September 2, 2008

The Honorable Gavin Newsom,
Mayor, City & County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 200
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Controller’s Office
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 312
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Subject: Adopted Budget for Fiscal Year 2008/2009

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I hereby certify, in conformance with Charter Section 9.115 and Administrative Code Section 3.14 that the funding provided in the budget for Fiscal Year 2008/2009 as adopted by the Board of Supervisors is adequate for my department to meet service levels as proposed to the Board.

I anticipate that I shall make no requests for supplemental appropriations barring unforeseen circumstances.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]
Julian Low
Director of Operations

cc: Nani Coloretti, Mayor’s Office of Public Policy & Finance
    Thomas DiSanto, Controller’s Office – Budget & Analysis Division
September 2, 2008

To: Gavin Newsom, Mayor
    Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
    Ben Rosenfield, Controller

From: Edwin M. Lee, City Administrator

Subject: Adopted Budget for FY 08-09

I hereby certify, in conformance with Charter Section 9.115 and Administrative Code Section 3.14, that the funding provided in the budget for fiscal year 2008-2009 as adopted by the Board of Supervisors is adequate for my department to meet service levels as proposed to the Board.

I anticipate that I shall make no requests for supplemental appropriations barring unforeseen circumstances.

c: Nani Coloretti, Mayor's Office of Public Policy and Finance
   Thomas DiSanto, Controller's Office – Budget & Analysis Division
September 4, 2008

The Honorable Gavin Newsom, Mayor  
City and County of San Francisco  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 200  
San Francisco, CA 94102

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

Mr. Ben Rosenfield, Controller  
City and County of San Francisco  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 312  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Subject: Adopted Budget for Fiscal Year 2008/2009

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am required by Charter Section 9.115 and Administrative Code Section 3.14 to certify that the funding provided through the annual budget process is adequate for the Department. As previously discussed with the Mayor’s Office, the President of Board of Supervisors, the Chair of the Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Committee and the Controller, recent events have resulted in the determination that administration of the City’s Fiber Network has been compromised. As a result, immediate funding has been required for assessment and remediation of the situation.

While the Department is working diligently to identify available funding with budgeted resources, the extent of the breach and necessary funding requirements will not be fully known until the initial assessment is completed in the coming weeks. I believe it is likely that the Department will be seeking a supplemental appropriation within the fiscal year to address one-time and ongoing funding requirements.

Sincerely,

Chris Vein  
Chief Information Officer

cc: Nani Coloretti, Mayor’s Office of Budget and Legislative Affairs  
    Thomas DiSanto, Controller’s Office – Budget and Analysis Division
Jim Burruel

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

From: Jim Burruel
Sent: 08/29/2008 02:37 PM PDT
To: Angela Calvillo
Subject: PDF copy of original Budget Certification sent Interoffice mail

Angela,

Here is a PDF copy for your records.

Thank you

Budget Certification FY 2008-2009.pdf

Jim Burruel - Finance Manager
San Francisco Employees' Retirement System
30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 3000
San Francisco, Calif. 94102-6062
Phone: (415) 487-7075
Fax: (415) 558-4577
e-mail: Jim.Burruel@sfgov.org
August 27, 2008

Honorable Gavin Newsom,
Mayor, City & County of San Francisco
City Hall Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
City Hall Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Edward Harrington, Controller
City Hall Controller’s Office, Room 316
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Subject: Adopted Budget for Fiscal Year 2008-09

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I hereby certify, in conformance with San Francisco Charter Section 9.115 and San Francisco Administrative Code Section 3.14 that the funding provided in the budget for Fiscal Year 2008-09 as adopted by the Board of Supervisors is adequate for my department to meet service levels as proposed to the Board.

I anticipate that I shall make no requests for supplemental appropriations barring unforeseen circumstances.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Clare M. Murphy
Executive Director

cc: Nani Coloretti, Mayor’s Budget Director - Office of Public Policy & Finance
    Thomas DiSanto, Controller’s Office – Budget & Analysis Division

(415) 487-7020
30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 3000
San Francisco, CA 94102
Hi Angela,

I wanted to forward to you for your records. Thanks.

---

Stacy Robson
(415) 379-5147
---Original Message---
From: Robson, Stacy
Sent: Thursday, August 28, 2008 12:42 PM
To: Mike Fernandez; Rick Wilson; 'Yiaway Yeh'
Cc: Thomas DiSanto; Nani Coloretti
Subject: RE: FY 2008-09 AAO & Turnaround Reports. Budget Certification Letter

Please find the attached Budget Certification letter from the California Academy of Sciences. Could you please let me know if this scanned/electronic copy of our letter is not sufficient for your files and if you prefer for me to send a hard copy to your office.

Thank you.

PLEASE NOTE NEW ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER

Stacy Robson
srobsn@calacademy.org
California Academy of Sciences
55 Music Concourse Drive
San Francisco, CA 94118
Direct (415) 379-5147
www.calacademy.org

---Original Message---
From: Nadia Feese [mailto:Nadia.Feese@sfgov.org]
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2008 11:07 AM
To: CON- Budget Contacts; CON-Finance Officers
Cc: Thomas DiSanto; Leo Levenson; Michelle Allersma; Cynthia Czerwin; Rick Wilson; Richard Kurylo; Nani Coloretti; Greg Wagner; Jenny Louie; Starr Terrell; Kate Howard; Mike Fernandez
Subject: FY 2008-09 AAO & Turnaround Reports. Budget Certification Letter

To Department Heads and Fiscal Directors,

Congratulations on completing the FY 2008-09 Budget!

Reports available for pick-up
The FY 2008-09 Final Annual Appropriation Ordinances (AAO) and budget turnaround reports are now available for pick-up in City Hall, Room 312. Two copies of the AAO and one turnaround report have been ordered for each department. Once this initial distribution is completed, additional AAOS will be available and additional turnaround reports requested by individual departments will be available this week.

Budget Certification Letter
Also, per San Francisco Charter Section 9.115 and Administrative Code Section 3.14, it is the duty of each department or agency head to certify his/her commitment to the responsible management of their department budget. Administrative Code Section 3.14 states:

"The head of each agency shall, within 30 days of the adoption of the annual budget by the Board of Supervisors, by letter addressed to the Mayor, Board of Supervisors and Controller, agree that funding provided is adequate for his or her department, board commission or agency."

Please submit your budget certification letters as soon as possible, but no later than August 28, 2008. Please send a letter to each of the following departments: Board of Supervisors, Mayor's Office, and the Controller. A template has been provided to assist with this letter.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact your respective Controller's Office Budget Analyst.
(See attached file: Sample Certification Letter.doc)

Thank you!

Nadia Feerer
Pr. Admin. Analyst - Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office, Budget Division
Ph: (415) 554-5247
Fax: (415) 554-7466

CCSF FY08 Final Budget Acceptance letter.pdf
August 11, 2008

The Honorable Gavin Newsom,
Mayor, City & County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 200
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Controller’s Office
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 312
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Subject: Adopted Budget for Fiscal Year 2008/2009

Ladies and gentlemen:

Congratulations on the successful adoption of a budget in such a difficult economic climate.

I hereby certify, in conformance with Charter Section 9.115 and Administrative Code Section 3.14 that the funding provided in the budget for Fiscal Year 2008/2009 as adopted by the Board of Supervisors is adequate for my department to meet service levels as proposed to the Board.

I anticipate that I shall make no requests for supplemental appropriations barring unforeseen circumstances.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Stacy Robson
Director of Finance
California Academy of Sciences

cc: Nani Coloretti, Mayor’s Office of Budget & Legislative Affairs
Thomas DiSanto, Controller’s Office – Budget & Analysis Division
August 28, 2008

The Honorable Gavin Newsom,
Mayor, City & County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 200
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Controller’s Office
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 312
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Subject: Adopted Budget for Fiscal Year 2007/2008

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I hereby certify, in conformance with Charter Section 9.115 and Administrative Code Section 3.14 that the funding provided in the budget for Fiscal Year 2007/2008 as adopted by the Board of Supervisors is adequate for my department to meet service levels as proposed to the Board.

- However, I am concerned that the funding provided does not fully fund all budgeted security or collections related positions required for our operations.

At this time I anticipate that I shall make no requests for supplemental appropriations barring unforeseen circumstances (outside of the above mentioned security issue and collections staffing that emanates from the impossibly high attrition budget).

Sincerely,

Jay Jie Xu
Director
Asian Art Museum of San Francisco

Cc: Nani Coloretti, Mayor’s Office of Budget & Legislative Affairs
    Thomas DiSanto, Controller’s Office – Budget & Analysis Division

ASIAN ART MUSEUM
CHONG-MOON LEE CENTER
FOR ASIAN ART AND CULTURE
September 2, 2008

The Honorable Gavin Newsom
Mayor
City & County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 200
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Controller’s Office
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Room 312
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Subject: Adopted Budget for Fiscal Year 2008-2009

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I hereby certify, in conformance with Charter Section 9.115 and Administrative Code Section 3.14, that the funding provided in the budget for Fiscal Year 2008-2009 as adopted by the Board of Supervisors is adequate for my department to meet service levels as proposed to the Board. I anticipate that I shall make no requests for supplemental appropriations barring unforeseen circumstances or service demands beyond the limitations set forth below.

Service has been reduced as of July 1, 2008, resulting in a loss of one-half hour per day of telephone services. There is now a gap of three hours and forty-five minutes during the City’s normal business hours when telephone service is unavailable. Services do not include new benefit programs or material changes to existing benefit programs created by collective bargaining or through action of the Health Service Board, Mayor or Board of Supervisors on or after July 1, 2008. The budget does not include any resources for data collection, consulting, research, project management, policy development, legal fees or compliance with GASB Statement 45 relating to any participating employers. In addition, the Department is dependent on the services of work order departments for all benefits administration IT hardware and support resources (including the PeopleSoft system that is the core system for all departmental operations and financial reports) and for all personnel and payroll
services for the Department. Promised service levels are therefore limited by any material deficiencies in the quality and quantity of services provided by such work order departments.

Very truly yours,

Bart Duncan
Director

cc: Nani Coloretti, Mayor's Office of Budget & Legislative Affairs
    Thomas DiSanto, Controller's Office – Budget & Analysis Division
    Scott Heldfond, President, Health Service Board
    Karen Breslin, Chair, Health Service Finance and Budget Committee
August 28, 2008

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Subject: Adopted Budget for Fiscal Year 2008/2009

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

I hereby certify, in conformance with Charter Section 9.115 and Administrative Code Section 3.14 that the funding provided in the budget for Fiscal Year 2008/2009 as adopted by the Board of Supervisors is adequate for my Department to meet service levels as proposed to the Board.

I anticipate that I shall make no requests for supplemental appropriations barring unforeseen circumstances.

Sincerely,

Joanne Hayes-White
Chief of Department

cc: The Honorable Gavin Newsom, Mayor
    Ben Rosenfield, Controller
    Nani Coloretti, Mayor's Office of Budget & Legislative Affairs
    Thomas DiSanto, Controller's Office – Budget & Analysis Division
SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT

698 Second Street
San Francisco, CA 94107-2015
Telephone (415) 558-3403
Facsimile (415) 558-3407

JOANNE M. HAYES-WHITE  Chief of Department
GARY P. MASSETANI    Deputy Chief of Administration

FACSIMILE COVER

TO:  Gavin Newsom, Mayor
     Ben Rosenfield, Controller
  ✔ Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
     Nani Coloretti, Mayor’s Office of Budget & Legislative Affairs
     Thomas DiSanto, Controller’s Office – Budget and Analysis Division

FROM: Joanne Hayes-White, Chief of Department

DATE: August 29, 2008

TOTAL PAGES
INCLUDING COVER LETTER: 2

COMMENTS:

This and any accompanying page(s) contain information which is confidential and privileged. The information is intended for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, then be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the accompanying document (or the information contained in it) is prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify us immediately.
August 28, 2008

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Subject: Adopted Budget for Fiscal Year 2008/2009

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

I hereby certify, in conformance with Charter Section 9.115 and Administrative Code Section 3.14 that the funding provided in the budget for Fiscal Year 2008/2009 as adopted by the Board of Supervisors is adequate for my Department to meet service levels as proposed to the Board.

I anticipate that I shall make no requests for supplemental appropriations barring unforeseen circumstances.

Sincerely,

Joanne Hayes-White
Chief of Department

cc: The Honorable Gavin Newsom, Mayor
Ben Rosenfield, Controller
Nani Coloretti, Mayor’s Office of Budget & Legislative Affairs
Thomas DiSanto, Controller’s Office – Budget & Analysis Division
August 5, 2008

The Honorable Gavin Newsom,
Mayor, City & County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 200
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Controller’s Office
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 312
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Subject: Adopted Budget for Fiscal Year 2008/2009

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I hereby certify, in conformance with Charter Section 9.115 and Administrative Code Section 3.14 that the funding provided in the budget for Fiscal Year 2008/2009 as adopted by the Board of Supervisors is adequate for my department to meet service levels as proposed to the Board.

I anticipate that I shall make no requests for supplemental appropriations barring unforeseen circumstances.

Very truly yours,

Margaret Brodkin
Director

cc: Nani Coloretti, Mayor’s Office of Public Policy & Finance
    Thomas DiSanto, Controller’s Office – Budget & Analysis Division

1390 Market Street, Suite 900, San Francisco, California, 97104
Tel 415-554-8990 Fax 415/554-8965
September 5, 2008

The Honorable Gavin Newsom
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 200

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Room 244, City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Fiscal Year 2008-2009 Budget Certification

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

Charter Section 9.115 and Administrative Code Section 3.14 require that each department head certify that the funding provided in the budget as adopted by the Board of Supervisors is adequate for their department to meet the service levels and operations proposed for the fiscal year. This certification takes the form of a letter addressed to the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and Controller, and must be issued within 30 days of the Board’s adoption of the budget.

At this time, all departments have submitted budget certification letters. The Asian Art Museum, City Attorney’s Office, Superior Court, Public Health Department, Health Service System, Police Department, Public Utilities Commission, Office of the Sheriff, Department of Technology, and Treasurer/Tax Collector have expressed concerns that their funding may not be adequate in the current year. A summary of these departmental comments or concerns is attached.

If you have any questions about this material, please contact me at (415) 554-7500.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Ben Rosenfield
Controller

cc: Mayor’s Budget Director
    Budget Analyst
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Comment/Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAM</td>
<td>Asian Art Museum</td>
<td>Funding provided does not fully fund all budgeted security- or collections-related positions required for operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>City Attorney</td>
<td>If client departments use services beyond those contemplated during the budget process, the City Attorney's Office anticipates that they will be reimbursed for actual costs incurred. Additionally, the department anticipates that it will request appropriation of attorney's fees and costs recovered from non-City sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>Superior Court</td>
<td>A supplemental request may be required for an &quot;extraordinary, high profile criminal case&quot; to provide constitutionally-mandated indigent defense services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPH</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>Structural needs at San Francisco General Hospital and Laguna Honda Hospital were not fully funded. The department may therefore require additional spending authority via a supplemental appropriation. The department has historically funded overspending using surplus revenue from the hospitals as a source of funds and may be able to address additional spending needs this year as it has in the past, without additional General Fund support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>Health Service System</td>
<td>Service has been reduced as of July 1, 2008, resulting in a loss of 1/2 hour per day of telephone services. There is now a gap of three hours and forty-five minutes during the City's normal business hours when telephone service is unavailable. Services do not include new benefit programs or material changes to existing benefit programs created by collective bargaining or through action of the Health Service Board, Mayor, or Board of Supervisors on or after July 1, 2008. The budget does not include resources for data collection, consulting, research, project management, policy development, legal fees, or compliance with GASB Statement 45 relating to any participating employers. In addition, the department is dependent on the services of work order departments for all benefits administration IT hardware and support resources (including the PeopleSoft system that is the core system for all departmental operations and financial reports) and for all personnel and payroll services for the department. Promised service levels are therefore limited by any material deficiencies in the quality and quantity of services provided by such work order departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>Police Department</td>
<td>Budget is adequate assuming that (1) there are no significant increases in service deployment, which are directly related to increases in serious criminal activity, natural disasters, or elevated homeland security threat levels; (2) any legislative mandates related to re-deployment of Police resources include the appropriation of additional funds to address these mandates; and (3) the department may need to reallocate potential salary savings to overtime if attrition significantly exceeds current projections in order to maintain the staffing of critical assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUC</td>
<td>Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>A supplemental appropriation request is anticipated during the fiscal year for a portion of the un-appropriated Water System Improvement Program as planned and discussed in the Ten-Year Capital Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Comment/Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF</td>
<td>Office of the Sheriff</td>
<td>Funding is adequate with four exceptions: (1) if jail population exceeds existing capacity, additional overtime will be needed to open more housing units; (2) any increased costs associated with requests from Police Department for staff support beyond the budgeted amount; (3) possible reductions of two state grants, Standards and Training for Corrections (STC) and Peace Officer Standards and Training grant (POST), which offset the costs of mandated trainings; and (4) escalating costs associated with the supply of ordnance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIS</td>
<td>Department of Technology</td>
<td>Recent events have resulted in the determination that administration of the City’s Fiber Network has been compromised. As a result, immediate funding has been required for assessment and remediation of the situation. While the Department is working diligently to identify available funding with budgeted resources, the extent of the breach and necessary funding requirements will not be fully known until the initial assessment is completed in the coming weeks. The Department will likely be seeking a supplemental appropriation within the fiscal year to address one-time and ongoing funding requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTX</td>
<td>Treasurer/Tax Collector</td>
<td>Budget may be inadequate with regards to some costs related to the transfer of Department of Technology functions to the Treasurer/Tax Collector that were not accounted for in the area of salaries, specifically standby pay of several transferred employees and salary differential of one employee. In addition, there are several new fees and a parcel tax to be collected by the Treasurer/Tax Collector that were passed after the budget was adopted, with associated costs that were not included in the budget.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

David Assmann, Deputy Director
San Francisco Department of the Environment
11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 355-3702

A Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

Bioregional General's Warning:
The use of SPORT UTILITY VEHICLES has been found to cause climate change intensifying floods, hurricanes, droughts, and rainforest fires, which can lead to the death of millions of people & other living things.
The Honorable Gavin Newsom,
Mayor, City & County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 200
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Controller’s Office
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 312
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Subject: Adopted Budget for Fiscal Year 2008/2009

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I hereby certify, in conformance with Charter Section 9.115 and Administrative Code Section 3.14 that the funding provided in the budget for Fiscal Year 2008/2009 as adopted by the Board of Supervisors is adequate for my department to meet service levels as proposed to the Board.

I anticipate that I shall make no requests for supplemental appropriations barring unforeseen circumstances.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Jared Blumenfeld
Director

cc: Nani Coloretti, Mayor’s Office of Budget & Legislative Affairs
    Thomas DiSanto, Controller’s Office – Budget & Analysis Division
The Honorable Gavin Newsom,
Mayor, City & County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 200
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Controller’s Office
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 312
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Subject: Adopted Budget for Fiscal Year 2008-09

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I hereby certify, in conformance with Charter Section 9.115 and Administrative Code Section 3.14 that the funding provided in the budget for Fiscal Year 2008-09 as adopted by the Board of Supervisors is adequate for my department to meet service levels as proposed to the Board.

I anticipate that I shall make no requests for supplemental appropriations barring unforeseen circumstances.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]
ANITA SANCHEZ
Executive Director

c: Nani Coloretti, Mayor’s Office of Public Policy & Finance
Thomas DiSanto, Controller’s Office – Budget & Analysis Division
August 29, 2008

The Honorable Aaron Peskin, President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Carlton Goodlett Place
San Francisco, Ca 94102-4689

Dear President Aaron Peskin:

RE: Reschedule hearing of Appeal of FEIR for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans

The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods (CSFN) urges the Board of Supervisors to reschedule the date of the hearing on Appeal of the Certification of the Final EIR for Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans from September 9, 2008, until September 23, 2008, at the earliest. CSFN filed an appeal of the Certification of the Final EIR for Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans on August 27, 2008, and we were informed that the Board of Supervisors had already set a date for the hearing on September 9, 2008. CSFN requests that the hearing be scheduled to a date no earlier than 21 days after the new version of the Eastern Neighborhoods documents are made available to the appellants.

The new version of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans documents, Volume I, II, III, IIIA, and IV, were not available until Monday, August 25, 2008, at a cost of $125. Please note that the documents contain up to 1700-plus pages.

Important materials on the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans have not been provided in a timely manner, thus compromising the ability of the public to actively participate in the process of review and informed decision-making which is afforded and encouraged by CEQA, Chapter 31, and the Sunshine Ordinance. The period for public comment on the Draft EIR was closed on September 14, 2007, but the draft legislation describing the 13 proposed new land use districts, containing substantial changes to currently established standards, was not released until April 17, 2008.
Between April 17, 2008 and August 7, 2008—date of Commission adoption of Planning Code Amendments Resolution #17663—additional important material changes to the Eastern Neighborhood Rezoning and Area Plans Project were proposed for consideration and adopted by said Resolution, including additional three new land use districts, thereby increasing the total number of new land use districts to sixteen (16), see pages 2 and 3 of our August 27, 2008 filing regarding lack of timely provision of necessary materials regarding this complex Project.

It is important to note that not only the number of land use districts being proposed changed, but that the character of said districts was altered during the short period within the two weeks prior to Commission adoption on August 7, 2008.

San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 31.16(a)(1), states an appeal must be filed within 20 days after certification of the EIR. SF Administrative Code Sect. 31.16(e), states the Board of Supervisors must act within 30 days of an appeal. CSFN believes the 30 days should not start until the 20-day period for filing is closed to allow any individual or organization who files an appeal on the 20th day, adequate time to prepare for the appeal and to notice any interested parties who support the appeal. Please note that CSFN’s August 27, 2008, appeal of the Certification of the Final EIR for subject Project. Requests, on page 6 of same--Fair Appeal-Hearing Process Requested--rescheduling of the hearing on same to September 23, 2008.

CSFN and the public need more time to review the voluminous “new version” of Eastern Neighborhoods documents. The Planning Department’s rush to approve the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR is an injustice to the residents of San Francisco.

Yours truly,

Gary Noguera, President

Cc: Supervisor Michela Alioto-Pier
    Supervisor Tom Ammiano
    Supervisor Carmen Chu
    Supervisor Chris Daly
    Supervision Bevan Dufty
    Supervisor Sean Elsbernd
    Supervisor Sophie Maxwell
    Supervisor Jake McGoldrick
    Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi
    Supervisor Geraldo Sandoval
Hello City Council,

Please leave this beautiful bridge alone. People are going to do what they want to do. The Golden Gate Bridge MUST be left alone! Must be kept how it is. We as humans will always find a way to really do what we really want to do. The government coming up with another way to protect us is not the answer.

YOU must make the correct decision and leave the original integrity of the GGB how it was at its inception. DO NOT ruin the beauty of the GGB.

If you do, it will just be another sign of the liberal government of SF controlling us as people. Controller with government how we choose to live and end out lives as we please.

I know you are all pro-choice. YOU MUST be pro-choice on letting people end their lives as they see fit.

Sincerely,

John
August 28, 2008

VIA FAX

The Honorable Aaron Peskin, President
Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: Central Subway Project
Appeal of Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report - Planning Motion M-17668
Request for Extension of Supervisor’s Appeal Hearing

Dear President Peskin:

Yesterday we learned that because of another appellant’s early filing, the Supervisor’s hearing of the subject appeal has been set for September 16, 2008.

In view of the complexity of the project and the issues surrounding it, and because of the absence of supporting data in Volume II, it would be difficult if not impossible for us to respond adequately to the many outstanding issues by September 16th. For this reason we hereby request that the Hearing be delayed 45 days.

Your consideration of our request would be appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

Gerald Cauthen
Howard Wong

cc: Clerk of Board
September 3, 2008

Honorable David L. Ballati
Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco
Department 206
400 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94102-4514


Dear Judge Ballati,

Pursuant to Penal Code Sec. 933 (c), attached are responses from the Mayor's Office of Community Investment (MOCI) to the Findings and Recommendations contained in the 2007-2008 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury report, "THE HOMELESS HAVE HOMES, BUT THEY ARE STILL ON THE STREET."

As required, MOCI is responding to the following recommendations identified in the report: #2,4,5,6,7, and 8.

Please contact either Melange Matthews, Chief Operating Officer-MOCI or me at 415.701.5570 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Adrienne Pon

attachment

cc: San Francisco Board of Supervisors
San Francisco Civil Grand Jury
MOCI RESPONSE TO THE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE 2007-2008 SAN FRANCISCO CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT, "THE HOMELESS HAVE HOMES, BUT THEY ARE STILL ON THE STREET."

**Recommendation #2**
Not applicable. MOCI does not fund supportive housing programs.

**Recommendation #4**
Not applicable. MOCI does not fund supportive housing programs.

**Recommendation #5**
MOCI does not provide funding for supportive housing programs. MOCI does provide funding for social services and emergency shelters for homeless individuals. For those grants, MOCI currently sets performance measures based on the performance measures of similar MOCI-funded homeless programs, the design of the program, and size of the grant. In our experience, we are not aware of private sector providers or non-profits that operate without significant government funding to provide similar services in these areas.

**Recommendation #6**
Not applicable. MOCI does not fund supportive housing programs.

**Recommendations #7 and #8**
MOCI does not provide funding for housing services for homeless clients. MOCI does, however, provide funding for operating costs of shelters and social services for homeless individuals and families, primarily through its Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) program. MOCI recently executed the current FY 2008-2009 grant agreement with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for ESG funding. The grant agreement states that HUD is currently in the process of developing standards for local Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS) and the collection and reporting of client-level information by homeless providers. Recipients of ESG funds will be expected to participate in a local Continuum of Care's HMIS in order to ensure that the Congressional goal that localities collect an array of unduplicated data on the number and characteristics of homeless persons can be met. MOCI has initiated a discussion with the City's Human Services Agency, who administers other HUD McKinney-Vento homeless funding that is required to participate in the local HMIS, to explore the joint use of the local HMIS.
Hi Angela,

I wanted to forward to you for your records. Thanks.

Please find the attached Budget Certification letter from the California Academy of Sciences. Could you please let me know if this scanned/electronic copy of our letter is not sufficient for your files and if you prefer for me to send a hard copy to your office.

Thank you.

PLEASE NOTE NEW ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER

Stacy Robson
srobson@calacademy.org
California Academy of Sciences
55 Music Concourse Drive
San Francisco, CA 94118
Direct (415) 379-5147
www.calacademy.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Robson, Stacy
Sent: Thursday, August 28, 2008 12:42 PM
To: Mike Fernandez; Rick Wilson; 'Yiaway Yeh'
Cc: Thomas DiSanto; Nani Coloretti
Subject: RE: FY 2008-09 AAO & Turnaround Reports. Budget Certification Letter

-----Original Message-----
From: Robson, Stacy
Sent: Friday, August 29, 2008 12:35 PM
To: 'angela.cavillo@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'Yiaway Yeh'
Subject: FW: FY 2008-09 AAO & Turnaround Reports. Budget Certification Letter
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2008 11:07 AM
To: CON- Budget Contacts; CON-Finance Officers
Cc: Thomas DiSanto; Leo Levenson; Michelle Allersma; Cynthia Czerwin; Rick Wilson; Richard Kurylo; Nani Coloretti; Greg Wagner; Jenny Louie; Starr Terrell; Kate Howard; Mike Fernandez
Subject: FY 2008-09 AAO & Turnaround Reports. Budget Certification Letter

To Department Heads and Fiscal Directors,

Congratulations on completing the FY 2008-09 Budget!

Reports available for pick-up
The FY 2008-09 Final Annual Appropriation Ordinances (AAO) and budget turnaround reports are now available for pick-up in City Hall, Room 312. Two copies of the AAO and one turnaround report have been ordered for each department. Once this initial distribution is completed, additional AAOs will be available and additional turnaround reports requested by individual departments will be available this week.

Budget Certification Letter
Also, per San Francisco Charter Section 9.115 and Administrative Code Section 3.14, it is the duty of each department or agency head to certify his/her commitment to the responsible management of their department budget. Administrative Code Section 3.14 states:

"The head of each agency shall, within 30 days of the adoption of the annual budget by the Board of Supervisors, by letter addressed to the Mayor, Board of Supervisors and Controller, agree that funding provided is adequate for his or her department, board commission or agency."

Please submit your budget certification letters as soon as possible, but no later than August 28, 2008. Please send a letter to each of the following departments: Board of Supervisors, Mayor's Office, and the Controller. A template has been provided to assist with this letter.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact your respective Controller's Office Budget Analyst.
(See attached file: Sample Certification Letter.doc)

Thank you!

Nadia Feerer
Pr. Admin. Analyst - Budget & Analysis
Controller's Office, Budget Division
Ph: (415) 554-5247
Fax: (415) 554-7466

CCSF FY09 Final Budget Acceptance letter.pdf
August 11, 2008

The Honorable Gavin Newsom,
Mayor, City & County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 200
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Controller’s Office
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 312
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Subject: Adopted Budget for Fiscal Year 2008/2009

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Congratulations on the successful adoption of a budget in such a difficult economic climate.

I hereby certify, in conformance with Charter Section 9.115 and Administrative Code Section 3.14 that the funding provided in the budget for Fiscal Year 2008/2009 as adopted by the Board of Supervisors is adequate for my department to meet service levels as proposed to the Board.

I anticipate that I shall make no requests for supplemental appropriations barring unforeseen circumstances.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Stacy Robson
Director of Finance
California Academy of Sciences

cc: Nani Coloretti, Mayor’s Office of Budget & Legislative Affairs
Thomas DiSanto, Controller’s Office – Budget & Analysis Division
Ms. Lonich:

Per our earlier conversation, please find enclosed pdf file that we delivered to your office.

[Attached file: Civil Grand Jury 090308.doc]

Please let me know when you get this.

Angela Alves
SFPD - Administration Bureau
850 Bryant Street, #511
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 734-3090 - Work
(415) 734-3092 - Fax
sfpd.dcofadmin@sfgov.org

**********Confidentiality Notice*********************
This electronic message transmission contains information that may be confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the content of this information is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify me immediately by email and delete the original message.
The Entertainment Commission: A Work in Progress

(6). *The Jury recommends that all opportunities be explored for regular meetings between the Entertainment Commission and the Police Department.*

The Department agrees with the findings and the recommendation has been implemented.

San Francisco police officers regularly attend and participate in the biweekly Entertainment Commission meetings. They are there to address concerns and answer questions about places of entertainment in their districts. Other officers (e.g. District Station Captains) also attend, as needed, to address license applications and the like. The Department additionally supports the idea of higher-level meetings to address, on a district by district basis, reports of violence, criminal and/or regulatory violations, and traffic concerns, at or in the area of entertainment venues.

(7). *The Jury supports the proposed legislation (file number 080323) which would amend the San Francisco Police Code and Business and Tax Regulation Code to give Entertainment Commission staff limited authority to cite and suspend permits, and encourages the Board of Supervisors to pass it.*

The Department agrees with the findings. The recommendation has yet to be implemented as it is subject to future approval by the Board of Supervisors.

The Department supports the proposal to expand the authority of the Entertainment Commission to cite and suspend permits, including the authority to immediately suspend permits without hearing. Implementation is, however, subject to the approval of the Board of Supervisors.
Compensation and Staffing Issues in the San Francisco Police Department.

(10). The Office of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors not only should ask at budget time but also require a routine report from the Police Department that shows trend data regarding civilian employment progress.

The Department agrees with the findings and the recommendation has been implemented.

The San Francisco Police Department has vigorously proceeded with the department’s civilianization plan. In furtherance of these efforts, the department has budgeted and hired additional human resources professional and technical staff to expedite the recruitment, selection, and monitoring of civilian hires. In addition, as part of the FY 08-09 annual budget, two additional professional Human Resources positions have been budgeted to assist in meeting the department’s civilian hiring goals.

The regular monitoring and tracking of civilian hires has been implemented and will be further enhanced with the department’s HRMS upgrade in conjunction with an automated position control system to access timely and current civilian hiring statistics for both sworn and civilian positions. This includes civilians that have been hired to replace sworn members and civilians that have been hired in support of new operational initiatives and functions. A monthly report reflecting the progress made in the hiring of civilians is now being produced by the Staff Services Division.

Additionally, in conjunction with the Controller’s Office, the department is working to evaluate the possibility of identifying additional positions that could be civilianized within the department. The department is committed to civilianizing, wherever feasible, all positions most appropriately filled by non-sworn members.
Submitted on: 9/2/2008 1:58:21 PM

name: Dave

phone:

comments: First of all I want to thank the San Francisco Board of Supervisors for taking this step. I read the article about the city of San Francisco issuing ID cards for illegal immigrants. I agree that San Francisco "can't stand by while the federal government takes no action to address the safety needs" of the community. When people have something to at least help them go to school and get some education, it takes away their idle time and offenses, crimes, etc. start reducing in number.

I just wanted to ask you if this has taken place or if it was dropped? the month (August) had already passed and I haven't heard anything about it. IS it still in action or was it dropped/stopped?

Thank You for your time.

Dave
August 29, 2008

The Honorable David Ballati, Presiding Judge
Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Francisco
400 McAllister Street
San Francisco, California 94102

Re: Response of the San Francisco Department of Elections to Civil Grand Jury Report, "A Year of Five Elections for the City and County of San Francisco."

Dear Judge Ballati:


The Department wants to commend the Jurors' high level of motivation to perform their work and their seriousness in studying and understanding how the Department conducts elections in San Francisco. The breadth of the Jurors' efforts is exemplified by the fact that the Jurors visited or contacted elections departments in other counties to develop a basis for a comparative analysis of elections processes. The Jurors were always professional in their interactions with the Department and sensitive to fulfilling their obligations while considering if their activities might interfere with the Department's work. I believe this Civil Grand Jury exemplified the effectiveness of a panel of citizens to objectively consider how their government operates and then provide thoughtful insight to our community and to City agencies.

Respectfully,

John Arntz, Director

cc: Civil Grand Jury
    Honorable Gavin Newsom, Mayor
    Honorable Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
    Elections Commission
CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS

1. The Department of Elections’ City Hall space is inadequate for the performance of all its functions, so the Department utilizes various locations throughout the City.

The Department agrees with this finding.

2. The use of multiple locations impacts the efficiency of the DOE operations and potentially compromises the security and even the integrity of elections.

The Department agrees that having separate locations adversely impacts efficiencies and that potential does exist for inefficiencies to affect security and integrity. However, in all of its planning and work, the Department gives priority to the importance of security and integrity of conducting elections and has been successful in safeguarding the election process in San Francisco.

3. Five years after the 2002-2003 Civil Grand Jury recommended that “the City should identify and secure a single site for consolidation of DOE operations,” the DOE is still without consolidated, permanent space.

The Department agrees with this finding.

4. The current off-site location at Pier 48 does not offer DOE personnel consistent access to a reliable supply of drinking water.

The Department agrees with this finding. The Department is in the final steps of having the City’s water vendor install a filtration system at Pier 48. The Department expects potable water to be available to personnel by early September.

5. Sequoia must obtain the Secretary of State’s certification that Sequoia voting machines have the capacity to count RCV ballots.

The Department agrees with this finding.

6. If Sequoia fails to obtain the needed certification, the Department of Elections must have a plan for counting RCV ballots.

The Department agrees with this finding.
7. As of the date of this report, the DOE does not have a contingency plan for counting RCV ballots.

The Department disagrees with this finding. In 2003, the Department developed a manual counting process to hand-tally RCV ballots. This manual counting process describes not only the methods by which RCV cards would be hand-tallied, but includes all necessary forms, floor plans, staffing considerations, etc. In fact, counties from across the country have requested this plan for their own hand-tally approaches for RCV elections.

The Department does not have a contingency plan that would allow for a separate voting system to be in place to count RCV ballots. Other than the Sequoia system, no other vendor is prepared to seek certification for its voting system to conduct RCV elections in California and in San Francisco. The City’s previous voting system manufactured by Elections Systems & Software (ES&S) is presently not certified to conduct RCV elections. ES&S is no longer under contract with the City and it is doubtful ES&S and the City could complete a contract, have it approved by other City agencies, funded, and for ES&S to complete and then submit an application with the SOS to have its system reviewed for certification.

8. The perception of fair and accurate elections requires that voters know in advance and understand the alternative plan for counting RCV ballots.

The Department agrees with this finding.

9. For partisan primary elections, some voters with a declared party affiliation believed incorrectly that they could appear at the polling place and request the ballot of another party.

The Department agrees with this finding.

10. These voters were unaware of the fact that they had to re-register and change their party affiliation prior to voting for another party’s candidate.

The Department agrees with this finding.

11. The Department of Elections is subject to federal, state, and local laws regarding voter outreach and education.

The Department agrees with this finding.
12. While the DOE does meet these legal requirements, additional outreach efforts are needed on voter registration requirements and deadlines, the Ranked-Choice Voting process and the requirements for submitting a valid Absentee Ballot.

The Department agrees with this finding.

CIVIL GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Office of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors must provide an adequate budget and direct the Division of Real Estate to find permanent, unified, secure, and safe for the San Francisco Department of Elections where all DOE staff can efficiently perform all their duties.

The Department agrees with this recommendation. The Grand Jury is correct in thinking the most efficient manner to organize and conduct elections is when an elections department operates from one site. Most elections departments in the state are organized by having all administrative and operational functions within one site, or, splitting the administrative and operational functions into their own, nearby, and separate sites. The Grand Jury visited the elections department for Santa Clara County several times and observed the positive impacts of a well-organized, two-site elections department. San Mateo County has one site for consolidated operations which allows for even better efficiencies. Alameda and Sacramento Counties also split their administrative and operational functions between two sites.

San Francisco most closely resembles the two-site approach to organizing its election work. City Hall provides space for the Department’s administrative functions and the Department’s operational functions occur mostly at Pier 48. The Department still uses space in Brooks Hall, located beneath the Bill Graham Auditorium, for storing ballots for the polling places since the air is too humid to stage these paper ballots at Pier 48. Also, the Department holds pollworker training at several sites in the City since there is too much activity at the Pier before the election to hold these classes.

Overall, the Department has been able to successfully work within the space provided at City Hall. Pier 48 is a tremendous improvement over the previous warehouse space located at Pier 29, and has allowed for the consolidation of most of the Department’s operations. The Mayor’s Office worked alongside the Department to acquire the five-year lease at Pier 48, and, the Board of Supervisors approved the funding. While the Department has been successful in City Hall, the Department does remove many rooms and storage areas from use by other agencies during an election cycle. This past year, during which San Francisco held five elections, the Department has monopolized the use of many rooms slotted for common use in City Hall.

The City will soon need to provide operational space for the Department since the lease at Pier 48 is short term. While the consolidation of all election-related activities at one site is the
ideal, the City may find it challenging to locate such a space in San Francisco. More likely, the City will continue with the Department functioning with its administrative and operational functions at separate locations.

If the Department moves from City Hall, as in other counties, the preference would be for the administrative functions to remain near the City’s Civic Center. If the Department does leave City Hall, it can still provide early voting at City Hall as has occurred for many years. However, moving most of the Department from City Hall with the exception of an office for the public, candidates, and campaigns to visit would be a highly inefficient approach to organizing elections. The functions of the Department are interdependent and splitting the department into three parts: administrative, operational, and public counter would instantly sever the Department’s ability to function effectively.

2. An appropriate source of drinking water must be made available at all times for on-site employees.

The Department agrees with this recommendation. The Department is nearing completion of the process by which potable water is provided to employees without using bottled water. When the Department began operating from Pier 48, personnel instantly realized that the color of the water and the evidence of particulate matter made the water unsafe to drink. While the Department pursued the necessary steps to acquire a water filtration system, individuals in the Department have been purchasing water, and which is made available to all personnel working at the Pier. The Department is hopeful the filtration system will be installed by the end of August 2008 and will be successful in providing clean, potable water.

3. The DOE should publicly establish a date certain by which Sequoia must receive the Secretary of State’s certification regarding the counting of RCV ballots. This date should be no later than September 15, 2008.

The Department disagrees with this recommendation. The certification process for voting equipment in California requires many steps which may not result in certification by a certain date, but if successfully completed, can indicate a system will be certified for use in time for an election. This has been the situation for the past four years regarding San Francisco’s voting systems being certified in time for November elections.

Presently, the City’s new Sequoia system has completed testing by the Secretary of State’s office. Early reports indicate the system is functioning as documented in the vendor’s application. SOS personnel are now writing reports from their observations of the system’s performance and the SOS’ office has announced a hearing date for September 26, 2008. The hearing will take place in September because state elections law requires a minimum of 30 days notice for hearings regarding the certification of voting systems.

After the hearing, the public has an additional seven days to provide comments to the Secretary. After the final review of public comment the Secretary will decide whether to
approve the system for use. Thus, under the current schedule the City will have a voting system ready for tabulation in time for providing results on the evening of the election. If the system is not certified, the Department will have time to implement its manual count process.

4. To prepare for the possibility that Sequoia fails to obtain the required certification, DOE must develop a contingency plan for counting RCV ballots, which should be in final form by October 6, 2006.

The Department agrees with this recommendation. In 2003, The Department developed an extensive set of procedures to conduct a full manual count of RCV ballots. The Department always considered these procedures for manually counting ballots to be a contingency plan should the City’s voting system not be available. The manual count procedures detail not only the manner by which votes are counted, but also include staffing requirements, work area diagrams, and forms.

San Francisco Municipal Elections Ordinance section 980 requires the Department to prepare a backup plan if the City’s voting system is pending certification from the Secretary of State. The Department certainly meets this requirement of the local elections code. Section 980 also includes the requirement that the Department consider entering into a contract with an alternate vendor. At this time, however, no vendor in California has a system certified for RCV elections and Sequoia is the sole vendor seeking certification for its system to conduct RCV elections.

5. The DOE should keep the public apprised of the status of the Secretary of State’s certification of the Sequoia voting machine for counting RCV ballots and the status of the contingency plan if required.

The Department agrees with this recommendation. The Department will issue memorandums and press releases regarding the status of certification of the Sequoia system and will post these materials on its website.

6. For a partisan primary election, where separate ballots are used based on a voter’s party affiliation, the DOE’s training and voter outreach programs need greater emphasis on the fact that in order to vote for a candidate in another party, voters must re-register and change their party affiliation by the voter registration deadline.

The Department agrees with this recommendation. The Department will reconsider its outreach and pollworker training materials so that voters will be more aware of voting according to their affiliations in primary elections.

Currently, the Department mails a notice regarding the importance of party affiliations in primary elections to all voters who are permanent vote-by-mail voters and registered as non-partisans. Also, information regarding party affiliations is included in the voter information pamphlet mailed to all voters and is printed on the application for a vote-by-mail ballot found
on the back cover of the voter information pamphlets. The Department also issues press releases regarding non-partisan voters being able to vote on ballots for certain political parties and provide notice indicating voters' needing to re-register with specific parties to vote for all contests on those parties' ballots. The Department has emphasized in its outreach efforts how voters' political affiliations affect which ballots they can vote in primary elections.

Additionally, with a newly developed voter registration look-up tool on the Department’s website, checking a registration status including political party affiliation will be a very convenient and accessible process. When a voter accesses the registration information, he or she sees what party he or she registered with. Preceding a primary election, the Department will add an explanation of ballot issuing rules and the importance of re-registering to be eligible to receive a preferred party's ballot.

Since the primaries are statewide elections, the Department always encourages the political parties themselves to assist the Department and the Secretary of State’s office in informing voters of the registration requirements to vote ballots for the specific parties.

7. The DOE’s pollworker training needs to emphasize the Ranked-Choice Voting process.

The Department agrees with this recommendation. The Department can provide pollworkers with information that explains the Ranked-Choice Voting process. The Department can also provide materials to the pollworkers to place inside polling places for voters to use and that explain RCV in more detail. Pollworker classes are relatively short for the amount of material that must be covered. Not only must pollworkers understand the basic operation of the voting equipment, but also the procedures related to voting, which include voting at the polls, voting by mail, and provisional voting, as well as how to open, run, and close the polls.

This is why the Department will provide information for the pollworkers, which can also be provided to voters at the polling places, while being mindful of the pollworkers’ need to understand the other information relevant to their election-day responsibilities.

Furthermore, the pollworkers are instructed to refer voters who are interested in RCV to the instructions provided on the ballot, posted in the voting booths, to the voter information kiosk located in each polling place, and to information included in the voter information pamphlet. If voters have further questions, pollworkers are instructed to call the Department’s call center from which more detailed information could be provided to voters.

8. The DOE’s outreach program needs to improve voter instructions on the Ranked-Choice Voting process and the use of Absentee Ballots.

The Department agrees with this recommendation. The Department has developed information that is more explanatory on how the RCV method tallies votes. This information is already posted on the Department’s website and will now be mailed to all voters registered
in Districts voting on contest with candidates for the Board of Supervisors. The Department in the past has focused more on how to mark the RCV ballot than on the elimination and reallocation of votes since many voters find the RCV method confusing.

9. In addition to its established communication approaches, the DOE should explore enhanced techniques to communicate information on the less understood aspects of voting such as partisan primary elections, Ranked-Choice Voting and Absentee Ballots.

For the November 4, 2008 general election, the Department of Elections will continue to educate San Francisco voters and the public-at-large about the voting process using established communication approaches with additional emphasis placed on registration requirements and deadlines, ranked-choice voting, and procedures for voting by mail. Outreach approaches include:

- Community presentation in English, Cantonese, Mandarin, and Spanish
- Attendance at community events throughout San Francisco
- Distribution of multilingual brochures, posters, flyers, and newsletters
- Newspaper advertising in ethnic media
- Earned media
- The Department’s website

The Department will also look for new avenues to communicate information directly to voters, including:

- MUNI bus shelter and interior bus card advertising
- A ranked-choice voting educational mailing that includes a pictorial demonstration for the candidate elimination and vote transfer process.
- Educational and informational emails sent directly to voters using email addresses collected from voter registration affidavits
Angela Calvillo  
Clerk of the Board  
City Hall, Room 244  
Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

September 4, 2008

Dear Ms. Cavillo,

Enclosed please find petitions signed by San Francisco Zoo visitors, from Friday, August 29th through Wednesday, September 3rd. These visitors are all opposed to the Rescue Zoo legislation put forth by Supervisor Chris Daly.

Thank you for your time,

Joe Fitting  
Director of Education  
San Francisco Zoo  
JoeF@sfczoo.org  
P: 415.753.8119  
F: 415.566.6379
Submitted on: 9/2/2008 3:49:19 PM

name: ___________

phone: ___________

comments: As property owners in San Francisco, we are very much AGAINST Chris Daly’s proposed amendments to the San Francisco Zoo ordinance, turning the zoo into a RESCUE ZOO. We understand that passing this measure would greatly affect the zoo’s AZA accreditation, hence affecting the zoo’s conservation efforts.

We enjoy the fact that the zoo currently rescues animals, provides competent care for endangered species, delivers unique education programs for children, and is a wonderful place to visit.

We would like the San Francisco Zoo to continue their role in conservation. We believe it our ethical and moral obligation to protect and conserve the flora and fauna of nature. Please let us do our part and please let the zoo do their part.

Sincerely,

__________

__________

User Data

Client IP (REMOTE_ADDR) : 24.4.134.122
Client IP via Proxy (HTTP_X_FORWARDED_FOR) :

name: Mable Jang

phone:

comments: Hello,
I have a disabled daughter who is autistic. I take her to the SF zoo weekly. This is one of her favorite outings that creates higher intensity for her, which is crucial to her development. It is absolutely necessary that I am able to continue to take her there for the many years to come.

I am a credentialed teacher and taught in the classroom for many years. My students and I have fond memories of taking field trips to the SF zoo.

On behalf of all the children, whether they are special needs, medically ill, or typically developing, please help keep the zoo the way it is now.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

---

User Data

Client IP (REMOTE_ADDR) : 209.240.207.76
Client IP via ProXy (HTTP_X_FORWARDED_FOR) :
Submitted on: 9/4/2008 2:35:19 PM

name: Christine Carmines

phone: 

comments: San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Re: Proposed Zoo Legislation to be voted on 9/9/08

Dear San Francisco Board Members:
Allow me to introduce myself. I am a second generation San Francisco native. I live in my grandfather's house on Potrero Hill. I am 51 years old, hold a Bachelor's Degree in Biology and am a volunteer at the San Francisco Zoo.

I understand that legislation is being proposed to turn our zoo into a rescue facility. Are the proposers entirely unaware of what our zoo does? We are already a rescue facility. All of our animals are either: endangered in the wild, poached from the wild when too young to have learned to survive there, injured by humans and now unable to survive in the wild, or captive bred. Without us they would all be dead.

Unlike the thousands of other rescue facilities in the United States (and the 51 in the Bay Area), we remain unique, diverse and even visionary. You should consider our zoo a precious asset, not an expendable embarrassment. Allow me to elucidate.

Modern zoos are not places where exotic animals have been stolen from their homelands to be caged and exhibited to a blissfully unconcerned public. Due to the profoundly negative impact humanity has had on the biosphere, modern zoos strive to be sanctuaries and refuges for the many species our species is destroying. The San Francisco Zoo has a nationally renowned captive breeding program wherein we breed critically endangered species not only to preserve healthy genetic lines but to hopefully reintroduce those species into the wild one day. We also have entirely unique educational programs, like those in the ARC (Animal Resource Center), where we teach children and teens about wildlife using a hands-on approach.

Further, we instituted the first outreach program in the U.S. (the ZooMobile), bringing wildlife into schools around the Bay Area to introduce children to animals up close and personal. As a volunteer I am astounded by the vast numbers of San Francisco children who've never met an animal that isn't a cat or dog, on a computer screen or on television. They don't understand them; they fear them; and they can only grow up to have no interest in preserving them. We all have a vested interest in changing their perspective.

Be of no doubt that our zoo's education and breeding programs will be eliminated by your proposed legislation. We will lose our accreditation by the AZA (Association of Zoos and Aquariums) which means that we will lose the majority of our funding. We will also lose our quality staff because without accreditation, working for us will be useless on a professional resume. Without that accreditation we will not be allowed to continue our captive breeding programs which are strictly controlled and monitored by the AZA to
ensure genetic health.

What will happen to the endangered species we are caring for now? What will happen to the many animals we have that can not be re-introduced into the wild? What will happen to our educational programs? Are the animal rights extremists going to come take care of them? Have they ever personally cared for any animal? I doubt it. Their arguments may sound chic at cocktail parties but they don't work in the real world.

Our environment is no longer Eden. We have to have the compassion, responsibility and bravery to care for the wildlife that we've been appointed guardians of (according to the texts of every major world religion). That means getting in there and helping, not pretending that Eden still exists and we can just let the animals go back.

Please help our zoo to remain, to grow and to continue to serve San Francisco as one of the world's unique zoos - where wild life and people come together, learn together and form the harmonious bonds future generations will need to survive together.

I beg you not to be swayed by ignorance or hysteria into destroying that uniqueness. Please come by and meet our very special animals, learn their stories, see our programs and realize that not only do we rescue animals, we rescue people too.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Christine Carmines
San Francisco native and resident

P.S. As a voter I am very interested to know how you will vote on this proposal. Please inform me by e-mail: drakonia@earthlink.net Thank you.
Submitted on: 9/5/2008 3:09:30 PM

name: timothy coppola

phone: 

comments: So much attention is being given to changing the mission of the San Francisco Zoo because of one foolish incident last Christmas.

I do not think the Board of Supervisors should change the Zoo's mission just to appease. Would it not be better for the Board to postpone any decision until they have a thorough, detailed study on the long term cost and management implications of any changes?

The staff morale at the Zoo is at an all time low because of all of this vacillation. For example, there is no reason that animal rescue cannot be included as part of an overall conservation mission at the zoo, but this type of decision is best determined by those who must carry out these types of missions.
Submitted on: 9/3/2008 11:08:14 AM

name: William Cole, Ph.D.

phone:

comments: Dear Board of Supervisors,
I have become aware that the board will be hearing arguments on Ordinance 080818 which would address longstanding animal welfare problems at the San Francisco Zoo and transform it into a world-class facility that would make all of the city's residents proud. I whole-heartedly support this ordinance and urge the Board to approve the action.

Sincerely,

User Data

Client IP (REMOTE_ADDR) : 69.228.179.198
Client IP via Proxy (HTTP_X_FORWARDED_FOR) :
Board of Supervisors

Dear [Supervisor],

I am writing to urge you to support Supervisor Daly's ordinance to reform the troubled San Francisco Zoo by transforming it to a rescue institution and establishing an animal welfare oversight committee.

The Christmas Day tiger tragedy opened a window for the world to see the animal welfare deficiencies that have plagued this zoo for decades. It is shocking that a world-class city like San Francisco would have a zoo that houses animals in such outdated and inhumane conditions.

It's time for San Francisco to establish a zoo that provides a refuge for animals in need and provides them with the best possible quality of life in a forever home.

Please co-sponsor and hold prompt hearings on Supervisor Daly's important legislation to rescue the San Francisco Zoo.

Sincerely,
Michael Mccartin

name: Rachel Allen

phone:  

comments: I signed up to go through training at the San Francisco Zoo to become a docent, but had not yet visited the zoo. Since it was in SF, I assumed the conditions would be optimal and I could be proud to volunteer. Despite the improvement in some of the newer habitats, I was pretty astonished at a number of surprising deficiencies - for example, the tiny enclosures of some of the big cats, with no plans, I was told, for improvement. I understand that building new enclosures could run into the millions of dollars, but I was ashamed of this zoo's apparent message that treating captive animals like this is okay, so I discontinued the program. There were only 5 or so other docents in training for a bi-annual training class. I believe more people don't sign up for what could be a really cool position because the zoo could be made a more desirable place to volunteer, especially in a city renowned for its animal advocacy. We can do better! Let's make this zoo, like so many other facets of San Francisco, a model for zoos around the world. Ordinance 080813 would address longstanding animal welfare problems at the San Francisco Zoo and transform it into a world-class facility that would make all of the city's residents proud.
Submitted on: 9/3/2008 11:17:40 AM

name: e. paras

phone:

comments: Re Ordinance 080810.

I am a San Francisco Bay area resident & I support the above.
The Ordinance 080810 would address longstanding animal welfare problems at
the San Francisco Zoo and transform it into a world-class facility that would
make all of the city's residents proud.
Submitted on: 9/3/2008 11:18:04 AM

name: Sarah Beckley

phone:

commits: Dear Board,

Ordinance 080810 would address longstanding animal welfare problems at the San Francisco Zoo and transform it into a world-class facility that would make all of the city’s residents proud. I hope that the SF Board of Supervisors will consider this legislation to improve conditions for the animals at the SF Zoo. Thanks,
Sarah Beckley

---
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name: Tamara Johnston
phone:
comments: I support ordinance 080818. This initiative is long overdue and would be a world class facility and a model for others to look to.
Submitted on: 9/3/2008 11:47:52 AM

name: sherry nunes

phone: ____________________

comments: I think it is a disgrace to the city of san francisco and the state of california to hear how our helpless precious wild animals are being treated. It breaks my heart to see how cruel and inhumane our city and state officials are! what kind of people can live everyday knowing how horrible the conditions of living are for these animals, and do nothing about it??? How can you live with yourselves?? These animals have no means of making life better for them selves!! As people who are in need can do for them selves that are in need. If an agreement can't be established on the idea for a recuing center at the zoo, There has got to be something done to help those animals we can't let this go on any longer!!! I would do whatever possible to help these animals volunteer my time anything, why can't city and state do the same?? Maybe we need more humane officials in office! I think everyone should start considering that @ election time!!! Heartbroken in Crockett, California
Sherry Nunes
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name: Deanne Franklin

phone: ________________________

comments: Ordinance 080810 would address longstanding animal welfare problems at the San Francisco Zoo and transform it into a world-class facility that would make all of the city's residents proud.
I am proud of many things in this city. It's my home for 28 years and one of the only things I feel shame about is our city's zoo. This would be such an exciting change, it could be a groundbreaking Ordinance for us.
Thank you,
Deanne Franklin, homeowner, SF
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Submitted on: 9/3/2008 12:17:50 PM

name: Mitra Mohsenian

phone:

comments: Ordinance 080810 would address longstanding animal welfare problems at the San Francisco Zoo and transform it into a world-class facility that would make all of the city's residents proud.

As an animal lover, I'm very excited about this very exciting opportunity to take a step further in support of animal welfare in our state and country!

---------------------------------------------
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name: Cynthia bournellis
phone:

comments: I am writing to ask you to support Ordinance 080810, which would address longstanding animal welfare problems at the San Francisco Zoo.
Submitted on: 9/3/2008 1:08:57 PM

name: Ted Jones

phone:

comments: I'm a voter in Supervisor Peskin's district.

This is just a note to let you know that I support Ordinance 080818 -- the San Francisco Zoo ordinance. It isn't every day I find myself in agreement with Supervisor Daly so I felt that I should do something.

Ted Jones

---
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name: Alicia Buckles

phone:

comments: Ordinance 080818 would address longstanding animal welfare problems at the San Francisco Zoo and transform it into a world-class facility that would make all of the city's residents proud. It is what we need to do to help the animals in danger. Please make this consideration.
Submitted on: 9/3/2008 1:47:42 PM

name: Leighann Esslinger

phone: ___________________

comments: Ordinance 080818 would address longstanding animal welfare problems at the San Francisco Zoo and transform it into a world-class facility that would make all of the city's residents proud.

name: Tim Comford

phone:

comments: Please note that I fully support Prop. 080818 which will provide for the welfare of animals, both current and future at the San Francisco Zoo. I am a resident, voter, as well as a frequent visitor to the Zoo and agree that the conditions are less than optimal. As an animal lover, I often imagine myself wondering how I may feel if the situation were reversed. So please, in a city that espouses caring and love and is and should be concerned about how we're viewed by visitors around the world, show us all that our opinions are important. Thank You, Tim Comford
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Submitted on: 9/3/2008 2:12:07 PM

name: Willow Liroff

phone: 

comments: I am writing to let you know of my strong support and commendation of the fantastic new proposal to turn the San Francisco Zoo into a rescue facility for needy animals. This important move to make a model facility for animal welfare, appropriately located in a city where precedents are and should be set, is a progressive move in the Bay Area.

I'm an Oakland resident and San Francisco frequenter and while I am unable to attend the City Hall meeting next week (my work schedule prevents it), I hope you can count me among the citizens who want to make sure and express my support. Thank you for your consideration of this important initiative for San Francisco!

Best,
Willow Liroff

---
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name: Michelle Keith

phone:

comments: To Whom It May Concern,
This letter is to tell you that I whole heartedly support ordinance 080818. After all, this IS about the animals.
Thank You in Advance,
Michelle Keith
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name: Sujatha Ramakrishna, M.D.

phone:

comments: I support any actions to encourage the SF Zoo to function as a rescue sanctuary for animals in need.

Sujatha Ramakrishna, M.D.

---
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name: Chrysta Giffen

phone:

comments: To the Board of Supervisors,

Ordinance 080818 would address longstanding animal welfare problems at the San Francisco Zoo and transform it into a world-class facility that would make all of the city's residents proud.
Please support ordinance 080818.

Thank you!

Chrysta Giffen
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name: l c

phone:

comments: Ordinance 080818 would address longstanding animal welfare problems at the San Francisco Zoo and transform it into a world-class facility that would make all of the city's residents proud.

---------------------------
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Submitted on: 9/3/2008 4:28:00 PM

name: Jesse Hoopes

phone: __________

comments: I, along with many other citizens of this city, fully support ordinance 080818 that would benefit the welfare of the animals at the San Francisco Zoo. This ordinance would also turn the zoo into a World Class facility that would make the citizens of San Francisco proud.

name: Genie Burton

phone:

comments: Do the right thing for zoo animals and put the ordinance into play. Rescue animals would benefit so much. These animals are the ones we often forget about. Here is our chance to change that. Thank you for your support,
Genie Burton

---
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Submitted on: 9/3/2008 6:24:50 PM

name: ross estes blum

phone:

comments: hello,

I am in full support of ordinance 080813 and hope you all are too! let's make our animal welfare consciousness shine in the ten directions and help change things for the better!

sincerely,

ross estes blum

---
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Submitted on: 9/3/2008 8:11:11 PM

name: Georgie Chen

phone:

comments: Dear Supervisors,
Ordinance 080818 would address longstanding animal welfare problems at the San Francisco Zoo and transform it into a world-class facility that would make all of the city's residents proud.

Please consider this groundbreaking ordinance to help animals in the San Francisco Zoo. And this will be a world-class model zoo for animal welfare.

Thank you very much!

Sincerely,
Georgie Chen  (SF Teacher, Art Institute.)
Submitted on: 9/3/2008 8:29:22 PM

name: laurie stern

phone: 

comments: It would be fantastic to see a supervisor-appointed animal welfare oversight committee effectively turning the zoo into a sanctuary. I would return to the S.F. Zoo again, like many others who would be in great support of it.

name: Bryan Todd

phone:

comments: I feel that Ordinance 080818 would address longstanding animal welfare problems at the San Francisco Zoo and transform it into a world-class facility that would make all of the city's residents proud. Thank you for your time.
Submitted on: 9/3/2008 10:35:21 PM

name: Andrew Lennon

phone:

comments: Ordinance 080818 would address longstanding animal welfare problems at the San Francisco Zoo and transform it into a world-class facility that would make all of the city's residents proud of the fact that we are helping animals in need as opposed to hurting more animals than we all ready have.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter, Andrew Lennon

User Data

Client IP (REMOTE_ADDR) : 71.132.203.38
Client IP via Proxy (HTTP_X_FORWARDED_FOR) :

name: Jana Botelho

phone:

comments: Dear Board of Supervisors,
The citizens of the San Francisco Bay area support this ordinance. Ordinance 080818 would address longstanding animal welfare problems at the San Francisco Zoo and transform it into a world-class facility that would make all of the city's residents proud.
Best regards,
Jana Botelho

name: Emily Mann

phone:

comments: I am a student at UC Irvine. As you can see, the youth community also has an opinion about animal rights. I am attending the San Francisco Board of Supervisors' hearing on the San Francisco Zoo ordinance. We, the citizens of San Francisco, support this ordinance! Please address the longstanding animal welfare problems at the San Francisco Zoo.

Thank you very much,
Emily Mann

name: Emily Mann

phone:

comments: I am a student at UC Irvine. As you can see, the youth community also has an opinion about animal rights. I am attending the San Francisco Board of Supervisors' hearing on the San Francisco Zoo ordinance. We, the citizens of San Francisco, support this ordinance! Please address the longstanding animal welfare problems at the San Francisco Zoo.

Thank you very much,
Emily Mann
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Submitted on: 9/4/2008 1:46:52 AM

name: Jackson

phone:

comments: Ordinance 080818 would address longstanding animal welfare problems at the San Francisco Zoo and transform it into a world-class facility that would make all of the city's residents proud.

Those who have abused and disregarded an animal's life are immoral and inexcusable. People, who have inflicted harm or acts of cruelty to animals, are capable of doing the same damage towards humans, and they never do so only once. Criminology studies show that violent offenders have committed constant animal cruelty in their childhoods. Abusing an animal is a way for a human to find power/joy/fulfillment through the torture of a victim they know cannot defend itself. People, who intentionally do these acts of cruelty, need a psychological evaluation and subsequent counseling.
Submitted on: 9/4/2008 7:56:05 AM

name: Isabella La Rocca

phone: 

comments: This is to show support for Ordinance 080618, which would address longstanding animal welfare problems at the SF Zoo, and transform it into a world-class facility that would make the city's residence proud.
Submitted on: 9/4/2008 8:53:09 AM

name: Ann Marie Coletta

phone:

comments: I am writing in support of the proposal to make our zoo a haven for abused or endangered animals. Let San Francisco once again be an example for other cities in our compassionate decision-making. Please help us teach the world that animals are sentient beings, not property. Thank you and take care,

Ann Marie Coletta
Clinical Social Worker
Submitted on: 9/4/2008 9:30:06 AM

name: Gerry Benko

phone:

comments:
Ordinance 080818 would address longstanding animal welfare problems at the San Francisco Zoo and transform it into a world-class facility that would make all of the city's residents proud.

This is the right thing to do.

Gerry Benko
Submitted on: 9/4/2008 2:15:19 PM

name: JesseAnne Meyers

phone: 

comments: Thank you for your time and attention to my email. I am writing to request that you support Ordinance 080818.

Ordinance 080818 would address longstanding animal welfare problems at the San Francisco Zoo and transform it into a world-class facility that would make all of the city's residents proud.

Ordinance 080818—which was introduced by San Francisco Supervisor Chris Daly—would establish a supervisor-appointed animal welfare oversight committee and state that the zoo should primarily (but not solely) acquire animals who are in need (i.e., rescued animals). The San Francisco Zoological Society is mischaracterizing this progressive proposal in an effort to derail it.

If the ordinance becomes law, the city of San Francisco has an exciting opportunity to make the city-owned zoo a model institution for animal welfare.

Please show your support for ordinance 080818 on Tuesday Sept. 9th

Kind Regards,
JesseAnne
Submitted on: 9/4/2008 6:16:59 PM

name: A. Ozols

phone:

comments: Please support Supervisor Chris Daly's Ordinance 080818 which would establish a supervisor-appointed animal welfare oversight committee and state that the zoo should primarily (but not solely) acquire animals who are in need (i.e., rescued animals).

Sincerely,
the Ozols family

---

User Data

Client IP (REMOTE_ADDR) : 75.62.238.17
Client IP via Proxy {HTTP_X_FORWARDED_FOR} :
Submitted on: 9/4/2008 8:46:29 PM

name: Rachel Farac
phone: 

comments: I am in support of Ordinance 080818. I will be at the hearing to support the animals of the zoo. Thank you!

Rachel Farac
Submitted on: 9/4/2008 10:19:10 PM

name: Jody Gibney

phone: 

comments: I enthusiastically support Ordinance 080818. San Francisco Zoo has a long history of negative issues surrounding animal welfare.

I haven’t visited the San Francisco Zoo in years, having found it a very disturbing place upon my first visit, an impression that has only been strengthened by media coverage of the various problems over the years. I've also made it a practice over the years to advise out-of-town visitors to avoid visiting the zoo for the same reasons.

Ordinance 080818 is our opportunity to transform this zoo into a world-class facility that would make all of the city's residents proud.
Submitted on: 9/5/2008 10:28:34 AM

name: chris

phone:

comments: Please pass the ordinance to help the animals at the SF Zoo. My kids come form the East Bay on school trips to your zoo. The zoo looks run down and the animals are in unhealthy conditions. SF can do better!
Submitted on: 9/5/2008 2:45:46 PM

name: Christy Wishon

phone:

comments: To the Board of Supervisors,

I am a citizen of Mountain View and travel frequently to visit the SF Zoo as I am a member. However, I do believe that in light of the various animal welfare problems that the zoo has faced, that Ordinance 080818 would make a welcome change for the animals at the zoo, and the zoo itself. This ordinance could make the citizens of SF and the bay area proud to have a facility in its own backyard that provides outstanding care for sick and injured animals that are in need of our help instead of running the zoo for profit.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Christy Wishon
Submitted on: 9/5/2008 3:59:14 PM

name: Breanna Martinico

phone:

comments: Please do everything you can to help pass the new ordinance that will help the existing and future animals at the San Francisco Zoo. Thank you, Breanna Martinico, San Jose.
ELECTIONS COMMISSION  
City and County of San Francisco

Gerard Gleason, President  
Richard P. Matthews  
Joseph B. Flair  
Rosabella Safont  
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Winnie Yu

August 27, 2008

The Hon. David Ballati, Presiding Judge  
Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Francisco  
400 McAllister Street  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Response of the Elections Commission to Civil Grand Jury Report, “A Year of Five Elections for the City and County of San Francisco”

Dear Judge Ballati:

The Elections Commission of San Francisco received the above-noted Civil Grand Jury report on July 3, 2008. We thank the Civil Grand Jury for its work in its investigation of the operations of the Department of Elections, recognize its valuable work as a citizens’ body, and are pleased to submit this response for your and the Jury’s consideration.

Background on the Elections Commission

The Elections Commission of San Francisco is a unique body that was created by voters and governed by San Francisco Charter Sec. 13.103.5. A seven-member body of unpaid citizens who are appointed by seven different elected officials (or bodies of elected officials), its powers are generally defined as:

The Commission shall set general policies for the Department of Elections and shall be responsible for the proper administration of the general practices of the Department, subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of this Charter. These duties shall include but not be limited to approving written plans prior to each election, submitted by the Director of Elections, detailing the policies, procedures, and personnel that will be used to conduct the election as well as an assessment of how well the plan succeeded in carrying out a free, fair and functional election. (Emphasis added.)
The Charter invests the Director of Elections with the day-to-day conduct and management of the Department of Elections.

Because the Commission is a policy-setting body, the implementation of the Recommendations of the Civil Grand Jury do not fall within its statutory purview, and thus does not have the power to enact any of the Recommendations. Nevertheless, as a citizens’ body that is ultimately “responsible for the general practices of the Department” (S.F. Charter Sec. 13.103.5.), the Commission offers the following responses to the Jury’s Findings and Recommendations.

Elections Commission’s Responses to Jury Findings

“1. The Department of Elections’ City Hall space is inadequate for the performance of all of its functions, so the Department utilizes various locations throughout the City.”

Response: The Commission agrees with this finding.

“2. The use of multiple locations impacts the efficiency of DOE operations and potentially compromises the security and even the integrity of elections.”

Response: The Commission agrees in part and disagrees in part with this finding. The Commission agrees that the use of multiple locations affects the efficiency of DOE operations, but does not agree that it potentially compromises the security or integrity of elections. It is a general principle of elections that security and integrity of elections are chiefly accomplished through well-designed and published procedures to be followed when ballots are moved, canvassed, remade, tabulated, or in any way handled as part of the elections process; and strict adherence to those procedures. The Commission believes that the DOE does a proper job of adhering to published procedures that ensure the security and integrity of elections.

“3. Five years after the 2002-2003 Civil Grand Jury recommended that ‘the City should identify and secure a single site for consolidation of DOE operations,’ the DOE is still without consolidated, permanent space.”

Response: The Commission agrees with this finding.

“4. The current off-site location at Pier 48 does not offer DOE personnel consistent access to a reliable supply of drinking water.”

Response: The Commission agrees with this finding.

“5. Sequoia must obtain the Secretary of State’s certification that Sequoia voting machines have the capacity to count [Ranked Choice Voting] ballots.”
Response: The Commission agrees with this finding.

"6. If Sequoia fails to obtain the needed certification, the Department of Elections must have a plan for counting [Ranked Choice Voting] ballots."

Response: The Commission agrees with this finding.

"7. As of the date of this report, the DOE does not have a contingency plan for counting the RCV ballots."

Response: The Commission disagrees with this finding. The Director of Elections produced and promulgated such a plan in 2003, and it remains valid.

"8. The perception of fair and accurate elections requires that voters know in advance and understand the alternative plan for counting [Ranked Choice Voting] ballots."

Response: The Commission agrees with this finding.

"9. For partisan primary elections, some voters with a declared party affiliation believed incorrectly that they could appear at the polling place and request the ballot of another party."

Response: The Commission agrees with this finding.

"10. These voters were unaware of the fact that they had to re-register and change their party affiliation prior to voting for another party’s candidate[s]."

Response: The Commission agrees that this might have been the case.

"11. Some pollworkers and voters do not understand the procedures for voting for candidates where Ranked-Choice ballots are used."

Response: The Commission agrees with this finding, although it is unclear from the Jury’s report how prevalent it finds this problem to be.

"12. There is a lack of understanding by some voters of the requirements for submitting a valid Absentee Ballot."
Response: The Commission agrees with this finding, although it is unclear from the Jury’s report how prevalent it finds this problem to be.

“13. The Department of Elections is subject to federal, state, and local laws regarding voter outreach and education.”

Response: The Commission agrees with this finding.

“14. While the DOE does meet these legal requirements, additional outreach efforts are needed on voter registration requirements and deadlines, the Ranked-Choice Voting process and the requirements for submitting a valid Absentee Ballot.”

Response: The Commission agrees in part and disagrees in part with this finding. The Commission agrees that the DOE meets its legal requirements regarding voter outreach and education—and in some cases it exceeds these requirements. The Commission further agrees that some voters did not and do not understand certain aspects of registration requirements, the Ranked Choice Voting process, and the requirements for submitting a valid Absentee Ballot. However, there is no data in the Jury’s report to illustrate either (a) that those are the result of insufficient instruction, (b) how prevalent a problem these are, or (c) that devoting greater amounts of scarce DOE resources to these particular issues—necessarily at the expense of other issues—would likely result in fairer, freer, or more functional elections.

The Commission does not wish to appear callous or indifferent to even a single voter’s ballot not being counted. Indeed, the Commission, as a body of fellow citizens, laments the loss of the opportunity to count even one ballot card of a voter who has put forth the effort to vote. Nonetheless, at least two things are inevitably true: (a) some voters will, unfortunately, misunderstand instructions despite all reasonable efforts of any department of elections and despite the fact that each of the phenomena described by the Civil Grand Jury are accompanied by clear written instructions to those voters; (b) elections cannot be perfect, nor are they expected to be perfect—but the imperfections should fall randomly, fairly, and not affect any outcomes. In the Commission’s experience with San Francisco’s elections and in its knowledge of other counties’ elections, nothing described in this section of the Jury’s report is at all out of the ordinary for any election held anywhere, regrettable though it is to lose the vote of even one person who has gone to the effort to try to vote.

Elections Commission’s Responses to Jury Recommendations

“1. The Office of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors must provide an adequate budget and direct the Division of Real Estate to find permanent, unified, secure, and
safe space for the San Francisco Department of Elections where all DOE staff can efficiently perform all their duties.”

Response: Nothing in this Recommendation falls within the jurisdiction or chartered authority of this Commission, but the Commission would defer to the operational preferences of the Director of Elections.

“2. An appropriate source of drinking water must be made available at all times for the on-site employees.”

Response: Nothing in this Recommendation falls within the jurisdiction or chartered authority of this Commission. However, the Commission supports this recommendation.

“3. The DOE should publicly establish a date certain by which Sequoia must receive the Secretary of State’s certification regarding the counting of [Ranked Choice Voting] ballots. This date should be no later than September 15, 2008.”

Response: The Commission cannot implement this Recommendation, as doing so would exceed its chartered authority to set policy for elections and would infringe on the Director of Elections’ statutory responsibility to conduct the day-to-day operations. (S.F. Charter Secs. 13.103.5, 13.104.) However, the Commission is aware of this issue, is monitoring it closely through the reports of the Director of Elections, and will continue to do so.

“4. To prepare for the possibility that Sequoia fails to obtain the required certification, DOE must develop a contingency plan for counting [Ranked Choice Voting] ballots, which should be in final form by October 6, 2008.”

Response: The Commission cannot implement this Recommendation, as doing so would exceed its chartered authority to set policy for elections and would infringe on the Director of Elections’ statutory responsibility to conduct the day-to-day operations. (S.F. Charter Secs. 13.103.5, 13.104.) However, the Commission is aware of this issue, and will monitor it closely. Certainly, in the event that Sequoia does not receive state certification of Ranked Choice Voting equipment by the time the Commission considers the Election Plan submitted by the Director in advance of the November 2008 election, it will expect to see reference to the 2003 contingency plan within that Election Plan.

“5. The DOE should keep the public apprised of the status of the Secretary of State’s certification of the Sequoia voting machine for counting [Ranked Choice Voting] ballots and the status of the contingency plan if required.”

Response: The Commission cannot implement this Recommendation, as doing so would exceed its chartered authority to set policy for elections and would infringe on the Director of Elections’ statutory responsibility to conduct the day-to-day operations. (S.F. Charter Secs. 13.103.5,
However, the Commission supports and encourages all efforts of the Department to be as transparent as possible with information about how the elections are conducted. The Commission also notes that if a contingency plan is needed, it will be referred to in the Election Plan for the November 2008 election, which is a public document.

“6. For a partisan primary election, where separate ballots are used based on a voter’s party affiliation, the DOE’s training and voter outreach programs need greater emphasis on the fact that in order to vote for a candidate in another party, voters must re-register and change their party affiliation by the voter registration deadline.”

Response: The Commission cannot implement this Recommendation, as doing so would exceed its chartered authority to set policy for elections and would infringe on the Director of Elections’ statutory responsibility to conduct the day-to-day operations. (S.F. Charter Secs. 13.103.5, 13.104.) However, the Commission is mindful of these concerns, and will have public discussions with the Director and discuss publicly among its members to determine whether greater efforts in these areas – necessarily at the expense of other things – would be expected to achieve significant improvement in the areas the Jury describes.

The Commission acknowledges that while some aspects of voting requirements are not intuitive for all voters, it is also true that all of this information is publicly posted, and it is worth noting that the overwhelming majority of voters managed to comply with the requirements.

“7. The DOE’s pollworker training needs to emphasize the Ranked-Choice Voting process.”

Response: The Commission cannot implement this Recommendation, as doing so would exceed its chartered authority to set policy for elections and would infringe on the Director of Elections’ statutory responsibility to conduct the day-to-day operations. (S.F. Charter Secs. 13.103.5, 13.104.) However, the Commission is mindful of these concerns, and will have public discussions with the Director and discuss publicly among its members to determine whether greater efforts in these areas – necessarily at the expense of other things – would be expected to achieve significant improvement in the areas the Jury describes.

The Commission acknowledges that while some aspects of voting requirements are not intuitive for all voters, it is also true that the pertinent RCV information is printed in three languages directly on the voting materials as well as in the Voter Information Pamphlet supplied to each registered voter in the language requested by that voter, and it is worth noting that the overwhelming majority of voters managed to comply with the requirements.

“8. The DOE’s outreach program needs to improve voter instructions on the Ranked-Choice process and the use of Absentee Ballots.”

Response: The Commission cannot implement this Recommendation, as doing so would exceed its chartered authority to set policy for elections and would infringe on the Director of Elections’ statutory responsibility to conduct the day-to-day operations. (S.F. Charter Secs. 13.103.5,
13.104.) However, the Commission is mindful of these concerns, and will have public
discussions with the Director and discuss publicly among its members to determine whether
greater efforts in these areas – necessarily at the expense of other things – would be expected to
achieve significant improvement in the areas the Jury describes.

The Commission acknowledges that while some aspects of voting requirements are not intuitive
for all voters, it is also true that all of this information is printed in three languages directly on
the voting materials, and it is worth noting that the overwhelming majority of voters managed to
comply with the requirements.

“9. In addition to its established communication approaches, the DOE should explore
enhanced techniques to communicate information on the less understood aspects of
voting such as partisan primary elections, Ranked-Choice Voting and Absentee
Ballots.”

Response: The Commission cannot implement this Recommendation, as doing so would exceed
its chartered authority to set policy for elections and would infringe on the Director of Elections’
statutory responsibility to conduct the day-to-day operations. (S.F. Charter Secs. 13.103.5,
13.104.) However, the Commission supports and encourages all efforts of the Department to be
as transparent as possible with information about how the elections are conducted.

Respectfully submitted,

Gerard Gleason
President, San Francisco Elections Commission
Please remove all upcoming restrictions to smoking related to small businesses.

"Educate, Not立法."

"Be Fair, Smoke Over There."

Private Enforcement allows individuals to sue you in addition to the City's Code Enforcement mechanism.
(This can encourage neurotic, costly, & time consuming law suits for the business & City of San Francisco.)

The second item is: Smoking is prohibited with 20 ft of entrances, exits and operable window and vents of commercial buildings where smoking is prohibited. On many neighborhood commercial corridors this could translate into blocks of streets where smoking is not allowed and who will enforce this? Realistically will the police come if called? Does this encourage complainers?

The Small Business Commission's concern is that it will be too easy under private enforcement to sue business.

If you are business who has lines that may form outside your business you will be required to stop people from smoking.

For bars and restaurants that have sunk good money into providing a separate area to smoke this legislation will no longer allow you to allow smoking in that space.

There is a place for everyone in San Francisco, let's learn to get along, not how to point fingers & fear others.

Respectfully,
Jean Marie Lescohier
Clipper Construction, Inc. - (415) 621-4733
NARI (National Association of the Remodeling Industry)
Information from ESET Smart Security, version of virus signature database 3415 (20080904)

The message was checked by ESET Smart Security.

http://www.eset.com
1. INTRODUCTION: Klein Foods, Inc. (P.O. Box 6010, Healdsburg, CA 95448), through their agent, Peter Bonadelli of Analytical Environmental Services, has applied for a Department of the Army permit to construct the Cooley Ranch Vineyard project. The project site is located approximately five miles west of the city of Cloverdale, Sonoma County, California (Figure 1–Project Location). This application is being processed pursuant to the provisions of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. Section 1344).

2. PROPOSED PROJECT:

Project Site: The Cooley Ranch Vineyard project site is approximately 3,450 acres located within the Dry Creek Watershed, upstream of Lake Sonoma. Elevation ranges between 800 feet above mean sea level up to 2,041 feet above mean sea level at the project site's largest peak, Sky High Mountain. The project site has a variety of vegetative communities including ruderal grassland, valley and foothill grassland, oak woodland, riparian forest, and redwood forest. The Corps issued a jurisdictional determination on September 20, 2007. The project site includes 26.396 acres of jurisdictional wetlands and streams that are fed by a combination of groundwater and rainfall (Figures 2, 2a – 2e, Jurisdictional Wetlands and Streams).

Project Description: The applicant proposes to develop approximately 280 acres of vineyards and associated features within the project site (Figure 3 – Proposed Vineyard Areas). The proposed vineyard areas have been grouped geographically in the western, eastern and northern portions of the project site. Five vineyard areas will be developed in the western portion of the project site (POU 1W through POU 5W). Four vineyard areas will be developed in the eastern portion of the site; POU 1E through POU 4E. Six vineyard areas will be developed in the northern portion of the project site (POU 1N through POU 6N).

The associated features are five reservoirs, six water diversion facilities, seven pipelines to connect diversion facilities to water storage facilities, and eleven road crossings across jurisdictional streams (Figure 4–Associated Features). The reservoirs will collect water from natural ephemeral and intermittent drainages and from the diversion facilities.

The proposed project will impact a total of 2.1 acres of wetlands for the construction of one of the reservoirs (Figures 5, 5a-5e - Wetland Impact). The applicant proposes to mitigate by creating 2.1 acres of onsite wetlands by expanding an existing 7.35 acre wetland to 9.45 acres (Figures 6 and 6a- Wetland Mitigation). The applicant also proposes to preserve the exiting 7.35 acres wetland. A 50 foot buffer will be placed around the combined wetland creation/preservation area.

The six water diversions will temporarily impact a total of 70 linear feet of stream that will be restored. The eleven road crossings will involve the
installation of culverts (approximately 70 feet each). Stream impacts from proposed reservoirs and road crossings total 4,010 linear feet (Figure 7, 7a-7e - Stream Impact). The applicant is proposing to offset stream impacts by fencing or otherwise protecting from grazing and enhancing the stream by the removing invasive species and by planting of trees with buffer zones to improve overall riparian corridors (Figure 8 - Stream Mitigation). The number of trees planted will be at a ratio of at least 3:1 to offset impact of tree removal due to reservoir construction.

The applicant is proposing to protect the wetland and stream mitigation areas, under a Forever Wild easement (Figures 9, 9a-9e - Forever Wild Areas).

3. COMPLIANCE WITH VARIOUS FEDERAL LAWS:

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA): The Corps will assess the environmental impacts of the proposed action in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. Section 4371 et. seq.), the Council on Environmental Quality’s Regulations (40 C.F.R. Parts 1500-1508), and the Corps’ Regulations (33 C.F.R. Part 230 and Part 325, Appendix B). Unless otherwise stated, the Environmental Assessment will describe only the impacts (direct, indirect, and cumulative) resulting from activities within the Corps’ jurisdiction. The documents used in the preparation of the Environmental Assessment will be on file with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, San Francisco District, Regulatory Branch, 1455 Market Street, San Francisco, California 94103-1398.

Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA): Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act requires formal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and/or the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) if a Corps permitted project may adversely affect any Federally listed threatened or endangered species or its designated critical habitat. The proposed project will not impact any known threatened or endangered species.

Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Conservation and Management Act: Essential Fish Habitat - The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act requires all Federal agencies to consult with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) on all actions, or proposed actions permitted by the agency that may adversely affect Essential Fish Habitat (EFH). There are no EFH concerns with this proposed project.

Clean Water Act of 1972 (CWA):

a. Water Quality: Under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. Section 1341), an applicant for a Corps permit must first obtain a State water quality certification before a Corps permit may be issued. The applicant applied to the State Water Resources Control Board’s Division of Water Rights (contact person: Camilla Williams, 916-327-4807) for diversion of water for a beneficial use. No Corps permit will be granted until the applicant obtains the required water quality certification. The Corps may assume a waiver of water quality certification if the State fails or refuses to act on a valid request for certification within 60 days after the receipt of a valid request, unless the District Engineer determines a shorter or longer period is reasonable for the State to act.

Those parties concerned with any water quality issue that may be associated with this project should write to the Executive Officer, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board 5550 Skylane Boulevard, Suite A, Santa Rosa, California 95403 by the close of the comment period of this Public Notice.

b. Alternatives: Evaluation of this proposed activity’s impact includes application of the guidelines promulgated by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency under Section 404(b)(1) of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. Section 1344(b)). An evaluation has been made by this office under the guidelines and it was determined that the
proposed project is not water dependent.

Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (CZMA): Section 307 of the Coastal Zone Management Act requires the applicant to certify that the proposed project is consistent with the State's Coastal Zone Management Program, if applicable. The proposed project is not within the Coastal Zone.

National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA): Based on a review of survey data on file with various City, State and Federal agencies, no historic or archeological resources are known to occur in the project vicinity. If unrecorded resources are discovered during construction of the project, operations will be suspended until the Corps completes consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

4. PUBLIC INTEREST EVALUATION: The decision whether to issue a permit will be based on an evaluation of the probable impact, including cumulative impact, of the proposed activity on the public interest. That decision will reflect the national concern for both protection and utilization of important resources. The benefits that reasonably may be expected to accrue from the proposed activity must be balanced against its reasonably foreseeable detriments. All factors that may be relevant to the proposal will be considered, including its cumulative effects. Among those factors are: conservation, economics, aesthetics, general environmental concerns, wetlands, historic properties, fish and wildlife values, flood hazards, floodplain values, land use, navigation, shoreline erosion and accretion, recreation, water supply and conservation, water quality, energy needs, safety, food and fiber production, mineral needs, considerations of property ownership, and, in general, the needs and welfare of the people.

5. CONSIDERATION OF COMMENTS: The Corps of Engineers is soliciting comments from the public, Federal, State and local agencies and officials, Indian Tribes, and other interested parties in order to consider and evaluate the impacts of this proposed activity. Any comments received will be considered by the Corps to determine whether to issue, condition or deny a permit for this proposal. To make this decision, comments are used to assess impacts on endangered species, historic properties, water quality, general environmental effects, and the other public interest factors listed above. Comments are used in the preparation of an Environmental Assessment and/or an Environmental Impact Statement pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act. Comments are also used to determine the need for a public hearing and to determine the overall public interest in the proposed activity.

6. SUBMISSION OF COMMENTS: Interested parties may submit, in writing, any comments concerning this activity. Comments should include the applicant's name and the number and the date of this Public Notice, and should be forwarded so as to reach this office within the comment period specified on Page 1. Comments should be sent to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, San Francisco District, Regulatory Branch, 1455 Market Street, San Francisco, California 94103-1398. It is the Corps' policy to forward any such comments that include objections to the applicant for resolution or rebuttal. Any person may also request, in writing, within the comment period of this Public Notice that a public hearing be held to consider this application. Requests for public hearings shall state, with particularity, the reasons for holding a public hearing. Additional details may be obtained by contacting the applicant whose name and address are indicated in the first paragraph of this Public Notice or by contacting Katerina Galacatos of our office at telephone 415-503-6778 or E-mail: Katerina.Galacatos@usace.army.mil. Details on any changes of a minor nature that are made in the final permit action will be provided upon request.
Figure 1
Project Location
Stream Impacts and Mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drainage Type</th>
<th>Linear Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inundated Drainages</td>
<td>4,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserved/Enhanced Drainages</td>
<td>30,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: "Big Foot Mountain, CA" and "Cloverdale, CA" USGS Topographic Quadrangle; AES, 2008

Figure 7
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Stream Impact
Proposed Forever Wild Areas

SOURCE: "Big Foot Mountain, CA" and "Cloverdale, CA" USGS Topographic Quadrangles, AES, 2009

Figure 9
Figure 9a
Proposed Forever Wild Areas

SOURCE: "Big Foot Mountain, CA" and "Clevedale, CA" USGS Topographic Quadrangles, AES, 2008
To: President Larry Martin, Recreation and Park Commission, 501 Stanyan Street, San Francisco, CA 94117-1898. Meeting Room 416, City Hall -- this date.  
From: Eula M. Walters (See Caption.) I represent 2300 persons -- I have their signatures and addresses.  
Re: After much thought and research, I have decided to ask you to reverse your decision of July 17, 2008 in which you voted to allow a Plaque for Ms Ernestine Weiss to be placed permanently on Ferry Park. I can give you multiple reasons why this must not happen. Yet, I can think of no reason why this park would be improved with this Plaque.  
STATEMENT: I was not given the amount of time by you to prepare for opposition arguments. You all were in such a rush to get it over with. When I would try to talk you would threaten me with sit down or I will call the security. (After one of these meetings Ms Weiss goes out and spreads the gossip that I have been thrown out of every meeting in the city. Even if this were true, I'd rather be "thrown out" for trying to assert my Constitutional Rights, than allowed by the Commission to casually stand and tell very untruthful things. Ms Weiss has done more harm to Ferry Park than you can imagine. I have proof of some incidents that you might find hard to believe. That is why she is in such a rush to get this Plaque in place. I have included one letter I wrote to CAO Bill Lee in 1996. I am withholding the documents that go with this letter because time does not allow. Anyhow, Ms Weiss had nothing to do with this research. Nor, did she do any research, "extensive" as she claims. The very reason I distanced myself from her in the beginning was because she was not only untruthful, she thrusts herself upon my presence for the same reason she does anyone she can use to her advantage. She didn't like it at all when I finally had to draw the line! Others tire of her persistence. I feel that some keep her around because they can use her "3 minutes at the mike" for their project. I wish it were not this way. Politics nepotism, favoratism is not good.  
Again, Ms Weiss should not grace the Park that I spent a fourth of my life, and much of my own money, my heart and soul trying to make beautiful. I have never asked for a plaque for myself. Seeing it enjoyed by children and adults -- like this past weekend when Mayor Newsom closed off The Embarcadero roadway that fronts Ferry Park. overwhelms me from the roots.  
Ferry Park needs no Plaques. Please reverse your decision. Ms Weiss has a full blown Commendation from the City. Her friend Mr. Peskin got that for her. By the way, Five Jewish names already grace our neighborhood. Isn't that enough. Next, we will have a banner with "Little Israel" on it. Enough. Ferry Park needs no Plaques or Banners.  

Eula M. Walters, J.D.
DATE: September 8, 2008

TO: Clerk, Board of Supervisors

FAX NUMBER: (415) 554-5163

FROM: Doug Stoddard, Personnel Analyst

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES (including cover sheet): 3

COMMENTS: I am providing you with a copy of a waiver request that the Fire Department submitted to the Human Rights Commission to rent meeting space at the Cathedral Hill Hotel for the administration of the first component of the H-4 Inspector examination. Also attached is a letter of justification from Gary Masetani, Deputy Chief of Administration.

Please call me at 558-3614 if you have any questions or require further information.

FIRE SERVICES EXAMINATION UNIT
698 Second Street, Room 209
San Francisco, CA 94107
Voice Line: (415) 558-3610
Telefax Line: (415) 558-3463
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

S.F. ADMINISTRATIVE CODE CHAPTERS 12B and 14B
WAIVER REQUEST FORM

Section 1. Department Information
Department Head Signature: [Signature]
Name of Department: FIRE
Department Address: 698 Second Street, San Francisco, CA 94107
Contact Person: Doug Stoddard, Personnel Analyst
Phone Number: (415) 558-3614
Fax Number: (415) 558-3463

Section 2. Contractor Information
Contractor Name: Cathedral Hill Hotel
Contact Person: Mark Guter
Contractor Address: 1101 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94109
Vendor Number (if known): 68370
Contact Phone No.: 674-3415

Section 3. Transaction Information
Date Waiver Request Submitted: 09/03/08
Type of Contract: Purchase Order
Contract Start Date: 09/27/08
End Date: 09/27/08
Dollar Amount of Contract: $4,074

Section 4. Administrative Code Chapter to be Waived (please check all that apply)
× Chapter 12B
□ Chapter 14B Note: Employment and LBE subcontracting requirements may still be in force even when a 14B waiver (type A or B) is granted.

Section 5. Waiver Type (Letter of Justification must be attached, see Check List on back of page.)
□ A. Sole Source
□ B. Emergency (pursuant to Administrative Code §6.60 or 21.15)
□ C. Public Entity
× D. No Potential Contractors Comply – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: 09/03/08
□ E. Government Bulk Purchasing Arrangement – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on:
□ F. Sham/Shell Entity – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on:
□ G. Local Business Enterprise (LBE) (for contracts in excess of $5 million; see Admin. Code §14B.7.1.3)
□ H. Subcontracting Goals

HRC ACTION
12B Waiver Granted: ________
12B Waiver Denied: ________
14B Waiver Granted: ________
14B Waiver Denied: ________

Reason for Action:

HRC Staff: __________________________ Date: __________________________

HRC Staff: __________________________ Date: __________________________

HRC Director: __________________________ Date: __________________________

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

Copies of this form are available at: http://intranet/
September 4, 2008

Cynthia Goldstein
Human Rights Commission
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Ms. Goldstein:

I respectfully request that the Human Rights Commission grant a waiver of requirements of Chapter 12B (Nondiscrimination in Contracts and Benefits) for a contract with the Cathedral Hill Hotel to rent meeting space for the administration of the first component of the H-4 Inspector examination. A waiver request form for that facility is enclosed.

The examination component requires meeting space of at least 8,000 square feet to test groups of up to 300 candidates at a time. Members of my staff contacted the Marriott Courtyard at Oyster Point and the Whitcomb Hotel (the only local hotels that are compliant). The Marriott's largest meeting space is 800 square feet, and the Whitcomb's largest meeting space is 6,300 square feet. Therefore, we are unable to consider using those facilities.

The Cathedral Hill Hotel is able to offer us over 10,000 square feet of meeting space, and is available on our targeted dates. Staff has advised personnel at the Cathedral Hill Hotel to contact the Human Rights Commission regarding the procedure for compliance certification.

I appreciate your favorable consideration of this request. If you have any questions or require further information, please contact Jesusa Bushong, Departmental Personnel Officer, at (415) 558-3615.

Very truly yours,

Gary P. Massetani
Deputy Chief of Administration

Endorsement

cc: Jesusa Bushong, Departmental Personnel Officer

698 SECOND STREET • SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107 • 415.558.3400
DATE: September 4, 2008

TO: Clerk, Board of Supervisors

FAX NUMBER: (415) 554-5163

FROM: Doug Stoddard, Personnel Analyst

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES (including cover sheet): 3

COMMENTS: I am providing you with a copy of a waiver request that the Fire Department submitted to the Human Rights Commission to rent sleeping rooms and meeting space at the Holiday Inn Fisherman's Wharf Hotel for the ratings of the second component of the H-20 Lieutenant examination. Also attached is a letter of justification from Deputy Chief Gary Masetani.

Please call me at 558-3614 if you have any questions or require further information.

FIRE SERVICES EXAMINATION UNIT
698 Second Street, Room 209
San Francisco, CA 94107
Voice Line: (415) 558-3610
Telefax Line: (415) 558-3463
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

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

Section 1. Department Information

Department Head Signature: [Signature]
Name of Department: FIRE
Department Address: 698 Second Street, San Francisco, CA 94107
Contact Person: Doug Stoddard, Personnel Analyst
Phone Number: (415) 558-3614
Fax Number: (415) 558-3463

Section 2. Contractor Information

Contractor Name: Holiday Inn Fisherman's Wharf
Contractor Address: 1300 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94133
Vendor Number (if known): 09338
Contact Phone No.: (415) 486-0702

Section 3. Transaction Information

Date Waiver Request Submitted: 09/02/08
Type of Contract: Purchase Order
Contract Start Date: 09/09/08
End Date: 09/15/08
Dollar Amount of Contract: $32,474.00

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

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

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

☐ A. Sole Source
☐ B. Emergency (pursuant to Administrative Code §6.60 or 21.15)
☐ C. Public Entity
☒ D. No Potential Contractors Comply – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: 09/02/08
☐ E. Government Bulk Purchasing Arrangement – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on:
☐ F. Sham/Shell Entity – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on:
☐ G. Local Business Enterprise (LBE) (for contracts in excess of $5 million; see Admin. Code §14B.7.1.3)
☐ H. Subcontracting Goals

HRC ACTION

12B Waiver Granted: ☐ 14B Waiver Granted: ☒
12B Waiver Denied: ☒ 14B Waiver Denied: ☐
Reason for Action:

HRC Staff: __________________________ __________________________
Date: __________________________

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

Date Waiver Granted: __________________________
Contract Dollar Amount: __________________________
September 2, 2008

Cynthia Goldstein
Human Rights Commission
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Ms. Goldstein:

I respectfully request that the Human Rights Commission grant a waiver of requirements of Chapter 12B (Nondiscrimination in Contracts and Benefits) for a contract with Holiday Inn Fisherman's Wharf to rent sleeping rooms and meeting space for the ratings of the second component of the H-20 Lieutenant examination. A waiver request form for that facility is enclosed.

Members of my staff surveyed a number of hotels in the area, including the Marriott Courtyard at Oyster Point and the Hotel Whitcomb (the only local hotels that are compliant). The meeting space at the Marriott Oyster Point is insufficient, and the meeting space at the Hotel Whitcomb is not available on all of the dates for which we would need it. Therefore, we are unable to consider using those facilities for these particular events.

The exam ratings process requires meeting space of at least 2,200 square feet. The event also requires the use of sleeping rooms to serve to accommodate officers from other jurisdictions who will be assisting with the administration or assessment of the test components. The Holiday Inn Fisherman's Wharf meets our space and availability requirements for the event. Staff has advised personnel at that hotel to contact the Human Rights Commission regarding the procedure for compliance certification.

I appreciate your favorable consideration of this request. If you have any questions or require further information, please contact Jesusa Bushong, Departmental Personnel Officer, at (415) 558-3615.

Very truly yours,

Gary P. Massetani
Deputy Chief of Administration

Enclosure

cc: Jesusa Bushong, Departmental Personnel Officer

name: Andrew Hart

phone: ________

comments: Dear Sir or Madam,

My name is Andrew Hart. I am a decorated Iraqi war veteran, with college degrees, I was presented with the Wisconsin Military Excelleece Award, by Wisconsin Governor Jim Doyle, (an award presented to only 40 of over 18,000 military members in Wisconsin). I recently moved to the Bay Area, and was not quite prepared for the huge cost of living increase, and my car got towed, so I ran out of money pretty quickly. So now I am broke, homeless, and sleeping in my car! I am writing to you now to expose the farce in San Francisco call Swords to Plowshares.

I went to Swords to Plowshares because I thought that they helped veterans in need, which for the first time in my life I am. First this man named Julian Pierson, (who takes more smoke breaks at work than anyone I have ever met!). He seemed like he was going to help me, gave a slip to go somewhere for housing on Friday and come back on Monday he would help me get somewhere better. I was sent to a place where a man had a needle in his arm as I approached the door, then when I walked inside a man was vomiting on the floor. I am not a drug user or a abuser, just a man that is having a hard time right now. So I said that I would continue to sleep in my car. I went back to swords to Plowshares on Monday, and was told Julian took called and wouldn't be there back until Thursday so again I am sleeping in my car.

Next I met with a man named Ricardo in the employment development department, this is honestly a man who does nothing all day long, he met with me then pawned me off on another person named Ken Crawford. This man is the only person in the organization who I think is sincere about helping veterans in need. However when he would give me money for gas to get to a job interview, he told me that it all better go in my gas tank, he said this in a manner that was very condescending, like I am junkie that would spend the money on drugs. I spoke with Ken, and told that I did not appreciate the way he talked down to me. After this he treated like normal man, but after meeting with him over a number of weeks, he still did not know my name, and continuously addressed me by a name that is not even remotely similar to mine. Shouldn't you know the name of the person you are trying to help?

I met veteran (a nice man named Vince) while sleeping in my car that had a room provided to him by swords to plowshare, he let me sleep on his floor for about a week. They day before I started my new job, this employee of Swords to Plowshares who worked at the front desk of Vince's building (his name is Tim, a former junkie who I doubt even had an Honorable discharge from the Military) kicked me out on the street. On top of this when I went to reclaim my ID from him, this man accused me of being AWOL, wanted to know my commander's name, and my unit. All this from a junkie!?!?! Again sleeping in my car. I find it very disturbing that a retired man on a very fixed income did more to help me, than a veteran's organization who's purpose it is to help.
After this incident, I went back to Julian Pierson (my assigned case manager), to hopefully get housing. I told him that I need a place to park my car, because it is the only thing that I have, my clothes and all my belongings are in it, I also told him that I would prefer not to be anywhere dangerous or nasty. So I wait there in his office for over an hour trying to get help, meanwhile Julian is joking it up with his co-workers. Tell me, is my homeless so funny that it requires jokes? I see nothing comical about my situation. Once Julian was done having his fun, he comes into the office and and tells me it will be easier for him if I wait to check into my housing until Monday (this was on a Friday), so I spend another three nights in my car.

When Monday night came I went to check into my room, very anxious for a shower since I was unable to bathe all weekend. I first noticed that there was zero parking. The housing was located on Market street in San Francisco. I am then greeted at the front door by a man who is offering to sell me rocks (crack). Then when I get to my room there was a semen or vaginal fluid stain on my comforter, the lock on my door did not work, and the whole building smelled of urine. Before this I was at a point in my life that I thought was rock bottom, where life couldn't get any worse, boy was I wrong, it just got worse. That night I sat with a gun to my head bailing like a child, I even pulled the trigger, luckily I moved my head in nick of time, received got a bullet graze across my head and a bullet hole in my car. This is the point I decided that I that I will get back on my feet without anyone, and that Swords to Plowshares should be exposed for the poverty pimps that they are. This is why I am emailing you.

I believe that this not-for-profit organization is doing the bare minimum to obtain their funding, their mission statement is noble, but actions speak louder than words. I have been homeless and sleeping in my car for over month now, I have not eaten in six days, and have not had a shower for even longer, and this would not be if Swords to Plowshares were sincere about helping veterans in need. I write this email to you not for any assistance, but hoping that you will use the authority of your office to make sure that this does not happen to someone else.

Please feel free to email me or call (the phone might not work for much longer, I am broke) if you would like to discuss this in more detail with me.

Sincerely,

Andrew Hart
Ms. Kamala Harris-District Attorney,

Please review the attached email from Micki Callahan. I would like to file a complaint against DHR and the City Attorney's Office on the matter of retaliation for having filed an employment discrimination complaint and informing the Ethics Commission and the Controller's Office of abuse of 911 public safety fees. I have been attacked by DTIS/DHR and the City Attorney's Office, in order to allow the DTIS/ECD to continue to abuse these earmarked funds. The same DTIS managers & officers are involved in this cover-up that filed charges against Terry Childs in July 2008. DTIS needs to be thoroughly investigated as significant abuses are being allowed to go unquestioned while being supported by Micki Callahan (latest DHR Director appointee).

Investigate DTIS, Chris Vein and Ron Vinson, investigate purpose of establishing this department as a "service fund" entity. "Service fund" department is another word for allowable employment and compensation abuse of professional and technical services.

Alvin Johnson

Her. Calif. 94547

---

Message from Micki Callahan <Micki.Callahan@sfgov.org> on Fri, 5 Sep 2008 16:28:13 -0700 ---
To: alv.johnson@
Subject: re: Application for Class 0941 Manager VI

Dear Mr. Johnson:
Please see the attached letter in response to your appeal.

(See attached file: Alvin P Johnson.pdf)

Thank you,

Micki Callahan
Human Resources Director
City and County of San Francisco

415.557.4845 Alvin P Johnson.pdf
Attn: San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, California 94102

Re: Board of Supervisors Meeting of 9/09/08
Agenda Item: 19 [ Prohibiting smoking in enclosed areas, certain enclosed areas, and sports stadiums ]

Document 080438 [ Legislation text/language ]

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I today (9/06/08) have learned that the Lower Polk Neighbors Association (LPN) executive committee has reviewed the ordinance and has identified the concerns listed below, that may adversely impact the neighborhood. Also sharing many of the similar concerns are our friends and allies in the Union Square community.

- For bars which provide a separate area to smoke (smoking rooms) this legislation will no longer allow smoking in that space.

What does this mean?

In a neighborhood such as Polk Street, where many neighbors are sensitive to crowds and the noise on street, these smoking rooms keep patrons off the street. These rooms safely separate smoking patrons from the non smoking patrons and employees. Typically these rooms are open on one side to the street and are enclosed by a security gate. The removal of these outdoor smoking rooms will push patrons on to sidewalks, creating more noise and disrupting foot traffic.

- Smoking will be prohibited within 20 feet of entrances, exits and operable window and vents of commercial buildings where smoking is prohibited.

What does this mean?
In a mixed use commercial district such as Polk Street, with narrow lots and small neighborhood-serving commercial storefronts, patrons of many bars and restaurants may find that the only legal place to smoke is in the alleys, often under residential windows. Most bars and restaurants on Polk utilize door persons. In addition to checking ID's, these persons provide valuable security and "eyes" on the street. Pushing smokers into the alleys raises major safety concerns as they will be unmonitored and the sidewalks are poorly suited for a large numbers of pedestrians. In those blocks where there is enough room for a legal place to smoke, these limited swaths of sidewalks will be packed with smokers, creating more noise and disrupting foot traffic. Neighbors of buildings located in these "smoking zones" will be adversely impacted. Neighbors already complain of having to walk into the street to get around the smoking crowds at bar entries.

As both an ally, and a member of the Lower Polk Neighbors Association (LPN), I fully agree with the above concerns. I on behalf of the Community Leadership Alliance (CLA) respectfully beseech you as a San Francisco Supervisor, to please afford the above described concerns your most serious and thoughtful consideration before making your decision on whether or not to pass this piece of legislation.

Sincerely
David James Villa-Lobos, Director
www.CommunityLeadershipAlliance.net
415.921.4192
081096 / 081097 / 081097 Tax rate for 2008-2009

The Parkmerced Residents Organization would like to voice our concerns on property tax pass-throughs to residents and tenants of properties.

The city of SF has lost money from the sales of property in our district, the 1000 units of rent controlled housing to SFSU CSU Foundation purchase of University Park South and North, and the sale of the SFUSD site at 700 Font.

Meanwhile the SFSU Foundation has re-incarnated itself as the University Corporation and has new offices in Daly City to acquire additional funding for expansion and development. The new library being built and the effects on the surrounding communities including prior agreements with the city for maintenance of the SFSU Muni Platform are in default by the university.

It is important that taxes be correctly levied on property owners, and the amount determined for the university take into account the changes of property ownership that has occurred through the SFSU expansion and land purchases.

The pass-through for tenants and residents of our communities should be accurately determined based on the changes that have occurred and the loss of tax-revenue producing land sold off to developers and private entities.

Please be sure to adjust the taxation accordingly so that the sales of public lands and sites is taken into account for this years tax determination, as we have seen violations of the apartment conversion and demolition municipal code section 41A and are concerned that changes and proposals for their use will again affect the taxation of tenants to their detriment.

A. Goodman VP @ PRO
www.parkmercedresidents.org
www.parkmercedlandscape.blogspot.com
Transmittal

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

FROM
Susan Yogi

DATE
September 5, 2008

PROJECT NAME
Yerba Buena Island Ramps Improvement Project

PROJECT NO
08080090.01

SUBJECT
Notice of Preparation

SENT VIA
USPS

Message

Ms. Calvillo,

Enclosed are 15 copies of the NOP and NOI for the Yerba Buena Island Ramps Improvement Project for distribution to the Board of Supervisors

Thank you.

Susan Yogi
Environmental Planner
September 5, 2008

Subject: Notice of Preparation – Environmental Impact Report for the Yerba Buena Island Ramps Improvement Project

Dear Responsible Agencies, Organizations, and Interested Parties:

The San Francisco County Transportation Authority (Authority) proposes to remove the westbound on-ramp and the westbound off-ramp located on the eastern side of Yerba Buena Island (YBI). A new westbound on-ramp and a new westbound off-ramp - that replicate the functional roles of the current ramps on the eastern side of YBI - would be constructed. The replacement ramps would address design standards, and seismic and traffic safety requirements. For the proposed action, the Authority is preparing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) under the provision of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The project involves a federal action and is therefore also subject to review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The environmental document will be a joint environmental impact statement/environmental impact report (EIS/EIR) and is hereinafter referred to as the EIS/EIR.

The Authority is the Lead Agency under CEQA. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is the Lead Agency under NEPA. We need to know the views of your agency regarding the scope and content of the environmental information germane to your agency's statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Your agency will need to use the EIS/EIR prepared by our agency when considering your permit or other approval for the project.

This YBI Ramps Improvement Project is separate from both the San Francisco Oakland Bay Bridge (SFOBB) East Span Seismic Safety Project, which is currently under construction and the Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island (TI/YBI) Redevelopment Plan, which is currently undergoing its own environmental review process. The YBI Ramps Improvement Project has been proposed to address the geometric and operational deficiencies of the existing westbound on-ramp and existing westbound off-ramp on the eastern side of YBI and their effects on the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge (I-80) mainline, without degrading the mainline operation as compared to the no-action alternative. This project would improve safety, and facilitate traffic operations, at the I-80/YBI interchange by replacing the westbound on-ramp and the westbound off-ramp located on the eastern side of YBI. The feasibility of improving the geometric configuration and operations of the current eastbound off-ramp on the eastern side of YBI to Hillcrest Road will also be studied. A more detailed project description, project location map, and project vicinity map, are contained in the attached materials.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15082(b) mandates that each Responsible Agency must respond to a NOP within thirty (30) days after receipt. The review period for the YBI Ramps Improvement Project will extend from September 5, 2008 through October 6, 2008.
Written comments must be received at the Authority office by 5 p.m. on October 6, 2008 and sent to Eric Cordoba, Project Manager; San Francisco County Transportation Authority; 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102. Phone: (415) 955-2904. Fax: (415) 522-4829. E-mail: eric@cordobaconsulting.com, with a copy of the comment sent to Melanie Brent, Caltrans District 4 Office of Environmental Analysis, 111 Grand Avenue, Oakland CA 94623. Telephone (510) 286-5231. Please include the name of an appropriate contact person in your agency for continued EIS/EIR coordination.

A copy of the Notice of Preparation and Notice of Intent can be found on the Authority’s website, at http://www.sfcta.org

Your views and comments on how the project may affect the environment are welcomed. Please contact Mr. Cordoba at (415) 955-2904 if you have any questions.

David Murray
Deputy Director for Finance and Administration
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

September 5, 2008
Date

Attachments (1)

cc: EC, LC - Chron, File: YBI Ramps Improvement Project NOI/NOP
NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP) ATTACHMENT

YERBA BUENA ISLAND RAMPS IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR)

The San Francisco County Transportation Authority (Authority), and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as the Lead Agencies under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) respectively, will prepare an Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/EIR) for the following project:

PROJECT TITLE: YERBA BUENA ISLAND RAMPS IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

The Authority requests the views of your agency on the scope and content of the environmental information relevant to your agency’s jurisdictional or regulatory responsibilities. If your agency is a responsible agency or trustee agency as defined by State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (Sections 15381 and 15386), your agency will need to use the EIS/EIR prepared for this project when considering your permit or other approval for the project. If your agency is not a responsible or trustee agency as defined by CEQA guidelines, or if you are an interested individual or organization, we would still appreciate your views on the scope of the environmental document for this project.

The project description, location, and probable environmental effects are described herein, along with date, time, and location of the project scoping meeting. The project has the potential to have a significant effect on the environment, and therefore an EIS/EIR is required pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines 15060(d). No initial study has been prepared. The review period for the Yerba Buena Island (YBI) Ramps Improvement Project will extend from September 5, 2008 through October 6, 2008. Written comments must be received at the Authority office no later than 5 p.m. on October 6, 2008 and sent to Eric Cordoba, Project Manager; San Francisco County Transportation Authority; 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor; San Francisco, CA 94102. Phone: (415) 955-2904. Fax: (415) 522-4829. E-mail: eric@cordobaconsulting.com, with a copy of the comment sent to Melanie Brent, Caltrans District 4 Office of Environmental Analysis, 111 Grand Avenue, Oakland CA 94623. Telephone (510) 286-5231. Please include the name of an appropriate contact person in your agency for continued EIS/EIR coordination.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

YBI is located in the San Francisco Bay, approximately halfway between Oakland and San Francisco, and is accessible by vehicles only via the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge (SFOBB), part of Interstate 80. The SFOBB is a critical link in the interstate network, providing access between San Francisco and the East Bay. YBI and the SFOBB also provide access to Treasure Island, which lies to the north of YBI. YBI and Treasure Island are accessed by on-and off-ramps located on the upper and lower decks of the SFOBB. The SFOBB and the associated
on- and off-ramps provide the only land access to the active U.S. Coast Guard facilities located on the southern side of YBI.

The proposed project would replace the existing westbound on-ramp and the westbound off-ramp located on the eastern side of YBI with a new westbound on-ramp and a new westbound off-ramp that replicate the functional roles of the current ramps. The replacement ramps would also address seismic and traffic safety requirements, and design standards. The feasibility of improving the geometric configuration and operations of the current eastbound off-ramp on the eastern side of YBI to Hillcrest Road will also be studied.

Build Alternatives have been proposed to address the geometric and operational deficiencies of the existing on- and off-ramps and their effects on the SFOBB (I-80) mainline without degrading the mainline operation as compared to the no-action. This YBI Ramps Improvement Project is separate and independent of the SFOBB East Span Seismic Safety Project, which is currently under construction and the Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island (TI/YBI) Redevelopment Plan, which is currently undergoing its own environmental review process. The proposed new ramps would improve traffic and seismic safety of the ramps and provide connections between YBI and the transition structure of the new SFOBB. The proposed project is located between Post Mile (PM) 7.8 and 8.1 starting at the east portal of the YBI tunnel and ending before the SFOBB Transition Structure.

**PURPOSE AND NEED**

The purpose of the project is to address the geometric and operational deficiencies of the existing on- and off-ramps, to the extent physically and economically feasible; improve traffic operations to and from the SFOBB and improve traffic safety by increasing deceleration length for the eastbound and westbound off-ramps, and increasing merging distance for eastbound and westbound on-ramps.

The YBI ramps currently do not meet Caltrans geometric standards. They have not been significantly updated since the 1960s and are seismically unsafe. Due to their non-standard entrances and exits, these ramps act as a traffic operational constraint. In addition, the deceleration length of the off-ramps and the merging distance for the on-ramps are insufficient and not up to current standards. The limited merging and deceleration distances make it challenging for vehicles to enter and exit traffic flows on the SFOBB.
THE PROJECT AND PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Preliminary alternatives under consideration for the EIS/EIR include:

(1) No Build Alternative, which assumes that the existing on- and off-ramps would remain in place and no further action or improvements would occur;

(2) Alternative 2B, which would include the removal of the existing westbound on- and off-ramps on the east side of YBI, construction of a westbound off-ramp to Macalla Court on the east side of YBI, and construction of a westbound hook on-ramp from Macalla Court on the east side of YBI. The feasibility of incorporating improvements to the current eastbound off-ramp on the eastern side of YBI to Hillcrest Road will be studied.;

(3) Alternative 4, which would include the removal of the existing westbound on- and off-ramps on the east side of YBI, the construction of westbound on-ramp from Hillcrest Road, and construction of westbound off-ramp from Macalla Court on the east side of YBI. The feasibility of incorporating improvements to the current eastbound off-ramp on the eastern side of YBI to Hillcrest Road will be studied.; and,

(4) Other alignment alternatives that emerge from the scoping and alternatives analysis process.

POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS TO BE ANALYZED

Potential environmental effects would be analyzed for the following issue areas:

- Land Use
- Consistency with State, Regional, and Local Plans and Programs
- Parks and Recreational Facilities
- Growth
- Farmland/Agricultural Lands
- Community Services
- Environmental Justice
- Utilities and Emergency Services
- Traffic and Transportation
- Visual/Aesthetics
- Historic and Cultural Resources
- Hydrology and Floodplain
- Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff
- Geology, Soils, and Seismicity
- Paleontology
- Hazardous Waste/Materials
- Air Quality
- Noise and Vibration
- Biological Resources
• Wetlands and Other Waters of the U.S.

Caltrans and the Authority will evaluate the impacts of each alternative. To ensure that the full range of issues to this proposed action are addressed and all significant issues identified, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties.

THE EIS/EIR PROCESS AND THE ROLE OF PARTICIPATING AGENCIES AND THE PUBLIC

In accordance with 23 CFR 771.105(a) and 771.133 and with CEQA and the implementing regulations, Caltrans and the Authority will comply with all applicable Federal and state environmental laws, regulations, and federal executive orders applicable to the proposed project during the environmental review process. These requirements include, but are not limited to, the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality and Caltrans implementing NEPA (40 CFR parts 1500-1508, and 23 CFR Part 771), the project-level air quality conformity regulation of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (40 CFR part 93), the Section 404(b)(1) guidelines of EPA (40 CFR part 230), the regulation implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (36 CFR Part 800), the regulation implementing section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (50 CFR part 402), Section 4(f) of the 1966 DOT Act (23 CFR 771.135; 49 U.S.C. 303), Section 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act, Section 6(f) Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, Section 10 Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), Section 9 Coast Guard, determination of consistency with the federal Coastal Zone Management Act by the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, federal Executive Orders 12898 on environmental justice, 11988 on floodplain management, and 11990 on wetlands, and the CEQA laws and regulations. The Authority Board would certify the EIR. Caltrans would certify the EIS, approve the project and project design, and would be responsible for project construction.

Letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments will be sent to appropriate Federal, state, participating agencies (including federally recognized Tribal governments, if any), and local agencies, and to private organizations and citizens who have previously expressed or are known to have interest in this proposal.

To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed action are addressed and all significant issues identified, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties. Comment or questions concerning this proposed action and the EIS/EIR should be directed to Eric Cordoba, Project Manager for the Authority, with a copy of comment sent to Melanie Brent, Caltrans Office Chief at the addresses listed at the end of this attachment.

SCOPING MEETINGS

A public scoping meeting is scheduled to be held at the Port of San Francisco office, in the Bayside Conference Room located at Pier 1, The Embarcadero, San Francisco, CA 94111 on Wednesday, September 24, 2008 from 6:30 to 8:00 p.m. Written comments on the scope of alternatives and impacts to be considered must be received at the Authority office no later than 5 p.m. on October 6, 2008 and should be sent to the Authority with a copy of the comment sent to Caltrans at the addresses below.
In addition, at least one public hearing will be held after the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR. Public notice will be given of the time and place of the meeting and hearing (as applicable). The Draft EIS/EIR will be available for public and agency review and comment prior to the public hearing.

ADDRESSES/CONTACT LIST/FURTHER INFORMATION

Written comments during scoping or on the proposed project in general should be sent to: Eric Cordoba, Project Manager; San Francisco County Transportation Authority; 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor; San Francisco, CA 94102. Phone: (415) 955-2904. Fax: (415) 522-4829. E-mail: eric@cordobaconsulting.com with a copy of the comment sent to Melanie Brent, Caltrans District 4 Office of Environmental Analysis, 111 Grand Avenue, Oakland CA 94623. Telephone (510) 286-5231.

To be added to the mailing list for the YBI Ramps Improvement Project, contact Mr. Cordoba at the address listed above.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Department of Transportation

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT: SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

AGENCY: California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and San Francisco County Transportation Authority (Authority)


SUMMARY: Caltrans and the Authority are issuing this notice to advise the public that an Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) will be prepared for the proposed Yerba Buena Island (YBI) Ramps Improvement Project on Interstate 80 (I-80) in San Francisco County, California.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Eric Cordoba, San Francisco County Transportation Authority, 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102, Telephone (415) 955-2904 or Melanie Brent, Caltrans District 4 Office of Environmental Analysis, 111 Grand Avenue, Oakland CA 94623, Telephone (510) 286-5231.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Effective July 1, 2007, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) assigned, and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) assumed, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) environmental responsibilities for highway projects pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327. In cooperation with Caltrans, the Authority will prepare a joint EIS/EIR for the proposed YBI Ramps Improvement Project at Yerba Buena Island.
in the City and County of San Francisco, California. Caltrans is the lead agency under NEPA and the Authority is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

YBI is located in San Francisco Bay, between Oakland and San Francisco, and is accessible by vehicles only via the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge (SFOBB), which is a critical link in the interstate network, providing access between San Francisco and the East Bay. The only access to Treasure Island, located north of YBI and the only land access to the active U.S. Coast Guard facilities on the south side of YBI, is also from the SFOBB and the associated on and off-ramps.

The proposed project would replace the existing westbound on- and off-ramps located on the east side of YBI with new westbound on- and off-ramps that replicate the functional role of the current ramps and also address seismic, traffic safety requirements, and design standards. The feasibility of improving the geometric configuration of the current eastbound off-ramp on the eastern side of YBI to Hillcrest Road will also be included. The YBI Ramps Improvement Project is separate and independent of both the SFOBB East Span Seismic Safety Project currently under construction, and the Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island (TI/YBI) Redevelopment Plan, which is currently undergoing its own environmental review process. The proposed new ramps would improve traffic and seismic safety of the ramps and provide connections between YBI and the transition structure of the new SFOBB. The proposed project is located between Post Mile (PM) 7.8 and 8.1 starting at the east portal of the YBI tunnel and ending before the SFOBB Transition Structure.
The purpose of the project is to address geometric and operational deficiencies of
the existing on- and off-ramps, improve traffic operations to and from the SFOBB and
improve traffic safety by increasing deceleration length for the eastbound and westbound
off-ramps, and increasing merging distance for eastbound and westbound on-ramps.
Preliminary alternatives under consideration for the EIS/EIR include:

(1) No Build Alternative, which assumes that the existing on- and off-ramps would
remain in place and no further action or improvements would occur;

(2) Alternative 2B, which would include the removal of the existing westbound on- and
off-ramps on the east side of YBI, construction of a westbound off-ramp to Macalla
Court on the east side of YBI, construction of a westbound hook on-ramp from
Macalla Court on the east side of YBI. The feasibility of incorporating
improvements to the current eastbound off-ramp on the eastern side of YBI to
Hillcrest Road will be studied.; and,

(3) Alternative 4, which would include the removal of the existing westbound on- and
off-ramps on the east side of YBI, the construction of westbound on-ramp from
Hillcrest Road, the construction of westbound off-ramp from Macalla Court on the
east side of YBI. The feasibility of incorporating improvements to the current
eastbound off-ramp on the eastern side of YBI to Hillcrest Road will be studied.

Anticipated federal approvals or permits include, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
(USFWS) Section 7 Endangered Species Act, Consultation, Sections 401 and 404 of the
Clean Water Act, Section 4(f) of the Transportation Act of 1966 Section 6(f) Land and
Water Conservation Fund Act, Section 10 Army Corp of Engineers (ACOE), Section 9
Coast Guard, and determination of consistency with the federal Coastal Zone Management Act by the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission.

Letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments will be sent to appropriate Federal, state, participating agencies (including federally recognized Tribal governments, if any), and local agencies, and to private organizations and citizens who have previously expressed or are known to have interest in this proposal. The NEPA environmental process for the proposed project began in June 2008. A public scoping meeting is scheduled to be held at the Port of San Francisco office, in the Bayside Conference Room located at Pier 1, The Embarcadero, San Francisco, CA 94111 on Wednesday, September 24, 2008 from 6:30 to 8:00 p.m.

In addition, at least one public hearing will be held after the publication of the Draft EIS/EIR. Public notice will be given of the time and place of the meeting and hearing (as applicable). The Draft EIS/EIR will be available for public and agency review and comment prior to the public hearing.

To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed action are addressed and all significant issues identified, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties. Comment or questions concerning this proposed action and the EIS should be directed to Eric Cordoba, Project Manager for the Authority, with a copy of comment sent to Melanie Brent, Caltrans Office Chief. Written comments must be received no later than 5 p.m. on October 6, 2008 and should be sent to Eric Cordoba at the Authority, with a copy of the comment sent to Melanie Brent at Caltrans at the addresses listed above.
(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Planning and Construction. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation on Federal programs and activities apply to this program.)

Issued on: September 5, 2008

JAMES B. RICHARDS, Deputy District Director
District 4 Division of Environmental Planning and Engineering
California Department of Transportation
Oakland, California
Dear Board,

Please change the name of Golden Gate Park's "Speedway Meadow" to honor Chet Helms, the father of San Francisco's Summer of Love.

Sincerely,
The People of San Francisco
Date: September 5, 2008
To: Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors
From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Subject: APPOINTMENTS BY THE MAYOR

The Mayor has submitted the attached appointments to various Boards and Commissions. Under the Board's Rules of Order a Supervisor can request a hearing on an appointment by notifying the Clerk in writing.

Upon receipt of such notice the Clerk shall refer the appointment to the Rules Committee so that the Board may consider the appointment and act within thirty days of the appointment as provided in Section 3.100(17) of the Charter.

Please notify me in writing by Noon, Thursday, September 11, 2008, if you wish any appointment to be scheduled before the Rules Committee.

Attachments
September 3, 2008

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

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Pursuant to the Charter Section 3.100 (17), I have appointed August Longo as a member of the Human Rights Commission effective today, September 3, 2008. August Longo will fill a seat that was previously held by Mark Dunlop, and the term of August Longo will expire on September 2, 2012.

Please see the attached biography which will illustrate that August Longo’s qualifications allow him to represent the communities of interest, neighborhoods and diverse populations of the City and County.

Should you have any questions, please contact my Liaison to Commissions, Jason Chan at 415-554-6253.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom  
Mayor
Notice of Appointment

September 3, 2008

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

I hereby appoint August Longo to serve as member of the Human Rights Commission for a 4-year term commencing September 3, 2008, in accordance with the 1996 Charter, Section 3.100, (17).

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

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

[Signature]

Gavin Newsom
Mayor
Metropolitan Transportation Commission  
Past Chair Elderly & Disabled Advisory Committee  
Member, MTC Advisory Council

Past Vice Chair  
S.F. County Transportation Authority  
Citizens Advisory Committee  
S.F. Paratransit Coordinating Council

President  
Disability Advocacy & Self Help  
Past Chair & Member  
San Francisco Mayor’s Disability Council  
Co-Chair  
Legislation & Equal Opportunity Committee  
California Democratic Party  
Past President  
Access Appeals Commission, City & County of San Francisco  
Independent Housing Services,  
[Secures housing for Seniors & Persons with Disabilities]  
Recipient  
Soldier of Justice Award – Justice for All  
for involving the Disabled Community in the Presidential Election, 1996

Member  
National Steering Committee, Americans with Disabilities for Clinton/Gore,  
Regional Director, Resolutions Comm.  
Past member Exec. Committee - Disability Caucus,  
California Democratic Party  
S.F. Giants Pacbell Park Access Advisory Committee  
Advisor  
FTA, reviewed key station plans for ADA compliance
September 3, 2008

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

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Pursuant to the Charter Section 3.100 (17), I have appointed Mark Dunlop as a member of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority effective today, September 3, 2008. Mark Dunlop will fill a seat that was previously held by Ron Miguel, and the term of Mark Dunlop will expire on March 25, 2009.

Please see the attached biography which will illustrate that Mark Dunlop’s qualifications allow him to represent the communities of interest, neighborhoods and diverse populations of the City and County.

Should you have any questions, please contact my Liaison to Commissions, Jason Chan at 415-554-6253.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom  
Mayor
Notice of Appointment

September 3, 2008

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

I hereby appoint Mark Dunlop to serve as member of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority for a 4-year term commencing September 3, 2008, in accordance with the 1996 Charter, Section 3.100, (17).

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

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

Gavin Newsom
Mayor

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 200, San Francisco, California 94102-4641
gavin.newsom@sfgov.org  •  (415) 554-6141
OBJECTIVE:
To find a position that will enable me to best take advantage my years of public service and marketing experience.

SUMMARY OF QUALIFICATIONS:
For the last ten years I have served as Redevelopment Commissioner and a Commissioner on the Human Rights Commission. This insider view into public policy and the personalities that make San Francisco what it is will be an immediate asset to your firm.

I have also worked on numerous election campaigns. Assisting in media relations and event planning.

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY:

**September 2006 to Present**
City and County of San Francisco
Commissioner, San Francisco Human Rights Commission
San Francisco, CA

Working with ten Commissioners appointed by the Mayor of San Francisco and approved by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to oversee the proper and efficient implementation of public policy by the staff of the Human Rights Commission. The Commissioners also serve as the judicial body for disputes regarding the implementation of the City's fair hiring practices.

**June 1977 to Present**
Various Political Campaigns
Numerous Volunteer Positions
San Francisco, CA

Since moving to San Francisco I have worked for many local and statewide political campaigns, both for individuals and propositions. I have worked in every volunteer facet from walking precincts to managing a campaign office and managing a campaign for a local judgeship. More details upon request.

**August 1998 to September 2006**
City and County of San Francisco
Commissioner, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency
San Francisco, CA

One of six Commissioners in charge of public policy and long term planning for the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. Reviewing and approving development plans and then implementation and management of major redevelopment projects throughout the City and County of San Francisco. The Commission also approves the hiring of the Agency's executive staff. Major development projects during my tenure include AT and T Park, the development at Mission Bay and Hunter's Point Shipyard to name a few.

**April 1992 to June 1998**
Underwriters Reinsurance Company
Manager/Underwriter
San Francisco, CA

Managed a small staff and was in charge of marketing and underwriting commercial reinsurance products for the northwestern district (Northern California, Oregon, and Washington) for a Southern California based reinsurance company. My duties included extensive marketing and then review of proposed reinsurance risk submissions by primary insurance companies.
EDUCATION:

1972 St. Charles High School
N/A GPA: 3.0

St. Charles, IL
September 3, 2008

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

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Pursuant to the Charter Section 3.100 (17), I have appointed August Longo as a member of the Human
Rights Commission effective today, September 3, 2008. August Longo will fill a seat that was previously
held by Mark Dunlop, and the term of August Longo will expire on September 2, 2012.

Please see the attached biography which will illustrate that August Longo’s qualifications allow him to
represent the communities of interest, neighborhoods and diverse populations of the City and County.

Should you have any questions, please contact my Liaison to Commissions, Jason Chan at 415-554-
6253.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom
Mayor
Notice of Appointment

September 3, 2008

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

I hereby appoint August Longo to serve as member of the Human Rights Commission for a 4-year term commencing September 3, 2008, in accordance with the 1996 Charter, Section 3.100, (17).

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

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

Gavin Newsom
Mayor
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Past Chair Elderly & Disabled Advisory Committee
Member, MTC Advisory Council

Past Vice Chair
S.F. County Transportation Authority
Citizens Advisory Committee
S.F. Paratransit Coordinating Council

President
Disability Advocacy & Self Help
Past Chair & Member
San Francisco Mayor’s Disability Council
Co-Chair
Legislation & Equal Opportunity Committee
California Democratic Party
Past President
Access Appeals Commission, City & County of San Francisco
Independent Housing Services,
[Secures housing for Seniors & Persons with Disabilities]
Recipient
Soldier of Justice Award –Justice for All
for involving the Disabled Community in the Presidential Election, 1996
Member
National Steering Committee, Americans with Disabilities for Clinton/Gore,
Regional Director, Resolutions Comm.
Past member Exec. Committee - Disability Caucus,
California Democratic Party
S.F. Giants Pacbell Park Access Advisory Committee
Advisor
FTA, reviewed key station plans for ADA compliance
September 3, 2008

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

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Pursuant to the Charter Section 3.100 (17), I have appointed Mark Dunlop as a member of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority effective today, September 3, 2008. Mark Dunlop will fill a seat that was previously held by Ron Miguel, and the term of Mark Dunlop will expire on March 25, 2009.

Please see the attached biography which will illustrate that Mark Dunlop’s qualifications allow him to represent the communities of interest, neighborhoods and diverse populations of the City and County.

Should you have any questions, please contact my Liaison to Commissions, Jason Chan at 415-554-6253.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gavin Newsom  
Mayor
Notice of Appointment

September 3, 2008

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

I hereby appoint Mark Dunlop to serve as member of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority for a 4-year term commencing September 3, 2008, in accordance with the 1996 Charter, Section 3.100, (17).

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

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

Gavin Newsom
Mayor
Mark Dunlop
San Francisco, CA 94130
Phone: ————
E-Mail: markdennis@ ————

OBJECTIVE:
To find a position that will enable me to best take advantage my years of public service and marketing experience.

SUMMARY OF QUALIFICATIONS:
For the last ten years I have served as Redevelopment Commissioner and a Commissioner on the Human Rights Commission. This insider view into public policy and the personalities that make San Francisco what it is will be an immediate asset to your firm.

I have also worked on numerous election campaigns. Assisting in media relations and event planning.

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2006</td>
<td>City and County of San Francisco</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Commissioner, San Francisco Human Rights Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Working with ten Commissioners appointed by the Mayor of San Francisco and approved by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to oversee the proper and efficient implementation of public policy by the staff of the Human Rights Commission. The Commissioners also serve as the judicial body for disputes regarding the implementation of the City's fair hiring practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1977</td>
<td>Various Political Campaigns</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Numerous Volunteer Positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Since moving to San Francisco I have worked for many local and statewide political campaigns, both for individuals and propositions. I have worked in every volunteer facet from walking precincts to managing a campaign office and managing a campaign for a local judgeship. More details upon request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1998</td>
<td>City and County of San Francisco</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Commissioner, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to September 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One of six Commissioners in charge of public policy and long term planning for the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. Reviewing and approving development plans and then implementation and management of major redevelopment projects throughout the City and County of San Francisco. The Commission also approves the hiring of the Agency's executive staff. Major development projects during my tenure include AT and T Park, the development at Mission Bay and Hunter's Point Shipyards to name a few.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1992</td>
<td>Underwriters Reinsurance Company</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Manager/Underwriter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to June 1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managed a small staff and was in charge of marketing and underwriting commercial reinsurance products for the northwestern district (Northern California, Oregon, and Washington) for a Southern California based reinsurance company. My duties included extensive marketing and then review of proposed reinsurance risk submissions by primary insurance companies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EDUCATION:

1972 St. Charles High School
N/A GPA: 3.0

St. Charles, IL