Mirkarimi, Jane.Kim,
Sean.Elsbernd, Scott.Wiener, David.Campos, Malia.Cohen, John.Avalos,
Board.of.Supervisors
05/24/2011 07:01 AM
Show Details

Supervisor,
I urge you to support BOS agenda item #3 - Affirming Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report - Parkmerced Project (File #110207).

I also urge you to oppose BOS agenda items #4 & 5 - Reversing Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report - Parkmerced Project (File #110208 & #110209).

Further, I urge you to support items #25 - 28, ordinances concerning the developer agreement, amending the General Plan, and Planning Code with regard to Parkmerced development.

Daniel W. Phillips, CEO
President Emeritus, The Board of Directors,
The Parkmerced Residents' Organization, LLC
Building Community with Parkmerced
www.parkmercedresidents.org.


21

701-5531), one of your workers at the Mayor's Office. Mr Kayhan promised me he will get involved in this case because he knows I am very serious about Qun's act of wrongdoing. Qun overtly steals time and money from our government, which is an act against the Constitution of the United States. And, Ms. Barbara Garcia, the Director of Health at the Department of Public Health (phone number 415-554-2526) has also agreed to help out in this case.

Our eyewitnesses in the building request that you, honorable Mayor, force Qun to return the money that she stole, because when I complained against her to her boss at the In-Home Supportive Service, the boss did not take it seriously and made cover-ups for her. I made a complaint on August 26, 2010, and March 25, 2011, but have received no response because of their wrongful cover-up.

Thank you in advance for your fair action regarding this matter.

Sincerely,



Abdalla Megahed

Community Activist of SF

CC: California Governor Jerry Brown, Sacramento
District Attorney George Gascon, 850 Bryant
Barbara Garcia, Director, Department of Public Health, Grove St.
Senior Action Network
SF Supervisors
President of the United States, Barack Obama, Washington D.C.
Chief of Police, Greg Suhr

May 24, 2011

San Francisco Mayor Edwin M. Lee

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

San Francisco, CA 94102

RECEIVED
MAYOR'S OFFICE

11 MAY 24 PM 4:31

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2011 MAY 24 PM 4:35

BY

AK


Dear Mr. Mayor,

As an American Egyptian Native and a community activist in San Francisco for the last 28 years I am very proud for all that I have accomplished for my City and the Mayor's office over these years. Yesterday was a bad day for me, because I have a lot of distress and I slept under your window outside the building, I was surprised that three sheriffs woke me up after they saw me on the security camera. To be honest, I don't want to die on the street, and I don't like to give a chance for stress to kill me.

My problem is coming from one of our Chinese providers who work in our building address at 990 Polk St. in San Francisco. This person I have watched for the last 23 weeks, because she loves sex more then she loves to service us as senior disabled people. Yes Mr. Mayor, she is the same one I spoke with you about on March 25th, in your office in front of your bodyguard. I know that she is having illicit sex within our building because we have three security cameras in each floor which can prove that. Moreover, she neglects the other seniors in apartment # 415 and only provides him one hour of her time, which should be three hours. She runs from his apartment, and goes to apartment # 408 to the other client named Hector Gonzales, which we know very well that she has a romantic affair with for more than five months. She takes him outside the building every Saturday at 10am until 1145am and she spends money on him for breakfast or lunch, the last time Starbucks Coffee and a donut, fresh meat, and gives him bucket money for his Golden Tongue. They have become addicted to these activities as Hector Gonzales has told me and he uses this to control people as well as her. Marco Tulcanaza (415) 440-6109, the building manager, who has this all on film says he has even found out that she has committed fraud by working less hour then she reports. I am especially distraught about this because she gets 10-12 hours a day to not do her job, and there is another Chinese woman with children at home who does a great job, but is only allowed to work four hours a week to service apartment # 419. I believe and I hope, that our investigator with the Human Services Agency Mr. David Turk, will continue to follow up on this and document via his camera with zoom and video to show you what is going on when they go outside as a married couple. Ramona Barrera (415) 503-4906, an investigator also with the Human Services Agency has promised me that she will do all that she can to investigate this matter. I look forward to the conclusion of this investigation because I know that they will find that she is not doing her job and is thusly harming the seniors she is there to service. She gets away with this by buying towels and paper for a dollar or two from her pocket as a bribe for the two or three hours that she is absent to go spend time with her lover and this has made me sick. Her supervisor Nina Tan and the Client Service Manager Joshua Martin and Erin Schwartz with IHSS In-Home Supportive Services Consortium have hidden my complaint which I gave them verbally on March 25th, for that reason I am bringing this to your attention

today. I hope that you will be able to help with this issue, and find out why IHSS In-Home Supportive Services Consortium organization has done nothing about this even though I complained to them August 20th 2010 and March 25th 2011. They don't need to continue to work with my City because they have known this for a long time. We are seniors who need help and service not sex with our service providers. I wish to give credit to Ms. Ramona and Mr. Turk for their own investigation and sooner or later you will find out that my complaint is 100% truth. The building manager and his staff have known about this a long time, but there has still been no action. However, Ms. Ramona and Mr. Turk deserve your thanks and credit for helping me investigate this. I intend to, as suggest by your Director of Neighborhood Services Joaquin Torres, to go to the Fillmore Police Station to report the illicit activity which includes prostitution. I appreciate your attention to this matter Mr. Mayor because as a tax paying senior in San Francisco for 28 years and a community activist, I expect much more from my service providers as does my constituency. Due to the fact that they have shown no effort to resolve this matter and cover up my complaints I am looking to you to help my City and stop this organization from stealing money from tax payers and insure that they are doing their job correctly. I hope Mr. Turk and Ms. Romona will provide information that the case needs to be proven and I look forward to this matter being resolved quickly. Thank you for your time and attention to this matter Mr. Mayor, I look forward to hearing back from you.

Sincerely,



Abdalla Megahed

Community Activist for San Francisco

990 Polk Street, San Francisco CA 94109

(415) 374-4141

CC: California Governor Jerry Brown, Sacramento

District Attorney George Gascon, 840 Bryant St.

Barbara Garcia, Director, Department of Public Health, Grove St.

Senior Action Network

San Francisco District Supervisors

The President of the United States Barak Obama



Block AT&T
jlw77 to: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

05/20/2011 11:18 AM

View: (Mail Threads)

May 20, 2011
Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Angela Calvillo,

On May 24th, the Board will be voting on whether or not to allow AT&T to continue working to upgrade its network. I think these new upgrades are burdensome and detrimental to our beautiful neighborhoods, and I think the Board should really consider requiring to bury this new technology in underground vaults instead of leaving them as visual nuisances on the street-scape.

Please vote in favor of preserving the beauty of our neighborhoods, and against the cheapness of AT&T. Thank you!

Sincerely,

Justin Mauslein
1420 Clayton St
San Francisco, CA 94114-2258

23



**San Francisco Group, Sierra Club,
85 Second Street, 2nd Floor, Box SFG, San Francisco CA 94105-3441**

May 20, 2011

Hon. David Chiu, President
& Members
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall
#1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: File No. 110347- AT&T utility boxes

Dear President Chiu:

The Sierra Club requests that the Board of Supervisors grant San Francisco Beautiful's appeal regarding CEQA exemption granted to American Telephone & Telegraph (AT&T) for their proposed placement of 726 utility boxes on the City's sidewalks and require the production of an Environmental Impact Report.

- Utility boxes may block sightlines for both pedestrians and motorists if located near intersections – this is a major safety issue.
- Utility boxes will crowd already narrow sidewalks, many of which do not meet standards for sidewalk width. Pedestrians may be forced to make dangerous detours to avoid the boxes..
- Utility boxes present a surface for tagging and graffiti.
- In neighborhoods where the streetscape improvements include widening sidewalks, the moving of utility boxes will increase the costs of such projects.

We ask that the Board protect its constituents and the City's neighborhoods and require an EIR.

Sincerely,

Becky Evans
Chair
San Francisco Group

23



To: Andrea Ausberry/BOS/SFGOV,

Cc:

Bcc:

Subject: File 110347: Appeal of CEQA exemption for AT&T utility boxes

From: BeckyE <rebecae@earthlink.net>

To: David Chiu <David.Chiu@sfgov.org>, John Avalos <John.Avalos@sfgov.org>, Eric Mar <Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org>, Mark Farrell <mark.farrell@sfgov.org>, Malia Cohen <malia.cohen@sfgov.org>, Jane Kim <Jane.Kim@sfgov.org>, David Campos <David.Campos@sfgov.org>, Scott Wiener <Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org>, Carmen Chu <Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org>, Ross Mirkarimi <Ross.Mirkarimi@SFGOV.org>, Sean Elsbernd <Sean.Elsbernd@SFGOV.ORG>

Cc: SF Board of Supervisors <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Date: 05/20/2011 01:59 PM

Subject: Appeal of CEQA exemption for AT&T utility boxes

Dear Supervisors: Attached is the Sierra Club letter in support of San Francisco Beautiful's appeal of the Planning Commission decision to exempt the placement of 726 utility boxes on San Francisco sidewalks from environmental review under CEQA.

A "hard" copy will be mailed to Board President David Chiu.

Thank you,

Becky Evans
Chair



San Francisco Group, Sierra Club ATT&Ttr.doc

BOS-11
✓ page



Yes on BOS Agenda Items #7&8 Today
Kathy Devincenzi

to:
Eric.L.Mar, Mark.Farrell, Board.of.Supervisors, Carmen.Chu, Ross.Mirkarimi, Jane.Kim,
Sean.Elsbernd, Scott.Wiener, David.Campos, Malia.Cohen, John.Avalos
05/24/2011 01:52 PM
Show Details

Dear Supervisors,

I urge you to support BOS agenda items #7 & 8 - Reversing Exemption
Determination - AT&T Network "Lightspeed" Upgrade & Preparation of
Findings to Reverse Exemption Determination (File #110346 & #110347).
I also urge you to oppose BOS agenda item #6 - Affirming the
Exemption Determination - AT&T Network "Lightspeed" Upgrade (File
#110345).

File { 110345
110346
110347

Thank you for your consideration.

Kathryn Devincenzi
22 Iris Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94118

505-11
@-page



I oppose AT&T Uverse boxes
Ajay to: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

05/24/2011 02:52 PM

Dear Board of Supervisors,
I am writing to place on the record my STRONG OPPOSITION to AT&T's boxes, for various reasons.

AT&T's Uverse is not a solution to the problem of broadband access. AT&T has a terrible track record of excluding other service providers from their network; for example, they were supposed to offer other DSL providers access to their DSL wire; but today, 15 years later, you have only 1 or 2 providers who have managed to work with AT&T. AT&T has a history of over-charging their customers.

In short: AT&T does NOT have the interest of the residents of San Francisco at heart. They will make all sorts of promises, but will renege on all of them over time.

San Francisco deserves BETTER than AT&T!

Ajay Shekhawat
80 Sanchez St
San Francisco, CA 94114



To: Andrea Ausberry/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:

Subject: File 110345, 110346, 110347: Urging Support for BOS Agenda Items #7 & 8 - Reversing Exemption Determination - AT&T Network "Lightspeed" Upgrade & Preparation of Findings to Reverse Exemption Determination (File #110346 & #110347)

From: AEBOKEN Boken <aeboken@msn.com>
To: <david.campos@sfgov.org>, <david.chiu@sfgov.org>, <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>, <eric.l.mar@sfgov.org>, <jane.kim@sfgov.org>, <john.avalos@sfgov.org>, <malia.cohen@sfgov.org>, <mark.farrell@sfgov.org>, <rick.caldeira@sfgov.org>, <ross.mirkarimi@sfgov.org>, <scott.weiner@sfgov.org>, <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>
Cc: <nancenumber1@aol.com>
Date: 05/22/2011 05:12 AM
Subject: Urging Support for BOS Agenda Items #7 & 8 - Reversing Exemption Determination - AT&T Network "Lightspeed" Upgrade & Preparation of Findings to Reverse Exemption Determination (File #110346 & #110347)

TO: San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am urging you to **support** for BOS agenda items #7 & 8 - Reversing Exemption Determination - AT&T Network "Lightspeed" Upgrade & Preparation of Findings to Reverse Exemption Determination (File #110346 & #110347).

I am also urging you to **oppose** BOS agenda item #6 - Affirming the Exemption Determination - AT&T Network "Lightspeed" Upgrade (File #110345):

Eileen Boken
District 4 resident

✓ C-page
BDS-11



Oppose AT&T sidewalk utility boxes as presently proposed
Pam Hemphill

to:

Eric.L.Mar, Mark.Farrell, David.Chiu, Carmen.Chu, Ross.Mirkarimi, Jane.Kim,
Sean.Elsbernd, Scott.Wiener, David.Campos, Malia.Cohen, John.Avalos,

Board.of.Supervisors

05/24/2011 10:32 AM

Show Details

Files / 110345
110346
110347

Supervisor,

At the meeting today, please support Board of Supervisors agenda items #7 & 8 - Reversing Exemption Determination - AT&T Network "Lightspeed" Upgrade & Preparation of Findings to Reverse Exemption Determination (File #110346 & #110347).

I also urge you to oppose Board of Supervisors agenda item #6 - Affirming the Exemption Determination - AT&T Network "Lightspeed" Upgrade (File #110345).

Thank you for your attention to this issue.

Pam Hemphill

BOS-11
✓ c-page



AT&T agenda items

Eric.L.Mar, Mark.Farrell, David.Chiu,
Audrey Cole to: Carmen.Chu, Ross.Mirkarimi, Jane.Kim,
Sean.Elsbernd, Scott.Wiener, David.Campos,

05/24/2011 10:13 AM

Supervisors,

We all want fast internet, but we also want to make that happen with as little degradation of our lovely city as possible. AT&T can find ways to do both.

I urge you to support BOS agenda items #7 & 8 - Reversing Exemption Determination - AT&T Network "Lightspeed" Upgrade & Preparation of Findings to Reverse Exemption Determination (File #110346 & #110347).

I also urge you to oppose BOS agenda item #6 - Affirming the Exemption Determination - AT&T Network "Lightspeed" Upgrade (File #110345).

Thank you,

Audrey

--

Audrey D. Cole
Computer Consulting - Databases in Access, Fox and FileMaker
415-648-1926 voice - 415-648-9455 fax - Audrey@AudreyCole.com

File-110345
File-110346
File-110347

** 1985 - 2011 **
** Celebrating 26 years of helping people manage their information! **

BOS-11
✓ @ page



AT&T Network "update"

Inge Horton

to:

Eric.L.Mar, Mark.Farrell, David.Chiu, Carmen.Chu, Ross.Mirkarimi, Jane.Kim,
Sean.Elsbernd, Scott.Wiener, David.Campos, Malia.Cohen, John.Avalos,

Board.of.Supervisors

05/24/2011 08:22 AM

Show Details

Dear Supervisors,

I urge you to **support** BOS agenda items #7 & 8 - Reversing Exemption Determination - AT&T Network "Lightspeed" Upgrade & Preparation of Findings to Reverse Exemption Determination (File #110346 & #110347). These boxes are a blight to our neighborhoods and additional boxes should not be allowed.

I also urge you to **oppose** BOS agenda item #6 - Affirming the Exemption Determination - AT&T Network "Lightspeed" Upgrade (File #110345). There are many issues connected with these ugly boxes cluttering the streets, obstructing pedestrian and wheelchair movement, and thus an environmental evaluation is advisable.

Sincerely,

Inge Horton

2363 44th Avenue

San Francisco, CA 94116

BOS-11
✓ e-page



Please support the Appeal of the Categorical Exemption for AT&T

Eric.L.Mar, Mark.Farrell, David.Chiu,

Larry Rosenfeld to: Carmen.Chu, Ross.Mirkarimi, Jane.Kim,

05/24/2011 07:30 AM

Sean.Elsbernd, Scott.Wiener, David.Campos,

Supervisor,

I urge you to support BOS agenda items #7 & 8 - Reversing Exemption Determination - AT&T Network "Lightspeed" Upgrade & Preparation of Findings to Reverse Exemption Determination (File #110346 & #110347).

I also urge you to oppose BOS agenda item #6 - Affirming the Exemption Determination - AT&T Network "Lightspeed" Upgrade (File #110345).

Lawrence Rosenfeld
1236 6th Ave. #3
San Francisco, CA 94122-2544

BOS-11
✓c-page



No public space for private gain!

pearl213

to:

Eric.L.Mar, Mark.Farrell, David.Chiu, Carmen.Chu, Ross.Mirkarimi, Jane.Kim,

Sean.Elsbernd, Scott.Wiener, David.Campos, Malia.Cohen, John.Avalos,

Board.of.Supervisors

05/24/2011 11:44 AM

Show Details

Supervisor,

I urge you to support BOS agenda items #7 & 8 - Reversing Exemption Determination - AT&T Network "Lightspeed" Upgrade & Preparation of Findings to Reverse Exemption Determination (File #110346 & #110347).

I also urge you to oppose BOS agenda item #6 - Affirming the Exemption Determination - AT&T Network "Lightspeed" Upgrade (File #110345).

110345
110346
File < 110347

Thank you for keeping blight out of our beautiful city.

Meg Mitchell Rosenfeld

1236 6th Ave. #3

San Francisco, CA 94122-2544

BOS-11

v C-page



AT&T Big Sidewalk Boxes

nancenumber1

to:

Eric.L.Mar, Mark.Farrell, David.Chiu, Carmen.Chu, Ross.Mirkarimi, Jane.Kim,

Sean.Elsbernd, Scott.Wiener, David.Campos, Malia.Cohen, John.Avalos,

Board.of.Supervisors

05/24/2011 11:35 AM

Show Details

Files { 110345
110346
110347

Dear Supervisors:

I urge you to support BOS agenda items #7 & 8 - Reversing Exemption Determination - AT&T Network "Lightspeed" Upgrade & Preparation of Findings to Reverse Exemption Determination (File #110346 & #110347).

I also urge you to oppose BOS agenda item #6 - Affirming the Exemption Determination - AT&T Network "Lightspeed" Upgrade (File #110345).

This is blight, pure and simple. Please stand up for preserving our public spaces for businesses and neighborhoods!

Sincerely,

Nancy Wuerfel
San Francisco

Bos - (1)
vc page



Parkmerced Development; AT&T Upgrade; Housing Element Amendments

Jean Barish

to:

mark.farrell, david.chiu, carmen.chu, Ross Mirkarimi, jane.kim, Sean Elsbernd,
scott.wiener, David Campos, malia.cohen, John Avalos, board.of.supervisors

05/24/2011 04:33 AM

Show Details

Dear Supervisors:

There are several important issues on today's Board of Supervisors agenda. I urge you to oppose the Parkmerced Development, the AT&T Network Upgrade, and proposed amendments to the Housing Element by voting as follows:

1) Parkmerced Development

Support Agenda items #4 & 5 - Reversing Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report - Parkmerced Project (File #110208 & #110209).

Oppose Agenda item #3 - Affirming Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report - Parkmerced Project (File #110207).

Oppose Items #25 - 28 - Ordinances concerning the developer agreement, amending the General Plan, and Planning Code with regard to Parkmerced development.

2) AT&T Network Upgrade:

Support Agenda items #7 & 8 - Reversing Exemption Determination - AT&T Network "Lightspeed" Upgrade & Preparation of Findings to Reverse Exemption Determination (File #110346 & #110347).

Oppose Agenda item #6 - Affirming the Exemption Determination - AT&T Network "Lightspeed" Upgrade (File #110345).

General Plan Amendments

Oppose Agenda item #17 - General Plan Amendments - 2009 Housing Element Update (File #110397).

Thank you very much for your consideration,

Jean

Jean B Barish
jeanbbarish@hotmail.com

24



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Chaffee -- Ethics Commission Complaint No. 01-100115 -- Not About Jewell Gomez

From: "James Chaffee" <chaffeej@pacbell.net>
To: "James Chaffee-Main" <chaffeej@pacbell.net>
Date: 05/20/2011 03:20 PM
Subject: Chaffee -- Ethics Commission Complaint No. 01-100115 -- Not About Jewell Gomez

Dear Friends,

I delivered the attached letter to the Board of Supervisors on Tuesday of this week.

We had the expectation that the hearing on this matter would come before the Ethics Commission in June. Now we are told that it will be July at the earliest. In fact, one wonders if it will come up at all if the Ethics Commission is not made aware that it is an issue of some concern.

I hope you will be able to send a communication to the Ethics Commission endorsing enforcement of this complaint.

James Chaffee

Member, Board of Supervisors
City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: **"It's Not About Jewelle Gomez"**
**"Conduct Falls below the Standard of Decency, Good Faith and Right
Action Impliedly Required of All Public Officials."**
Ethics Complaint No. 01-100115

Dear Supervisor:

When we consider the privatization of the San Francisco Public Library and the diversion of public resources into private hand not just in the library but in every part of our community, suppression of access and accountability is of the essence. What must be understood is that the corporate rape of our public library and the record of sunshine violations are two sides of the same coin.

On June 4, 2009, a member of the public named Sue Cauthen was denied the right to make public comment at a Library Commission meeting, on the agenda item, "General Public Comment." A complaint was brought against the president of the Library Commission, Jewelle Gomez. Ms. Gomez refused to offer any justification of this action before the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. The Secretary of the Library Commission issued a statement that the president of the Library Commission "stood by her actions."

The Sunshine Ordinance Task Force heard the issue and found that there had not only been a violation of the Sunshine Ordinance but voted to refer the violation to the Ethics Commission for enforcement based on a determination that actions by Jewell Gomez constituted a "willful failure" to comply with the Sunshine Ordinance. The Task Force also found failure to respect the order of determination of the Task Force, and failure to abide by requirements for representatives of public bodies to attend Task Force hearings. The referral cites a complete failure of the Library Commission to show responsibility for its actions. The Sunshine Ordinance at section

25

67.34 states that "willful failure . . . shall be deemed official misconduct."

A report issued by the staff of the Ethics Commission found that the president of the Library Commission's conduct "*falls below the standard of decency, good faith and right action impliedly required of all public officials.*" The Ethics Commission's report proposes to send this finding to the Mayor as the commissioner's appointing authority.

In the two years since this finding of a violation the Library Commission has twice confirmed its endorsement of the violation by ratifying the presidency of Jewelle Gomez on two separate occasions.

Of course, the abuse has been ratified and endorsed because it is a necessary reflection of the privatization and anti-democratic actions that are necessary to divert public resources into private hands, and to sell influence to participate in that diversion. The individuals involved are only too happy to present themselves as aristocrats at the expense of accountability and the virtues of an open society.

It is not about Jewelle Gomez. It is about the abuse and lawlessness that is needed to make her president of the Library Commission. When a private organization is given a license to rip off the community of millions of dollars without accountability and that organization gets to sponsor library commissioners, that is the level of abuse that is necessary to keep the whole system afloat.

An attack on Ms. Cauthen's right to speak is emblematic of the right to speak for all of us. An attack on one, is an attack on all.

Very truly yours,

James Chaffee



SUPES 00 05-17-11-NotAboutJewelleGomez-toPrint.pdf

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

**PLEASE READ AT THE MAY 24,
9 AM BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING.**

TO: Board of Supervisors
FROM: Residents of Block #9 - Parkmerced
3 Gonzalez Dr., 5 Gonzalez Dr., 5A Gonzalez Dr., 7 Gonzalez Dr.
7A Gonzalez., 9 Gonzalez Dr.
DATE: May 23, 2011
RE: We are AGAINST the proposed Parkmerced Project
File No. 110300. Development Agreement

We the residents of Block #9 living in Parkmerced for more than twenty (20) years each resident have written several letters opposing the planned development of ParkMerced.

WE DO NOT WANT OUR HOMES TORN DOWN AND TO LIVE IN A HIGH RISE. In the current almost depression like era in the United States; and especially in California; it is inhumane to think that the Board of Supervisors would even consider tearing down of "perfectly good homes," and building new ones.

Parkmerced cannot even manage and take care of its current property. Originally, they told us that we would only have to move one time; into a new high rise. Now, they are saying, we would have to move twice; 1) into one of the towers and then 2) into a new tower when it is built. The towers are worst than living in a prison with the 24/7 partying of the college students that Parkmerced now having living on the premises. They said our rent will remain the same. Who will believe Parkmerced.

Instead of tearing down our "homes." Why not come in and paint with high quality paint, so that it will last more than 6-months. Keep the lawns manicured; keep the graffiti away; pick up the trash more often; get rid of the mold; keep ALL buildings painted and the list goes on and on.


**PLEASE VOTE NO ON THE PROPOSED
TEARING DOWN OF OUR HOMES. PLEASE
VOTE NO ON THE PROPOSED
PARKMERCED AGREEMENT; FILE NO.
110300 - Development Agreement.**

Thank you,
Liz R. Pruiett and Resident of Block #9
7A Gonzalez Dr., SF 94132

26

City and County of San Francisco

OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF



Michael Hennessey
SHERIFF

(415) 554-7225

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAY 24 AM 9:43
JY
AK

Date: 5/20/11
To: Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
From: Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

Subject: Request for Waiver of applicable San Francisco Administrative Code Requirements for Garbage Collection Services for the San Francisco County Jails in San Bruno, CA to Be Provided by Recology Peninsula Services, Vendor #16179 in the amount of \$120,000 for the Term July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012.

The San Francisco Sheriff's Department (SFSD) requests your approval of the above referenced sole source request for the reasons set forth in this memo.

The San Bruno, CA Municipal Code Section 10.20.050 provides that San Bruno, CA City Council "may provide for the issuance of an exclusive permanent contract for the collection of garbage and rubbish with the city in the manner and upon the terms set forth in this chapter." Please refer to the language attached to this memo.

San Bruno Garbage Company is the company contracted by the City of San Bruno for garbage collection under the provisions of San Bruno's municipal Code.

Please call Maureen Gannon (CFO) at 415-554-4316 with any questions you may have regarding this request.




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: Sheriff
 Department Address: 1 Dr Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Rm#456, San Francisco, CA
 Contact Person: Maureen Gannon, CFO
 Phone Number: 554-4316 Fax Number: 554-7050

➤ **Section 2. Contractor Information**

Contractor Name: Recology Peninsula Services Contact Person: _____
 Contractor Address: 101 Tanforan Avenue, San Bruno, CA 94066
 Vendor Number (if known): 16179 Contact Phone No.: _____

➤ **Section 3. Transaction Information**

Date Waiver Request Submitted: 5/20/10 Type of Contract: _____
 Contract Start Date: 7/1/11 End Date: 6/30/12 Dollar Amount of Contract:
 \$120,000

➤ **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: 5/20/11
- 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: _____

City and County of San Francisco

OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF



Michael Hennessey
SHERIFF

(415) 554-7225

May 20, 2011

To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

From: Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

Re: Waiver Request – Rapid Notify, Inc.

Pursuant to the San Francisco Administrative code Chapters 12B & 14B attached is a copy the Waiver Request Form (HRC Form 201) sent to the Human Right Commission on 5/6/11.

The Sheriff's Department is requesting a waiver from Administrative Code Chapters 12B and 12C requirement for Rapid Notify, Inc.

This is a one year subscription fee which allows access to Rapid Notify a proprietary emergency telecommunication system for San Mateo County. The System is fully automated and pre-programmed with all residential and business telephone numbers in that county. This will allow the Sheriff to initiate automated emergency telephone calls, to residents and business of San Mateo County, with emergency information (prisoner escapes, etc.) related to the San Francisco County Jails, located in San Bruno.

If you have any questions about this request, please contact me at (415) 554-4316. Thanks you for your consideration of this matter.

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAY 24 AM 9:43
BY AK

28



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: Maureen Gannon
 Name of Department: Sheriff
 Department Address: 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Rm#456, San Francisco, CA
 Contact Person: Maureen Gannon, CFO
 Phone Number: 554-4316 Fax Number: 554-7050

► Section 2. Contractor Information

Contractor Name: Rapid Notify, Inc. Contact Person: _____
 Contractor Address: 26041 Cape Dr., Suite 220, Laguna Niguel, CA 92677
 Vendor Number (if known): 76003 Contact Phone No.: _____

► Section 3. Transaction Information

Date Waiver Request Submitted: 05/20/11 Type of Contract: _____
 Contract Start Date: 7/1/11 End Date: 6/30/12 Dollar Amount of Contract: \$12075

► 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: 05/20/11
- 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: _____

Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector
City and County of San Francisco



BOS-11, cpage

José Cisneros, Treasurer

Business Tax Section, Audit Unit
George Putris, Tax Administrator

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAY 25 AM 10:38
BY [signature]

May 25, 2011

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

Re: Annual Report
2010 Payroll Expense Tax Credit – Enterprise Zone

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

The Tax Administrator, pursuant to the provisions of the San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations Code, herewith submits the annual report of businesses that filed for tax credits for the 2010 calendar year. This year the report covers the Enterprise Zone Tax Credit only.

Schedule A of the report summarizes for the 2010 calendar year the number of firms filing for the tax credit, the total number of San Francisco employees, the number of eligible employees, and the amount of tax credit claimed. Sixty-one (61) firms successfully claimed the Enterprise Zone Tax Credit in the amount of \$217,189. The San Francisco firms reported 249 employees that qualify for this tax credit.

Schedule B of the report compares the Enterprise Zone Tax Credits for tax years 2008 through 2010.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact me at (415) 554-4874.

Very truly yours,

George W. Putris
Tax Administrator

cc: José Cisneros
San Francisco Public Library

Attachments

**TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT
PAYROLL EXPENSE - ENTERPRISE ZONE TAX CREDIT
CALENDAR YEAR 2010**

Schedule A

Year	Number of Firms	Total SF Employees	Number of Eligible Employees	Total Enterprise Zone Tax Credit
2010	61	6,742	249	\$ 217,189

**TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT
PAYROLL EXPENSE - ENTERPRISE ZONE TAX CREDIT
CALENDAR YEARS 2008 THROUGH 2010**

Schedule B

Year	Number of Firms	Total SF Employees	Number of Eligible Employees	Total Enterprise Zone Tax Credit
2008*	16	4,529	175	\$ 30,035
2009*	33	2,722	92	\$ 57,081
2010	61	6,742	249	\$ 217,189
Increase (from 2009 to 2010)	28	4,020	157	\$ 160,108

* - amended

Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector
City and County of San Francisco

Business Tax Section, Audit Unit
George Putris, Tax Administrator



BOS-11 cpage

José Cisneros, Treasurer

May 25, 2011

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAY 25 AM 10:38
W

Re: Annual Report
2010 Payroll Expense Tax Exclusion - Clean Technology Business

Dear Ms. Calvillo:


The Tax Administrator, pursuant to the provisions of the San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations Code, herewith submits the annual report of businesses that were processed for the Clean Technology Business Exclusion for the calendar year 2010.

Schedule A of the report summarizes for the 2010 calendar year the number of firms processed for the exclusion, their total San Francisco employees, the number of eligible employees, and the amount of Biotechnology Exclusion claimed for calendar year 2010. Thirty-one (31) firms claimed the Clean Technology Business Exclusion in the amount of \$50,173,008. These firms reported 402 employees that qualified for the exclusion.

Schedule B of the report summarizes the Biotechnology Exclusion for calendar years 2008 through 2010 with amounts updated. Compared to the preceding calendar year 2009, results indicate an increase of 114 jobs in the clean technology business sector for the calendar year 2010 in San Francisco.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact me at (415) 554-4874.

Very truly yours,


George W. Putris
Tax Administrator

cc: José Cisneros
San Francisco Public Library

Attachment

30

**TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT
PAYROLL EXPENSE TAX CLEAN TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS EXCLUSION
CALENDAR YEAR 2010**

Schedule A

Year	Number of Firms	Total SF Employees	Number of Eligible Employees	Biotechnology Exclusion	Payroll Expense Tax Foregone
2010	31	892	402	\$ 50,173,008	\$ 756,851

**TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT
PAYROLL EXPENSE TAX CLEAN TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS EXCLUSION
CALENDAR YEARS 2008 THROUGH 2010**

Schedule B

Year	Number of Firms	Total SF Employees	Number of Eligible Employees	Biotechnology Exclusion	Payroll Expense Tax Foregone
2008*	6	167	167	\$ 15,127,037	\$ 232,234
2009*	15	330	288	\$ 25,396,189	\$ 385,283
2010	31	892	402	\$ 50,173,008	\$ 756,851
Increase (from 2009 to 2010)	16	562	114	\$ 24,776,819	\$ 371,568

* - amended

Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector
City and County of San Francisco

Business Tax Section, Audit Unit
George Putris, Tax Administrator



BOS-11
cpage
José Cisneros, Treasurer

May 25, 2011

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAY 25 AM 10:38
BY: [initials]

Re: Annual Report
2010 Payroll Expense Tax Biotechnology Exclusion Annual Report

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

The Tax Administrator, pursuant to the provisions of the San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations Code, herewith submits the annual report of businesses that were processed for the Biotechnology Exclusion for the calendar year 2010.

Schedule A of the report summarizes the number of firms processed for the exclusion, their total San Francisco employees, the number of eligible employees, and the amount of Biotechnology Exclusion claimed for calendar year 2010. These twenty-four (24) firms claimed the Biotechnology Exclusion in the aggregate amount of \$75,469,827 with a reported 774 employees that qualified for the exclusion.

Schedule B of the report summarizes the Biotechnology Exclusion for calendar years 2008 through 2010 with amounts updated. Compared to the preceding year of calendar year 2009, results indicate an increase of 209 jobs in the biotechnology business sector in the City in calendar year 2010.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact me at (415) 554-4874.

Very truly yours,

George W. Putris
Tax Administrator

cc: José Cisneros
San Francisco Public Library

Attachment

31

**TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT
PAYROLL EXPENSE TAX BIOTECHNOLOGY EXCLUSION
CALENDAR YEAR 2010**

Schedule A

Year	Number of Firms	Total SF Employees	Number of Eligible Employees	Biotechnology Exclusion	Payroll Expense Tax Foregone
2010	24	818	774	\$75,469,827	\$1,132,047

**TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT
PAYROLL EXPENSE TAX BIOTECHNOLOGY EXCLUSION
CALENDAR YEARS 2008 THROUGH 2010**

Schedule B

Year	Number of Firms	Total SF Employees	Number of Eligible Employees	Biotechnology Exclusion	Payroll Expense Tax Foregone
2008	9	243	231	\$24,333,555	\$372,451
2009*	13	571	565	\$59,790,369	\$896,856
2010	24	818	774	\$75,469,827	\$1,132,047
Increase (from 2009 to 2010)	11	247	209	\$15,679,458	\$235,192

* - amended



**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER**

c-page

**Ben Rosenfield
Controller**

**Monique Zmuda
Deputy Controller**

May 24, 2011

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAY 24 PM 2:23
me

RE: Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Committee of Interns and Residents, SEIU

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

In accordance with Ordinance 92-94, I am submitting a cost analysis of the MOU between the City and County of San Francisco and the Committee of Interns and Residents. The MOU applies to the period commencing July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2014, affecting 222 authorized positions with a salary base of approximately \$13.3 million and an overall pay and benefits base of approximately \$15.5 million.

The University of California at San Francisco (UCSF) administers payroll for interns and residents and bills the City and County of San Francisco for the costs authorized by the MOU. During the term of the MOU, wages and housing stipends for City and County of San Francisco Interns and Residents will be set at the same rate as UCSF Interns and Residents as of July 1 of each fiscal year. The total cost of any wage increases is capped at 2% of total payroll per year.

The total cost of wage increases in FY 2011-12 including fringe benefits is approximately \$255,283, or approximately 1.6% of wage and benefit costs. If wages in FY 2012-13 and FY 2013-14 increase at the same rates as in FY2011-12, this would result in increases of approximately \$260,339 and \$265,498, respectively. The MOU also caps the resident meal allowance at \$23 per day, resulting in estimated savings of \$153,546 in FY 2011-12. This brings the total incremental cost in FY 2011-12 to \$101,737.

If you have additional questions or concerns please contact me at 554-7500 or Michelle Allersma of my staff at 554-4792.

Sincerely,

Ben Rosenfield
Controller

cc: Martin Gran, ERD
Harvey Rose, Budget Analyst

(32)

Attachment A
Committee of Interns and Residents, SEIU
Estimated Costs/(Savings) FY 2011-2012
Controller's Office

<u>Annual Costs/(Savings)</u>	<u>FY 2011-2012</u>	<u>FY 2012-2013</u>	<u>FY 2013-2014</u>
Wages			
Wages for City and County of San Francisco Interns and Residents set at wage rate for UCSF Interns and Residents	\$219,504	\$223,852	\$228,287
Wage-Related Fringe Increases/(Decreases)	\$35,779	\$36,488	\$37,211
Daily meal allowance limited to \$23	(\$153,546)	-	-
Total Estimated Incremental Costs/(Savings)	<u>\$101,737</u>	<u>\$260,339</u>	<u>\$265,498</u>

BOS-11 File 110300
page


Controller's Office Report: ParkMerced Redevelopment: Economic Impact Report

Controller Reports to: Angela Calvillo, Peggy Nevin, BOS-Supervisors,
BOS-Legislative Aides, Steve Kawa, Greg Wagner,
Christine Falvey, Jason Elliott, ggiubbini, Severin

05/24/2011 02:16 PM

Sent by: **Debbie Toy**

This message is digitally signed.



The Controller's Office has released an economic impact report on the proposed ParkMerced Redevelopment.

Main Conclusions:

The ParkMerced Development Agreement and associated rezoning will permit the construction of approximately 5,700 new housing units in a redesigned ParkMerced neighborhood.

The anticipated redevelopment will have a positive citywide economic impact, because of:

1. Greater economic activity from construction and demolition.
2. Downward pressure on citywide housing prices resulting from expanded housing supply in the neighborhood.
3. Downward pressure on citywide commercial rents, by expanded retail and office space.

The combined impact of the construction activity, reduced housing prices, and reduced commercial rent will be to increase employment in San Francisco by nearly 2,000 jobs by 2032, and to increase the size of the City's economy by \$400 million. Most of this growth will not occur in the ParkMerced area.

In the early years of the project, the bulk of the jobs benefit will be created by the construction itself. Over time, however, the expansion of housing supply will be the most important impact to the city's economy. The impact of the non-residential construction is comparatively small, in the context of the city as a whole.

The redevelopment of the neighborhood, and its economic impacts, will also expand the property, payroll, and sales tax revenues of the city over the long term.

<http://co.sfgov.org/webreports/details.aspx?id=1277>

ParkMerced Redevelopment: Economic Impact Report

Office of Economic Analysis

May 24, 2011

Items #110300-110303



Introduction

- The ParkMerced Development Agreement and associated rezoning will permit the construction of approximately 5,700 new housing units in a redesigned ParkMerced neighborhood.
- Over 400,000 square feet of new non-residential construction is planned, and nearly 1,700 existing units will be renovated.
- Over 1,500 existing rent-controlled rental units will be demolished, and new replacement rent-controlled units constructed.
- The planned redevelopment will increase the population of ParkMerced by 12,000.
- This analysis is focused on the citywide economic impact of this redevelopment, and not an economic and fiscal impact of the project build-out per se.




Economic Impact Factors

- The anticipated redevelopment will have a positive citywide economic impact for the following reasons:
 - Greater economic activity from construction and demolition.
 - Downward pressure on citywide housing prices resulting from expanded housing supply in the neighborhood.
 - Downward pressure on citywide commercial rents, by expanded retail and office space.
- Lowering housing prices increases consumer incomes, indirectly reduces labor costs, and makes San Francisco a more competitive business location.
- Lowering commercial rent also makes San Francisco more competitive, by increasing business incomes.

Assessment: Citywide Impacts on Employment and GDP

ParkMerced Redevelopment Impact on San Francisco
Employment and GDP, 2012-2032



The combined impact of the construction activity, reduced housing prices, and reduced commercial rent will be to increase employment in San Francisco by nearly 2,000 jobs by 2032, and to increase the size of the City's economy by \$400 million.


Most of this growth will *not* occur in the ParkMerced area.

Source: OEA REMI Model, based on EIR/CBRE Fiscal & Economic Impact Study



Breakdown of Employment Impacts

Breakdown of Estimated Job Impacts of ParkMerced Redevelopment, 2012-2032



In the early years of the project, the bulk of the jobs benefit will be created by the construction itself.

Over time, however, the expansion of housing supply will be the most important impact to the city's economy.

The impact of the non-residential construction is comparatively small, in the context of the city as a whole.

Source: OEA REMI Model, based on EIR/CBRE Fiscal & Economic Impact Study



Impacts on the City's General Fund

- Payroll Tax:
 - Based on REMI model estimates of citywide growth in employee compensation, City payroll tax revenue is expected to increase by an average of \$1.6 million over the 20-year build-out period.
- Sales Tax:
 - Based on REMI model estimates of citywide growth in consumer spending, City sales tax revenue is expected to increase by an average of \$1.06 million per year.
- Property Tax:
 - Earlier work by EPS and CBRE confirmed significant incremental property tax revenue generated within the project area, equaling \$24 million per year to the General Fund.
 - However, the project will absorb housing demand from elsewhere in the city, and suppress housing prices, assessed valuations, and property tax revenue growth across the city as well.
 - The average annual reduction in citywide assessed value is projected to be 0.38% over the next twenty years.
 - Based on today's property tax base, such a reduction would cost the General Fund approximately \$3.6 million per year.
 - Thus, even with the expected citywide dampening of housing prices, the project will still generate significant new property tax revenues for the General Fund.

Conclusions

- By expanding the ability to develop new housing in San Francisco, the proposed redevelopment of ParkMerced will create long-term economic benefits for the city as a whole.
- In helping to contain the expected future growth in housing prices, the project will, in the future, reduce what San Francisco residents pay for housing, and reduce what San Francisco businesses will have to pay for labor.
- The redevelopment of the neighborhood, and its economic impacts, will also expand the property, payroll, and sales tax revenues of the city over the long term.

Staff Contacts

Ted Egan, Chief Economist (415) 554-5268

ted.egan@sfgov.org



ROUND THE DIAMOND
Sports & Public Service Pathways
Consulting & Educational Services

Team & Sports
Psychology



College & Career
Guidance

Dennis G. MacKenzie, M.A.

www.RoundTheDiamond.com

DennisMacKenzie@RoundTheDiamond.com

346 Precita • San Francisco, CA 94110 USA • Ph/Fax (415) 648-8655

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2011 MAY 25 PM 1:37

AK

page

May 24, 2011

Honorable Ed Lee, Mayor
City and County of San Francisco
Room 200 – City Hall

San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

Honorable David Chiu, President
Honorable John Avalos
Honorable David Campos
Honorable Carmen Chu
Honorable Malia Cohen
Honorable Sean Elsbernd
Honorable Mark Farrell
Honorable Jane Kim
Honorable Eric Mar
Honorable Ross Mirkarimi
Honorable Scott Wiener

C/o Ms. Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place – Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Request to Mayor Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors for support from City and County of San Francisco public officials and agencies to include a Sports Management Career Pathway Academy / Field Study Classroom, as an integral component within the proposed construction of a Basketball Arena on Port of San Francisco Seawall Lot 337 property.

Dear Mayor Lee, and President Chiu and members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,


Please review the enclosed proposal summary I have submitted to the San Francisco Port Commission and Ms. Monique Moyer, Executive Director of the Port of San Francisco.

As City and County of San Francisco public leaders, I am respectfully requesting your support to work in collaboration with the Seawall Lot 337 LLC development team, headed by the San Francisco Giants, the Port Commission and all involved public and private sector agencies and officials, in order to initiate a model Sports Management Career Pathway Academy / Field Study Classroom facility within the original design and construction of a Basketball Arena.

I welcome the opportunity to assist the City and County of San Francisco and Port of San Francisco in meeting the numerous economic and social challenges and responsibilities we face as a community. I trust that a model partnership can be created to construct a multi-purpose Basketball Arena, capable of including a far-sighted vision for a year-round education and career guidance facility in collaboration with the Seawall Lot 337 LLC development team. This model facility can build a successful and innovative partnership, working in cooperation with the San Francisco Unified School District and community leaders for the benefit of all our high school and college age students; including our diverse, cross-cultural San Francisco families and business communities.

Thank you once again for your time, and I look forward to working for the mutual benefit of all public and private sector investors – as well as on behalf of the health, well-being and future of all our students, youth, and young adults of all ages.

Sincerely,



Dennis G. MacKenzie

CC: Seawall Lot 337 Associates, LLC - Development Team:
San Francisco Giants; Wilson Meany Sullivan;
The Cordish Company; Farallon Capital Management, LLC

San Francisco Port Commission; Ms. Monique Moyer, Executive Director, Port of SF
C/o Ms. Amy Quesada, Commission Secretary / Executive Assistant

San Francisco Board of Education;
Honorable Hydra B. Mendoza, President, and Commissioners
C/o Ms. Esther V. Casco, Executive Assistant to the Board of Education

Mr. Carlos Garcia, Superintendent; San Francisco Unified School District

Mr. David Goldin, Chief Facilities Officer; San Francisco Unified School District

Mr. Don Collins, Commissioner of Athletics; AAA/CIF San Francisco Section

Mr. Dennis Kelly, President; United Educators of San Francisco

ROUND THE DIAMOND
Sports & Public Service Pathways
Consulting & Educational Services

Team & Sports
Psychology



College & Career
Guidance

Dennis G. MacKenzie, M.A.

www.RoundTheDiamond.com

DennisMacKenzie@RoundTheDiamond.com

346 Precita • San Francisco, CA 94110 USA • Ph/Fax (415) 648-5655

May 10, 2011

San Francisco Port Commission:
Honorable Kimberly Brandon, President
Honorable Ann Lazarus, Vice President
Honorable Francis X. Crowley, Commissioner
Honorable Leslie Katz, Commissioner

Ms. Monique Moyer, Executive Director, Port of San Francisco
C/o Ms. Amy Quesada, Commission Secretary/Executive Assistant

Re: May 10, 2011 – Port Commission Meeting - Agenda Item 9B
Informational presentation on the Lease and Development of Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48
bounded by China Basin Channel, Third Street, Mission Rock Street, and San Francisco Bay.

Round The Diamond Proposals:
Port of San Francisco / City and County of San Francisco
Public-Private Partnerships - In Collaboration with the San Francisco Unified School District
Public Service Leadership Career Pathway-Field Study Academy / Port of San Francisco
Sports Management Career Pathway-Field Study Academy / Basketball Arena
Marine Science Career Pathway-Field Study Academy / America's Cup Project

Dear Commissioners and Director Moyer,

Please review the proposal material I have shared with you, the Seawall Lot 337 and America's Cup development teams and investors, City and County of San Francisco officials including Mayor Lee, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, civic and community leaders, as well as state and federal officials.

I am requesting the creation of a model, public-private Non-Profit Foundation and partnership for the long-term benefit of San Francisco's economic growth, including investments in creating positive education reform initiatives that are essential for the interdependent health and well-being of all San Francisco citizens and communities – including our high school and college age students and youth.

To summarize the intention of these three collaborative, interdisciplinary Field Study Academies, I am proposing that this Seawall Lot 337 project - with the potential to build a Basketball Arena - include within the original design and construction a Sports Management Career Pathway-Field Study Academy.

This project is currently one of several major Port of San Francisco developments that will impact the entire city, including all San Franciscans now and for future generations to come. The comprehensive success of these projects will be critical to the individual and collective economic potential and success for both public and private sectors, and of all our cross-cultural and diverse communities of San Francisco - and beyond.

As an element of the America's Cup project, I am proposing a Marine Science Career Pathway-Field Study Academy be included as a permanent, year-round high school facility located along the waterfront in collaboration with Mr. Larry Ellison and his team of investors.


As these major partnerships and projects evolve - and other developments in the future - I am requesting the Port of San Francisco take a leadership role in order to gain support from all parties involved for the creation of a Public Service Leadership Career Pathway-Field Study Academy centrally located on Port of San Francisco property. This collaborative facility can serve as an introduction for our San Francisco Unified School District high schools students to the essential, real-working world cooperation required between public and private sector entities in order to complete entitlement and environmental review processes successfully.

These Field Study Academies will offer our students and future leaders practical experiences that can assist them in understanding their classroom studies as relevant and critical to meet their college and career goals - and how successful local businesses and community resources are built through shared visions and cooperation; and provide healthy, constructive and creative jobs, families and communities.

I want to share my support to all parties involved in this Seawall Lot 337 project, and trust that the inclusion of a Sports Management Career Pathway-Field Study Academy can assist in creating a model Facility worthy of national emulation.

Thank you once again for your time, consideration and support.

Sincerely,



Dennis G. MacKenzie

T-Mobile

T-Mobile West Corporation
a subsidiary of T-Mobile USA Inc.
Engineering Development
1855 Gateway Boulevard, 9th Floor
Concord, California 94520

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2011 MAY 23 PM 3:34

May 11, 2011

Anna Hom
Consumer Protection and Safety Division
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

**RE: T-Mobile West Corporation as successor in interest to Omnipoint Communications, Inc.
d/b/a T-Mobile (U-3056-C) Notification Letter for T-Mobile Site No. BA10033H**

This letter provides the Commission with notice pursuant to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California (CPUC) that with regard to the project described in Attachment A:

- (a) T-Mobile has obtained all requisite land use approval for the project described in Attachment A.
- (b) No land use approval is required because

A copy of this notification letter is being sent to the local government agency identified below for its information. Should there be any questions regarding this project, or if you disagree with the information contained herein, please contact Rana Christie, Manager 3, for T-Mobile, at (925) 521-5886, or contact Ms. Anna Hom of the CPUC Consumer Protection and Safety Division at (415) 703-2699.

Sincerely,



Rana Christie
Manager 3
T-Mobile West Corporation
a subsidiary of T-Mobile USA Inc.

Enclosed: Attachment A

cc: City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Planning Director, 1660 Mission St, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102
City & County of San Francisco, Attn: City Administrator, 1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102
City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Clerk of the Board, 1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102

35

ATTACHMENT A

1. Project Location

Site Identification Number: BA10033H
Site Name: Warfield Theatre
Site Address: 982 Market Street, San Francisco, CA 94102
County: San Francisco
Assessor's Parcel Number: 0342-007
Latitude: 37° 46' 57.3" N
Longitude: 122° 24' 37.01" W

2. Project Description

Number of Antennas to be installed: 6
Tower Design: Rooftop
Tower Appearance: Installation of six (6) antennas mounted to penthouse
Tower Height: 131.8 feet
Size of Buildings: 231.2 sq feet

3. Business Addresses of all Governmental Agencies

City & County of San Francisco	City & County of San Francisco	City & County of San Francisco
Attn: Planning Director	Attn: City Administrator	Attn: Clerk of the Board
1660 Mission St	1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl	1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl
5 th Floor	Room 244	Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94103	San Francisco, CA 94102	San Francisco, CA 94102

4. Land Use Approvals

Date Zoning Approval Issued: A Permit to Alter (Minor Alteration) was issued on April 14, 2011 and its comment period expired May 4, 2011. The building permit application was subsequently approved by the project planner (Aaron Hollister) on May 4, 2011.

Land Use Permit #: 2010.0629.5553 (Building Permit Application) &
2011-0383H (Permit to Alter)

If Land use Approval was not required: N/A



T-Mobile West Corporation
 a subsidiary of T-Mobile USA Inc.
 Engineering Development
 1855 Gateway Boulevard, 9th Floor
 Concord, California 94520

May 09, 2011

Anna Horn
 Consumer Protection and Safety Division
 California Public Utilities Commission
 505 Van Ness Avenue
 San Francisco, CA 94102

RECEIVED
 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
 SAN FRANCISCO

2011 MAY 23 PM 3:31
 BY *Mc*


RE: T-Mobile West Corporation as successor in interest to Omnipoint Communications, Inc. d/b/a T-Mobile (U-3056-C) Notification Letter for T-Mobile Site No. SF43582A

This letter provides the Commission with notice pursuant to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California (CPUC) that with regard to the project described in Attachment A:

- (a) T-Mobile has obtained all requisite land use approval for the project described in Attachment A.
- (b) No land use approval is required because

A copy of this notification letter is being sent to the local government agency identified below for its information. Should there be any questions regarding this project, or if you disagree with the information contained herein, please contact Rana Christie, Manager 3, for T-Mobile, at (925) 521-5886, or contact Ms. Anna Horn of the CPUC Consumer Protection and Safety Division at (415) 703-2699.

Sincerely,



Rana Christie
 Manager 3
 T-Mobile West Corporation
 a subsidiary of T-Mobile USA Inc.

Enclosed: Attachment A

cc: City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Planning Director, 1660 Mission St, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102
 City & County of San Francisco, Attn: City Administrator, 1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102
 City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Clerk of the Board, 1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102

36

ATTACHMENT A

1. Project Location

Site Identification Number: SF43582A
Site Name: AMCO Building
Site Address: 650 5th St, San Francisco, CA 94107
County: San Francisco
Assessor's Parcel Number: 3785-002
Latitude: 37° 46' 32.27" N
Longitude: 122° 23' 53.49" W

2. Project Description

Number of Antennas to be installed: 8
Tower Design: Rooftop
Tower Appearance: Installation of eight (8) antennas flush mounted to penthouse
Tower Height: 73.6 feet
Size of Buildings: 192 sq feet

3. Business Addresses of all Governmental Agencies

City & County of San Francisco	City & County of San Francisco	City & County of San Francisco
Attn: Planning Director	Attn: City Administrator	Attn: Clerk of the Board
1660 Mission St	1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl	1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl
5 th Floor	Room 244	Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94103	San Francisco, CA 94102	San Francisco, CA 94102

4. Land Use Approvals

Date Zoning Approval Issued: 03/24/11
Land Use Permit #: Planning Commission Motion 18306
If Land use Approval was not required: N/A



T-Mobile West Corporation
a subsidiary of T-Mobile USA Inc.
Engineering Development
1855 Gateway Boulevard, 9th Floor
Concord, California 94520

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2011 MAY 23 PM 3:32

May 09, 2011

Anna Hom
Consumer Protection and Safety Division
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: T-Mobile West Corporation as successor in interest to Omnipoint Communications, Inc. d/b/a T-Mobile (U-3056-C) Notification Letter for T-Mobile Site No. SF23286D

This letter provides the Commission with notice pursuant to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California (CPUC) that with regard to the project described in Attachment A:

- (a) T-Mobile has obtained all requisite land use approval for the project described in Attachment A.
- (b) No land use approval is required because

A copy of this notification letter is being sent to the local government agency identified below for its information. Should there be any questions regarding this project, or if you disagree with the information contained herein, please contact Rana Christie, Manager 3, for T-Mobile, at (925) 521-5886, or contact Ms. Anna Hom of the CPUC Consumer Protection and Safety Division at (415) 703-2699.

Sincerely,

Rana Christie
Manager 3
T-Mobile West Corporation
a subsidiary of T-Mobile USA Inc.

Enclosed: Attachment A

cc: City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Planning Director, 1660 Mission St, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102
City & County of San Francisco, Attn: City Administrator, 1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102
City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Clerk of the Board, 1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102

37

ATTACHMENT A

1. Project Location

Site Identification Number: SF23286D
Site Name: Nervous Dog Coffee
Site Address: 3438 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94110
County: San Francisco
Assessor's Parcel Number: 660-008
Latitude: 37° 44' 30.12" N
Longitude: 122° 25' 21.31" W

2. Project Description

Number of Antennas to be installed: 5
Tower Design: Rooftop
Tower Appearance: Installation of five (5) antennas within faux "T" vents on rooftop.
Tower Height: 51.3 feet
Size of Buildings: 93.96 sq feet

3. Business Addresses of all Governmental Agencies

City & County of San Francisco	City & County of San Francisco	City & County of San Francisco
Attn: Planning Director	Attn: City Administrator	Attn: Clerk of the Board
1660 Mission St	1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl	1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl
5 th Floor	Room 244	Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94103	San Francisco, CA 94102	San Francisco, CA 94102

4. Land Use Approvals

Date Zoning Approval Issued: 04/24/11
Land Use Permit #: CU2010.0386C
If Land use Approval was not required: N/A



T-Mobile West Corporation
a subsidiary of T-Mobile USA Inc.
Engineering Development
1855 Gateway Boulevard, 9th Floor
Concord, California 94520

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2011 MAY 23 PM 3:33

May 05, 2011

Anna Hom
Consumer Protection and Safety Division
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

**RE: T-Mobile West Corporation as successor in interest to Omnipoint Communications, Inc.
d/b/a T-Mobile (U-3056-C) Notification Letter for T-Mobile Site No. SF13114B**

This letter provides the Commission with notice pursuant to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California (CPUC) that with regard to the project described in Attachment A:

- (a) T-Mobile has obtained all requisite land use approval for the project described in Attachment A.
- (b) No land use approval is required because

A copy of this notification letter is being sent to the local government agency identified below for its information. Should there be any questions regarding this project, or if you disagree with the information contained herein, please contact Rana Christie, Manager 3, for T-Mobile, at (925) 521-5886, or contact Ms. Anna Hom of the CPUC Consumer Protection and Safety Division at (415) 703-2699.

Sincerely,

Rana Christie
Manager 3
T-Mobile West Corporation
a subsidiary of T-Mobile USA Inc.

Enclosed: Attachment A

cc: City of San Francisco, Attn: Planning Director, 1650 Mission St, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94102
City of San Francisco, Attn: City Manager, 1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102
City of San Francisco, Attn: City Clerk, 1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102

38

ATTACHMENT A

1. Project Location

Site Identification Number: SF13114B
Site Name: 501 Greenwich
Site Address: 501 Greenwich Street, San Francisco, CA 944133
County: San Francisco
Assessor's Parcel Number: 0088-001
Latitude: 37° 48' 08.29" N
Longitude: 122° 24' 29.17" W

2. Project Description

Number of Antennas to be installed: 1
Tower Design: Rooftop
Tower Appearance: Installation of one (1) antenna within a faux radome vent on rooftop.
Tower Height: 43.6 feet
Size of Buildings: 40 sq feet

3. Business Addresses of all Governmental Agencies

City of San Francisco	City of San Francisco	City of San Francisco
Attn: Planning Director	Attn: City Manager	Attn: City Clerk
1650 Mission St, Suite 400	1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl	1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl
San Francisco, CA 94102	San Francisco, CA 94102	San Francisco, CA 94102

4. Land Use Approvals

Date Zoning Approval Issued: Planning Commission did not take Discretionary Review and recommended approval on 2/17/11. The Board of Supervisors denied the CEQA appeal on 4/12/11. Aaron Hollister, the case planner, signed off on the building permit application on 4/13/11.

Land Use Permit #: 2010-0557D (Discretionary Review case) and 2009.0626.1437
(Building Permit Application)

If Land use Approval was not required: N/A

**OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

P.O. BOX 942896
SACRAMENTO, CA 94296-0001
(916) 445-7000 Fax: (916) 445-7053
calshpo@parks.ca.gov



RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAY 23 PM 3:35
BY

May 20, 2011

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

RE: Doolan Building Listing on the
National Register of Historic Places

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I am pleased to notify you that on May 11, 2011, the above-named property was placed on the National Register of Historic Places (National Register). As a result of being placed on the National Register, this property has also been listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, pursuant to Section 4851(a)(2) of the Public Resources Code.

Placement on the National Register affords a property the honor of inclusion in the nation's official list of cultural resources worthy of preservation and provides a degree of protection from adverse effects resulting from federally funded or licensed projects. Registration provides a number of incentives for preservation of historic properties, including special building codes to facilitate the restoration of historic structures, and certain tax advantages.

There are no restrictions placed upon a private property owner with regard to normal use, maintenance, or sale of a property listed in the National Register. However, a project that may cause substantial adverse changes in the significance of a registered property may require compliance with local ordinances or the California Environmental Quality Act. In addition, registered properties damaged due to a natural disaster may be subject to the provisions of Section 5028 of the Public Resources Code regarding demolition or significant alterations, if imminent threat to life safety does not exist.

If you have any questions or require further information, please contact the Registration Unit at (916) 445-7008.

Sincerely,

Milford Wayne Donaldson
Milford Wayne Donaldson, FAIA
State Historic Preservation Officer

Enclosure: National Register Notification of Listing

39

May 20, 2011

The Director of the National Park Service is pleased to send you the following announcements and actions on properties for the National Register of Historic Places. For further information contact Edson Beall via voice (202) 354-2255, or E-mail: <Edson_Beall@nps.gov> This and past Weekly Lists are also available here: <http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/nrlist.htm>

Our physical location address is:

National Park Service 2280, 8th floor
National Register of Historic Places
1201 "I" (Eye) Street, NW,
Washington D.C. 20005

NHL Spring Meeting Announced:

The National Park Service, National Historic Landmarks Program announces the Spring 2011 meeting of the Landmarks Committee of the National Park System Advisory Board to be held on May 24-26, 2011. The meeting will be held in the Second Floor Boardroom at the National Trust for Historic Preservation Headquarters at 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, DC.

The purpose of the meeting is to evaluate nominations of historic properties in order to advise the National Park System Advisory Board of the qualifications of each property being proposed for National Historic Landmark designation, and to make recommendations regarding the possible designation of those properties as National Historic Landmarks. The agenda and copies of the nominations for properties to be considered may be found at <http://www.nps.gov/nhl/Spring2011Noms.htm> For further information about this meeting or about the National Historic Landmarks Program, please contact Patty Henry at the National Park Service at 202-354-2216 or by e-mail at patty_henry@nps.gov.

WEEKLY LIST OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON PROPERTIES: 5/09/11 THROUGH 5/13/11

KEY: State, County, Property Name, Address/Boundary, City, Vicinity, Reference Number, NHL, Action, Date, Multiple Name

CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY,
Doolan, Richard P., Residence and Storefronts,
557 Ashbury St./1500-1512 Haight St.,
San Francisco, 09001201,
LISTED, 5/11/11

COMMISSIONERS
Jim Kellogg, President
Discovery Bay
Richard Rogers, Vice President
Montecito
Michael Sutton, Member
Monterey
Daniel W. Richards, Member
Upland
Jack Baylis, Member
Los Angeles

EDMOND G. BROWN, JR.



BUS-11 fgc
1416 Ninth Street
Box 944209
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090
(916) 653-4899
(916) 653-5040 Fax
fgc@fgc.ca.gov

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Fish and Game Commission

May 17, 2011

This is to provide you with a copy of the notice of proposed regulatory action relative to sections 300, 311, and 472, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to upland game hunting, which will be published in the California Regulatory Notice Register on May 20, 2011.

Please note the dates of the public hearings related to this matter and associated deadlines for receipt of written comments.

Dr. Eric Loft, Chief, Wildlife Branch, Department of Fish and Game, phone (916) 445-3555, has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Sheri Tiemann".

Sheri Tiemann
Staff Services Analyst

Attachment

40

**TITLE 14. Fish and Game Commission
Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Fish and Game Commission (Commission), pursuant to the authority vested by sections 200, 202, 203, 355, 3680 and 3800 of the Fish and Game Code and to implement, interpret or make specific sections 200, 202, 203, 203.1, 215, 220, 355, 356, 3680, 3801 and 3801.5 of said Code, proposes to amend sections 300, 311 and 472, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to upland game hunting.

Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

Amend Section 300, Title 14, CCR, Re: Upland Game Birds

Current regulations provide general hunting seasons for taking resident game birds. The Department is recommending 2 changes, including a range of permit numbers for the 2011 sage-grouse hunting season and changing the regulation for white-winged dove harvest to make it consistent with proposed changes to Federal regulations.

Existing regulations provide a number of permits for the general sage-grouse season in each of 4 zones. These specific numbers are replaced by a range of numbers for the 2011 season as listed below. The final number will be proposed in June after spring lek counts are completed and annual data are analyzed.

Permit ranges for sage-grouse hunting in 2011:

East Lassen: 0-50 (2-bird) permits
Central Lassen: 0-50 (2-bird) permits
North Mono: 0-100 (1-bird) permits
South Mono: 0-100 (1-bird) permits

Existing regulations in Section 300 (a)(3)(F)(2) provide for take by falconry and establish a 1 bird per day, 2 bird per season limit in the North Mono and South Mono zones. This regulation is inconsistent with subsections 300(a)(1)(D)(2) and 300 (a)(2)(D)(2) where the bag and possession limits are 1 per day and 1 per season, in the North Mono and South Mono zones.

Also, minor editorial changes are proposed to clarify and simplify the regulations.

Existing regulations permit white-winged dove harvest in San Bernardino, Riverside and Imperial counties. A proposal to amend the federal regulations to permit white-winged dove harvest throughout California and the entire Pacific Flyway has been made by the Pacific Flyway. If adopted by the Federal government, federal regulations would permit the harvest of white-winged doves throughout California. The proposal would make the state regulation consistent with the Federal regulation.

Additionally, an alternative is provided to consider an early youth-only hunt for chukar and quail in the Mojave National Preserve. This proposal from the National Park Service would provide for a youth-only hunt for chukar and quail for the first Saturday in October extending for two days. Existing regulations for general quail season in Zone Q3 (balance of the state excluding Zone Q2) open the quail and chukar seasons on the third Saturday in October and extends through the last Sunday in January.

Amend Section 311, Title 14, CCR, Re: Methods Authorized for Taking Resident Small Game

Current regulations provide methods authorized for taking resident small game. Air rifles are authorized for taking resident small game with a minimum of a 0.20 caliber for taking wild turkeys. This proposal would change regulations to allow a minimum of a 0.177 caliber for taking wild turkeys.

Amend Section 472, Title 14, CCR, Re: Non-game Animals

Under current regulations (Section 472, Title 14, CCR), only English sparrow and starling, both non-native, non-game birds, may be taken at any time of the year and in any number. The Fish and Game Code (Section 3680) however, provides for the take of domestic pigeon, in addition to English sparrow and starling (Section 3801).

The proposed regulatory change will improve the consistency of California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 472 with Fish and Game Code (Section 3680) and clearly provide for the take of domestic pigeons.

NOTICE IS GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, on all options relevant to this action at a hearing to be held at the Lexington Plaza Waterfront Hotel, 110 West Fremont Street, Stockton, California, on Thursday, June 30, 2011, at 8:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard.

NOTICE IS ALSO GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, on all actions relevant to this action at a hearing to be held at the State of California, Resources Agency Building Auditorium, 1416 Ninth Street, Sacramento, California, on Thursday, August 4, 2011, at 8:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard. It is requested, but not required, that written comments be submitted on or before July 28, 2011, at the address given below, or by fax at (916) 653-5040, or by e-mail to FGC@fgc.ca.gov. Written comments mailed, faxed or e-mailed to the Commission office, must be received before 5:00 p.m. on August 1, 2011. All comments must be received no later than August 4, 2011, at the hearing in Sacramento, CA. If you would like copies of any modifications to this proposal, please include your name and mailing address.

The regulations as proposed in strikeout-underline format, as well as an initial statement of reasons, including environmental considerations and all information upon which the proposal is based (rulemaking file), are on file and available for public review from the agency representative, Jon K. Fischer, Acting Executive Director, Fish and Game Commission, 1416 Ninth Street, Box 944209, Sacramento, California 94244-2090, phone (916) 653-4899. Please direct requests for the above mentioned documents and inquiries concerning the regulatory process to Sheri Tiemann at the preceding address or phone number. **Dr. Eric Loft, Chief, Wildlife Programs Branch, phone (916) 445-3555, has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations.** Copies of the Initial Statement of Reasons, including the regulatory language, may be obtained from the address above. Notice of the proposed action shall be posted on the Fish and Game Commission website at <http://www.fgc.ca.gov>.

Availability of Modified Text

If the regulations adopted by the Commission differ from but are sufficiently related to the action proposed, they will be available to the public for at least 15 days prior to the date of adoption. Circumstances beyond the control of the Commission (e.g., timing of Federal regulation adoption, timing of resource data collection, timelines do not allow, etc.) or changes made to be responsive to public recommendation and comments during the regulatory process may preclude full compliance with the 15-day comment period, and the Commission will exercise its powers under Section 202 of the Fish and Game Code. Regulations adopted pursuant to this section are not subject to the time periods for adoption, amendment or repeal of regulations prescribed in Sections 11343.4, 11346.4 and 11346.8 of the Government Code. Any person interested may obtain a copy of said regulations prior to the date of adoption by contacting the agency representative named herein.

If the regulatory proposal is adopted, the final statement of reasons may be obtained from the address above when it has been received from the agency program staff.

Impact of Regulatory Action

The potential for significant statewide adverse economic impacts that might result from the proposed regulatory action has been assessed, and the following initial determinations relative to the required statutory categories have been made:

- (a) Significant Statewide Adverse Economic Impact Directly Affecting Businesses, Including the Ability of California Businesses to Compete with Businesses in Other States:

The proposed action will not have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states.

There are no economic or business impacts foreseen or associated with the proposed regulation change.

- (b) Impact on the Creation or Elimination of Jobs Within the State, the Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses, or the Expansion of Businesses in California:

None.

- (c) Cost Impacts on a Representative Private Person or Business:

The agency is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.

- (d) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State:

None.

- (e) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies: None.

- (f) Programs mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts: None.
- (g) Costs Imposed on Any Local Agency or School District that is required to be Reimbursed Under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4, Government Code: None.
- (h) Effect on Housing Costs: None.

Effect on Small Business

It has been determined that the adoption of these regulations may affect small business.

Consideration of Alternatives

The Commission must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the Commission, or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Commission, would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action.

FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

Dated: May 10, 2011

Jon K. Fischer
Executive Director

COMMISSIONERS
Jim Kellogg, President
Discovery Bay
Richard Rogers, Vice President
Montecito
Michael Sutton, Member
Monterey
Daniel W. Richards, Member
Upland
Jack Baylis, Member
Los Angeles

EDMOND G. BROWN, JR.



Governor

BDS-11
Cpage

1416 Ninth Street
Box 944209
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090
(916) 653-4899
(916) 653-5040 Fax
fgc@fgc.ca.gov

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Fish and Game Commission

May 17, 2011

This is to provide you with a copy of the notice of proposed regulatory action relative to Section 502, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to waterfowl hunting, which will be published in the California Regulatory Notice Register on May 20, 2011.

Please note the dates of the public hearings related to this matter and associated deadlines for receipt of written comments.

Dr. Eric Loft, Chief, Wildlife Branch, Department of Fish and Game, phone (916) 445-3555, has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations.

Sincerely,

Sheri Tiemann
Staff Services Analyst

Attachment

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAY 20 PM 3:09
BY _____ AK

41

**TITLE 14. Fish and Game Commission
Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Fish and Game Commission (Commission), pursuant to the authority vested by sections 202 and 355 of the Fish and Game Code and to implement, interpret or make specific sections 202, 355 and 356 of said Code, proposes to amend Section 502, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to waterfowl hunting.

Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

Current regulations in Section 502, Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR), provide definitions, hunting zone descriptions, season opening and closing dates, and establish daily bag and possession limits. In addition to the five proposals contained herein, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), after analysis of waterfowl population survey and other data, may change federal regulations; if this occurs, changes in existing and proposed regulations in California may be necessary. Changes in federal regulations for season opening and closing dates, elimination or creation of special management areas, season length, and daily bag limits for migratory birds may occur. Items 1, 2, and 4 require changes in the federal regulations and must be approved by the Pacific Flyway Council at its meeting on July 21, 2011. Item 5 (including the table below) provide a proposed range of season dates and bag limits for waterfowl. The Service will consider recommendations from the Flyway Council at their meeting on July 28, 2011. At this time, the California Waterfowl Breeding Population Survey has not been conducted and the Service has not established federal regulation "frameworks" which will occur in August after the analysis of current waterfowl population survey, other data, input from the Flyway Councils and the public. Also, minor editorial changes are proposed to clarify and simplify the regulations and to comply with existing federal frameworks.

The Department's proposals are as follows:

1. Remove the restriction on the Small Canada goose daily bag limit in the Northeastern Zone.
2. Increase the white-fronted and white goose season length to 105 days in the Balance of State Zone and split the season into two segments.
3. Increase the white-fronted goose daily bag limit to 6 geese per day in the Northeastern, Southern San Joaquin Valley, and Balance of State zones.
4. Extend the white-fronted goose season length in the Sacramento Valley Special Management area by 7 days.
5. Provide a range of waterfowl hunting season lengths (which may be split into two segments) between 38 and 107 days (including 2 youth waterfowl hunt days) for all hunting methods. A range of daily bag limits is also given for ducks in all zones. Federal regulations require that California's hunting regulations conform to those of Arizona in the Colorado River Zone. See table below for season and bag limit ranges.

Summary of Proposed Waterfowl Hunting Regulations

AREA	SPECIES	SEASONS	DAILY BAG & POSSESSION LIMITS
Statewide	Coots & Moorhens	Concurrent w/duck season	25/day, 25 in possession
Northeastern Zone <i>Season may be split for Ducks, Pintail, Canvasback and Scaup.</i>	Ducks	Between 38 & 105 days	4-7/day, which may include: 3-7 mallards but no more than 1-2 females, 0-3 pintail, 0-3 canvasback, 0-2 redheads, 0-7 scaup. Possession limit double the daily bag.
	Pintail Canvasback Scaup	Between 0 & 105 days	
	Geese	100 days	
Southern San Joaquin Valley Zone <i>Season may be split for Ducks, Pintail, Canvasback and Scaup.</i>	Ducks	Between 38 & 105 days	4-7/day, which may include: 3-7 mallards no more than 1-2 females, 0-3 pintail, 0-3 canvasback, 0-2 redheads, 0-7 scaup. Possession limit double the daily bag.
	Pintail Canvasback Scaup	Between 0 & 105 days	
	Geese	100 days	
Colorado River Zone	Ducks	Between 38 & 105 days	4-7/day, which may include: 3-7 mallards no more than 1-2 hen mallards or Mexican-like ducks, 0-3 pintail, 0-3 canvasback, 0-2 redheads, 0-7 scaup. Possession limit double the daily bag.
	Pintail Canvasback Scaup	Between 0 & 105 days	
	Geese	Between 101 & 105 days	
Southern California Zone <i>Season may be split for Ducks, Pintail, Canvasback and Scaup.</i>	Ducks	Between 38 & 105 days	4-7/day, which may include: 3-7 mallards no more than 1-2 females, 0-3 pintail, 0-3 canvasback, 0-2 redheads, 0-7 scaup. Possession limit double the daily bag.
	Pintail Canvasback Scaup	Between 0 & 105 days	
	Geese	100 days	
Balance of State Zone <i>Season may be split for Ducks, Pintail, Canvasback, Scaup and Dark and White Geese.</i>	Ducks	Between 38 & 105 days	4-7/day, which may include: 3-7 mallards no more than 1-2 females, 0-3 pintail, 0-3 canvasback, 0-2 redheads, 0-7 scaup. Possession limit double the daily bag.
	Pintail Canvasback Scaup	Between 0 & 105 days	
	Geese	100-105 days (Large Canada geese 105 days)	
SPECIAL AREA	SPECIES	SEASON	DAILY BAG & POSSESSION LIMITS
North Coast <i>Season may be split</i>	All Canada Geese	105 days except for Large Canada geese which can not exceed 100 days or extend beyond the last Sunday in January.	6/day, only 1 may be a Large Canada goose. Possession limit double the daily bag.
Humboldt Bay South Spit	All species	Closed during brant season	
Sacramento Valley	White-fronted geese	Open concurrently with general goose season through Dec 14-21	2/day. Possession limit double the daily bag.
Morro Bay	All species	Open in designated areas only	Waterfowl season opens concurrently with brant season.
Martis Creek Lake	All species	Closed until Nov 16	
Northern Brant	Black Brant	From Nov 7 for 30 days	2/day. Possession limit double the daily bag.

Balance of State Brant	Black Brant	From the second Saturday in November for 30 days	2/day. Possession limit double the daily bag.
Imperial County <i>Season may be split</i>	White Geese	102 days	6/day. Possession limit double the daily bag.
YOUTH WATERFOWL HUNTING DAYS	SPECIES	SEASON	DAILY BAG & POSSESSION LIMITS
Northeastern Zone	Same as regular season	The Saturday fourteen days before the opening of waterfowl season extending for 2 days.	Same as regular season
Southern San Joaquin Valley Zone		The Saturday following the closing of waterfowl season extending for 2 days.	
Southern California Zone		The Saturday following the closing of waterfowl season extending for 2 days.	
Colorado River Zone		The Saturday following the closing for waterfowl season extending for 2 days.	
Balance of State Zone		The Saturday following the closing of waterfowl season extending for 2 days.	
FALCONRY OF DUCKS	SPECIES	SEASON	DAILY BAG & POSSESSION LIMITS
Northeastern Zone	Same as regular season	Between 38 and 105 days	3/ day, possession limit 6
Balance of State Zone		Between 38 and 107 days	
Southern San Joaquin Valley Zone		Between 38 and 107 days	
Southern California Zone		Between 38 and 107 days	
Colorado River Zone	Ducks only	Between 38 and 107 days	

NOTICE IS GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, on all options relevant to this action at a hearing to be held at the Lexington Plaza Waterfront Hotel, 110 West Fremont Street, Stockton, California, on Thursday, June 30, 2011, at 8:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard.

NOTICE IS ALSO GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, on all actions relevant to this action at a hearing to be held at the State of California, Resources Agency Building Auditorium, 1416 Ninth Street, Sacramento, California, on Thursday, August 4, 2011 at 8:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard. It is requested, but not required, that written comments be submitted on or before July 28, 2011, at the address given below, or by fax at (916) 653-5040, or by e-mail to FGC@fgc.ca.gov. **Written comments mailed, faxed or e-mailed to the Commission office, must be received before 5:00 p.m. on August 1, 2011. All comments must be received no later than August 4, 2011, at the hearing in Sacramento, CA.** If you would like copies of any modifications to this proposal, please include your name and mailing address.

The regulations as proposed in strikeout-underline format, as well as an initial statement of reasons, including environmental considerations and all information upon which the proposal is based (rulemaking file), are on file and available for public review from the agency representative, Jon K. Fischer, Acting Executive Director, Fish and Game Commission, 1416 Ninth Street, Box 944209, Sacramento, California 94244-2090, phone (916) 653-4899. Please direct requests for the above mentioned documents and inquiries concerning the regulatory process to Sheri Tiemann at the preceding address or phone number. **Dr. Eric Loft, Chief, Wildlife Programs Branch, phone (916) 445-3555, has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations.** Copies of the Initial Statement of Reasons, including the regulatory language, may be obtained from the address above. Notice of the proposed action shall be posted on the Fish and Game Commission website at <http://www.fgc.ca.gov>.

Availability of Modified Text

If the regulations adopted by the Commission differ from but are sufficiently related to the action proposed, they will be available to the public for at least 15 days prior to the date of adoption. Circumstances beyond the control of the Commission (e.g., timing of Federal regulation adoption, timing of resource data collection, timelines do not allow, etc.) or changes made to be responsive to public recommendation and comments during the regulatory process may preclude full compliance with the 15-day comment period, and the Commission will exercise its powers under Section 202 of the Fish and Game Code. Regulations adopted pursuant to this section are not subject to the time periods for adoption, amendment or repeal of regulations prescribed in Sections 11343.4, 11346.4 and 11346.8 of the Government Code. Any person interested may obtain a copy of said regulations prior to the date of adoption by contacting the agency representative named herein.

If the regulatory proposal is adopted, the final statement of reasons may be obtained from the address above when it has been received from the agency program staff.

Impact of Regulatory Action

The potential for significant statewide adverse economic impacts that might result from the proposed regulatory action has been assessed, and the following initial determinations relative to the required statutory categories have been made:

- (a) Significant Statewide Adverse Economic Impact Directly Affecting Businesses, Including the Ability of California Businesses to Compete with Businesses in Other States:

The proposed action will not have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states. The proposed regulations are intended to provide additional recreational opportunity to the public. The response is expected to be minor in nature.

- (b) Impact on the Creation or Elimination of Jobs Within the State, the Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses, or the Expansion of Businesses in California:

None.

- (c) Cost Impacts on a Representative Private Person or Business:

The agency is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.

- (d) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State:

None.

- (e) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies: None.

- (f) Programs mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts: None.

- (g) Costs Imposed on Any Local Agency or School District that is required to be Reimbursed Under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4, Government Code: None.
- (h) Effect on Housing Costs: None.

Effect on Small Business

It has been determined that the adoption of these regulations may affect small business.

Consideration of Alternatives

The Commission must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the Commission, or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Commission, would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action.

FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

Jon K. Fischer
Executive Director

Dated: May 10, 2011

May 23, 2011
TO: STATE, COUNTY AND CITY OFFICIALS

1005-11

CPAGE

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAY 25 PM 2:57
AIR

NOTIFICATION OF APPLICATION FILING OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY: APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF ENERGY SAVINGS ASSISTANCE/CARE PROGRAMS AND BUDGET (A.11-05-019)

On March 30, 2011, Commissioner Michael Peevey and the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) issued a ruling that ordered Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) to file an Application proposing programs and budget for PG&E's 2012 - 2014 Low-Income Assistance programs -i.e., California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) and Energy Savings Assistance (ESA) Program.

On May 16, 2011, PG&E filed application No. 11-05-019, for the approval of the 2012-2014 CARE and ESA program and budget (Application). The ESA program offers free weatherization services, energy efficient appliances and energy education to income-qualifying households. The CARE program provides a discount on the PG&E bill of income-qualifying households of at least 20 percent.

This Application requests an annual ESA Program budget of \$137.9 million in 2012, \$167.5 million in 2013, and \$173.4 million in 2014. This represents a **decrease** of \$18.9 million in 2012 over the approved 2009-2011 ESA program budget. For the CARE program, the Application requests an annual administrative budget of \$12.1 million for 2012, \$11.3 million for 2013, and \$11.7 million for 2014. This represents an increase of \$2.6 million in 2012 over the approved 2009-2011 CARE administrative budget.

HOW DOES THIS AFFECT RATES?

If this application is approved, it would result in a change of **less than one percent** in PG&E's total annual revenue. The bundled system average electric rate in 2014, the year with the largest request, will increase by 0.1 percent relative to current rates. PG&E's electric rate change will affect the Public Purpose Program rate component which is paid by bundled, direct access, community choice aggregation and eligible departing load customers. The bundled non-CARE residential average gas rate in 2014, the year with the largest request, will increase by 0.5 percent relative to current rates.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

To request a copy of the application and exhibits or for more details, call PG&E at 1-800-743-5000.
For TDD/TTY (speech-hearing impaired), call 1-800-652-4712.
Para mas detalles llame 1-800-660-6789
詳情請致電 1-800-893-9555

You may request a copy of the application and exhibits by writing to:
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
ESA/CARE Application
P.O. Box 7442, San Francisco, CA 94120.

THE CPUC PROCESS

The CPUC's Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) may review this application.

The DRA is an independent arm of the CPUC, created by the Legislature to represent the interests of all utility customers throughout the state and obtain the lowest possible rate for service consistent with reliable and safe service levels. The DRA has a multi-disciplinary staff with expertise in economics, finance, accounting and engineering. The DRA's views do not necessarily reflect those of the CPUC. Other parties of record may also participate.

The CPUC may hold evidentiary hearings where parties of record present their proposals in testimony and are subject to cross-examination before an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ). These hearings are open to the public, but only those who are parties of record may present evidence or cross-examine witnesses during evidentiary hearings. Members of the public may attend, but not participate in, these hearings.

After considering all proposals and evidence presented during the hearing process, the ALJ will issue a draft decision. When the CPUC acts on this application, it may adopt all or part of PG&E's request, amend or modify it, or deny the application. The CPUC's final decision may be different from PG&E's application.

If you would like to learn how you can participate in this proceeding or if you have comments or questions, you may contact the CPUC's Public Advisor as follows:

Public Advisor's Office
505 Van Ness Avenue
Room 2103
San Francisco, CA 94102
1-415-703-2074 or 1-866-849-8390 (toll free)
TTY 1-415-703-5282 or TTY 1-866-836-7825 (toll free)
E-mail to public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov

If you are writing a letter to the Public Advisor's Office, please include the number of the application (11-05-019) to which you are referring. All comments will be circulated to the Commissioners, the assigned Administrative Law Judge and the Energy Division staff.

A copy of PG&E's ESA/CARE Application and exhibits are also available for review at the California Public Utilities Commission, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, Monday-Friday, 8 a.m.-noon, and on the CPUC's website at <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/puc/>.

42

Street and Sidewalk Perception Study

Angela Calvillo, Board of Supervisors,
Controller Reports to: BOS-Legislative Aides, Steve Kawa, Greg Wagner,
Christine Falvey, Starr Terrell, Jason Elliott, Francis
Sent by: Kristen McGuire

05/26/2011 01:46 PM

Controller Reports	Street and Sidewalk Perception Study
--------------------	--------------------------------------

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

The Controller's Office is pleased to present the Street and Sidewalk Perception Study Report. The purpose of the study was to measure user perceptions of San Francisco street and sidewalk cleanliness, satisfaction with street conditions, and how well public perceptions match the City's actual street and sidewalk maintenance standards and programs. The study interviewed 841 random sidewalk users at 56 locations distributed evenly across a mix of commercial and residential locations throughout the City's 11 supervisorial districts.

The key findings of the study include:

- Survey respondents had generally positive perceptions of the cleanliness of streets and sidewalks included in the study;
- Respondents were satisfied with sidewalk cleanliness in many locations that failed the City's actual maintenance standards; and
- A high percentage of survey respondents believe that the City owns the sidewalks and should take primary responsibility for their cleanliness.

Report recommendations for the City to consider include:

- Changing street and sidewalk litter and graffiti maintenance standards. For example, users are strongly negative about cigarette butts, glass, and feces and not strongly negative about graffiti. The City's programs in these areas could be aligned to better match perceptions of cleanliness; and
- Investing in infrastructure improvements such as sidewalk repair programs since these are highly linked to overall satisfaction.

The public's general satisfaction with street and sidewalk cleanliness presents an opportunity for DPW to consider reallocating resources to balance cleanliness and infrastructure needs of the streets and sidewalks.

The report was developed by the consulting firm Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates (FM3), working under contract with the Controller's Office, using funding from the Department of Public Works (DPW).

To view the full report, please visit our website at:
<http://co.sfgov.org/webreports/details.aspx?id=1278>

You can also access the report on the Controller's website (<http://www.sfcontroller.org/>) under the News & Events section.

This is a send only email, for more information please contact:

Office of the Controller
City Services Auditor Division
Phone: 415-554-7463
Email: CSA.ProjectManager@sfgov.org

43

C. rages



Re: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY
Jocelyn Kane to: Board of Supervisors
Cc: mark.farrell, Vajra Granelli, Ann Mannix
This message is digitally signed.

05/26/2011 11:00 AM

History: This message has been forwarded.

Dear Supervisor Farrell,

Thanks for your inquiry. I am aware of the issues relate to *1787 Union Street (The Brick Yard)* and will work with Northern Station to check compliance with the noise ordinance at this location on random dates and times over the next 3 months. We will check compliance with relevant Planning conditions (listed below) at that time, as well.

Best,

Jocelyn Kane
Executive Director
San Francisco Entertainment Commission
City Hall, Room 453
415 554-5793 (voice)
415 554-7934 (fax)
jocelyn.kane@sfgov.org

Board of Supervisors BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY For an... 05/26/2011 10:41:51 AM

From: Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
To: jocelyn.kane@sfgov.org
Cc: mark.farrell@sfgov.org
Date: 05/26/2011 10:41 AM
Subject: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY
For any questions, call the sponsoring supervisor

TO: Jocelyn Kane
Entertainment Commission

FROM: Clerk of the Board
DATE: 5/26/2011
REFERENCE: 20110524-005
FILE NO.

Due Date: 6/25/2011

This is an inquiry from a member of the Board of Supervisors made at the Board meeting on 5/24/2011.

44

Supervisor Farrell requests the following information:

Requesting the Entertainment Commission and the SFPD Northern Station to conduct random noise tests at 1787 Union Street (The Brick Yard) after their outside patio becomes operational to determine compliance with the City's noise ordinance pursuant to Police Code Section 2916. See letter below.

As soon as the outdoor patio at 1787 Union Street is completed and in use, I request that both the SFPD Northern Station and the Entertainment Commission conduct at least three random noise tests over a three-month period during various points of the day and evening to determine compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance and to report back to my office with their findings during their analysis and at the end of the three-month period.

On January 20, 2011, the Planning Commission set forth conditions at the Discretionary Review Hearing to address noise issues. Those conditions include closing the outdoor patio by 10:00p.m., keeping the doors closed if the patio is not occupied; keeping two of the five panel doors closed when patrons are seated on the patio, limiting the seating to 12 people. Installing a canvas awning to dampen the sound and other conditions.

If any of these conditions are not being met or the property is in violation of the City's Noise Ordinance when the agency is conducting the noise test, that should also be noted in the report back to my office. Thank You Supervisor Mark Farrell

Please indicate the reference number shown above in your response, direct the original via email to Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org and send a copy to the Supervisor(s) noted above.

Your response to this inquiry is requested by 6/25/2011

May 23, 2011

David Chiu, President, and Members
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA 94102



Dear President Chiu and Board Members:

United Taxicab Workers urges the Board of Supervisors to reject Supervisor Weiner's proposed Resolution opposing a taxi meter rate increase unless it is "implemented in conjunction with a significant and meaningful increase in taxi service." Treating taxi drivers as whipping boys for service deficiencies that are entirely beyond their control is both wrongheaded and counterproductive to the goal it seeks to achieve.

First, some facts:

- Cab drivers are low-income workers whose average earnings for a 40-hour week were estimated to be \$24,315 in a 2006 study conducted by graduate students at the Goldman School of Public Policy.
- It has been over eight years since the last meter increase of consequence went into effect in January 2003. The Board of Supervisors repeatedly rejected subsequent Controller's recommendations for increases aimed at keeping pace with the cost of living.
- The cost of living in the San Francisco Bay Area has increased over 19 percent since January 2003 according to the Consumer Price Index compiled by the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics.
- The only increase in taxi fares in the past eight years has been a 25-cent hike in the flag drop in 2006, amounting to less than 2 percent of an average ride. It was accompanied by an increase in the gate cap of \$5-12.50 a shift, which resulted in a net loss to drivers.
- San Francisco gas prices have risen 150 percent since January 2003, from \$1.69 a gallon for regular gas to \$4.28 at the start of this month, according to the U.S. Department of Energy. By a conservative estimate, drivers of conventional fuel vehicles are paying \$30 more per shift for gas than they were then. By the same estimate, even the drivers of hybrid cabs are paying about 25 percent more for gas today than they were paying in a gas guzzler in January 2003.

Phone: (415) 864-8294 ■ Fax: (415) 864-8295 ■ E-mail: utw8294@energy-net.org ■ Web site: www.utw.us

Working for dignity, justice and decent conditions in San Francisco's taxi industry.  

45

- Under new rules promulgated by the MTA, cab drivers have recently been saddled with credit card processing charges that were previously company responsibility.
- The MTA has extracted for its own uses close to \$10 million from drivers' pockets in the past year by way of medallion sales. That is in addition to the many millions that have gone to sellers of medallions, most of whom paid only an application fee to obtain them. The MTA's share of the revenues immediately devalues the worth of the medallion to the purchaser by 20 percent.

As a consequence of these factors, drivers have suffered an enormous loss of earning power over the past eight years.


United Taxicab Workers has long advocated for measures to improve taxi service, especially ways to increase the efficiency of the taxi fleet. We support an integrated dispatch system as well as the proposed Open Taxi Access System that would put users of smart phones and other Internet devices in direct contact with drivers. We are also open to a system of peak-time cabs, assuming they are properly regulated and the permits for their operation are in the hands of cab drivers.

But the most important factor in improving both the quality and quantity of taxi service is to have an experienced, dedicated, professional workforce behind the wheel. Long-experienced drivers are, on the whole, more courteous and knowledgeable, less prone to accidents and more adept at handling emergencies and unanticipated situations. They can get passengers to their destinations more quickly and efficiently, and therefore can handle significantly more rides per shift than inexperienced drivers can.

The way to develop and maintain such a workforce is to ensure that drivers have decent earnings, working conditions, and job benefits – the same things that every worker deserves. We are far from that goal, and the proposed Resolution puts it that much more distant by treating drivers as mere pawns, whose hardships don't count and whose legitimate claims can freely be sacrificed where expedience dictates. The message to drivers, coming at a time of enormous unrest and dissatisfaction over a number of regulatory and job-related issues, couldn't be worse.

If you have any respect for cab drivers and the vital work they do, vote no.

Sincerely,


Mark Gruberg

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



C-Page
EDWIN M. LEE
MAYOR

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
FROM: *for* Mayor Edwin M. Lee *JE*
RE: Address Regarding FY2011-2012 Budget Submission
DATE: May 26, 2011

Dear Madame Clerk:

It is my pleasure to inform you that on June 1, 2011 at 11:00AM, I will submit my balanced budget to the Board of Supervisors and deliver an address regarding that budget.

I have invited all members of the Board of Supervisors as well as other Citywide elected officials and Department Heads to join me in the Legislative Chamber as I present our budget.

I invite the public to join us for this speech as well. There will be limited, first-come, first-served seating in the Board Chamber, and we will have an overflow area set up in one of the Light Courts.

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAY 26 PM 1:43
PC



NOTICE OF MAYOR'S PRESENTATION

FISCAL YEAR 2011-2012 BUDGET

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Mayor's presentation and introduction of the Fiscal Year 2011-2012 Budget will be held as follows:

Date: Wednesday, June 1, 2011

Time: 11:00 a.m.

Location: Legislative Chamber, Room 250 located at City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA

At this presentation the Mayor will submit the balanced budget to the Board of Supervisors and deliver an address regarding the same. Please be advised that all Members of the Board of Supervisors, as well as other Citywide elected officials, Department Heads of the City and County of San Francisco, and members of the public are invited to attend this presentation.

There will be limited, first-come, first-served seating in the Board Chamber, and an overflow area will be available in one of the Light Courts.

DATED: May 26, 2011

POSTED: May 26, 2011

C page



Dog Issue- supporting letter from Cheryl Arnold via John's email
John Frykman

#110196

to:

George_Durgerian@nps.gov, Board of Supervisors, Eric L. Mar, Frank_Dean
05/24/2011 09:26 AM

Land Use
Clerk

Cc:

Thomas Kuhn, Julie Burns, Jason Jungreis, Ron Miguel, Chronicle Watch, Amy Meyer,
Kathy Howard, Cheryl Arnold

Show Details

I write in firm support of the GGNRA's Draft Dog Management Plan.

My husband and I have two dogs and one cat (whom we keep indoors for her safety). We live in our own home near Ocean Beach on the Richmond side. Almost every day, we walk our dogs, on leash, in our beautiful neighborhood, usually in the west end of Golden Gate Park and on the promenade above the beach. Our small back yard is also very convenient for our dogs' hygiene and recreation.

On our usual neighborhood routes — especially the beach promenade, we encounter many other people with dogs, most on leash — no problem. Dogs supposedly under voice "control" are almost always a problem, challenging our dogs, raising the issue of dominance. When the situation is threatening, we usually say something polite and clear to the "handlers" about leash requirements. Typically, they say nothing or else reaffirm their disrespect for regulations.

Looking beyond at the gatherings of loose dogs carousing near the surf, we are dismayed by the handlers' disregard for the safety and peace-of-mind of others: wildlife, birds, children, seniors, disabled, all law-abiding citizens, people seeking safe and relaxing recreation where laws and mutual respect are observed.

Many people are afraid of dogs, on or off leash, and should have areas where they can enjoy recreation, free of fear. Although I love dogs in general, I am often afraid of them in public encounters until reassured or out-of-range.

Once I observed to my husband, "We're so lucky to have a house with an enclosed yard. If not, I don't think I could in conscience have dogs in the city. We'd have to take them out on leash for everything, and they'd get no real exercise, no running and playing. It wouldn't be fair to them." Please note: I would cope by not having a dog, rather than insisting on "my rights."

Communities are, by definition, places where people co-operate, where they give up certain privileges in turn for others gained or shared. When problems of give-and-take arise in communities, people work out compromises and laws — many for the protection of living things which cannot protect themselves. Many people in the community of SF forget that the GGNRA is a Federal park, subject to requirements distinct from those of a city — e.g., protecting wildlife, vegetation, and humans.

I think that the GGNRA/NPS have done a good job of working out compromises on these particular issues and have gone far beyond the usual effort to balance the myriad concerns.

One other related issue that I'm not sure has been addressed yet:

In both City/County and Federal parks, a substantial problem is created by professional dog-walkers who pay nothing to use the public parks for their private livelihood. In the process, they endanger people and wildlife, and damage parks. I witness one of these "dog-walkers" who drives daily into Golden Gate Park, parks her van

47

by a large open field, opens the rear door, and watches her charges (usually 6 – 8 dogs) race to all corners of the field and defecate. She makes no attempt to pick up their waste (it would be impossible to do so), then leads them to a path, where they disappear into the woods.

Such people should purchase licenses and pay fines for violations. In this particular city, it should be easy for different jurisdictions to co-operate in crafting and enforcing a universal license, then sharing revenues equitably.

Thank you so much for the thorough exercise in democracy which you are conducting.

Sincerely, Cheryl C. Arnold

Cheryl C. Arnold
751 - 47th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94121-3205

Personal 415-387-1305
Facsimile 415-387-0357

Typed by my husband, John Frykman, and sent on his email.

FROM: Patricia Garber, 895 Rockaway Beach Ave., Pacifica, CA. 94044
TO: Frank Dean, General Superintendent, GGNRA, Park Planning Division
RE: Off-Leash Dog Walking Areas
DATE: March 9, Cabrillo High School Public Meeting

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2011 MAY 23 PM 3:16
AK

I am writing as a Disabled Senior Citizen who uses the public off-leash dog walking areas to exercise my service dog. I am requesting that you continue the current policies regarding dog use at public parks – policies that have provided many otherwise unavailable opportunities for seniors and disabled people to use the beautiful, safe facilities..

Fort Funston provides one of the only opportunity for my service dog to get unleashed exercise. Also, like many other disabled seniors, I am able to enjoy being outdoors in our lovely ocean-side parks and to take advantage of the many social interactions we have while dog walking at Fort Funston. Many of the seniors who, like me, use Fort Funston several times a week, have found exercise and friendships along with a profound enjoyment of the outdoors and scenery – opportunities we would not have without the current policies.

The professional dog walkers have provided me with much needed assistance on many occasions. For example, when I have been unable to exercise my own dog because I was either hospitalized or unable to leave my own house, the professional dog walkers took care of my dog. On days when I have gone to walk my dog, but had difficulty physically navigating the path, the professional dog walkers were always there to give me a hand. I have observed the professional dog walkers frequently encouraging seniors and providing a hand to older disabled people when needed.

There is absolutely no way any disabled senior could manage the steps down to the beach with a leashed dog. Well, there is no way we could manage the steps without a dog, as the stairs are inaccessible to any of us who have trouble walking. You can take a cane, walker, or wheel chair along the path at Fort Funston, as many of us do, but a walker or wheel chair can not go up and down stairs. I don't know what the ADA requirements are for a public park, but Funston is currently accessible as it is now, and will be completely inaccessible if the plans change as proposed.

I read one comment opposing the current of-leash dog policy in which the writer stated that there was no need for such a policy because dog owners could simply take leashed dogs jogging with them. I think I do not need to point out the obvious – that many of us simply cannot move as quickly as a running, happily exercising dog.

The parks provide many valuable uses for our community, including uses for the human community. I pick up after my dog, keep her out of fenced areas, and make sure she presents no harm to any wildlife (such as birds). There are many of us seniors who count on the dog parks for our personal recreation. It is safe, healthy, and beautiful. Please do not make Fort Funston inaccessible to me, to others like me, and to responsible dog owners and walkers in our community.

Seniors like myself are often living on restricted incomes, and it is important for our mental and physical health to have an opportunity to safely socialize with a like-minded community. Fort Funston has resources, such as plants and geologic resources, but it is equally important not to ignore the social resources; the human social resource should be of equal value as the geologic resources.

This, however, begs the point that we users of the park are in conflict with the environment peculiarities of the environment (bird safety, care of the dunes, growth opportunities for specialized plants). To argue that we are in conflict is a false assumption, and to conclude that off-leash dog use (and the people to whom the dogs are attached) are a danger to the flora and fauna of the park is a conclusion that is ineluctably drawn from a false premise. We all guard the plant life, we clean up after our animals, we value the wild animal life (i.e. the birds); in the 5 years that I have walked, limped, or rolled on the path at Fort Funston, I have never observed a dog harming a bird. Someone posted a picture of a dog chasing an injured bird by the beach. That is a peculiar and one-time activity – an activity that neither I nor anyone I have ever asked has seen repeated. Please do not draw a false and harmful conclusion from a one-time, media seeking photo op provided by those who look for ways to cause the GGRNA to change its policy.

Please think of the many seniors and disabled people who happily, safely, and carefully utilize the park opportunity, and continue the current off-leash dog policies that have served many of us so well this past decade.

May 23, 2011

c-page

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2011 MAY 27 AM 9:46

Frank Dean, General Superintendent
Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Building 201
Fort Mason
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

File # 110796
Land Use
Clerk

Dear Superintendent Dean:

I am disabled because I suffer from Bipolar Disorder. I have lived in Marin for over 35 years, and hiked every trail on Mt. Tamalpais, as well as the Marin Headlands, and I worked back in the '70s at Marine Mammal Center. In all those years, we have enjoyed taking our dogs to Rodeo Beach, Fort Funston, Ocean Beach and Crissy Field, as those are the only places they could run off leash. Every dog I've ever owned has been voice-control trained, well behaved, and I have always picked up their feces, plus any others I happen to see.

I now have two huskies, and since I got them, have had knee surgery and several other things which have made hiking impossible for me anymore. As a result, the only places I can take my dogs are the above and dog parks. Huskies need to run, especially young huskies, so I have always been grateful for the GGNRA areas where they can do so. I have learned of your plans to severely restrict off-leash dog walking in the areas I have frequented, and was dismayed to find out about it. I wanted to look into the issue before writing to voice my concerns, and have been even further disturbed to read the Draft Dog Management Plan.

From what I have read, this plan is poorly written, contains inaccuracies and does not address important issues. For one, it doesn't take into account the quality of life in an urban environment where recreation is limited for those of us with dogs who are a large part of our outdoor activities. My quality of life has gone downhill for several years now, and the places I enumerated have become a larger and larger part of my ability to get outdoors. Being outdoors is vital to my mental and physical health, and without places where I can get out with my dogs, my outdoor activities become virtually nil. I can't just go out and sit, nor can I hike any longer; taking the dogs to the beach is important to my health and allows me to get outside without having to walk much. I have always loved the ocean; having been born in the Bay Area, it has always been a huge part of my life.

I was happy when the GGNRA came to this area, as it preserved places like the Marin Headlands, which are close to my heart. We've been frequenting Rodeo Beach all the years we've lived in Marin, I've rescued seals and sea lions there, released them there, and taken my breaks there in the years I worked for Marine Mammal Center. To have Rodeo taken away from my family and our pets is a huge blow. Given it is the Golden Gate RECREATION Area, I can't understand why there is a move to take these areas away from us.

For another, given my mental and physical condition, I live a relatively isolated life. I've been able to meet people, get to know them and their dogs, and now I'm at the point where the only socialization I get is within these groups. I value that highly, and I know most of us won't frequent these areas without our dogs and I will lose contact with those friends. I'm

48

uncomfortable in most social situations and don't have visitors to my home, so I would be even further isolated if I couldn't take my dogs to the beach.

All my dogs have been well socialized from an early age, and I have trained them all myself to walk off leash and be good social inhabitants. If there are not places like this where people can take their dogs to learn to be good citizens, I can envision upcoming generations of pets, not having gotten the chance to be socialized from a young age, being less controllable and causing more problems for their owners and their neighbors. People love my dogs and children get the opportunity to learn not to fear dogs by meeting mine, which is healthy for both the dogs and the children. There are few dog parks available where this is possible and not many bring children to them, so I also fear for upcoming generations of children who miss the opportunity to meet well-behaved dogs. Pets are important to our well being; healthy, well-behaved pets especially so. I can't imagine, in my circumstances, being without my dogs, and my dogs would not be the good citizens they are if I weren't able to socialize them and let them meet other dogs off leash.

Within the "dog management plan" I saw many references to detrimental impacts by off-leash dogs, yet I saw no backup or specifics to indicate their existence HAS been detrimental, only suggestions of how they "might" be. All the dog owners I know are very careful to pick up any animal waste, theirs and others', and we point out to others who might not see their dog eliminating that there is poop to be picked up. We self-police to a degree I find impressive specifically BECAUSE we don't want to impact the environment negatively or cause difficulties for others. My dogs have always been trained to not disturb wildlife and I never allow them to set foot on areas designated as protected. All the other dogs owners I know are the same, and I've yet to see any negative impact caused by dogs in the areas I mentioned, so I don't know where the evidence for deleterious effects by dogs was obtained. I would like to have actual facts taken into consideration before a judgment is made that the environment has actually been affected.

I have personally never seen any dog harass wildlife at any of the places I listed. At Fort Funston and Crissy Field, for example, there are specific areas delegated for wildlife; I've never seen any dogs in those areas and I know personally that people who frequent those areas respect the wildlife and control their dogs. We love the environment as much as or more than most people and want it protected. I see people drop cigarette butts and litter all the time; I see dog people picking UP such things, as do I. People with dogs get out a lot more in places such as this and we treasure these environments.

I've seen very few people at Fort Funston BESIDES people with dogs. It's not an area that is or would ever be popular for many other activities; if people with dogs don't utilize it, I don't think it will be of much value to many other people. It's cold, windy, out of the way and many wouldn't consider it scenic, so I'm not sure how much "recreation" it would provide if it weren't for us. As for Crissy Field and Ocean Beach, if nothing else, I would suggest taking into consideration making perhaps HALF of them no-dog or leash area; they are huge, long beaches which could easily accommodate both those with dogs and those who don't want them around. Rodeo Beach is also not a popular place, partly because of the weather there as well. There are people with dogs out there in even the worst weather, when nobody else would frequent the area, and I've never seen any conflict between off-leash dogs and people there in all the years we have frequented it.

Superintendent Dean

5/23/2011

Page 3

GGNRA was set up as a recreation area; that should include all forms of recreation. Bicyclists, runners, equestrians and others have myriad places in the Bay Area for recreation; only a few places are available to dogs and dog owners. Our form of recreation is as valid as any other and that should be taken into account. The 1979 "pet policy" was set up to recognize dog walking as a legitimate form of recreation; to change that policy would have a negative impact for many in an urban area where there are few "recreation" areas available for dogs and their owners. For decades my family and I have been grateful for the GGNRA; for me personally, it would become essentially useless if this proposed action is implemented. Please give ALL of us the use of the GGNRA equally. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Niki Beecher
120 Spring Grove Avenue
San Rafael, CA 94901

415-454-5305

Nikovich@pacbell.net

cc: Senator Feinstein
Senator Boxer
Congresswoman Pelosi
Congresswoman Speier
Secretary Salazar
Director Jarvis
Director Lehnertz
Mayor Ed Lee
S.F. Board of Supervisors

B05-11, page

COMMISSIONERS
Jim Kellogg, President
Discovery Bay
Richard Rogers, Vice President
Montecito
Michael Sutton, Member
Monterey
Daniel W. Richards, Member
Upland
Jack Baylis, Member
Los Angeles

EDMUND G. BROWN, JR.



1416 Ninth Street
Box 944209
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090
(916) 653-4899
(916) 653-5040 Fax
fgc@fgc.ca.gov

Governor

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Fish and Game Commission

May 24, 2011

TO ALL AFFECTED AND INTERESTED PARTIES:

This is to provide you with a Notice of Receipt of Amended Petition to list the American pika (*Ochotona princeps*) as a threatened species. This notice will appear in the California Regulatory Notice Register on May 27, 2011.

Sincerely,

Sheri Tiemann
Staff Services Analyst

Attachment

49

**CALIFORNIA FISH AND GAME COMMISSION
NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF AMENDED PETITION**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, pursuant to the provisions of Section 2073.7 of the Fish and Game Code, the California Fish and Game Commission, at its May 4, 2011, meeting in Ontario, determined that a 43-page letter dated March 31, 2011, from the Center for Biological Diversity amounted to a substantive amendment of the petition submitted to list the American pika (*Ochotona princeps*) as a threatened species.

The American pika inhabits talus fields fringed by suitable vegetation on rocky slopes of alpine areas throughout western North America.

Pursuant to Section 2073.7 of the Fish and Game Code, the Commission transmitted the amended petition to the Department of Fish and Game for review pursuant to Section 2073.5 of said code. Interested parties may contact Dr. Eric Loft, Wildlife Branch, Department of Fish and Game, 1812 Ninth Street, Sacramento, CA 95811, or telephone (916) 445-3555 for information on the petition or to submit information to the Department relating to the petitioned species.

Fish and Game Commission

May 17, 2011

Jon K. Fischer
Acting Executive Director



[Dog Eat Dogma] A Happy Homeless Baby Boomer Ending in The Financial District.
TimGiangiobbe
to:
board.of.supervisors
05/24/2011 05:06 PM
Show Details

Security:

To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images

Score One for The City of San Francisco.

This homeless baby boomer is quite pleased with the help San Francisco gave Sparky FINALLY after he spent ten years sleeping at this location help with no help from a stubborn trust fund. Until the City lit a fire under the Trusts BUTT.

Sparky(Stacey) Hill lived on the commercial side of this building In the doorway for almost a decade.He is now in The North Beach Hotel.

Sparky Hill is camera shy and that is OK.He said give him about a month inside and then he will have his picture taken when he is sure it ALL WILL NOT END.

He is worried it will stop!

That is normal after spending so many weeks outside.

Sparky has great cognitive function,Thank God HOMELESSNESS has not effected him mentally but the physical implications are not great he has a huge Swollen Leg he must take care of it soon.

He is as stubborn as many men when it comes to doctors.

Other than that this is a HAPPY ENDING for a Homeless Baby Boomer.

Sparky and I spoke of the Gentleman who did not make it off the streets after shuffling around for six months and dying right around the corner from Sparky's spot in the same building on November 29th at the 520 Montgomery street address doorway.

Winter Came Early and claimed a life that day.

It was a shame and a bad ending that we will remind the city about when the year anniversary happens on Nov 29th.That you can BE SURE OF !!


That did not happen to Sparky BUT it was close when he had Pneumonia two years ago.

After being homeless for so long he said the bed was TOO SOFT and he had a hard time sleeping !

He was grinning from ear to ear when visiting.

IT IS SO FRIGGING COOL !!

50



**Sparky slept here for a decade because of NO RESOURCES.
He is the Man who would blow bubbles every day and Read Books.
The BUBBLEHOLIC and BOOKAHOLIC.**

Yes Indeed Homeless OUTREACH you did well here !

Thank You !

There is No Sparky Sleeping but another Baby Boomer already has the same Spot.

How many years will he sleep here ?

San Francisco

PEACE

--
Posted By TimGiangiobbe to Dog Eat Dogma at 5/24/2011 05:06:00 PM



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: busshelter_c.jpg

517C

From: "Richard Skaff" <richardskaff@designingaccessiblecommunities.org>
To: "Susan Mizner" <susan.mizner@sfgov.org>
Date: 05/21/2011 08:51 AM
Subject: busshelter_c.jpg

Well, someone finally found a good use for the new San Francisco bus shelters!

These are the same "shelters" that have one of the back panels that were there to protect people waiting for a transit vehicle from weather/rain removed, apparently to make the shelter accessible!

Richard Skaff
Executive Director
Designing Accessible Communities
PO Box 2579
Mill Valley, CA 94942
Voice/Fax 415 388-7206
Cell 415 497-1091
Email: richardskaff@designingaccessiblecommunities.org
Web: www.designingaccessiblecommunities.org



Sent via BlackBerry from Cingular Wireless busshelter_c.jpg

51

BOS-11
C page



pedestrian-motorist laws..... an "unwell kept secret"

Jack Barry

to:

Eric.L.Mar, Mark.Farrell, David.Chiu, Carmen.Chu, Ross.Mirkarimi, Jane.Kim,
Sean.Elsbernd, Scott.Wiener, David.Campos, Malia.Cohen, John.Avalos,

Board.of.Supervisors

05/24/2011 06:29 AM

Show Details

Supervisors:...

A pedestrian in an unmarked crosswalk has the exact same rights as if "they" were in a marked crosswalk.

The Police NEVER promulgate that fact. If they did, the city would be much more pedestrian-friendly.. The Police are good at doing their "stings" of motorists who do not yield to peds. in marked crosswalks.

Can you ask the Police to publish on their website commonly abused laws such as pedestrians vs. cars.???

j.barry

<http://BarryHillRealtors.com>

JackBarry99@gmail.com

415-564-0225/415-235-7897cell

1627 10th Ave, S.F.,Ca.94122/ DRE#00696713

"

Two, four, six, eight...Time to transubstantiate"

52



Zig! Heil!
Carla Ward to: Board.of.Supervisors

05/20/2011 01:00 PM

Carla Ward	Zig! Heil!
------------	------------

How anti-Semitic of you! What next? A concentration camp on Alcatraz Island? Since most of the ACLU is Jewish, I guess you'll be hearing from them. Wait, I know what's next: Let's ban Sunday Schools! You should have done your homework. This isn't about "male mutilation." It's just plain anti-Jewish. I am sure if you scratch below the surface of this unnamed group, you'll find Neo-Nazis.

53