September 8, 2008

Dear Members of the City Council,

I disagree with the Transportation Effectiveness Project (TEP)'s revised recommendations for shortening the "M" line streetcar so that it stops at San Francisco State. Such a change will adversely affect the daily lives of people living along the M line outward from the proposed new last stop.

Switching to the newly extended "J" line at San Francisco State will cause severe inconvenience particularly for the elderly and mothers with young children. It will take considerably longer to get between home and work. The proposed extended J line is a much longer route.

Currently people in this neighborhood are suffering quite enough from MUNI's ineffective service. Now MUNI wants to institute a change that, they claim, will improve service and benefit the riders. Unfortunately, the TEP will not have that affect. Instead it will cause hardship for all Ocean View riders. OMI-NIA, METNA and large number of Ocean View Chinese residents expressed their concerns in a meeting at Temple United Methodist Church in May 22 of 2008. Many also responded to the TEP survey after that meeting.

MUNI's TEP continues to ignore the voices of this neighborhood and has now decided to refer their proposal to the MTA Board. Ocean View M riders live in this city and pay taxes. We just want to be treated like other M line riders and not sent to MUNI siberia. I am writing to you in hope that you will listen to the concerns of this neighborhood and help those of us who live here avoid this MUNI disaster.

Sincerely,

(Eva Chung)

Enclosures: Two photos.
(One picture showed the residents of the Ocean View District attended the OMI meeting to oppose TEP's proposal for shortening M-line and expressed their concerns to the Muni TEP presenter on May 22 of 2008. Another picture showed the Muni TEP presenter (left) and a volunteer who helped translation.)
本人关文锦，一家十二人都住在该地址，全家八口人都被逮捕入狱。有关方面和负责人要慎重考虑，不能没有汽车，更不能迷失，也不可不更改，更不可用什么车来代替，只有希望你将这辆车才是群众的希望和要求。

电话：1415

O: August Sandman
本人遵照你一九五四年十二月二日开会时讲的话，已将...

C. S. J. 看不懂
本人关某，家小，居住在125的地址上，住家
人要乘搭几辆上落班，不但是专业巴士，而是命
根子。万万个要求，不能删除，更不能更改，也不要用
什么车代替，希望有关部门或关键人负责，务须听取群
众意见，删除26号车，已习惯来很不便和烦恼，办
什么大小事，都要以群众来来，群众中去，这是我
们的最大请求，也是我们的希望。

电话——

[信封]
本人胡先娥按合同三口租住在该地，每周七日都要求用车接送上学、放学。因工故工，不论什么情况都不得更改或删除，更不能用什么车代替。需要有关部门和负责人千万慎重考虑，为人民群众想想。无需多言一事。

电话：

2

O. Supr. Andoral
City and County of San Francisco

September 4, 2008

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 2007/2008 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,

Victor F. Pacheco
Interim Dept. Head

cc: Nani Coloretti, Mayor’s Office of Budget & Legislative Affairs
    Thomas DiSanto, Controller’s Office – Budget & Analysis Division
To whom it may concern,

Please change the name of Speedway Meadows to Chet Helms.

Sincerely,
The People of San Francisco

People of the Board of Supervisors,

Golden Gate is "Speedway Meadows" must be changed to honor the infamous Chet Helms, known as the HEART of San Francisco's Summer of Love.

Sincerely, The People of San Francisco

People of the Board,

We humbly request that the name of Chet Helms, aka "Speedway Meadows," be changed to honor Chet Helms.

Much love,
The People of San Francisco
Dear Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to continue to support and implement community choice energy aggregation. This will create the largest urban solar facility in the world right here in San Francisco. Please take leadership to ensure CCA has adequate resources and has professional, independent oversight.

Thank you very much!

JANNA Burrows 94109
Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing you to urge you to continue to support and implement Community Choice Energy Aggregation. This will create the largest urban solar facility in the world right here in San Francisco. Please take leadership to ensure CCA has adequate resources and has professional, independent oversight. Thank you.

Naomi Kanne
Dear Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to continue to support & implement Community Choice Energy aggregation.

Thank you,

Alvin Ling
Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to urge you to continue to support and implement community choice energy Aggregation.

Thanks for your time.

Rasj Dodd
Dear Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to continue to support and implement Community Choice Energy Aggregation.

It is the right thing to do!

Sincerely,

[Signature]

M5C 283
Dear Board of Supervisors:

Please continue support and help implement community choice energy aggregation.

Thanks,

Courtney Chalmers
9/10/08
Dear Board of Supervisors

I support solar energy here in San Francisco.

Sincerely,

SF 94123
Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support and implement Community Choice Energy Aggregation. Please take the initiative to create a leadership committee to create this program. It would help us create a more sustainable city.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

City of San Francisco
Dear Board of supervisors -

I support and implement Community Choice Energy Aggregation!

Asia Landrum - 94124
The intentions here are more adequate than [blank] to choose against something of such productive measures. Bring the choice back to the people—those of whom [blank] the results of effect. Help the community in progress—by supporting economically and environmentally advancing projects.

X Holly Ryno 94108
Dear Board of Supervisors:

(To whom it may concern)

I'm writing to urge you to continue to support Solar Power & Community Choice Energy Aggregation. This will create jobs, and will be one of the largest urban solar facilities in the world. Please take the time to ensure C.C.A. has the resources to have independent oversight.

Jim Ferguson
S.F. 94108
Dear Board of Supervisors, please support community choice Energy proposals to help the city reduce its energy reliance.

Kristen
Dear Board & Supervisors— I support Community choice energy.

Mike Comaroby 94131
Dear Board of Supervisors

Please support John Lenczyk

Thanks, Jessica Brown

P.S. RMP 88
Dear Board Of Supervisors,

I'm writing to urge you to support and implement Community Choice Energy Aggregation. This would create the largest urban solar facility in the world right here in San Francisco. Please take leadership to ensure CCEA has adequate resources and has professional independent oversight.

Thanks very much,

Nicola Hardy
Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am in full support of the Community Choice Energy Aggregation. Thank you.

April

Brooklyn, NY
Dear Board of Supervisors:

I strongly urge you to continue your support for community choice energy aggregation. This will create the largest urban solar facility and make San Francisco an international leader in sustainable, eco-friendly energy sources.

Thank you,

Jason Halal
Dear Board of Supervisors:

I support community choice energy.

[Signature]

94110
Dear board of supervisors,

I support community choice energy.

Sincerely,

Joan Foley
94131
Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to urge you to continue to support and implement Community Choice Energy Aggregation. Please lead us on this issue!

Thank you,
Mollie Kazan, zip 94110
Dear Board of Supervisors,

I support Community Choice Energy -

we want solar energy for San Francisco!

[Signature]

Lise Fremont
Dear Board of Supervisors:

I am very supportive of Community Choice Energy. I am urging you to implement this important program.

Sincerely,

W. Moore

94133
To the board of supervisors,
I support community choice energy.

Jonathan Baciu
August 19, 2008

Kay Gulbengay, Interim Clerk
San Francisco County Board of Supervisors
City Hall, No. 1 Drive
Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Ms. Gulbengay:

FOSTER CARE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNTY MATCH BUDGET REVISION #1—FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2007-2008

This letter is to provide approval of your budget revision request of May 22, 2008. San Francisco County’s Foster Care Administrative County Match Budget for FY 2007-2008 has been revised according to the enclosed documents.

Please contact your Regional Nurse Consultant, Ms. Mary O’Reilly, at (510) 286-0739 if you need further assistance.

Sincerely,

Annette Irving, R.N., M.P.A.
Program Manager
Children’s Medical Services
Northern California Regional Office

Enclosures

cc: Philip R. Ziring, M.D., Director
San Francisco County CHDP Program
30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 210
San Francisco, CA 94102
cc: Twila Brown, P.H.N., N.P., M.P.H.
MCAH Director
San Francisco County CCS Program
30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 210
San Francisco, CA 94102

Ms. Mary O'Reilly, R.N., M.S.
CHDP Nurse Consultant
Children's Medical Services Branch
1515 Clay Street, Suite 401
Oakland, CA 94612
May 22, 2008

Consuelo Bautista  
Administrative Consultant  
1515 Clay Street, Suite 401  
Oakland, Ca  94512

Dear Consuelo,

Attached are the budget revision 1 for HCPCFC and Foster Care Administration. Based on the analysis of the program staff time studies, there is a need to reallocate funds from Enhance to Non-Enhance; no change on the approved total budget amount.

Thank you for your assistance on this matter.

Sincerely,

Florence Atangan

cc: file
### Foster Care Administrative Budget Revision Summary Number 1

**County/City Match**

**County/City Funds and Title XIX Federal Funds**

**County/City Name:** San Francisco

**Fiscal Year:** 2007-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category/Line Item</td>
<td>Approved Budget</td>
<td>Revision Amount</td>
<td>Revised Budget (1 + 2 or 4 + 5)</td>
<td>Enhanced County-City/Federal (25/75)</td>
<td>Nonenhanced County-City/Federal (50/50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Total Personnel Expense</td>
<td>$1,015,763</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,015,763</td>
<td>$873,617</td>
<td>$142,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Total Operating Expense</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Total Capital Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Total Indirect Expense</td>
<td>$75,242</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,242</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Total Other Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Grand Total</td>
<td>✓ $1,095,005</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,095,005</td>
<td>$877,217</td>
<td>$217,788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Total Revision Funds</th>
<th>Enhanced County-City/Federal (25/75)</th>
<th>Nonenhanced County-City/Federal (50/50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County-City Funds</td>
<td>✓ $328,198</td>
<td>✓ $219,304</td>
<td>✓ $108,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds (Title XIX)</td>
<td>✓ $766,807</td>
<td>✓ $657,913</td>
<td>✓ $108,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Grand Total</td>
<td>✓ $1,095,005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Prepared By (Signature):**

签名

7/18/2008 (415) 575-5711 florence.tangani@sfdph.org

**Date Prepared**

7/18/2008

**Phone Number**

(415) 575-5692

**Email Address**

twila.brown@sfdph.org

---

**CHDP Director or Deputy Director (Signature):**

签名

7/18/2008 (415) 575-5692
twila.brown@sfdph.org

**Date**

7/18/2008

**Phone Number**

(415) 575-5692

**Email Address**

twila.brown@sfdph.org
# Foster Care Administrative Budget Summary County-City Match

**Fiscal Year 2007-2008**

**County/City Name: San Francisco**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Line Item</th>
<th>Total Budget (2 + 3)</th>
<th>Enhanced County-City/Federal (25/75)</th>
<th>Nonenhanced County-City/Federal (50/50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Total Personnel Expense</td>
<td>$1,015,763</td>
<td>$873,617</td>
<td>$142,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Total Operating Expense</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Total Capital Expense</td>
<td>$75,242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Total Indirect Expense</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Total Other Expense</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,095,005</strong></td>
<td><strong>$877,217</strong></td>
<td><strong>$217,788</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Total Funds</th>
<th>Enhanced County-City/Federal (25/75)</th>
<th>Nonenhanced County-City/Federal (50/50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County-City Funds</td>
<td>$328,198</td>
<td>$219,304</td>
<td>$108,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds (Title XIX)</td>
<td>$766,807</td>
<td>$657,913</td>
<td>$108,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,095,005</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source County-City Funds:** Department of Humans Services (Work Orders) and Department of Public Health General Fund

---

Florence Atangan  
Prepared By  
Date: 5/23/2008  
Phone Number: 415-575-5711  
Email Address: florence.atangan@sfdph.org

CHDP Director or Deputy Director  
Date: 5/23/2008  
Phone Number: (415) 575-5712  
Email Address: ellen.wolfe@sfdph.org
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Line Item</th>
<th>% or FTE</th>
<th>Annual Salary</th>
<th>Total Budget (1A x 1B or 2 + 3)</th>
<th>% or FTE</th>
<th>Enhanced County-City/Federal (25/75)</th>
<th>% or FTE</th>
<th>Nonenhanced County-City/Federal (50/50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Personnel Expense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 2322 Linda Medeiros N. Man.</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>$122,664</td>
<td>$85,865</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>$47,226</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>$38,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 2830 Vacant, PHN</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$114,365</td>
<td>$114,365</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>$102,929</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$11,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 2830 Vacant PHN</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$114,365</td>
<td>$114,365</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>$102,929</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$11,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 2830 Vacant PHN</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$114,365</td>
<td>$114,365</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>$102,929</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$11,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 2830 Cynthia Hollis-Franklin PHN</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$114,365</td>
<td>$114,365</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>$102,929</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$11,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 2830 Veronica Robertson PHN</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$114,365</td>
<td>$114,365</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>$102,929</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$11,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 2830 Nylette Saulog PHN</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$104,546</td>
<td>$104,546</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>$94,091</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$10,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Salaries and Wages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$752,417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$647,124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less Salary Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Salaries and Wages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$752,417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$647,124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Benefits (specify)</strong></td>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$263,346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$226,493</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Total Personnel Expense</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>$1,015,763</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>$873,617</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>$142,146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Operating Expense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Total Operating Expense</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Capital Expense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Total Capital Expense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. Indirect Expense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Internal (Specify %)</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. External</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>$75,242</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>$75,242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. Total Indirect Expense</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>$75,242</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>$75,242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. Other Expense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. Total Other Expense</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>$877,217</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>$217,788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Budget Grand Total**

✓ $1,095,005 ✓ $877,217 ✓ $217,788

---

**Foster Care Administrative Budget County-City Match**
**Fiscal Year 2007–2008**
**County/City Name: San Francisco**

---

**Fiscal Year:** 2007–2008
**County/City Name:** San Francisco

---

**Florence Atangan**
**Prepared By**
5/23/08
(415) 575-5712

---

**Ellen Wolfe**
**CHDP Director or Deputy Directeur (Signature)**
5/23/08
(415) 575-5712
September 8, 2008

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Supervisor Sophie Maxwell,
Chair, Land Use Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall - 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., Room #244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: Hearing on the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning Plan

Dear Supervisor Maxwell and Committee Members:

We represent an owner of property located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area. This owner has existing tenants who may be displaced as a result of the proposed rezoning, including the much-admired local business Timbuk2, which has a large office suite on the third floor of the building.

While some of the tenants may receive protection under the proposed Planning Code Section 179.1 that will allow office tenants to legalize as an office use, others will not because this Section only protects tenants who have existed for three years. We believe the three year minimum should be reduced to two years.

We feel it is fairer for the City to use two years as a grandfather date for the “legitimization” of existing uses whose permit history may not be totally clear in showing an approved office use.

The Planning Commission has approved January 7, 2007 as the date for grandfathering in residential projects in the pipeline from some of the effects of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning. Our client feels that it is only fair that commercial property owners be given the benefit of the same date. Instead, the Commission’s proposal would be to allow a tenant to go through the “legitimization” process only if they had been in the building as of some date three years before, such as August 2005.
over various spaces on the ground floor. We believe the proposed language should be amended to clarify that the use may be considered “established” even if the activity was relocated within the building during the establishment period.

Thus, we respectfully request that the Board amend the proposed Planning Code Section 179.1(b)(1) as follows:

(1) has been regularly operating, conducting business, or otherwise functioning on a reasonably continuous basis within any part of the building for no less than 2 years prior to the effective date of Ordinance No. ________.

We appreciate your consideration of this matter.

Very Truly Yours,

M. Brett Gladstone / Sgd.

cc: Board of Supervisors Members, through the Clerk of the Board
OFFICE OF THE TREASURER
AND TAX COLLECTOR:

Review of the Statement of
Cash and Investments as of
March 31, 2008

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

September 9, 2008
September 9, 2008

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

Re: Rent Board Annual Statistical Report 2007-08  

Dear Ms. Calvillo:  

Please find attached the department's annual statistical report with copies for each of the Board members.  

Please call me at 252-4650 if you have any questions.  

Very truly yours,  

[Signature]  

Delene Wolf, Executive Director  
Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board  

encl.  
cc: Supervisor Michela Alioto-Pier  
Supervisor Tom Ammiano  
Supervisor Carmen Chu  
Supervisor Chris Daly  
Supervisor Bevan Dufty  
Supervisor Sean Elsbernd  
Supervisor Sophie Maxwell  
Supervisor Jake McGoldrick  
Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi  
Supervisor Aaron Peskin, Board President  
Supervisor Gerardo Sandoval
Rent Board Memorandum

Date: September 5, 2008
To: To Interested Parties
From: Delene Wolf, Executive Director
Re: Annual Statistical Report, FY 2007-08

The following pages reflect the filings and activities at the Rent Board for the past fiscal year ending June 30, 2008. Overall, the number of petitions filed with the Board increased by 6% from 1,447 in FY06-07 to 1,530 in FY07-08. The increase in total petitions was due to the greater number of utility passthrough petitions filed with the Board (494 petitions in FY07-08 compared to 406 petitions in FY06-07). Excluding utility passthrough petitions, the number of both landlord and tenant petitions remained about the same. Tenant appeals decreased significantly in FY07-08 after a substantial increase in FY06-07 that was due to the large number of hardship appeals filed by tenants in two cases involving major complexes.

Total eviction notices filed with the Board increased by about 8% from 1,475 to 1,600, and the number of tenant reports of alleged wrongful eviction increased by 14% from 466 to 531. The number of units withdrawn from the rental market under the Ellis Act increased from 330 to 393 units.

Highlights of some of the tables are as follows (percentages as compared to last year):

+1% Tenant Petitions
-49% 1.21 (Principal Place of Residence) Petitions
+5% Capital Improvement Petitions
-1% Operating and Maintenance Petitions
+8% Eviction Notices
+14% Allegations of Wrongful Evictions
+3% Ellis Act Filings
-55% Tenant Appeals
-25% Landlord Appeals

Document is available at the Clerk’s Office
Room 244, City Hall
DATE: September 8, 2008

TO: San Francisco Board of Supervisors

FROM: Nathaniel P. Ford, Sr.
Executive Director/CEO

SUBJECT: Response to the San Francisco Board of Supervisor's Resolution No. 73-08

This memorandum responds to Resolution No. 73-08, adopted by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors on February 12, 2008, which requested that the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) “work with other city agencies to develop a timeline and funding plan for a comprehensive planning process on Masonic Avenue from Geary Boulevard to Haight Street including traffic calming and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements.”

In response to this resolution and the traffic calming petition submitted by the Fix Masonic Coalition, we have been in regular contact with Fix Masonic, WalkSF, and the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition (SFBC) to identify the most appropriate course of action for Masonic Avenue. We are very cognizant of the fact that a project of this nature, which could result in a complete redesign of the street and potentially immittigable impacts, necessitates a great deal of discussion and coordination among City agencies and the public. We are actively discussing this project with the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA), relevant SFMTA Programs (Traffic Calming, Bicycle, Pedestrian, Special Projects, and SFgo), and relevant City departments (e.g. DPW and the Planning Department).

SFMTA has already made, or is in the process of making, a number of changes to increase safety along Masonic Avenue. These changes include:

- Having upgraded traffic signals to improve visibility at the intersections of Grove Street/Masonic Avenue, Fell Street/Masonic Avenue, and Masonic Avenue/Oak Street within the past two years;
- Having removed the double right turn lane from Masonic Avenue to Oak Street and installed “Yield to Pedestrian” signs within the last year;
- Having installed signs for the approved, lower speed limit on Masonic Avenue from 30 mph to 25 mph in July;
• Adding pedestrian countdown signals to the Fulton Street/Masonic Avenue intersection as part of a signal contract (construction to start later this year); and

• Adding a separate bicycle signal phase at the intersection of Fell Street and Masonic Avenue. The SFMTA and the City Attorney’s Office successfully argued before the court that this improvement should be exempted from the bicycle injunction. This item passed the SFMTA Board of Director’s hearing on August 5, 2008 and construction is scheduled for completion by the end of September.

Due to the court injunction of the San Francisco Bicycle Plan, no bicycle-related changes may be implemented on Masonic Avenue until the Board of Supervisors has certified the Plan’s Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The Bicycle Plan EIR calls for two options for the redesign of Masonic Avenue, from Fell Street to Geary Boulevard. In response to feedback from Fix Masonic, WalkSF, and SFBC, we amended the EIR analysis to replace one of our design options with one developed by Fix Masonic. This new option is being studied in the Bicycle Plan EIR as “Option 1.” The draft EIR of the bicycle plan is scheduled for release by Thanksgiving – it will include a detailed accounting of all the environmental impacts (such as transit delays and automobile level of service, noise and air pollution, as well as impacts on pedestrians, bicycles, and loading) associated with the project. These details will be critical to informing our discussions with the community.

Resolution No. 73-08 directs the SFMTA to develop a timeline and funding plan for a comprehensive planning process on Masonic Avenue from Geary Boulevard to Haight Street. After meeting with Fix Masonic, the SFBC, and Walk SF, we collectively agreed to restrict the project limits to Fell Street in the south. These limits address the advocacy groups’ concerns, conform to the limits outlined for Masonic Avenue in the Bicycle Plan EIR, and are consistent with our existing bicycle network (Bicycle Route 55 ends at Fell Street). Therefore, SFMTA is only committing planning and funding resources to Masonic Avenue between Fell Street and Geary Boulevard.

The following table presents our timeline for Masonic Avenue’s planning process. Please note that although the start date is listed as fall 2008, bicycle-related planning work for Masonic Avenue has already started and is ongoing.

**Masonic Avenue Planning Timeline:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Project Activities</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project start-up</td>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prop K allocation request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project coordination team/technical advisory committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administrative start-up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan development</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regular outreach &amp; coordination meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Project Activities</td>
<td>Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft EIR impacts &amp; additional traffic analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop preferred alternative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine preferred alternative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify transportation demand management strategies and/or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mitigation measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop draft plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan approval</td>
<td>Winter 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public hearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department - Major Environmental Analysis (MEA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(if appropriate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFMTA Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop construction cost estimates</td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on experience with comparable projects, we expect a planning project of this magnitude to cost $150,000. We anticipate funding the project from a variety of Prop K sources and SFMTA's operating budget, but currently we only have half of the $150,000 in funding committed. We are actively working with our partner agencies to get commitments for the remaining $75,000.
September 3, 2008

San Francisco Civil Grand Jury
c/o The Honorable David L. Ballati
Presiding Judge
San Francisco Superior Court
400 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

To the Members of the Grand Jury:

On behalf of the Department on the Status of Women, I want to commend the Civil Grand Jury for its hard work in the area of housing and services for San Francisco’s homeless population. This is a challenging issue requiring multi-tiered solutions, and the Grand Jury has done an admirable job in considering the myriad complexities at play. We thank the Grand Jury for working toward improving the quality of life of all San Franciscans, including the homeless and under-housed.

We have reviewed the Grand Jury’s July 2008 report The Homeless Have Homes, But They Are Still on the Street. Though in-depth work led to some insightful recommendations, the Department on the Status of Women feels that the unique needs of homeless women in San Francisco have been overlooked. We challenge some of the assumptions contained in the report, and find the discussion of the wellbeing and housing of women in San Francisco insufficient. Though the most recent homeless count reported that 90% of the homeless population is male, the Department feels that this underrepresents the hundreds of women who are not visibly homeless, but who are instead staying with family and friends, on couches and mattresses on the floor, usually with their children, for as long as they can.

Domestic violence is a primary factor in women’s homelessness. Women are at the highest risk of homicide at the time they leave their violent homes. The need for confidentiality and secrecy under these circumstances is paramount, and typical avenues of assistance, such as homeless shelters or SROs, do not adequately protect women and their children. There are only 3 domestic violence shelters in San Francisco: La Casa de las Madres, the Riley Center’s Rosalie House, and the Asian Women’s Shelter. There are only 75 beds available at any given time. Funded by our Department, these shelters operate at capacity every night, and they are forced to turn away over 600 women and children each year.

A short stay at an emergency shelter does not end the threat of violence for these women. The Department also funds the transitional shelters before domestic violence survivors find safe permanent housing. Though the providers are successful in creating ongoing stability and safety for women, the process is long and capacity is limited. For example, the 3 transitional shelters funded by the Department in FY07-08 housed fewer than 100 women throughout the entire year.
Though, in general, the Department agrees with the spirit of the recommendations made in the report, we have several concerns that we hope can be addressed as we move forward on the issue of homelessness. Below are our responses to Recommendations 6, 7, and 8.

6. **City Departments and Agencies should base decisions about renewing or terminating supportive housing contracts solely on the outcomes of the enhanced performance measures.**

**DISAGREE.** The decision to renew or terminate supportive housing *solely* on the outcome of the enhanced performance measures is not the only way, or even the best way, to know if supportive housing is working. Quantitative measurements do not take into account the human condition or the unique and disparate influences on the lives of individuals. Setting measurable objectives and outcomes can provide baseline data and assist in tracking trends. However, to ascertain whether a program is successful, qualitative factors also must be taken into account. Any decision-making process should include site visits, interviews and/or other evaluative tools. We support a model similar to the Office of the Controller’s Standard Fiscal and Compliance Citywide Non-Profit Monitoring Committee, an interagency body that employs site visits, self-evaluations, interviews, and group discussions, in addition to the careful review of standardized forms (e.g., in-take and exit) and accounting books.

7. **City Department and Agencies should simplify reporting requirements for non-profit service providers and develop a computerized tracking system to help monitor homeless housing clients, in line with the recommendations of the Controller’s April 2008 Care Not Cash audit.**

**AGREE, WITH RESERVATIONS.** The Department on the Status of Women is in favor of simplifying the reporting requirements city-wide. The Department has developed statistical and qualitative reporting forms to collect a wide array of data and information from our grantees. Many of these grantees receive funding from other City agencies with separate protocols, and we understand that the burden of writing multiple reports takes resources away from clients. A uniform reporting process that takes into account the data needs of each granting agency would reduce this burden on the grantees and assist City agencies in collaboration and data-sharing.

While a computerized tracking system would be a concrete tool for collecting and tracking data about who accesses services in San Francisco, the Department maintains certain reservations about its implementation. Though all homeless clients should be able to maintain confidentiality as they receive treatment and services from City agencies, the safety needs of domestic violence survivors makes this an *essential* aspect of any tracking system established. Stalking is a hallmark of the most lethal domestic violence cases, and stalkers are notoriously determined and technologically savvy in tracking down their victims. It is critical to ensure absolute confidentiality of clients when safety is an issue, as in cases of domestic violence. Victims who are aware of a computerized system may avoid accessing services so as to avoid the potential danger of their batterer locating them through it. Domestic violence advocates should be involved in the creation and implementation of a tracking system to ensure that system protocols do not endanger victims however unintentionally.
8. The City should create a computerized tracking system with an individual identification number of each homeless housing client, which would be linked with a medical case management system in use by the Health Department.

AGREE, WITH RESERVATIONS. Again, the Department sees the value in a computerized tracking system, but urges caution. See our recommendations above.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond. The Department is committed to providing the best emergency and transitional shelter services to survivors of domestic violence and their children, and we welcome any improvements arising as a result of the Grand Jury’s report and recommendations.

Sincerely,

Emily M. Murase, Ph.D.

cc: Board of Supervisors
cc: Mayor’s Director of Homelessness
September 6, 2008

The Honorable Aaron Peskin, President and Members
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Appeal of Certification of the Central Subway Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report – Planning Motion M-17668

Dear President Peskin and Supervisors:

On behalf of San Francisco Tomorrow, I am writing in support of the appeal submitted by Gerald Cauthen and Howard Wong. SFT’s analysis of this document finds that the document provides inadequate information about the impacts of the project, unsubstantiated estimates of its benefits, and fails to include an alternative that addresses the deficiencies of the preferred alternative.

Among the defects of this document, which have been well-researched by the appellants, are:

- inaccurate analysis of total travel time
- inadequate analysis of the pedestrian impacts of the stations at Union Square and Chinatown.
- Unsubstantiated estimated of ridership based on questionable assumption of future travel patterns
- a failure to include reasonably foreseeable congestion management measures in the analysis
- a failure to consider the extension of Caltrain to the Transbay Terminal
- a failure to consider feasible, environmentally superior alternatives

The failure to include an alternative that assumes the extension of Caltrain to the Transbay Terminal is particularly egregious, and could have serious future consequences for both projects. Every conclusion in this document assumes the failure of the Transbay project, even while it is still in development. That is irresponsible. At minimum, this document must consider completion of the Caltrain extension within an alternative.

Moreover, this document completely ignores the Northeast quadrant of the City in its analysis of the project’s impacts, or in consideration of alternatives. Both North Beach and Fisherman’s Wharf are directly linked to Chinatown transit; any change that affects Chinatown affects these neighborhoods directly. As written, one can only assume that nothing changes in these neighborhoods, and the entire project impact lies between.

The Central Subway represents a large investment in our City’s transportation infrastructure. It is imperative that we create the best project – one that doesn’t abandon neighborhoods, or preclude other transportation improvements. To ensure this, the City must have complete and accurate data. Unfortunately, this document fails to provide that data. For that reason, we ask that you vote against certification of this document.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jennifer Clary
President

Will you want to live in San Francisco – tomorrow?

41 Sutter Street, Suite 1579. San Francisco CA 94104-4903. (415) 566-7050

Recycled Paper
September 10, 2008

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

Re: Appeal of Planning Commission Certification of the Central Subway Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report – Planning Motion M-17668

Dear President Peskin and Supervisors:


This letter listed many problems with and deficiencies of this EIR which make its certification an inappropriate action. In addition to the deficiencies in the EIR stated in this letter I note additional ones discussed below.

On page 3-36 it predicts that 89% of the total ridership at the Fourth and King (Caltrain) Station will be Caltrain passengers in 2030. This is questionable since the present T Line routing runs the full length of the Market Street spine and takes people closer to work places and shopping than the Central Subway will. A closer study should be made of the destinations of Caltrain passengers. This would probably show that the majority of them are going to and from locations in or near the Financial District and will take a train that runs into the Market Street Subway (currently the N Line).

On pages 6-51 to 6-53 there are discussions of the businesses and dwelling units displaced by the Chinatown Station. The locally preferred alternative is the worst in this respect. The dwelling units are undoubtedly occupied by low income persons and the businesses are no doubt ones patronized by low income persons. The vague statement about mitigation measures on page 6-4 is simply not enough. Meeting vague requirements of existing laws is not enough. Meeting social justice and needs of the persons and businesses displaced by this project must be a requirement of this project’s mitigation measures. No buildings should be removed until replacement dwelling units and business spaces have been built for them to move into.

I urge that this certification be overruled and a new EIR be ordered.

Very truly yours

Norman Rolfe
September 10, 2008

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

RE: File No. 081137
Appeal of Final Supplemental ERI for Central Subway Project

Dear Supervisors:

Reference as above, I write to protest locating a surface station for the proposed Central Subway Project in Washington Square Park, or in the Frank Marini Triangle facing the park.

These two beautiful sites are of supreme importance to the quality of life in North Beach. They are exemplars of their kind in our nation. They function as the calming, soothing heart of our densely populated neighborhood.

It would be a civic crime to invade either of them with a subway station.

Also, let us learn from the experience of the residents of Glen Park, which has been as safe a neighborhood as any in San Francisco. When the subway station surfaced in Glen Park, it brought street crime, home invasion and business burglaries with it. These surface stations give felons a way to invade a neighborhood and quickly disappear. Wherever a station is placed, it creates the 24/7 need of foot patrol policing, which our city cannot provide.

I am disabled, without the stamina to appear at the hearing. I trust this letter will become part of the official public record.

Sincerely,

Mary Etta Moss
August 29, 2008

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


Dear Judge Ballati:

On behalf of the Department of Children, Youth and Their Families, I am writing to thank you and the Civil Grand Jury for addressing a key policy issue for San Francisco’s children, youth and families and residents—homelessness—and to provide the departmental responses requested to recommendations 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8.

Recommendation # 4 (pg. 16) The City should develop performance criteria for its supportive housing programs that emphasize inputs (e.g. intake criteria, building operating costs, and capital construction costs or master lease payments) and outcomes (in particular housing retention rates, reduction in use of emergency services and increase in client incomes).

DCYF agrees with the finding. DCYF is ready and willing to participate in any efforts lead by our city colleagues to develop and monitor performance criteria for its supportive housing programs that support children, youth and families. DCYF does not provide capital funding for supportive housing. Our particular area of emphasis is related to service funding for residents—on site and in the community—to improve outcomes for children, youth and families.

Recommendation # 5 (pgs 16 - 17) The City should require non-profits and city agencies to benchmark their performance against each other, against the private sector, and against non-profits which operate without significant government funding.

DCYF agrees with the finding. Benchmarking is a performance management best practice employed by DCYF generally. DCYF is ready and willing to participate in any efforts lead by our city colleagues to undertake benchmarking across agencies, sectors, and funding sources specific to supportive housing.

Recommendation # 6 (pg. 17) City Departments and Agencies should base decisions about renewing or terminating supportive housing contracts solely on the outcomes of the enhanced performance measures.
DCYF agrees with the finding. DCYF policy currently requires funding decisions to factor past and current performance in renewals or new funding awards. This practice will continue as improved or new performance measures are developed specifically for supportive housing and are applicable to any agencies DCYF funds.

Recommendation # 7 (pg. 17) City Departments and Agencies should simplify reporting requirements for non-profit service providers and develop a computerized tracking system to help monitor homeless housing clients, in line with recommendations of the Controller’s April 2008 Care Not Cash audit.

DCYF agrees with the finding. DCYF is actively committed to simplifying reporting efforts for non-profit service providers both within our own department and across public agencies. We are committed to this work to both reduce administrative burden and to improve the quality and utility of data collected for funders and providers. We are currently involved in two such efforts — in child care and family support—with First Five San Francisco and Human Services Agency. With regard to services for supportive housing programs serving children, youth and families, we would welcome participating in any such joint effort initiated by our city colleagues.

Recommendation #8 (pg. 17) The City should create a computerized tracking system with an individual identification number of each homeless housing client, which would be linked with a medical case management system now in use by the Health Department.

This Recommendation Requires Further Analysis by DCYF. DCYF has not had the time to consider this recommendation in depth, and will need time to understand the applicability of this recommendation to children and youth as well as to the types of services typically funded by our organization. From past data collection and coordination efforts for this population, we understand the need to carefully consider confidentiality and data collection for children, youth and families fleeing domestic violence. We will review this recommendation with our city colleagues and current grantees and be prepared to discuss it by December 12, 2008.

If you have any questions about this response, or need more information, please do not hesitate to contact me at 554-8958 or Margaret@dcyf.org or September Jarrett, Director of Policy and Planning, at 554-8959 or September@dcyf.org. We deeply appreciate the contributions of the Civil Grand Jury to much needed efforts to address homelessness in San Francisco.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Margaret Brodkin
Director

Cc: Angela Cavillo, Clerk, Board of Supervisors
Office of the Grand Jury
September Jarrett, Director of Policy & Planning, DCYF
September 10, 2008

The Honorable David L. Ballati  
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court  
400 McAllister Street, #206  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4514

Re: Response to the San Francisco Civil Grand Jury 2007-08 Report,  
"Homeless Have Homes, But They Are Still On The Street"

Dear Judge Ballati:

Pursuant to Penal Code Sec. 933 (c), attached please find the San Francisco Human Services Agency’s response to the Findings and Recommendations in the above referenced report.

The Human Services Agency appreciates the work of the Civil Grand Jury who created this report on behalf of the citizens of the City and County San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Trent Rhorer  
Executive Director

Attachment  
cc: Civil Grand Jury  
Board of Supervisors
**Services Agency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Public Health Services Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success of Supportive Housing Programs:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Department of Public Health and the Human Services Agency should develop and apply simple performance measures for the
- H.S.A. already has

**Response:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 1.2.3.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Required From:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 1.2.3.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Will Be Implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Explanation**

- Implementation - Anti-Implementing Timeframe for: 1 - Illegal
- No Implementation - None
- 4.2 Will Not Be Implemented: Not
- 4.3 Requires Further Analysis: Not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 1.2.3.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Will Be Implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Explanation**

- Implementation - Anti-Implementing Timeframe for: 1 - Illegal
- No Implementation - None
- 4.2 Will Not Be Implemented: Not
- 4.3 Requires Further Analysis: Not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 1.2.3.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Will Be Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- California Penal Code Sections 5320.5(e) and (f) require the responding party to report for each recommendation of the Civil Grand Jury one of the following.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response Required From:</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each recommendation below, indicate which action you have taken or plan to take and provide the required information.

- Explanation
  - Warranted: Required
  - Unwarranted: Not Required

- Will Be Implemented
- Not Implemented
- Anticipated Implementation in the Future
- Will Be Implemented
- Base Implementation
- Summary of Implementation

Actions:
- Calendar for Next 12 months
- Administrative Timeframe for
  - Closeout
  - Modification
  - Timeframe
  - Standards

2007-08 Civil Grand Jury Report - Homeless Services Agency

For each recommendation, indicate which action has been taken or is being planned to address the issue.
Families & Department of Childen, Youth and Their
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency
Mayor's Office of Community Development
Public Health, Mayor's Office of Housing
Department of Human Services Agency, Department of
Information Systems Office of the Controller
Department of Reckonizations and
See answer to number #7.

The city should create a computerized tracking system with an
individual identification number for each homeless housing client.

Recommendation:

For each recommendation below, indicate which action you have taken or plan to take and provide the required information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Timeframe for Implementation</th>
<th>Recommendation Timeframe for</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
<th>Action Taken or Planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Recommendation implemented</td>
<td>Date implemented</td>
<td>Summary of implemented</td>
<td>Date implemented</td>
<td>Summary of implemented</td>
<td>Action taken or planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Will be implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Requires further analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Not implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actions:
California Penal Code Sections 933.05(a) and (b) requires the responding party to report for each recommendation of the Civil Grand Jury one of the following:

- Homeless have homes, but they re still on the street
- 2007-08 Civil Grand Jury Report - Response from the Human Services Agency
September 11, 2008

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

Dear Judge Ballati:

To follow, please find my response to the 2007-2008 Civil Grand Jury Report, “The Homeless Have Homes, But They Are Still On the Street.” I personally want to thank the Grand Jury for all of their hard work. I am always interested in trying to improve the functions of government and the suggestions made by the Civil Grand Jury are appreciated.

Housing the homeless and providing appropriate support services has been the lynchpin of the City’s Housing First model. As the report indicated, Housing First is working, service providers are dedicated and providing critical services, and the City is committed to monitoring and improving the tracking of services and spending. I am confident that our strategy is yielding the desired outcomes: since January of 2004 a total of 8,240 homeless single adults have left the streets or shelter system for permanent housing.

Following are the Mayor’s Office’s responses to the Civil Grand Jury findings.

Recommendation 2: The City should order that comprehensive cost/benefit analysis be performed on current supportive housing programs to include: (A) costs of the supportive programs for various homeless populations compared to the cost avoidance through reduced use of emergency services, hospitals, jails, etc., and (B) comparative analysis of specific programs and supportive housing models to assess reasons that the cost of providing supportive housing differs substantially between different programs that seem equally successful in outcome.

Response:
2. Agree, in progress. The Mayor’s office agrees that a comprehensive cost/benefit analysis should be performed on current supportive housing programs. Toward that end, we are supportive of a department-led workgroup of supportive housing providers, known as SASH (Single Adult Supportive Housing), to analyze and make recommendations to improve upon the system. This workgroup is conducting a cost/benefit analysis so the City can better understand variations in service delivery models, and their effectiveness. This workgroup will also allow the City to better identify the variables that drive operating and service costs at single adult supportive housing sites. We expect recommendations from this workgroup in early 2009.
Dear Mayor Newsom, Supervisors and Mr. Kanaley:

The hospice at Laguna Honda has, over two decades, provided over 2,000 San Franciscans with emotional and spiritual care, physical comfort, expert medical care, and relief from pain, despair and worry in their final months, days and hours. The hospice's longtime director, Dr. Derek Kerr, and the rest of the palliative care team have done this with unique grace, humor and kindness, creating a peaceful, dignified atmosphere that is reassuring, positive and respectful not only for the hospice residents, but for their family members and friends. I have witnessed this firsthand in visits to the hospice over the years. Even outside Laguna Honda, I have heard many people speak with effusive praise about the hospice staff for the care their loved ones have received there.

Unlike many other hospice programs, the Laguna Honda hospice is a residential, inpatient hospice. Many people want and need this type of setting because of their medical condition, their desire to be part of this unique community at the end of their lives, and for other reasons. Some are longtime residents of Laguna Honda, transferred from other units, and others, new to Laguna Honda, are admitted from home, from hospitals and from the street.

Unfortunately, the hospice is gravely threatened. Although San Francisco's budget crisis is real, the cost of maintaining the hospice as it should be maintained would be small in relation to the Health Department budget, and extremely small in relation to the extraordinary and unique benefit the hospice provides San Franciscans.

I strongly urge you to ensure that:

1. Both currently and in the rebuilt Laguna Honda, the hospice be maintained at 30 beds, the size it has been for many years. Reducing its size would dramatically reduce the number of people benefited - not only residents but their many family members and friends. The savings, however, would be disproportionately small, because a smaller hospice would not be able to take advantage of the economies of scale inherent in a 30-bed hospice. 15 residents would simply not constitute a critical mass. Also, it's important to keep in mind that the hospice attracts many volunteers, which, besides being essential for the residents, is an effective way of leveraging the City's dollars. Moreover, many activities in the hospice, such as eating and playing games, are done (or offered) communally; reducing its size would diminish its richness and spirit of community. Finally, I am afraid that cutting the hospice's size would be merely the first step in its eventual elimination.

2. The hospice remains in its current location until it is relocated to the new building. Having an
intermediate move would be disruptive for dying residents (as well as for families, friends, staff, volunteers and everyone involved with the hospice), would involve twice the work, and would take residents away from its beautiful, serene garden, which has been lovingly and painstakingly built over many years with the efforts of hospice staff, volunteers, residents and families, and is an important part of residents’ daily lives. Moreover, if history is any guide, an intermediate move would almost certainly take far more time, effort and expense than planned, severely undercutting the rationale for such a move.

3. The chaplain dedicated to the hospice be reinstated, including having his compensation paid for by the Laguna Honda budget, as had been done for so many years. Truly, cutting the chaplain in order to save $26,000 a year epitomizes the phrase “penny wise, pound foolish.” There has been much testimony about the importance of the chaplain’s work. I can’t improve on the eloquent words of Sister Miriam Walsh, Laguna Honda’s Director of Pastoral Care, in her appeal for keeping the chaplain.

4. In the new building, the hospice be located next to a unit of quiet, sedentary residents, as it is currently located. A tranquil, peaceful setting is an important part of what the hospice provides. The hospice should be a place apart from the noise, stress, and activity found in some of the units. Also, for the reasons described above, the hospice should continue to have its own private, dedicated garden.

The Laguna Honda hospice epitomizes the best spirit of San Francisco, and the ideals that San Franciscans have for our city. The cost of preserving it would be small in the scheme of things, and the benefits immeasurable.

Sincerely

Howard L. Chabner
Dear Mr. Chabner:

Thank you for your letter regarding the Laguna Honda Hospice.

I am pleased to hear your strong words of praise. The hospice program is one among many fine programs here at Laguna Honda and we have every intention that it continue its good work as we move into our new facility. You may be aware that the hospice team has now selected a location for the program in the new building and our planning is going forward based on the team’s preferred location next to the garden.

You may also know that Laguna Honda is undergoing a thirty-five percent reduction in capacity that requires all of our programs to seek creative ways to maintain services in the face of cutbacks. I have encouraged all our program directors to rise to the challenge by working collaboratively to build a stronger organization that can continually improve its service delivery.

I am pleased to say that the hospital’s program directors have joined together to match resident needs to the amenities of the new facility – and to do what is best for the organization as a whole so that we may continue to provide the best possible long term care and rehabilitation services to a broad and varied population of San Franciscans.

For the most part, our hospice program has been insulated from recent budget cuts. Last fiscal year, we deleted 147 positions at an annual cost reduction of over $14 million. This fiscal year, we will be cutting 173 positions at an annual cost reduction of $20 million. The hospice program has had to absorb only $44,000 of these reductions.

Our hospice program is important to us, and we have many other outstanding programs that we hope to maintain and protect as we move into our new facility. Among them are our award-winning restorative care program, our excellent rehabilitation program, the Bay Area’s only HIV/AIDS skilled nursing program, two monolingual programs for speakers of Cantonese and Spanish, an Adult Day Health Center that serves 60 participants each day, and many others.

We care for people with Alzheimer’s and other forms of dementia, people with multiple sclerosis and other degenerative diseases, with spinal cord injuries and traumatic brain injuries, and people with complex diagnoses who are living with multiple disabilities.

Our practice is comprehensive, and most people who complete their lives at Laguna Honda
do not live on the hospice unit. On the current 25 bed Hospice unit, on average, 15 hospice residents stay less than one year, nine stay over one year, and some stay as long as five years. Were we to apply a thirty-five percent reduction to hospice, the program would have a bed capacity of 16.

The new Laguna Honda will be organized around four 15-person households per floor. The hospice will occupy either one or two households depending on our decision about how best we can meet the many competing needs we are called upon to fill. The decision will be made by an interdisciplinary team of clinicians – doctors, nurses, social workers and therapists. The team is aware of the arguments, and will carefully consider them.

Again, my thanks for your support for one of our outstanding programs.

Sincerely,

John T. Kanaley
Executive Administrator
Laguna Honda Hospital and Rehabilitation Center
(415) 759-2363

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL:
This message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying use or distribution of the information included in this message and attachments is prohibited. If you received this message in error, please notify me by reply email and immediately and permanently delete this message and any attachments. Thank you.

"Howard Chabner" <hchabner@jps.net>

"Howard Chabner"
09/14/2008 05:32 PM

To <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>, <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>, <bevan.duffy@sfgov.org>, <sophie.maxwell@sfgov.org>, <gerardo.sandoval@sfgov.org>, <tom.ammiano@sfgov.org>, <michela.alioto-pier@sfgov.org>, <jake.mcgoldrick@sfgov.org>, <ross.mirkarimi@sfgov.org>, <chris.daly@sfgov.org>, <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>, "Boris Delepine" <Boris.Delepine@sfgov.org>, <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>, <nicholas.kinsey@sfgov.org>, <poonja@sfgov.org>, <angela.caivillo@sfgov.org>, <Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org>, <Colleen.Crowley@sfgov.org>, <Boe.Hayward@sfgov.org>, <David.Noyola@sfgov.org>, <Rebekah.Krell@sfgov.org>, <Cammy.Blackstone@sfgov.org>, <Regina.Dick-Endrizzi@sfgov.org>, <Vallie.Brown@sfgov.org>, <gavin.newsom@sfgov.org>, <Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org>, <john.kanaley@sfdph.org>

Subject Please Preserve the Hospice at Laguna Honda

Dear Mayor Newsom, Supervisors and Mr. Kanaley:
The hospice at Laguna Honda has, over two decades, provided over 2,000 San Franciscans with emotional and spiritual care, physical comfort, expert medical care, and relief from pain, despair and worry in their final months, days and hours. The hospice’s longtime director, Dr. Derek Kerr, and the rest of the palliative care team have done this with unique grace, humor and kindness, creating a peaceful, dignified atmosphere that is reassuring, positive and respectful not only for the hospice residents, but for their family members and friends. I have witnessed this firsthand in visits to the hospice over the years. Even outside Laguna Honda, I have heard many people speak with effusive praise about the hospice staff for the care their loved ones have received there.

Unlike many other hospice programs, the Laguna Honda hospice is a residential, inpatient hospice. Many people want and need this type of setting because of their medical condition, their desire to be part of this unique community at the end of their lives, and for other reasons. Some are longtime residents of Laguna Honda, transferred from other units, and others, new to Laguna Honda, are admitted from home, from hospitals and from the street.

Unfortunately, the hospice is gravely threatened. Although San Francisco’s budget crisis is real, the cost of maintaining the hospice as it should be maintained would be small in relation to the Health Department budget, and extremely small in relation to the extraordinary and unique benefit the hospice provides San Franciscans.

I strongly urge you to ensure that:

1. Both currently and in the rebuilt Laguna Honda, the hospice be maintained at 30 beds, the size it has been for many years. Reducing its size would dramatically reduce the number of people benefited – not only residents but their many family members and friends. The savings, however, would be disproportionately small, because a smaller hospice would not be able to take advantage of the economies of scale inherent in a 30-bed hospice. 15 residents would simply not constitute a critical mass. Also, it’s important to keep in mind that the hospice attracts many volunteers, which, besides being essential for the residents, is an effective way of leveraging the City’s dollars. Moreover, many activities in the hospice, such as eating and playing games, are done (or offered) communally; reducing its size would diminish its richce and spirit of community. Finally, I am afraid that cutting the hospice’s size would be merely the first step in its eventual elimination.

2. The hospice remains in its current location until it is relocated to the new building. Having an intermediate move would be disruptive for dying residents (as well as for families, friends, staff, volunteers and everyone involved with the hospice), would involve twice the work, and would take residents away from its beautiful, serene garden, which has been lovingly and painstakingly built over many years with the efforts of hospice staff, volunteers, residents and families, and is an important part of residents’ daily lives. Moreover, if history is any guide, an intermediate move would almost certainly take far more time, effort and expense than planned, severely undercutting the rationale for such a move.
3. The chaplain dedicated to the hospice be reinstated, including having his compensation paid for by the Laguna Honda budget, as had been done for so many years. Truly, cutting the chaplain in order to save $26,000 a year epitomizes the phrase “penny wise, pound foolish.” There has been much testimony about the importance of the chaplain’s work. I can’t improve on the eloquent words of Sister Miriam Walsh, Laguna Honda’s Director of Pastoral Care, in her appeal for keeping the chaplain.

4. In the new building, the hospice be located next to a unit of quiet, sedentary residents, as it is currently located. A tranquil, peaceful setting is an important part of what the hospice provides. The hospice should be a place apart from the noise, stress, and activity found in some of the units. Also, for the reasons described above, the hospice should continue to have its own private, dedicated garden.

The Laguna Honda hospice epitomizes the best spirit of San Francisco, and the ideals that San Franciscans have for our city. The cost of preserving it would be small in the scheme of things, and the benefits immeasurable.

Sincerely

Howard L. Chabner
----- Original Message ----- 
From: Michael Goldstein  
Sent: 09/15/2008 11:21 AM MST  
To: Angela Calvillo 
Cc: Tom Ammiano; Zach Tuller 
Subject: Marijuana Offenses Oversight Committee resignation

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

This is to inform the Board of Supervisors that I am resigning my seat on the above committee due to time constraints. I occupied seat # 4 (civil rights advocate).

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at the email address above or by phone, 415-613-2436.

best regards,
Michael Goldstein
September 8, 2008

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

Subject: Response to City Grand Jury Recommendations

This letter is in response to the Civil Grand Jury report titled "Fits and Starts: The Response of San Francisco Government to Past Civil Grand Jury Recommendations", dated June 2008, Item 4. Item 4 states: "The Office of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should follow up with the Department of Building Inspection to make certain that questions of seismic safety are addressed at all designated City operation centers."

The Department of Building Inspection (DBI) has met with representatives from the Department of Emergency Management, Department of Public Works, Department of Real Estate, and others regarding the seismic safety and operability of City Department Operations Centers (DOC). This core group has become the lead group to implement Strategic Goal 10: Improve the functional and operational capabilities of Department Operating Centers of the San Francisco All-Hazards Strategic Plan.

At this time, we are in the process of determining the seismic safety and operability of the buildings where existing DOC's are located.

If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Raymond Lui, S.E.
Deputy Director for Plan Review Services

Cc: Mike Fernandez, Mayor's Office of Public Policy and Finance
    Vivian L. Day, Acting-Director
    Neal Taniguchi, Manager for Administration and Finance
September 5, 2008

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

Re: Public Convenience & Necessity Resolution

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am submitting this letter in support of a “public convenience and necessity” resolution from the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to allow me to sell alcoholic beverages at my proposed new bar.

1. My name is John I. Luna. My proposed business is located at 289 Eighth Street, San Francisco, California 94103. My proposed business name is “The 289 Bar.” My daytime phone number is (415) 572-3233. Lastly, my mailing address is 279 Ney Street, San Francisco, California 94112.

2. I am applying for an On-Sale General Alcoholic Type 48 Liquor License. It is a transfer of License from 170 O’Farrell Street, San Francisco, California 94102 to my new proposed business located at 289 Eighth Street, San Francisco, California 94103.

3. My proposed business hours are from 9 a.m. to 2 a.m., seven days a week.

4. Obtaining an alcoholic beverage license at my proposed bar serves the public convenience and necessity in the soma neighborhood and citywide for the following reasons:

   A. While a bar business can negatively impact a neighborhood if operated under irresponsible ownership, my 8 years of dependable business experience and my family’s 50 year history of responsible operation in south of market guarantees that the proposed business will be responsibly managed and a welcome addition to the neighborhood.

   B. The south of market region of San Francisco has improved tremendously in the past 10 years. Many needed new businesses and services have been established in that time period. This process has been aided by, and may not have been possible if not for,
the long term native businesses, like those of my family and others who established the neighborhood foundation to attract these newer businesses. My grandfather set our family footprint in south of market when he opened LA FE in September 15, 1958 at Folsom Street at Russ Street. In years to come he would open 4 other SOMA businesses. The community can expect my proposed business to be managed with the same care and service that my grandfather, my dad and uncles has always brought to the south of market community.

C. I have talked to several residents and business owners and their employees about my proposed business plan. I have gathered plenty of their support and insight on what they would expect from this neighborhood bar. I have also taken notice that there is a neighborhood bar void in our vicinity of 8th and Folsom. While there are plenty of restaurants and dance clubs, there is a convenient necessity to provide a venue where residents and employees can stop in for a cocktail. My business will also attract tourists who visit our beautiful city and stay in near by motels and hotels.

Thank you for you kind consideration.

Respectfully,

John I. Luna 9/5/08
INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS -
SECTION 23958.4 B&P

Instructions: This form is to be used for all applications for original issuance or premises to premises transfer of licenses.
- Part 1 is to be completed by an ABC employee, given to applicant with pre-application package, with copy retained in holding file or applicant's district file.
- Part 2 is to be completed by the applicant, and returned to ABC.
- Part 3 is to be completed by the local governing body or its designated subordinate officer or body, and returned to ABC.

PART 1 - TO BE COMPLETED BY ABC

1. APPLICANT'S NAME
   289 BAR

2. PREMISES ADDRESS (street number and name, city, zip code)
   289 8TH ST, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103 - 3924

3. LICENSE TYPE
   48

4. TYPE OF BUSINESS
   - Full Service Restaurant
   - Deli or Specialty Restaurant
   - Cafe/Coffee Shop
   - Bed & Breakfast
   - Wine only
   - Supermarket
   - Liquor Store
   - Drug/Pharmacy
   - Other - describe: 

5. COUNTY POPULATION
   5829

6. CENSUS TRACT NUMBER
   0478

7. TOTAL NUMBER OF LICENSES IN COUNTY
   On-Sale
   Off-Sale

8. NO. OF LICENSES ALLOWED IN CENSUS TRACT
   19

9. NO. OF LICENSES EXISTING IN CENSUS TRACT
   47

10. RATIO OF LICENSES TO POPULATION IN COUNTY
    On-Sale
    Off-Sale

11. IS THE ABOVE CENSUS TRACT OVERCONCENTRATED WITH LICENSES? (i.e., does the ratio of licenses to population in the census tract exceed the ratio of licenses to population for the entire county?)
    Yes
    No

12. DOES LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY MAINTAIN CRIME STATISTICS?
    Yes (Go to item #13)
    No (Go to item #20)

13. CRIME REPORTING DISTRICT NUMBER
    232

14. TOTAL NUMBER OF REPORTING DISTRICTS
    654

15. TOTAL NUMBER OF OFFENSES IN ALL REPORTING DISTRICTS
    120,367

16. AVERAGE NO. OF OFFENSES PER DISTRICT
    184

17. 120% OF AVERAGE NUMBER OF OFFENSES
    221

18. TOTAL NUMBER OF OFFENSES IN REPORTING DISTRICT
    487

19. IS THE PREMISES LOCATED IN A HIGH CRIME REPORTING DISTRICT? (i.e., has a 20% greater number of reported crimes than the average number of reported crimes as determined from all crime reporting districts within the jurisdiction of the local law enforcement agency)
    Yes
    No

20. CHECK THE BOX THAT APPLIES (check only one box)

   a. If "No" is checked in both item #11 and item #19, Section 23958.4 B&P does not apply to this application, and no additional information will be needed on this issue. Advise the applicant to bring this completed form to ABC when filing the application.

   b. If "Yes" is checked in either item #11 or item #19, and the applicant is applying for a non-retail license, a retail license for public eating place license, a retail license for a hotel, motel or other lodging establishment as defined in Section 25503.16(b) B&P, or a retail license issued in conjunction with a beer manufacturer's license, or winegrower's license, advise the applicant to complete Section 2 and bring the completed form to ABC when filing the application or as soon as possible thereafter.

   c. If "Yes" is checked in either item #11 or item #19, and the applicant is applying for an off-sale beer and wine license, an off-sale general license, an on-sale beer license, an on-sale beer and wine (public premises) license, or an on-sale general (public premises) license, advise the applicant to take this form to the local governing body or its designated subordinate officer or body to have them complete Section 3. The completed form will need to be provided to ABC in order to process the application.

   Governing Body/Designated Subordinate Name:

   [Signature]

   [Date]

FOR DEPARTMENT USE ONLY
PREPARED BY (Name of Department Employee)

[Signature]

[Date]

ABC-245 (12/03)
Section 1. Department Information

Department Head Signature: [Signature]
Name of Department: San Francisco Water Dept. WTRST
Department Address: 1000 El Camino Real, Millbrae, CA 94010
Contact Person: Kent Nelson
Phone Number: (650) 871-3016 Fax Number: (650) 872-5984

Section 2. Contractor Information

Contractor Name: Northern Energy
Contractor Address: 1155 North 15th Street, San Jose, CA 95112
Vendor Number (if known): 67958

Section 3. Transaction Information

Date Waiver Request Submitted: 9/5/08 Type of Contract: Purchase
Contract Start Date: 9/9/08 End Date: Dollar Amount of Contract: $5500.

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.)

- [x] 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: 9/10/08
- [ ] 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: [Signature] 14B Waiver Granted: [Signature]
12B Waiver Denied: [Signature] 14B Waiver Denied: [Signature]
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.
To: Mayor Gavin Newsom and Board of Supervisors  
1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Pl Rm 244  
San Francisco, California 94102

I’m an employee of LHH and begging your office in behalf of all concerned nurses to investigate what the administration and Chief Nursing Officer are doing to the budget. She pulled out her favorite nurses on the floor and created titles for them. You could never see these people; they’re always in their office and will only come out when the State Surveyors are around. We have five RNs for advance practice and six RNs for Quality Management. In addition, for title of Clinical Resource Team, there are two Rns, one Certified Nursing Assistant (has her own office). Mr. Bevan has his own office, and one LVN with a title of Nursing Informatics, total of four people. Those who are doing staff assignments are four clerks, one RN, with one supervisor every shift, a total of eight. During the office of Ms. Lieshmann, only three persons are doing the staff assignment for 24 hours operation. We used to have only three RNs giving in-services, now we have ten. Two many chiefs. Then they hire a lot of RNs because we have an RN recruiter and her job is only to hire RNs. What happened is there an overflow of RNs, that in one unit of thirty residents have three to four RNs and short of CNAs every day for ten to eleven units and it’s been happening for more than two months now. So, we RNs are doing patient care every day. We brought this up to the Union many times, but they cannot help us. Ms. Oletha and Mr. Bevan, the Clinical Resource Team, went to every unit and recruited CNAs to be transferred to SFGH due to budget cuts. Due to fear of layoffs, fifteen CNAs went to SFGH. This 08/19/08, the Nursing Office posted as needed CNAs at the front door for hire again. Why can’t they let go these new RNs and hire more CNAs to save money for the city? Our supervisors won’t listen to us, these nurses with
titles under administration are doing nothing; put them back in the ward. What a waste of
tax-payer’s money. Please don’t waste anymore dollars on these kind of people.

Respectfully,

Laguna Honda Nurses
Anita Sanchez,

I have already appealed the immediate and biased rejection issued by Ms. Valdez, concerning the SFPD CIO position. Ms. Callahan, reiterates the same prejudice, and takes it a step further by trashing all Position based testing conducting before her appointment. She does not have this authority. She is questioning the earlier test now that I have based my appeal on their merits. She is changing the rules in the middle of the game. The is business as usual for her department. I have respectfully requested on numerous occasions an appeal hearing on this matter. I respectfully requested a hearing on the very belated and untimely decision to dismiss discrimination complaints brought to DHR’s and DTIS and the BOS’ attention several years ago. I appealed her dismissal of the wrongly recorded complaint (#1117). DHR has and continues to obstruct justice by not hearing complaints and dismissing them without any hearing with the Civil Service Commission.

Ms. Sanchez, am I going to be allowed a hearing on the matter of being wrongfully terminated by DTIS in September of last year? I asked for an immediate hearing and your office claimed they were waiting on a report from DHR. It has been a year, they have now claimed that there is a separate hearing with the Civil Service Commission for this matter, which they (DHR) are still working on. Is this going to be allowed to continue? There is no credibility to this process. You won’t allow a hearing until they (DHR) can claim that is untimely.

Why are you not allowing a hearing on the discrimination charge that I have appealed. I responded to this dismissal with an appeal for a hearing to modify and seek a remedy to the actions and pain caused by DHR and DTIS to my career. I have an injury suffered while working from 1011 Turk St (ECD), performing tasks to help out my co-workers at 1011 Turk St, who were mostly women on the day shift. DTIS never hired enough personnel to maintain a complete 24/7/365 emergency communications network. The burden was always more on the men in this environment (thousands of computers maintained by staff of 6). I helped out every where I could. I carried a city pager and cell phone 24/7/365 w/o any pay for several years (1999-2003). I asked for back pay and received nothing, the City Attorney’s Office (Sally Gibson and Gina Roccanova) is well aware of this, yet covers it up or keeps it from the Mayor.

I was dedicated to my profession and the function of 911 emergency communications. You cannot deny this but apparently Ms. Callahan can w/o any ability to defend this
false claim. She (Callahan) makes statements but refuses a hearing in which these matters can be cleared. Ms. Callahan knows that she is lying, why else would she continue, at all cost to stop anyone from hearing the story of DTIS and 911 Fees abuse. She totally deforms the Civil Service reform attempted by Phil Ginsburg, the prior DHR Director. She is a poor reflection of the city, which is why there should be a means of probing her actions, if not to the Civil Service Commission, then to the BOS and Superior Court. I will continue to ask the District Attorney Office to respond, when I receive no response to a charge from your office or DHR. I have followed your rules on this matter and still there is no hearing to resolve the dispute that has ruined my life.

What DTIS has done to Terry Childs, they have done to several employees of DTIS. They have attacked my profession and the Mayor appears to allow it to continue. DHR supports disciplining employees by removing medical benefits the day after surgery and forcing me to retire if I want medical insurance. They then refuse these retirement medical benefits until July 1, 2009. I have requested from the Mayor's Disability Council to have benefits restored, even this complaint is obstructed in Mayor's Office.

Jose Caedo, took my ADA complaint two weeks ago, one week ago he is retired by the Mayor's Disability Council Office. When I call to find out what happened, the matter is dropped, I am routed to another person who knows nothing about it and does not investigate the matter any further or returns any calls. The disregard for ADA or discrimination or retaliation is very rampant in the present administration. It is appalling that we have reached this state of affairs. But this is where we are today. I have to beg for health insurance, while the Mayor touts Universal Health, and allows city employees who complain about discrimination to be terminated w/o any hearing whatsoever. If I want health insurance I must retire first, not fight my termination and ask for a hearing to be able to keep my job.

Answer the question concerning whether or not the Civil Service Commission will hear appeal of Ms. Callahan's decision to drop discrimination complaints, I respectfully request a hearing on this life altering matter. Please respond to this request seeking to exhaust all manner of administrative remedies available. You (CSC) have already allowed DHR to take more than a year to respond to retaliatory termination on September 12, 2007. What is the explanation for this delay? You have allowed DHR to reject applicable and professionally based interest in position of responsibility with the SFPD as their CIO. I am appealing this matter as well, as it is related to all other PBT appeals filed and denied by DHR.

I asked to be able provide all employment documentation to the Civil Service Commission, instead of DHR, in light of their habit of denying my existence as the WAN Engineer for CCSF E911 Project. Is this not a reasonable request that is very manageable. DHR has abused my personnel file, I filed this complaint with EEOC in 2006, DHR/DTIS responded in 2007, then terminated me, after I re-filed Worker's
Comp claim for continued knee and back complications.

What is your decision on the three appeals that I have sent to your office?

   (#1117)

2. PBT Appeal and Anti-Reform actions of the new DHR, under Ms Callahan, for
   SFPD-CIO
   and 0941 Manager classification abuses, abuse of testing procedures by Charlie Castillo
   and
   James Horan (no email address for acting DHR director Horan during his questionable
   tenure just before Callahan)

3. Appeal of Wrongful and retaliatory and discriminatory termination on September
   12, 2007 and ADA violations (submitted to Mayor’s Disability Council)

Please respond, I am seeking to resolve not expand these issues as Ms. Callahan's
actions are designed to do. Every denial to hear these matters speaks volumes for San
Francisco. I have asked legitimate questions of professional concern on the issue of
911 fee disbursement. I deserve a response from the Controller's Office, as they
received my cover letter expressing an interest, w/resume, in August of 1999, not DTIS
or DHR or the City Attorney's Office. Ms. Callahan should not be recognized as an
authority nor the last word on these matters, as she held no position of authority in 911
technical support or public safety concerns in her entire life, which measures up to my
career accomplishments in high priority communication networks.

DTIS/DHR are treating employees like the Mayor treats the BOS. The example of
how to treat your fellow co-worker in San Francisco is being set by how those two
BOS, and the Mayor completely trash each other in public, unless they are Mayoral
appointees. It is distasteful and counter-productive to allow this same thing to occur
with permanent civil servants in high technology occupations.

A new course of action is needed, and a new respect for the individual is demanded. I
have respectfully requested to debate the Mayor or anyone in his staff or DHR's staff
or you, for that matter, on the issues that have plagued me since my employment
became disrupted by racism in city government.

This communication will be sent via fax to your office and BOS and Ethics
Commission.

I copy the District Attorney due to the threats of retaliation of DHR/DTIS and their
past actions involving employees that complain about mistreatment. I involve them in
an attempt to secure an investigation into 911 fees, which is being ignored by new
Controller (Ben Rosenfield), after stating that he would look into the matter of 911 fees
and why I was transferred from 911 under false pretense by City Attorney’s Office,
given the reason that funds were cut from 911, after 9/11/2001. A patently false claim
by City Attorney’s Office and DTIS/DHR, which I have tried to get an answer from.
past Controller Ed Harrington to clear up to no avail, as he has being censored by this administration, therefore he can only talk if subpoena in court.

Thank You,
Alvin Johnson

-------------- Original message from Micki Callahan <Micki.Callahan@sfgov.org>:
--------------

>
> 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
Mayor Newsom,

It should be mandatory, that Ms. Callahan or any newly appointed Director of DHR, after Phil Ginsburg, at lease give the impression that they have read The Civil Service Reform report (attached once again and faxed to DHR) as commissioned under your authority, in 2004, at the start of your first administration. From the responses to employment and compensation discrimination and retaliation and denial of medical/health benefits, retired, universal or otherwise, negative employee development and training, supported and championed by Ms Callahan, it appears that this DHR administration has let be known that the noted recommendations of Phil Ginsburg's report, have no place in Ms Callahan DHR regime. It is as if there were a hostile takeover of professionally trained employees with extensive education and experience.

It is noted that Ms. Callahan played no role in any of the considerations and recommendations for Civil Service Reform, planned, promised, proposed or promoted by Phil Ginsburg, as a result of your direct request, Mayor Newsom. You asked for recommendations, and he along with the stakeholders concerned, responded. It appears ever single moment spent on this endeavor was a complete waste of time, per the series of totally irresponsible and prejudicial rejections to employment opportunity I have received from Ms. Callahan and Mr. Horan (who never provided a known email address). Mr. Horan (your immediate predecessor) completely rejected my application after I was given a Position-Based Test, which I turned in to Chazlie Castillo, that he never graded. Instead, he claimed that he had made a mistake on his initial review, apologizing for providing PBT, which he promptly discarded. I sent Ms. Callahan and your office the email from Charlie Castillo on the testing methods he abused and disregarded last July 2007.

Mayor Newsom, are you now allowing and supporting the deformity of Civil Service by DHR appointees of your administration? You will leave the city in a huge (Mother of All Labor Disputes) mess, if this is the intended course you desire. Take a good look at the recommendations and input from all public/civil service stakeholders. Ms Callahan is not one of the stakeholders.

Ask Micki Callahan to offer her personal opinion on each item recommended in the attached report from Phil Ginsburg. If you are convinced that she deserves a standing ovation for her position as outlined in her rejection letter to my interest in position of
SFPD CIO, and a few other positions of responsibility, then accept an invitation to
debate me on this topic with the assistance of the Willie Brown Institute on Politics and
Public Service, which provides a forum for such discussions impacting public policy.

The audacity of deforming technology in public services is at stake. Technology in San
Francisco, has been attacked by DTIS and DHR. DTIS technical employees are not
safe at work or at home, under the present circumstances allowed to mushroom into
employee imprisonment (WAN Engineer), under your watch Mr Mayor.

I am a WAN engineer, Mr Mayor, just as the imprisoned DTIS employee (Terry Childs)
was at his removal. Except I have about 20 more years of experience and applicable
education, US Navy Vietnam-Era veteran (Electronic Warfare), Long-distance carrier
(SBS/MCI)veteran, large/global corporate communications networks veteran, and I
am an African-American male. I have only worked in support of large government and
corporate enterprise networks my entire career (over 30 years). You will not find
anyone with more experience in corporate or government, state-wide, nation-wide, or
global networks. You have and continue to be misled by the City Attorney’s Office or
just refuse to consider that I was misled into leaving my job with Kaiser Permanente &
offer from Oracle (global-network support/Redwood Shores location), for what now
appears to have been a fraudulent advertisement for 911 Project Technical Support
(911 fee-funded).

Is it okay to place a fraudulent advertisement in several local newspapers for
employment with the CCSF 911 Project? Is it okay to refute this advertisement after a
complaint of discrimination is lodged and manufacture another one that did not exist at
the time or was never known to me or identified in my cover letter? Ms Callahan,
disputes the paid advertisement for employment, that I responded to and listed on my
cover letter. I have sent a copy of this 1999 ad to your office. Instead, she attempts to
supplant this with a retroactive HR bulletin, with manufactured job description, created
in July 2005, a few months before my 6th anniversary. This has been reported to
DFEH and EEOC, along with other false information provided by DHR and City
Attorney’s Office in defense of DTIS.

I have asked the District Attorney’s Office and the Board of Ethics to investigate these
obstructions of justice and official misconduct by Ron Vinson, Chris Vein, Gail
Kuwamoto and an assortment of DHR transfers, but everyone, so far, is intimidated
by your administration, particularly after imprisoning a DTIS employee. There is no
way that any network engineer or DTIS manager can feel comfortable working under
these conditions of high technology abuse and under-compensated schemes resulting
from DTIS’ questionable business model. Their business model relies on abuse of
professional service engineers. They charge the prospective department 3 to 4 times
the rate of pay that is provided to the employee providing the technical service. This
over charge pays for more unknown and unannounced managers w/ dubious titles.
Very little is spent on required and necessary training or career development of the
engineers providing the service. DTIS is a new-age technology pyramid marketing
scheme, in short, a service funded by the few for the many managers and HR personnel
of DTIS who provide no service at all. This overcharge or overhead, funds the
salaries of non-service providing, non-technical DTIS employees (HR, CAO, CFO,
COO, Dept Head, DTIS secretaries).

It is my hope that the District Attorney's Office is not intimidated by a team of appointed DHR Directors and other recent appointees to be CCSF Controller and DTIS/CCSF CIO. If Chris Vein is qualified to be CCSF CIO with absolutely no technical background whatsoever, (i.e Public Affairs ??, Organizational Communications ??, Foreign Diplomacy??), then what does this say for the future of innovation and employment opportunity in technology under his leadership. This crime of careers needs to be investigated at once, technology has been put on life-support under the direction of Chris Vein, Ron Vinson, Deborah Baker, Denise Brady, Gail Kuwamoto, Rod Loucks, Herb Tong and the City Attorney's Office. 911 Fees disbursement is the culprit, it is only thing that can make this much noise and cause this much retaliation. Follow the public safety money meant to be used for 911 operations and equipment support (my committed function), the source of the problem is there.

---------- Original message from Micki Callahan <Micki.Callahan@sfgov.org>:
----------

> 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  CSRReformReport.pdf
As we come upon the 7th anniversary of 9-11 I found myself wanting to run far, far away from all the media pageantry, celebration and fanfare. I don't wanna see another retrospective TV special designed to pull my heartstrings and yet not soothe my soul. It's apparent that the goal of these mass media outlets is to garner ratings and NOT use their vast resources to heal any of the people who were traumatized by that day's events.

I realize that so many of us have forgotten just how shook up we were on September 11th 2001. So many of us forgot how we initially thought up to 50 thousand people have died when those towers collapsed and for the most part the world came to a stand still on that sunny day in September. In many people's minds, what took place was beyond comprehensible. How could this happen? How could this happen on our soil? Those were the questions so many of us asked? I'm still not sure if they've been fully answered to this day.

I remember shortly after 9-11 it led to people going all out and showing compassion to one another as so many of us at least for a brief moment were reminded that no one is promised tomorrow and that it was important to take some time out, be patient and show kindness. For weeks and even months after the tragedy, you could still smell the smoke throughout New York and it wasn't unusual to see somebody just break down and start crying in the middle of the streets. People seemed to understand and would show love and concern.
I remember going down to Ground Zero for the first time in early November. It was at night and seemed so eerie. The pungent odor, the mammoth pieces of twisted metal, the emptiness of that area was something you could never forget. If you were from New York then you really felt it because the WTC was such a fixture not just to our skyline but also to what we many of us envisioned when you said New York.

September 11 was so traumatizing for folks, that I saw hardened thugs sharing kind words and hugging cops who lost many of their own that day. Even with the ghost of an unarmed Amadou Diallo and 41 shots just two or three years behind them people still reached out and showed love. I saw American flags being waved from rooftops and windows from hood to the burbs and not because we all found some sort xenophobic American pride, but because that flag was the only thing we had that symbolized our collective desire to connect to one another.

I recall shortly after 9-11 the Hip Hop community coming out. We had Dr Dre donating one million dollars to the victims relief fund. He and Eminem were working on a song that brought heat to Osama Bin Laden. In fact I recall Dre being on Fox 5 in New York spitting some incendiary lyrics. The song never came out. I’m not quite sure why.

I recall the Hip Hop has a Heart program they had on Hot 97 where all sorts of artists from Wu-Tang on down gave lots of money. I recall Wu-Tang donating money. I recall Naughty By Nature doing a fundraiser for the families of slain firefighters at Roseland. I recall Jay-Z wrapping himself up in the flag and taking a picture while MC Hammer did a song for the troops. I recall Canibus demanding that he be drafted to go fight. he later went and volunteered. I recall cats wearing red, white and blue doo rags talking about they’re thugging for America. I also recall artists like Mr Lif, J-Live, Jahi and the Life and so many others who sparked off songs about 9-11.

I recall Jermaine Dupri and a number of other artists including Christina Aguilera, Questlove, the Backstreet Boys, Mary J, Blige, Bono, Destiny’s Child, Fred Durst, Eve, Nelly Furtado, Nona Gaye (Marvin’s daughter), Ja Rule, Wyclef Jean, Alicia Keys, Aaron Lewis (of Staind), Lil’ Kim, Jennifer Lopez, Nas, Nelly, NSYNC, P. Diddy, Britney Spears and Gwen Stefani just to name a few, had did a remake of Marvin Gaye’s classic jam song ‘What’s Going On?’. The song was intended to bring attention to Aids in Africa, and had just been completed a few days before 9-11. Another verse was added and the song then went out to aid the families of the 9-11.

The world poured its heart out to us 7 years ago because back then we realized that ALL of us died on 9-11. It wasn’t just the crying suburban housewives wives who lost their husbands that day or chisel jawed all American fire fighters who lost their colleagues who are seemingly the only one’s shown and whose stories are told on these manipulative TV networks.

I remember all those undocumented Mexican restaurant workers who perished that day and because they were using fake names their families never got benefits. I recall that there were a number of Muslims who
perished but because it was Muslims who were the hijackers we somehow want to keep Muslims dehumanized so they can all be scapegoated.

There were single moms, brothers who were just barely making it, elderly Puerto Ricans, Asian folks, disabled, Native Americans, gays, straights and people from 59 different countries from Cuba to Canada to China and all around the world who all died in those towers and on those jets that crashed into the Pentagon and that field in Pennsylvania My home boy’s elderly Puerto Rican uncle perished that day, unfortunately his tale never makes the TV specials—probably because he didn’t work at a fancy law firm nor fit the bill of the type of person who needs to be showcased to satisfy so called Middle American viewers.

Hell, let’s be honest—seven years after 9-11, it has become a mass media event designed to satisfy the misguided whims of soccer now turned ‘hockey’ moms who want us all wearing flag pins. Healing and coming to terms with those real life losses isn’t really on the table. Ground Zero is not grave site, which interestingly enough is built upon a slave grave site, but instead its now become a mandated political pit stop for high profile politicians seeking to show the world just how ‘American’ they are.

Today as we commemorate the 7th anniversary, senators Barack Obama and John McCain will show up to Ground Zero this afternoon and try to look presidential. They’re gonna stand there and look all somber and try to show concern when really their visit is just one big photo op.

They say they are putting all politics aside for today, but their visit is nothing but political. Sure they may not snipe at one another, but they are only there to woo the people.

I have to raise the question were any of those men put and about touching lives before today’s 9-11 event? Did they show up in years past to this grave site to show their compassion? Have they ever called any of the families outside of today’s festivities just to offer a soothing word, a helping hand or to simply say that their concern goes beyond politics or is their appearance designed to satisfy people who weren’t really victims but somehow wanna ‘own’ and redefine 9-11?
I guess the word is out that if you play your cards right an appearance at Ground Zero can do wonders for your political career. Just ask George Bush and former NY Mayor Rudy Giuliani.

I'm still wondering how a day that was so tragic for so many got pimped to the point that an unpopular president who still had people salty at him for stealing an election just 9 months earlier and an even more unpopular mayor who was on his way to his political grave, managed to become the sole faces of it.

When 9-11 comes around I never ever forget how those two uncaring men came around and used their position and influence for political and material gain. The former New York mayor has a popular international consulting firm where he shows other countries like El Salvador the types of steps they need to take to fight terrorism.

In the case of George Bush can we say Iraq? 9-11 was his long awaited excuse to go wage war in the middle east. No matter what the so called media pundits and experts espouse, I am convinced that man at the very least, had prior knowledge. Like Jadakiss said in his song 'Bush knocked down the towers'.

Am I the only one who recalls then San Francisco Mayor Willie Brown stating during an interview that he had been warned not to fly that day?
Bay Area artists Paris who was among the first to do a song calling out the Bush and his Neo-Con friends within PNAC (Project for the New American Century) for the role they played in 9-11.

He painstakingly noted in his landmark song 'What Would You Do?' how Bush and company were hoping for a Pearl Harbor-like event and used 9-11 to carry out their game plan to exude global military influence around the world. The War in Iraq was first on the list.

We need to remember that when we think of 9-11.

We need to never forget how Bush and his cronies played upon everyone's emotions shortly after 9-11 and took people's desire to connect and our collective anxiousness and flipped it into a political witch hunt. I remember vividly how everyone's patriotism was suddenly called into question especially if you were in media, an artists, a professor or speaking from the pulpit. If you raised questioned there were political attack dogs on you.

If you was in media and you spoke out calls were made and pressure was put on those who owned those outlets to either silence you or let you go.
I know I fell victim to it at Clear Channel, Comedian Bill Maher fell victim to it with his show Politically Incorrect on ABC.
Professor Ward Churchill was fired from his post in Denver just last year because of his remarks around 9-11.

San Francisco Pastor and former SF Supervisor Amos Brown caught all kinds of hell when he dared raise the question 'What did we (America) do that 9-11 happened'?
He and other pastors including senator Barack Obamas' former pastor Jeremiah Wright as recently as April of this year caught hell for speaking out and raising questions about 9-11.

There were two newspaper columnist who were hounded out of their jobs by right wing Bushites when they wrote unfavorable columns.
Hell I even recall the host of Rap City getting mad at Chuck D for raising questions about 9-11. The list is along one for people who caught hell.
We should never forget the viciousness that was directed at Oakland Congresswoman Barbara Lee who days after 9-11 was the only one with enough sense and courage to say ‘No’ to George Bush when he asked for a what amounted to a blank check to fight the this new War on Terror.

I remember how Boots and the Coup came under fire because their album cover which was released 6 months prior to 9-11 showed the World Trade being blown up.

The pressure to conform and heed Bush’s assertion ‘either your for us or against us’ was hard for many especially those who talked to the masses to stand up to.

I remember attending a rally in Snow Park in Oakland the day after 9-11. It was put on by the folks from Lots Get Free which was designed to call attention to all the Muslims and Arab brothers and sisters who were suddenly catching hell because of the tragedy. I remember one of the organizer Jamani raising questions about our foreign policy decisions and whether or not it led to the attacks. I remember the issue was raised about our refusal to attend the racism summit in Durbon South Africa which was just days before the 9-11 tragedy and how that came across as us being arrogant.

I recall Michael Franti and the late poet June Jordan doing heartfelt poems and songs that called upon us to keep our humanity in check. Even though 9-11 had just happened, Franti noted how he could feel the pressure to really morph this into something that would have long term political implications. As for Jordan, it was sadly the last time I would see or hear her do a piece. She died a few months later.

There are lots of things to remember about 9-11. There were a lot of people who needlessly suffered that day. There was alot of political manipulation that took place in the aftermath. There are those who have done their best to make us forget what this day is really about.

By smiling and repeating a lie over and over and over again until it becomes truth, 9-11 went from being a day in which were humbled and came back showing a bit more concern and passion to being a propaganda piece and rallying tool for war mongers. There were lives lost that day, lets not lose sight of that. Let’s make sure those who suffered are healed.

Psssst... Have you heard the news? There's a new fashion blog, plus the latest fall trends and hair styles at StyleList.com.
Submitted on: 9/11/2008 1:16:08 PM

name: Tracie Broom

phone: ______

comments: I agree wholeheartedly with Sup. Ammiano's letter, copied below!!

Supervisor Ammiano inquires:

"Letter of Inquiry to the District Attorney, City Attorney, Mayor's Office, and ALL City Departments.

I had a very constructive meeting yesterday with the Chief and her command staff, together with the Mission Community Response network. We discussed how the SFPD and the CBOS would need to coordinate and share information in the future. My office will continue to facilitate this dialogue until an appropriate level of coordination has become institutionalized the norm amongst all sides of the violence prevention community, community and law enforcement.

In the last few days, we have heard from an alarming number of constituents that the extra officers deployed to patrol the Mission have been on Mission street, posted in front of locales like the "Foreign Cinema", and Valencia street bars where little gang violence is known to occur.

Perceptions like these do not help the department's image nor efforts to build the prerequisite trust with the community necessary in order to prevent violence and pursue investigations to a fruitful conclusion. What's more, many officers were assumed to be newer recruits, if for no other reason than who they decided to stop, question, and search. This judgment may have been made in error, but I would like to know who, demographically speaking, from the department has been deployed.

In less turbulent times, Mission station, which has the highest volume of calls of any precinct in the city, has had a staff of 160 officers. Now it has only between 105-110 at any given time. This level of staffing is plainly inadequate. Some precincts without doubt require more staffing than others. We need 50-60 more officers now. There is uniform agreement amongst my constituents that a redeployment of the SFPD's forces to the Mission must happen, and must be sustained for the foreseeable future.

I will not tolerate an abandonment of the Mission after a few days or weeks of what may be relative calm. The current levels of staffing simply do not insure an acceptable level of safety in the Mission. What sort of redeployment does the Chief envision going forward?

The original promise from the Mayor's office with regard to the installation of a Shotspotter gunfire detection system in the Mission was that one would be deployed within 60 days of an efficacy test of existing systems. We are now very long overdue. When exactly will the system be installed and what area exactly will it cover?
To the Office of the District Attorney and the SFPD, please explain the disturbing lack of suspects, arrests, and thus successful prosecutions with respect to violence in the Mission.

To the City Attorney, I have been supportive of the gang injunction because it seemed to hold the potential to reduce violence in the Mission. This has not happened yet. Please explain how the injunction has positively impacted the plague of violence in the Mission, and what its future prospects are.

Over the next week, I will be working with the Controller’s Office, our Budget Analyst, violence prevention advocates in the community, and the law enforcement to secure any and all necessary funding to ensure that City government and its community partners are appropriately equipped to address the ongoing violence in the Mission.

Additionally, I will be looking for
- money for neighborhood Rec centers to be open at night
- for more access to vans used by CBOs to provide safe passage out of harm’s way to the youth of the Mission
- And a progress report on what drastic and needed changes have been made, since the audit I commissioned, to the City's previously lackluster Workforce development programs, and how workforce development will be retooling its efforts to train the Mission's young people for jobs.

This city has a 6.2 billion dollar budget, and the matter securing money to address violence in the Mission is one of priorities, not of available funds. There are a wide array of things the city currently spends money on which, under the circumstances, should obviously be prioritized as less urgent than the dedication of any and all resources to confronting the tide of violence in the Mission."

---
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While you are legislating what people buy, you forgot to force all stores in the city to remove everything that is "harmful to one's health" - like sugar, flour, ice cream and most fruits and vegetables (as the majority still have pesticides on them!) from their shelves. IF you really wanted to be "righteous" you would refuse to accept the taxes you get from the sale of cigarettes at all!

The only grocery store (that I could afford to shop in!) within two miles of my apt closed three years ago. Since then, I have "made do" purchasing most things I need from the nearby Walgreens.

IF this idiotic law of yours about not letting pharmacies sell cigarettes does go through, I will drive to the peninsula and do all my shopping so you will not get a single penny in sales tax from me AND I will purchase my cigarettes direct from the reservations so the state will not get a penny of those sales taxes either!

You cannot honestly believe that not allowing me to buy cigarettes in a pharmacy is going to get me to quit OR keep people from smoking.

It is no wonder San Francisco continues to be the "laughing stock" of the world!

Bonnie Birk
A Registered and active voter!
Submitted on: 9/10/2008 2:55:35 PM

name: Laurie Estrada

phone:

comments: To Tom Ammiano - District 9

Aside from the current shootings and killings of 7 people in your district, there are other issues going on. Not only are there never enough police in the area, but the garbage, the park (Garfield) and the pool is unkept and drunks are allowed to hang out while children play. What are you going to do about this? By the way you need to have a more professional person answer your phone. The one you have working is quite the whiner.

---
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Attn: San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1Dr.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
facsimile transmittal

To: Angela Calvillo  
Clerk of the Board
Fax: 415-554-5163

From: Tanya M. Peterson, Executive Director  
San Francisco Zoo
Date: 09-08-08

Re: Supervisor Daly's Rescue Zoo Legislation

We would appreciate this fax being added to the already existing documentation submitted against Supervisor Daly's proposed legislation and distributed to each supervisor today.

If you have any questions, please contact Katie Davis, executive assistant, at 415-753-7123 or katied@sfzoo.org.

The San Francisco Zoological Society  
1 Zoo Road  
San Francisco, CA 94132-1098  
(415) 753-7080  Fax: (415) 681-2039
Dear

I am writing in connection to the hearings regarding transforming the San Francisco Zoo into a rescue facility.

I do this with a vast amount of experience. I have been on the Board of Directors of the zoo since 1979, and was Chairman for five years. I also know something about rescue in that I am the current Chairman of the Board of the Marine Mammal Center, the largest organization in the world devoted to the rescue, rehabilitation and release of injured and sick marine mammals.

I am strongly opposed to converting the zoo to rescue, for many reasons. The zoo was not built, as TMMC is, to be a rescue facility. While the zoo has commendable veterinary services, the bulk of the area consists of exhibits and displays for animals and birds. On the other hand, TMMC is built to be a hospital, since that is its purpose. If the zoo becomes a rescue zoo, one cannot just retrieve a wounded animal, throw it into a cage and expect that animal to suddenly regain health.

The zoo was largely built, since I became a board member, with private funds. I have personally given over $500,000 to the zoo, largely for new exhibits, and have solicited more than $10 million from individuals, foundations and corporations for the same purposes. I assure you that we donors would be not only outraged to see the exhibits converted to rescue purposes, and I assure you my donations, and those from the other sources mentioned above, will cease.

The proponents of a rescue zoo decry what they consider sub-standard animal care. It is well documented how the zoo came to acquire two grizzly bears who were about to be euthanized. After they arrived the zoo built them a new facility costing $3.7 million. This exhibit is widely considered the finest grizzly exhibit in the world and draws large crowds. If the proponents had taken over, five years ago at the time of the grizzly acquisition, they probably would have been placed in an existing bear grotto and there they would have remained. It takes money to run a zoo, and I have sincere doubts that they proponents have access to significant amounts of money.

I have severe reservations over what would happen to the employees of the zoo should it be forced to convert to rescue status. You have already heard from many
of them as well as quite a few docents. All of them work at the zoo due to a love of animals and a desire to see them flourish. Most of them enjoy talking to our visitors. Believe me, it is an entirely different culture from The Marine Mammal Center. At TMMC, we are able to release 50% of the rescued animals back to the sea. Unfortunately, this means we have to euthanize, or watch die, the other 50%. This takes a fortitude that I do not see at the zoo.

I could go on and on, but I suspect some of what I would write would be duplicative of other efforts. I have tried to illustrate from my somewhat unique point of view why a rescue zoo should not be considered at this time, or ever.

Sincerely Yours,

Merrill Lynch Magowan
To Whom It May Concern:

I am a volunteer at the San Francisco Zoo as well as a native San Franciscan. I am surprised a major city such as San Francisco would even consider the possibility of not having a Zoo. Every major city in the United States proudly supports their Zoo. But that aside, the Zoo is an educational fount for the youth of today and our hope for tomorrow as well as for us older folks. I could hardly wait to retire so I could volunteer to work with the animals at the Zoo. I was taught by a 20 something old young woman who had been with the Zoo programs since she was 12 and just recently became a keeper. The Nature Trail program is a wonderful program, in fact my grandson who lives in Long Beach spent a summer here in order to participate in this program. He loved it, but missed his brother, Mom and friends in Long Beach. Three months is a long time when you are 12. That is only one of many educational programs for youth and adults. Where would our national bird the bald eagle be without our Zoo. Our breeding program made California a bald eagle state again. We are also doing a good job in our Lemur program as well as recently restoring the California Garter Snake into our area again, it too was non-existent. The San Diego Zoo is also part of this program. We are showing our youth and hopefully impressing on our adults the need to keep our animal population alive and well. Recently we had an event at the Zoo where all the eating tools (plates, forks, spoons and cups) were compost able. The children knew where to put the various items (we had trash, recycle and compost). The adults didn't have a clue on the most part. I asked some of the children where they learned this process and they said their schools and the Zoo.

Even the events the Zoo hosts are educational and also fun with a capital F. Our Children's Zoo is the most popular place at the Zoo and I work there also. The interaction between the children and the animals are a joy. Yes some are scared, but in time are encouraged to try brushing or petting the goats and sheep and usually leave very happy. Where else could city kids enjoy the diverse collection of animals we have. I also work at the Animal Resource which houses the animals for the Zoo Mobile which takes our programs with animals into the classrooms as well as to senior citizen centers. This is also the home of the Nature Trail Program which runs each summer using children age 12 to 18 as teachers. They start presenting animals and must learn their facts before they can do this, they then progress (after 2 years or so) to the a Junior Zoologist who then helps take care of the animals physically and mentors the younger children. Once they are 18 they become an adult volunteer and many attend colleges that have animal husbandry classes. Many come back to our Zoo to be staff members and we should be proud of them.

I ask why you would take a good place like this away from all the people who love it. If bet if you put this on the ballet and had the citizens of San Francisco vote on this, the Zoo as we love it now would remain as is.

Thank you,

Patricia K. Perruquet
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San Francisco
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., Rm 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to you about the SF Zoo. The zoo management needs to be replaced with more progressive professionals who are dedicated to transforming the zoo into one that puts the animal's needs first, and that includes the animal's physical, social and psychological needs. The zoo's mission should focus on rescue and rehabilitation of animals, and not on exploitation and entertainment.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this very important matter.

Sincerely,

Serena Seo
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 into 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,
Roswitha von Heissen
Submitted on: 9/9/2008 8:04:20 AM

name: Tom Cooke

phone: 

comments: I urge you to vote no on the Chris Daly's proposed changes to the smoking ordinances in SF. This is another attempt by Daly's "Progressive" agenda to control private activities of San Franciscans. The current system and ordinances work fine—we don't need this ridiculous overreaching governmental intrusion!!!!

TELL DALY "NO"!

User Data
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Submitted on: 9/9/2008 5:29:39 AM

name: Mark Behrens

phone:  

comments: To all members of the Board of Supervisors: I urge you to vote against the new, harsh, expanded smoking prohibition legislation.

I am fed up with the ever increasing demonization and persecution of smokers.

I am fed up with the erosion of personal freedoms regarding the use of a legal product.

I am fed up with the accelerating attack on the rights of property and business owners.

I am fed up with the uncritical addiction to junk science shown by politicians and the news media, especially in regard to second hand smoke, and the cowardly behavior by politicians caving in to every pressure and fraudulent lie from the professional antismokers, and the seemingly deliberate ignoring of much more accurate science from many sources just because it doesn't happen to fit a current social fad.

I am fed up with politicians and "activists" and their dependence on arrogant social engineering schemes and the elitist mindset behind them: The presumption that you know how everyone should live, and by god you're going to force us to do it, and if any of us, the socially engineered, don't like it, well, that's not even relevant, is it?

I'm fed up with politicians who claim to be "progressive" having so little commitment to freedom.

When the state smoking prohibition law went into effect in the last decade I quit going to bars and restaurants except for those infrequent occasions where social or professional obligation requires it, OR for those places that can allow smoking legally, such as owner operated bars, bars and restaurants with comfortable outside tables, and at tobacconists. Otherwise, bars and restaurants no longer get my money. Now you even want to ban smoking in those few remaining places. How incredibly uncivilized and inhospitable can you be? If smoking is prohibited even in those last places I will not go out to eat or drink AT ALL. No bar or restaurant will ever get my money again.

Why not consider the general public, and not just take your marching orders from the likes of that old fraudster Stanton Glantz at UCSF, or the Director of the Public Health Department, Mr. Katz, whose statements on the topic are nothing less than fascist. (And I use the term with accuracy; try studying the history of the Nazis and their tobacco policies. Ditto the Taliban and Al Qaeda. All of them were/are fanatical antismokers.)

I'm so fed up on the topic that it has come to this: From now on, even though
I have never been a single issue voter. I will no longer vote for anyone who votes for more, or expanded, antismoking measures, or any other personal lifestyle heavy-handed legislation. I don't need to be "taught", or "encouraged", or any other euphemism for legal arm twisting. Provide me with as much information as you like (and it better be accurate), and then give me the respect to know how to make up my own mind, especially regarding the use of legal products.

---
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From: Christian Holmer [mailto:mailto:csr.sf.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2008 1:57 PM
To: 'Marim Morley'; 'Paula Jesson'; 'Mayor G Newsom'; 'Ron Vinson'; 'Chris Vein'; 'Hello Trent Rhorer'; 'Nathan (WS0052) Ballard@sf.gov'; 'Brian (WS0076) Purchia'; 'Giselle (WS0023) Barry'; 'Erin (WS0051) Garvey'; 'David (WS0054) Miree'; 'Shirley (WS0052) Chou'; 'Mike (WS0020) Farrah@sf.gov'; 'Wade.Crowfoot@sf.gov'; 'Wade.Crowfoot@sf.gov'; 'Wade.Crowfoot@sf.gov'; 'Goodbye Phil Ginsburg'; 'Paul.Zarefsky@sf.gov
Cc: Norman.Goldwyn@eim.org; 'SOTP'; 'Paul (WS0001) Callender'; 'Ethics Commission Director'; 'districtattorney@sf.gov'; 'Allen Grossman'; 'w_lanier@'; 'Josh Wolf'; 'Bruce Wolfe'; 'istasiahr@' —— James Chaffee'; 'Peter Warfield'; 'MARTIN L MACINTYRE'; 'Pmonette-shaw@' —— 'Kimo Crossman'; 'sf.voter_education_project@yahoo.com'; 'Herb (DTIS) Tong'; 'Richard (DTIS) Robinson'; 'Thomas (DTIS DCA) Long'; 'Brian (DTIS) Roberts'; 'home@prosf.org'; 'Sunshine Posse'; 'istasiahr@'; 'Joe Lynn'; 'h. brown'; 'Angela Calvillo'; 'Board of Supervisors'; 'Jake McGoldrick'; 'D2 - Michelle Alioto-Pier'; 'Aaron Peskin'; 'Ed Jew'; 'Ross Mirkarimi'; 'Chris Daly'; 'Sean Elsbernd'; 'Bevan Dufty'; 'tom.ammann@sf.gov'; 'Gerardo Sandoval'; 'Sophie Maxwell'; 'pro.sf@yahoo.com'; 'Steve Jones'

Importance: High

Marilyn Morley (Interim Supervisor of Records - Paula Jesson, The Acting DCA Who Is Helping Us With This Request Is Out Until 09/22/08). Zarefsky Told Me You Were Acting Supe of Records And Shes Gone For A Few Weeks So Heres an Easy One.

Paula Already Ruled These As Public Records And She Has Been Expecting Submissions from the Mayors Office for Over a Month. Could You Check In With Them (Rhorer and Co.) And See What Portion Of Responsive Documents are Stored Off Site With GRM Information services and Which Portion Are Readily Accessible Electronically?

Acting CA Supervisor of Records (Marilyn Morley): May Ask to You Refer Item One (#1) To Attorney General Jerry Brown: 123 Weeks (in a row) Outstanding: These are Exceedingly Overdue Requests for the Most Public of Documents.

1. 2 Years 4+ Months (123 Verifiable) Weeks and For Each a Separate Logged and Dated Request) Outstanding SFSM Requests: Copies off Public Records & PRESS Requests Received By Mayors Office Weekly: Outstanding Request For Mayors Office Sunshine Log (See Attached Sunshine / CPRA/Press Logs from Ethics Commission and Controllers Office).


SFSM Information Clearinghouse
SFSM 2008 Sunshine Data Request Related Correspondence

Pursuant to BOS Resolution #040694

From: Christian Holmer [mailto:mailtocsrf.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 17, 2008 11:30 AM
To: [Email Address]


CA Supervisor of Records (Paula): May Ask to You Refer Item One (#1) To Attorney General Jerry Brown: 118 Weeks (in a row) Outstanding: These are Exceedingly Overdue Requests for the Most Public of Documents.

1. 2 Years 3 Months (118 Weeks and For Each a Sepated Dated Request) Outstanding SFSM Requests: Copies off Public Records & PRESS Requests Received By Mayors Office Weekly: Outstanding Request For Mayors Office Sunshine Log (See This Weeks Sunshine Logs from Ethics Commission and Controllers Office).


DTIS Staff (Ron, Chris)
3. Mayors Office Servers Still Handled by City Administrators Staff? Files Subject To This Request In The Sole Possession or the Mayors Office, Her Employees, The City Administrators Office or GRM Information Services? Is the DTIS/Cisco Trying To Access Any of These Subject Files Or Locations They Reside As A Result of Those Actions Taken By DTIS Employee Held By DA?

Yes/No

Christian Holmer
SFSM Information Clearinghouse
SFSM 2008 Sunshine Data Request Related Correspondence
Pursuant to BOS Resolution #040694
We have been unable to find any mention of 9/11 remembrances planned by this city. Does that mean you're just going to ignore the anniversary, or would an observance coincide with something really important, like a bike race or a mardi gras?

We are not surprised by this lack of respect for anything besides your pet projects. Perhaps you plan to memorialize the jihadists who killed nearly 3000 people in 2001. That would be more the style of SF officials.

M & R Recker
SF
When the Big One strikes - do we have a rescue plan that works?

http://www.franciscodacosta.com/articles/oped152.html

Francisco Da Costa
WHEN THE BIG ONE HITS (9/12/08)

In 1989 when the Big One struck some of us that saw what we saw - as will the so called first responders - it, struck home the intensity of the focused information and resources that are needed to address death, injury, rescue, outreach, and all that goes to address the worst - calamities.

It does not help when the San Francisco Office of Emergency Services thinks it can gather heads of Departments from San Francisco and others - address a Big Earthquake, related issues or some other natural calamity striking San Francisco - and keeps addressing - the issues in vague - generalities.

The Mayor of San Francisco opened his big mouth and started by saying our sister city Haifa - have emergency exercises where the whole City of Haifa - with no exception participate in emergencies exercises and that San Francisco should do the same. It is this type of nonsense talk that betrays the ignorance of Mayor Gavin Newsom.

If we invited the authorities that conduct the Haifa emergency exercises, and Haifa is in Israel - the first thing the Haifa authorities would ask us is to review our empirical data and our Standard Operating Procedures linked to each quadrant in the City and County of San Francisco.

The population of San Francisco is about 760,000 - that grows to over 1.2 million daily. If the Big One strikes us as any other major calamity natural or otherwise - we San Franciscans are in deep trouble. San Francisco Office of Emergency Services loves to talk the talk but fails to walk the walk.

At the meeting held on September 12, 2008 at Pier 48 closer to Mission Bay - San Francisco City Department Heads were present. Our best equipment used in various emergencies were on display and so were the so called experts - that did not expect some ordinary citizens to ask them poignant questions only, to get drab and silly - answers.

The San Francisco Office of Emergency Services has come a long way from the days of Ann Marie Conroy but it still is managed by a few folks that have no clue about San Francisco and the seriousness of the emergency situations at hand. Of course they talk the talk - only because they make the big bucks but have little if nothing to show for huge salaries they earn - paid by the tax payers.

According to the United States Geological Survey and the excellent information on the website - we, in San Francisco are prime targets for a Big Earthquake. We also know that the areas that will be most prone to damage will be those areas that are landfill and areas that have soil that is not sturdy.

The Office of Emergency Service must learn to respect the community. Gone are the days when jerks could talk and get away with murder. Ever since Katrina we have learned a lot. We have learned from Gustav another well know hurricane - but we are learning more from Ike - and will learn more from other hurricanes that are on their way - pertaining to Emergencies Services.

We are fortunate that since 1989 we have not experienced a major Earthquake. However, we know one is in the pipeline - waiting to happen. We know the manner, the San Francisco Office of

Emergency Services is operating - we will experience serious difficulties and the Southeast Sector will suffer the most.

Over ninety percent of the Hunters Point Shipyard is landfill. The Final Historical Radiological Assessment - a document prepared by the United States Navy gives detail information about radiological elements and there are other documents that speak of heavy metals like mercury, lead and other contaminants. Any land that is landfill is prone to heavy damage when a Big Earthquake strikes.

Yet, Mayor Gavin Newsom and some dubious entities want to build tall buildings on the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. More, a stadium that these fools think - serves some purpose - even though only ten football games - will be played a year. A Causeway is planned on land prone to liquefaction leading the proposed Stadium on Hunters Point.

The whole of Candlestick Point is prone to liquefaction and the tall buildings planned in this location - will, all come tumbling down and will be demolished. We must learn to respect Nature - but many in this City are so full of greed that they are defying Mother Nature.

The Office of Emergency Services continues to talk the talk but soon it must learn to walk the walk. It must do this because San Franciscans have spoken and the Office of Emergency Services does not seem to comprehend what the community is saying. Do we have an Emergency Plan - complete with detail plans - rescue, injury, evacuation and so on for the Bayview Hunters Point that we can review?

Can San Franciscans review the empirical data so that we can invite experts to give their input - since years have gone by and the Office of Emergency Services continues to fail and does so by talking the talk and failing to walk the walk.

photos

top - back
Dear Melissa:

Thanks for alerting us to the going-ons at SF, especially the first two issues, which are very important to the City dwellers.

The first issue where parents are rightfully upset and complain the most about the incomprehensible and ridiculous process where they cannot send their children to the school a block away. Supervisor Carmen Chu is trying to serve the SF citizens properly, especially the parents in introducing a resolution urging the SFUSD to "reconsider the current school assignment system to ensure students a greater chance of attending a neighborhood school".

I agree with Sean Elsbernd that after just giving $60 million from the city budget, it should allow the Board to lean on SFUSD to satisfy the needs of the parents who are paying the taxes from which this money comes from. I also fully agree with Supervisor Gerardo Sandoval's that the priorities of the Board is out of whack, ignoring the basic duties to the concerns of the SF citizens, because they are too busy trying to formulate foreign policies ("telling Chinese government and our Federal Government what to do") which is not in their domain or their responsibilities. I am sorry to see some Board members shirked their duties to deal with the important concern of SF citizens, but have time for other shenanigans.

On issue 2, I also agree with our District 7 Supervisor, Sean Elsbernd, to vote down Daly's ordinance that would make the San Francisco Zoo into an animal-rescue facility. The Zoo is a refuge that the families with children can go to for a relaxing traffic-free place. The Board should be utilizing its time to make it a safe haven for the families of SF.

Keep on shaming the "authorities" or shall I say "idiots" fantasizing they are running the U.S. State Department, and out of touch with the needs of SF citizens they are supposed to
be serving.

Sincerely regards,

M. Tin Wa, Ph.D.
Dear Supervisors: City Operations & Neighborhood Services Committee: Chu, McGoldrick, and Elsbernd:

Re: Street Sweeping

At least most streets in SF get mechanical street swept. We live on Teresita Blvd. - one of the longest major through feres and virtually NONE OF IT IS SWEPT - ever.

We checked into it and DPW told us that we have to collect signatures on a petition from 75% of ALL RESIDENTS all the way up and down the highest hill in the City (Mt. Davidson) indicating resident approval of street sweeping. Our unscientific math says that is about 2,300 signatures... unreasonable, unfair, and a cop-out!

We'd be happy to have ANY SWEETING on Teresita - even if only once/month!! While DPW is reducing sweeping elsewhere - please ADD US TO THE LIST to get SOME SWEETING.

Before you ask why we don't get sweeping - we don't know how it got to that (some old timers are still mad about it), but one of the reasons we've heard is that people got used to using their garages as extensions of their living quarters, stopped putting their cars in garages, and don't want to be bothered with moving cars. The number of cars per household in our immediate area has increased exponentially - we'll talk about paved-over fronts and turning them into parking lots later.

We are tired of all the trash that collects in front of our house and want our share of services for the taxes we pay so that everyone but us can receive street cleaning services.

Thanks,
Andrea & Rick O'Leary

Psssst...Have you heard the news? There's a new fashion blog, plus the latest fall trends and hair styles at StyleList.com.
Scary video on election fraud, released by UCSB Security team--UPDATE w/video ©
by SmartAleg [Subscribe]
Tue Sep 09, 2008 at 02:53:46 PM PDT

Sequoia Voting Systems, a major provider of electronic voting machines to the United States, has a little problem with its security. Turns out, the machines are not so difficult to tamper with—even the paper trail can be jiggered as well. Follow me below the fold for the rest of the story...

- SmartAleg's diary :: ::

The Computer Security Group at UC Santa Barbara has a lot of interesting security projects going on—these guys are the ones you want to talk to to find out whether or not your system is vulnerable to tampering. So, in the wake of the "hanging chad" issue of 2000, where Sequoia was implicated by its own employees in a scheme to drive sales of electronic voting machines by distributing deliberately poorly made paper ballots to West Palm Beach, FL for the presidential elections (reported by Dan Rather in 2007 --redacted Wired article here,) there has been a lot of scrutiny of Sequoia Systems voting machines.

In March of 2008, Professor Edward Felten received a rather telling email from Sequoia requiring that he cease and desist from any attempts to audit the security of their machines under threat of legal action. You might recall Prof. Felten as the person who showed how easily Diebold machines could be hacked by an enterprising and not terribly technically minded person. Prof. Felten published the email in its entirety on his Freedom to Tinker blog site. So it seems obvious that Sequoia does not welcome "unauthorized" (one is tempted to translate that as "competent" or perhaps "unbiased") auditing and testing of its machines.

Which brings us to the UCSB team. In a very thorough, one might say exhaustive report, the team shows exactly how a Sequoia Systems voting machine can be hacked before it ever gets to a polling place, using a program small enough to fit on a USB thumb drive. In fact, as the video on
the site proves, there are five scenarios in which the votes can be easily switched from one
candidate to the preprogrammed preferred candidate, and it clearly demonstrates that the paper
receipt trail that accompanies the electronic vote is jiggered to show the false result as well. All
it would take is one determined person getting hold of the voting machines before the
election--and it wouldn't need to be right before, just sometime before--and the machines will
make sure that no matter HOW the actual votes are cast, the preferred candidate will receive the
vote.

This is some chilling stuff, people. While we're all focussing on the Palin avalanche of dirt and
muck, giving her the attention and diversion they need, operatives can quietly be loading
malware onto the voting machines to make sure our votes don't go where we want them to go.
All it takes is the MSM massaging the data to make the polls seem artificially close, using the
Palin mess to show how she's "energizing the base," and "getting out the conservative vote" to
muddy the waters further, and then afterwards we all sit, once again, in shocked amazement at
the "close race" that resulted in yet another victory for the Rove team.

I realize this isn't as sexy as yet another "OMG, Palin is teh suxxorz!" diary with juicy details of
the latest and greatest malfeasance and scandal. However, the more attention that goes to those
stories and diaries, the less goes to the very real, very scary nuts and bolts methods of making
sure elections go the way certain people want them to go. Republicans are very, very good at
handwaving and dismissing information that ought to be damaging to them, and they are
incredibly good at disinformation campaigns that paint people like the UCSB Security Team and
Prof. Edward Felten and those who listen to them as "cranks" and "crackpots" and "conspiracy
theorists." The thing is, just as a paranoid can have real enemies, a "conspiracy theorist" can and
often does uncover very real conspiracies. Voter fraud is a huge elephant in the room, and if we
don't pay attention to it, the thing is likely to trample us flat. Just like it did in 2000. Just like it
did in 2004.

We tend, as liberal type smart people, to completely dismiss the Republicans as technologically
incompetent because their web sites are crappy and amateurish, they can't manage a live
streaming video feed of their convention and their candidate doesn't know how to "do a google."
However, they know perfectly well how technology can help them out when they need it, and
seeming to be stupid on the subject gives them plausible deniability--the old "Who, stupid l'il old
me?" defense. This is a flaw in our thinking that we can't afford.

The Republicans have proven over and over that they're smart enough to jigger elections. We
have it right in front of our noses that these electronic voting machines are pretty easy to tamper
with. We need to get the spotlight out on our local security for voting machines, and question
any results that seem off. Most importantly, we need a candidate who will NOT concede, no
matter how convincing the evidence, until it's proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that there was
no tampering if the unthinkable happens and the election goes to McCain.

UPDATE: Okay, the video is on YouTube now, which is great because the old site was
going slammed by Slashdot traffic.
The Recreation & Park Commission is set to approve construction of the North Beach library on 4100 sq. ft. parcel the city took by eminent domain (for $2.8 million) to turn into a park. The site was originally an Exxon service station.

We have reviewed documents at the Department of Public Health, including a geotechnical report. There is not conclusive evidence that the underground tanks have been mitigated and that the area is clean.

I would encourage inquiry on this point.

Sue Cauthen, Chair  
BOS Library Citizens Advisory Committee (speaking for myself)

PS: Enclosed is an article that appeared in the September 8 issue of the SF Flier.
Subject: San Francisco Flier: Doing the Palin Polka; North Beach Library

New in the San Francisco Flier:

September 8, 2008

BETSEY CULP

Doing the Palin Polka

Hey, guys! John McCain really did a number on you when he selected Sarah Palin as his running mate. And he’s been jerking your chains ever since. Why did you let John McCain jerk your chain last week? There’s been a whole lotta jerkin’ goin’ on. And y’all did a cute little dance in response, jumping up and down, back and forth.

To read more, click here.

North Beach Library: Politics Trumps Reason

SUE CAUTHEN

The City’s attempts to modernize a branch library are shaking up North Beach. The seemingly innocent endeavor has all the earmarks of back-room dealing: secret meetings at the highest level, coercion of the uninstructed, naïve blundering. Its ripple effect touches every one of the 28 libraries in San Francisco. What started as an effort to deliver a cutting-edge library to the neighborhood has devolved into a boondoggle that could tie up library funding for years to come. The ultimate fall guys: library patrons and the taxpayers.

To read more, click here.

San Francisco Flier
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