

FILE NO. 130218

Petitions and Communications received from February 25, 2013, through March 4, 2013, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on March 12, 2013.

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 will not be redacted.

From Clerk of the Board, reporting the following individuals have submitted a Form 700 Statement: (1)

Malia Cohen – Supervisor – Annual
Katy Tang – Supervisor – Assuming
Katy Tang – Legislative Assistant – Leaving
Matthias Mormino – Legislative Assistant – Annual
Amy Chan – Legislative Assistant - Annual

From National Shooting Sports Foundation, Inc., regarding ammunition proposals. File No. 130040. Copy: Neighborhood Services & Safety Committee Clerk. (2)

From concerned citizens, regarding the renaming of SFO. File No. 130037. 4 Letters. Copy: Each Supervisor. (3)

From the Mayor, submitting Notice of Appointment for the Historic Preservation Commission. Copy: Each Supervisor, Rules Committee Clerk. (4)

Jonathan Pearlman
Ellen Johnck

From Supervisor Mark Farrell, submitting a memo regarding the Budget & Finance Committee Schedule. (5)

From the Mayor, submitting issuance of the Oath of Office to the District 4 seat of the Board of Supervisors. Copy: Each Supervisor. (6)

Katy Tang

From concerned citizens, regarding opposition to the Pagoda Palace. File No. 130019. 3 Letters. Copy: Land Use & Economic Development Committee Clerk. (7)

From the Youth Commission, regarding Four Youth Commission actions. File No. 120669. Copy: Land Use & Economic Development Committee Clerk. (8)

From Supervisor Chiu, regarding the updated Government Audit & Oversight Committee Assignments. Copy: Each Supervisor, Government Audit & Oversight Committee Clerk. (9)

From the Controller's Office, submitting a report regarding the Economic Barometer Q4 2012. (10)

From Naomi Kelly, regarding recommendations on the proposed Port of San Francisco's Infrastructure Financing District Policy. File No. 120614. Copy: Each Supervisor, Budget & Finance Committee Clerk. (11)

From Naomi Kelly, regarding certificates of participation for the Moscone Center Expansion Project. File Nos. 130015 and 130016. Copy: Each Supervisor, Budget & Finance Committee Clerk. (12)

From Chris Geiger, regarding the Department of the Environment relocating. (13)

From Supervisor Norman Yee, regarding a Rules Committee Report. Copy: Rules Committee Clerk. (14)

From Department of the Environment, submitting the Annual Urban Forest Report for FY 2011-12. (15)

From Department of the Environment, submitting the 2011 Annual Report: Buy Green Ordinance Program for City Staff. (16)

From Nina Beety, regarding FCC proceeding action needed. (17)

From Roland Salvato, regarding CEQA Legislation. File No. 121019. Copy: Land Use & Economic Development Committee Clerk. (18)

From Mara Rosales, regarding supplemental item to Exhibit J to JCDecaux North America, Inc. protest letter. File No. 130072. Copy: Each Supervisor. (19)

From the Fish and Game Commission, submitting Notice of Findings regarding the white shark. Copy: Each Supervisor. (20)

*From Joan Girardot, submitting a petition regarding Woodhouse Marina Green. File No. 120987. Copy: Each Supervisor, Government Audit & Oversight Committee Clerk. (21)

From concerned citizens, regarding Woodhouse Marina Green. File No. 120987. Copy: Each Supervisor, Government Audit & Oversight Committee Clerk. 3 Letters. (22)

From Beth Weissman, regarding garbage cans and litter. (23)

From concerned citizens, regarding fossil fuels and firearm divestments. File No. 130123. 2 Letters. Copy: Budget & Finance Committee Clerk. (24)

From Isa Isaacs, regarding the renewal of the Uptown Parking Lease. File No. 121185. Copy: Budget & Finance Committee Clerk. (25)

*(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.)

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: March 1, 2013
To: Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors
From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Subject: Form 700

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

Malia Cohen – Supervisor - Annual
Katy Tang – Supervisor – Assuming
Katy Tang – Legislative Assistant - Leaving
Matthias Mormino – Legislative Assistant – Annual
Amy Chan - Legislative Assistant – Annual

From: Board of Supervisors
To: BOS-Supervisors; Evans, Derek; Calonsag, Rana
Subject: File 130040: Letter Re Ammunition Proposals
Attachments: NSSF_Keane_Oppose HP Ammunition Ban _2-25-2013_.pdf


From: Elizabeth Karasmeighan [<mailto:ekarasmeighan@nssf.org>]
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2013 11:09 AM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Letter Re Ammunition Proposals

To the Board of Supervisors:

Please accept the attached letter as the National Shooting Sports Foundation's comments on "Police Code - Possession or Sale of Law Enforcement or Military Ammunition and Police Code - Reporting Ammunition Sales of 500 or More Rounds."

Thank you,
Elizabeth

Elizabeth Karasmeighan
Director of Legislative & Policy Research
National Shooting Sports Foundation, Inc.
11 Mile Hill Road
Newtown, CT 06470-2359
(203) 426-1320 ext. 222
(203) 426-1087 - FAX
ekarasmeighan@nssf.org
www.nssf.org



NATIONAL SHOOTING SPORTS FOUNDATION, INC.

11 Mile Hill Road • Newtown, CT 06470-2359 • Tel (203) 426-1320 • Fax (203) 426-7182 • www.nssf.org

LAWRENCE G. KEANE
SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT
& GENERAL COUNSEL

February 25, 2013

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

Position: OPPOSE

Re: Police Code - Possession or Sale of Law Enforcement or Military Ammunition and Police Code - Reporting Ammunition Sales of 500 or More Rounds

Dear Board of Supervisors:

The National Shooting Sports Foundation (“NSSF”) is the trade association for America’s firearms, ammunition, hunting and shooting sports industry. Our members make and sell the tools used by law-abiding California hunters, target shooters, sportsmen, gun owners, the U.S. military and law enforcement agencies throughout California. This letter is to express our opposition to the proposed amendments to the San Francisco Police Code that would ban hollow-point ammunition and force reporting of ammunition sales of 500 or more rounds.

Hollow-point ammunition is prevalent in the U.S. market. According to a recent NSSF survey of ammunition retailers and manufacturers, hollow-point ammunition comprises about 40 percent of their ammunition sales and production. There have been many unfortunate misconceptions about hollow-point ammunition perpetuated over the years. However, a ban on this type of ammunition would do nothing to reduce crime and could in fact put the general public in a less safe situation.

The primary reason law enforcement officers use hollow-point ammunition is to reduce the risk of bystanders being hit by over-penetrating or ricocheting bullets. Whether the application is for law enforcement or the legal use of the firearm for self defense, the requirement is the same, to quickly neutralize an aggressor to prevent further loss of life, or where it is desirable for the bullet to remain inside the target to prevent collateral damage e.g. Air Marshall on an aircraft, or in private dwelling, an appropriate expanding bullet such as the hollow point is considered the safest to use. Further, the body armor that law enforcement officers are required to wear is much less likely to be penetrated by hollow-point ammunition than by ammunition with a regular full metal jacket.

A ban on hollow-point ammunition would not only impact those that may discharge a firearm to defend themselves or another from a threat of deadly force, but also sportsmen. In fact, hollow-point ammunition was developed in response to the growing interest in handgun and rifle small game/varmint hunting in the 1960s. The rapid expanding characteristic engineered into hollow point rifle bullets insured that the bullet would break up on contact with these very small light skinned animals insuring a humane kill and little to no chance of the bullet exiting the animal, or in the case of a miss, ricocheting off the ground or rock to possibly hit a nearby building or livestock.

There are, of course, exemptions for law enforcement officers, zoo-keepers and others in the ordinance, which begs the question, are ordinary citizens worthy of less protection than government employees? Banning this type of

common ammunition would limit the choices of firearms owners without any evidence the ban would reduce crime. Banning commonly owned ammunition and firearms also raises important Second Amendment issues.

Likewise, a reporting requirement for ammunition sales over a certain threshold is an ineffective policy proposal and would lead to a bureaucratic nightmare. Every year there are about 10 billion rounds of ammunition sold in the United States. Approximately 70 percent of all ammunition purchased is used for legal, recreational target and sport shooting, where the consumption of 1,000 rounds or more is often routine for a weekend trip to the range. Reporting each sale over 500 rounds would overwhelm the police for no useful purpose. The most commonly used and inexpensive target shooting ammunition, .22 caliber rimfire, is frequently sold in packages of 500 cartridges, which would require a retailer to submit a report to the police for each package sold. What exactly would we realistically expect the police to do with each one of these reports of a perfectly normal and lawful retail transaction? There is no benefit to outweigh the onerous implementation challenges of requiring retailers within the city or remote sellers delivering to an address in the city to report such a sale to the police within 24 hours.


In fact, evidence shows that keeping records of ammunition sales is an ineffective law enforcement tool. In 1986, Congress repealed the 1960s-era ban on mail order sales that also required licenses to sell ammunition and the keeping of voluminous detailed purchase logs by licensed dealers. During congressional hearings on the issue, the director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) provided a statement that, "The Bureau and Department have recognized that current recordkeeping requirements for ammunition have no substantial law enforcement value. In addition, their elimination would remove an unnecessary recordkeeping burden from licensees."

These facts have not changed with the passage of time. As recently as July 2012 at the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty, Assistant Secretary of State Thomas Countryman discouraged treaty negotiators from including ammunition, warning of "significant burdens associated with licensing, authorizations, and recordkeeping." He continued, "Our own experience in regulating domestic transfers has shown that there is little utility for law enforcement in imposing the same controls on ammunition transfers as we do on arms. Accordingly, the United States largely eliminated most controls on domestic transfers of ammunition."

In seeking means to reduce violence, we should not expand existing policies that experience shows do not reduce crime. Current federal law already makes it illegal for felons to possess ammunition. People with ill-intentions will find ways to acquire ammunition. Further, despite the fear tactics of the anti-gun lobby regarding criminals stockpiling ammunition for misuse, the empirical evidence demonstrates that criminal shootings involve less than four rounds, on average.

The firearms industry and law-abiding gun owners in California continue to be the most heavily regulated population in the nation. The financial burden that is created with each new measure makes it increasingly more difficult for law-abiding retailers to earn their livelihood and create jobs and tax revenue for the state. The National Shooting Sports Foundation opposes these proposals because they will only serve to increase the regulatory burden on law-abiding licensed firearms retailers and their law-abiding customers who exercise their Second Amendment rights, impose undue cost on the taxpayer, and divert law enforcement resources, all without improving public safety.

Sincerely,



Lawrence G. Keane

BOS-11


File 130037
page

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

February 28, 2013

2013 MAR -1 PM 2:33

To: Melissa Griffin
The Examiner
sfexaminer.com

BY 


Reg: SFO Airport name

cc: SF Supervisors

Dear Ms. Griffin, it is very insightful for you to inform the public about David Campos political purpose for wanting the S.F. Citizens to vote for renaming the SFO airport.

Consideration the confusion it would cause for people living outside of San Francisco and even abroad if San Francisco Airport was just renamed Harvey Milk. How about naming a terminal after Harvey Milk and another one for Willie Brown. Would this meet the diversity/equality fairness advocates?

Yours Truly, Mrs. Joan Leong citizen of the Bay Area



February 26. 2013

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

File 130037

Bos-11

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2013 FEB 27 PM 2:43


I am against renaming The San Francisco International Airport to "Harvey Milk Airport". The airport should only carry the name of our beautiful city, it is well known internationally. Harvey Milk was a local guy, so give his name to some park or street in the city he loved. If you want to do something for the San Francisco International Airport so arrange for a small fill of the bay, I think it is something like 75 feet and build a new runway that could accomodate todays air traffic and eliminate the delays caused by even a small drizzle.

Next thing you can do have the fix the streets, potholes are everywhere and the overhead wires in our streets, it looks like in some Third World Country.

Also do an audit of all the city departments, I am sure that you will find waste in some of them.

By the way, I did vote for Harvey Milk when the voting was at large and I am sure that he would tell you don't name the airport after me.

Sincerely yours


Victor Machacek

From: Board of Supervisors
To: BOS-Supervisors; Wong, Linda (BOS)
Subject: File 130037: NO to a measure changing the name of SFO

From: Sherri Ferris [<mailto:sfsherri@aol.com>]
Sent: Monday, February 25, 2013 4:42 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: NO to a measure changing the name of SFO

Dear Board of Sups:

Please please do NOT spend \$4 million dollars on renaming SFO. Everyone in SF loved Harvey Milk but this is not sound fiscal policy, when there are so many other critical quality of life issues that must be addressed. Pay tribute to him in another way.

Thank you,

Mrs. Henry Miller
Russian Hill

From: Board of Supervisors
To: BOS-Supervisors; Wong, Linda (BOS)
Subject: File 130037: NO re: re: renaming SFO

From: monique carment [<mailto:moniquecarment@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, March 03, 2013 7:03 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: NO re: re: renaming SFO

moniquecarment@yahoo.com e-mail is checked at infrequent intervals as I am using computers at the public library

Phone at # 415-474-7220-----If immediate response needed

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



Orig: Leg Clerk
Bos-11, COB, Leg Dep.
Dep City Atty, Rules Clerk
EDWIN M. LEE
MAYOR
cpage
Acfile

February 26, 2013

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,

Pursuant to Charter Section 4.135, I hereby make the following nominations for the Historic Preservation Commission:


Jonathan Pearlman, Seat 3, formerly held by Charles Chase, for a term ending December 31, 2016

Ellen Johnck, Seat 5, formerly held by Courtney Damkroger, for a term ending December 31, 2016

I am confident that Mr. Pearlman and Ms. Johnck, both CCSF electors, will serve our community well. Attached are their qualifications to serve, which demonstrates how these nominations 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 nominations.

Sincerely,


Edwin M. Lee
Mayor

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



EDWIN M. LEE
MAYOR

Notice of Appointment

February 26, 2013

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to Charter Section 4.135, I hereby make the following nominations for the Historic Preservation Commission:

Jonathan Pearlman, Seat 3, formerly held by Charles Chase, for a term ending December 31, 2016

Ellen Johnck, Seat 5, formerly held by Courtney Damkroger, for a term ending December 31, 2016

I am confident that Mr. Pearlman and Ms. Johnck, both CCSF electors, will serve our community well. Attached are their qualifications to serve, which demonstrates how these nominations 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 nominations.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Edwin M. Lee".

Edwin M. Lee
Mayor

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2013 FEB 26 PM 3:37

JONATHAN PEARLMAN

Curriculum Vitae, January 2013

Career (In San Francisco since 1989)

Principal and Founder, ELEVATIONarchitects, 1995 - present

ELEVATIONarchitects (EA) is a small architecture firm that specializes in residential, commercial and non-profit projects throughout the San Francisco Bay Area with a primary focus in San Francisco. EA works with non-profit organizations on their building needs. In addition to his architectural work, Jonathan is a historical consultant completing Historic Resource Evaluation Reports for dozens of projects since 2004. Current projects include a low-income senior center and housing for Self Help for the Elderly, the renovation of the Alexandria Theater with a 37-unit residential building on 18th Avenue in San Francisco and the rehabilitation of the Hibernia Bank Building, San Francisco Landmark. No. 130. Jonathan has been a licensed architect since 1989 with a California license since 1995.

Jonathan has presented his projects to many San Francisco governmental bodies including: the Planning Commission, Historic Preservation Commission, Board of Permit Appeals, Recreation and Parks Commission, and Board of Supervisors. He has also presented his work to various local agencies including: the Richmond Planning Commission, San Carlos Planning Commission, San Rafael Planning Commission, Los Altos Architecture and Design Review Board and the Los Altos City Council.

Founder, Director, The AIDS/HIV Life Center 1990-98

I worked with the minister of Trinity United Methodist Church which had burned down in 1981 to create a community services building for people with AIDS and HIV at 2099 Market Street, at the corner of 16th and Noe Streets in San Francisco. Although our efforts to build a new building did not come to fruition, we succeeded in securing all of the entitlements for the project, worked with many AIDS service organizations and helped foster new organizations including Under One Roof, the Life Conference Center and Positive Resource. In addition, under the auspices of the AIDS/HIV Life Center, Jonathan managed the renovation of the Bank of America building at 400 Castro Street at Market for the AIDS Health Project. His role included: grant writing, Board relations, staff and office management and architect for agency facility improvements.

Senior Designer, RMW Architects, 1989-91

As a staff member of RMW Architects, I was the Project Designer responsible for the renovation design of Temple Emanu-el and the entry portico to the California Academy of Sciences in Golden Gate Park. For the Temple project, we worked with original linen drawings by the firm of Bakewell and Brown, the architects of San Francisco City Hall, with Bernard Maybeck, who acted as a design consultant. We derived much of the interior design directly from Maybeck's plaster designs that had never been executed.

JONATHAN PEARLMAN

Curriculum Vitae, January 2013

EDUCATION

Bachelor of Arts, Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts, 1980 Major: Art and Architectural History
Master of Architecture, University of Texas at Austin, 1984

COMMUNITY WORK

- The Arc* Member of the Housing Committee to seek housing opportunities for people with developmental disabilities. Assisted in securing two Section 811 grants for \$2.5 million each. (2009-2011)
- Self Help for the Elderly:* Designed and coordinated MOCD-funded elevator replacement in historic downtown office. (2007-2008) Architect for new senior housing and counseling center in Chinatown (2006-2014)
- The Perinatal Council:* Coordinated the design and construction of new office space in Richmond, CA. (2002-2004)
- The NAMES Project::* Volunteered in the workshop 1988 - 1992. Participated in the National Display of the AIDS Memorial Quilt in Washington D.C. in 1988 and 1989
- Positive Resource:* One of the founders of the organization in 1991. Managed the program 1991-1994. Designed its office space and coordinated furniture and material donations (1998-99)
- Asian & Pacific Islander Wellness Center:* Programming merger of GAPA HIV Program and Asian AIDS Project. Designed and coordinated construction of new office space at 730 Polk Street (1996-97)
- AIDS Health Project:* Coordinated the effort to convert the Bank of America building at 400 Castro Street into an AIDS/HIV Community Center for the AIDS Health Project. Raised \$175,000 for renovation; designed and coordinated the construction.

San Francisco and National political campaigns:

- Roberta Achtenberg for Supervisor – 1990
- Cleve Jones for Supervisor – 1992
- Roberta Achtenberg for Mayor – 1995
- Terence Hallinan for District Attorney - 1995
- Bill Clinton for President – 1992 and 1996
- Al Gore for President - 2000

Board Member

- Positive Resource 1991-1994
- The AIDS/HIV Life Center 1995-1998
- Philanthropy By Design 1998-1999

Community Member

- National Trust for Historic Preservation
- SPUR: San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association
- Residential Builders Association
- California Preservation Foundation

HISTORIC STUDY AND ARCHITECTURE (in San Francisco, 1989 – present)

- Member of the San Francisco Landmark Preservation Advisory Board, 2002
- Panel Presentation at the 2003 California Preservation Foundation Conference: Cultural Landscapes: Landmarks of the Gay, Labor and Japanese Communities Panel Discussion with Tim Kelly and Gerry Takano
- Research and writing of landmark nomination for 2362 Market Street, the Jose Theater and home of the AIDS Memorial Quilt. Approved in 2004 as Landmark No. 241
- Article 10 Committee: Evaluation and updating of Planning code section to the historic built environment (2002-2003)

JONATHAN PEARLMAN

Curriculum Vitae, January 2013

Historic Resource Evaluation Reports

Research and authored Historic Resource Evaluations based on CEQA requirements for community, commercial and residential buildings

- The Harding Theater, 616 Divisadero Street, 2005-2006
- The Alexandria Theater, 5400 Geary Boulevard, 2006
- 1746 Post Street, 2006
- 56 Ringold Street, 2009
- 3525 Pacific Avenue, 2010
- 1576 Market Street, 2005, revised 2011

Historic Projects

Lead architect for commercial and institutional buildings that are historic resources:

- Temple Emanu-el, 2 Lake Street (project designer for RMW Architects) (1989-1991)
- California Academy of Sciences (old building) (project designer for RMW Architects) (1990)
- Hamm's Building, 1550 Bryant Street (various projects) (2001-2003)
- AHP Center at 400 Castro Street (1993-95)
- Ninth Street Independent Film Center, 145 - 9th Street (2001-2002)
- Serra Preschool, 7 Funston Avenue in the Presidio (2004-2005)
- Self-Help for the Elderly, 407 Sansome Street (2007)
- Alexandria Theater, 5400 Geary Boulevard (2010-2013)
- Hibernia Bank Building, 1 Jones Street, SF Landmark No. 130 (2009-2013)

Lead architect for renovations and additions to residential buildings that are historic resources:

- * 200-202 Fair Oaks Street (The Oakley House, SF Landmark No. 192)
- 178 Randall Street
- 1495 McAllister Street
- 1847 Scott Street
- 2721 Broderick Street
- 3707, 3711 and 3715- 22nd Street
- 4031 and 4033 - 19th Street
- 2821 Steiner Street
- 2729 California Street
- 2102 Bush Street

HISTORIC RESEARCH AND WRITING (in Boston area 1978-1986)

- Tufts University, Bachelor of Fine Arts in Architectural History, 1980 Honors Thesis, "The Architecture of George Minot Dexter - Link from Bulfinch to the Back Bay"
- Articles on G.M. Dexter's work published in Jordy, William H., Monkhouse, Christopher P., Buildings on Paper, Rhode Island Architectural Drawings 1825-1945, Brown University, the Rhode Island Historical Society and the Rhode Island School of Design, 1982, pgs. 59-60.
- Paper Presentation on G.M. Dexter's work and the development of Brookline, the first streetcar suburb of Boston at the national convention of the Society of Architectural Historians, 1979.
- Research for National Historic Register nomination for Sacred Heart Church, East Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1979
- Research and architectural photography for articles and books by noted New England architectural historian, Margaret Henderson Floyd including: Architecture After Richardson: Regionalism before Modernism - Longfellow, Alden and Harlow in Boston and Pittsburgh
- Research and assisted in the design of the first computer searchable database of historic architectural drawings for MassCOPAR: Massachusetts Committee on the Preservation of Architectural Records, 1978-1980.
- Research assistant to Margaret Henderson Floyd for historic evaluation of the Custom House Tower in Boston (1849 and 1915) for adaptive reuse (Marriott Hotel, completed in 1994), 1986.

Ellen Joslin Johnck, RPA

Environmental and Cultural Resources Permitting, Planning and Management

Education

--M.A. Cultural Resources Management, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, CA

-- B.A., Political Science, Elmira College, Elmira, NY

--Master's Certificate studies in urban and regional planning, University of California, Berkeley

Credentials

Registered Professional Archaeologist (RPA)

Appointee of CA Governors to the California Coastal Commission, North Central Region (1972-1983) and elected Chairman (1982-83)

Candidate for the Nomination of Assistant Secretary of the U. S. Army for Civil Works (Senator Dianne Feinstein) (2005;2009)

Instructor, University of California at Berkeley Ext, Department of Landscape Architecture, "The Cultural Landscape: Preservation and Sustainable Practice"

Affiliations

-National Academy of Sciences' Transportation Research Board Ports and Channels and Marine Environment

-S. F. Bay Trail Board Member
-Society California Archaeology;
California Preservation Founda

Certifications

Women-Owned Small Business Concern (CCR, OBSCR, S.F.City)

Years' Experience: 45

Statement of Qualifications

Ellen Joslin Johnck, RPA is a sole proprietor firm providing project consultant services for environmental and cultural resources planning, permitting and management. These services also include government and community relations and political, legislative and funding strategies. Prior to establishing her business in 2009, Ellen was the founding executive director of the Bay Planning Coalition (1983-2011) and served the dual roles as chief of staff and also consultant to the Coalition's 200 S. F. Bay business and industry members' for permitting in-water and landside projects. (see attached list)

Her project consulting experience are in the areas of marine and shoreside construction; dredging and dredged material beneficial reuse; air and water quality compliance; flood protection and climate change; fish and wildlife habitat restoration; water and shoreside recreation facilities', e.g. marinas, parks and trails; and environmental stewardship.

With the award of a Master's Degree in Cultural Resources Management (CRM) in 2008, Ellen's consulting practice also includes cultural resources management archaeology covering historic resources' surveys, archaeological site and materials recording, monitoring, documentation, and analysis; cultural landscape reports and landscape treatments.

Ellen's work has also involved the creation of stakeholder organizations to achieve collaboration and partnerships and a consensus-based approach for needed infrastructure projects linked to environmental improvements.

Over the course of her career, Ellen has written new and shaped existing, California and federal environmental laws and policy related to Bay fill; public access, water and air quality; dredging and dredged material disposal and beneficial reuse, parks and recreation, fish and wildlife habitat restoration and climate change.



Ellen Joslin Johnck, RPA

Environmental and Cultural Resources Permitting, Planning and Management

PROJECTS: Title, Location, Role

Representative areas of expertise in state and federal agency environmental and cultural resources law and regulations:

- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
- Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act
- McAteer-Petris Act (BCDC)
- CA Fish and Game Code and CA Endangered Species Act
- California Coastal Act
- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA),
- Federal Clean Water Act, Section 404
- National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106
- Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act
- Federal Endangered Species Act
- Federal Magnuson-Stevens Act-(Essential Fish Habitat)
- (partial list)

PROJECT LIST

Environmental permitting; political, legislative and community relations strategy

Current Projects

International Matex Tank Terminal (IMTT) Richmond-CA and Manson Construction (2012-13): Marine Oil Terminal Engineering and Maintenance Standard (MOTEMS) Wharf Modification Project. Securing local, state and federal permits for CBC Section 31f (Marine Oil Terminals) compliance,

Shell Oil Refinery, Martinez, CA: The S. F. Bay to Stockton Channel Deepening Navigation Improvement Project (2012-ongoing). Consulting on funding and legislative strategies and environmental analysis for the USACE, locally cost-shared project.

California State Coastal Conservancy/Moffatt & Nichol Engineers/URS,, South San Francisco Bay Salt Pond

Ellen Joslin Johnck, RPA

Environmental and Cultural Resources Permitting, Planning and Management

Restoration Project Phase 2 (2012-13). Subconsultant on Phase 2 restoration team for the beneficial reuse of dredged material on the south bay salt ponds.

Port of Redwood City, (2012-13): Facilitator for the Bair Island Task Force; planning advisor for the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers' Redwood City Harbor maintenance dredging and the channel deepening feasibility study projects.

Sims Metal Management, Redwood City, CA (2012-2013)
Planning consultant for Sims' community relations plan as well as the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers' Redwood City Harbor maintenance dredging and the channel deepening feasibility study projects.

The Dutra Group, Crescent City, CA: Crescent City Harbor Inner Boat Basin Rehabilitation (2012-ongoing). Providing planning and permitting consulting for the rebuilding program following the Japanese tsunami in 2012.

Recent and Past Projects

Port of San Francisco (1990-ongoing):

- Currently co-chair Maritime Commerce Advisory Committee;
- Pier 14 breakwater funding
- Pier 27-29 QE2 cruise ship emergency dredging; Pier 27 shorepower installation (won PUC support and grants from BAAQMD and EPA); served as a member of the Port's Air Quality Policy Committee; appointment to the Cruise Terminal Advisory Committee by Port E.D. for the analysis and selection of Pier 27-29 as future cruise terminal;
- Advisory to Engineering Dept. with environmental permitting of types of construction materials
- Advisory for Pier 94 wetland restoration planning, permitting and funding;

Port of Oakland (1983-2010): Berths 55-58 and Middle Harbor Shoreline Park planning, funding and permitting assistance; dredging and dredged material reuse in wetland restoration planning, funding and permitting assistance for navigation channel deepening to -38', -42' and -50'.



Ellen Joslin Johnck, RPA

Environmental and Cultural Resources Permitting, Planning and Management

Port of Richmond (1995-2010): Assisted with planning, funding and permitting for parking lot construction using dredged sediment; assisted with resolution of S. F. Bay Trail issues among port tenants and the GGNRA.

Bair Island Restoration/Port of Redwood City (2005-present): Initiated a partnership between the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service to achieve the Port of Redwood City's harbor annual federal maintenance dredging and the beneficial reuse of dredged material as a joint project with the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) 1,400-acre Bair Island habitat restoration and public access plan in the Don Edwards National Wildlife Refuge. I wrote a Memorandum of Understanding identifying Bair Island restoration project goals for the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers and USFWS which has formed the basis for the continuing partnership. The strategic combination of elements including the MOA along with the convening of the public-private entity stakeholder group resulted in the landmark approval of over \$6M in the federal Energy and Water Appropriations for 2010, for the Port of Redwood City Harbor Project. The joint project involves planning and negotiation around such issues as public access, a major sewer pipeline, the adjacent general aviation airport in addition to navigation and habitat restoration. I convened and continue to facilitate the multi-public sector-private sector agency stakeholder group, the Bair Island Task Force today.

Chevron Refinery's Castro Cove Remediation Project, Richmond, Ca (1990-2010): assisted Chevron with advocacy and permit strategy for cleanup plan and wetland creation at the S. F. Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Montezuma Slough wetland restoration project (1999-present), Solano County: Ellen assisted property owner, Jim Levine, as an advisor with local, state and federal agency permitting and funding advocacy for this 1,800-acre, dredged material beneficial reuse site. The site has a 20mcy capacity. About 3mcy has been placed at the site, primarily from the Port of Oakland.

Alameda Marina Village Master Plan, Alameda, and Ca (1972-1982): assisted with the master planning and master plan permit strategy.



Ellen Joslin Johnck, RPA

Environmental and Cultural Resources Permitting, Planning and Management

Open Space/Parks

San Francisco Bay Trail: Founding member in 1990 and continue to serve as a member of the Board of Directors. Ellen was proud to be recognized at the 20-year anniversary for a legacy of projects resulting in 350 miles of the 500-mile Bay Trail goal now completed.

Archaeology and Cultural Resources

CA-MRN-67: Currently recording data from a 6,500 year old shell midden first identified by archaeologist, Nels Nelson in 1900.

Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS) documentation of China Camp Heritage Village, Currently conducting a HALS with a team from HALS of northern California for the last remaining Chinese shrimp harvesting village in S. F. Bay located in China Camp State Park, San Rafael, CA in cooperation with the California State Department of Parks and Recreation and Friends of China Camp.

South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project (2004-present): This 15,100 acre restoration project is the largest tidal wetland restoration project on the West Coast. It was initiated in 2002 with the announcement by the property owner, Cargill, of its intent to the sell the property to the state and federal government for wetland restoration purposes.

- As member of the project consultant team (EDAW), I conducted the background cultural resources survey and historic context reports including the cultural landscape treatment recommendations submitted to the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the lead agency for the NHPA Section 106 evaluation.
- The recommendations in my cultural resources assessment for the 15,000- acre cultural landscape treatment plan have formed the basis for the USFWS' submission to SHPO for determination of eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places.
- I compiled the material for and was the interviewee for an historical interpretive audio tour which is now featured on the website for the San Francisco Bay Wetland Joint Venture: www.sfbjv.org.

A Cultural Resource Study and Supplemental Recording for CA-LAK 1260 and 286. UC Davis' McLaughlin Reserve at Lake, Napa and Solano counties, California.

101 Lombard Street, #217E
San Francisco, CA 94111
ellen.johnck@gmail.com

www.ellenjohnck.com
office: 415-480-4344
cell: 415-297-0920



Ellen Joslin Johnck, RPA

Environmental and Cultural Resources Permitting, Planning and Management

Ellen was Project Coordinator as a member of the Anthropological Studies Center team based at Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, CA for CA-LAK 1260 and 286. Ellen performed surveying and recording tasks for petroglyphs and other cultural materials now stored and recorded in the Archaeological Studies Center and Northwest Information Center, respectively.

Benton District Historic Resources Survey and Inventory in Santa Rosa, CA. Ellen was a member of the survey team led by Diana Painter, Architectural Historian, and Ph.D. Tasks included conducting the Historic District survey plus writing the nomination for Benton District's eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historic Sites.

Submitted by Ellen Joslin Johnck Federal Tax ID: 27-3476967
DUNS #969071336 State of California OBSCR Registered

Member, Board of Supervisors
District 2



City and County of San Francisco

MARK E. FARRELL
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: ANGELA CALVILLO, CLERK OF THE BOARD

FROM: SUPERVISOR MARK E. FARRELL, CHAIR – BUDGET & FINANCE COMMITTEE *mf*

SUBJECT: BUDGET & FINANCE COMMITTEE SCHEDULE

DATE: FEBRUARY 26, 2013

CC: VICTOR YOUNG; RICK CALDEIRA, CATHERINE STEFANI

Please be advised that beginning March 6, 2013, the Budget & Finance Committee will expand to the five-person committee to begin to hear matters related to FYs 2013-2014 and 2014-2015.

I intend for the three-person sub-committee to meet on Wednesdays at 10:00 a.m. and for the full committee to meet at 1:00 p.m. on Wednesdays.

Please let me know if you have any questions. I can be reached at 554-7752.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



orig: HR file
BOS-11
COB, Deputies
Dep City attorney, Budget + Leg
Analyst
EDWIN M. LEE
MAYOR
TA clerk
cpages
AC file
AC 2/27/13

February 27, 2013


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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Under Charter Section 3.100(15), effective today, February 27th, upon issuance of the Oath of Office, I hereby appoint Katy Tang to the District 4 seat of the Board of Supervisors.

The District 4 seat is currently vacant because, pursuant to Charter Section 3.100(15) I have appointed Carmen Chu to Assessor-Recorder, effective today, February 27th. The office of Assessor-Recorder was vacated when the voters elected Phil Ting to serve as California Assemblyman for the 19th Assembly District.

Sincerely,


Edwin M. Lee
Mayor

From: Board of Supervisors
To: BOS Supervisors; Miller, Alisa
Subject: File 130019, Opposition to the Pagoda Palace
Attachments: Pagoda Palace Letter.docx

From: Jared Pool [mailto:jpool83@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2013 9:27 AM
To: mtaboard@sfmta.com; Boomer, Roberta; central.subway@sfmta.com; Board of Supervisors; Chiu, David; Wiener, Scott; Kim, Jane
Cc: Anjali Singh
Subject: Opposition to the Pagoda Palace

To whom it may concern,

My name is Dr. Jared Pool, owner of Washington Square Park Dental. Due to the proximity of the planned Pagoda extraction site to our office, we would like to formally oppose the project.

I have attached a formal letter noting our disapproval and vouching for the viable alternatives.

Thank you for your time.

Dr. Jared Pool

Washington Square Park Dental
1719 Powell Street
San Francisco, CA 94133

(1) opposing the project next-door, (2) pointing out that you believe that the City has reasonable alternatives that would not have a negative effect on your business or any other business, and, lastly, (3) specifically pointing out the ways your business -- the clients, the infrastructure of the building and your employees are likely to be hurt by the project.

Washington Square Park Dental

1719 Powell Street • San Francisco, CA 94133
Phone: 415.609.3779 • Fax: 415.398.4123 • E-Mail: wsparkdental@gmail.com
Web: wsparkdental.com

Date: 02.25.2013

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Dr. Jared Pool, owner of Washington Square Park Dental. We have thirteen employees and treat nearly 3,500 patients a year. Our office is located in North Beach, San Francisco, next-door to the historic remains of the Pagoda Theater.

With the planned demolition of the Pagoda Palace and construction of an extraction shaft, we oppose the planned project due to the negative consequences our clients and staff will face. These negative consequences include: inability to access Powell Street, loss of metered-parking along Columbus Street and Powell Street, and negative noise implications for an office branded to "take care of patients" in a comfortable and relaxing environment.

In our opinion, we believe the City has reasonable alternatives that would not have a negative effect on our business and other businesses surrounding the planned excavation site. These alternatives will allow the Muni extension to occur while negating detrimental side effects to North Beach businesses.

Thank you for your time,

Jared Pool

Dr. Jared Pool
Owner – Washington Square Park Dental

From: John Reed [johnreed@sonic.net] File 130019
Sent: Monday, February 25, 2013 1:56 PM
To: Mike.Sonn@thd.org
Cc: Board of Supervisors; Chu, Carmen; Olague, Christina; Campos, David; Chiu, David; Mar, Eric (BOS); Kim, Jane; Avalos, John; Cohen, Malia; Farrell, Mark; Wiener, Scott; Elsbernd, Sean; True, Judson; Howard Wong
Subject: Proposed diversion of \$9.15 million and further cuts to MUNI
Attachments: PAGODA-THD LETTER 2-20-13 MUNI\$9MillionBusCuts.pdf

Mike Sonn
Chair, Transportation & Parking Committee
Telegraph Hill Dwellers

Dear Mr. Sonn:

Just want to express my sincere thanks to you for your letter (attached) protesting the diversion of \$9.15 million and further cuts to MUNI bus service in North Beach and neighborhoods to fund the Central Subway machine extraction plan.

The fully utilized #15 bus had provided very functional and excellent transportation to downtown with excellent connections to Bart, the MUNI underground and other bus lines. This line ran pretty much parallel to the then overcrowded Stockton Street lines that have different destinations. I don't use a car and the #15 line provided me with very satisfactory and reliable transportation and connections to all my destinations outside of North Beach. This line was eliminated more than 3 years ago and left the many former #15 passengers (including many tourists) on to the already overcrowded Stockton Street route. Not my destination, but my only choice. They have since diverted this line even further out of the way by turning on Sutter and going down Mason to Market. Now that they have crushed all these people on to this one route they want to cut back on service?

Logic is not at work here. Concern for our community is not at work here. I have written and complained about this in the past to apparently deaf ears. I use to be able to walk to the Financial district on occasion, but I'm old and have health limitations and can no longer do that. Nothing has made me more angry with the indifference and arrogance of San Francisco City government than all the shenanigans that have been going on over the blind drive to push this disastrous Central Subway project forward at ANY expense. Public transportation needs to be returned to the Public. Common sense and service to the community needs a lot more consideration than what it's now getting.

Sincerely,

John T. Reed



February 20, 2013

Supervisor Scott Wiener, Chair
Supervisor Jane Kim
Supervisor David Chiu
Land Use & Economic Development Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Proposed diversion of \$9.15 million and further cuts to MUNI bus service in North Beach and neighborhoods to fund Central Subway machine extraction plan

Dear Members of the Land Use Committee:

While we are glad to see that MUNI has dropped its poorly-conceived plan to dig up and close off the middle of Columbus Avenue for years to extract Central Subway drilling equipment for a station many blocks away, we are very concerned to now learn that MUNI's new plan is to divert \$9.15 million out of MUNI's day-to-day operating fund to pay for an extraction site under the Pagoda Theater.

MUNI bus service to North Beach and Telegraph Hill has been slashed continually for years due to operational funding shortfalls. Today, residents and visitors to North Beach no longer have even one direct bus route to or from downtown that runs during non-rush hour times. And in MUNI's proposed new "Transit Effectiveness Plan," service to North Beach would be reduced even further through cuts to the 8X line.

Diverting \$9.15 million in precious funds from MUNI's operational budget will steal that money directly from the bus service we desperately need for an unnecessary drilling machine extraction site we absolutely don't. Instead, we urge you to pursue the less-expensive and less-disruptive alternative to leave the drilling machine under the ground near the final Central Subway stop on Washington Street.

Sincerely,

Mike Sonn
Chair, Transportation & Parking Committee
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
email: Mike.Sonn@thd.org

Cc: Members of the Board of Supervisors
MTA Director Ed Reiskin
Interested North Beach Merchants & Residents

P.O. BOX 330159 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94133 • 415.843.1011 www.thd.org

To: Miller, Alisa
Subject: Four Youth Commission actions: Questions regarding BOS file no. 120669 [Condo Conversion Impact Fee]; resolutions urging the City not to equip juvenile probation officers with firearms and police officers with Tasers; and resolution re: undocumented y
Attachments: 4 Youth Commission Actions (2-27-2013).doc; 1213--10--Urging the SFUSD and City & County to Assist Undocumented Students File for Deferred Action.doc; 1213--11--Urging the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to Urge the San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department Not to Equip SOP Unit Probation Officers with Firearms.doc; 1213--12--Recommending Against the Issuance of Taser Devices to San Francisco Police Department Officers.doc

From: Youthcom [mailto:youthcom@sfgov.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 11:23 AM
To: Lee, Edwin (Mayor); BOS-Supervisors
Cc: Calvillo, Angela; 'matthaney@sfusd.edu'; 'kim-shreemaufus@sfusd.edu'; 'hydramendoza@sfusd.edu'; 'emilymurase@sfusd.edu'; 'JillWynns@sfusd.edu'; 'RachelNorton@sfusd.edu'; 'sandrafewer@sfusd.edu'; 'RichardCarranza@sfusd.edu'; RichardCarranza@sfusd.edu; Suhr, Greg; Siffermann, William; Maria Su; Elliott, Jason; Wheaton, Nicole
Subject: Four Youth Commission actions: Questions regarding BOS file no. 120669 [Condo Conversion Impact Fee]; resolutions urging the City not to equip juvenile probation officers with firearms and police officers with Tasers; and resolution re: undocumented youth

YOUTH COMMISSION

MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Mayor Edwin M. Lee
Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors

CC: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Honorable Members, Board of Education
Richard Carranza, Superintendent, San Francisco Unified School District
Greg Suhr, Chief of Police
William P. Siffermann, Chief, Juvenile Probation Department
Maria Su, Director, Department of Children, Youth and their Families
Jason Elliott, Director of Legislative & Government Affairs, Mayor's Office
Nicole Wheaton, Commissions & Appointments, Mayor's Office

FROM: Youth Commission

DATE: Wednesday, February 27, 2013

RE: Four Youth Commission actions: Questions regarding BOS file no. 120669 [Subdivision Code - Condominium Conversion Impact Fee]; resolutions urging the City not to equip juvenile probation officers with firearms and police officers with Tasers; and resolution regarding City/school district partnership on federal Deferred Action program for undocumented youth

At our regular meeting Tuesday, February 19, 2013, the Youth Commission voted to take no position on BOS file no. 120669 [Subdivision Code - Condominium Conversion Impact Fee]. The Youth Commission urges the Board of Supervisors to consider the following three issues in the ongoing negotiations regarding this proposed legislation:

- The average household income of the owners of Tenancies in Common (TIC) who would be eligible for the condo conversion bypass and fee proposed in this ordinance;
- How the most vulnerable San Franciscans—especially young people, people of color, seniors, queers, single mothers, dependent children and low-income people in general—living in eligible TIC’s could be impacted by this legislation (we wonder if the City could undertake a study of these issues, which could be called an “equity impact analysis”); and
- What the long term impact of this legislation will be on affordability of housing.

At this same meeting, moreover, the Youth Commission adopted resolution *1213—AL10 Urging the SFUSD to create a centralized process and facilitating the application process for students that are eligible for the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program and urging the Board of Supervisors and Mayor to work together with the SFUSD to support our undocumented students and transitionally aged youth.*

This resolution (attached) calls on the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) to join with the City’s Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs (OCEIA) in publicizing the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, an Obama administration policy that provides the federal government with the discretion to defer deportation proceedings for undocumented young immigrants who meet certain qualifications. The resolution also asks the Mayor and the Board to do whatever possible to support our undocumented students and transitionally aged youth.

Please note that this resolution has already born fruit: many thanks to the SFUSD for already creating this centralized web resource for public school students who are eligible for Deferred Action!

In addition to this immigration-related resolution, the Youth Commission adopted two resolutions regarding criminal justice and law enforcement.

Resolution *1213—AL11 Urging the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to urge the San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department not to equip probation officers in the Serious Offender Program unit with firearms* is meant as a contribution to a policy discussion that is currently underway in the City. Last December, San Francisco Chief Juvenile Probation Officer William P. Siffermann announced he was reviewing his department’s safety protocols for juvenile probation officers and was considering revising these protocols to include the provision of firearms for certain juvenile probation officers. Chief Siffermann said at the January 9 meeting of the Juvenile Probation Commission that he plans to present revised protocols in April of 2013.

This resolution acknowledges the Chief’s need to revise safety protocols given the new public safety climate. At the same time, the resolution expresses the Youth Commission’s steadfast opposition to any potential protocols that include providing firearms for juvenile probation officers.

In turn, resolution *1213—AL12 Urging the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to urge the San Francisco Police Department not to acquire stun weapons (Tasers) for police officers* draws on studies from Amnesty International and researchers at UCSF, as well as literature from the American Civil Liberties Union and the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights, in urging the City Family not to move forward with the Police Chief’s proposal to arm police officers with Tasers.

If you have any questions about these items or anything related to the Youth Commission, please don't hesitate to contact our office at (415) 554-6446 or your Youth Commissioner.

President, Board of Supervisors
District 3
第三區
市參事會主席



DAVID CHIU
邱信福

Bos-11, Dep City Attny
COB
Deputies Comm Clerk page
RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
City and County of San Francisco
三藩市市及縣政府
2013 FEB 27 PM 2:29
SAB

February 27, 2013

To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Re: Updated Government Audit and Oversight Committee Assignments

Madam Clerk,

Following Mayor Lee's appointment of former Supervisor Carmen Chu to the office of Assessor-Recorder and of Katy Tang as Supervisor, I am pleased to transmit the following updated assignments to the Government Audits & Oversight Committee. These assignments are effective immediately.

Government Audits & Oversight

Malia Cohen, Chair
Katy Tang, Vice Chair
David Campos, Member

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "David Chiu".

David Chiu

From: Toy, Debbie [debbie.toy@sfgov.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 10:29 AM
To: Calvillo, Angela; BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; Howard, Kate; Falvey, Christine; Campbell, Severin; Newman, Debra; Rose, Harvey; sfdocs@sfpl.info; gmetcalf@spur.org; jlazarus@sfchamber.com; dconaghan@sfchamber.com; joe@sanfrancisco.travel; Lane, Maura; CON-EVERYONE
Subject: Controller's Office Report: Economic Barometer Q4 2012

Today the Controller's Office is re-launching its Economic Barometer report as a website. The website will be continuously updated with new economic data as it becomes available. Every three months, the quarterly summary will be updated to subscribers to this email.

We hope the site will be useful for Economic Barometer readers who want deeper access to economic data on San Francisco, and the ability to make their own tables and charts, as well as read a snapshot of the latest economic trends.

The website can be accessed at <http://sfbarometer.weebly.com>

If you would like to remove yourself from these emails, you may update your preferences here:
<http://sfcontroller.org/index.aspx?page=474>

CCSF Controller's Office
City Hall, Room 316
San Francisco, CA 94102
Tel: 415-554-7500
Fax: 415-554-7466
Email: controller@sfgov.org



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Office of the Controller

Ben Rosenbly, Controller



Search Econc

[Home](#)[Quarterly Summary](#)[Economy-Wide](#)[Real Estate](#)[Visitors](#)[Retail Commerce](#)[Demographics](#)[Build Your Own](#)*Office of Economic Analysis*

Economic Barometer

About the Economic Barometer:

The purpose of the Economic Barometer is to provide the public, elected officials, and City staff with a current snapshot of San Francisco economic indicators. Economic Barometer reviews general economy-wide employment indicators, as well as major sectors of the City's economy, including real estate, tourism, and

In January 2013, changes were made to the format and content for the Economic Barometer. Significant changes include:

- Issuance of the Economic Barometer will now be on a quarterly basis rather than a bi-monthly basis.
- Indicators will be updated at www.sfbarmeter.weebly.com. PDF of the quarterly summary will be downloadable on the website.
- The website will include data visualizations of the economic indicators.
- Some indicators have changed.
- Data on the website will be updated throughout the quarter as it becomes available.

Program Team:

For more information, contact:

Ted Egan, Chief Economist
(415) 554-5268
ted.egan@sfgov.org

Jay Liao, Economist
(415) 554-5159
jay.liao@sfgov.org



CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Office of the Controller
Ron Rosenthal, Controller



Search Econo

Home

Quarterly Summary

Economy-Wide

Real Estate

Visitors

Retail Commerce

Demographics

Build Your Own

City and County of San Francisco
Controller's Office
Economic Barometer - December 2012



Economic Indicator	Period	Value	Period-to-Period % Change*	Year-to-Year % Change	Five-Year Trend ^b
Economy-Wide					
San Francisco Unemployment Rate	November 2012	6.7%	1.3%	-15.2%	
Total Employment, San Francisco IJD	November 2012	998,600	-0.2%	3.4%	
Temporary Employment, San Francisco IJD	November 2012	9,700	-0.4%	1.0%	
Consumer Price Index, San Francisco (ISA)	December 2012	240	-0.3%	2.2%	
County Adult Assistance Program Caseload	December 2012	6,757	-1.1%	-6.1%	
SF 20 Stock Index	December 2012	87.0	2.9%	4.4%	
Real Estate					
Zillow Home Price Index	December 2012	\$770,600	0.7%	17.6%	
Office Vacancy Rate	Q4 2012	11.8%	-8.1%	-19.2%	
Office Average Class A Asking Lease Rate	Q4 2012	\$54	3.2%	16.9%	
Visitors					
Domestic Air Passengers	December 2012	2,705,503	-3.5%	-0.4%	
International Air Passengers	December 2012	731,809	-2.4%	2.1%	
Hotel Revenue Per Average Room	December 2012	\$124	1.4%	14.3%	
Powell St. BART Average Saturday Exits	December 2012	31,173	-1.9%	0.0%	
Retail					
Sales Tax Revenue	Q3 2012	\$34,868,507	0.12%	-4.81%	

Notes:
 a) Period-to-Period % Change uses seasonally-adjusted data.
 b) Five-Year Trend uses seasonally-adjusted data and the SF 20 index spanning in a 2-year trend due to availability of data.



File 120614
Capital Planning Committee BOS-11
B+Feldek

Naomi M. Kelly, City Administrator, Chair

MEMORANDUM

January 2, 2013

To: Supervisor David Chiu, Board President
From: Naomi Kelly, City Administrator and Capital Planning Committee Chair
Copy: Members of the Board of Supervisors
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Capital Planning Committee

Regarding: Recommendations of the Capital Planning Committee on the proposed Port of San Francisco's Infrastructure Financing District (IFD) Policy

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2013 FEB 27 PM 1:03

In accordance with Section 3.21 of the Administrative Code, on December 17, 2012, the Capital Planning Committee (CPC) reviewed a capital-related policy proposal by the Port of San Francisco to be considered by the Board of Supervisors.

Board File Number TBD: **Consideration of the Port of San Francisco's proposed Infrastructure Financing District (IFD) policy.**

Recommendation: By a vote of 11-0, the CPC recommended approval of the Port IFD Policy with an amendment that the nexus study be updated at intervals no longer than every ten years.

Comments: Committee members or representatives voting in favor include: Naomi Kelly, City Administrator; Judson True, Office of the President of the Board of Supervisors; Ed Reiskin, Director of the SFMTA; Kate Howard, Mayor's Budget Director; John Rahaim, Director of Planning; Ben Rosenfield, Controller; Douglas Legg, Department of Public Works; Harlan Kelly, General Manager of SFPUC; Dawn Kamalanathan, Recreation and Parks Department; Elaine Forbes, Port of San Francisco; and Julia Dawson, San Francisco International Airport.



Capital Planning Committee

BOS-11 cpage
B/F
duk

Naomi M. Kelly, City Administrator, Chair

MEMORANDUM

January 14, 2013

To: Supervisor David Chiu, Board President

From: Naomi Kelly, City Administrator and Capital Planning Committee Chair

Copy: Members of the Board of Supervisors
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Capital Planning Committee

Regarding: Authorization and Supplemental Appropriation Request to Issue up to \$507,880,000 in Certificates of Participation (COPs) for the Moscone Center Expansion Project

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2013 FEB 27 PM 1:03

In accordance with Section 3.21 of the Administrative Code, on January 14, 2013, the Capital Planning Committee (CPC) reviewed one authorization of debt issuance and a related supplemental appropriation request.

1. Board File Numbers 130015 and 130016

Authorization and Supplemental Appropriation to Issue up to \$507,880,000 in Certificates of Participation (COPs) for the Moscone Center Expansion Project

Recommendation:

Recommend the Board of Supervisors (BOS) approve the authorization and the supplemental appropriation on the condition that the Moscone Expansion District formation is approved by the BOS.

Comments:

The CPC recommends approval of these items by a vote of 11-0.

Committee members or representatives in favor include: Naomi Kelly, Office of the City Administrator; Judson True, Board President's Office; Kate Howard, Mayor's Budget Office; Ed Reiskin, SFMTA; Mohammed Nuru, Public Works; John Rahaim, Planning Department; Ivar Satero, San Francisco International Airport; Ben Rosenfield, Controller's Office; Todd Rydstrom, SFPUC; Toks Ajike, Recreation and Parks Department; and Elaine Forbes, Port of San Francisco.

From: Board of Supervisors
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: The San Francisco Department of the Environment is moving on Friday, March 1st!

From: Geiger, Chris
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2013 5:57 PM
To: Geiger, Chris
Subject: The San Francisco Department of the Environment is moving on Friday, March 1st!

Though we're only moving a couple blocks up Market Street, we're looking forward to the change. All department staff and interns will be located on one floor in a LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) certified office that has an open floor plan, plenty of natural light and a variety of meeting spaces, including our new Eco-Center.

Our current 11 Grove location will be closed as of 1:30 pm, Thursday, February 28th, and our new office will reopen to the public beginning 9am, Tuesday, March 5th.

During that transition time, we ask for your patience since we will not be able to receive calls, faxes or visits. However, we can receive emails during that time.

All email, phone and fax numbers will remain the same.

Our new address is:
San Francisco Department of the Environment
1455 Market Street, Suite 1200
San Francisco, CA 94103
[Click here for map of new location](#)

Please update your records to reflect this change.

We look forward to seeing you at our new space!

Many thanks,



Chris Geiger, Ph.D.
Integrated Pest Management &
Green Purchasing Programs
San Francisco Department of the Environment
Vote now to nominate San Francisco as Greenest City!

Our NEW address, as of March 2013:
1455 Market Street, Suite 1200, San Francisco, CA 94103
chris.geiger@sfgov.org T: (415) 355-3759 @cgeiger4

Member, Board of Supervisors
District 7



*orig: Rules Clerk
c: COB, Leg. Dep
cpage*
City and County of San Francisco

NORMAN YEE

DATE: February 27, 2013
TO: Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
FROM: Supervisor Norman Yee
RE: Rules Committee
COMMITTEE REPORT

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2013 FEB 28 AM 11:42

Pursuant to Board Rule 4.20, as Chair of the Rules Committee, I have deemed the following matters to be of an urgent nature and request it be considered by the full Board on March 12, 2013, as a Committee Report:

130209 [Appointment, Historic Preservation Commission – Jonathan Pearlman]

Motion approving/rejecting the Mayor's nomination for appointment of Jonathan Pearlman to the Historic Preservation Commission, Seat No. 3 for a term ending December 31, 2016.

130210 [Appointment, Historic Preservation Commission – Ellen Johnck]

Motion approving/rejecting the Mayor's nomination for appointment of Ellen Johnck to the Historic Preservation Commission, Seat No. 5, for a term ending December 31, 2016.

These matters will be heard in the Rules Committee on March 7, 2013, at 1:30 p.m.

From: Rodriguez, Guillermo
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2013 10:45 AM
To: Board of Supervisors
Cc: Fish, Monica
Subject: ANNUAL URBAN FOREST REPORT for Fiscal Year 2011-12
Attachments: 2012 Annual Report FINAL.pdf

Transmitted via Email

February 28, 2013

Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 2244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Supervisors,

In accordance with Environment Code Section 12, Section 1209(a), Urban Forestry Council Ordinance, an Annual Report on the state of the urban forest is to be transmitted to the Board of Supervisors. The attached Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2011-12 contains a review of the quality of urban forest stewardship and an assessment of how well public agencies and other urban forest managers are implementing the Urban Forest Plan.

If you have any questions or require paper copies, please contact me at (415) 355-3756.

Best,

Guillermo Rodriguez
Director, Policy & Communications
San Francisco Department of the Environment
Vote now to nominate San Francisco as Greenest City!

Our NEW address, as of March 2013:
1455 Market Street, Suite 1200, San Francisco, CA 94103
guillermo.rodriguez@sfgov.org T: (415) 355-3756



SF Environment

SFEnvironment.org [Newsletter](#)
[Facebook](#) [Twitter](#)

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

ANNUAL URBAN FOREST REPORT

JULY 1, 2011-JUNE 30, 2012



Submitted to Mayor Edwin M. Lee and the Board of Supervisors by SF Environment and the Urban Forestry Council, pursuant to San Francisco Environment Code Chapter 12 Sec. 1209.

Overview of San Francisco's Urban Forest, FY 201-212

SF Environment staff surveyed 19 city departments and non-government organizations that oversee or manage a portion of the urban forest in San Francisco. Departments were queried on forestry budget, resources, and maintenance activities for fiscal year 2011-2012. Of the 19 organization surveyed 13 provided full or partial responses.

This data is tracked to:

- To better understand the resources used to maintain the urban forest across city departments.
- To track the priorities, needs, and concerns of city departments and local nonprofits, and monitor how they change over time.
- To better understand threats to the future well-being of our urban forest.
- To find ways to increase the contributions that trees provide to our community.

In fiscal year 2011-2012, reporting organizations **planted 3,760 trees and removed 723 trees**, compared to the previous year where 2,753 trees were planted and 1,011 trees were removed.

Friends of the Urban Forest (FUF), the Department of Public Works (DPW), the Recreation and Park Department (RPD), and the Presidio Trust (Trust) had the most active tree planting programs. City agencies and nonprofits **provided maintenance to 15,943 trees**. The same four organizations as well as San Francisco International Airport (SFO) and Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) were the most active in tree care.

San Francisco agencies reported approximately **121 staff positions that dedicate a portion of their time to urban forest programs**. Of these staff positions, approximately **76 staff only work on planting and maintaining trees**. While this is generally on par with the previous year's reporting, individual department responses are not consistent year-to-year. Comparing programming of the most active and consistently responsive departments and organizations:

- Friends of the Urban Forest decreased overall staff that spend a portion of their time on forestry maintenance activities to **7.5 FTE this year from last year's 13.5 FTE** and increased staff that only work on trees to **7.5 FTE this year from last year's 3.5 FTE**.
- The Recreation and Park Department **reduced forestry program staff to 25 FTE down from 29 FTE in last year's report**.
- The Department of Public Works had the greatest staffing reduction; **reducing staff to 41 FTE from the previous year's 59 FTE**. DPW also reduced staff that only work on trees to **26 FTE from 29 FTE in last year's report**.

Together, DPW and RPD **reduced overall forestry staffing by 22 full-time positions, a 25% total staff reduction**. Forestry specific staff was reduced by 3 FTE, a 5% staff reduction.

Consistent with earlier reports, departments and agencies identified staffing constraints as their greatest limitation, followed closely by funding constraints. Additionally, the loss of trees due to age and/or disease and inability to provide adequate care for newly planted trees were the most significant concerns for forestry managers.

List of Participating Agencies

The following organizations and city departments responded to the survey:

- Department of Public Health, General Hospital (DPH)
- Department of Public Works (DPW)
- Friends of the Urban Forest (FUF)
- Municipal Transit Authority (MTA)
- Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)
- Port of San Francisco (PORT)
- Presidio Trust (Trust)
- Public Utilities Commission, City Distribution Division (PUC)
- Recreation and Park Department (RPD)
- San Francisco International Airport (SFO)
- San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD)
- Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA)
- University of California, San Francisco (UCSF)

The following organizations and departments were queried and did not respond:

- A Living Library
- City College of San Francisco
- Golden Gate National Recreation Area
- Department of Public Health, Laguna Honda Hospital
- San Francisco Housing Authority
- San Francisco State University

Please note: While this report seeks to be as comprehensive as possible, it is based on data provided by responding agencies and does not include complete information on all urban forestry work performed within the City of San Francisco.

Major opportunities and challenges reported by participating organizations

Management of San Francisco's urban forest is divided among many stakeholders who provide direct care to trees within land under their jurisdiction, as well as nonprofit organizations who engage with agency partners to support forestry activities on city-owned land.

The **San Francisco Department of Public Health** (DPH) has many facilities with on-site trees, though the General Hospital Facility was the only site to respond to this year's survey. The hospital continues to report concern with the health and upkeep of trees on this site.

The **Department of Public Works** (DPW) began transferring maintenance responsibility of trees they formerly maintained to the adjacent property owners. This is a result of budget cuts and a continuing lack of stable funding for their arborist crews, which they have reported for several years. DPW continues to be concerned with the lack of funding, long-term financing for tree care, and public response to tree maintenance transfer. They additionally note that illegal pruning is a very serious concern, which results in a loss of structural integrity even if the tree survives.

Friends of the Urban Forest (FUF) provides an estimated mortality rate of 4000 street trees per year and an estimated 2,350 street trees planted per year. They are concerned that funding cuts have reduced the number of trees planted by the city and point to a need to increase tree planting levels to ensure that the city is not losing tree canopy coverage. Additionally, FUF is concerned with budget cuts that have led to DPW's relinquishment of tree care. FUF believes that while DPW has no choice due to chronic budget cuts, it is a disastrous move for the health and growth of the San Franciscan Urban Forest. FUF identifies a need to improve the overall care of street trees, noting poor pruning practices that result in damage to trees. Additionally, FUF is concerned with future funding to maintain their programs.

The **San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency** (MTA) reports concerns with community interface regarding how the agency should care for trees within their jurisdiction, along with a lack of adequate resources and complications related to hiring competent tree specialists.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) identified public safety and service reliability issues related to the inability to effectively prune palm trees growing near power lines, the difficulty in safely pruning trees near cars, and the potential hazards trees pose to the electric facilities after car-caused damage.

The **Port of San Francisco** (PORT) worked with the Department of Public Works and contracted a specialist to diagnose and recommend a plan to replace the dead palms and to care for the remaining palms along the Embarcadero. Based on DPW's recommendation, the Port replanted 4 palms and implemented the treatment plan for the remaining palms. They are highly concerned with any future loss of these palms, due to the significant replacement cost of approximately \$30K per tree.

The **Presidio Trust** (Trust) oversees approximately 70,000 trees in San Francisco, with over 10,000 trees under active management. Their greatest concern is the age and vitality of the Presidio's Historic Forest.

The **San Francisco Public Utilities Commission** (PUC) transferred their forester position from the City Distribution Division to the Natural Resources Lands Management Division. The CDD expressed concern that there is no concomitant requirement to perform former Forester's functions within the city and county.

The **Recreation and Park Department** (RPD) expressed continuing concern with loss of staff and adequate resources for programmatic maintenance of their estimated 131,000 trees. In previous years, RPD noted that Urban Forestry program staffing continued to decline due to inability to fill position vacancies.

The **San Francisco International Airport** (SFO) is in the process of performing a comprehensive tree inventory to prioritize operations and project future needs. They performed soil testing to mitigate health issues with some plantings and are focused on healthy soil management, moving towards an organic-based fertilizer program. As their urban forest matures, maintenance of trees around freeway ramps and buildings will increase. They are primarily concerned with the logistics of performing these operations around heavily-trafficked areas.

The **San Francisco Unified School District** (SFUSD) has doubled the number of organizations planting trees within their jurisdiction, while their budget for equipment and personnel has not increased. Their greatest concerns are related to inappropriate species selection, how existing trees may be affected by climate change, and how these issues coupled together may result in property damage and create public safety issues. SFUSD appreciates the efforts of their gardeners and contractors, while noting that their lack of forester staff positions is a significant constraint.

The **Treasure Island Development Authority** (TIDA) expresses concern about tree health and the need for better pre-identification and removal of diseased trees.

The **University of California, San Francisco** (UCSF) continues to report concerns with the health of their aging forest and budgetary constraints.

Responses from the 2011 Annual Urban Forest Report Survey

Table 1: Respondents were asked about staffing and budget:

Department	Urban forest-related staff positions	# Staff (or FTE equiv) performing only forestry work	Total department budget	Urban forestry related budget	Est. % of UF budget spent on tree planting, care, and removal	
					Amount	%
DPH	2.5	0*	\$1M	~\$25K	\$10K	40%
DPW	41	26	\$162.5M	\$5.5M	\$2.2M	40%
FUF	7.5 FTE	7.5 FTE	\$1.7M	\$947K	\$947K	100%
MTA	3	0	no answer	~\$200K	~\$20K	~10%
PG&E	1	5*	no answer	no answer	no answer	no answer
PORT	2	0	\$66.3M	\$167K	\$30K	18%
Trust	10	10	no answer	no answer	no answer	no answer
PUC	0	0	unknown	0	unknown	100%
RPD	25	25	\$127.8M Operations Budget	\$3.5M	\$3.5M	100%
SFO	16	1.6 FTE*	no answer	\$85K	\$35K	41%
SFUSD	10	0*	\$1M	\$60K	\$60K	100%
TIDA	2	0*	~\$8.3M	~\$824K	~\$24.7K	~3%
UCSF	1	less than 1*	\$8 million	~\$100K	~\$100K	100%
TOTAL:	121 FTE	~76 FTE	\$376.6M	\$11.4M	\$6.9M	60.5%

*Department utilized services of contractors and/or included forestry work within non-forestry specific staff workloads. For these departments, there may be additional unknown staffing hours and/or equivalent FTE staffing hours are estimated.

Table 2: Respondents were asked about work plans:

Depart.	How many trees within the department's purview were:			Work the department performed for others:	Work other departments performed for the departments or org:
	Planted	Cared for	Removed		
DPH	6	400	0	None	DPW cared for 20 trees and removed 2
DPW	923	3,155	201	PUC contracted care of ~75 trees and removal of ~20 trees. SFHA contracted care of ~200 trees and removal of ~35 trees.	None
FUF	1170	2,795	0	None	None
MTA	6	41	0	None	Private contractors pruned 35 trees.
PG&E	0	~2,000	29	None	Private contractors performed forestry inspection work and work noted on left.
PORT	6	30+	8	None	DPW planted 4 trees and removed 6 trees.
Trust	500	~4,600*	120	None	None
PUC	0	unknown	~ 20		RPD performed forestry management services. Totals provided not provided.
RPD	817	572	276	PUC contracted forestry management services. Totals not provided.	Private contractors planted 218 trees, cared for 66 trees, and removed 443 trees.**
SFO	~ 150	2,600	5	CalTrans contracted planting of 100 trees and care of 400 trees.	Private contractors removed 5 trees.
SFUSD	100	500	40	None	Nonprofits, community groups, and Private contractors planted 50 trees, cared for 740 trees, and removed 70 trees.
TIDA	0	0	0	None	DPW cared for ~200 trees and removed ~65 trees. Private contractors cared for ~500 trees.
UCSF	82	~250	24	None	Private contractors planted 82 trees, cared for ~150 trees, and removed 22 trees.
Totals:	3,760 trees	15,943 trees	723 trees	3 Departments performed work for other departments	10 Departments contracted forestry services

*Note: 3,600 trees are under active Reforestation Management. Care activities associated with these trees may be atypical for other agencies or may represent work not typically included in other agency responses.

**Note: additional tree planting to replace these hazardous removals will occur in FY12-13

Table 3: Respondents were asked to rate commonly cited urban forest-related concerns on a 1-5 scale, with 1 being "not significant" and 5 being "extremely significant"

Department	Loss of significant numbers of trees due to age and/or disease	Inability to provide adequate care to established trees	Inefficiencies in the way forestry programs operate on a city-wide basis	Inability to provide adequate care to newly planted trees	Loss of significant numbers of trees due to development	Loss of significant numbers of trees due to vandalism, illegal pruning, and/or illegal removal
DPH	2	2	4	1	4	1
DPW	4	5	4	2	4	4*
FUF	4	5	4	3	2	4
MTA	3	4	4	2	1	1
PG&E	no answer	no answer	no answer	no answer	no answer	no answer
PORT	5	3	2	3	4	1
Trust	no answer	no answer	no answer	no answer	no answer	no answer
PUC	5	5	2	4	1	1
RPD	5	5	4	2	1	5
SFO	1	2	n/a	1	1	1
SFUSD	4	5	3	5	4	1
TIDA	5	3	1	1	1	1
UCSF	5	2	3	2	2	4
TOTAL	43	41	31	26	25	24
AVERAGED TOTAL	3.9	3.7	3.1	2.4	2.3	2.2

*Note from DPW: While trees are not always lost when they are pruned illegally, it is a very serious concern due to loss of structural integrity if the tree survives

Table 4: Respondents were asked commonly cited limitations that affect their forestry programming on a 1-5 scale, with 1 being "not significant" and 5 being "extremely significant"

Department	Staffing constraints	Funding constraints	Lack of coordinated efforts to protect and manage the overall urban forest	Lack of management plan	Prioritization of urban forestry programs within your agency/the city at large	Lack of tree inventory
DPH	3	3	4	4	3	2
DPW	5	5	2	3	2	3
FUF	1	5	5	5	1	5
MTA	5	3	3	4	5	1
PG&E	no answer	no answer	no answer	no answer	no answer	no answer
PORT	5	1	4	3	4	1
Trust	no answer	no answer	no answer	no answer	no answer	no answer
PUC	5	5	5	5	5	5
RPD	5	5	3	3	4	2
SFO	2	1	1	2	2	1
SFUSD	5	5	4	4	2	1
TIDA	1	3	1	1	2	3
UCSF	5	5	4	2	2	2
TOTAL	42	41	36	36	32	26
AVERAGED TOTAL	3.8	3.7	3.3	3.3	2.9	2.4



SF Environment

Our home. Our city. Our planet.

A Department of the City and County of San Francisco



EDWIN M. LEE
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

Transmitted via Email

February 28, 2013

Ms. Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 2244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Angela,

In accordance with Environment Code Section 2, Section 203(g), Environmentally Preferable Purchasing Ordinance, an annual review and report to the Commission and Board of Supervisors is required on the progress of City departments towards full compliance with this Chapter. The Commission on the Environment has approved the *2011 Annual Report: Buy Green Ordinance Program for City Staff* at its meeting on January 22, 2013, and it is attached for transmittal to the Board of Supervisors.

If you have any questions or require paper copies, please contact me at (415) 355-3756.

Best,

Guillermo Rodriguez
Department of the Environment

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2013 FEB 28 PM 4:30
PN

116



SF Environment
 Our home. Our city. Our planet.



EDWIN LEE
 Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
 Director

2011 Annual Report: Buy Green Ordinance Program for City Staff

Presented to the San Francisco Commission on the Environment

January 22, 2013

Prepared by San Francisco Department of the Environment (SFE): Jessian Choy and Chris Geiger

Assisted by: Alicia Culver and Marci Yellin, Responsible Purchasing Network

[Click to see City staff that bought green, limited use, or prohibited batteries, computers, cleaners, lighting \(p. 5-20\).](#)

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary	2
II. Introduction	2
A. History and Mandate	2
B. Development of Green Product Specifications	2
C. Summary of Past Annual Reports	2
D. Staff That Worked on Green Citywide Contracts in 2011	3
II. Accomplishments	3
A. City Staff That Bought Green or Prohibited Products	3
B. Buy Green Club of Year Award	3
C. New Green Citywide Contracts and Products	3
D. Outreach	3
III. Ideas to Help the City Buy Green and Save Money	3
A. In performance appraisals, write the percent of green products staff bought	3
B. It would help if Citywide contracts required online stores with no prohibited products	3
C. Revamp City purchasing software to steer staff to buy green	3
IV. Table A. Summary of green purchases	4

I. Executive Summary

SFE and Office of Contract Administration (OCA) lead the implementation of the ordinance requiring City staff to buy green products listed on SFApproved.org. Green products can be less-toxic, energy-efficient and made with recycled or recyclable materials. In 2011, 83% of \$3.6 million dollars of purchases by the City were green in the targeted categories of computers, cleaners, lighting, and batteries (according to sales reports from Citywide contracted vendors). The percentage of green computers and computer servers increased from 81% in 2010 to 88% in 2011. SFE also improved SF Approved.org so users can rate products and share any page on social media.

II. Introduction

A. History and Mandate

San Francisco has been buying green since the 1980s, but purchasing requirements were scattered among several ordinances. In 1998, the City launched the Environmentally Preferable Purchasing Pilot Program which:

- Inventoried and assessed hazardous chemical products bought by City departments
- Established environmental and health criteria
- Compared costs between green and conventional products
- Set priorities and field tested products with City departments

In 2003, San Francisco became the first city in the nation to adopt the Precautionary Principle. That means, based on the best available science, the City must buy products that present the least potential threat to our health and the environment. In 2005, San Francisco enacted the Precautionary Purchasing Ordinance (Environment Code, Chapt. 2). This ordinance was groundbreaking in requiring City funds to be used for approved alternative ("green") products, now summarized at SFApproved.org. The Ordinance also consolidated disparate green purchasing requirements in one place in the Environment Code.

B. Development of Green Product Specifications

SFE works with City departments and OCA to develop green specifications for City commodity and service contracts. These specifications consist of recommendations for products to be certified by third-party ecolabels, such as Energy Star or Green Seal, or include lists of specific products. After contracts are awarded, green products and specifications are listed on SFApproved.org. Our primary goals for product selection are maximum performance, minimum impact, and lowest cost:

1. Performance: Does the product work well? Is it durable? Does it make efficient use of resources? SFE works with City staff and established Green Teams to obtain information on product performance.
2. Impact: SFE takes the lead role in assessing impacts on our health and environment.
3. Cost: Is it cost-effective in its manufacturing, use and disposal (life cycle) compared to its alternatives? Office of Contract Administration is responsible for obtaining the best possible prices on City purchases.

SF Approved products fall into four categories: Required, Suggested, Limited Use, and Prohibited.

- Required green products. These products meet all goals above and can save money because they are in City contracts. "Required" products generally meet all three goals above (performance, impact and cost effectiveness). Departments are required to buy *only* these products.
- Suggested green products. These products meet San Francisco's environmental and health criteria. Some products may need more research on cost or performance. City departments are encouraged to try these products and rate them at SFApproved.org so they might be included in future contracts.
- Limited use products are permitted for purchase only when required or suggested products do not meet performance requirements; for example, some less-efficient light bulbs may be permitted until a retrofit of light fixtures can be completed.
- Prohibited products are sometimes listed on SFApproved.org to remind purchasers of existing mandates prohibiting their use; for example, magnetic ballasts are specifically prohibited for new lighting installations. However, not all prohibited products are listed.

C. Summary of Past Annual Reports

Table A shows the amount of green products the City has bought over the years.

D. Staff That Worked on Green Citywide Contracts in 2011

OCA: Bill Jones, Deirdre Darley, Galen Leung, Jaci Fong, Jennifer Browne, Judy Wong, Ken Easton, Pamela Olivier
SFE: Chris Geiger, Jessian Choy, Julie Bryant, Soko Made

II. Accomplishments

A. City Staff That Bought Green or Prohibited Products

SFE lists the purchases made by City staff (page 6), which allows SFE to:

- Thank and give green prizes to staff that bought green.
- Ask staff why they bought limited use or prohibited products. If they say a green product didn't work, then SFE can do more research. About 90% of 150 staff from 38 departments said they would recommend the Buy Green Consultation which includes this friendly discussion.

B. Buy Green Club of Year Award

Gave the 2012 Buy Green Club of Year Award at the Blue and Green Awards to Madeleine Licavoli and the Board of Supervisors (BOS). As the BOS Buy Green Leader, she added a reminder to their purchasing and performance evaluation forms to remind staff to find green products from SFApproved.org, and got co-workers to post SFApproved.org sticky note reminders by their computers.

C. New Green Citywide Contracts and Products

In 2011, SFE worked on contracts for bags for compost and trash bins, multi-function devices (all-in-one copier, fax, scanner), pest control services. Contracts that went out to bid in 2011 include fuel efficient sedans/enforcement vehicles. Since 2009, SFE and OCA worked on lighting bulbs, ballasts (which went to out to bid in 2012).

New, non-contracted products added to SFApproved.org include keyboard brushes which can replace computer can dusters (which have greenhouse gasses that cause climate change).

D. Outreach

- Increased departments that accepted a Buy Green Consultation from 6 (2007-11) to 38 (2011). Trained over 500 City staff through 12 consultations.
- Got 38 depts. to select Buy Green Leaders and fill out the Buy Green Scorecard, thanks to assistance from the Climate Team. The Scorecard is a new online tool that immediately shows departments their score, giving staff a chance to do things to improve their score before they submit it.

III. Ideas to Help the City Buy Green and Save Money

Some departments said that buying safer, green products can reduce worker compensation complaints. Unfortunately, the City spent \$643,060 on limited use or prohibited products in 2011. To prevent that, here are the most popular ideas from meetings with 700 staff from 25 departments in 2010-12:

A. In performance appraisals, write the percent of green products staff bought

If staff that bought green formally received positive feedback from their supervisor, it could encourage staff to buy a higher percent of green products.

B. It would help if Citywide contracts required online stores with no prohibited products

SFE and OCA customized the Office Depot online store so City staff could not see or buy certain prohibited products. City staff said if other city contracted vendors did that, they could avoid prohibited products.

C. Revamp City purchasing software to steer staff to buy green

Since it is hard for staff to recall or find green products they are required to buy, they said it may be more efficient to be like other governments and companies and get a City purchasing software that steers staff to buy green.

TABLE A. Summary of purchases

2010

2011

(Data not available from some City contracted vendors: foodware, paper towels, bath tissue, seat covers, office paper, toners)

		% Green	\$ Green products	\$ Limited use or prohibited products	% Green	\$ Green products	\$ Limited use or prohibited products	Notes
COMPUTERS, SERVERS		81%	\$ 3,900,519	\$ 926,381	88%	\$ 2,748,295	\$ 369,862	Some departments need specialty monitors that are not EPEAT gold. In 2011, data was not available from Computerland.
JANITORIAL CLEANERS	Bathroom, Tub, Tile	100%	\$ 108					In 2011, some City staff purchases could not be tracked because several contracts for vendors ended.
	Degreasers	86%	\$ 12,879	\$ 2,079	94%	\$ 72,452	\$ 4,976	
	General Purpose Cleaners	11%	\$ 22					
	Glass cleaners	0%		\$ 1,004	0%		\$ 7,654	
	TOTAL	80%	\$ 13,008	\$ 3,083	85%	\$ 72,452	\$ 12,630	
LIGHTING	Bulbs/Tubes	32%	\$ 165,589	\$ 357,482	26%	\$ 66,558	\$ 189,762	
	Ballasts	79%	\$ 40,187	\$ 10,837	48%	\$ 40,129	\$ 42,860	
	Fixtures				70%	\$ 24,594	\$ 10,534	
	TOTAL	18%	\$ 205,776	\$ 368,319	35%	\$ 131,282	\$ 243,157	
OFFICE SUPPLIES	Batteries (rechargeables AAA -D, 1.5-9 volt)	42%	\$ 10,421	\$ 24,732	40%	\$ 11,714	\$ 17,410	
TOTAL		76%	\$ 4,129,724	\$ 1,322,515	82%	\$ 2,963,742	\$ 643,060	

Table B. Batteries (AAA-D, 9-volt)

City staff are:

1. Required to buy rechargeables (lithium, NimH, hybrid). Free recycling boxes and pickup will be available.
2. Allowed to use non-rechargeable alkalines (LIMITED USE) but will have to pay SFDPH \$90/hr for recycling pickup. Alkalines are allowed for emergency equipment, or if rechargeables are not available in a reasonable time or price; or fail to meet performance standards.
3. Prohibited from buying Ni-Cad batteries.

Dept. & Staff	% rechargeables bought	\$ All batteries bought from Maltby. (Batteries should be bought from the contracted vendor, Staples.)
Library: Bill Bizjak	0%	\$ 13.80
Airport: Bill Lehw	0%	\$ 205.41
Airport: Willie Walsh	0%	\$ 718.31
City College Of San Francisco: Kevin Waight	0%	\$ 51.11
Municipal Railway: Alan Della Maggi	0%	\$ 169.11
Police: Victor Rothenberg	0%	\$ 4,003.13
Public Utilities Commission (Water): Edith Modie	0%	\$ 1,980.79
Purchasing: Bart Murphy	0%	\$ 302.00
Rec And Park:Declan Sharkey	0%	\$ 199.89
Rec And Park:Domiñiq Bartosik	0%	\$ 399.59
Rec And Park:Ron Perez	0%	\$ 294.88
Technology: Benny Alcantara	0%	\$ 247.68
Total from Maltby	0%	\$ 8,585.69

Dept. & Staff	% rechargeables bought	\$ all batteries bought from Staples
a.salcedo	12%	\$ 132.02
Ada Aberilla	71%	\$ 13.74
Alexandria Ashley	0%	\$ 11.82
Alicia David	41%	\$ 380.03
Alicia Leon-Jhong	28%	\$ 122.30
Alicia Venegas	0%	\$ 50.31
Alicia Wong	0%	\$ 10.59
Allan Renken	0%	\$ 27.64
Alli Catzalco	53%	\$ 59.92
Amy Demonteverde	0%	\$ 10.35
Ana Carcamo	63%	\$ 564.47
Ana Segura	100%	\$ 13.62
Andrew Schoenwetter	100%	\$ 27.55
Angela Alvarez	0%	\$ 5.91
Angela Auyong	0%	\$ 284.81
Angela Winston	0%	\$ 18.94
Aniana Salcedo	0%	\$ 158.52
Anita Asturias	82%	\$ 31.75
Anna Chu	0%	\$ 191.80
Annette Yuk	26%	\$ 65.92
Annie Leary	0%	\$ 22.06
Anthony Vallergera	100%	\$ 1,501.34
Arica Bolbolian	100%	\$ 14.30
Arthur Khoo	100%	\$ 16.88
Asja Steeves	0%	\$ 6.35
Ay-Lih We	0%	\$ 14.39
Baby Ruth Santander	100%	\$ 28.60

Dept. & Staff	% rechargeables bought	\$ all batteries bought from Staples
Barbara Luedtke	0%	\$ 100.23
Beatrice Thomas	100%	\$ 38.94
Bernadette White	0%	\$ 23.56
Bernardita Espadilla	86%	\$ 211.75
Beth Tison	0%	\$ 50.44
Bill Caponera	0%	\$ 23.64
Bonnie Ma	0%	\$ 20.66
Brenda Mendieta	0%	\$ 51.75
Brett Conner	0%	\$ 8.83
Caling Li	98%	\$ 302.11
Camilla Arcia	0%	\$ 60.32
Carlos Paniagua	0%	\$ 52.22
Carmen Nolasco	0%	\$ 109.52
Carol Kaminski	100%	\$ 12.98
Carol Williams	0%	\$ 28.36
Carolyn Karlegan	0%	\$ 42.90
Cathy Davey	0%	\$ 152.46
Cecile Soliai	0%	\$ 12.40
Cecilia Martinez-Rios	100%	\$ 30.22
Cecilia Rustom	0%	\$ 1.54
Ceres Delapaz	0%	\$ 418.04
Charlene DeDios	0%	\$ 72.47
Charmaine Estacio	0%	\$ 4.58
Chief of Branches Office	0%	\$ 184.86
Chien/ ITSS	100%	\$ 8.62
Christia Mea	68%	\$ 84.32
Christina Ho	0%	\$ 3.12
Christina Ortiz	0%	\$ 81.10
Christine Hanson	0%	\$ 107.70
Christine Qiu	0%	\$ 53.66
Christine Schwartz	0%	\$ 9.47
Cici Fung	22%	\$ 157.35
Clayton Choy	0%	\$ 9.00
Collins	100%	\$ 74.62
Connie Gruber	34%	\$ 48.00
Cynthia Delacruz	25%	\$ 64.47
Cynthia Phan	0%	\$ 5.51
Daisy Avalos	0%	\$ 129.97
Debbie Toy	0%	\$ 33.42
Debbie Yeung	81%	\$ 16.74
Delia Quintero	100%	\$ 118.59
Denise Hammond	0%	\$ 30.14
Denisha Lewis	0%	\$ 19.57
Detlef Luebben	0%	\$ 66.60
Diana Oquendo	100%	\$ 64.79
Diane Perry	77%	\$ 90.10
Dino Duazo	7%	\$ 326.02
Dorothy Thomas	52%	\$ 49.60
Eddy Ang	81%	\$ 179.11

Dept. & Staff	% rechargeables bought	\$ all batteries bought from Staples
Eleanore Fernandez	100%	\$ 22.66
Elizabeth Fitzgerald	0%	\$ 14.75
Elizabeth Saiz	0%	\$ 51.75
Ella Empleo	96%	\$ 353.82
Ella Frenkel	0%	\$ 28.41
Elma Young	100%	\$ 101.71
Elsie Sanchez	100%	\$ 15.69
Elvira De Leon	0%	\$ 23.92
Emily Chau	54%	\$ 60.79
Emmanuel Yeboah	0%	\$ 26.18
Erica Mendoza	0%	\$ 85.68
Erika Vergara	0%	\$ 11.03
Feliciano Payumo	38%	\$ 361.78
Gail Van Sciver	0%	\$ 26.18
Gigi Borromeo	0%	\$ 87.79
Gina Priest	100%	\$ 58.16
Gladis Steinway	0%	\$ 277.20
Gladys Carey	100%	\$ 12.98
Gloria Lopez	0%	\$ 3.34
Gloria Ng	100%	\$ 68.39
Grace Alvendia	100%	\$ 568.83
Hammons	100%	\$ 25.96
Hernan Canas	26%	\$ 107.61
Howard Wong	0%	\$ 13.21
Iheoma Anoruo	0%	\$ 26.93
Irin Blanco	0%	\$ 9.47
Jane Arce	0%	\$ 77.40
Jane Chu	0%	\$ 132.00
Janet Austin	66%	\$ 43.08
Janet Winder	0%	\$ 81.35
Janin Cordoba	0%	\$ 17.73
Jason Bielski	100%	\$ 71.50
Jesse Cristo	100%	\$ 77.42
Jessie Katz	10%	\$ 586.76
Jn Kendall	44%	\$ 1,489.23
Joanna Au	0%	\$ 20.50
Joery Nacion	0%	\$ 88.57
Josie Cooper	100%	\$ 15.04
Josie Deocampo	0%	\$ 28.41
Jossy Bayot	79%	\$ 59.41
Joyce Furlough	0%	\$ 109.45
Julie Creer	0%	\$ 17.26
Julie McDonald	0%	\$ 170.32
Julius Gawaran	17%	\$ 338.92
Kam Ko	100%	\$ 1,603.82
Karen Henderson	60%	\$ 64.23
Katherine Basconcillo	0%	\$ 32.72
Kathleen Toy	100%	\$ 242.08
Kathryn Nicholas	100%	\$ 9.77

Dept. & Staff	% rechargeables bought	\$ all batteries bought from Staples
Kathryn Won	92%	\$ 268.06
Kathy Chau	74%	\$ 36.15
kathy Shih	0%	\$ 36.80
Kayce Gibson	0%	\$ 12.71
Kenton Owyang	0%	\$ 7.19
Kristina Nelly	42%	\$ 70.19
Kristine Doan	0%	\$ 24.72
Laura Tham	0%	\$ 227.07
Lavinia Leung	0%	\$ 108.53
Lawrence Aviado	100%	\$ 115.69
Lee Mitchell	0%	\$ 10.35
Lena	64%	\$ 82.68
Lenise Kimes	0%	\$ 10.24
Lenora Journette	0%	\$ 5.51
Linda P. Lee	0%	\$ 5.51
Lisa Chan	0%	\$ 57.24
Lisa Degirolamo	0%	\$ 90.83
Lisa Mak	40%	\$ 253.14
Lise Chansin	59%	\$ 58.04
Liz Garcia	0%	\$ 7.68
Lizz Holman	0%	\$ 150.54
Lizzette Henriquez	0%	\$ 6.91
Lolita Espinosa	29%	\$ 54.25
Lorelei Patricio	66%	\$ 20.68
Lori Fobbs-Guillory	18%	\$ 78.10
Lucy Guzman	0%	\$ 21.78
Lulu Hwang	0%	\$ 60.94
Luzviminda Velasco	21%	\$ 329.51
Lyla Conrad	100%	\$ 10.22
Mabel Martinez	68%	\$ 46.72
Maggie Flores	100%	\$ 206.15
Maggie Onderdonk	0%	\$ 9.47
Maneerat Vipusithimakool	0%	\$ 42.89
Maria Frias	84%	\$ 34.64
Maria Garcia	57%	\$ 51.07
Maria Sosa	0%	\$ 76.92
Maribelle Manantan	91%	\$ 69.06
Marieje Arguelles	0%	\$ 42.26
Marina A Villena	0%	\$ 10.93
Mario Gonzalez	0%	\$ 10.62
Mario Yedidia	0%	\$ 12.20
Marisa Ramos	100%	\$ 115.56
Marisa Sum	0%	\$ 65.68
Martha Rendon	100%	\$ 13.11
Martha Yanez	100%	\$ 19.99
Marvin Ford	0%	\$ 23.92
Mary Lou Remo	0%	\$ 25.70
Mary May Beltran	0%	\$ 5.51
Maureen Flanigan	100%	\$ 51.54

Dept. & Staff	% rechargeables bought	\$ all batteries bought from Staples
Mauricio Rodriguez	97%	\$ 81.19
Melinda Reyes	100%	\$ 56.18
Mengo Darr	0%	\$ 72.81
Michael Kellogg	0%	\$ 59.35
Michelle Blalock	62%	\$ 49.82
Michelle Hooker	0%	\$ 15.95
Michelle Peters	100%	\$ 132.85
Minna Cotter	0%	\$ 21.78
Mintong Chen	80%	\$ 212.77
Monica Huynh	0%	\$ 35.46
Myisha Hervey	100%	\$ 14.30
Myrna Evangelista	0%	\$ 54.60
Nancy Banda	0%	\$ 91.17
Nancy Terranova	0%	\$ 53.72
Nathan Rodis	48%	\$ 83.14
Nick Majeski	0%	\$ 579.96
Nikole Ford	74%	\$ 71.43
Noreen Mangabay-Battle	0%	\$ 15.15
Nuvia Bolanos	0%	\$ 148.41
Pamela Jang	0%	\$ 8.68
Patrick Monette-Shaw	0%	\$ 180.86
Paul Virgil	0%	\$ 224.70
Pauline Gonzalez	0%	\$ 38.30
Phoebe Lim	0%	\$ 41.40
Pilar Salvador	83%	\$ 148.42
Priscilla Hart	48%	\$ 40.55
Rachel Cukierman	0%	\$ 3.24
Rana Calonsag	0%	\$ 32.50
Randy Swanson	0%	\$ 7.32
Raquel Vasquez	0%	\$ 8.88
Rebecca Ona	0%	\$ 39.90
Renee Anderson	0%	\$ 12.80
Renee Young	0%	\$ 3.15
Rey Salonga	0%	\$ 15.16
Rita Donahue	0%	\$ 152.87
Ritchele Arnaldo	0%	\$ 9.47
Robert Clark	0%	\$ 104.25
Robert Pineda	100%	\$ 39.06
Robin Earle	21%	\$ 262.14
Robin Earle/Louise Gomes	0%	\$ 22.06
Rochelle Magtibay	0%	\$ 168.42
Rosalinda Miran-Ramirez	0%	\$ 0.74
Roselinda Miran-Ramirez	0%	\$ 73.45
Ruby Ponce	0%	\$ 5.12
Sally Santoyo	100%	\$ 40.22
Samir Sakkal	0%	\$ 317.06
Sandra Poole	0%	\$ 71.61
Sarah Gieseke	59%	\$ 152.00
Selina Ho	0%	\$ 9.57

Dept. & Staff	% rechargeables bought	\$ all batteries bought from Staples
Serena Chuong	0%	\$ 5.51
Seretha Gallaread	0%	\$ 47.12
Shalise Bill	0%	\$ 152.16
Sharon Page Ritchie	100%	\$ 28.62
Sharon Salmon	88%	\$ 46.57
Shauna Rose	0%	\$ 29.08
Sheila Crawford	0%	\$ 6.89
Simon Nahel	0%	\$ 81.51
Sin Mei Leung	0%	\$ 3.97
Sophia Simpliciano	83%	\$ 105.98
Stacey Lo	0%	\$ 14.47
Stephani Thompson	0%	\$ 354.95
Stephanie Johnson	0%	\$ 295.36
Stephen Brooks	0%	\$ 105.16
Stephen Lee	91%	\$ 518.02
Sue Keller	0%	\$ 137.20
Susan Manzano	69%	\$ 112.28
Susie Choy	0%	\$ 35.18
Suzie Auyeung	54%	\$ 125.38
Tania Fokin	0%	\$ 294.03
Ted Davis	0%	\$ 346.18
Teresa Roiz	0%	\$ 38.51
Terry De La Paz	0%	\$ 432.79
Thomas Harvey	0%	\$ 161.89
Torita Mila	0%	\$ 19.68
Tyronne Julian	0%	\$ 43.56
Vedasto Lucero	0%	\$ 1.54
Verma Walton	0%	\$ 52.56
Vickey Beltran	0%	\$ 7.40
Vicky Chu	64%	\$ 412.21
Victor Baja	0%	\$ 16.53
Victor Rothenberg	0%	\$ 1,383.08
Vincent Jones	0%	\$ 74.14
Virginia Van Patten	0%	\$ 28.98
Wendy Hamilton	85%	\$ 43.55
Wennie Columna	0%	\$ 10.35
Whitney D. Bagby	76%	\$ 716.93
Wong Ivy	0%	\$ 11.82
Yock Chow	0%	\$ 37.88
Zenaida Arguelles	67%	\$ 39.44
Zina Williams	0%	\$ 19.36
Zoe Taleporos	100%	\$ 39.51
Total from Staples	40%	\$ 29,124.06




Table B. Computers, Laptops, Monitors, Servers from SFApproved.org

EPEAT computers are less-toxic, energy-efficient; made with more recyclable materials; reduction of environmental impacts in product design, manufacturing, packaging, use, disassembly, recycling, and disposal.

Data is from contracted vendors the City was required to buy from in 2011: Enpointe, Xtech. Data was not available from Computerland.

Dept. & Staff	% green by staff	\$ by staff	% green by dept.	\$ by dept.	EPEAT Gold computers	EPEAT Silver computers	Not EPEAT computers	ENERGY STAR servers	Not ENERGY STAR servers
Admin Svcs: Janin Cordoba	100%	\$ 39,885	100%	\$ 39,885	\$ 39,885				
Airport: Michelle Trainer	68%	\$ 74,933	68%	\$ 74,933	\$ 50,627				\$ 24,306
Arts Commission: Michelle Chang	100%	\$ 14,501	100%	\$ 14,501	\$ 14,501				
Board of Appeals	100%	\$ 885	100%	\$ 885	\$ 885				
Board of Supervisors: Alvin Moses:	100%	\$ 2,442	100%	\$ 2,661	\$ 2,442				
Board of Supervisors: Erika Cheng:	100%	\$ 219		\$ 219					
Building Inspection	100%	\$ 9,840	100%	\$ 9,840	\$ 9,840				
Children, Youth & Families	100%	\$ 7,725	100%	\$ 9,163	\$ 7,725				
Children, Youth & Families: Shawn Ewing:	100%	\$ 1,438		\$ 1,438					
Controller: Grace Enriquez:	100%	\$ 35,237	100%	\$ 35,237	\$ 35,237				
District Attorney: Voltaire Almendrala:	100%	\$ 5,075	100%	\$ 5,075	\$ 5,075				
Ethics Commission	0%	\$ 1,950	0%	\$ 1,950			\$ 1,950		
Health Service System	100%	\$ 1,945	100%	\$ 6,445	\$ 1,945				
Health Service System: Wanda Woo:	100%	\$ 4,500		\$ 4,500					
Human Resources : Peter Stokes:	90%	\$ 24,251	90%	\$ 24,251	\$ 21,916		\$ 2,335		
Human Services: Nelly Ovando :	100%	\$ 3,300	100%	\$ 67,785	\$ 3,300				
Human Services: Nelly Ovando:	100%	\$ 64,485		\$ 64,485					
Library: Alicia Wong	100%	\$ 50,752	100%	\$ 67,626	\$ 50,752				
Library: Steven Lew:	100%	\$ 16,874		\$ 16,874					
Mayor's Office of Community Dev.: Karen Henderson:	100%	\$ 2,625	100%	\$ 2,625	\$ 2,625				
MTA Finance	100%	\$ 13,103	100%	\$ 13,103	\$ 13,103				
Office of Citizen Complaints: Chris Wisniewski:	100%	\$ 18,340	100%	\$ 18,340	\$ 18,340				
Planning	100%	\$ 15,501	100%	\$ 15,501	\$ 15,501				
Police	100%	\$ 5,620	100%	\$ 5,620	\$ 5,620				
Port	100%	\$ 12,558	100%	\$ 12,558	\$ 12,558				
Public Defender	100%	\$ 146,285	100%	\$ 146,285	\$ 146,285				
Public Health : Remy Doyle	97%	\$ 467,038	97%	\$ 518,468	\$ 451,091		\$ 15,947		
Public Health- General Hospital	100%	\$ 51,430		\$ 51,430					
Public Works: Jesse Cristo	100%	\$ 485	100%	\$ 485	\$ 485				
PUC Clean Water / Water Pollution Control	100%	\$ 2,820	100%	\$ 121,164	\$ 2,820				
PUC Finance: Maggie Davenport	100%	\$ 114,214			\$ 114,214				
PUC- WasteWater Enterprise Collection System Division: Andrew Ong	100%	\$ 1,260			\$ 1,260				
PUC Water Quality Bureau	100%	\$ 2,870			\$ 2,870				

Dept. & Staff	% green by staff	\$ by staff	% green by dept.	\$ by dept.	EPEAT Gold computers	EPEAT Silver computers	Not EPEAT computers	ENERGY STAR servers	Not ENERGY STAR servers
Rec & Park	100%	\$ 86,980	100%	\$ 86,980	\$ 86,980				
Registrar of Voters	100%	\$ 17,067	100%	\$ 17,067	\$ 17,067				
Rent Board: Delene Wolf	100%	\$ 20,473	100%	\$ 20,473	\$ 20,473				
Sheriff	100%	\$ 279	100%	\$ 279	\$ 279				
Status of Women: Carol Sacco	100%	\$ 7,230	100%	\$ 7,230	\$ 7,230				
Technology	100%	\$ 60,069	100%	\$ 60,069	\$ 60,069				
War Memorial				\$ 1,650	\$ 1,650				
War Memorial: Marilou Faro:	100%	\$ 13,830	100%	\$ 12,180	\$ 12,180				
*Alicia C Wong	84%	\$ 52,900	84%	\$ 52,900	\$ 44,300		\$ 2,465		\$ 6,135
*Alicia Wong	97%	\$ 151,559	97%	\$ 151,559	\$ 146,481		\$ 5,079		
*Ana Carcamo	100%	\$ 1,954	100%	\$ 1,954	\$ 1,954				
*Anita Sevilla	0%	\$ 23,037	0%	\$ 23,037			\$ 2,103		\$ 20,935
*Belinda Blaylock	23%	\$ 12,327	23%	\$ 12,327	\$ 2,869			\$ 9,458	
*Bernie Arrieta	0%	\$ 8,686	0%	\$ 8,686			\$ 8,686		
*Bo-Ming Ng	100%	\$ 12,587	100%	\$ 12,587	\$ 12,587				
*Brandon Nelson	100%	\$ 11,200	100%	\$ 11,200	\$ 11,200				
*Buck Lee	0%	\$ 4,000	0%	\$ 4,000					\$ 4,000
*Buckman Lee	26%	\$ 13,400	26%	\$ 13,400	\$ 3,458		\$ 6,414		\$ 3,529
*Candace Alexander	97%	\$ 113,787	97%	\$ 113,787	\$ 110,588	\$ 2,759	\$ 440		
*Carlos F Peza	100%	\$ 82,099	100%	\$ 82,099	\$ 81,883		\$ 216		
*Carlos F. Peza	97%	\$ 54,745	97%	\$ 54,745	\$ 53,276	\$ 464	\$ 1,005		
*Carlos F. Peza	100%	\$ 9,393	100%	\$ 9,393	\$ 9,393				
*Carlos Peza	75%	\$ 76,427	75%	\$ 76,427	\$ 57,407	\$ 5,058			\$ 13,962
*Charles Rivera	100%	\$ 6,144	100%	\$ 6,144	\$ 6,144				
*Chris Siu	100%	\$ 214	100%	\$ 214	\$ 214				
*Craig Lee	56%	\$ 31,283	56%	\$ 31,283	\$ 17,521		\$ 10,315	\$ 3,447	
*Daniel Cervantes	76%	\$ 8,406	76%	\$ 8,406	\$ 6,410	\$ 1,996			
*David Ishikawa	100%	\$ 41,602	100%	\$ 41,602	\$ 41,602				
*Dina Quesada	0%	\$ 12,245	0%	\$ 12,245			\$ 12,245		
*Eileen Marshall	100%	\$ 10,050	100%	\$ 10,050	\$ 10,050				
*Eric Bettencourt	0%	\$ 307	0%	\$ 307			\$ 307		
*Eric Ma	100%	\$ 17,869	100%	\$ 17,869	\$ 17,869				
*Erica Cheng	100%	\$ 195	100%	\$ 195	\$ 195				
*Fonda Davidis	0%	\$ 5,646	0%	\$ 5,646			\$ 5,646		
*Gary Yee	100%	\$ 1,172	100%	\$ 1,172	\$ 1,172				
*George Powers	62%	\$ 8,012	62%	\$ 8,012	\$ 4,970		\$ 3,043		
*Geraldine Silverio	98%	\$ 34,249	98%	\$ 34,249	\$ 33,468		\$ 781		
*Gerry Surban	86%	\$ 2,090	86%	\$ 2,090	\$ 1,788	\$ 302			
*Henry Chen	100%	\$ 556	100%	\$ 556	\$ 556				
*James Flowers	100%	\$ 354	100%	\$ 354	\$ 354				
*James Flowersss	100%	\$ 905	100%	\$ 905	\$ 905				
*Jamil Niazi	0%	\$ 44,160	0%	\$ 44,160				\$ 44,160	
*Javier Tous	0%	\$ 17,619	0%	\$ 17,619			\$ 17,619		
*Jim Brehmer	100%	\$ 1,053	100%	\$ 1,053	\$ 1,053				
*Jim Brehmer	87%	\$ 122,420	87%	\$ 122,420	\$ 106,244	\$ 4,462	\$ 11,713		
*John Applegarth	0%	\$ 41,660	0%	\$ 41,660			\$ 41,660		
*Jolie Gines	0%	\$ 2,226	0%	\$ 2,226				\$ 2,226	
*Khalil Boykin	100%	\$ 9,062	100%	\$ 9,062	\$ 9,062				

Dept. & Staff	% green by staff	\$ by staff	% green by dept.	\$ by dept.	EPEAT Gold computers	EPEAT Silver computers	Not EPEAT computers	ENERGY STAR servers	Not ENERGY STAR servers
*Lee Okumoto	100%	\$ 364	100%	\$ 364	\$ 364				
*Louis Huie	100%	\$ 1,560	100%	\$ 1,560	\$ 1,560				
*Lt Hardy	0%	\$ 708	0%	\$ 708					\$ 708
*Marc Tagaro	100%	\$ 63,945	100%	\$ 63,945	\$ 63,945				
*Marc W Tagaro	1%	\$ 33,668	1%	\$ 33,668	\$ 225	\$ 33,443			
*Maya Fischer	98%	\$ 78,210	98%	\$ 78,210	\$ 76,373				\$ 1,837
*Norman Goldwyn	100%	\$ 6,325	100%	\$ 6,325	\$ 6,325				
*Norman Nobel	0%	\$ 1,366	0%	\$ 1,366			\$ 1,366		
*Norman Noble	80%	\$ 17,834	80%	\$ 17,834	\$ 14,282		\$ 3,552		
*Paul Karawanny	0%	\$ 16,842	0%	\$ 16,842				\$ 16,842	
*Phillips Mar	100%	\$ 225	100%	\$ 225	\$ 225				
*Phillip Mar	100%	\$ 18,100	100%	\$ 18,100	\$ 18,100				
*Rachael Perez	100%	\$ 4,716	100%	\$ 4,716	\$ 4,716				
*Rey Bernardo	90%	\$ 29,833	90%	\$ 29,833	\$ 26,738	\$ 3,095			
*Ricky Cristobal	100%	\$ 34,876	100%	\$ 34,876	\$ 34,876				
*Ron Bell	94%	\$ 132,780	94%	\$ 132,780	\$ 125,331	\$ 6,272	\$ 1,177		
*Ruben Vasquez	100%	\$ 10,047	100%	\$ 10,047	\$ 10,047				
*Stephen Roja	100%	\$ 276	100%	\$ 276	\$ 276				
*Steve Roja	100%	\$ 357	100%	\$ 357	\$ 357				
*Teddy Sia	76%	\$ 17,978	76%	\$ 17,978	\$ 13,575		\$ 4,403		
*UNKNOWN	100%	\$ 1,555	100%	\$ 1,555	\$ 1,555				
*Victor Zarazua	100%	\$ 156,700	100%	\$ 156,700	\$ 156,700				
*Voltaire Almendrala	100%	\$ 20,953	100%	\$ 20,953	\$ 20,953				
*Wanda Materre	100%	\$ 1,024	100%	\$ 1,024	\$ 1,024				
Grand Total	88%	\$ 3,118,157			\$ 2,748,295	\$ 57,852	\$ 160,467	\$ 76,132	\$ 75,411



TABLE C. Janitorial cleaners from SFApproved.org

Cleaners the City is required to buy have been screened for ingredients that can cause cancer, infertility, asthma, severe eye, liver or kidney damage. Non-green, ready-to-use products cost 15 times more than equivalent, concentrated green cleaners.

Summary below compiled from [this data](#) from some of contracted vendors the City is required to buy from: Champion, Santora, United, Waxie.

Data was not available for all products the City is required to buy (bathroom or general purpose cleaners, or bath tissue, paper towels, seat covers)

Dept. & Staff	% green by staff	\$ by staff	% green by dept.	\$ by dept.	DEGREASER: Liquid Sunshine 777 (REQUIRED)	Prohibited DEGREASER	Prohibited GLASS cleaner
DPW : Brooks Fenton	0%	\$ 785					\$785
DPW : Joel Prather	0%	\$ 783					\$783
DPW : John Lee	100%	\$ 26,751	93%	\$ 28,847	\$ 26,751		
DPW : Mark Vanlooy	0%	\$ 211				\$211	
DPW : Mike Kelly	0%	\$ 318					\$318
Library: Darren Brown	100%	\$ 9,848	100%	\$ 9,848	\$ 9,848		
MTA: Pat Lloyd	100%	\$ 14,394	100%	\$ 14,394	\$ 14,394		
Port: Gene Sheets	0%	\$ 334					\$334
PUC: George Dugan	0%	\$ 955				\$955	
PUC: Mabel Chow	0%	\$ 348	0%	\$ 3,612			\$348
PUC: Olee Wade	0%	\$ 155					\$155
PUC: Ray Mattias	0%	\$ 955				\$955	\$348
PUC: Tomio Takeshita	0%	\$ 517				\$517	
Real Estate: Joe Stelmak	100%	\$ 7,828	100%	\$ 16,373	\$ 7,828		
Real Estate: Otis Williams	100%	\$ 8,545			\$ 8,545		
SFSD: Ken Ford	100%	\$ 1,727	100%	\$ 1,727	\$ 1,727		
UNKNOWN	59%	\$ 5,697	59%	\$ 5,697	\$ 3,359	\$2,338	\$4,584
Grand Total	85%	\$ 85,082			\$ 72,452	\$4,976	\$7,654




Table F. Lighting Fixtures

Fixtures the City is required to buy are more energy-efficient and long-lasting.

Data is from contracted vendors from which the City is required to buy: Maltby and Omega Pacific.

Dept & Staff	% Green by Customer	\$ by City Staff	% Green by Dept.	\$ by Dept.	REQUIRED GREEN FIXTURES: REQUIRED: 4-pin CFL, Pulse Start Metal Halide, energy-efficient, low-mercury lighting, LED (e.g., exit sign)	LIMITED USE FIXTURES: Incandescent lamp and motion sensor, Incandescent Sealed Beam Lamps, Halogen, HID MAGNETIC (for Pulse Start MH lamps), HPS Probe Start, Metal Halide	PROHIBITED FIXTURES: 4-foot T8 fluorescent without high-efficiency ballasts, circular T9 fluorescent, incandescent, preheat fluorescent, probe start metal halide
Airport: William Co	0%	\$ 49.93	0%	\$ 49.93			\$49.93
City College: Kevin Waight	0%	\$ 169.00	0%	\$ 169.00			\$169.00
Human Services: Albert	0%	\$ 547.64	0%	\$ 547.64		\$140.64	\$407.00
Library: Bill Bizjak	0%	\$ 427.60	0%	\$ 427.60			\$70.52
MTA: Alan Della Maggi	0%	\$ 371.96					\$371.96
MTA: Steve Russell	0%	\$ 367.48	0%	\$ 2,530.54		\$29.60	\$337.88
MTA: Tony San Jose	0%	\$ 1,791.11				\$1,347.13	\$443.98
Public Works: Cabrera, Willie	3%	\$ 748.63			\$25.00	\$350.00	\$373.63
Public Works: Carmichael, Rona	32%	\$ 4,519.16	31%	\$ 6,446.81	\$1,464.37	\$1,014.45	\$2,040.34
Public Works: Hajjar, Chad	42%	\$ 1,179.02			\$499.34	\$679.68	
PUC: Dave Spinetta	64%	\$ 800.05			\$512.05	\$288.00	
PUC: Gene Welch	72%	\$ 5,274.72			\$3,800.00	\$998.72	\$476.00
PUC: Jack Patterson	91%	\$ 5,065.88	89%	\$ 21,946.76	\$4,626.10		\$439.77
PUC: John Kyllonen	94%	\$ 1,292.02			\$1,218.88		\$73.14
PUC: Mike Maraviglia	99%	\$ 9,514.09			\$9,438.25	\$75.84	

Dept & Staff	% Green by Customer	\$ by City Staff	% Green by Dept.	\$ by Dept.	REQUIRED GREEN FIXTURES: REQUIRED: 4-pin CFL, Pulse Start Metal Halide, energy-efficient, low-mercury lighting, LED (e.g., exit sign)	LIMITED USE FIXTURES: Incandescent lamp and motion sensor, Incandescent Sealed Beam Lamps, Halogen, HID MAGNETIC (for Pulse Start MH lamps), HPS Probe Start, Metal Halide	PROHIBITED FIXTURES: 4-foot T8 fluorescent without high-efficiency ballasts, circular T9 fluorescent, incandescent, preheat fluorescent, probe start metal halide
Purchasing: Bart Murphy	100%	\$ 53.17	100%	\$ 53.17	\$53.17		
Real Estate: Ken Hangartner	100%	\$ 219.99	100%	\$ 219.99	\$219.99		
Rec & Park: Declan Sharkey	100%	\$ 1,280.12			\$1,280.12		
Rec & Park: Helen Vozenilek	100%	\$ 876.92	100%	\$ 2,353.31	\$876.92		
Rec & Park: Ryan Jackson	100%	\$ 196.27			\$196.27		
SFUSD: Tony Chavez	100%	\$ 384.04	100%	\$ 384.04	\$384.04		
Total	70%	\$35,128.77			\$24,594.49	\$4,924.06	\$5,253.14




Table E. Lighting: Ballasts from SFApproved.org

Ballasts the City is required to buy are more energy-efficient and long-lasting.

Data is from contracted vendors from which the City is required to buy: Maltby and Omega Pacific.

Dept & Staff	% Green by Customer	\$ by City Staff	% Green by Dept.	\$ by Dept.	GREEN BALLASTS Fluorescent Electronic: CFL, 4-pin; INSTANT START, (standard efficiency for non-4-foot T8s); INSTANT START, NEMA	LIMITED USE BALLASTS: Fluorescent, Electronic for T12; HID: Magnetic (for Cycling, Non-cycling HPS); MAGNETIC Ballast (for all Pulse	PROHIBITED BALLASTS: Fluorescent, Electronic, RAPID start for T8; Fluorescent, Magnetic
Airport	0%	\$ 1,728.19				\$ 1,728.19	
Airport: Barry Neal	0%	\$ 1,376.95				\$ 1,376.95	
Airport: Bill Lehew	53%	\$ 35,483.88	47%	\$ 39,705.02	\$ 18,762.34	\$ 15,183.58	\$ 1,537.96
Airport: William Co	0%	\$ 1,116.00				\$ 1,116.00	
Candlestick Park	82%	\$ 1,840.32	82%	\$ 1,840.32	\$ 1,515.00	\$ 325.32	
City College	50%	\$ 2,873.09			\$ 1,435.25	\$ 1,437.84	
City College: Kevin Waight	0%	\$ 135.00	48%	\$ 3,008.09		\$ 135.00	
Fire	100%	\$ 128.92	100%	\$ 128.92	\$ 128.92		
Human Services: Albert Bhroom	100%	\$ 627.28	42%	\$ 2,249.53	\$ 627.28		
Human Services: Jose Escobar	19%	\$ 1,622.25			\$ 316.29	\$ 1,305.96	
Juvenile Probation	100%	\$ 167.60	100%	\$ 167.60	\$ 167.60		
Library	100%	\$ 951.50			\$ 951.50		
Library: Larry Ferraz	0%	\$ 107.09	90%	\$ 1,058.59		\$ 107.09	
Mta	23%	\$ 4,014.20	23%	\$ 4,014.20	\$ 927.40	\$ 3,086.80	
Port:	100%	\$ 190.30	100%	\$ 190.30	\$ 190.30		
Public Health General Hospital	65%	\$ 884.52			\$ 570.90	\$ 313.62	
Public Health: John Tam	82%	\$ 1,072.05	74%	\$ 1,956.57	\$ 878.38		\$ 193.67
Public Works	62%	\$ 3,336.54			\$ 2,069.50	\$ 1,267.04	
Public Works: Cabrera, Ruben	0%	\$ 50.25	39%	\$ 5,746.90		\$ 50.25	
Public Works: Franko, Robert	7%	\$ 2,360.12			\$ 153.97	\$ 2,206.15	
PUC	62%	\$ 1,683.60			\$ 1,044.20	\$ 639.40	
PUC: Dave Clarkson	0%	\$ 528.62				\$ 528.62	
PUC: Denis Brabant	0%	\$ 810.00				\$ 810.00	
PUC: Gene Welch	65%	\$ 854.77	16%	\$ 9,864.92	\$ 554.10	\$ 300.67	
PUC: Jack Patterson	0%	\$ 600.00				\$ 600.00	
PUC: Jonathan Myers	0%	\$ 3,172.97				\$ 3,172.97	
PUC: Neil Denatale	0%	\$ 299.99				\$ 299.99	
PUC: Tim Bell	0%	\$ 1,914.99				\$ 1,914.99	
Real Estate: Ken Hangartner	100%	\$ 70.06	100%	\$ 70.06	\$ 70.06		
Rec & Park	67%	\$ 6,118.70			\$ 4,085.70	\$ 2,033.00	
Rec & Park: Declan Sharkey	100%	\$ 169.10	68%	\$ 6,353.71	\$ 169.10		
Rec & Park: Helen Vozenilek	100%	\$ 65.91			\$ 65.91		
School District: Tony Chavez	100%	\$ 3,377.61	100%	\$ 3,377.61	\$ 3,377.61		
Sheriff	60%	\$ 2,989.96	60%	\$ 2,989.96	\$ 1,800.60	\$ 579.96	\$ 609.40
Zoo: Brian Brim	100%	\$ 266.86	100%	\$ 266.86	\$ 266.86		
Grand Total	48%	\$ 82,989.16			\$ 40,128.75	\$ 40,519.38	\$ 2,341.03



Table D. Lighting: bulbs/tubes from SFApproved.org

Bulbs/tubes the City is required to buy have less mercury (Hg) which is toxic. And they are more energy-efficient and long-lasting.

Dept & Staff	% Green by Customer	\$ by City Staff	% Green by Dept.	\$ by Dept.	GREEN= CFL <5mg Hg, 4-pin; Electronic; Self-ballasted, Energy Star. FLUORESCENT (80+ CRI, Electronic): instant start, standard efficiency non-4' T8; T5 Linear, T8 4', ECO, long life; non-4' T8 Linear. HID, Metal Halide.	LIMITED USE= Fluorescent: T9 Circular; CFL, 2-pin, <5 mg of Hg; Preheat, T12, T8 not long life; T8 with CRI >75<80. Halogen. HID, HPS, metal halide: cycling or probe start. Incandescent (non-A shape)	PROHIBITED= CFL, Self-Ballasted, not ENERGY STAR, or >5mg of Hg. Fluorescent: 4' T8, Not TCLP/ECO, CRI <80, NOT long life; Magnetic Except Preheat. HID, Mercury Vapor. Incandescent, Exit Sign or A-shape.
Asian Art Museum: Evan Kierstead	0%	\$ 10.65	0%	\$ 10.65		\$ 10.65	
Airport:	64%	\$ 59,305.39	63%	\$ 59,697.36	\$ 37,767.40	\$ 21,353.43	\$ 184.56
Airport: Bill Lehew	9%	\$ 391.97			\$ 33.95	\$ 181.59	\$ 176.43
Candlestick Park:	0%	\$ 488.88	0%	\$ 488.88		\$ 128.52	\$ 360.36
Central Shop:	0%	\$ 19.52	0%	\$ 19.52		\$ 19.52	
City College :	10%	\$ 1,021.29	15%	\$ 1,094.45	\$ 104.61	\$ 144.48	\$ 772.20
City College: Kevin Waight	81%	\$ 73.16			\$ 58.92	\$ 14.24	
City Hall:	5%	\$ 4,514.93	5%	\$ 4,514.93	\$ 240.48	\$ 4,274.45	
Davies Symphony Hall:	17%	\$ 1,354.36	17%	\$ 1,354.36	\$ 229.80	\$ 952.32	\$ 172.24
Fire:	8%	\$ 1,815.73	8%	\$ 1,815.73	\$ 151.31	\$ 583.34	\$ 1,081.08
Hall Of Justice:	0%	\$ 1,028.64	0%	\$ 1,028.64		\$ 513.84	\$ 514.80
Human Svc :	0%	\$ 889.39	0%	\$ 889.39		\$ 65.70	\$ 823.69
Juvenile Probation:	0%	\$ 363.84	0%	\$ 363.84		\$ 363.84	
Library:	58%	\$ 16,617.96	58%	\$ 16,628.29	\$ 9,583.60	\$ 4,984.76	\$ 2,049.60
Library: Bill Bizjak	100%	\$ 10.33			\$ 10.33		
MTA (Muni):	2%	\$ 71,730.51	3%	\$ 71,964.72	\$ 1,770.18	\$ 68,365.53	\$ 1,594.80
MTA: Alan Della Maggi	100%	\$ 20.10			\$ 20.10		
MTA: Steve Neff	100%	\$ 14.00			\$ 14.00		
MTA: Steve Russell	83%	\$ 200.11			\$ 166.42	\$ 11.36	\$ 22.33
Port:	38%	\$ 1,236.48	39%	\$ 1,253.73	\$ 472.20	\$ 630.36	\$ 133.92
Port: John Leonard	100%	\$ 10.37			\$ 10.37		
Port: Kevin Quan	100%	\$ 6.88			\$ 6.88		
Public Health (General Hospital):	69%	\$ 10,737.74			\$ 7,421.58	\$ 1,893.44	\$ 1,422.72

Dept & Staff	% Green by Customer	\$ by City Staff	% Green by Dept.	\$ by Dept.	GREEN= CFL <5mg Hg, 4-pin; Electronic; Self-ballasted, Energy Star. FLUORESCENT (80+ CRI, Electronic): instant start, standard efficiency non-4' T8; T5 Linear, T8 4', ECO, long life; non-4' T8 Linear. HID, Metal Halide.	LIMITED USE= Fluorescent: T9 Circular; CFL, 2-pin, <5 mg of Hg; Preheat, T12, T8 not long life; T8 with CRI >75<80. Halogen. HID, HPS, metal halide: cycling or probe start. Incandescent (non-A shape)	PROHIBITED= CFL, Self-Ballasted, not ENERGY STAR, or >5mg of Hg. Fluorescent: 4' T8, Not TCLP/ECO, CRI <80, NOT long life; Magnetic Except Preheat. HID, Mercury Vapor. Incandescent, Exit Sign or A-shape.
Public Health (Mental Health):	31%	\$ 349.29	67%	\$ 11,224.49	\$ 108.51	\$ 240.78	
Public Health:	0%	\$ 93.60					\$ 93.60
Public Health: John Tam	68%	\$ 43.86			\$ 30.00	\$ 13.86	
Public Works:	17%	\$ 8,197.33			\$ 1,403.29	\$ 6,434.40	\$ 359.64
Public Works: Cabrera, Ruben	0%	\$ 9.87				\$ 9.87	
Public Works: Franko, Robert	25%	\$ 86.36	17%	\$ 8,296.01	\$ 21.33	\$ 65.03	
Public Works: O'dowd, Brigid	0%	\$ 2.45				\$ 2.45	
PUC (Millbrae):	0%	\$ 102.96					\$ 102.96
PUC (Water Quality):	0%	\$ 249.96				\$ 249.96	
PUC:	0%	\$ 354.48				\$ 148.56	\$ 205.92
PUC Bureau Of Light, Heat, P/M:	4%	\$ 59,007.45			\$ 2,569.44	\$ 56,438.01	
PUC: Dave Clarkson.	0%	\$ 17.46				\$ 17.46	
PUC: Denis Brabant	0%	\$ 17.04				\$ 17.04	
PUC: Gene Welch	22%	\$ 37.88	5%	\$ 60,718.62	\$ 8.19	\$ 29.68	
PUC: Jack Patterson	39%	\$ 55.40			\$ 21.33	\$ 34.07	
PUC: John Kyllonen	0%	\$ 33.32				\$ 33.32	
PUC: Jonathan Myers	7%	\$ 458.49			\$ 32.11	\$ 426.38	
PUC: Mike Maraviglia	63%	\$ 283.20			\$ 177.43	\$ 94.97	\$ 10.80
PUC: Neil Denatale	0%	\$ 66.58				\$ 66.58	
PUC: Tim Bell	0%	\$ 34.39				\$ 34.39	
Real Estate:	0%	\$ 1,132.38				\$ 360.18	\$ 772.20
Real Estate: Bernard Sandoval	0%	\$ 14.00	0%	\$ 1,153.33		\$ 14.00	
Real Estate: Ken Hangartner	0%	\$ 6.95				\$ 6.95	

Dept & Staff	% Green by Customer	\$ by City Staff	% Green by Dept.	\$ by Dept.	GREEN= CFL <5mg Hg, 4-pin; Electronic; Self-ballasted, Energy Star. FLUORESCENT (80+ CRI, Electronic): instant start, standard efficiency non-4' T8; T5 Linear, T8 4', ECO, long life; non-4' T8 Linear. HID, Metal Halide.	LIMITED USE= Fluorescent: T9 Circular; CFL, 2-pin, <5 mg of Hg; Preheat, T12, T8 not long life; T8 with CRI >75<80. Halogen. HID, HPS, metal halide: cycling or probe start. Incandescent (non-A shape)	PROHIBITED= CFL, Self-Ballasted, not ENERGY STAR, or >5mg of Hg. Fluorescent: 4' T8, Not TCLP/ECO, CRI <80, NOT long life; Magnetic Except Preheat. HID, Mercury Vapor. Incandescent, Exit Sign or A-shape.
Rec & Park:	30%	\$ 5,465.69			\$ 1,654.12	\$ 2,593.87	\$ 1,217.70
Rec & Park: Bill Gunn	0%	\$ 28.00				\$ 28.00	
Rec & Park: Declan Sharkey	0%	\$ 5.22	30%	\$ 5,520.34		\$ 5.22	
Rec & Park: Helen Vozenilek	0%	\$ 21.44				\$ 21.44	
School District: Nick	100%	\$ 24.86	100%	\$ 27.47	\$ 24.86		
School District: Tony Chavez	100%	\$ 2.61			\$ 2.61		
Sheriff:	36%	\$ 6,750.21	36%	\$ 6,750.21	\$ 2,402.04	\$ 2,222.37	\$ 2,125.80
Technology: Benny Alcantara	0%	\$ 1.46	0%	\$ 1.46		\$ 1.46	
War Memorial:	0%	\$ 1,197.00				\$ 1,197.00	
War Memorial: Jim Jacobs	0%	\$ 93.41	0%	\$ 1,290.41		\$ 93.41	
Zoo: Angela Potts	100%	\$ 9.58			\$ 9.58	\$ -	
Zoo: Brian Brim	5%	\$ 124.92	19%	\$ 213.92	\$ 6.38	\$ 118.54	
Zoo: Lorena Cota	31%	\$ 79.41			\$ 24.92	\$ 52.11	\$ 2.38
Grand Total			26%	\$256,320.74	\$ 66,558.28	\$ 175,562.73	\$ 14,199.73

From: Board of Supervisors
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: FCC proceeding action needed
Attachments: FCC reply instructions for cities, counties.doc; Background information, Elect. Pollution.doc; Notice of prop rulemaking excerpt12-12.pdf; Sample resolution.doc

From: nbeety@netzero.net [mailto:nbeety@netzero.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 9:19 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: FCC proceeding action needed

February 27, 2013

To the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

The FCC has opened a proceeding in which they could revise our national exposure limits for RF (radiofrequency electromagnetic radiation), including as it pertains to wireless radiation.

This board requested this by resolution 102-10 in 2010 – "Resolution urging the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to study the health impacts of wireless facilities and, if appropriate, to establish a safe level of exposure to radiofrequency radiation emissions; urging the Federal Communications Commission to update its existing standards". In it you said a number of things, including

...the San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges the Federal Communications Commission to pursue a comprehensive global analysis of best practices and scientific evidence in order to update its existing standards and to adequately measure the health impacts of wireless facilities.

Would you agendize for next Tuesday consideration of writing a letter to the FCC stating this?

The FCC could raise exposure limits -- in other words, make them more lenient. That is why the input the FCC receives is so important.

Attached is a sample resolution. However, you have a very short deadline – March 6. A simple letter from you would be significant.

The important thing is to write to the FCC and ask them to establish biologically-based (rather than only thermally based) exposure standards for RF, taking into account the research and the most vulnerable populations, including children. Asking them to have the EPA do the evaluation of research is also, I think, important.

Here are some of the resolutions along with yours that passed:

http://cloutnow.org/lacbospdf/lacbos_resolutions.pdf
County of Los Angeles June 2, 2009

<http://cloutnow.org/localrespdf/PimaCountyResolution.pdf>
County of Pima, Arizona August 4, 2009

<http://santabarbara.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=536114&GUID=3D142EF5-AB4A-4244-BFD1-72F46246FC06>
County of Santa Barbara November 10, 2009

<http://www.westsanpedro.org/T-Mobile%20Cell%20Tower%20Resolution.pdf>
Los Angeles Unified School District Dec. 8, 2009

<http://www.sfbos.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/bdsupvrs/resolutions10/r0102-10.pdf>
County and City of San Francisco March 23, 2010

<http://cloutnow.org/localrespdf/PortlandResolution.pdf>
Portland, Oregon May 12, 2009

Attached is information on the proceeding from www.electricalpollution.com, with excerpts from the FCC notice of proposed ruling, and instructions on filing an FCC reply comment from EMR Policy Institute (www.emrpolicy.org). The proceeding is in the "reply" phase of taking public input; if the board takes action, it would be submitting a "reply".

This is very important. Please agendaize this for your consideration next week. Thank you.

Nina Beety
Monterey, CA
nbeety@netzero.net

File 121019

From: Roland Salvato [rolandsalvato@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2013 5:26 PM
To: Wiener, Scott
Cc: Board of Supervisors; Avalos, John; Breed, London; Cohen, Malia; Farrell, Mark; Kim, Jane; Mar, Eric (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Chu, Carmen; Campos, David; Chiu, David; Tang, Katy; Planning Commissioner (Hisashi) Sugaya; Planning Commissioner Rodney FONG; Planning Commissioner Kathrin MOORE; Planning Commissioner (Gwyneth) Borden; Rodney (Planning Commission) Fong; Planning Commissioner (Cindy) Wu; Planning Commissioner (Michael) Antonini; HPC Andrew Wolfram; HPC RSE Johns; HPC Karl Hasz; aaron.hyland.hpc@gmail.com; HPC Diane
Subject: Still Time To Do The Right Thing With Your CEQA Legislation

Land Use Clerk

Supervisor Wiener,

It's been more than three months since the November hearing in which the Planning Commission suggested that you meet with constituents and stakeholders about your CEQA legislation, instead of just throwing it up to see if it sticks.

Since then you've hosted a few meetings with some of the stakeholders (I'm aware of two, plus one planned for tomorrow) and you had a chance to see a range of concerns and suggestions, most of which were given to you in writing and in very good faith.

Yet, the two sets of changes you've made to your first draft of the legislation do not reflect *any* of the significant recommendations from the more than 15 community-based groups focusing on improving CEQA. You've taken the time to host these "outreach" meetings, but your stated goal in the preamble to each meeting was to "explain" the legislation, rather than work with us to improve it.

This is ironic, given your statement that *"I've been meeting with various community stakeholders to ensure that the public has accurate information about the legislation and to receive feedback to make the legislation even stronger."* What gives you the right to say that, if it's not true?

Even if we try to overlook the obvious flaws at the outset of your legislative process (i.e., neglecting to call a broad set of community stakeholders to the table), there are two other concerns that cannot be ignored:

- You've neglected to supply any evidence—statistical or otherwise—to substantiate the reasons your legislation includes shorter appeal periods, looser notification requirements, more leniency to the Environmental Review Officer and other stunning restrictions on the public's rights of appeal under CEQA in all of your drafts.
- You've neglected to incorporate the most important elements devised by the community groups to improve the legislation, even though they've been elucidated verbally at each meeting and provided to you consistently in writing.

You have said: "*CEQA is an important environmental protection statute that, at times, can be used not to protect the environment but rather to oppose projects having nothing to do with the environment.*" If that is true then it shouldn't be so hard to provide evidence that some CEQA appeals are illegitimate. Without proof, this statement is no more than unfounded prejudice. If you are proposing by this statement to change the State's definition of 'Environmental Protection', then nothing in your legislation does that.

You have also said: "*Our current process is the opposite - vague and chaotic, favoring those who are experienced in the process at the expense of the general public.*" Can you specify the 'expense to the public' of this 'vague and chaotic' process – a process that citizens have been applying since 1970 when Governor Ronald Reagan signed the State legislation?

Finally, what have you really accomplished—and what can you justly accomplish—by pretending to solicit community feedback to your legislation? Tomorrow you will have one more opportunity to do the right thing – please don't waste it.



ROSALES LAW PARTNERS LLP
February 28, 2013

File 130072
BOS-11
cpage

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2013 MAR - 1 PM 2:25

Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors
c/o Angela Calvillo, Clerk
San Francisco, City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4698

Re: Supplemental item to Exhibit J to JCDecaux North America, Inc. Protest Letter

Dear Supervisors:

On February 8, 2013, the undersigned, on behalf of JCDecaux North America, Inc., presented correspondence and supporting documentation entitled: "Protest to the Airport Commission's Award of the SFO Advertising Lease to Clear Channel Airports" (hereinafter "JCDecaux Protest"). Exhibit J to that JCDecaux Protest is identified as "Summary of Clear Channel's practices at other Airports" and describes Clear Channel's business practices with the City of Los Angeles and ongoing litigation involving Clear Channel and the City of Los Angeles in the California Court of Appeal.

Attached to this letter is a February 23, 2013 Los Angeles Times online news article¹ stating that Clear Channel has provided notice to Los Angeles of its intent to pursue a \$100MM claim against the city if the city complies with the Court's decision to remove illegal digital signs erected by Clear Channel across Los Angeles.

We ask that this news article be considered a supplemental to JCDecaux Protest's Exhibit J, filed with the Board of Supervisors' Clerk Office on February 8, 2013. I enclose eleven courtesy copies for Board members.

Sincerely,

Mara E. Rosales

cc: City Attorney Dennis Herrera
John L. Martin, Airport Director
Hon. Airport Commission, c/o Jean Caramatti, Secretary
Sheryl Bregman, Airport General Counsel
Harvey Rose, Board of Supervisors Budget Analyst
Bernard Parisot, Co-CEO, JCDecaux

¹ Source: <http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/lanow/2013/02/digital-billboard-company-issues-100-million-threat-against-la.html>

Los Angeles Times LOCAL



L.A. NOW

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA -- THIS JUST IN

Digital billboard company issues \$100-million threat against L.A.

February 23, 2013 | 2:07 pm

This post has been corrected. See note below for details.

A billboard company fighting to preserve dozens of digital signs it has erected across Los Angeles warned this week that it would go to court to seek more than \$100 million from City Hall if it is ordered to remove its electronic signs.

In an 11-page letter sent Friday, Clear Channel Outdoor described its digital signs as "valuable assets that the city cannot attempt to take away without paying just compensation."

The letter comes two months after a three-judge panel struck down an agreement approved by the City Council in 2006 that allowed Clear Channel and CBS Outdoor to replace 840 existing billboards with digital billboards.

That panel ordered a lower court to invalidate all digital conversions permitted under the agreement. But Sara Lee Keller, Clear Channel's lawyer, warned that if the council instructs the company to turn off the signs "it would be exposed to liability to Clear Channel for the fair market value of such signs, which substantially exceeds \$100 million."

"While litigating these claims would be costly and time-consuming for all ... we believe it is important to be clear about the consequences," Keller wrote. Clear Channel managed to install 79 digital billboards before the agreement was blocked.

The letter drew a sharp response from Summit Media, a competing sign company that successfully sued to block the 2006 agreement. Phil Recht, the company's attorney, said in a statement that Clear Channel made it clear that it has "no regard for the rule of law."

"Clear Channel is trying to bully the city into submission so that they can continue to make hundreds of millions of dollars in illegal profits from these digital billboards two courts ruled to be illegal," he said.

The threat was sent one day before neighborhood activists and outdoor advertising lobbyists -- including Clear Channel and its representatives -- participated in a working group to discuss possible digital sign legislation. One proposal up for discussion would allow new digital billboards to be installed in exchange for the removal of a greater number of static billboards.

Clear Channel and a handful of other billboard companies have contributed tens of thousands of dollars in recent weeks to Proposition A, which is on the March 5 ballot and would hike the sales tax rate to 9.5%. That measure, if passed, would generate more than \$200 million annually for the city budget.

Meanwhile, Lamar Advertising, which has proposed its own plan for converting signs to digital formats, has been spending \$5,000 per candidate on outdoor advertising promoting the City Council campaigns of Councilman Joe Buscaino, Assemblymen Bob Blumenfield (D-Woodland Hills) and Gil Cedillo (D-Los Angeles), and former Assemblyman Felipe Fuentes, as well as the city controller campaign of Councilman Dennis Zine.

Summit has portrayed the original 2006 digital sign agreement as a "sweetheart deal" that gave CBS and Clear Channel permission to install technology prohibited under city law. The company also argues that digital signs diminish the quality of life in Los Angeles.

Clear Channel has been waging a massive publicity campaign in favor of digital billboards, creating an advocacy group to argue on its behalf. In its letter, the company touted support for electronic signs from such groups as AIDS Project Los Angeles, Art Share L.A. and the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce. Those groups, among others, have asked the state Supreme Court to review the ruling that invalidated the 2006 digital sign pact, according to Clear Channel's letter.

Jim Cullinan, a Clear Channel spokesman, said his company was still looking for a legislative solution but is required to give 90 days' notice that it may file a legal claim in court. "This letter gives notice," he said in a statement. "But we hope it doesn't come to litigation."

[For the record, 8:27 p.m. Feb. 23: A previous version of this post identified the company paying for billboards to promote candidates as Vista Media. In fact, it is Lamar Advertising. Lamar also has a different mix of candidates who will appear on its billboards: According to the company, it is not promoting council aide Mike Bonin and Councilman Paul Koretz but is promoting former Assemblyman Felipe Fuentes and Councilman Dennis Zine.]

ALSO:

Santa Ana hoping for big returns in first-ever gun buyback

Whittier police hunt for girl believed to have escaped kidnapper

Marine corporal accused of murder in Army Reserve officer's death

-- David Zahniser at Los Angeles City Hall

BOS-11
page

Commissioners
Michael Sutton, President
Monterey
Richard Rogers, Vice President
Santa Barbara
Jim Kellogg, Member
Discovery Bay
Jack Baylis, Member
Los Angeles
Vacant, Member

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor

Sonke Mastrup, Executive Director
1416 Ninth Street, Room 1320
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-4899
(916) 653-5040 Fax
www.fgc.ca.gov

Fish and Game Commission



February 26, 2013

TO ALL AFFECTED AND INTERESTED PARTIES:

This is to provide you with a Notice of Findings regarding the white shark (*Carcharodon carcharias*) which will be published in the California Regulatory Notice Register on March 1, 2013.

Sincerely,

Sheri Tiemann
Sheri Tiemann
Staff Services Analyst

Attachment

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2013 MAR - 1 PM 2:35
BY *[Signature]*

Commissioners
Michael Sutton, President
Monterey

Richard Rogers, Vice President
Santa Barbara
Jim Kellogg, Member
Discovery Bay
Jack Baylis, Member
Los Angeles
Vacant, Member

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor

Fish and Game Commission



Sonke Mastrup, Executive Director
1416 Ninth Street, Room 1320
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-4899
(916) 653-5040 Fax
www.fgc.ca.gov

CALIFORNIA FISH AND GAME COMMISSION NOTICE OF FINDINGS

White Shark (*Carcharodon carcharias*)


NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, pursuant to the provisions of Section 2074.2 of the Fish and Game Code, the California Fish and Game Commission, at its February 6, 2013, meeting in Sacramento, California, accepted for consideration the petition submitted to list the Northeastern Pacific Ocean population of white shark as a threatened or endangered species. Pursuant to subdivision (a)(2) of Section 2074.2 of the Fish and Game Code, the aforementioned species is hereby declared a candidate species as defined by Section 2068 of the Fish and Game Code.

Within one year of the date of publication of this notice of findings, the Department of Fish and Wildlife shall submit a written report, pursuant to Section 2074.6 of the Fish and Game Code, indicating whether the petitioned action is warranted. Copies of the petition, as well as minutes of the February 6, 2013, Commission meeting, are on file and available for public review from Sonke Mastrup, Executive Director, Fish and Game Commission, 1416 Ninth Street, Box 944209, Sacramento, California 94244-2090, phone (916) 653-4899. Written comments or data related to the petitioned action should be directed to the Commission at the aforementioned address.

Fish and Game Commission

February 19, 2013

Sonke Mastrup
Executive Director



File 120987
Bos - 11
GAO Clerk
Page

Marina Civic Improvement & Property Owners Association

February 28, 2013

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2013 MAR - 1 PM 4: 26
AK

Re: File No. 120987 – Marina Degaussing Station

Dear President Chiu and Supervisors,

Marina Civic Improvement & Property Owners Association remains adamantly **OPPOSED** to the commercialization of our beloved, historic Marina Green through the proposed 20-year ground and building lease agreement with Woodhouse Marina Green LLC to operate a 75-seat restaurant and take-out food service at the Degaussing Station.

We are herewith submitting the attached 37 petition pages representing 501 signatures of members, neighbors and friends of the Green who support our position. This is in addition to the 201 signatures we submitted on November 28, 2012 and the 759 signatures we submitted on January 30, 2013.

The Marina Green is San Francisco's prime public shoreline open space and a Category A Historic Resource. Please do not degrade our OPEN SPACE by commercializing it.

Vote NO on the Lease Agreement.

Sincerely,

Joan Girardot
Secretary

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

21

BOS-11
FILE # 120987
Gao Clerk
CPAGE

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2013 MAR - 1 PM 4:27

SAVE MARINA GREEN

WWW.SAVEMARINAGREEN.ORG

Sampling of Comments From Citizens Supporting "NO RESTAURANT ON MARINA GREEN"

- 2/26/13 Nancy Kivette, San Francisco, CA
"Please uphold public policy, which does not permit conversion of this historic building and landmark of the Marina Green public park space, into a restaurant that violates the Open Space Element of the General Plan. The Woodhouse Fish Company will generate noise, traffic, pollution and waste, and is not welcome or needed by anyone who enjoys the Marina Green in its intended form as a beautiful park and open space. Thank you"
- 2/23/13 Howard Wong, San Francisco, CA
"Instead, strengthen the restaurant corridors on Chestnut Street, Fillmore Street, Union Street, Presidio and adjoining neighborhoods."
- 2/23/13 Robert Arnold, San Francisco, CA
"Don't ruin this beautiful area with new construction"
- 2/23/13 Malana Moberg, San Francisco, CA
"We need to stop these undemocratic maneuvers throughout the city."
- 2/20/13 Murielle Robert, San Francisco, CA
"There are already a lot of restaurants in San Francisco. Why can't we leave this green and open space alone? They are not too many places left in San Francisco where you can relax and not see another commercial building."
- 2/19/13 Sara Beebe, Reno NV
"I came to San Francisco for a day trip and saw a "Stop Restaurant" sign and was curious as to what was going in. Upon reading the article I feel it's best to help in my way to keep Marina Green commercial free."
- 2/18/13 Roland Salvato, San Francisco, CA
"Insist on open government, fair land use policies!"
- 2/17/13 Michael G. Prieto, Moss Beach, CA
"We frequently visit the Marina Green area and friends with homes and families in the Marina District (including young children). The "restaurant" approval needs to undergo the same review process required of me if I wanted to start a business on the Marina Green. The Navy never intended the area to be used like this and the project should be stopped."

22)

- 2/17/13 Linda Prieto, Moss Beach, CA
"There are enough restaurants for everybody in San Francisco and not enough open space!"
- 2/14/13 Margaret Hazelrig, San Francisco, CA
"Let's preserve the marina green! There is already so much commercial space throughout SF. This is the one place that has continuously stayed the same & it should be as it is a historic landmark & what keeps people coming back. Good luck!"
- 2/14/13 Jacob, San Francisco, CA
"Please save the marina green as an open space for recreation and not commercial interest. We really love to utilize the area for running and soccer and other outdoor/healthy interest!"
- 2/13/13 Martha Shaughnessy, Mountain View, CA
"We have to stop SF from being overrun by people who come live here for a party period of their 20s. This is a treasured family environment, and its destruction will only add to the sense that SF is not a good place to raise kids."
- 2/13/13 Lisa Ligon, San Francisco, CA
"I strongly support this petition ."
- 2/13/13 Matthew Lynch, San Francisco, CA
"San Francisco is already packed with Bars & Restaurants, let's keep the Marina Green GREEN after-all."
- 2/13/13 Nanci Baccei, San Francisco, CA
"Don't ruin our neighborhood!"
- 2/13/13 Patricia Kruger, San Francisco, CA
"Last open space for kids to play soccer or just fly a kite. The Marina has enough bars and restaurants."
- 2/10/13 David Maloney, San Francisco, CA
"The historic building is the degaussing station and it had a major role in the defenses of the Bay Area during WWII. The building should be retained with a placard in front of it which would explain the historical significance of the building."
- 2/9/13 Alexander Darabian, San Francisco, CA
"Protect our open spaces and stop commercial use of Marina Green"

- 2/9/13 Frances Stack, San Francisco, CA
 "Do not spoil the beauty of Marina Green. There are enough restaurants in the city and close by to suffice. Leave Marina Green natural."
- 2/8/13 Karen Nelson, Sacramento, CA
 "I care about the Marina Green!"
- 2/7/13 Dennis Caselli, DDS, San Francisco, CA
 "There are many restaurants within walking distance of Marina Greens so there is no need for this. The greens were meant to be an open space and should be kept that way."
- 2/7/13 Ashley Wessinger, San Francisco, CA
 "Absolutely NO commercialization of Marina Green!!"
- 2/6/13 Daniela Kirshenbaum, San Francisco, CA
 "Must every bit of our waterfront be converted for private profit?"
- 2/6/13 Lucy Serafino, San Francisco, CA
 "I oppose any restaurant on the Marina Green. Marina Green is beautiful and tranquil...leave it that way. There are plenty of restaurants close by on Chestnut Street that should suffice one's appetite."
- 2/6/13 Tess Lispi, San Francisco, CA
 "The marshes and marina are fragile ecosystems that a restaurant will permanently disrupt. All for what? No thank you."
- 2/6/13 Deanna Gumina, San Francisco, CA
 "I do not support SF Park and Rec Dept's proposal to allow Woodhouse Fish Company to operate a restaurant on the Marina Greens."
- 2/5/13 Jeanne Pellegrini, San Francisco, CA
 "I grew up across the street and enjoyed the Marina Greens and the beautiful view all of my life. There is enough congestion on Chestnut Street and Lombard Street and plenty of places to eat and drink. Why ruin a beautiful residential neighborhood and one of the only beautiful and open places left in our City."
- 2/5/13 Ray Wilhelm, San Francisco, CA
 "THIS MADNESS MUST STOP !"
- 2/5/13 Richard Pellegrini, San Francisco, CA
 "It would be a disgrace to allow one of the most beautiful important views in the world with a commercial restaurant"

- 2/5/13 Jana Shober, Elk Grove, CA
 “NO RESTAURANT! Keep the Marina Green as is - a commercial free space for the people!”
- 2/5/13 Doug Clark, Snellville, GA
 “Please do not destroy this valued asset to the city and the country. Remember that tourism is a significant part of your economy. Please do not chip away at it for a fish restaurant.”
- 2/5/13 Katrina Sherman, San Francisco, CA
 “Please keep the integrity of our parks as places to relax from the hustle and bustle of traffic and commerce.”
- 2/5/13 Celia Sanders, Knebworth, United Kingdom
 “I lived in S.F. for two years and agree with my friends there that this plan should not go ahead.”
- 2/4/13 Selma Bomfim, Mill Valley, CA
 “stop proposed commercial use of the Marina Green”
- 2/4/13 Dorsey McTaggart, Corte Madera, CA
 “Keep the area non-commercial, please!”
- 2/4/13 Louise Ajer, San Francisco, CA
 “Any kind of commercial use would destroy the beauty and neighborhood of the Marina Green.”
- 2/4/13 Robin Mitchell, San Francisco, CA
 “Marina Green is a wonderful open space as it is, and should remain as it is.”
- 2/4/13 Siegfried and Eike Linkwitz, Corte Madera, CA
 “Please keep the Marine Green, our beautiful park free of any commercial use, like a restaurant serving alcohol on top of it.”
- 2/4/13 Kay Gillis, Kentfield, CA
 “This needs an Environmental Report done and an ADA evaluation before ANY plans proceed!”
- 2/4/13 Janet Neaves, San Francisco, CA
 “I love the food at Woodhouse but it doesn't belong in a public park.”
- 2/4/13 Jean Chaitin, San Francisco, CA
 “Marina Green is a gem. Don't ruin it by commercializing it.”

- 1/28/13 Ashley Blinn, Cameron Park, CA
"True, I am no longer living in San Francisco, but I will always care. I do enjoy Marina Green when I visit the city and have many fond memories from high school particularly. I'm sure that it can never mean the same to tourists who might just look at it as a big lawn with a bay view. I know it means very much more to residents, and want to be residents."
- 1/28/13 Angela Alioto, San Francisco, CA
"As a born and raised San Franciscan, I am stunned that any person the City government would not understand that the absolute beauty of the Marina Greens should never be touched. If one restaurant goes in that is the camel's nose in the tent and the gorgeous Marina Greens will become another Fisherman's Wharf, it's just THAT simple."

Signed, Angela Alioto, Former President of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco
- 1/28/13 Tom Sinkovitz, San Francisco, CA
"It is almost impossible to comprehend that the city's search for revenues would result in such carelessness. A restaurant/bar on the Marina Green is grotesquely out of character. It says that commercialization -- on the Green and surely in other parks -- takes priority over all else including plain common sense."
- 1/28/13 Virginia Travers, Mill Valley, CA
"I grew up in the Marina. This is wrong. Let tourists go to the Warf, leave the Marina for the San Franers."
- 1/28/13 Pat Akrell, San Rafael, CA
"This spot should be kept available for everyone to use, not just for those going to a restaurant. Do not spoil a perfect spot."
- 1/27/13 Christina Giner, San Francisco, CA
"A restaurant doesn't belong on the Marina Green. It's too small of a park for a restaurant. Keep the Marina Green a non-commercial zone."
- 1/26/13 Richard Wilpitz, San Francisco, CA
"no restaurant. There are plenty of restaurants in the city and in the area, but few open un commercial areas"
- 1/25/13 Junona Jones, San Francisco, CA
"There are too few green spaces in San Francisco as it is. The Marina Green is a treasure for all of us who live in SF. PLEASE DO NOT MAKE IT A COMMERCIAL RESTAURANT!"

- 2/4/13 Eve Solomon, San Francisco, CA
"NO COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT ON MARINA GREEN"
- 2/4/13 Dennis Ziebell, San Francisco, CA
"Commercialization of Public Spaces are short term solutions for incompetent contingency planning and fiscal policy by San Francisco Politicians. Leave our Public Spaces alone. If you are short on cash, cut your own benefits --not the Public's."
- 2/4/13 Edward and Judith Troy, San Rafael, CA
"Please, no commercialization of the Marine Green. Don't spoil it by allowing another restaurant to open in this public spot."
- 2/2/13 Claire Blake, San Francisco, CA
"We already have one Pier 39. No commercialization of the Green, please."
- 2/1/13 Nuala Caulfield, San Francisco, CA
"We need space free of commercialization more than we need a fish or any other kind of restaurant. Why block the view of our magnificent bay?"
- 2/1/13 Poul Poulsen, San Rafael, CA
"Why on earth would anybody to ruin this lovely space."
- 1/31/13 Joseph Hill, San Francisco, CA
"I have read both sides of the argument and have come to the realization that commercial development of the Marina Green, in any capacity is not in the interest of any denizen of San Francisco."
- 1/30/13 Max Brunner, Los Altos Hills, CA
"I strongly believe this green space should be preserved."
- 1/29/13 James Syar, San Francisco, CA
"This is a historic vista. Restaurants are not self-contained units---they have dumpsters, kitchen waste, napkins that blow away in the wind, smoke and smells. The town is full of restaurants and this is the last spot that needs more traffic, food delivery trucks, and garbage trucks. Also very likely they may go belly up in a year or -to leave behind a ruined little city treasure"
- 1/29/13 Marilyn McDonagh, San Francisco, CA
"No commercial use!"
- 1/28/13 Virginia Traves, Mill Valley, CA
"I grew up in the Marina. This is wrong. Let tourists go to the Wharf, leave the Marina for the San Franciscans!"

- 1/25/13 Chad Wayne Smiddy, San Francisco, CA
 "I run where they want to put this restaurant every other day... How obnoxious it would be to deal with the parking lot, people, etc. as I attempt to enjoy a public space a block from my home."
- 1/25/13 Susan Williams-Pellegrini, Hillsborough, CA
 "A blind idea that would open the door to other such enterprises. Preserve Marina Greens as open space."
- 1/25/13 Susan Wilpitz, San Francisco, CA
 " Preserve the Marina Green"
- 1/25/13 Robert Pellegrini, Hillsborough, CA
 "Preserve Marina Greens"
- 1/24/13 Jeanne Glennon, San Francisco, CA
 "Stop this stupid idea!"
- 1/24/13 John Grauel, San Francisco, CA
 "Please - no commercial development on the Marina Green."
- 1/24/13 Kate Robinson, San Francisco, CA
 "We simple can not commercialize the Marina Green. Keep it open space. There already exist many food sources, both take out & sit down"
- 1/21/13 Bina Shah, San Francisco, CA
 "Please do not take away our open urban spaces. There are plenty of restaurants on Chestnut Street for people to eat at. We do not need to commercialize our beautiful Marina Green. Please keep it "Green" for the thousands of residents and tourists who pass through it daily."
- 1/20/13 Aaron Travis, San Francisco, CA
 "Love food but keep it away from MG!"
- 1/20/13 Annabella Travis, San Francisco, CA
 "Boo Restaurant"
- 1/20/13 Selena Travis, San Francisco, CA
 "Keep SF green!"
- 1/19/13 Mark Souter, San Francisco, CA
 "This does not make Financial or Civic Sense!"

- 1/19/13 Ryan Weidenmiller, San Francisco, CA
 "Commercialization of an important and historic waterfront should be prevented so that we have more green space for our future."
- 1/18/13 Kate Doherty, San Francisco, CA
 "Green space in a city is so important to our well-being - please don't take our green space!"
- 1/18/13 Al Shelly, Circleville, WV
 "Let's save what we can of the SF of my youth!"
- 1/16/13 Darian Swig, San Francisco, CA
 "I vehemently oppose the commercialization of the Marina Green"
- 1/16/13 Corinne de Ciofalo- Guell, San Francisco CA
 "Stop the greed, money, money, MONEY!"
- 1/15/13 Gerald Nutt, Portland OR
 "One wonders what has become of the City Government, that it would consider defacing Marina Green."
- 1/14/13 Bergen Hung, San Francisco
 "I would like to protect the environment. Thanks.
- 1/14/13 Vita Rodriguez, San Francisco, CA
 "Please, no restaurant on The Greens!
- 1/14/13 Donald Russell, San Francisco, CA
 "The economics of this type of facility at this location is not sustainable. You can count the evenings each year on both hands that you can enjoy an outdoor dinner on Marina Green."
- 1/14/13 Ella Duval, San Francisco, CA
 "Please - no restaurant on Marina Green."
- 1/13/13 Rachael Kim, San Francisco, CA
 "Keep Marina Green pure."
- 1/13/13 Nancy Wuerfel, San Francisco, CA
 "A restaurant is not a recreational building that is permitted to be newly constructed on R/P land WITHOUT A VOTE OF THE PEOPLE! Read the CHARTER, ART. 4, SEC. 4.113. DO NOT let our parks become just vacant land to be turned into commercial buildings! Where does it Stop?"
- 1/1/13 David Lehr, San Francisco, CA
 "The Marina is one of the few open spaces left. We do not want a restaurant here, especially one that serves alcohol and violates public policy"

- 1/9/13 Vaibhav Singh, San Francisco, CA
 “No more construction on open spaces !!”
- 1/8/13 Maureen Downey, San Francisco, CA
 “Chestnut Street - mere blocks away has many, many, many restaurant choices and a Starbucks across from Safeway at the base of the Marina Green if you cannot make it to Chestnut Street- this will increase litter and unwanted traffic in a park area - not to mention besmirch the ambiance of the Marina Green.”
- 1/8/13 Lisa Rostoker. Tamalpais Valley, CA
 “Chestnut Street is loaded with restaurant choices... just blocks away. We have little open space available to enjoy as it is. Please keep Woodhouse away from the Marina Green!”
- 1/8/13 Rick Elfman, San Francisco, CA
 “Please don’t open a restaurant on our beautiful open space. It will create traffic problems, parking problems and people problems.”
- 1/8/13 Sally Seehafer, San Francisco, CA
 “Please keep our open space. Please. Thank you.”
- 1/8/13 Refuel David Freeman, San Francisco, CA
 “I am against letting Wood house Fish Company open for business without going through the necessary approvals and procedures. This is not right!”
- 1/7/13 Donna Francesconi, San Francisco, CA
 “Please leave the "Green" alone.”
- 1/7/13 Marian Chin, San Francisco, CA
 “Please preserve the Marina Green as a public area.”
- 1/6/13 Connie Mansell, San Francisco, CA
 “Protect our open spaces, stop proposed commercial use of the Marina Green”
- 1/6/13 Rose Sullivan, San Francisco, CA
 “I do not feel that Marina Green should have a commercial establishment!”
- 1/6/13 Irving Zaretsky, San Francisco, CA
 “Protect our open spaces; stop proposed commercial use of the Marina Green.”
- 1/6/13 Aida Pelligrini, San Francisco, CA
 “I am Aida Pelligrini's next door neighbor and she asked me to sign this petition for her. She is in her 80's and does not have a computer / internet. My husband,

Marc Goldyne, and I, Gail Goldyne, signed a petition in December at the SFYC ("light up the Blvd.")”

- 1/3/13 Paula Burton, San Francisco, CA
“Of all places, why one of the most tranquil spots in San Francisco to establish what promises to be a nightly beer garden? “
- 12/31/12 Mike Ackrell, San Francisco, CA
“There should not be any commercial development on Marina Green...public access/views should always be maintained”
- 12/23/12 Mary Anne Miller, San Francisco, CA
“Rec and Park would commercialize the Garden of Eden if they had jurisdiction. Nothing is off limits. Say no to extending Fisherman's Wharf to Marina Green.”
- 12/23/12 Firas Miro, San Francisco, CA
‘Stop woodhouse from bastardizing our land “
- 12/23/12 Olivia Provan, San Francisco, CA
‘Stop woodhouse from ruining our land ‘
- 12/23/12 Sfcoborne, San Francisco, CA
“We have lived in sf for 30years and enjoy walking along the water front which is unspoiled and free from commercial activity. We do not need a restaurant there at the Marina Green. Stop spoiling our City with ugly buildings. Leave it as is.”
- 12/23/12 Andrea Kaye, San Francisco, CA
“Please do not do this. The last thing needed is a high end restaurant in this space serving alcohol...”
- 12/23/12 Michael Barrett, San Francisco, CA
“Enough commercialism of our beautiful natural resources! Leave Mother Nature Alone. Slowly but surely green space in SF is being turned into commercial space. Business is doing just fine in SF. It is the parks and green spaces that are hurting!”
- 12/22/12 Andrea O'Leary, San Francisco, CA
“Lack of public input and civic oversight to this project is, unfortunately, how RPD rams through such projects - and with complicity from City Hall and civic agencies. It needs to stop.”
- 12/22/12 Jane Morrison, San Francisco, CA
“PROTECT OUR OPEN SPACES. NO ROOM ON MARINA GREEN FOR COMMERCIAL USE.”

- 12/22/12 Denis Mosgofian, San Francisco, CA
 “This away-from-public-view proposed contract is exactly what takes place in "public-private" partnership deals, in which control of public property is transferred into private hands. RPD's mission since at least 2009 has been to become an "enterprise" agency, relying on fees from privatizing and commercializing our public realm and relying more on philanthropic donations and fund raising events than on public tax dollars. The same City Administration handed over more than \$30,000,000 of tax dollars to support Larry Ellison's billionaire boat "race", but does not hire sufficient gardeners for our parks, and fired all its recreation directors. To achieve "enterprise" agency status, such regulations as restrictions along our shore line are considered a hindrance like environmental and labor regulations are treated as after thoughts in the secretly negotiated "free trade" agreements. We generally expect our officials to watch out for aggressive developer and commercial demands on public space and rights, but when the head of our Rec & Parks Dept. is himself aggressively pursuing the same thing that developers and investors pursue, the Dept. is out of line. This issue must have full public discussion, and discussion at the RP Commission does not count, since the Commission sees its role as responding only to staff proposals. But where can such a thorough discussion be held since District 2 supervisor is an investor in the hospitality industry and the Mayor and Supervisor Wiener are 100% supporters of RPD's decisions?”
- 12/21/12 Paul Wells, San Francisco, CA
 “Please stop selling off the Waterfront in a hap-hazard, highest bidder manner, subverting due process. I'm a fan of the Woodhouse Fish Company, but also on open space and other concerns, like traffic and parking. Thank you.”
- 12/21/12 Anthony Long, San Francisco, CA
 “You bureaucrats seem hell-bent on turning everything in this town into a commodity.....”
- 12/20/12 Aexandra Grover, San Francisco, CA
 “There are quite enough restaurants in the vicinity. This violates the Open Space Element of the General Plan. The Marina Green should continue to be a public open recreation area where people may enjoy the park.”
- 12/20/12 Corinne Charlton Barbour, San Francisco
 “I grew up in SF & I believe the Marina Green should not be used for commercial purposes. It should remain the peaceful environment that it already is. Thank you.”
- 12/20/12 Darcy Brown, San Francisco

- 12/18/12 Laura a Thompson, San Francisco, CA
 "I feel that the drunkenness that now accompanies the bars on Chestnut Street regardless of weather will spill over to this place even though it closes at 9am. I prefer to see bldg. torn down or at least preserved for some non-alcohol purpose if the city is needing the revenue. Drunken parking and driving near playing children will be dangerous."
- 12/17/12 Marlys Saveri, San Francisco, CA
 "No restaurant on marina green"
- 12/17/12 Don Dutil, San Francisco, CA
 "I am not against commercial use of properties, just as long as we follow the rules which allow for it."
- 12/17/12 Audrey Cole, San Francisco, CA
 "Come on! Don't let them get away with this!"
- 12/17/12 Denise LaPointe, San Francisco, CA
 "Please find a better way to get revenue for our parks and open space."
- 12/17/12 Richard Best, San Francisco, CA
 "The Marina Green provides a unique vista and open space used and enjoyed by all San Franciscans. It should not be sold off and commercialized. Park, Rec and Restaurants should live within its budget and not sell off open space for short term gain at a long term expense to the environment with more traffic, rodents, trash, noise, obstruction of the open vista, etc. Two yacht club structures already provide restaurants for the elite. Fort Mason and the Presidio both provide less offensive restaurants for the public. Once established, restaurants tend to expand in size, liquor sales, noise, hours crowds, etc. Park and Rec posts numerous signs saying "No" to a list of outdoor activities on the Green and now says yes to converting open vistas to private business. Say NO to Park Rec & Restaurants."
- 12/17/12 Lee Radner, San Francisco, CA
 "We must preserve our open recreational space"
- 12/17/12 Jean Barish, New York, NY
 "Another example of RPD's abuse of power. Why are they consistently allowed to be above the law?"
- 12/16/12 Jeanne Quock, San Francisco, CA
 "Please. San Franciscans want to see natural skyline and expanses of land and water. We need peaceful, non-commercialized zones."

- 12/16/12 Edith Walker, San Francisco
 “Space + greenery should be cherished, especially combined with that vista. Restaurants can go ELSEWHERE. It's nice to walk, jog, bike, or play and meanwhile have a break from commerce.”
- 12/16/12 Katherine Howard, San Francisco, CA
 “This is part of RPD's strategic plan to commercialize and privatize our public spaces, ignoring the fact that parks should be PARKS and that natural, open space is important for a city as dense as San Francisco. Please also join us in fighting the plans to rip out over 7 acres of naturalistic parkland and habitat in the western end of Golden Gate Park and install a soccer complex. There are alternatives! Learn more at sfoceanedge.org.”
- 12/16/12 Ron Mori, San Francisco, CA
 “The Port Authority (SF Rec and Park) needs to see the value of the public space it handles - BEYOND the moneys it can generate.”
- 12/16/12 Carolyn Peterson, San Francisco, CA
 “I would rather see the Degaussing Station permanently torn down, rather than see it moved and reborn as a restaurant.”
- 12/15/12 Judy Berkowitz, San Francisco, CA
 “Negotiations between the City and Woodhouse were done behind closed doors, so no one but the two parties have known about this plan. There was no notice to those neighbors. Now it's going back to committee because the SF General Plan is specific in what is situated on the shoreline, and a restaurant isn't in those specifics. And CA Statutes §437 specifically forbids commercial leases on Marina Green. The Rec&Park Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval to the Board of Supervisors, but have you ever seen a RPC meeting? It's pretty much lock-step yes-men. Since RPD under Ginsburg is moving toward becoming an enterprise department, churning out its own source of income instead of relying on the city's budget (General Fund), the business is expected to generate over \$100K for RPD. And RPD doesn't have to share any of that with the city.”
- 12/13/12 Maria Laur, San Francisco, CA
 “Use it as a clubhouse that will promote sports/outdoor activities for kids and adults ... There are more than enough restaurant in the Marina.”
- 12/6/12 Camille Denton, Plant City FL
 “I don't live in the area but I am a frequent visitor and my favorite running path is the stretch from Ft. Mason to Crissy Field and I love to see that open green field and all the kids and dogs playing in it. It would be a shame to see yet more commercialism take that place!”

- 11/28/12 Kenneth A Selvidge, San Francisco, CA
 “Creating commerce in a beautiful landmark park is not a responsible action
 Please keep this wonderful open green space for all of San Francisco”
- 11/27/12 Jaein Yoon, Alameda, CA
 “Nooooooooo restaurants on marina green please!”
- 11/27/12 Gilbert Williams, San Francisco, CA
 “No commercial use of the marina green!”
- 11/26/12 Anisha Shiao, San Francisco, CA
 'Woodhouse Fish Company' in neon lights will now adorn the lovely Marina
 Green. It's amazing how many people think this is a great idea! Stop it before it's
 too late.”
- 11/26/12 Lindon Shiao, San Francisco, CA
 “This is not the place to operate a business”
- 11/26/12 Kwei Hung, San Francisco, CA
 “This is a ridiculous idea, unless sharing your fish and chips with seagulls defines
 fine dining in San Francisco. Has anyone thought of the nuisance value this type
 of operation will bring? And what about the number of people it benefits? A very
 small number compared to the people who it will affect. The residents on Marina
 Blvd will have to live with this nightmare of noise, bright lights and litter 7 days a
 week!”
- 11/26/12 Vera Haile, San Francisco, CA
 “Marina neighborhood residents oppose many public programs like parts of Muni,
 but surely they want to keep the Marina there.”
- 11/26/12 Jeff Bragg, San Francisco, CA
 “Please stop prostituting San Francisco's public places. Please no alcohol in
 public playgrounds”
- 11/26/12 Carl Mazer, San Francisco, CA
 “THE CITY IS NOT FOR SALE!”
- 11/26/12 Ruth Obuhoff, San Francisco, CA
 “NO Alcohol, no restaurant, no commercialization of our City's Open Space”
- 11/26/12 Caroline Talley, San Francisco, CA
 “Please keep the Marina the way it is- there are not many beach front parks like
 this anymore. Commercial businesses are all taking over. Let's Keep San
 Francisco unique like it's always been!”

- 11/25/12 John McGee, San Francisco, CA
"Please don't build here!"
- 11/18/12 Joanna Richardson, San Francisco, CA
"This is a family neighborhood with enough restaurants already! Open space is MORE IMPORTANT!!"
- 11/15/12 Oleg Obuhoff, San Francisco, CA
"Need city wide disclosures Transparency of project"
- 11/15/12 Nicole Prieto, San Francisco, CA
"Please stop the proposed commercial use on the Marina Green"
- 11/15/12 Arthur Scampa, San Francisco, CA
"Stop the Commercialization of the Marina Green, preserve this unique urban open shoreline park."
- 11/15/12 Meghan Harris, San Francisco, CA
"this should be stopped!"

BOS-11

From: Ashley Wessinger [ashleywessinger@me.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 02, 2013 7:32 AM
To: Chiu, David
Cc: Board of Supervisors
Subject: File # 120987 (Marina Degaussing Station Restaurant Proposal)

Dear David,

I am a resident of the Marina and a member if the Marina Community Association.

I am strongly **opposed** to the Woodhouse project for the following reasons:

- 1) I do not want alcohol near a public park or play area.
- 2) I do not want to see the water front developed.
- 3) I do not want more traffic in the area.
- 4) I do not want our police force impacted with the mix of serving alcohol when large group activities are on Marina Green.
- 5) I do not want our environment compromised.

Lack of Notification

- 1) Rec and Park **did not** inform the neighbors.
- 2) The MCA **did not** inform their members as they usually do. I met with the directors, discussed their actions. I have a **detailed folder** on this if you wish to review (It is a quick read as the outreach was minimal).
- 3) Mark Farrell who represents our neighborhood **did not** do a proper outreach to his constituent.

Thank you for your time and I hope after reviewing the situation you will conclude that this project has little benefit for our city.

Sincerely,

Ashley Wessinger

From: Board of Supervisors
To: BOS-Supervisors; Calonsag, Rana
Subject: File 120987: Why I signed -- I live 3 blocks

From: Charles Cory [mailto:mail@change.org]
Sent: Monday, March 04, 2013 7:09 AM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Why I signed -- I live 3 blocks

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Dylan MacNiven's petition "[Yes to Woodhouse on Marina Green!](#) " on Change.org.


Here's why I signed:

I live 3 blocks away and I think this would be a great addition to the neighborhood!

Sincerely,
Charles Cory
san francisco, California

There are now 591 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Dylan MacNiven by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/yes-to-woodhouse-on-marina-green?response=9272c59f571d>



From: Board of Supervisors
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: garbage cans and litter

From: Beth Weissman [mailto:beth@bweissman.com]
Sent: Monday, March 04, 2013 10:15 AM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: garbage cans and litter

Good Morning,

I have talked to my Cow Hollow Association and they are interested in this subject and will also contact you.

There is a dearth of garbage cans in the Cow Hollow and Marina areas of the City. For example, the Fillmore and Steiner street areas between Union Street and Chestnut Street are filled with litter (especially after the weekend bar activity) and no one seems to feel it is their jobs to clean up. Perhaps, if we took a page from New York's book and put garbage cans all over with a designated person to go around and empty them each day, people would stop throwing litter on the ground. I have walked over two miles on Green street for example, without finding a single garbage can. When Mayor Bloomberg decided to clean up New York, cans were placed on all four of almost every intersection in the city, and the resulting cleanliness puts San Francisco to shame. If neighborhoods as nice as Cow Hollow are so filthy that tourists say (as they do) that they are never coming back, what are the tougher neighborhoods like?

Another cause of the litter on the streets is, I'm sorry to say, the garbage trucks. I've watched the emptying of trash cans where a lot of the litter in the can ended up on the street, and the truck just moves on to the next. By the end of a block, there is often significant garbage on the sidewalks. Surely, they can be made to do a better job. We gave them a monopoly, but it wasn't to become sloppy.

I hope you will work to make this the clean city it deserves to be. This area will be filled with tourists this summer and spring, even greater than normal with the sailboat races. It would be embarrassing for it to remain as it is now. And, it's terrible for those of us who live in and love this city.

Thank you for your time,

Beth Weissman

C-Page
B&F Clerk

From: Board of Supervisors
To: BOS-Supervisors; Young, Victor
Subject: File 130123: support from Supervisor Avalos' fossil fuel and firearm divestments

From: sonia [mailto:sonia.rani@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, March 04, 2013 12:47 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: support from Supervisor Avalos' fossil fuel and firearm divestments

Dear Supervisors of San Francisco,

I'm writing to support Supervisor Avalos' proposed resolutions for the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System to divest more than \$1.9 billion away from fossil fuel and firearm companies over the next five years.

Climate change is one of the most important challenges we currently face as a city and as a society. In recent months, we have witnessed the significant damage and financial impacts of climate change on our fellow East Coast communities. As fossil fuel corporations now have 2,795 gigatons of carbon dioxide in their reserves - five times the amount considered safe to avoid catastrophic climate change - we know the problem will only get worse if we don't take action.

As a city and community, we have committed to addressing climate change, promoting renewable energy sources, and advancing efforts to control access to firearms - it's time for our investment decisions to reflect these values.

There is a clear economic argument for divestment. While fossil fuel companies do generate a return on investment, San Francisco and our neighboring communities will suffer greater economic and financial losses from the impact of unchecked climate change. Our infrastructure, our businesses, and our communities would face greater risk of damages and losses due to turbulent weather that climate change causes. As a waterfront city, several of our neighborhoods and industrial districts are at risk if climate change causes a significant rise in sea level.

Seattle was the first city to join the growing Go Fossil Free divestment campaign, an effort that has already spread to over 192 campuses across the country. **It's time for San Francisco to join the movement and invest the SFERS pension funds in companies that can provide a good return on our investment without putting our city and our future at risk.**

Sincerely,

Sonia Aggarwal
Concerned San Francisco Resident - Mission District

From: Board of Supervisors
To: ~~BOS~~ Supervisors; Young, Victor
Subject: File 130123: Support for SFERS Carbon Divestment

From: Molly Oshun [<mailto:mollyoshun@gmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, March 01, 2013 12:55 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Support for SFERS Carbon Divestment

Dear Supervisors of San Francisco,

I'm writing to support Supervisor Avalos' proposed resolutions for the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System to divest more than \$1.9 billion away from fossil fuel and firearm companies over the next five years.

Climate change is one of the most pressing challenges we face as a city and as a society. In recent months, we have witnessed the significant damage and financial impacts of climate change on our fellow East Coast communities. As fossil fuel corporations now have 2,795 gigatons of carbon dioxide in their reserves - five times the amount considered safe to avoid catastrophic climate change - we know the problem will only get worse if we don't take action.

San Francisco is a self-proclaimed leader in the global push for environmental and social sustainability. We have committed to addressing climate change, promoting renewable energy sources, and adopting progressive land-use and transit policies - it's time for our investment decisions to reflect these values.

There is a clear economic argument for divestment. While fossil fuel companies do generate a return on investment, San Francisco and our neighboring communities will suffer greater economic and financial losses from the impact of unchecked climate change. Our infrastructure, our businesses, and our communities would face greater risk of damages and losses due to turbulent weather that climate change causes. As a waterfront city, several of our neighborhoods and industrial districts are at risk if climate change causes a significant rise in sea level.

Seattle was the first city to join the growing Go Fossil Free divestment campaign, an effort that has already spread to over 192 campuses across the country. **It's time for San Francisco to join the movement and invest the SFERS pension funds in companies that can provide a good return on our investment without putting our city and our future at risk.**

Sincerely,

Molly Oshun
Concerned San Francisco Resident - Lower Haight Voter

From: Board of Supervisors
To: ~~BOB~~ Supervisors; Young, Victor
Subject: File 121185: Renew the Uptown Parking Lease Please! :)

-----Original Message-----

From: Isa GlitterGirl Isaacs [<mailto:glittergirl@templeofpoi.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2013 5:44 AM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Renew the Uptown Parking Lease Please! :)

Dear Board of Supervisors:

Greetings. My name is Isa Isaacs, also known as GlitterGirl and I am writing in support of the Uptown Lease being renewed for Union Square Park.

I request this because I have been fortunate enough to produce the largest, free-to-the-public, legal, fire dancing show in the Western Hemisphere in Union Square and in recent years, this has been made possible through the generous support of Union Square Live.

Union Square Live (USL) is a program that subsidizes productions by offering the stage and a large assortment of fee associated with running it to select organization for whom it creates a free-to-the-public program to add culture to our amazing city. The Fire Dancing Expo, holding the 8th Annuals event on April 27, 2013, not only brings artists from around the country and world together for the San Francisco audience, it had afforded hundreds of artists the opportunity to perform in front of 3000+ people each year. This year's program is an unprecedented 43 acts featuring 95 artists, none of whom would be afforded the amazing opportunity of performing in Union Square were it not for the work USL brings to the city.

Please continue to empower them to empower us and allow the renewal of the Uptown Parking Lease.

Please contact me if you wish to discuss this or have any questions.

Thank you for your consideration. :)

blessings, bliss, beauty, brilliance and flow, ...isa

--

it's much more about how it looks on bottom than how you think it looks on top.

isa "glittergirl" isaacs
founder, temple of poi
<http://templeofpoi.com>
415.424.8581 (voice mail)