The Elections Commission has reviewed and agrees with the Director of Elections’ recommendation for a waiver to allow a certain number of City Employees to assist the Department of Elections with the conduct of the November 4, 2008 General Election.

This request for a waiver to allow City employees to assist the Department of Elections is made under provisions of City & County of San Francisco Charter section 13.104.5.

The Elections Commission of the City & County of San Francisco agrees with this recommendation for the waiver as submitted by the Director of Elections and forwards this request to grant the waiver to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors.

In forwarding this request to grant the waiver, the Elections Commission respectfully asks that the Board of Supervisors make note of the limited number of City employees requested. These City employees have specific technical skills which will assist the Department of Elections with the conduct of the election. The specific number is mentioned by the Director of Elections on the last page of the attached waiver recommendation.

The Elections Commission greatly appreciates the Board of Supervisors’ immediate attention to this request.

cc: Gerard Gleason, Commission President
Memorandum

To: Elections Commission

From: John Arntz, Director

Date: October 16, 2008

Re: Waiver Allowing City Employees to Assist the Department of Elections with the November 4, 2008 Consolidated General Election

This memorandum requests that the Elections Commission approve the Department of Elections' (Department) request for the Board of Supervisors to waive the prohibition under Charter section 13.104.5 that disallows City employees from assisting the Department in the conduct of elections. The Department seeks a general waiver of this prohibition so the Department is able to utilize the services and expertise of City personnel when necessary; however, the Department presently expects to require the assistance of approximately 10 people from other City departments.

The Department will require technical assistance to upload the vote tallies contained in the memory packs that will be transported from each polling place to City Hall, as well as preparing the information for results reporting. The memory packs record the voting that occurs in the polling places on vote tabulation machines. The City personnel will assist in uploading the voting information contained inside the memory packs into the central count system located in the Department's computer room in City Hall Room 48.

While the uploading of the voting information from the memory packs will last a few hours after the polls close, the Charter prohibits City personnel from providing such assistance to the Department. (13.104.5).

Except as provided below, no City employee or officer, other than the Director of Elections, an appointee of the Director of Elections or a member of the Elections Commission, may in any capacity perform any function relating to the conduct of an election that this Charter places under the Department of Elections. This section prohibits City personnel from providing to the Department of Elections services that are unique to that department. . . . The Elections Commission may, upon the recommendation of the Director of Elections request from the Board of
Supervisors a waiver of this prohibition so as to allow City employees and officers to assist the Department of Elections. The Board of Supervisors shall approve or deny such requests from the Elections Commission by motion.

The Department does seek to conduct elections exclusively with its permanent and temporary staff, but we find it necessary in some instances to utilize the skills of City personnel who work with other departments. Thus, after considering staffing needs for the November 4, 2008 Consolidated General Election, I recommend that the Elections Commission request from the Board of Supervisors a waiver of the prohibition of City employees performing election-related tasks and allow City personnel to assist the Department of Elections.

The Department requests that this be a general waiver in order to provide flexibility in planning for the election. Still, at this time the Department has identified the need for the assistance of six people from other City Departments. The five personnel are expected to work in the departments listed in the attachment to this memorandum.

I will be glad to answer any questions you might have on this matter.

Encl; waiver request list
October 16, 2008

Re: Waiver Allowing City Employees to Assist the Department of Elections with the November 4, 2008 Consolidated General Election

TECHNICAL SUPPORT
Number of City Employees: 10
Departments: Department of Technology, General Services Agency, and City Attorney’s Office.
October 16, 2008

Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Sir or Madam:

The attached report is submitted pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25180.7.

The report documents information regarding the illegal discharge (or threatened illegal discharge) of hazardous waste, which could cause substantial injury to the public health or safety.

The report is submitted on behalf of all designated employees of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

Sincerely,

Kim C. Le
District Office Chief
Office of Maintenance Services

Attachment
### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### PROPOSITION 65 REPORTING FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY:</th>
<th>DATE REPORTED:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Office of Maintenance Services 111 Grand Avenue Oakland, CA 94612</td>
<td>October 15, 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORTED BY:</th>
<th>TELEPHONE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neil Lundgren</td>
<td>(510) 286-4492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME:</th>
<th>ADDRESS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:44 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE OF INCIDENT:</th>
<th>ROUTE:</th>
<th>POST MILE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 27, 2008</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY OF INCIDENT:</th>
<th>OWNER:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION CAUSE OF ACCIDENT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leaking fuel tank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY NAME:</th>
<th>TELEPHONE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFICATION OF DISCHARGE WASTE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diesel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHEMICAL NAME COMMON NAME:</th>
<th>PHYSICAL STATE:</th>
<th>VOLUME:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diesel fuel</td>
<td>Liquid</td>
<td>8.00 Gallons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENT AFFECTED:</th>
<th>LOCALE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer or Storm Drain</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay/Ocean</td>
<td>Other Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Public Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Private Property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF EXTENT OF CONTAMINATION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fuel in roadway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF PERSONS REPORTEDLY INJURED:</th>
<th>MEDICAL TREATMENT RECEIVED:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER PERTINENT INFORMATION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean up completed by Caltrans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: October 21, 2008

TO: Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

FROM: Micki Callahan
Human Resources Director

SUBJECT: Quarterly Report of Economic Settlements

The attached report lists the economic grievance settlements approved pursuant to Chapter 10, Article II, Section 10.25-12, of the San Francisco Administrative Code for FY 2006-2007, 2007-2008 and July 1, 2008 through September 30, 2008. The reports provide data required by Section 10.25-12(c).
# Quarterly Report of Economic Grievance Settlements Pursuant to Section 1, Article II
Section 10.25-12(c) of the San Francisco Administrative Code
Fiscal Year 2006 - 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File No.</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>No. of Employees Affected</th>
<th>Reason for Settlement</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27-06-1510</td>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back pay for distribution operator certificate premium</td>
<td>$1,193.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-06-1519</td>
<td>AAM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back pay for supervisory differential</td>
<td>$3,316.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-06-1495</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td></td>
<td>Refund Union for FY 05-06 Employee Development Fund</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-05-1403</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Floating holidays</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-06-1512</td>
<td>DPH-LHH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Parking expenses</td>
<td>$775.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-05-1444</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back pay for one day suspension</td>
<td>$239.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-06-1508</td>
<td>JUV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back pay for reduced 5 day suspension to 1 day</td>
<td>$827.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-06-1475</td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acting assignment pay</td>
<td>$3,389.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-06-1521</td>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back pay for 16 hrs of overtime</td>
<td>$948.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## July 1, 2006 – September 30, 2006

## October 1, 2006 – December 31, 2006

| 17-06-1507 | CSS        | 1                          | Back pay for 5 day suspension                              | $1,596.50  |
| 81-05-1580 | DPH-SFGH   | 1                          | Failure to pay same salary step                            | $16,780.55 |
| 29-06-1541 | PLN        | 1                          | Acting assignment pay                                      | $10,000.00 |
| 40-05-1446 | PUC        | 86                         | Standby Pay                                                | $167,090.33|
| 06-06-1521 | Sheriff    | 1                          | Back pay for 16 hrs. of overtime                           | $948.00    |

## January 1, 2007 – March 31, 2007

<p>| 27-07-1593 | AIR        | 1                          | Back pay for reduced 3 day suspension to 1 day suspension   | $272.60    |
| 81-06-1584 | DPH        | 1                          | Acting assignment pay                                      | $4,689.95  |
| 81-06-1573 | DPH-LHH    | 1                          | Back pay for suspension without just cause                 | $1,305.60  |
| 35-05-1412 | MTA        | 1                          | Back pay for 1 day suspension                              | $221.80    |
| N/A        | SFPD       | 1                          | Payment for 262 hrs. CTO                                   | $17,626.23 |
| 42-06-1514 | REC        | 1                          | Back pay for reduced 5 day suspension to 1 day             | $499.80    |
| 08-06-1569 | TTX        | 1                          | Back pay for 11 day suspension                             | $1,988.70  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File No.</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>No. of Employees Affected</th>
<th>Reason for Settlement</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62-07-1635</td>
<td>AAM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back pay for 20 hrs. vacation</td>
<td>$949.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-05-1432</td>
<td>DPH-LHH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back pay for City's failure to pay at appropriate class</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-07-1636</td>
<td>DPH-SFGH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back pay- Rescinded dismissal &amp; reinstated back</td>
<td>$2,640.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-07-1636</td>
<td>DPH-SFGH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Failure to pay same salary step</td>
<td>$65,780.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-05-1580</td>
<td>DPH-SFGH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Failure to pay same salary step</td>
<td>$16,780.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

April 1, 2007 – June 30, 2007
Quarterly Report of Economic Grievance Settlements Pursuant to Section 1, Article II
Section 10.25-12(c) of the San Francisco Administrative Code
Fiscal Year 2007 - 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File No.</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>No. of Employees Affected</th>
<th>Reason for Settlement</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 1, 2007 – September 30, 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-06-1527</td>
<td>AAM</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Back pay for lost overtime opportunities</td>
<td>$3,839.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-06-1528</td>
<td>AIR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back pay – 30 calendar days reduced to 19 calendar days</td>
<td>$1,644.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-07-1652</td>
<td>AIR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acting assignment pay</td>
<td>$3,831.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-07-1654</td>
<td>DBI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Severance pay</td>
<td>$3,451.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-07-1654</td>
<td>DBI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Severance pay</td>
<td>$83,507.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-07-1630</td>
<td>DBI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acting assignment pay</td>
<td>$2,877.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-07-1686</td>
<td>DPH-SFGH</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Acting assignment pay</td>
<td>$22,954.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-02-0817</td>
<td>DTIS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back pay for supervisory differential</td>
<td>$7,310.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-07-1639</td>
<td>PUC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acting assignment pay</td>
<td>$6,899.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-07-1643</td>
<td>PUC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back pay for supervisory differential</td>
<td>$4,467.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-07-1669</td>
<td>RPD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acting assignment pay</td>
<td>$1,823.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1, 2007 – December 31, 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-07-1734</td>
<td>DBI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acting assignment pay</td>
<td>$3,008.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-07-1735</td>
<td>DPH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acting assignment pay</td>
<td>$2,545.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-06-1462</td>
<td>DPH-SFGH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back pay for reduction of suspension</td>
<td>$2,314.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-07-1610</td>
<td>GSA-DPW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Acting assignment pay</td>
<td>$11,861.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-07-1698</td>
<td>GSA-DPW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back pay for reduction of suspension</td>
<td>$328.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1, 2008 – March 31, 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-07-1781</td>
<td>DPH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back pay for reduction of suspension</td>
<td>$1,673.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-06-1465</td>
<td>DPH-SFGH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back pay – Termination</td>
<td>$133,751.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-07-1685</td>
<td>HSA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back pay – Resignation in lieu of termination</td>
<td>$41,540.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-07-1701</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Severance Pay</td>
<td>$78,718.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-07-1762</td>
<td>Port</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back pay – Resignation in lieu of termination</td>
<td>$20,862.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-07-1767</td>
<td>Port</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back pay – Resignation in lieu of termination</td>
<td>$20,862.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-07-1604</td>
<td>PUC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back pay – Release from probation during probationary period extension</td>
<td>$23,856.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File No.</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>No. of Employees Affected</td>
<td>Reason for Settlement</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-07-1709</td>
<td>AIR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Resignation in lieu of termination</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-07-1710</td>
<td>AAM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back pay for reduction of suspension</td>
<td>$214.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-07-1789</td>
<td>DPH-SFGH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back pay for reduction of suspension</td>
<td>$441.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-08-1844</td>
<td>DPH-SFGH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back pay for Acting assignment pay</td>
<td>$2,702.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Back pay for Shift differential</td>
<td>$1,451.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-07-1680</td>
<td>HSA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Acting assignment pay</td>
<td>$12,727.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-07-1770</td>
<td>PUC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back pay – Acting assignment pay</td>
<td>$1,473.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-07-1729</td>
<td>RPD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back pay – Reinstatement for 45 days then voluntarily resignation</td>
<td>$10,035.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quarterly Reports of Economic Grievance Settlements
Pursuant to Section 10.25-12(c) of the San Francisco Administrative code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPT</th>
<th>Administrative Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>ERD No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1220</td>
<td>70-08-1924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPT</th>
<th>Adult Probation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>ERD No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8434</td>
<td>13-08-1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8444</td>
<td>13-07-1777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8444</td>
<td>13-07-1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8444</td>
<td>13-07-1775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8444</td>
<td>13-07-1774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT</td>
<td>Nature/Description of Settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Airport</strong></td>
<td>Back pay for AAP from 7/1/07 through 5/2/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7347</td>
<td>Reduced suspension to written warning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Inspection Dept.</strong></td>
<td>Back pay which represents supervisory diff from 2/27/06 thru 4/30/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dept. of Public Health</strong></td>
<td>Back pay representing 15 days of unpaid suspension served from 10/1/07 to 10/19/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire Dept</strong></td>
<td>Reduced 4 day suspension to 2-days. Back pay for 12/5-6/07.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Resources Dept.</strong></td>
<td>Appointment above the entrance at step 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**DEPT** Pub. Utilities Comm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>ERD No.</th>
<th># of 'ees affected</th>
<th>Nature/Description of Settlement</th>
<th>Settlement Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7341</td>
<td>40-08-1854</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Back pay for 10 hrs of suspension served on 5/8/08</td>
<td>$413.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEPT** Rec & Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>ERD No.</th>
<th># of 'ees affected</th>
<th>Nature/Description of Settlement</th>
<th>Settlement Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8208</td>
<td>42-07-1724</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>General Damages lump sum</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum of Total Settlements: $32,744.89
October 16, 2008

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

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Please accept my formal resignation from the Family Seat of the San Francisco SRO Task Force, effective today.

I have notified my colleagues on the Task Force of my resignation.

As one of the first members to the SRO Task Health and Safety Task Force, and a member of the Families in SROs Workgroup since 2000, my resignation is submitted with sadness and great pride that members of the Task Force (under the wise leadership of Anne Kronenberg) were able to accomplish so much together in this relatively short amount of time.

There is still much work to do and you will be receiving a nomination for the families' seat very soon.

I would like to thank Supervisor Ammiano for the opportunity to serve these families.

Sincerely,

Maria X Martinez

cc: Anne Kronenberg, Chair, SRO Task Force
Supervisor Ammiano,

We have compiled the mayor's office and city departments’ response to your inquiry, reference number 20080909-033. The response is attached below. We have asked the City Attorney's Office and Public Defender to respond to the inquiry separately.

Please feel free to contact myself or the Mayor's Budget Director, Nani Coloretti, if you have any additional questions regarding this response.

Thank you,
Gigi Whitley

Gigi Whitley
Deputy Budget Director
Mayor’s Office of Public Policy & Finance
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 288
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-6971
(415)554-6158 Fax
Supervisor Tom Ammiano  
Board of Supervisors  
City and County of San Francisco  
City Hall – Room 268  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA. 94102

Dear Supervisor Ammiano:

Thank you for your inquiry. This correspondence is offered in response to your request dated 9/15/08. We are answering in a combined way from city departments highlighting law enforcement efforts and investment in violence prevention programming. Certain departments will respond on their own (i.e., the City Attorney and Public Defender).

**Law Enforcement Efforts**  
**San Francisco Police Department**

Since the September increase in homicides in the Mission, the Police Department has increased its efforts in the neighborhood. The department augmented its zone strategy and increased officers in targeted areas of the Mission during hours when the homicides were most prevalent. SFPD also deployed the Gang Task Force, the SWAT / Tactical Unit, and Narcotics unit. Chief Heather Fong also redistributed violence prevention resources to this effort. As a result, SFPD has increased the number of sector cars covering the problem areas and has also increased the number of foot beats staffed on a daily and nightly basis. The current number of sworn SFPD personnel currently assigned to Mission Station is 146 and five civilians.

The Police Department is also collaborating closely with the Adult Probation Department to coordinate probation compliance checks before the weekend to increase weekend safety. SFPD is also working closely with the District Attorney’s Office on enhanced investigation and prosecution strategies. As always, the city deploys victim services and victim relocation to help support the community and assist with solving crimes.

To help SFPD respond to firearm incidents, the administration anticipates having the Shotspotter gunfire detection system fully implemented in the Mission by December 1st. The system will also be installed in 10 patrol cars by December 1st. The administration anticipates this technology will be an added benefit to law enforcement in the Mission. The implementation of the Shotspotter gunfire detection system was delayed because Department of Technology (DOT) staffers were diverted away from Shotspotter implementation to respond to the city’s computer security breach. Additional delays were attributed to a contract issue that now has been resolved. For security reasons, the administration is not disclosing the exact location of the Shotspotter system that will cover one square mile. The exact location was...
determined by an historical analysis of gunfire incidents in cooperation with the commanding officer of the SFPD Mission Station.

**District Attorney’s Office**
Since 2004, the District Attorney’s Office has expanded its gang unit and advocated for stricter probation restrictions for gang-affiliated probationers. The District Attorney’s Office also has increased investigators performing witness relocation from seven to 21 and has established a regional collaboration with other Bay Area district attorney investigator offices to enhance regional witness relocation strategies. The District Attorney’s Office has been prosecuting violations of the civil gang injunction in coordination with the City Attorney’s Office. The District Attorney’s Office has experienced a 40 percent increase in gang convictions since 2003.

In the 17 homicides that have occurred in the Mission District in 2008, there have been five arrests. Four of the five have been charged with murder and one was determined to be a justifiable homicide in defense of another. There are other ongoing investigations that the District Attorney’s Office is not at liberty to discuss at this time.

**Adult Probation Department**
The Adult Probation Department has initiated an evidence-based case assessment system developed by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. The assessment determines the risk of reoffending and identifies specific needs of the probationer to be addressed through supervision and supportive services. Since December 2007, the department has completed assessments on 3,025 of the 6,497 adult probationers, and many have been identified as being high risk for reoffending.

The Adult Probation Department has 67 funded Deputy Probation Officer positions to provide direct supervision services. Probationers who are at high risk of reoffending should be supervised on intensive supervision caseloads of approximately 30 cases per probation officer. The Adult Probation Department has established 20 specialized caseloads (averaging 63 cases per probation officer) for the following high risk cases:
- Domestic Violence cases (589)
- Sex Offenders (160)
- Select High Risk gang, violence, and mental health cases (511)

The remaining 5,237 Adult Probationers are supervised by 24 Deputy Probation Officers with caseloads averaging 218 cases per Probation Officer. The probationers on these larger caseloads receive periodic monitoring.

The Adult Probation Department has one Deputy Probation Officer assigned to an intensive high-risk gang caseload that focuses on 83 select high-risk Hispanic gang members and associates with ties to the Mission District. Some of these probationers live within the Mission District. However, many of these probationers with ties to the Mission (employment, family, friends, program involvement, criminal activity, etc.) live in neighboring communities, and some in different Bay Area counties.

The Adult Probation Department and the SFPD have established a collaborative working relationship including routine information sharing on probationers and community issues, joint community work such as probationer contacts and searches, and apprehension of suspects. Though the department does not directly fund community programs, the probation officers have established collaborative working relationships with many community organizations and other city agencies providing services in the
Mission. This collaboration facilitates information sharing and provision of supportive resources for probationers. Adult Probation Department Division Director Ernest Mendieta serves as a member of the Mission Council Board of Directors.

**Juvenile Probation Department**
The Juvenile Probation Department works in partnership with youth-focused agencies located in the Mission to provide comprehensive community supervision programs for juvenile probationers and their families. These programs are intended to help them successfully complete probation and preserve public safety.

The Juvenile Probation Department funds approximately $645,000 to three Mission-based agencies who provide detention alternative programming and community supervision services to juvenile probationers. Additionally, the department oversees $3.7 million in contracts to other community-based organizations citywide who also serve families in the Mission.

The Juvenile Probation Department’s commitment to reducing violence in the Mission includes the deployment of a team of probation officers to the Mission on a weekly basis to conduct random compliance and welfare checks on its probationers in conjunction with SFPD.

The Juvenile Probation Department is also working to create additional youth employment opportunities for Mission neighborhood probationers through the department’s New Directions Employment Program (NDEP). This program is funded by the Department of Children, Youth and their Families. Job skills assessment, readiness training, job placement and mentoring are readily available to all juvenile probationers from the Mission.

**Investment in Violence Prevention Programs and Services**

**Department of Children, Youth and Their Families**
The Department of Children, Youth and Their Families (DCYF) invested more than $17.8 million in the Mission this fiscal year to provide youth services and prevent violence. These services include job training programs, after-school programs, diversion programs, school-based violence prevention programs, and violence response services.

DCYF has issued a $780,000 Youth Workforce Development expansion request for proposals to provide services for high needs and disconnected youth ages 16 and 17. High-needs youth are defined as those engaged with multiple systems (juvenile justice, child welfare, foster care system, etc) and residing in public housing.

DCYF has enhanced its New Directions Employment Program, with particular focus in streamlining service referrals, increasing occupational therapy assessment, and placement opportunities for youth engaging in the juvenile justice system.

DCYF provided a summer intensive programs for its Community Response Network youth. Sixty youth across the CRN and transitional aged youth were placed to work on Department of Public Works projects, with close supervision by Mission Neighborhood Center’s case managers and staff.
DCYF partners with Youth Treatment Education Center (YTEC) to create education and vocation pathway to the EMT field, which was a highly requested career pathways identified by high-risk youth who are enrolled at this Principals Center site.

DCYF responded to youth advocacy for more youth workforce outreach and work readiness services targeting hard-to-reach youth. Enterprise for High School Students (EHSS) was funded to provide on-site job readiness training, job placement assistance and career/college counseling at Balboa, Marshall, Burton and ISA high schools.

**Mayor’s Office of Economic and Workforce Development**
The Mayor’s Office of Economic and Workforce Development supports a wide array of job training and career placement services in the Mission totaling more than $2.7 million. Many of these resources are targeted to youth involved in the juvenile justice systems, foster care youth, pregnant teens and gang members. Services include tutoring, study skills training, leadership development, adult mentoring, occupational skills training, and other support services. Through investment in community agencies and city departments these resources serve youth 14 to 24, youth in and out of school, and low-income residents with multiple barriers to employment.

**Mayors Office of Community Investment (formerly MOCD)**
The Mayor’s Office of Community Investment’s mission is to partner with the community to strengthen the social, physical and economic infrastructure of San Francisco's low-income neighborhoods and communities in need. Beginning this fiscal year, MOCI assumed administration of criminal justice and violence prevention grants formerly administered by the Mayor’s Office of Criminal Justice. These services include employment skills training, counseling, supportive services, and job placement; legal services primarily for immigrants and refugees, case management and tattoo removal; life skills, mental health and case management services for youth ages 12 to 18 who have come in contact with the juvenile justice system; youth mentoring program; and micro-enterprise development and peer mentoring primarily serving youth ages 16 to 24.

**Human Services Agency**
HSA's targeted violence prevention investments focus on child and elder abuse rather than on the type of street violence that is the concern of this inquiry. However, HSA also partners closely with the Mayor’s Office of Economic and Workforce Development to help link its clients—including at-risk young adults—with employment opportunities. In FY 07-08, 2,648 youth ages 16-24 were served at the 3120 Mission One Stop, 703 were served at the Southeast One Stop and 336 were served at the Civic Center location. In addition to universal One Stop services, in July 2007 HSA launched a $140,000 per year Youth Employment Initiative targeting homeless and foster youth between the ages of 16 and 24. The initiative is a partnership between Arriba Juntos, Larkin Street, the One Stop System and HSA’s Connected by 25 program. Services provided include outreach, assessment, case management, job placement, job retention and linkages to support services.

**Next Steps**
The city funds a comprehensive level of enforcement and violence prevention programming in the Mission. Going forward, the administration is working with all relevant city agencies and Mission community-based organizations to discuss creative ways to use existing resources to meet the community’s identified needs. Those needs include:
• Increasing services for youth in the northern section of the Mission district
• Increasing the number of vans available for outreach and transporting youth safely across gang territory in the Mission
• Enhancing intensive case management and street outreach services.
• Enhancing recreational opportunities

We will be prepared to report to the full board on this plan by October 21, 2008, and expect that city agencies will not require the proposed $498,000 supplemental appropriation for this purpose. Thank you for your inquiry and for working collaboratively with our office to find the most effective strategy for reducing violence in the Mission.
October 22, 2008

Gavin Newsom
Office of the Mayor
City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Complaint re Conditions at 150 Otis Homeless Shelter

Dear Mayor,

This is an open letter to you and the full San Francisco Board of Supervisors. My name is Abdalla Megahed, the man who has spent 25 years of his life fighting for the homeless who can’t fight for themselves, and a community activist who attempts to draw attention to wrongs committed against the homeless. Such wrongs that I have witnessed and attempted to expose, include individuals who work for the City of San Francisco who take advantage of their positions by taking food or donations that belonging to the homeless. When I attempt to lodge a complaint against such employees with the employees’ boss, I am retaliated against by other employees and even sometimes the city agency itself.

For that reason, I request from you and your administration that you take notice of Mr. Xuan Nguyen, a.k.a., Tony, a maintenance worker at the 150 Otis Street Shelter. At the shelter, use of the community room includes two hours of television privileges from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. for the specific purpose of allowing the residents to keep up with the news, and is posted as such by the Director. Last Sunday, the staff supervisor at 150 Otis, Mr. Mark set the television in the community room to Good Morning America so that the residents could watch the news. After the supervisor left that morning at 8:30 a.m., Tony decided to changed the television to the football game against the wishes of the residents who had specifically requested the news channel, as well as in violation of the Director’s order. This preemptive action was interpreted by the residents as being very disrespectful.

On Monday, at 6:50 a.m., Mr. Nguyen told us in a loud voice, “I want to see who is the ‘motherfucker’ who is going to use the bathroom before I finish the floor?” One resident, at bed ten, asked him, “are you threatening us?” At the same time I asked Mr. Nguyen why he was looking at me when he asked that question. Mr. Nguyen answered, “Especially you.” Two supervisors, Miss Teriana and Mr. Mark, who heard the interaction led Mr. Nguyen away and told him to behave himself.
Mayor Gavin Newsom  
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I request that Mr. Nguyen be investigated for these disrespectful actions against the residents at 150 Otis Street, and for possible drug use that may in fact be the underlying factor in this conduct.

Very truly yours,

Abdullah Megahed

Abdullah Megahed

cc: Kamala Harris, SF District Attorney  
Homeless Monitoring Group
7 October 2008

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

Subject: Proposed Police Station at 17th and De Haro Streets

Dear Supervisor:

I believe that it has come to your attention that the Police Department is in negotiation to install a Specialized Police Facility on the block bounded by 17th Street, De Haro Street, 16th Street and Carolina Street. This will be a Special Use Facility, "Bomb Squad, Homeland Security, Gang Task Force, etc.," not the Standard District Station serving the Community.

As a concerned Potrero Hill resident and member of the Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Association and Potrero Hill Association of Merchants and Businesses, organizations that have voted "against" this use for this property, I strongly OPPOSE the installation of this Police Facility.

These neighborhood organizations, as well as many Potrero Hill concerned citizens, have been working on the development of the Showplace Square, Potrero Hill Area Plans (re zoning) and are very concerned over the proposed rezoned uses, PDR, Commercial, Residential and combinations. We believe that this Police use is inappropriate here. There are already PDR, Commercial and Residential uses in place, the land use direction we favor. The Police design as we, the public, will see it will be a paint job, some trees, private police parking lots, plus 6 NEW driveway entrances along De Haro Street, removing 12 parking spaces. Also, when these police activities kick into action this vital transit area will go all to hell.

De Haro and 17th Streets is Potrero Hill's transit hub; MUNI's 22, 19 and 10 which originates there. Both the 19 and 10 run along De Haro at that point and go around the entire proposed Police block. This proposed use is in conflict here.

Please, STOP the installation of this Police Facility, here.

Sincerely,

Dick Millet
October 14, 2008

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Please hold hearings to carefully evaluate the purpose and practices of the SF Zoo. Make animal welfare concerns a top priority in your evaluation. Please replace existing zoo management with more progressive professionals who are dedicated to transforming the zoo into one that puts the animal's needs first. And also redefine the zoo's mission to focus on rescue and rehabilitation of animals and not on exploitation and entertainment.

Thanking you,

Marion Lamberti
San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

October 23, 200

I recently learned of the tragedy at the San Francisco Zoo that resulted in the loss of Tatiana, a Siberian Tiger. I would like for you to consider taking action so that these types of events do not occur.

When I look back to my childhood days I remember the zoo as such a wonderful place. I have always loved animals. What a great thing to do, go to the zoo. As a child, I just didn’t analyze things the way that I do now. I now realize that animals have NO place in captivity when it is simply for the enjoyment of humans. This is what I consider, now, when involving myself with any establishment that contains wild animals. Animals should not be held against their will in confined, unnatural spaces for our entertainment.

Please hold hearings to evaluate the purpose of the San Francisco Zoo. I ask that you make animal welfare your priority during the evaluation. I would like to see existing personnel replaced with progressive professionals who are dedicated to making sure that this zoo put the needs of the animals first! It is important that the zoo adopt a mission that focuses on rescue and rehabilitation rather than exploitation and entertainment.

Until I am aware of changes like these in all zoos around the country, I will not visit another zoo. This is an important issue that needs urgent and speedy attention.

Please take a stand!

Sincerely,

Gina Swindell
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October 22, 2008

Gina Calva
Cedarpines Park, CA 92322-9321

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

Dear S.F. Board of Supervisors or whom it may concern,

I am writing on behalf of all the animals at the S.F. Zoo. I am asking you to please carefully evaluate the purpose and practices of the zoo. Please make animal welfare concerns a top priority.

All animals in any zoo should live in a sanctuary as close to their natural environment as possible. Animals should not be on display just for “our” sheer pleasure. What gives us the right to take them from their “homes” and make-shift a new home that is nothing close to the freedom they should have in the wild?

Please take into consideration that we as humans should be providing a safe and comfortable environment for these animals that are currently in the S.F. Zoo. We need to put the animals needs first since we took it upon ourselves to remove them from their natural environment and place them in ours.

Please help rescue and rehabilitate these animals who deserve and have the right just as we humans do, to live in a natural and normal habitat. I am asking for these animals for your help in restoring a zoo with the appropriate management and professionals who really care for the life of these and any animals.

They cannot speak, but they do have emotion and feelings and why should they have to suffer in any way? Please make a difference in their already transformed lives for the better!

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter. If I may be of any further assistance, please notify me, as I am willing to help in any way possible.

Sincerely,

Gina Calva
Attn: All Supervisors  
Email: angela.calvillo@sfgov.org (for distribution prior to meeting and inclusion as public comment)

RE: SF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING TUESDAY OCT. 21st 2008

The Parkmerced Residents Organization is "for" the passage of the following items to be heard:
081285-[Lobbyist Ordinance amendments to regulate permit lobbying] Rules Committee
080162-[Disclosure of lobbying by campaign consultants]
080652-[Rental Subsidy Program for Low-Income Families]

The Parkmerced Residents Organization is "Opposed" to the following items to be heard:
080436-[Pass-through from landlord to residential tenants of 50% water and sewer services]

The Parkmerced Residents Organization submits "General Comment" on the following item to be discussed; 081301-[Impact of the Financial Crisis of SF, and Development of a Blueprint for economic recovery]

San Francisco Supervisors, and Members of the Land-Use Committee;

We are in strong support of items 081285/080162 due to concerns that individuals, private interests, bankers and developers are strong-arming the city and county in regards to financing and influencing the moves and efforts of some supervisors. The repeated attendance and meetings of some developer associated individuals to specific supervisors brings into question the process and independence of some supervisors to development, and their constituents. The mandatory disclosure and amendments on lobbyists is crucial to making sure campaign donations, and connections are noted to supervisors, and the public.

We are in strong support of item 080652 and urge the Supervisors to consider the effects of the Bay-View Hunters Point, Market Octavia, and Eastern Neighborhoods along with future developments in mandating the need for low-middle income assistance with increasing rental costs in the city, with a lack of development of affordable rental stock.

We are strongly opposed to item 080436 due to the lack of oversight on prior pass-throughs to tenants for irrigation and systems at Parkmerced that tenants have had to pay repeatedly (O+M '1) and the consistent efforts to use "green" strategies as a way of increasing rental costs over and above the rent-control laws. The need to have sustainable practices is important and we fully support the checking and testing of water and sewage lines for leaks, but deferred maintenance is a negligent act by land owners, and cannot be placed entirely on the backs of renters at this critical juncture of housing crisis, and total lack of affordability in the market place for renters.

We suggest under item 081301 that the city look specifically to working with creative concept generators, in regards to city development, and possible private public partnerships with large enterprise groups (such as what was done at Parkmerced with Met-Life) to develop larger planned infrastructure projects, and proposals that will help propel SF into the future with an eye on sustainable, well planned, open and green designs and proposals. Perhaps a competition for neighborhood developments, that focus on rehabilitation, use of the mills act, and development and implementation of energy efficiency, and creation of jobs and business and market areas can help rejuvenate the ideas and creativity that help this city focus on being at the cutting edge of design and development.
Sincerely
Aaron Goodman VP @ PRO
www.parkmercedresidents.org
www.parkmercedlandscape.blogspot.com

cc:
SF Board of Supervisors (c/o angela.calvillo@sfgov.org)
SF BOS Land-Use Committee (c/o linda.laws@sfgov.org)
Tenants Together (Dean Preston dean@tenantstogether.org)
District 7 Supervisor Sean Elsbernd (sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org)
SFBG Tim Redmond (tredmond@sfbg.com)
File (PRO Daniel Phillips cc: copy)
Land Use and Economic Development Committee  
City Hall  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
SF, CA 94102-4689  

Attn: Supervisors Maxwell, Sandoval, Peskin  
Email: linda.laws@sfgov.org (for distribution prior to meeting and inclusion as public comment)  
Email: Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org (for distribution to all supervisors)  

RE: Items slated for Meeting Monday October 20, 2008 @ 10am  
080281 [Building Code - Slope Protection Act]  

San Francisco Supervisors, and Members of the Land-Use Committee;  

The Parkmerced Residents Organization is writing to you in regards to concerns on the above noted proposed legislation. The reason for our concern is that the SF BOS approved a project along 800 Brotherhood Way without an EIR. The majority of the slope along 800 Brotherhood Way, and the southern border of Parkmerced is a steep sloped engineered hillside built and planted during the original construction and development of Parkmerced. The consistent cutting of trees by the SF DPW group along the "right-of-way" without any re-planting, and the precarious position of some Parkmerced units and Towers in the vicinity of these sloped areas brings into sharp question the approval process of the EIR and why the issue of review of the slopes safety and on-going maintenance and repair due to public transit line bus 17 runs along the engineered wall that routes around parkmerced. The need exists to have the Structural Advisory Committee to review such proposals, and future proposals in Parkmerced due to our area also being shown as part of the liquifaction zones of the Lake Merced area plans. Mr. Badiner the zoning administrator recently showed overlapping maps at the Dept. of Building Inspection meeting where these zones include some but not all areas of Parkmerced that are steep sloped and engineered. We request strongly that the maps being created include the 800 brotherhood way site, and areas around the south-east and western towers due to liquifaction maps shown in a recent chronic article seem to have missed the maps of the building dept. and zoning administrator in there overlays. It may well serve the DPW and City to address the lack of planting and engineered hillside area south of Parkmerced along the "right-of-way" prior to the winter season, as people have been killed by falling trees, and land-slides are also a possibility now due to repeated tree-cuttings and a lack of plantings that is very visible along the southern slope. Perhaps a resolution regarding the South Slope protection area of Parkmerced would be forwarded as legislation by Supervisor Elsbernd in the hopes of fixing this issue before further hazards occur.  

Sincerely,  

Aaron Goodman VP @ PRO  
www.parkmercedresidents.org  
www.parkmercedlandscape.blogspot.com  

cc:  
SF Board of Supervisors (c/o angela.calvillo@sfgov.org)  
SF BOS Land-Use Committee (c/o linda.laws@sfgov.org)  
CSFN Coalition for SF Neighborhoods (c/o Pres. Gary Noguera garynoguera@earthlink.net & Land-Use Housing Hiroshi Fukuda ninersam@aol.com)  
SF Tenants Union (Ted Gullickson ted@sftu.org)  
Tenants Together (Dean Preston dean@tenants/together.org)  
Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco (Tommi Avicelli Mecca tmecca@hrcsf.org)  
District 7 Supervisor Sean Elsbernd (sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org)  
SFBG Tim Redmond (tredmond@sfbg.com)  
Laurence Badiner Planning Dept.  
File (PRO Daniel Phillips cc: copy)
Land Use and Economic Development Committee
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
SF, CA 94102-4689

Attn: Supervisors Maxwell, Sandoval, Peskin
Email: linda.lums@sfgov.org (for distribution prior to meeting and inclusion as public comment)
Email: Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org (for distribution to all supervisors)

RE: Items slated for Meeting Monday October 20, 2008 @ 10am
081004 [Interim Controls on Major Rights of Way Along and Near the Southern 19th Ave. Corridor]
081005 [19th Ave. Cumulative Impact Study]
081281 [Application to Amend San Francisco's Priority Development Area Designation]

San Francisco Supervisors, and Members of the Land-Use Committee;

The Parkmerced Residents Organization is writing to you in regards to concerns on the above noted proposed legislation(s). The majority of which have direct issues related to development and joint impacts that need to be reviewed in terms of their cumulative impact on Parkmerced and surrounding neighborhoods. Per our prior emails to re-iterate;

We are in support of items 081004 and 081005 in relation to review of impacts on the current changes and congestion occurring in and around our neighborhoods however it does not accurately represent the needed scope of area to be included and we request that it be amended as below;

The proposal by Supervisor Elsbernd however does not show or mention currently the Brotherhood way route that is connecting the 19th to Lake Merced Boulevard, the Font "short-cut" often taken by motorists to bypass through Parkmerced at high speeds which is a risk to seniors, and students of the monterosi school, the stonestown bypass used to cut between lake merced blvd. and 19th ave, ocean avenue and City College development, or the impacts of the SFSU Masterplan, and Muni TEP as points of inclusion in the interim controls or impact study. We believe the overall impact study area should be made to include not only major rights of way, but parking as well and should be implemented in conjunction with 19th Ave. Caltrans plans, and general transit SF Muni TEP issues that were not included in the SF Muni TEP proposal to date of changing muni routing, and cutting services. These items of transportation and critical infrastructure improvements being at the fore-front of any density or development is critical, as 19th avenue serves as the emergency egress route from the city, and already is experiencing critical levels of traffic. A recent pedestrian struck on foot, and another motorcycle accident death at 19th and holloway that stalled traffic throughout the are is an example of the problems the district faces due to growth, and development within and outside the district as a intersection of traffic and thoroughfare through the city.

081281 - This legislation we have not seen or been able to review prior to this meeting, and are concerned that although it sounds like a transportation request, it also seems like a push for a label as a transit orientated district or development area, and this is a concern that many neighbors and citizens of the district are concerned with due to proposals for routing Muni through Parkmerced. We believe the Muni TEP, SFSU Masterplanners and CSU Regents, along with City Agencies have colluded in the development process prior to notifying and informing residents and neighbors to allow adequate and clear issues to be raised with these proposals. The SFSU MOU with the City and County of SF shows negotiations on transit that are far to lenient for the SFSU/CSU Masterplan, when we are faced with such a drastic issue currently with development and density, and little relief in sight through transportation funds at the city/state/federal level. ABAG and Caltrans have known for some time the problems existing in this district and have been lax, and non-communicative on the developments to date to our
knowledge. We support the issue, but are again concerned about the efforts of developers and private interests over citizens in this area.

Sincerely

Aaron Goodman VP @ PRO
www.parkmercedresidents.org
www.parkmercedlandscape.blogspot.com

cc:
SF/Board of Supervisors (c/o angela.calvillo@sfgov.org)
SF BOS Land-Use Committee (c/o linda.laws@sfgov.org)
CSFN Coalition for SF Neighborhoods (c/o Pres. Gary Noguera garynoguera@earthlink.net & Land-Use Housing Hiroshi Fukuda ninersam@aol.com)
SF Tenants Union (Ted Gullickson ted@sftu.org)
Tenants Together (Dean Preston dean@tenantstogther.org)
Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco (Tommi Avicollie Mecca tmeeca@hrcsf.org)
District 7 Supervisor Sean Elsbernd (sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org)
SFBG Tim Redmond (tredmond@sfbg.com)
File (PRO Daniel Phillips cc: copy)
To: District 1 Jake McGoldrick, Jake.McGoldrick@sfgov.org
District 2 Michela Alioto-Pier, Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org
District 3 Aaron Peskin, Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org
District 4 Carmen Chu, Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org
District 5 Ross Mirkarimi, Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org
District 6 Chris Daly, Chris.Daly@sfgov.org
District 7 Sean Elsbernd, Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org
District 8 Bevan Dufty, Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org
District 9 Tom Ammiano, Tom.Ammiano@sfgov.org
District 10 Sophie Maxwell, Sophie.Maxwell@sfgov.org
District 11 Gerardo Sandoval, Gerardo.Sandoval@sfgov.org

Cc: Parkmerced Residents Organization www.parkmercedresidents.org
Preservation Groups (SF Heritage, National Trust for Historic Preservation, Docomomo,
SF Preservation Consortium, The Cultural Landscape Foundation, California Preservation
Association, State Office of Historic Preservation)

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

Dear Supervisors:

As the representatives of the Parkmerced Residents Organization the tenant advocacy group
for parkmerced residents. We have been concerned about the number and size of the projects
that are currently in the pipeline for development along the 19th Ave transit corridor. We feel that
it's very important that we examine the cumulative impact that these multiple projects, and past
approved projects such as the SFSU Masterplan, and 800 Brotherhood Way (without an EIR)
and 77 Cambon Drive, sale of 700 Font SFUSD site for development, and Stonestown proposal,
will have on the infrastructure and quiet neighborhood scale we have in Parkmerced. We would
like to discuss the ways to mitigate some of the problems that will inevitably come with growth,
and ways to preserve and protect tenants in Parkmerced as well as provide future areas for
growth and rental housing stock units for future citizens of San Francisco. The impacts alone on
the masterplanned community of Parkmerced threaten its integrity as a possible National
Landmark, Bulletin No. 19 has been submitted to the SF LPAB in October of 2006 where it has
been in limbo. The Cultural Landscape Foundation announces in November its "Landscapes @
Risk" under "Marvels of Modernism" for 2008 of which Parkmerced has been submitted as a
nominee.

Resolutions 081004 & 081005 (Interim Controls and Cumulative Impact studies) that
Supervisors Elsbernd and Chu drafted on behalf of neighborhood organizations was not issued
to TENANTS throughout the district. The addition of the recent legislation focusing the area as a
Transit Impacted Area for funding through ABAG and its programs seems to be pushing for a
"transit orientated development" right through Parkmerced one of the largest rental communities
in the city. We are greatly concerned due to the physical nature of this proposal through the
heart of parkmerced and its impacts on the masterplanned garden rental apartment
development and its seclusion and former peacefull tranquility that has been affected by SFSU
and eventually be lost by such a decision. The recent cuts to the 17/18 bus lines drastically
affect transit to all parkmerced residents who rely on the bus systems to reach West Portal, and
provide a back-up link to Stonestown. The surrounding neighborhood amenities like the YMCA
and the majority of the property and commercial areas of Parkmerced. We are concerned that
the traffic and public zone of review should include Brotherhood Way, Lake Merced Blvd., Font, Holloway, Junipero Serra Blvd., Ocean Avenue to City College and side streets which have become dangerous raceways through our district during commute hours. The survey should include both traffic and public transit impacts which are already at a max. capacity as can be witnessed daily on the K to city college and the M-Line outbound at SFSU/Holloway due to student enrollment easily reaching 30,000 students this year (SFSU Masterplan noted FTE’s 25,000 by 2014) however impacts on housing especially parkmerced, stonestown and neighborhood rental properties has not been addressed by the MOU reached without community input, nor the loss of use of our recreation site, purchased by SFSU however not compensated for or addressed in terms of the locked facilities currently.

We hope that there is definitive resolve in addressing the notification process to neighborhood organizations especially tenants that will ensure adequate neighborhood noticing for projects that are granted Conditional Use permits under these resolutions. We require adequate time to notify tenants of the issues involved and be able to respond formally.

I strongly urge you to consider the effects on the neighborhoods surrounding and within Parkmerced in light of the issues of development(s) that have been approved prior (also re-investigating any such issues of projects approved without an EIR *800 Brotherhood Way mentioned as a erosion slope area of concern during the last land-use meeting) and that community involvement is mandated to its fullest to provide proper review of Historical District and Landscape/Architecture candidates, and that alternative forms of conservation, and land-use are considered as part of any zoning measures implemented in such “better neighborhood” or planning outline efforts being considered by the Planning Department without community involvement.

The FOCUS program through ABAG also notes a “Priority Conservation Area” option to such impacted areas and may prove to be a more optimal solution to the redevelopment of Parkmerced, due to its rarity as a possible National Landmark of urban planning and modern design, and its phenomenal mature courtyards and landscape that is being changed consistently due to the lack of a historical resources analysis, and proper protection or review at the local state or national level.

We sincerely hope you consider the notification process, and the interests of tenants, tenure and tenancy in the future plans of the western neighborhoods, and that development priority, and emphasis on transit and green issues do not overturn adequate review, process and mitigation of effects on such a large community of people without adequate representation and input on the mitigation measures to be considered.

Sincerely,

Aaron Goodman  VP @ PRO

www.3465george.com
www.reserve relieved.com
October 6, 2008

Ms. Anna Hom
Consumer Protection and Safety Division
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
alh@cpuc.ca.gov

Re: Notification Letter for SF Noe Valley DAS 12 of GTE Mobilnet of California Limited Partnership (U-3002-C), of San Francisco-Oakland, CA MSA

This is to provide the Commission with notice according to the provisions of General Order No. 159.A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California ("CPUC") for the project described in Attachment A.

A copy of this notification letter is also being provided to the appropriate local government agency for its information. Should there be any questions regarding this project, or if you disagree with any of the information contained herein, please contact Alice Silverthorn of Verizon Wireless at (770) 797-1062.

Very truly yours,

Alice Silverthorn
MTS Network Compliance
Attachment A

CPUC CELL SITE REPORT GTE Mobilnet of California Limited Partnership (U-3002-C)

1. PROJECT LOCATION: SF Noe Valley DAS 12- I/B

SITE NAME: SF Noe Valley DAS 12
SITE ADDRESS: 5183 Diamond Heights Blvd
LOCATION: San Francisco, CA 94114
COUNTY: San Francisco
APN: B7500 L001 AV#44
COORDINATES: 37° 44' 47.15"/122° 26' 24.18" (NAD83)

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

GET Mobilnet of California Limited Partnership (U-3002-C) proposes installation of an Andrew Ion DAS Node and one (1) Omni directional antenna on a new steel pole.

ANTENNAS: One (1) panel directional antenna
TOWER DESIGN: New Steel Pole
TOWER APPEARANCE: Galvanized Steel Pole
TOWER HEIGHT: 37'
BUILDING SIZE: N/A
OTHER: N/A
3. BUSINESS ADDRESSES OF ALL LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES:

Cc: John Rahain  
Director of Planning  
Planning Department  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400  
San Francisco, CA 94103

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

Carlos Garcia  
District Superintendent  
San Francisco Unified School District  
555 Franklin Street  
San Francisco, CA 94102

4. LAND USE APPROVALS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type:</th>
<th>Personal Wireless Device Installation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issued:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency:</td>
<td>Department of Street Use and Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit No.:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution No.:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type(2):</th>
<th>Encroachment Permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issued(2):</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective(2):</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency(2):</td>
<td>Department of Street Use and Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit No.(2):</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution No.(2):</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CPUC Worksheet

USER INSTRUCTIONS: This worksheet should be used to detail information for all Regulatory Dept. generated CPUC letters. Fill out each section as indicated by the instructions noted by the red corners. Print your cursor to the red corner to display instructions. Each site must be prepared on a separate worksheet. Worksheets must be saved separately. When the worksheet has been completed, e-mail the worksheet to your Regulatory Contact.

Attachments may be sent separately, but must be received by Regulatory prior to submittal of the letter to the CPUC.

Site Name: VRZ1912CA-NVN12

Choose Type of Project

Note: Select
- New Build (New Verizon Wireless Presence) or
- Modification to existing Verizon site

Street Address of Site
5183 Diamond Heights Blvd

Site Location City
San Francisco

Site Location Zip Code
94114

Site Location County
San Francisco

Site Location APN Number

Brief Description of Project
Place new steel pole. Place new Andrew Ion Node with associated hardware. Place new Directional Panel Antenna at 30°.

Number and type of Antennas/Dishes
DB772G05LEXM DIRECTIONAL PANEL

Tower Design
Antenna

Tower Appearance
New steel pole

Tower Height (in feet)
30

Size of Building or NA

Planning Director (or equivalent)
Director of Planning - John Rahain

Contact 1 Agency Name
Planning Department

Contact 1 Street Address
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco

Contact 1 City
San Francisco

Contact 1 State
CA

Contact 1 Zip Code
94105

City Manager (or equivalent)
Position Vacant

Contact 2 Agency Name

Contact 2 Street Address

Contact 2 City

Contact 2 State

Contact 2 Zip Code

City Clerk (or equivalent)
Kay Guibangay - Interim Clerk of the Board of

Contact 3 Agency Name
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Contact 3 Street Address
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Rm 244
San Francisco

Contact 3 City
San Francisco

Contact 3 State
CA

Contact 3 Zip Code
94102

Director of School Board (or equivalent)
Carlos Garcia - San Francisco Unified School District Superintendent

Contact 4 Agency Name
San Francisco Unified School District

Contact 4 Street Address
955 Franklin Street

Contact 4 City
San Francisco

Contact 4 State
CA

Contact 4 Zip Code
94102

LAND USE OR BUILDING APPROVALS

Type of Approval Issued
Personal Wireless Device Installation

Issue Date of Approval

Effective Date of Approval

Agency Name
Department of Street Use and Mapping

Approval Permit Number

Resolution Number (if applicable)

Type of Approval Issued (2)

Issue Date of Approval (2)

Effective Date of Approval (2)

Agency Name (2)

Approval (2) Permit Number

Resolution Number (2) (if applicable)

Department of Street Use and Mapping
Submitted on: 10/22/2008 10:09:20 AM
name: Safe Paul
phone:
comments: Re: In The Cards, IDs are OK, but launch is TBD

How can city administrators guarantee ID cards when they allow Social Security identity theft and fraud by organized crime syndicates (MSX3, Nortenos, La Familia, Arellano Felix, &c.), and their customers (mostly women) to go unpunished for an entire race of people, which flies in the face of our US Constitution?

If an American commits identity theft, then she/he goes to jail, but if a non-citizen, someone who has no authority to be in the United States, commits identity theft and fraud, she/he is rewarded with employment. This is racism at it's highest.

I heard on the radio this week that homelessness is up 40% in SF this year, but no one seems to think that these poor people are being ripped off by city administrators' policies and practices.

J. P. Morgan and Goldman Sachs rip off Americans on the high end, and MSX3, Nortenos, La Familia, Arellano Felix, and their Micas, Seguros customers and city administrators, rip off Americans on the low end.

Who will defend America's poor? Who will defend the American victims of these crime syndicates and city administrators who, with these policies and practices, oppress the poor?

.the ACLU?

Illegal immigrants have a better chance at making a success here than the natives who have been oppressed and victimized by them. Tell the truth about who is perpetuating these crimes, and who is paying, with your tax dollars, to have these crimes funded.

User Data
Client IP (REMOTE_ADDR) : 67.115.155.134
Client IP via Proxy (HTTP_X_FORWARDED_FOR) :

---
More support for JROTC !!
From: <mgoodynuff@ >
Subject: Re: Prop V on our Ballot ~ Jr ROTC.
Date: Sunday, October 19, 2008, 4:56 PM

I totally agree. Having been a vice principal at two high schools in S.F. I was amazed and very impressed at the wonderful job the ROTC was doing in helping young men & women learn manners, courtesy, caring for each other and positive attributes that they might not have ever learned in their homes or in a PE program. The ROTC builds men & women with character who might otherwise have ended up on the streets.

On Oct 18, 2008, at 12:53 PM,
From a SF Voter. . .
I have never been in the service, or ROTC.

I'm anti-war, and prior to speaking with a group of Jr.ROTC kids, and their leaders at a petition signing drive at Safeway, I had thought of the Jr. ROTC as an enlistment arm of the US military forces preying on kids in our schools.

Here is what I learned from these JROTC kids and their dedicated leaders.

THIS PROGRAM IS ONE OF THE FEW REMAINING IN SF FOR MANY AT RISK YOUTH TO STAY OUT OF TROUBLE, GET THROUGH THEIR TEEN YEARS AND MAKE IT TO COLLEGE

OR A DECENT JOB.

THE LEADERS OF THE JROTC IN SF were not shy about publicly speaking about how they DO NOT PROMOTE ENLISTMENT INTO THE MILITARY.

As I listened, to the sergeants speak, I felt the passion of these men who are clearly dedicated to mentoring, and teaching vital life skills to these "City" kids.
In San Francisco, JROTC is a school program that keeps kids off the streets and teaches them how to prepare for job interviews and entrance into college or vocational training and broadens their life experience. It is clearly an effective gang deterrent.

I questioned the kids and their “Sergeants”.

I learned that they are being taught how to “dress for success”, practice filling out job applications, and college admission forms, and given help with keeping on top of homework and guidance with entering into the college system.

The Sergeant told me of the need for these kids to get more than video games and the city streets. The kids shouted in their two cents of “yeah they show me how to dress for jobs and how to fill out applications, they take us horseback riding, to the opera, and the symphony and outside the city on trips”.

The sergeant proudly spoke of “my kids” like they were his own.

He named each of them and the colleges, vocational training schools, and jobs that each of “his” young men and women have gone on to or have graduated from.

When I asked the kids what would they be doing if this program were not around, they said “I don’t know, I guess I would hang out with my friends, or on the street”, others said, “I am scared of the gangs in my schools and the JROTC is what helps me”, another boy said “I stopped smoking, I don’t think I would have if I weren’t in this program”.

The San Francisco Unified School District has offered a Physical Education option to replace this vital program; but, it doesn’t offer anywhere near what the JROTC does!

When you go to the polls, please don’t let your anti-military or anti-war feelings confuse this issue. This is a program where your federal military dollars are doing something phenomenal to
vitaly impact the lives of young men and women in the San Francisco school system.

I’m voting YES on V for the kids of San Francisco.

*Alber Nathan Bader*
OCTOBER 26, 2008

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

DEAR FRIENDS:

READ IN THE SUNDAY CHRONICLE WHERE YOU WANT TO PUT A NEW "CITY PLACE" IN SAN FRANCISCO ON MARKET BETWEEN FIFTH AND SIXTH STREETS. GOOD IDEA. THAT AREA IS A MESS, MATTER OF FACT THE WHOLE DOWNTOWN IS A MESS ON MARKET FROM POWELL TO CIVIC CENTER. DRUGS OPENLY SOLD ON THE STREETS, FILTH (BRICKS SHOULD NEVER HAVE BEEN PUT ON MARKET STREET.) THEY LOOK NICE BUT.

PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE INCORPORATE EITHER A LUCKY GROCERY STORE IN IT, ON THE FIRST FLOOR OR A SAFEWAY.

WHY? I SAY LUCKY AS IT IS CHEAPER THAN SAFEWAY BUT IN EITHER CASE ONE IS DESPERATELY NEED IN THE AREA FOR REASONABLE PRICED FOODS. E.I. SAFEWAY HAS DISCOUNTS ON THE PURCHASES WITH THEIR SAFEWAY CARD HOLDERS, TEN FOR $10.00 SALES AND THEIR COUPONS AND THEY TAKE OTHER FLYER COUPONS FOUND IN THE PAPERS AROUND TOWN.

I LIVE IN GLEN PARK AND HAVE A BOYFRIEND THAT LIVES IN THE DALT HOTEL AT 34 TURK STREET. ON OCCASION I GO WITH HIM TO THE STORE. THE (MOM & POP) STORES IN THE TENDERLOIN ARE EXPENSIVE, I KNOW THAT HIS FINANCES INCLUDE NO LUXURIES AND PRESUME OTHERS IN HIS HOTEL AND THE AREA COULD USE AN INEXPENSIVE GROCERY STORE TO SHOP IN. THE ONE IN THE OLD EMPORIUM IS A GOOD STORE. IT HAS HIGH QUALITY FOODS BUT IS REALLY EXPENSIVE BUT LOTS OF THE FOOD IS NO APPROPRIATE TO THOSE LIVING IN THE TENDERLOIN WITH NOT HAVING ACCESS TO WHAT I HAVE AT HOME. A STOVE, AND A LARGE REFRIGERATOR FREEZER TO KEEP THING FROM BECOMING RIDDEN WITH BACTERIA CAUSING FOOD POISING.

I KNOW "YOU, WHO EVER THAT MAY FIT (THE CITY, STATE OR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT)" WOULD LIKE THE HOMELESS AND POOR TO GO AWAY BUT THEY WILL NOT. (I AM NOT RELIGIOUS, BUT JESUS SAID "THE POOR WILL ALWAYS BE WITH YOU") AND I SEE NO REASON WHILE THERE LIFE IS LESS THAN COMFORTABLE WITH THE REST OF US AND I PRESUME WITH THEM, AS WE CAN SEE OURSELVES IN THE SAME SITUATION THAT IT SHOULD BE MADE HARDER. THE SIMPLICITY OF AN INEXPENSIVE GROCERY STORE WOULD REALLY HELP THESE PEOPLE, AS IT HELPS ME.

I KNOW ABOUT THRIFT TOWN, FOR CLOTHS (17/MISSION), I KNOW ABOUT THE FOOD BANK, COSTCO, AND DISCOUNT PLACES FOR WHICH THOSE WITH OR WITHOUT THE MONEY GO TO SHOP (BARGAINS GALORE – MY KIND OF PLACE – FORGET MACY'S FOR A $32.00 TIE, OR BLAIR FOR A $17.98 TIE. I CAN GET A TIE FOR $12.00 BUT AT THRIFTTOWN. I CAN GET DEVOONCIE, DECOR, JERRY GARCIA TIES (APROX $45.00 EACH) FOR TWO-THREE DOLLARS. I DO NOT CARE WHO MAKES THE PRODUCT, I AM NOT TRYING TO IMPRESS ANYONE THAT I HAVE MONEY. IF I LIKE IT, CAN AFFORD IT (CHARGE IT IF I DO NOT HAVE ANY MONEY), NEED IT (I AM OUT OF IT AND IT IS A NECESSITY AS DEODORANT), I BUY IT.
AGAIN PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE PUT A GOOD GROCERY STORE IN THE MALL. IT WILL HELP COMMUTERS TO AS OF NOW GET OF THE MUNI AT CHURCH ON MY WAY TO THE CASTRO, WE SHOP AT SAFEWAY IN DIAMOND HEIGHTS WHICH IS OUT OF THE WAY FOR A FEW ITEMS (ONLY THE 52 BUS GOES THERE THEN YOU WALK DOWN TWO BLOCKS AND CATCH MY CONNECTING BUS (35 EUREKA UNTIL IT IS WHIPPED OUT ON THE NEW BUS ROUTES ALONG WITH THE 26 VALENCIA BUS WHICH TAKES ME DIRECTLY TO THE EMERGENCY ROOM AT SAINT LUKE'S HOSPITAL WHERE, I WAS BORN. NOW I WILL HAVE TO TAKE BY BLEEDING AND BRUISED BODY, WALK SIX BLOCK TO MISSION, TAKING THE BUS TO CAESAR CHAVES STREET, WALKING THREE BLOCKS TO THE EMERGENCY ENTRANCE ON MY CANE OR WALK 12 BLOCKS TO THE HOSPITAL. ANOTHER SUBJECT, ANOTHER TIME.

SINCERELY,

REV. VERNON LINK
QUARTERLY AIDS SURVEILLANCE REPORT
San Francisco Department of Public Health
AIDS Cases Reported Through September 2008
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AIDS Surveillance Summary

San Francisco (as of 09/30/08)

Cumulative cases: 27,952
Cumulative deaths: 18,756

California (as of 08/31/08)

Cumulative cases: 150,791
Cumulative deaths: 85,457

United States\(^2\) (as of 12/31/06)

Cumulative cases: 982,498
Cumulative deaths: 545,805

San Francisco AIDS Incidence, Mortality, and Prevalence by Year, 1980-2008\(^3\)

1. Includes SF residents diagnosed in SF and SF residents diagnosed in other jurisdictions. Excludes persons diagnosed in SF who resided in other jurisdictions at the time of their AIDS diagnosis.
2. The US numbers do not represent actual cases or deaths reported. Rather, these numbers are estimated and adjusted for reporting delays. Estimated cases and deaths for 2006 were subject to data revisions (for additional details, see www.cdc.gov/hiv/resources/qa/datarevision.htm).
3. Reporting for recent year is incomplete. See Table 9 for actual numbers per year.
Table 1. Adult/Adolescent AIDS Cases (>12 years) by Transmission Category, San Francisco, 1980-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transmission Category</th>
<th>No. (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gay or bisexual male</td>
<td>20627 (73.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual male injection drug user</td>
<td>1412 (5.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual female injection drug user</td>
<td>678 (2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay or bisexual male injection drug user</td>
<td>3944 (14.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian or bisexual injection drug user</td>
<td>55 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender (1)</td>
<td>382 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemophiliac</td>
<td>16 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual contact male (2)</td>
<td>126 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual contact female (2)</td>
<td>291 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfusion recipient</td>
<td>143 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk not reported/Other (3)</td>
<td>240 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>27914 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. AIDS Cases by Gender and Year of Diagnosis, San Francisco, 1980-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21643 (95.8)</td>
<td>627 (90.3)</td>
<td>515 (89.6)</td>
<td>481 (86.8)</td>
<td>451 (88.4)</td>
<td>442 (89.3)</td>
<td>495 (100)</td>
<td>476 (100)</td>
<td>469 (100)</td>
<td>431 (100)</td>
<td>420 (100)</td>
<td>182 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>723 (3.2)</td>
<td>50 (7.2)</td>
<td>48 (8.3)</td>
<td>52 (9.4)</td>
<td>45 (8.8)</td>
<td>35 (7.1)</td>
<td>559 (100)</td>
<td>469 (100)</td>
<td>431 (100)</td>
<td>420 (100)</td>
<td>182 (100)</td>
<td>162 (88.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender (1)</td>
<td>215 (1.0)</td>
<td>17 (2.4)</td>
<td>18 (3.1)</td>
<td>21 (3.8)</td>
<td>14 (2.7)</td>
<td>18 (3.6)</td>
<td>24 (4.3)</td>
<td>24 (4.3)</td>
<td>24 (4.3)</td>
<td>24 (4.3)</td>
<td>24 (4.3)</td>
<td>24 (4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>22581 (100)</td>
<td>694 (100)</td>
<td>581 (100)</td>
<td>554 (100)</td>
<td>510 (100)</td>
<td>495 (100)</td>
<td>559 (100)</td>
<td>476 (100)</td>
<td>469 (100)</td>
<td>431 (100)</td>
<td>420 (100)</td>
<td>182 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Residents of San Francisco at time of initial AIDS diagnosis.
(1) Transgender information was collected since September 1996. Data prior to this are incomplete.
(2) Includes persons who have had heterosexual contact with a person with HIV/AIDS or with a person who is at risk for HIV.
(3) Includes persons for whom risk information is incomplete (due to death, refusal to be interviewed or loss to follow-up), cases still under investigation, or interviewed patients who offered no plausible risk for HIV.
Table 3. AIDS Cases by Transmission Category and Race/Ethnicity, San Francisco, 1980-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transmission Category (1)</th>
<th>White No. (%)</th>
<th>African American No. (%)</th>
<th>Latino No. (%)</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islander No. (%)</th>
<th>Native American No. (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult/Adolescent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay or bisexual male</td>
<td>16023 (80.1)</td>
<td>1566 (43.7)</td>
<td>2414 (73.9)</td>
<td>696 (76.9)</td>
<td>70 (47.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injection drug user (IDU)</td>
<td>745 (5.7)</td>
<td>1050 (29.3)</td>
<td>233 (7.1)</td>
<td>44 (4.9)</td>
<td>20 (13.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay or bisexual male IDU</td>
<td>2334 (14.7)</td>
<td>664 (18.5)</td>
<td>424 (13.0)</td>
<td>70 (7.7)</td>
<td>52 (34.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian or bisexual IDU</td>
<td>26 (0.1)</td>
<td>21 (0.6)</td>
<td>6 (0.2)</td>
<td>2 (0.2)</td>
<td>1 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemophiliac</td>
<td>8 (0.0)</td>
<td>2 (0.1)</td>
<td>5 (0.2)</td>
<td>1 (0.1)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual (2)</td>
<td>115 (0.6)</td>
<td>172 (4.8)</td>
<td>89 (2.7)</td>
<td>39 (4.3)</td>
<td>4 (2.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfusion recipient</td>
<td>69 (0.4)</td>
<td>26 (0.7)</td>
<td>26 (0.8)</td>
<td>22 (2.4)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk not reported/Other (3)</td>
<td>80 (0.4)</td>
<td>71 (2.0)</td>
<td>61 (1.9)</td>
<td>26 (2.9)</td>
<td>1 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric (0-12 years) (4)</td>
<td>8 (0.0)</td>
<td>13 (0.4)</td>
<td>10 (0.3)</td>
<td>5 (0.6)</td>
<td>1 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20007 (100)</td>
<td>3585 (100)</td>
<td>3368 (100)</td>
<td>905 (100)</td>
<td>149 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. AIDS Cases by Transmission Category and Asian/Pacific Islander Ethnicity, San Francisco, 1980-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transmission Category (1)</th>
<th>Chinese No. (%)</th>
<th>Japanese No. (%)</th>
<th>Filipino No. (%)</th>
<th>Southeast Asian No. (%)</th>
<th>Korean No. (%)</th>
<th>Pacific Islander No. (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult/Adolescent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay or bisexual male</td>
<td>156 (79.6)</td>
<td>85 (64.2)</td>
<td>228 (80.0)</td>
<td>63 (74.1)</td>
<td>10 (76.9)</td>
<td>46 (65.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injection drug user (IDU)</td>
<td>8 (4.1)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>10 (3.5)</td>
<td>4 (4.7)</td>
<td>2 (15.4)</td>
<td>9 (12.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay or bisexual male IDU</td>
<td>8 (4.1)</td>
<td>12 (11.9)</td>
<td>22 (7.7)</td>
<td>7 (8.2)</td>
<td>1 (7.7)</td>
<td>8 (11.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian or bisexual IDU</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemophiliac</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (1.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual (2)</td>
<td>4 (2.0)</td>
<td>1 (1.0)</td>
<td>12 (4.2)</td>
<td>5 (5.9)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4 (5.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfusion recipient</td>
<td>11 (5.6)</td>
<td>1 (1.0)</td>
<td>7 (2.5)</td>
<td>3 (3.5)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk not reported/Other (3)</td>
<td>7 (3.6)</td>
<td>1 (1.0)</td>
<td>5 (1.8)</td>
<td>3 (3.5)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric (0-12 years) (4)</td>
<td>2 (1.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (0.4)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>196 (100)</td>
<td>101 (100)</td>
<td>285 (100)</td>
<td>85 (100)</td>
<td>13 (100)</td>
<td>70 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Residents of San Francisco at time of initial AIDS diagnosis.
(1) Persons with more than one risk factor (other than the combinations listed in the tables) are tabulated only in the most likely transmission category.
(2) Includes persons who have had heterosexual contact with a person with HIV/AIDS or with a person who is at risk for HIV.
(3) Includes persons for whom risk information is incomplete (due to death, refusal to be interviewed or loss to follow-up), cases still under investigation, or interviewed patients who offered no plausible risk for HIV.
(4) Includes children who have hemophilia or other coagulation disorder, have received a blood transfusion, or who have acquired their infection from an infected mother during the perinatal period.
Table 5. AIDS Cases by Transmission Category and Year of Diagnosis, San Francisco, 1980-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Diagnosis</th>
<th>Adult/Adolescent</th>
<th>Pediatric (0-12 years) (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category (1)</td>
<td>No. (%)</td>
<td>No. (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult/Adolescent</td>
<td>17398 (77.0)</td>
<td>442 (63.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay or bisexual male</td>
<td>1398 (6.2)</td>
<td>90 (13.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injection drug user (IDU)</td>
<td>3233 (14.3)</td>
<td>137 (19.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay or bisexual male IDU</td>
<td>106 (0.5)</td>
<td>9 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian or bisexual IDU</td>
<td>15 (0.1)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual (2)</td>
<td>223 (1.0)</td>
<td>13 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfusion recipient</td>
<td>146 (0.6)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk not reported/Other (3)</td>
<td>106 (0.5)</td>
<td>9 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric (0-12 years) (4)</td>
<td>459 (100)</td>
<td>476 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Residents of San Francisco at time of initial AIDS diagnosis.

(1) Persons with more than one risk factor (other than the combinations listed in the tables) are tabulated only in the most likely transmission category.

(2) Includes persons who have had heterosexual contact with a person with HIV/AIDS or with a person who is at risk for HIV.

(3) Includes persons for whom risk information is incomplete (due to death, refusal to be interviewed or loss to follow-up), cases still under investigation, or interviewed patients who offered no plausible risk for HIV.

(4) Includes children who have hemophilia or other coagulation disorder, have received a blood transfusion, or who have acquired their infection from an infected mother during the perinatal period.
### Table 6. AIDS Cases by Gender, Age Group and Race/Ethnicity, San Francisco, 1980-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Diagnosis (Years)</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Transgender (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White No. (%)</td>
<td>African American No. (%)</td>
<td>Latino No. (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 12</td>
<td>4 ( 0.0)</td>
<td>4 ( 0.1)</td>
<td>5 ( 0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 19</td>
<td>12 ( 0.1)</td>
<td>0 ( 0.0)</td>
<td>14 ( 0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>309 (1.6)</td>
<td>68 ( 2.3)</td>
<td>101 ( 3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>1649 (8.4)</td>
<td>251 ( 8.6)</td>
<td>429 (14.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>8783 (45.0)</td>
<td>1382 (40.4)</td>
<td>1412 (48.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>6390 (32.7)</td>
<td>966 (33.0)</td>
<td>742 (24.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>1902 (9.7)</td>
<td>362 (12.4)</td>
<td>209 (7.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 +</td>
<td>471 (2.4)</td>
<td>96 (3.3)</td>
<td>57 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male subtotal</td>
<td>19520 (100)</td>
<td>2929 (100)</td>
<td>2999 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Age at Diagnosis (Years)</td>
<td>White No. (%)</td>
<td>African American No. (%)</td>
<td>Latino No. (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 12</td>
<td>4 (1.1)</td>
<td>9 (1.7)</td>
<td>5 (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 19</td>
<td>1 (0.3)</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
<td>2 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>15 (4.0)</td>
<td>10 (1.9)</td>
<td>11 (7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>41 (10.8)</td>
<td>44 (8.3)</td>
<td>23 (14.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>155 (40.9)</td>
<td>207 (36.9)</td>
<td>50 (32.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>100 (26.4)</td>
<td>184 (34.6)</td>
<td>40 (25.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>34 (9.0)</td>
<td>53 (10.0)</td>
<td>15 (9.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 +</td>
<td>29 (7.7)</td>
<td>24 (4.5)</td>
<td>9 (5.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female subtotal</td>
<td>379 (100)</td>
<td>532 (100)</td>
<td>155 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender Age at Diagnosis (Years)</td>
<td>White No. (%)</td>
<td>African American No. (%)</td>
<td>Latino No. (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 29</td>
<td>23 (21.3)</td>
<td>27 (21.8)</td>
<td>32 (28.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>53 (49.1)</td>
<td>44 (35.5)</td>
<td>54 (47.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 +</td>
<td>32 (29.6)</td>
<td>53 (42.7)</td>
<td>28 (24.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender subtotal</td>
<td>108 (100)</td>
<td>124 (100)</td>
<td>114 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Residents of San Francisco at time of initial AIDS diagnosis.
(1) Total includes persons with multiple or unknown race.
(2) Transgender information was collected since September 1996. Certain age or race/ethnic groups are combined for transgender cases because of small number.
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Table 7. AIDS Cases by Race/Ethnicity and Year of Diagnosis, San Francisco, 1980-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. (%)</td>
<td>No. (%)</td>
<td>No. (%)</td>
<td>No. (%)</td>
<td>No. (%)</td>
<td>No. (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>16889 (74.8)</td>
<td>445 (64.1)</td>
<td>341 (58.7)</td>
<td>321 (57.9)</td>
<td>299 (58.6)</td>
<td>293 (59.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2564 (11.4)</td>
<td>141 (20.3)</td>
<td>105 (18.1)</td>
<td>113 (20.4)</td>
<td>100 (19.6)</td>
<td>88 (17.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>2382 (10.5)</td>
<td>76 (11.0)</td>
<td>103 (17.9)</td>
<td>88 (15.9)</td>
<td>70 (13.7)</td>
<td>76 (15.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>610 (2.7)</td>
<td>28 (4.0)</td>
<td>26 (4.5)</td>
<td>27 (4.9)</td>
<td>34 (6.7)</td>
<td>32 (6.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>106 (0.5)</td>
<td>3 (0.4)</td>
<td>5 (0.9)</td>
<td>6 (1.2)</td>
<td>3 (0.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (1) 22581 (100) 694 (100) 581 (100) 554 (100) 510 (100) 495 (100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. (%)</td>
<td>No. (%)</td>
<td>No. (%)</td>
<td>No. (%)</td>
<td>No. (%)</td>
<td>No. (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>287 (51.3)</td>
<td>266 (55.9)</td>
<td>275 (58.6)</td>
<td>246 (57.1)</td>
<td>244 (58.1)</td>
<td>101 (55.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>107 (19.1)</td>
<td>76 (16.0)</td>
<td>84 (17.9)</td>
<td>79 (18.3)</td>
<td>75 (17.9)</td>
<td>33 (18.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>121 (22.6)</td>
<td>106 (22.3)</td>
<td>81 (17.3)</td>
<td>74 (17.2)</td>
<td>67 (16.0)</td>
<td>24 (13.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>34 (6.1)</td>
<td>19 (4.0)</td>
<td>24 (5.1)</td>
<td>24 (5.6)</td>
<td>28 (6.7)</td>
<td>19 (10.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>6 (1.1)</td>
<td>4 (0.8)</td>
<td>3 (0.6)</td>
<td>6 (1.4)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (1) 559 (100) 476 (100) 469 (100) 431 (100) 420 (100) 182 (100)

Table 8. AIDS Cases and Cumulative Rates per 100,000 by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, San Francisco

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Male No. (Rate)</th>
<th>Female No. (Rate)</th>
<th>Total (2) No. (Rate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>19520 (11279.8)</td>
<td>379 (231.0)</td>
<td>19899 (5502.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2929 (7857.8)</td>
<td>532 (1361.7)</td>
<td>3461 (4533.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>2999 (5844.5)</td>
<td>155 (313.7)</td>
<td>3154 (3131.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>806 (816.3)</td>
<td>67 (62.6)</td>
<td>873 (424.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>132 (9607.0)</td>
<td>13 (1030.9)</td>
<td>145 (5502.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (1) 26421 (7288.6) 1149 (317.9) 27570 (3808.2)

* Residents of San Francisco at time of initial AIDS diagnosis.
(1) Total includes persons with multiple or unknown race.
(2) Transgender cases were excluded because population size for transgender cannot be determined for rates calculation.
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Table 9. AIDS Incidence, Mortality, and Prevalence by Year, San Francisco, 1980-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Cases Reported per Year</th>
<th>Number of Cases Diagnosed per Year (1)</th>
<th>Number of Deaths Occurred per Year (1)</th>
<th>Number of Persons Living with AIDS (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>1289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>2041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1408</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>2765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1585</td>
<td>2162</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>3652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>1364</td>
<td>4336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>2285</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>5116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>2327</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>5802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>4272</td>
<td>2074</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>6277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>6472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>1564</td>
<td>1483</td>
<td>6553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>6649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1061</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>7033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>7326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>7552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>7758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>7946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>8117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>8375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>8567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>8659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>8931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>9127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>9196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Residents of San Francisco at time of initial AIDS diagnosis.
(1) Data in recent years is incomplete due to delay in cases/deaths reporting.
### Table 10. Cases by Initial AIDS-Defining Condition, San Francisco, 1980-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial AIDS-Defining Condition</th>
<th>Def. (1)</th>
<th>Pres. (2)</th>
<th>Total No. (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bacterial infections, recurrent, &lt;13 years [HIV+]</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A(4)</td>
<td>8 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidiasis of bronchi, trachea, or lungs</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>24 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidiasis of esophagus</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>523 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cervical cancer, invasive [HIV+]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coccidioidomycosis, disseminated or extrapulmonary [HIV+]</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryptococcosis, extrapulmonary</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>377 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryptosporidiosis, intestinal (&gt;1 mo. duration)</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>334 (1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cytomegalovirus (except liver, spleen, lymph nodes), &gt;1 month of age</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>204 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMV retinitis with loss of vision [HIV+]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV encephalopathy [HIV+]</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>385 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herpes simplex: chronic (&gt;1 mo.), bronchitis, pneumonia, esophagitis</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>97 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histoplasmosis, disseminated or extrapulmonary [HIV+]</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>25 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isosporiasis, intestinal (&gt;1 mo. duration) [HIV+]</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>21 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaposis's sarcoma (5)</td>
<td>2547</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>2837 (10.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymphoid interstitial pneumonia/pulmonary lymphoid hyperplasia, &lt;13 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymphoma, Burkitt's [non-Hodgkin's] [HIV+]</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>107 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymphoma, immunoblastic (non-Hodgkin's) [HIV+]</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>417 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymphoma, primary in brain (5)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>40 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycobacterium avium complex or M. kansasii, disseminated or extrapulmonary</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>259 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycobacterium tuberculosis, pulmonary [HIV+]</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>217 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycobacterium tuberculosis, disseminated or extrapulmonary [HIV+]</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>147 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycobacterium other species, disseminated or extrapulmonary [HIV+]</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumocystis carinii pneumonia</td>
<td>5086</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>5680 (20.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumonia, recurrent [HIV+]</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>247 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive multifocal leuкоencephalopathy</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmonella sepsis, recurrent [HIV+]</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxoplasmosis of brain, &gt;1 month of age</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>243 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasting syndrome [HIV+]</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>680 (2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD4 T lymphocyte count &lt;200 or percent &lt;14 [HIV+]</td>
<td>14861</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>14861 (53.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any AIDS indicator condition and HIV-negative and CD4 count &lt;400 (6)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                                                                                           | 26472    | 1480      | 27952 (100) |

* Residents of San Francisco at time of initial AIDS diagnosis.

1. Indicator conditions diagnosed definitively (e.g. culture or biopsy proven).
2. Indicator conditions diagnosed presumptively in a person who has laboratory evidence of HIV infection.
3. [HIV+]: Indicator conditions that require laboratory evidence of HIV infection.
4. N/A: Conditions which require definitive diagnoses only.
5. Laboratory evidence of HIV infection in persons > 60 years of age.
6. In the absence of other causes of immunocompromise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AIDS Indicator Condition (1)</th>
<th>Total No. (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bacterial infections, recurrent, &lt;13 years [HIV+(2)]</td>
<td>11 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidiasis of bronchi, trachea, or lungs</td>
<td>135 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidiasis of esophagus</td>
<td>2487 (8.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cervical cancer, invasive [HIV+]</td>
<td>11 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coccidioidomycosis, disseminated or extrapulmonary [HIV+]</td>
<td>60 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryptococcosis, extrapulmonary</td>
<td>1830 (6.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryptosporidiosis, intestinal (&gt;1 mo. duration)</td>
<td>1367 (4.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cytomegalovirus (except liver, spleen, lymph nodes), &gt;1 month of age</td>
<td>2420 (8.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMV retinitis with loss of vision [HIV+]</td>
<td>2478 (8.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV encephalopathy [HIV+]</td>
<td>2457 (8.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herpes simplex: chronic (&gt;1 mo.), bronchitis, pneumonitis, esophagitis</td>
<td>411 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histoplasmosis, disseminated or extrapulmonary [HIV+]</td>
<td>155 (0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isosporiasis, intestinal (&gt;1 mo. duration) [HIV+]</td>
<td>67 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaposi's sarcoma (3)</td>
<td>6665 (23.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymphoid interstitial pneumonia/pulmonary lymphoid hyperplasia, &lt;13 years</td>
<td>5 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymphoma, Burkitt's (non-Hodgkin's) [HIV+]</td>
<td>536 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymphoma, immunoblastic (non-Hodgkin's) [HIV+]</td>
<td>1116 (4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymphoma, primary in brain (3)</td>
<td>387 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycobacterium avium complex or M. kansasii, disseminated or extrapulmonary</td>
<td>5042 (18.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycobacterium tuberculosis, pulmonary [HIV+]</td>
<td>644 (2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycobacterium tuberculosis, disseminated or extrapulmonary [HIV+]</td>
<td>470 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycobacterium other species, disseminated or extrapulmonary [HIV+]</td>
<td>330 (1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumocystis carinii pneumonia</td>
<td>10893 (39.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumonia, recurrent [HIV+]</td>
<td>990 (3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive multifocal leuкоencephalopathy</td>
<td>304 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmonella sepsis, recurrent [HIV+]</td>
<td>57 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxoplasmosis of brain, &gt;1 month of age</td>
<td>1153 (4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasting syndrome [HIV+]</td>
<td>4301 (15.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Residents of San Francisco at time of initial AIDS diagnosis.
(1) Cases may have more than one condition.
(2) [HIV+]: Indicator conditions that require laboratory evidence of HIV infection.
(3) Laboratory evidence of HIV infection in persons > 60 years of age.
### Table 12. Living Adult/Adolescent AIDS Cases (>12 years) by Transmission Category, San Francisco

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transmission Category</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gay or bisexual male</td>
<td>6592</td>
<td>(71.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual male injection drug user</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>(5.4 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual female injection drug user</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>(3.0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay or bisexual male injection drug user</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>(13.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian or bisexual injection drug user</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(0.3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender (I)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>(2.1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemophiliac</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(0.1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual contact male (2)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>(0.8 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual contact female (2)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>(1.8 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfusion recipient</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(0.2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk not reported/Other (3)</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>(1.4 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9182</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13. Living AIDS Cases by Transmission Category and Race/Ethnicity, San Francisco

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transmission Category</th>
<th>White No. (%)</th>
<th>African American No. (%)</th>
<th>Latino No. (%)</th>
<th>Asian/ Pacific Islander No. (%)</th>
<th>Native American No. (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult/Adolescent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay or bisexual male</td>
<td>4692 (78.8)</td>
<td>539 (41.8)</td>
<td>1068 (75.1)</td>
<td>337 (75.6)</td>
<td>27 (48.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injection drug user (IDU)</td>
<td>283 (4.8)</td>
<td>373 (28.9)</td>
<td>85 (6.0)</td>
<td>18 (4.0)</td>
<td>9 (16.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay or bisexual male TDU</td>
<td>859 (14.4)</td>
<td>224 (17.4)</td>
<td>170 (11.9)</td>
<td>37 (8.3)</td>
<td>16 (28.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian or bisexual IDU</td>
<td>11 (0.2)</td>
<td>12 (0.9)</td>
<td>1 (0.1)</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemophiliac</td>
<td>3 (0.1)</td>
<td>2 (0.2)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual (2)</td>
<td>57 (1.0)</td>
<td>97 (7.5)</td>
<td>59 (4.1)</td>
<td>28 (6.3)</td>
<td>3 (5.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfusion recipient</td>
<td>7 (0.1)</td>
<td>3 (0.2)</td>
<td>5 (0.4)</td>
<td>6 (1.3)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk not reported/Other (3)</td>
<td>41 (0.7)</td>
<td>36 (2.8)</td>
<td>30 (2.1)</td>
<td>16 (3.6)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pediatric (0-12 years) (4)</strong></td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4 (0.3)</td>
<td>5 (0.4)</td>
<td>3 (0.7)</td>
<td>1 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5953 (100)</td>
<td>1290 (100)</td>
<td>1423 (100)</td>
<td>446 (100)</td>
<td>56 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Residents of San Francisco at time of initial AIDS diagnosis.

1. Transgender information was collected since September 1996. Data prior to this are incomplete.
2. Includes persons who have had heterosexual contact with a person with HIV/AIDS or with a person who is at risk for HIV.
3. Includes persons for whom risk information is incomplete (due to death, refusal to be interviewed or loss to follow-up), cases still under investigation, or interviewed patients who offered no plausible risk for HIV.
4. Includes children who have hemophilia or other coagulation disorder, have received a blood transfusion, or who have acquired their infection from an infected mother during the perinatal period.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male Current Age (Years)</th>
<th>White No. (%)</th>
<th>African American No. (%)</th>
<th>Latino No. (%)</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islander No. (%)</th>
<th>Native American No. (%)</th>
<th>Total (1) No. (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 12</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (0.1)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 19</td>
<td>1 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (0.1)</td>
<td>1 (0.3)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>8 (0.1)</td>
<td>4 (0.4)</td>
<td>8 (0.6)</td>
<td>3 (0.8)</td>
<td>2 (4.1)</td>
<td>25 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>47 (0.8)</td>
<td>10 (1.0)</td>
<td>36 (2.8)</td>
<td>8 (2.1)</td>
<td>3 (6.1)</td>
<td>105 (1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>492 (8.5)</td>
<td>102 (10.2)</td>
<td>230 (18.0)</td>
<td>66 (22.2)</td>
<td>6 (12.2)</td>
<td>926 (10.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>2269 (39.4)</td>
<td>388 (38.6)</td>
<td>604 (47.3)</td>
<td>143 (37.0)</td>
<td>27 (55.1)</td>
<td>3441 (40.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>2226 (36.9)</td>
<td>388 (36.8)</td>
<td>296 (23.2)</td>
<td>106 (27.4)</td>
<td>10 (20.4)</td>
<td>2908 (34.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 +</td>
<td>812 (14.1)</td>
<td>128 (12.8)</td>
<td>100 (7.8)</td>
<td>40 (10.3)</td>
<td>1 (2.0)</td>
<td>1082 (12.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Male subtotal           | 5755 (100)    | 1000 (100)               | 1276 (100)    | 387 (100)                     | 49 (100)                | 8493 (100)       |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female Current Age (Years)</th>
<th>White No. (%)</th>
<th>African American No. (%)</th>
<th>Latino No. (%)</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islander No. (%)</th>
<th>Native American No. (%)</th>
<th>Total (1) No. (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 12</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 19</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2 (0.9)</td>
<td>3 (3.5)</td>
<td>1 (2.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>6 (1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2 (0.9)</td>
<td>2 (2.4)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>3 (2.0)</td>
<td>4 (1.7)</td>
<td>5 (5.9)</td>
<td>5 (13.5)</td>
<td>1 (20.0)</td>
<td>18 (3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>29 (19.1)</td>
<td>32 (13.9)</td>
<td>17 (20.0)</td>
<td>9 (24.3)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>89 (17.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>65 (42.8)</td>
<td>82 (35.7)</td>
<td>26 (30.6)</td>
<td>12 (32.4)</td>
<td>3 (60.0)</td>
<td>188 (36.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>41 (27.0)</td>
<td>84 (36.5)</td>
<td>23 (27.2)</td>
<td>8 (21.6)</td>
<td>1 (20.0)</td>
<td>157 (30.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 +</td>
<td>14 (9.2)</td>
<td>24 (10.4)</td>
<td>9 (10.6)</td>
<td>2 (5.4)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>49 (9.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Female subtotal           | 152 (100)     | 230 (100)                | 85 (100)      | 37 (100)                      | 5 (100)                 | 511 (100)        |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transgender (2) Current Age (Years)</th>
<th>White No. (%)</th>
<th>African American No. (%)</th>
<th>Latino No. (%)</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islander No. (%)</th>
<th>Native American No. (%)</th>
<th>Total (1) No. (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 - 39</td>
<td>13 (28.3)</td>
<td>10 (16.7)</td>
<td>23 (37.1)</td>
<td>7 (29.2)</td>
<td>53 (27.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 +</td>
<td>33 (71.7)</td>
<td>50 (83.3)</td>
<td>39 (62.9)</td>
<td>17 (70.8)</td>
<td>139 (72.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Transgender subtotal               | 46 (100)      | 60 (100)                 | 62 (100)      | 24 (100)                      | 192 (100)               |                 |

* Residents of San Francisco at time of initial AIDS diagnosis.
(1) Total includes persons with multiple or unknown race.
(2) Transgender information was collected since September 1996. Certain age or race/ethnic groups are combined for transgender cases because of small number.
### Table 15. Living AIDS Cases by Initial AIDS-Defining Condition, San Francisco

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial AIDS-Defining Condition</th>
<th>Def. (1) No.</th>
<th>Pres. (2) No.</th>
<th>Total No. (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bacterial infections, recurrent, &lt;13 years [HIV+ (3)]</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N/A (4)</td>
<td>7 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidiasis of bronchi, trachea, or lungs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidiasis of esophagus</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>101 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cervical cancer, invasive [HIV+]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coccioidiomycosis, disseminated or extrapulmonary [HIV+]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryptococcosis, extrapulmonary</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>48 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryptosporidiosis, intestinal (&gt;1 mo. duration)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>108 (1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cytomegalovirus (except liver, spleen, lymph nodes), &gt;1 month of age</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>24 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMV retinitis with loss of vision [HIV+]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV encephalopathy [HIV+]</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>57 (0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herpes simplex: chronic (&gt;1 mo.), bronchitis, pneumonitis, esophagitis</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>14 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histoplasmosis, disseminated or extrapulmonary [HIV+]</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaposi's sarcoma (5)</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>392 (4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymphoid interstitial pneumonia/pulmonary lymphoid hyperplasia, &lt;13 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymphoma, Burkitt's (non-Hodgkin's) [HIV+]</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>24 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymphoma, immunoblastic (non-Hodgkin's) [HIV+]</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>48 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymphoma, primary in brain (5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycobacterium avium complex or M. kansasii, disseminated or extrapulmonary</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycobacterium tuberculosis, pulmonary [HIV+]</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>84 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycobacterium tuberculosis, disseminated or extrapulmonary [HIV+]</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycobacterium other species, disseminated or extrapulmonary [HIV+]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumocystis carinii pneumonia</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>552 (6.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumonia, recurrent [HIV+]</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>88 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive multifocal leuкоencephalopathy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmonella sepsis, recurrent [HIV+]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxoplasmosis of brain, &gt;1 month of age</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasting syndrome [HIV+]</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>136 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD4 T lymphocyte count &lt;200 or percent &lt;14 [HIV+]</td>
<td>7374</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7374 (80.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any AIDS indicator condition and HIV-negative and CD4 count &lt;400 (6)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 8873 | 323 | 9196 (100)

* Residents of San Francisco at time of initial AIDS diagnosis.

(1) Indicator conditions diagnosed definitively (e.g. culture or biopsy proven).
(2) Indicator conditions diagnosed presumptively in a person who has laboratory evidence of HIV infection.
(3) [HIV+]: Indicator conditions that require laboratory evidence of HIV infection.
(4) N/A: Conditions which require definitive diagnoses only.
(5) Laboratory evidence of HIV infection in persons > 60 years of age.
(6) In the absence of other causes of immunocompromise.
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Table 16. Cumulative AIDS Indicator Conditions among Persons Living with AIDS, San Francisco

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AIDS Indicator Condition (1)</th>
<th>Total No. (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bacterial infections, recurrent, &lt;13 years [HIV+][2]</td>
<td>10 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidiasis of bronchi, trachea, or lungs</td>
<td>22 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidiasis of esophagus</td>
<td>418 (4.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cervical cancer, invasive [HIV+]</td>
<td>1 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coccidioidomycosis, disseminated or extrapulmonary [HIV+]</td>
<td>11 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryptococcosis, extrapulmonary</td>
<td>262 (2.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryptosporidiosis, intestinal (&gt;1 mo. duration)</td>
<td>297 (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cytomegalovirus (except liver, spleen, lymph nodes), &gt;1 month of age</td>
<td>195 (2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMV retinitis with loss of vision [HIV+]</td>
<td>198 (2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV encephalopathy [HIV+]</td>
<td>191 (2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herpes simplex: chronic (&gt;1 mo.), bronchitis, pneumonitis, esophagitis</td>
<td>63 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histoplasmosis, disseminated or extrapulmonary [HIV+]</td>
<td>24 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isosporiasis, intestinal (&gt;1 mo. duration) [HIV+]</td>
<td>15 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaposi's sarcoma (3)</td>
<td>882 (9.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymphoid interstitial pneumonia/pulmonary lymphoid hyperplasia, &lt;13 years</td>
<td>2 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymphoma, Burkitt's (non-Hodgkin's) [HIV+]</td>
<td>61 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymphoma, immunoblastic (non-Hodgkin's) [HIV+]</td>
<td>116 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymphoma, primary in brain (3)</td>
<td>12 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycobacterium avium complex or M. kansasii, disseminated or extrapulmonary</td>
<td>295 (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycobacterium tuberculosis, pulmonary [HIV+]</td>
<td>190 (2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycobacterium tuberculosis, disseminated or extrapulmonary [HIV+]</td>
<td>100 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycobacterium other species, disseminated or extrapulmonary [HIV+]</td>
<td>40 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumocystis carinii pneumonia</td>
<td>13086 (15.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumonia, recurrent [HIV+]</td>
<td>239 (2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive multifocal leucoencephalopathy</td>
<td>13 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmonella sepsis, recurrent [HIV+]</td>
<td>3 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxoplasmosis of brain, &gt;1 month of age</td>
<td>83 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasting syndrome [HIV+]</td>
<td>622 (6.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Residents of San Francisco at time of initial AIDS diagnosis.
(1) Cases may have more than one condition.
(2) [HIV+]: Indicator conditions that require laboratory evidence of HIV infection.
(3) Laboratory evidence of HIV infection in persons > 60 years of age.
October 10, 2008

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

Re: Board of Supervisory Inquiry #20080909-010
Board of Supervisory Inquiry #20080909-012
Outside Lands Music Festival, August 22-24, 2008

Dear Clerk of the Board:

In response to your inquiry regarding the Outside Lands Music Festival, I have responded to those areas that pertain to the San Francisco Police Department. A detailed after action report will not be completed for some time, therefore, the following information is based on the best current information available. For the three day event, SFPD’s labor expense $12,308.00, two sergeants, and twenty-eight officers.

Noise Complaints/Disturbing the Peace
The complaints were called in by neighbors regarding noise, parking, traffic gridlock, overcrowding, public drunkenness and urination. These calls were received by various sources including Richmond and Taraval police stations, dispatch (emergency and non-emergency lines), e-mails and the Another Planet hotline. Three-day total, 253 noise and disturbing the peace complaints.

Traffic Congestion & Parking Violations
Pedestrian traffic flow prior to, and during the event, was manageable. Post event flow created a number of issues, particularly in the Taraval district. Essentially, the number of people leaving the event in such a short range of time could not be absorbed into the surrounding neighborhoods. Pedestrians were taking to the streets which, in turn, negatively impacted the vehicle traffic flow. Additionally, people who were attempting to board MUNI Light Rail Vehicles (LRV) were more numerous than space available on the trains. When the LRVs reached capacity, people would remain in the street waiting for the next one instead of returning to the sidewalk or island. Three-day total, 272 traffic/parking complaints.

Vehicular traffic was heavy both before and after the event. Once again, post event traffic ranged from very heavy to gridlock in some areas adjoining the event; some of these issues were attributable to volume, some to pedestrian interaction.

Sincerely,

Kevin Cashman
Deputy Chief, Field Operations bureau
October 14, 2008

Angela Calvillo  
Clerk of the Board  
City Hall, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Board of Supervisors Inquiry Number 20080909-052

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

I write in response to the above-referenced inquiry by Supervisor Tom Ammiano at the September 9, 2008 Board of Supervisors hearing.

As you know, the SFPUC is a conglomeration of three utilities which provide drinking water, power and waste water services to the Mission District and all neighborhoods in San Francisco. While we seek and advance short and long term solutions to protect the health and safety of the community involving these vital services, our impact on law enforcement considerations is minimal.

Leading up to and subsequent adoption of Board of Supervisors Ordinance 270-07, the SFPUC has cooperated fully with the Mayor’s Department of Economic and Workforce Development (DEWD). We increased direct funding for CityBuild from $175,000 to $275,000 for 2008-2009; we have provided Workforce Director Rhonda Simmons with detailed reports on our activities, and we work collaboratively with Ms. Simmons and the DEWD staff on a variety of initiatives. We have allocated a portion of the Water System Improvement Program’s program management services to supporting local and disadvantaged employment on SFPUC-sponsored construction projects and have assigned the management of those services to the CityBuild Director. We support DEWD’s initiatives such as participation in the Agency’s efforts to develop consistent measurements for workforce development activities. We sponsor and participate in employment and community fairs through our Communications and Personnel Divisions and work collaboratively with the San Francisco Unified School District and other educational institutions. The SFPUC maintains year-round and robust internship programs to support our activities in engineering, field services, plant operations and administration.

I share you concerns and pledge the support of the SFPUC in any way that we can to reduce violence in the Mission District. Please let me know if I can provide further information or assistance.

Sincerely,

Ed Harrington

c: Supervisor Tom Ammiano
October 20, 2008

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

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Attached please find a copy of Library Commission Resolution No. 2008-04 determining to utilize a lease financing transaction involving the issuance and sale of lease revenue bonds to finance a portion of the Branch Library Improvement Program and associated financing costs; and requesting the Mayor to recommend and the Board of Supervisors to authorize such lease financing transaction and related actions.

Sincerely,

Sue Blackman
Commission Secretary

cc: Jewelle Gomez, President Library Commission
Luis Herrera, City Librarian
SAN FRANCISCO LIBRARY COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. 2008-04

RESOLUTION DETERMINING TO UTILIZE A LEASE FINANCING TRANSACTION INVOLVING THE ISSUANCE AND SALE OF LEASE REVENUE BONDS TO FINANCE A PORTION OF THE BRANCH LIBRARY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND ASSOCIATED FINANCING COSTS; AND REQUESTING THE MAYOR TO RECOMMEND AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO AUTHORIZE SUCH LEASE FINANCING TRANSACTION AND RELATED ACTIONS

WHEREAS, On November 6, 2007, the voters of the City and County of San Francisco ("City") passed Proposition D, "Library Preservation Fund" ("Prop. D"), amending and restating Section 16.109 of the City Charter and authorizing the issuance of revenue bonds or other evidences of indebtedness or the incurrence of lease financing or other obligations ("Debt Obligations") the proceeds of which are to be used for the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation and/or improvement of real property and/or facilities that will be operated by the Library Department of the City for library purposes and for the purchase of equipment relating to such real property and/or facilities; and

WHEREAS, At a meeting of the San Francisco Public Library Commission ("Library Commission") held on September 18, 2008, the City Librarian presented the Library Commission with information concerning the financing of a portion of the Branch Library Improvement Program ("BLIP") through one or more lease financing transactions involving the issuance of lease revenue bonds under the authority of Section 16.109 of the City Charter; and

WHEREAS, The City Librarian now proposes to utilize an initial lease financing transaction involving the issuance and sale of lease revenue bonds to raise additional funding to complete the renovation and/or building of the following BLIP projects: Anza Branch Library, Bayview/Anna E. Waden Branch
Library, Golden Gate Valley Branch Library, Merced Branch Library, North Beach Branch Library and Ortega Branch Library, and to fund a program reserve and certain program-wide services (collectively, the “Financed Costs”); and

WHEREAS, Under Section 18.109 of the City Charter, the Library Commission may request, and upon recommendation of the Mayor of the City (the “Mayor”), the Board of Supervisors of the City (the “Board of Supervisors”) may authorize, lease financing transactions involving the issuance of lease revenue bonds for the aforesaid purposes; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Library Commission hereby determines to utilize an initial lease financing transaction involving the issuance and sale of lease revenue bonds to fund the Financed Costs and any associated debt service reserves, credit enhancement costs, capitalized interest, costs of issuance and other financing costs; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Library Commission hereby requests the Mayor to recommend and the Board of Supervisors to authorize an initial lease financing transaction involving the issuance and sale of lease revenue bonds to fund the aforesaid costs, and to take all necessary actions in furtherance thereof; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That any lease revenue bonds authorized to be issued pursuant to this request shall be limited in principal amount to $36,000,000, have a final maturity of between 24 and 26 years from the date of issuance, bear interest at a per annum rate not to exceed 12%, and amortize on a substantially level annual debt service basis; and be it
FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Library Commission may in the future determine to utilize one or more additional issues of Debt Obligations to finance other portions of BLIP.

Approved on October 2, 2008, by a vote of 6-0.

[Signature]
Sue Black
Library Commission Secretary
First and Third Thursday of the Month*
4:30PM

January 15
February 5 and 19
March 5 and 19
April 2 and 16
May 7 and 21
June 4 and 18
July 16
August 20
September 3 and 17
October 1 and 15
November 5 and 19
December 3

* There will be only one scheduled regular meeting of the San Francisco Public Library Commission during January, July, August and December 2009.

S. Blackman Commission Secretary 10/17/08
October 20, 2008

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

Re: File 081284, Renaming of Avery Street

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

The San Francisco Fire Department is in receipt of your request for comments regarding Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi's proposed resolution to rename the Avery Street between Geary Boulevard and Post Street to Boswell Way.

The Fire Department has no objections to the proposal and is in support of Supervisor Mirkarimi's resolution.

When the resolution is passed, my recommendation is that the Division of Emergency Communications (DEC) be contacted in order for the street name change to be entered into the Computer Assisted Dispatch (CAD) system.

If I can provide additional information regarding this issue, please do not hesitate to contact me at (415) 558-3401.

Very truly yours,

Joanne Hayes-White
Chief of Department

cc: Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi, Member, Board of Supervisors
    Linda Laws, Clerk, Land Use and Economic Development Committee
October 20, 2008

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

Re: File 031248, Renaming of Rowland Street

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

The San Francisco Fire Department is in receipt of your request for comments regarding Supervisor Tom Ammiano’s proposed resolution to rename the Rowland Street to Dirk Dirksen Alley.

The Fire Department has no objections to the proposal and is in support of Supervisor Ammiano’s resolution.

When the resolution is passed, my recommendation is that the Division of Emergency Communications (DEC) be contacted in order for the street name change to be entered into the Computer Assisted Dispatch (CAD) system.

If I can provide additional information regarding this issue, please do not hesitate to contact me at (415) 558-3401.

Very truly yours,

Joanne Hayes-White
Chief of Department

cc: Supervisor Tom Ammiano, Member, Board of Supervisors
    Linda Laws, Clerk, Land Use and Economic Development Committee
October 20, 2008

Dear Supervisor:

We are writing on behalf of our respective organizations to express our support for Supervisor McGoldrick's ordinance to establish an annual right-of-way occupancy assessment fee for driveways (item 38 on the agenda of the Board of Supervisors Meeting of Tuesday October 21st, file number 081086).

Currently, when a curb-cut is made to accommodate a garage, a public street side parking spot is permanently removed for the benefit of the owner of the new garage. We feel that it makes sense to charge the owner of the garage a rate that is at least the cost of a residential parking permit.

Curb cuts are usually bad for bicycling, as they are almost always associated with vehicular driveways and garage access - new curb cuts bring new conflicts to bicycle right-of-way, increasing the chances for collisions and diminishing cyclists' sense of safety, discouraging better bicycling in direct and indirect ways.

Furthermore, curb-cuts tend to harm the pedestrian environment. The sidewalk in front of many garages in San Francisco have a grading going up from the road to the sidewalk and then have a grading down to the garage as many garages are built below grade. In many locations, this means a flat sidewalk width of no more than 2 feet, which is well below ADA standards of 4-5 foot sidewalk widths.

We further recommend that monies collected by this ordinance be used specifically for ADA remediation activities such as curb ramps.

Sincerely,

Manish Champsee, President
Walk San Francisco

Tom Radulovich, Executive Director
Livable City

Andy Thornley, Program Director
San Francisco Bicycle Coalition

995 Market Street Suite 1550 San Francisco, CA 94103 • 415-431-WALK • www.walksf.org
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...a bi-weekly update on U.S. Department of Education activities relevant to the Intergovernmental and Corporate community and other stakeholders

STUDENT LOAN ACCESS

In a joint statement on October 10, Secretary Spellings and Treasury Secretary Henry Paulson pledged additional support for the student loan market. "Continuing constraints in our capital markets have posed challenges for students and student lenders throughout the last year," they said. "We recognize that education is the foundation of a strong American workforce, and we must not let challenges in our capital markets hinder our students' opportunities. Given these ongoing concerns, the Administration is taking a series of steps to support the student loan market." Earlier in the week, President Bush signed an extension of the Ensuring Continued Access to Student Loans Act (see http://edlabor.house.gov/micro/loansact_extend.shtml). Since the original May 2008 enactment of this law, no student has been unable to access federal student aid. The new law simply extends -- for another year -- certain temporary provisions, including granting the Secretary of Education the authority to purchase loans from lenders within the federal guaranteed loan program (to ensure they continue to have access to capital to originate new loans). Next steps? "Over the next few months, schools and lenders will be making decisions for the 2009-2010 school year," the executives noted. "Using our newly extended authorities, the Administration is moving aggressively to support the continued availability of funding for federal student loans in the next school year, with the goal of restoring the federal guaranteed student loan market to normal operations. We are working on an expedited basis and will make further announcements in the coming weeks." FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE GO TO http://www.ed.gov/news/pressreleases/2008/10/10102008.html. (Note: A dedicated agency web site, http://federalsstudentaid.ed.gov/ffelp/, provides key guidance regarding the authority to purchase loans.)

Meanwhile, last week, the Department conducted the last of six public meetings soliciting issues to be considered for action by negotiated rulemaking committees under the Higher Education Opportunity Act. A list of presenters and a transcript from each meeting is available at http://www.ed.gov/policy/highered/leg/hea08/index.html#neg-reg.
And, this week, the Department published in the Federal Register final regulations for Title IV student loan programs, as amended by the College Cost Reduction and Access Act (see http://edlabor.house.gov/micro/ccraa.shtml). These regulations address, among other issues, income-based repayment plans, public service loan forgiveness, economic hardship deferments, and military deferments. **FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE GO TO http://www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister/finrule/2008-4/102308a.html.**

---

**BROAD PRIZE**

Congratulations to the Brownsville Independent School District, winner of the 2008 Broad Prize for Urban Education -- the largest education prize in America awarded to the most improved urban district. Brownsville, located at the southern-most tip of Texas along the U.S.-Mexico border and serving one of the poorest urban populations in the U.S. (with 94% of students qualifying for subsidized lunch), bested four finalists: Aldine (TX), Broward County (FL), Long Beach (CA), and Miami-Dade. (Long Beach won the 2003 Broad Prize, and Aldine and Miami-Dade are three-time finalists. This was Brownsville's and Broward County's first year in the running.) The $2 million prize goes directly to graduating high school seniors for college scholarships. Brownsville receives $1 million, while the other finalists receive $250,000 each. Scholarships are given to students who demonstrate significant financial need and have a record of academic improvement during their high school career. Recipients who enroll in four-year colleges will receive up to $20,000 ($5,000 per year). Recipients who enroll in two-year colleges will receive up to $5,000 ($2,500 per year). **FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE GO TO http://www.broadprize.org/**.

---

**OUT OF AFRICA**

For more than a week, Secretary Spellings traveled the African continent, discussing a variety of regional and multilateral education programs. In **Zambia** (http://zambia.usembassy.gov/pr10202008.html), she met with government representatives, toured the Bwafwano OVC Home-Based Care Center (supported through President Bush's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief), visited Silver Rest Basic School and Mwaanabwami Community School, and addressed hundreds of teacher trainees at David Livingston College of Education. In **Kenya** (http://nairobi.usembassy.gov/2008-press-releases/pr_20081017.html), the Secretary met with President Mwai Kibaki and Minister of Higher Education Sally Kosgei regarding implementing the Africa-U.S. Higher Education Collaboration Initiative, as well as visited Nairobi's Precious Blood School and Dagoretti High School. In **Rwanda**, the Secretary laid a wreath at the Kigali Genocide Memorial Centre (in memory of those who fell victim to the 1994 genocide), visited the Forum for African Women Educationalists (FAWE) Girls' School, and delivered remarks at the Africa Regional Higher Education Summit (http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/education_and_universities/afrsummit/). The regional summit builds on the work that began during the Higher Education Summit for Global Development (http://www.hedglobalsummit.org/), held at the U.S. Department of State in April 2008.
ED PUBLICATIONS

On October 21, the Department’s Office of Innovation and Improvement (OII) released the latest publications in its popular series of “Innovations in Education” guides. "Creating and Sustaining Successful K-8 Magnet Schools" profiles six elementary and middle school magnets that uses instructional themes -- in subjects such as leadership, fine arts, and math and science -- to meet the needs of students from diverse backgrounds. This guide offers insight into the strategies these schools used in planning and implementation and, more importantly, outlines the keys to success that have helped make the schools sustainable in the face of changes in context and leadership. "Successful Magnet High Schools" profiles eight secondary school magnets that are effectively preparing students for college and the workforce. This guide spotlights innovative approaches to forming a culture of high-quality teaching, providing rigorous academic programs, promoting equity, forging partnerships, and modeling innovation. FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE GO TO http://www.ed.gov/about/pubs/intro/innovations.html#ms.

Later that day, OII released "A Commitment to Quality: National Charter School Policy Forum Report," drawing from discussions with nearly 100 charter school leaders at the Department’s May 2008 forum on charter schools and 15 years of experience and research with charter schools. Among its findings, the report indicates that, in several states, more than 70% of charter schools had reading proficiency rates for low-income students that exceeded statewide rates for low-income students in 2006-07. The report also delineates six principles to produce and maintain quality charter schools: (1) charters achieve excellence early in their operations; (2) charters improve their performance year in and year out; (3) charters that have consistently strong results can expand and replicate; (4) charters have access to a robust infrastructure to help students and teachers succeed; (5) charter authorizers remedy chronic underperformance by closing the school and opening superior options swiftly; and (6) charters strengthen all corners of public education by sharing successful practices and fostering choice and competition among schools. FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE GO TO http://www.ed.gov/admins/comm/choice/csforum/report.html.

In addition, the Department’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) has unveiled results from the 2005 school crime supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey. Data is presented on the prevalence and type of student victimization at school (4% of students ages 12-18 reported they were victims of any crime at school), selected characteristics of victims, and the availability of drugs and presence of gangs and weapons. FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE GO TO http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2009306.

TITLE III INTERPRETATIONS

Last Friday (October 17), the Secretary issued final interpretations for several provisions of Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act. In particular, she interprets provisions related to the annual
administration of English language proficiency assessments to limited English proficient (LEP) students served by Title III, the establishment and implementation of annual measurable achievement objectives for states and subgrantees receiving Title III funds, and state and local implementation of Title III accountability provisions. Department officials made adjustments to the proposed interpretations based on comments submitted by states and other interested parties. FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE GO TO http://www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister/other/2008-4/101708a.html.

Also: Earlier this month, Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education Kerri Briggs and Acting Assistant Deputy Secretary for English Language Acquisition Richard Smith sent a letter and guidance document to Chief State School Officers reiterating that states and school districts may not replace local, state, or other federal funds with Title III funds. FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE TO GO http://preview.ed.gov/programs/sfop/legislation.html.

FROM THE FIELD...

Some important announcements:

- The National Endowment for the Arts' The Big Read, now in its fourth year, provides citizens with the chance to read and discuss a single book within their communities. Libraries, municipalities, and non-profit organizations are encouraged to apply for one of approximately 400 grants that will be awarded for programming between September 2009 and June 2010. The deadline for applications is February 3. Aside from a $2,500 to $20,000 grant and financial support to attend an orientation meeting, communities will receive many resources, including reader's and teacher's guides and audio guides with commentary from artists, educators, and notable public figures. FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE GO TO http://www.neabigread.org/.

- The National Endowment for the Humanities recently extended the deadline (to November 14) for the second round of Picturing America applications. This initiative promotes the study, teaching, and understanding of U.S. history and culture by introducing students and the general public to America's art treasures. It supplies schools and public libraries with free, high-quality reproductions of 40 great American works of art (approximately 24" x 36" in size) and an illustrated teacher resource book with notes for all grade levels. The materials will be delivered in spring 2009. FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE GO TO http://picturingamerica.neh.gov/.

- Through December 19, elementary and secondary students, teachers, administrators, and parents from across the nation have the opportunity to share their ideas and opinions on how technology should be used in the education process, through Project Tomorrow’s sixth annual Speak Up survey. Results are shared with participating schools so they can use the data for planning and community discussions. Results are also used by government agencies and various organizations to inform new programs and policies. FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE GO TO http://www.tomorrow.org/speakup/.
QUOTE TO NOTE

"The loan purchase and participation interest programs implemented over the last few months have helped ensure that federal student loans were available to students enrolling in postsecondary institutions for the 2008-09 school year, and federal student lending is now exceeding last year’s pace. Our financing program has supported just over 40% of the Federal Family Education Loan Program (FFELP) loans that have been distributed this year. Over 800 lenders have enrolled in our loan purchase program. Almost $51 million of federally guaranteed loans have been originated for the current school year, up from approximately $45 billion for the same period last year."

-- Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings and Secretary of the Treasury Henry Paulson
(10/10/08)

UPCOMING EVENTS

On Tuesday (October 28), at 12:00 noon ET in Columbia, South Carolina, Secretary Spellings will issue final Title I regulations to strengthen the No Child Left Behind Act, including requirements that states implement a uniform graduation rate and enhance parents' leverage in accessing public school choice and supplemental educational services options for their children. Soon thereafter, materials will be posted at http://www.ed.gov/news/pressreleases/2008/10/10282008.html.

The next Scientific Evidence in Education (SEE) forum is set for October 30 (11:30 a.m.-1:45 a.m. ET) at the Charles Sumner School (1201 17th and M Street, N.W.), in Washington, DC. The topic? "Meeting the Teacher Quality Imperative: New Evidence on Teacher Induction and Professional Development." The forums are free, but space is limited, so register in advance online. FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE GO TO http://www.seeforums.org/.

Over the next two weeks, the Department will be exhibiting at the National Black Child Development Institute's 38th Annual Conference in Atlanta (October 25-28), the National Coalition of ESEA Title I Parents' 35th Annual In-Service Training Conference in Birmingham, AL (October 29-November 2), and the National Middle School Association's 35th Annual Conference in Denver (October 30-November 1). If you are attending any of these events, please stop by the Department's booth.

Please feel free to contact the Office of Communications and Outreach with any questions:
Director, Intergovernmental Affairs -- Rogers Johnson, (202) 401-0026, mailto:Rogers.Johnson@ed.gov
Deputy Director -- Keith Brancato, (202) 401-6178, mailto:Keith.Brancato@ed.gov
Program Analyst -- Adam Honeysett, (202) 401-3003, mailto:Adam.Honeysett@ed.gov
To be added or removed from distribution, or submit comments (we welcome your feedback!), contact Adam Honeysett. Or, visit http://www.ed.gov/news/newsletters/edreview/.
This newsletter contains hypertext links to information created and maintained by other public and private organizations. These links are provided for the user's convenience. The U.S. Department of Education does not control or guarantee the accuracy, relevance, timeliness, or completeness of this outside information. Furthermore, the inclusion of links is not intended to reflect their importance, nor is it intended to endorse any views expressed, or products or services offered, on these sites, or the organizations sponsoring the sites.
Dear Board of Supervisors:

Please support Community Choice Energy.

Thank you,

Dawn Olson

SF 94114
Dear Board Supervisors,

Please support community choice energy.

Thanks,

[Signature]
Dear board of supervisors,

I urge you to support Community Choice Energy, which would help San Francisco invest in a sustainable future and lead the nation to a greener and healthier future.

Zip - 94105
Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am doing my part by installing solar panels on my home. Can you please join me in this effort? Thank you for your cooperation.

"94114"
Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support Community Choice Energy to make our city a worldwide leader in solar energy. With unanimous support from the Mayor, the Board, & the PUC, now is the time to make sure the Community Choice Energy Power Plan is implemented by the end of summer.

Thanks so much!

Kak Feller

SF, CA 94117
Please support Community Choice

Sincerely,
Harry Blandwell
9/28/08
I support Community Choice Energy. I hope the city of San Francisco looks hard at the German model currently in place for non-petroleum energy generation. I find wind generators to have been extremely successful in generating power—yet, fact, superior to solar in regards to investment vs. BTU's.

To your wishes,

James F. Briden
S.F. CA. 94117
Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to ask that you please support efforts to make our wonderful city of San Francisco a leader in solar energy power. Upon supporting the construction of new solar plants, I am hoping that you will promote San Francisco's reputation as a progressive, environmentally conscious city.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Typed Name]
Please Support Community Choice Energy, a plan to make SF a worldwide leader in solar energy.

Chuck Tweedle

SF, CA 94115
Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support community choice energy. We need it!

Sincerely,

Carole Grubbs (Carole Grubbs)
9/1/21
Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support community choice energy.

Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

91114

[Redacted]
SF Board of Supervisors,

Please support Community Choice Energy, a plan to make SF a worldwide leader in solar energy.

Carole Siegel
SF, CA 94115
Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support Community Choice Heating.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Board of Supervisors

As a San Franciscan, I would be so proud of our city if you would please put solar panels on our public buildings. Be a leader and represent our shared interests.

Thank you,
Heather Ford
SF, CA 94110
Please support Community Choice Energy, a plan to make our city a worldwide leader in solar energy.

- Conz Vera
Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am a resident of Marin County who supports Community Choice Energy. All the reports show that Community Choice will keep rates the same or lower and results in cleaner power. Please stop any construction of power plants in the Bay View.

Denise R. Castellucci

SR, CA 94903

SF, CA 94116
Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support Community Choice Energy.

Mayor Kieser
Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a person deeply concerned with the environment, and a proud citizen of SF, I support Community Choice Energy. Because I want there to be gorgeous environments available to my generation and those to follow.

A concerned student,

Emily Z

94131
Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please don't act on this important issue - we need your thoughtful consideration on the Community Choice Energy Initiative. Let's continue to work on programs.

Sincerely, [Handwritten Signature]

S.F. 94132

[Handwritten Signature]

S.F. 94121
Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support Community Choice Energy and help SF go solar by the end of the summer.

Sincerely,

Laura O. Hansen
94115
Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support Community Choice Energy.

Sincerely,
[Signature]
Dear BOS,

Let's get the solar show on the road! Please get Community Choice Energy to get us going on the solar path.

Thanks,

William Higgins

7/12/08

SF, CA 94131
Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support community choice energy help San Francisco go solar by the end of the summer.

Davien Thompson-Black

9/4/11
Board of Supervisors:

PLEASE support Community Choice Energy to help San Francisco and our children invest in a solar future by the end of the summer. We can be (and should be) a leader in green technology!

Sincerely,

Tali Bray
SF, CA 94114
Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support community choice energy help us go solar by the end of the summer.

Sincerely,

Julia Baxter
94121
Dear Supervisor,

I support your initiative, Common Clean.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Board Supervisors,

Please support community choice energy.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Bd of Supervisors -

Please Support Community Choice Energy.

Elaine [Signature]

94114
Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support Community Choice Energy.

Let's be leaders in solar power!

Brad Mattick 9/11/7
Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support Community Choice Energy.
Dear Supervisors,

Please support Community Choice Energy.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

9/4/11
Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support Community Choice Energy, particularly solar energy.

Thank you.

Lawrence C. Sutten

SF 94131
Board of Supervisors,

Community Choice Energy is important to our city as we make solar a viable reality. Please do all you can.

Beit,

Christopher Reina

9/4/14
Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support community choice energy.

Yvahel Moron
Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support community choice energy. Help us go solar by the end of the summer.

Daniel Richard
94019
Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support Community Choice Energy. Help SF go clean by the end of summer.

Barbara Allen 9/16/08
Dear Board of Supervisors,

Solar energy community choice energy should be supported. This important initiative can save our planet!

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Board of Supervisors:

I support Community Choice Energy, and keep us go solar by the end of the summer.

Sincerely,

Jacqui Mila Wong
94114
Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support community choice energy. Make San Francisco a solar leader.

Chris Luna
94110
Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please implement Community Choice Energy to help San Francisco become a leader in solar energy.

Patrick Schwartz
9/1/10
Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support Community Choice Energy in order to make our city a worldwide leader in solar energy ASAP!

Thank you,

Kit Still
SF Resident

Kindra Smarich
9/11/14
Dear Board of Directors, Supervisors,

Please, I Beg You, Support Community Choice Energy. The Energy Savings and Environmental Impact (positive) will be substantial.

Respectfully,
Michael Francis Smith
Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support community choice energy.

Mara Lattie
94103
Dear Board of Supervisors,

I want solar energy and I support solar energy community

Nate Wells
94 110
Dear Board of Sups,

Please support community choice energy!

Stephanie Silva
04/31
Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support Community Choice Energy. I think San Francisco deserves to be a leader nationwide in implementing solar energy.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

9/1/12
I am writing regarding San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department determination of the future for the City's golf courses, specifically Sharp Park Golf Course. I urge the City and County of San Francisco to restore Sharp Park as a coastal lagoon and wetland habitat for endangered species.

Sharp Park Golf Course has a long history of environmental issues due to the design and location on a coastal lagoon. The course has experienced problems with flooding and drainage ever since opening, and the Recreation & Parks Department has created new and significant environmental impacts. The current operation of the golf course harms the wetland habitat and causes illegal take of two federally listed species, the California red-legged frog and the San Francisco garter snake.

Restoration of this area to a natural state is the best option for Sharp Park. Restoration will provide access to hiking trails, picnicking spots, camping facilities and educational opportunities needed in the area. Restoration will provide habitat for the locally endangered species at Sharp Park.

Ecological restoration is the most fiscally responsible method of managing Sharp Park and managing flood issues at the site. Compared to the costs of implementing capital improvements necessary to maintain the golf course combined with the high potential for massive civil penalties for harming endangered species, restoration alternatives seem to be the most fiscally responsible method for retaining recreational uses of the area.

Please evaluate restoration alternatives at Sharp Park before any long-term decisions about the future of the area.

Thank you

Noreen Weeden

San Francisco, CA 94107
Submitted on: 10/27/2008 11:31:15 AM

name: Paul Collis

phone:

comments: Dear Supervisors,
regarding the recent amendment to the Noise Control Ordinance:
in response to a recent article in the SF Chronicle detailing the proposed
amendments, about 80% of the 100 or so commentators (I was one) wanted loud
motorcycles to be included. 'Loud' motorcycles are inevitably Harley Davidsions
modified to have little or no silencing (muffling). Their riders often aspire
to an 'outlaw' lifestyle, so why not give them what they want, and fine them?
There is already a California code that defines the noise parameters of
motorcycles, and the decibel level of unsilenced Harley Davidsions is way
beyond it. We've all heard them; they can be deafening. These motorcyclists
often protest that 'louder = safer'. If that were so, the police forces of
Europe would have removed the mufflers from their BMW police bikes long ago.

As would the cops here. So, if the appropriate law is already in place, why is
it not enforced? Do our cops not have the necessary measuring equipment? Is
fining a Harley rider un-American? Are your cops scared of bikers?

Any bike loud enough to activate car alarms (and they are another relevant
issue) as it passes by is too loud. To the majority of San Francisco residents
it is obvious that scofflaw riders of loud 'bikes must be included in an
amendment. Please reconsider the majority's wishes.

Thank you,
Paul Collis.
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Submitted on: 10/24/2008 1:31:47 PM

name: Joe West

phone:

comments: Do something about the motorcycle noise in the city. Enforce our laws.

Excerpts from the comments on the SFGate on new NOISE laws in SF, does anyone not think load MOTORCYCLES are the biggest problem?:

larouchfoisauld7
10/24/2008 7:55:35 AM

Like most other posters, I agree that motorcycles are the worst offenders. A law which does not deal with them is pointless.

omnipotent1
10/24/2008 7:57:12 AM

Motorcycles aren't covered because SFPD and Oakland swapped out all the factory exhausts with expensive louder pipes. Good move, Chief Fong! There's two America's alright, one for citizens, and one for police who think they should have special privileges to violate our sleep. http://tinyurl.com/4btumc

fzbark
10/24/2008 8:00:24 AM

California does have standards on noise levels for motorcycles. I found it to be California (1985), Motor Vehicle Code 27202 states that a motorcycle cannot exceed 80 dba (decibels) Most loud motorcycles are in excess of 95 dba. The trouble is the police choose not to enforce that law. I don't know if there is a conspiracy between the cops and crooks (harley guys), or if the technology is not there to allow them to make the ticket stick. For whatever reason, I've seen multiple instances of extremely loud pipes going by and a local cop does nothing. I've thought of filing complaints against the riders, myself, but if the cops won't enforce it what chance does a 'citizen' have in making a complaint?

cityboy2008
10/24/2008 8:23:39 AM

For the uninformed, and there are a lot of us out there, there IS a law on the books regulating excessive noise from vehicles: CVC 27007. Ask the cops why they don't enforce it. Noise 50 feet beyond the vehicle. We ate downtown the other night (big mistake) and the parade of no-necked Mission Streeters in $500 Camaros equipped with $5,000 stolen stereo systems was endless. The booming wrinkled the glass windows on Nordstrom. Start there. Increase the fines and drive them out... Harley's with modified pipes next. Otherwise don't
waste my time with talk. DO IT!

cirpus
10/24/2008 8:27:43 AM

PLEASE start enforcing noise laws by ticketing people on loud motorcycles! Those guys purposely annoy everyone else in the city--how many times have you been woken up or had a pleasant conversation interrupted by some jerk on a motorcycle? Those guys should be given hefty fines that double with every repeated offense.

eric5sf7
10/24/2008 8:00:57 AM

in a dense urban setting a certain level of noise is inescapable, whether we like it or not. but there are noise sources that are useless and excessive: 1. motorcycle stereos 2. modified motorcycle mufflers 3. car alarms 4. car stereos 5. sanitation workers who don't take residents into consideration 6.permitted construction very early in the morning and late at night. address some of these issues and there would be a major improvement.

vrosauer
10/24/2008 8:04:53 AM

The motorcycles are the absolute worst. The world would be 100% quieter and more peaceful without those idiots. It astounds me that there is no legislation/laws to require them to have a muffler. They must have some persuasive lobbyists (redundant, I know) in D.C.

nutmonkey
10/24/2008 8:06:41 AM

Motorcycles (even Harleys) don't come from the factory like that. Cars don't come equipped with those ridiculous low frequency woofers. And that multi-sound car alarm hat seems to make up 90% of the false alarms that wake you up at 3 AM is a cheap ad-on product. People make decisions about these things, and they should be issued expensive tickets on the spot.

goliver5
10/24/2008 8:07:36 AM

I live in North Beach. Sometimes a motorcycle will set off every car alarm in on the block. Even the Blue Angels don't do that. Minimally, ban motorcycles from going up to Coit Tower. When they gun the engines to go up the hill at higher speeds, it shakes the entire building. Oh, I should disclose that I have owned motorcycles and plan on buying another in next year. I don't need to compensate by modifying my motorcycle to be really loud.

iwannatalktoo
10/24/2008 8:09:52 AM

vrosauer that's because bikes are (for the most part) male and men have traditionally made up our laws...always have!
The most disruptive noises in our neighborhood are motorcycles and the low frequency bass in cars outside, which rattles our windows when cars pass or simply sit parked outside booming. I'm sure there's already a law against motorcycle noise, but it's certainly not enforced anywhere in SF.

lfivepoints69
10/24/2008 8:15:06 AM

Why are motorcycles exempted? They're the worst offenders.

eylandagone
10/24/2008 8:17:02 AM

Will someone please explain to me the allure of an extra noisy motorcycle? Are the riders so starved for attention that they will risk annoying everyone within a mile radius? Are the male riders lacking in their "equipment"? Thus they must compensate with loud pipes? Why dear god, please help me understand why? Maybe they should just wear a pink tutu while riding the ugly bike and receive all of the attention with none of the noise.

tuttut
10/24/2008 8:20:08 AM

Another thing, the police actually need to CITE loud boomy cars and muffler violators. Aftermarket loud mufflers are for sale that clearly exceed legal noise limits. But of course, police have more important things to do...Chief Fong, how about tasking your officers with citing noise scofflaws? Talk is cheap. Write some tickets!

estephans500
10/24/2008 8:20:10 AM

My friends, I came to this comment box in order to say "Why the heck would motorcycles be exempted" and I find that everyone else on the page says the SAME thing. Please take note, people in the political process: PEOPLE WANT A LAW ABOUT INCREDIBLY LOUD MOTORCYCLES. I would go to a rally, or donate to it, in a heartbeat.

ibij
10/24/2008 8:21:03 AM

Have the same problem with motorcycles over here in the EBay;

gjackson
10/24/2008 8:21:35 AM

Motorcycles are excluded? Well what on earth is the ordinance for, then?
oakilland
10/24/2008 8:06:15 AM

It's the load motorcycles that make all the noise
I am outraged! It's the motorcycles with their open throttles that creates the most OBNOXIOUS NOISE POLLUTION in the city!!

as someone who lives in one of the noisiest areas of the city, I can tell you it's not my neighbors, it's the open throttle motorcycles. At 2am. What makes someone such a jerk that they believe that 1,000 people won't mind hearing their stupid motorcycle?

why the hell aren't motorcycles covered? They're the most obnoxious and unnecessary source of noise.

Motorcycles unaffected? What gives jerk load bike riders the right to go down residential streets with open exhaust systems that sound like a dragster going down a dragstrip? The city is asking for a lawsuit here. Also, blocks that have multiple apartment buildings pay extra to have garbage trucks come twice a week. On my block, that means 5 days a week of garbage trucks slamming and banging those cans in the trucks with total disregard for the horrendous noise they make. If you call the garbage company, some lubebrain woman will tell you "... Well, you should have known that when you bought the house ...". Being a native SPer, and the house being in the family for 36 years, you can imagine what I said to that dumb broad.

Bos is right, what about those very inconsiderate bikers and their "hogs" *oink*oink*? They are the real nuisance.

Talk about missing the obvious. As far as I can tell from this article the ordinance is entirely focused on fixed sources. The single most annoying source of noise in the city (as the other comments make obvious) is jerks who have modified the vehicles (mostly Harleys) to make them as loud as possible. Let's start by enforcing the existing laws against those illegally modified vehicles against the a-holes whose self-esteem seems depend entirely on how many people notice them, even if 99% are hoping they get run over by a truck.

Here's my short list: 1. Motorcycles have got to be quieter.
10/24/2008 7:33:22 AM

***Catch Motorcycles With Noise Cameras*** Just use the same cameras used to catch red light runners and put a Db. meter on the pole. If the Db. level goes above the limit, it snaps a picture of the offending vehicle -usually a motorcycle or a sports car.

gavin_lvs_billy
10/24/2008 7:40:37 AM

"Helicopters and motorcycles also would be unaffected"..... excellent! I just put new loud pipes on my chromed out Harley! They're so loud they set off car alarms! So glad to know I am above from the law!

reyinsf
10/24/2008 7:44:36 AM

The biggest difference would definitely be made by regulating motorcycle noise. It is ridiculous that it is OK to be startled awake 10 times a night by the throttling motorcycles that make more noise than double length eighteen wheelers. It's obnoxious, it's unnecessary and if there was anything this anti-regulate-everyone guy would ask is to regulate open throttle motorcycle noise. It's one of the things that makes living in SF not so great. Excerpts from the comments on the SFGate on new NOISE laws in SF, does anyone not think load MOTORCYCLES are the biggest problem?:

san_frankiscan
10/24/2008 7:49:44 AM

Doesn't cover human generated noise, motos or helicopters - pretty much useless IMHO as that is exactly what I have to deal with :(

db4080
10/24/2008 7:53:51 AM

Again local politicians seem clueless to the real life of S.F. As we all cover our ears from the loud exhaust emitted by the motorcycles of young men that didn't get the attention from their fathers, our local politicians sleep deeply in their secluded Pac Hts. residence. Do these folks even live in SF?

larouchfocaul7
10/24/2008 7:55:35 AM

Like most other posters, I agree that motorcycles are the worst offenders. A law which does not deal with them is pointless.
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October 14, 2008

Ms. Angela Calvillo  
Clerk of the Board  
Board of Supervisors  
City and County of San Francisco  
Room 244, City Hall  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, California 94102-4845

Subject: Quarterly Report of the Department of Public Works  
Defective Sidewalk Repair Revolving Account

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

Pursuant to Section 707 of the Public Works Code, attached is the Quarterly Report of the Department of Public Works Defective Sidewalk Repair Revolving Account for the period July 1, 2008 through September 30, 2008.

Sincerely,

Edward D. Reiskin  
Director of Public Works

Attachment: As noted

CC: Main Library, Document Desk  
Mary Ellen Casey, BSM  
Robert Carlson, DDFMA  
Jocelyn Quintos  
Nini Leigh
Department of Public Works  
Defective Sidewalk Repair Account  
Rvolving Fund (Fund Type 2S)  
Quarterly Report  
September 30, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Abatements</td>
<td>$153,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Cash Balance July 1, 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection from tax redemption</td>
<td>$3,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance - September 30, 2008</td>
<td>$156,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 98-99 Contract Retention</td>
<td>(4,537)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Fund Balance (Calculated)</td>
<td>$151,602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

TO: CLERK
FROM: Aimee F. Reeder
COMPANY: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
DATE: 10.24.08
FAX NUMBER: (415) 554-5163
TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER: 3
CC: SUPERVISOR ROSS MIRKARIMI & RICK GALBREATH
FAX NUMBER: (415) 554-7634
CC: RAQUEL FOX
FAX NUMBER: 415.771.1287

RE: 1166 Haight Street Matter – Remove from Tuesday’s Board of Supervisors Hearing

Please find following a copy of the letter to the Department of Public Works, with the corresponding fax confirmation page, for your records. Please remove the 1166 Haight issue from the calendar for the Board of Supervisor’s Tuesday meeting.

Please confirm via fax, phone or email that you have done so.

Thank you!

• CONFIDENTIAL FAX •

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE ADDRESSEE, AS IT CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL, PRIVILEGED, AND NON-DISCLOSABLE INFORMATION. PLEASE DELIVER IT PROMPTLY. READ ONLY IF YOU ARE THE PARTY TO WHOM IT IS SENT. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE DO NOT REAL DISTRIBUTE OR COPY. PLEASE NOTIFY US AT THE ABOVE NUMBERS BY TELEPHONE (COLLECT) AND MAIL THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE BACK TO US. THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!
October 24, 2008

SF Department of Public Works
2323 Cesar Chavez
San Francisco, CA 94124
Fax: 415.558.6649

San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103
Fax: 415.558.6409

VIA FAX ONLY

Re: Application # 200510195970 / 1166 Haight Street

To whom this may concern:

Please accept this letter as my formal request to withdraw the permit for 1166 Haight Street.

Please do not hesitate to contact me via my attorney’s office:

The Austin Law Group
799 Castro Street
San Francisco, CA 94114
t. 415.282.4511 f. 415.282.4536
Contact Person: Attorney Alex Austin

Thank you in advance for your assistance in this important matter.

Best regards,

Dennis McCarthy
DM:ar

CC: Rick Galbreath, Legislative Aide to Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi
     Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
     Raquel Fox
Hello,
Below is a letter that I sent to the Parkmerced Resident Organization and I am not sure if they can help me. Please read this letter and tell me that they should be allowed to do this to me and other residents living here. I need help and I need it ASAP. It is making my partner ill and nobody should have to go through this just because Parkmerced assumes they are too big to tackle! I will keep writing letters and letters until I get help. Parkmerced is a lousy company and these people should be investigated. I do hope you read this letter and truly think how we feel. If they get away with this then my whole perception on life is nothing but delusional and nobody cares. Please, if you can't help with this story send it to where I can get help.

Sincerely,
Craig Martell

Hello,
I am writing today to let you know of a certain situation that I am having with this management company. In all of our years of living in apartment communities we have never come across such an unprofessional/sleazy company. We have been living here for about 18 months now and from the beginning we have had nothing but nothing from them. We moved her thinking that we found our place to stay and what a great location for us. My partner who is in the Apartment Industry is besides himself and just shakes his head and can understand why they get sued. I am in the Hotel Industry and I shake my head. Once we moved in and about two months later we knew we had made a big mistake, the biggest. We knew at this time they were not going to help us unless we got difficult by contact different agencies and their corporate office which I should have know would be like them. After many letters and calling at all times of the day and night we did get some action but it took like 5 months to get it and many hours of lost sleep due to the parties and yelling going on here at 350 Arballo Drive. I can't say that I have anything good to say about them and I think you will agree after what I tell you next.

It has been six months now, yes six months and they have not cashed any of my checks, any!!! I have called them and left messages and e-mails and they don't respond or forgive me the one time they did they told me they did not know why the checks were not cashed. Yeah right! I have sent e-mails and e-mails and no response. Not only don't they respond to my e-mails regarding my checks they don't respond to anything I ask of them. I am looking for a way to get my fob for the doors and they don't respond. I fell recently and injured my leg badly and I can't get them to respond to let me know who to send my bills to or I will most likely have to sue them and I am sure the courts don't look kindly on Parkmerced.
I have asked for my heating to be checked due to my partner needs to have the house warm because he has a Neuropathy and when it is cold he has a hard time walking so having a warm house in the morning would be nice. I have to turn on the stove and let it run for hours to get it warm and I don't think having the stove on is a good thing, but what do I do? I even sent a letter to the President of Alliance asking to have my heat checked in the dining/living room and no reply at all. We are not in an situation that we can just get up and move due to my partners condition and even more so since he fell. Now you tell me if I should have a positive outlook towards this company. They are shameless and rotten to the core and they will have to pay one day for all of their hatefulness. I am a person who believes in Karma and one day they will have to answer to a Judge!
So, as you can see it is quite clear they want us to move and I am sure they are doing it to other people too. This has to stop and if nobody here is willing to step up to the plate then I need to go public with it. I will not let them do this to me or to other people especially seniors and this upsets me even more. My partner knows the law and is ready anytime to take them on for things they will be in trouble for. If I go to file a law suit I will request a trial by jury just to show the jury what kind of people are behind this company.

In conclusion, I don't know to what extent you can help me but maybe you can give me some kind of information to help me make a judgement against them. They need to be brought up on charges of discrimination and harassment and the lack of making my apartment totally livable.

I am at home on the weekends and during the week I am at work but you can speak to Randy with any concerns you may have. We can be reached at: 

Thank you for your time and cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

Craig Martell
Randy Eckhardt
Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi, Chair
Supervisor Sophie Maxwell
Supervisor Bevan Dufty
Public Safety Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Room 244, City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Supervisors:

I write regarding Agenda Item 2, File 081072 – a State contract for a Secure Reentry Program Facility (SRPF). The proposed resolution would authorize me to execute a contract with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to establish a pilot program providing up to 12 months of intensive, in-custody evidence-based reentry programming followed by 12 months of accountability-based out-of-custody reentry programming for “non-serious, non-violent” offenders who will be paroled to San Francisco at the end of their sentences. The goal of the program, a joint project of the District Attorney and the Sheriff’s Department, is to reduce recidivism among San Francisco’s offender population.

The program will be housed at County Jail #5 in San Bruno. The housing unit has a capacity of 48 prisoners. Custody costs will be reimbursed at the Daily Jail Rate of $77.17 per day. Routine jail medical costs will be reimbursed at the rate of $17.81 per day, for a total per diem rate per inmate of $94.98 per day and maximum annual revenue of $1,664,050. Any non-routine medical care will be billed and paid for separately. The State has guaranteed funding for this program at a 90% occupancy rate after the first month of program operation, even if the census falls below that number.

Prisoners transferred from State prison to this program will be screened by Sheriff’s staff prior to acceptance in the program. Prisoners will be housed at County Jail #5 for up to the last 12 months of their sentence. The Sheriff’s Department has the right to refuse to accept a prisoner and can also require the prisoner be returned to State custody.
Upon arrival at County Jail #5, prisoners will be assessed to develop and implement an individual reentry plan. The Sheriff's Department will provide education services through the Five Keys Charter High School as well as substance abuse and other services in the housing unit.

The District Attorney will provide case managers and a job developer, as well as services through local community agencies, to work with the State prisoners while they are in custody and for up to 12 months post-release.

The State will pay up to $723,225 per year for the programming services to be provided by the Sheriff and the District Attorney.

Once the Board of Supervisors authorizes the Sheriff to enter into this agreement, the program will begin accepting prisoners as of January 1, 2008.

Anticipated revenues for the period January 1 through June 30, 2009 are approximately $1.1 million to $1.2 million. The anticipated revenues will fully recover program costs during that time period.

While the SRPF program will only accept non-serious, non-violent offenders, the Sheriff's Department, through its No Violence Alliance (NoVA) Project has a State grant to provide intensive case management and related services, both pre-release and post-custody, for prisoners, many convicted of violent offenses, housed at San Quentin Prison. The NoVA Project has worked with 94 participants since program inception in October, 2007. As of September 30, 2008, 60 participants had been paroled to San Francisco and begun working with the community based case managers. Of the 60 participants released from prison, only 24 clients have been arrested and only one charged with a new offense, the remainder were charged with parole and probation violations.

If you have questions about either the proposed SRPF program or the NoVA Project, please contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL HENNESSEY
Sheriff
October 20, 2008

Ms. Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
Room 208 City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA  94102

RE: File No 08-0379 [Regulating the conditions for purchasing prior public service credit through the Retirement System]

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

This letter serves as the actuarial report of the cost and effect of the proposed ordinance amendment to Administrative Code sections 16.55-1 through 16.55-4 as required by Charter section A8.500.

The purchase of public service credit was authorized by the voters in Proposition E on November 5, 1968. Subsequently the Board of Supervisors enacted the cited Administrative Code sections on May 18, 1970.

The Charter provides that:

The Board of Supervisors, by ordinance enacted by a three-fourths vote of its members, may provide for the crediting as service under the retirement system as service, other than military service, rendered as an employee of the federal government and service rendered as an employee of the State of California or any public entity or public agency in the State of California. Said ordinance shall provide that all contributions required as the result of crediting of such service shall be made by the member and that no contributions therefor shall be required of the City and County.

The ordinance enacted in 1970 was drafted consistent with the related Charter provisions and pay practices of the day. Over the intervening period a number of the provisions of the ordinance no longer fulfill practical purposes and the advent of a period of zero employer contribution rate requirements has created unintended consequences. This proposed amendment to the 1970 ordinance accomplishes the changes listed below while ensuring that the full intent of Proposition E (Nov. 1968) is accomplished. The proposed changes include:

1. Clarification that any SFERS member maintaining a miscellaneous member account may purchase qualified credit. A clarification required to include safety officers who
have maintained a miscellaneous account for a portion of their academy training period as eligible to purchase public service in their miscellaneous member account.

2. Clarification that qualified service has been rendered under a public defined benefit pension plan operated by a California local jurisdiction or served when qualified to participate in CalPERS. This clarification is needed to address the creation of defined contribution plans starting in 1979 and to avoid dual credit for the same period of public service.

3. Elimination of August 1 to October 31 window for application to purchase public service credit. During the 1970s, it was the San Francisco City and County (SFC&C) practice to have annual pay increases payable on July 1 of each fiscal year. The selection of the window was to preclude “adverse selection” by members applying to purchase public service credit immediately prior to a wage increase. Current pay practices are the result of collective bargaining and have resulted in pay adjustments which occur much more randomly. Further SFC&C has had wage freezes more than five times over the last 20 years.

4. Replacement of the language requiring the payment of “the required SFERS employee and employer contribution rates as of the date of election to purchase”... with the “normal cost percentage as published in the most recent actuarial valuation.” This revision is the result of the impact of a period of reduced or zero required employer contributions which occurred from the mid 1990s thru June 30, 2004. The revised language ensures that “all contributions required as the result of crediting such service shall be made by the member and that no contributions therefore be required of the City and County.” The normal cost is that percentage of a member’s covered compensation during a given valuation year that represents the portion of the actuarial present value of the projected benefits earned during a given year of employment, i.e. the full cost of an accruing year of service.

5. Clarification that the contributions required to purchase public service credit are not matched under the vesting formula. This revision adds language to make sure that no additional cost be required of the employer, by specifically recognizing that the normal cost includes the employer contribution which is otherwise represented by the dollar match provided in the vesting formula.

6. The 1970 ordinance provided that a member who failed to complete a purchase would receive a refund of the public service contributions paid to date and forego any future right to purchase such service. This provision was designed to preclude “shopping” of contribution rates, the proposal to change to normal cost and the tax code requirements for pre-tax purchase significantly reduce this risk. The proposal allows prorated purchase based on contributions completed and is consistent with practice relating to other service purchases under the plan.

7. The second draft which is before the committee on October 23, 2008 for amendment adds public service credit purchases among the qualified purchases for which the
Retirement system will accept a rollover from Internal Revenue Code qualified source as payment.

This proposed ordinance amendment can best be viewed as an updating and clarification of the 1970 ordinance taking into account almost 40 years of legislative changes and pay practice modifications while more fully complying with the Charter requirement that no contributions be required of the City and County. As noted in the original Charter provision, the Board of Supervisors must act by a nine vote majority to amend the ordinance.

Representatives of the Retirement System will attend the hearing regarding this proposed ordinance amendment when scheduled.

Very truly yours

[Signature]

Clare M. Murphy
Executive Director and Acting Actuary

cc: Supervisor Sean Elsbernd
    Clerk of Government Audit and Oversight Committee
    Supervisor Aaron Peskin, Chair
    Supervisor Tom Ammiano
    Supervisor Sophie Maxwell
    Mayor Gavin Newsom
    Ben Rosenfield, Controller
    Peg Stevenson, Controllers Office
    Budget Analyst
    Martin Gran, Director of Employee Relations
Date:       October 23, 2008  
To:         Members of the Board of Supervisors  
From:       Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board  
Subject:    Form 700  

This is to inform you that the following individuals have submitted a Form 700 Statement of Economic Interests to my office.  

  - Jennifer Stuart, Legislative Aide to Supervisor Alioto-Pier
October 22, 2008

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

RE: Board Inquiry 20082007-003

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

This is in response to a request made by Supervisor Carmen Chu at the Board meeting on October 7, 2008 concerning various stop sign requests in the Sunset District. Our Agency has reviewed some of the locations in the October 8, 2008 request but others were new.

In making STOP sign recommendations we have to balance the various impacts that STOP signs are associated with. Though STOP signs can at times improve safety by assigning right-of-way, overuse of STOP signs can decrease compliance with these regulations. State and federal guidelines on the use of traffic control devices usually try to balance the safety and circulation considerations of requiring all vehicles to come to a stop at a location. Requiring a full stop where not strictly required leads to increases in delay, emergency consumption, and air and noise pollution. While the impacts of one additional stop are arguably small, over time and over many locations, the effects of STOP sign proliferation can become significant.

The Agency has in the past decades converted many two-way STOP locations in the Sunset with higher than average collision totals to all-way STOP. As a result the number of higher collision locations remaining has dropped in recent years, decreasing the likelihood that a location with be recommended for all-way STOP controls. At times, other measures such as pavement marking, signage, and parking changes can improve safety without the negative impacts of additional STOP signs.

Below is a summary of our current recommendations:

Locations already recommended for new STOP signs
38th Avenue and Escolta Way (installed in May of 2008)
44th Avenue and Rivera Street (work order pending installation)
Irving Street and Lower Great Highway (installed September of 2008)

New all-way STOP being considered
39th Avenue and Kirkham Street (pending SFMTA approval)

Crosswalks painted in place of additional STOP signs
20th Avenue and Judah Street (installed June of 2008)
Fixing America
by flushing the toilet called Congress

Senator Barack Obama: Your grandmother and we the congressionally betrayed people of the United States want you to always hesitate to use deadly military force against our earth neighbors, regardless of what your warmongering sponsors want. We also do not want impostor commanded American volunteers deployed from one unconstitutional war in Iraq for United States owners Big Oil to another unconstitutional war in Afghanistan for energy starved United States creditors Communist China, Japan, and South Korea.

Senator John McCain: Save lives, $2 billion per day, country, your honor, and maybe your campaign by calling for a cease fire in an undeclared war of your wrong choice, never necessity. Admit that Osama bin Laden did not kill “3,000 people,” as you told Dave Letterman. Enron desperation, fascist greed, and Lust did.

Senate Leader Harry Reid: Why are you not correcting “the worst foreign policy mistake in the history of this country” that you and Senator McCain made by repealing strike-first Public Law 107-243 that authorized 9-11 attempted wife killer Bush to use deadly military force “as he determines to be necessary.”

Senator Joseph Biden: You took an oath to support and defend the Constitution without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion. The undeclared war in Iraq that you and Senators McCain, Reid, and China Doll Dianne Feinstein mistakenly corruptly authorized violates the 4th, 5th, and 14th Amendments. You all violated your oaths and breeched your contracts to give aid and comfort to your domestic enemy sponsors who profit from human misery in 61 years of Hoover Institute-advised and CIA-produced unconstitutional wars of congressional choice.

Senator Barbara Boxer: Why are you not saying Iraq IS an unconstitutional war of congressional choice, NEVER necessity instead of “Iraq was a war of choice, not necessity?”

Governor Sarah Palin: Your son is in harms way because Senators McCain, Biden, Feinstein and 370 other traitors in the 107th Congress authorized the President to use deadly military forces in Iraq “as he determines to be necessary.” We the congressionally betrayed people do not grant any man or woman the power to use deadly United States force on foreign or domestic soil without due process of law and examination of probable cause.
California Senate President Don Perata: Why is the California legislature not holding public hearings where 9-11 Truth campaigners can inform California about the United States is cutting back grants to all states, counties, and cities to fund more mass murder in unconstitutional wars of congressional choice, NEVER necessity?

Former President George H.W. Bush: Thank you for saving the life of your daughter-in-law Laura Bush on 9-11. Unfortunately, saving our first lady from treachery by your son and first companion Condoleezza Rice led to the shoot down of restored United Flight 93 in cold blood by USAF Major Rick Gibney, and to the 2,629 unplanned New York murders during controlled demolitions of the Twin Towers by WTC principal Larry Silverstein and investor Lloyd Goldman.

Colin Powell: Why do you support a candidate for president who would “never hesitate to use” deadly United States military force on innocent third world neighbors? Are you a closet fascist too?

Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey: Why are you not telling your constituents that Congress passed $1.253 trillion more United States blood debt to Communist China in S3001 and H.R. 2638 under the cover of bailing out lenders in H.R.1424.

Congresswoman Barbara Lee: Why are you not telling your constituents that House Speaker Nancy Pelosi force you to pass bail out bill H.R. 1424 after you and Representative Woolsey refused to pass the first bail out bill, H.R. 3397?

Congressional Candidate Cindy Sheehan: Why are you not telling voters in San Francisco that Nurse of Death Nancy Pelosi whipped up over $500 billion dollars of public blood debt to Communist China for an optional conflict that killed your son for Big Oil?

Judge Arnold Rosenfield: Why are you forcing an angry 9-11 Truth Campaigner who hates mass murder and corruption in undeclared war of congressional choice, NEVER necessity, to take 15 sessions if anger management before you allow her to exercise her 1st Amendment right to file documents for her and her child’s protection so she can restore custody of her victimized child in a well documented domestic violence case?

Judge Gary Nadler: Why are you evading your duty to compel Secretary of State Debra Bowen to disqualify Joseph Biden, John McCain, Barack Obama and 19 federal officers from California including Duncan Hunter, Jerry Lewis, and Ellen Tauscher from holding ANY office under the United States?
# U.S. House of Representatives Roll Call Votes

## 110th Congress - 2nd Session (2008)

as compiled through the electronic voting machine
by the House Tally Clerks under the direction of the Clerk of the House

(Result designators are P for Passed, F for Failed, and A for Agreed To)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roll</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Title/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>683</td>
<td>3-Oct</td>
<td>H.R. 6867</td>
<td>On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>682</td>
<td>3-Oct</td>
<td>S. 3197</td>
<td>On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>National Guard and Reservists Debt Relief Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>2-Oct</td>
<td>H.R. 7221</td>
<td>On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>677</td>
<td>2-Oct</td>
<td>S. 3641</td>
<td>Table Motion to Reconsider</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>To authorize funding for the National Crime Victim Law Institute to provide support for victims of crime under Crime Victims Legal Assistance Programs as a part of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>676</td>
<td>2-Oct</td>
<td>S. 3641</td>
<td>On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>To authorize funding for the National Crime Victim Law Institute to provide support for victims of crime under Crime Victims Legal Assistance Programs as a part of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>674</td>
<td>29-Sep</td>
<td>H.R. 3997</td>
<td>On Concurring in Senate Amendment With An Amendment</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide earnings assistance and tax relief to members of the uniformed services, volunteer firefighters, and Peace Corps volunteers, and for other purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>673</td>
<td>29-Sep</td>
<td>ADJOURN</td>
<td>On Motion to Adjourn</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Providing for an adjournment or recess of the two Houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>671</td>
<td>29-Sep</td>
<td>H Res 1517</td>
<td>On Agreeing to the Resolution</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Rule providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 3997, the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H.R.1424

Title: A bill to provide authority for the Federal Government to purchase and insure certain types of troubled assets for the purposes of providing stability to and preventing disruption in the economy and financial system and protecting taxpayers, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for energy production and conservation, to extend certain expiring provisions, to provide individual income tax relief, and for other purposes.


Related Bills:

Latest Major Action: Became Public Law No: 110-343 [GPO: Text, PDF]


MAJOR ACTIONS:

3/9/2007 Introduced in House

10/15/2007 Reported (Amended) by the Committee on Education and Labor. H. Rept. 110-374, Part I.

10/15/2007 Reported (Amended) by the Committee on Ways and Means. H. Rept. 110-374, Part II.


10/1/2008 Passed/agreed to in Senate: Passed Senate, pursuant to the order of September 30, 2008, having achieved the required 60 votes in the affirmative, with an amendment and an amendment to the Title by Yea-Nay Vote. 74 - 25. Record Vote Number: 213.

10/3/2008 Resolving differences -- House actions: On motion that the House agree to the Senate amendments Agreed to by the Yeas and Nays: 263 - 171 (Roll no. 681).


10/3/2008 Presented to President.

10/3/2008 Signed by President.

10/3/2008 Became Public Law No: 110-343 [Text, PDF]
NEW SEARCH | HOME | HELP |

H.R.3997

2nd Act, Bailout Sideshow

Title: An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief and protections for military personnel, and for other purposes.


Related Bills: H.RES.884, H.RES.1517

Latest Major Action: 9/29/2008 Resolving differences -- House actions. Status: On motion that the House agree to the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment Failed by recorded vote: 205 - 228 (Roll No. 674).

House Reports: 110-426


MAJOR ACTIONS:

10/30/2007 Introduced in House


11/6/2007 Passed/agreed to in House: On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended Agreed to by the Yeas and Nays: (2/3 required): 410 - 0 (Roll no. 1042).

12/12/2007 Passed/agreed to in Senate: Passed Senate with an amendment and an amendment to the Title by Unanimous Consent.

12/18/2007 Resolving differences -- House actions: House agreed to Senate amendment to the title. House agreed to Senate amendment to the text with an amendment pursuant to H. Res. 884.

12/19/2007 Resolving differences -- Senate actions: Senate concurred in the House amendment to the Senate amendment with an amendment (SA 3890) by Unanimous Consent.

9/29/2008 Resolving differences -- House actions: On motion that the House agree to the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment Failed by recorded vote: 205 - 228 (Roll No. 674).
FINAL VOTE RESULTS FOR ROLL CALL 674
(Democrats in roman; Republicans in italic; Independents underlined)

HR 3997  RECORDED VOTE  29-Sep-2008  2:07 PM
QUESTION: On Concurring in Senate Amendment With An Amendment
BILL TITLE: To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide earnings assistance and tax relief to members of the uniformed services, volunteer firefighters, and Peace Corps volunteers, and for other purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AYES</th>
<th>NOES</th>
<th>PRES</th>
<th>NV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEMOCRATIC</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLICAN</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEPENDENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---- AYES 205 ----

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)

Fossella
Foster
Frank (MA)
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Gordon
Granger
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herger
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hobson
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inglis (SC)
Israel
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)

Nadler
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ross
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
S.3001

Title: An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2009 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Sponsor: Sen Levin, Carl [MI] (introduced 5/12/2008) Cosponsors (None)

Related Bills: H.R.5658, S.3002, S.3003, S.3004

Latest Major Action: Became Public Law No: 110-417 [GPO: Text, PDF]

Senate Reports: 110-335

Note: In this Act: Division A is Department of Defense Authorizations; Division B is Military Construction Authorizations; Division C is Department of Energy National Security Authorizations and Other Authorizations.

MAJOR ACTIONS:

5/12/2008 Introduced in Senate


9/24/2008 Passed/agreed to in House: On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended Agreed to by the Yeas and Nays: (2/3 required): 392 - 39 (Roll no. 631).

9/27/2008 Resolving differences -- Senate actions: Senate agreed to the House amendment to the bill by Unanimous Consent.


10/6/2008 Presented to President.

10/14/2008 Signed by President.

10/14/2008 Became Public Law No: 110-417 [Text, PDF]
H.R.2638

Title: Making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes.


Cosponsors (None)

Related Bills: H.RES.473, H.RES.1488

Latest Major Action: Became Public Law No: 110-329 [GPO: Text, PDF] 9-30-08

House Reports: 110-181

Note: Division A provides continuing appropriations for all agencies and activities that would be covered by the regular fiscal year 2009 appropriations bills, until enactment of the applicable regular appropriations bill or until March 6, 2009, whichever occurs first. Emergency FY09 appropriations for LIHEAP and advanced technology vehicle manufacturing loans are also included. Division B provides $22.9 billion in emergency supplemental appropriations for relief and recovery from hurricanes, floods, and other natural disasters. Division C provides $487.7 billion in FY09 funding for the Department of Defense. Division D provides $40 billion in FY09 funding for the Department of Homeland Security. Division E provides $72.9 billion in FY09 funding for Military Construction and Veterans Affairs.
SEC. 2. SUPPORT FOR UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC EFFORTS.

The Congress of the United States supports the efforts by the President to—

(1) strictly enforce through the United Nations Security Council all relevant Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq and encourages him in those efforts; and

(2) obtain prompt and decisive action by the Security Council to ensure that Iraq abandons its strategy of delay, evasion and noncompliance and promptly and strictly complies with all relevant Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The President is authorized to use the Armed Forces of the United States as he determines to be necessary and appropriate in order to—

(1) defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq; and

(2) enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq.

(b) PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION.—In connection with the exercise of the authority granted in subsection (a) to use force the President shall, prior to such exercise or as soon thereafter as may be feasible, but no later than 48 hours after exercising such authority, make available to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate his determination that—

(1) reliance by the United States on further diplomatic or other peaceful means alone either (A) will not adequately protect the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq or (B) is not likely to lead to enforcement of all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq; and

(2) acting pursuant to this joint resolution is consistent with the United States and other countries continuing to take the necessary actions against international terrorist and terrorist organizations, including those nations, organizations, or persons who planned, authorized, committed or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001.

(c) WAR POWERS RESOLUTION REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) SPECIFIC STATUTORY AUTHORIZATION.—Consistent with section 8(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution, the Congress declares that this section is intended to constitute specific statutory authorization within the meaning of section 5(b) of the War Powers Resolution.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—Nothing in this joint resolution supersedes any requirement of the War Powers Resolution.

SEC. 4. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) REPORTS.—The President shall, at least once every 60 days, submit to the Congress a report on matters relevant to this joint resolution, including actions taken pursuant to the exercise of authority granted in section 3 and the status of planning for efforts that are expected to be required after such actions are completed, including those actions described in section 7 of the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–338).
Candidate’s Pledge

to help we the people of the United States end mass murder and plunder in 61 years of unconstitutional United States wars by compelling Congress to declare a cease fire in a Jihad of “congressional choice, not necessity,” quoting United States Senator Barbara Boxer, that is authorized under “the worst foreign policy mistake in the history of this country,” quoting authorizing Senate Leader Harry Reid. This pledge is made by

(Please print your name) ________________________________,
a 2008 candidate for election to a seat of honor on the
________________________ County Board of Supervisors.

I hereby promise that I will uphold my Oath of Office to support and defend the Constitution for the United States without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion. As a Member of the __________ County Board of Supervisors, my first order of business will be to seek an agenda item that considers petitioning the United States of America to declare a cease fire in a Jihad in order to end an undeclared war against the people of Iraq that the United States started on false pretense and is depriving persons of life, liberty or property without due process of law. This cease fire will end 61 years of United States killing over 10 million foreigners for greed. It will also save the lives of 2 American volunteers each day, save over $2 billion per day for an optional conflict, and end federal cutbacks for fascist gain.

I will seek a second agenda item to consider petitioning Congress to repeal strike-first Public Law 107-243 because it establishes foreign policy for our President to use deadly United States military force in Iraq “as he determines to be necessary,” at the expense of we the congressionally betrayed people.

Signature:

Dated: __________ In the County of ________________, California
Honorable candidate: Please fill out and sign this life saving pledge in blue ink and send the original document through regular United States Mail to ‘da 9-11 Truth Campaign, 3325 Gravenstein Highway North, Sebastopol, California, 95472. Thank you. By the way, if you have ANY idea on how to make this critical document more effective, PLEASE call 800-500-7083. Also, Barack Obama is not going end unconstitutional wars. He said “we should never hesitate to use military force.”
Dear Board of Supervisors:

Director Ed Reiskin responded directly to Supervisor Chu with the attached e-mail.

Sincerely,
Frank W. Lee
Executive Assistant to the Director
Department of Public Works
Tel: (415) 554-6993
Fax: (415) 522-7727

-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors
Sent: Thursday, October 23, 2008 11:52 AM
To: Reiskin, Ed
Subject: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - DUE NOTICE

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - DUE NOTICE
If you have already responded, please disregard this notice.
For any questions, call (415) 554-7708.

TO: Edward Reiskin
Public Works

FROM: Clerk of the Board
DATE: 10/23/2008
REFERENCE: 20080909-009
FILE NO.

Due Date: 10/11/2008
Reminder Sent: 10/8/2008

The inquiry referenced above from Supervisor Chu was made at the Board meeting on 9/9/2008 and a response was requested by the due date shown above.

Please indicate the reference number shown above in your response, direct the original via email to Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org and send a copy to the Supervisor(s) noted above.

For your convenience, the original inquiry is repeated below.
Requesting the Recreation & Parks Department, Department of Public Works, Police Department, Municipal Transportation Agency, 311, and the Office of Economic and Workforce Development as to impacts of the Outside Lands Music Festival that took place in Golden Gate Park from August 22 - 24.

Report should include information on total revenue generated from event and what the City will be receiving, number of participants, cost recovery, number complaints made by neighbors, number of traffic or vehicular problems, and impact on Golden Gate Park and surrounding neighborhoods in terms of cleanliness and traffic flow.

Request also includes inquiry as to feasibility of holding Recreation & Parks Commission meetings in neighborhood(s) that may be impacted by future events.
MEMORANDUM

October 24, 2008

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Ben Rosenfield, Controller of the City and County of San Francisco

THROUGH: Human Services Commission

FROM: Trent Rhorer, Executive Director
Phil Arnold, Deputy Director for Administration

SUBJECT: Human Services Care Fund: FY08-09 1st Quarter Update

This memo is intended to notify the Board of Supervisors and the Office of the Controller that pursuant to Administrative Code Section 10.100-7(e), the Human Services Commission has approved the Human Services Agency’s revised FY08-09 savings projection for the Human Services Care Fund.

The FY08-09 savings in homeless CAAP aid payments resulting from the implementation of Care Not Cash is now projected at $14,116,698, which is approximately seventeen thousand more than the amount previously projected. The projected savings for this fiscal year are roughly five hundred thousand dollars more than the FY08-09 budgeted amount.

(memo continued on next page)
The table below shows the detailed monthly projections made last quarter and compares them to the actual figures for the first quarter of FY08-09 and the updated projections for the rest of the fiscal year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Previous Quarterly Update (Q4 FY07-08)</th>
<th>Current Quarterly Update (Q1 FY08-09)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul-08</td>
<td>$1,135,319</td>
<td>$1,133,063</td>
<td>($2,256)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-08</td>
<td>$1,135,665</td>
<td>$1,133,894</td>
<td>($1,771)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-08</td>
<td>$1,136,008</td>
<td>$1,138,560</td>
<td>$553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-08</td>
<td>$1,188,069</td>
<td>$1,189,524</td>
<td>$1,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-08</td>
<td>$1,188,069</td>
<td>$1,189,734</td>
<td>$1,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-08</td>
<td>$1,188,069</td>
<td>$1,189,943</td>
<td>$1,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-09</td>
<td>$1,188,069</td>
<td>$1,190,150</td>
<td>$2,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-09</td>
<td>$1,188,069</td>
<td>$1,190,357</td>
<td>$2,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-09</td>
<td>$1,188,069</td>
<td>$1,190,562</td>
<td>$2,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-09</td>
<td>$1,188,069</td>
<td>$1,190,767</td>
<td>$2,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-09</td>
<td>$1,188,069</td>
<td>$1,190,970</td>
<td>$2,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-09</td>
<td>$1,188,069</td>
<td>$1,191,173</td>
<td>$3,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FY08-09</td>
<td>$14,099,617</td>
<td>$14,116,698</td>
<td>$17,081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Shaded figures are actuals (versus projections).

The FY08-09 budgeted amount for the Human Services Care Fund is $13,596,803. As shown in the table below, current savings projections are roughly five hundred thousand more than this budgeted amount.

**FY08-09 Human Services Care Fund**

**Budget Comparison**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY08-09 Budget</td>
<td>$13,596,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Savings</td>
<td>$14,116,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Amount Under-Funded</td>
<td>$519,895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: October 23, 2008

TO: Clerk, Board of Supervisors

FAX NUMBER: (415) 554-5163

FROM: Doug Stoddard, Personnel Analyst

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES (including cover sheet): 3

COMMENTS: I am providing you with a copy of a waiver request that the Fire Department submitted to the Human Rights Commission to rent meeting space and rooms for testing at the Holiday Inn Golden Gateway for the administration of the H-4 Inspector examination. Also attached is a letter of justification from Gary Massetani, Deputy Chief of Administration.

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

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

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

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

Section 2. Contractor Information
Contractor Name: Holiday Inn Golden Gateway
Contractor Address: 1500 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94109
Vendor Number (if known): 09340
Contact Person: Christopher Leong
Contact Phone No.: (415) 447-3046

Section 3. Transaction Information
Date Waiver Request Submitted: 10/20/08
Type of Contract: Purchase Order
Contract Start Date: 11/14/08
End Date: 11/17/08
Dollar Amount of Contract: $14,497.00

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

Section 5. Waiver Type (Letter of Justification must be attached, see Check List on back of page.)
- [ ] A. Sole Source
- [ ] B. Emergency (pursuant to Administrative Code §6.60 or 21.15)
- [ ] C. Public Entity
- [ ] D. No Potential Contractors Comply – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: 10/20/08
- [ ] 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.7.13)
- [ ] H. Subcontracting Goals

HRC ACTION
12B Waiver Granted: ________ 14B Waiver Granted: ________
12B Waiver Denied: ________ 14B Waiver Denied: ________
Reason for Action: __________________

HRC Staff: __________________ Date: ________
HRC Staff: __________________ Date: ________
HRC Director: __________________ Date: ________

DEPARTMENT ACTION – This section must be completed and returned to HRC for waiver types D, E & F.
Date Waiver Granted: ________ Contract Dollar Amount: ________
October 21, 2008

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

Dear Ms. Goldstein:

I respectfully request that the Human Rights Commission grant a waiver of requirements of Chapter 12B (Nondiscrimination in Contracts and Benefits) for a contract with the Holiday Inn Golden Gateway to rent meeting space and guest rooms for the administration of the second component of the H-4 Inspector examination, on November 14-16, 2008. A waiver request form for that facility is enclosed.

The examination component requires one large meeting room, two smaller meeting rooms, and a total of 21 guest rooms that will be used as test rooms. Members of my staff contacted the Marriott Courtyard at Oyster Point and the Whitcomb Hotel (the only local hotels that are compliant). The Marriott’s meeting space is not sufficient for this component, and the Whitcomb’s meeting space is not available. Therefore, we are unable to consider using those facilities.

The Holiday Inn Golden Gateway is able to offer us the necessary meeting space and guest rooms, and is available on our targeted dates. Staff has advised personnel at the Holiday Inn Golden Gateway to contact the Human Rights Commission regarding the procedure for compliance certification.

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

Very truly yours,

Gary P. Massetani
Deputy Chief of Administration

Endorsement

cc: Jesusa Bushong, Departmental Personnel Officer
Complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Satisfaction form by clicking the link below. http://www.sfgov.org/site/bdsupvrs_form.asp?id=18548

----- Forwarded by Angela Calvillo/BOS/SFGOV on 10/24/2008 03:20 PM -----  

"Kevin Jefferson"  
<Kevin@ilrscf.org>  
10/24/2008 03:17 PM  

To <Michela.Alito-Pier@sfgov.org>, <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>, <sophie.maxwell@sfgov.org>, <Gerardo.Sandoval@sfgov.org>, <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>  

cc  

Subject Hearing on 10/27 @ 1 pm Land Use and Economic Development

October 27, 2008

Agenda Item 1  
# 081082  
Requiring Activation of Closed Captions during Video Events  
Sent by email

Dear Committee Members:

Please add these comments to the official record for the above agenda item. We are writing to express our support of Supervisor Alioto-Pier’s ordinance that would require television closed captioning to be turned on in all public places. This legislation helps ensure that all people with disabilities can participate in society while in public places and supports the best spirit of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

The Independent Living Resource Center San Francisco is a non-profit organization whose core values include choice, consumer leadership, as well as full access to and inclusion in the community. We serve people with all types of disabilities by providing direct services and by educating the community. This proposed legislation will have a
very positive and tangible impact on the lives of people with disabilities across our city, including allowing people with disabilities to participate in community activities.

Since 1993 regulations requiring various closed captioning abilities have been in effect. As television use has increased closed captioning use has also increased however closed captioning frequently is not used on televisions in public locations. This excludes many deaf and hard-of-hearing consumers from participation in events such as receiving updates, or even just enjoying their favorite sports team in action.

Sincerely,

Kevin Jefferson
In. Living Assistive Technology Educator
Independent Living Resource Center San Francisco

415-543-6222 X 107
kevin@ilrcsf.org
www.ilrcsf.org
Below is the link to a report of all of the performance measures in the citywide performance measurement system. It contains actual values for FY 2005-06 through FY 2007-08 and target values for FY 2008-09, sorted by department, program, and goal.


Departments are responsible for updating the data in the citywide performance measurement system at least every six months. The report represents departments' most recent entries, for FY 2007-08 year end. Note that data is not available ("n/a") for some measures where:

- Data comes from an external source and was not available in time for the report or is collected less often than annually;
- Measures are new and data has not yet been collected or are old and are awaiting deletion; or
- The department simply did not complete their data entry in time for this report.

For FY 2008-09, the Controller's Office plans to implement several initiatives to improve data in the citywide performance measurement system and reporting of such. We will work closely with several departments to revise their measures and/or improve their data collection techniques. We will also continue to develop several of the advanced features of the Cognos-based software system to improve reporting to policymakers and the public.

We hope you will find this report interesting and informative. If you have any questions or comments, please contact us using the information below or through email at performance.con@sfgov.org.

Sincerely,

Andrew Murray, City Performance Deputy Director
Controller's Office, City Services Auditor
415-554-6126

Mike Wylie, Project Manager
Controller's Office, City Services Auditor
415-554-7570
MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Mayor Gavin Newsom
Members of the Board of Supervisors
Department Directors and Department Chief Financial Officers

FROM: Andrew Murray, City Performance Deputy Director
Michael Wylie, Project Manager
Controller’s Office, City Services Auditor

DATE: October 23, 2008

SUBJECT: Departmental Performance Measures FY 2007-08

Attached is a report of all of the performance measures in the citywide performance measurement system. It contains actual values for FY 2005-06 through FY 2007-08 and target values for FY 2008-09, sorted by department, program, and goal.

Departments are responsible for updating the data in the citywide performance measurement system at least every six months. The report represents departments’ most recent entries, for FY 2007-08 year end. Note that data is not available (“n/a”) for some measures where:

- Data comes from an external source and was not available in time for the report or is collected less often than annually;
- Measures are new and data has not yet been collected or are old and are awaiting deletion; or
- The department simply did not complete their data entry in time for this report.

For FY 2008-09, the Controller’s Office plans to implement several initiatives to improve data in the citywide performance measurement system and reporting of such. We will work closely with several departments to revise their measures and/or improve their data collection techniques. We will also continue to develop several of the advanced features of the Cognos-based software system to improve reporting to policymakers and the public.

We hope you will find this report interesting and informative. If you have any questions or comments, please contact us at 554-6126 (Andrew Murray), 554-7570 (Michael Wylie) or through email at performance.con@sfgov.org.

cc: Department Performance Measurement Contacts
    Board of Supervisors’ Budget Analyst

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

415-554-7500 City Hall • 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place • Room 316 • San Francisco CA 94102-4694 FAX 415-554-7466
Dear Ms. Kamalanathan and the Golf Task Force,

I was present at your September 30th meeting and learned of the SF Rec and Park Department’s consultant suggestions to turn our beautiful Lincoln Park into a pitch and putt course and practice facility. Having listened and seen the drawing of the proposal, I must state my strong opposition to this suggestion.

Lincoln Park and Sharp Park are 18 holes. There are two nine-hole courses, Golden Gate and Fleming, which are used mostly by beginner golfers. I have played all of these courses for forty years and Lincoln is San Francisco's crown jewel.

Lincoln Park is not a beginner course; it is hilly with views on every hole. I have played with young and old from every ethnic community. Tourists play at Lincoln and marvel at it’s beauty. They wonder why San Francisco (The City That Knows How) supports Harding but not the other courses. Also, the afternoons at Lincoln are filled with San Francisco school teams practicing and playing teams from all over the bay area. Where will these schools practice if you eliminate Lincoln? Where will seniors and others with limited funds go to play? Lincoln is accessible by bus or taxi; Sharp Park is many miles away.

It was stated at the meeting the costs of the Lincoln Park proposal are totally beyond the cost of preserving the present golf course. Where will San Francisco find funds in our present economic disaster to fulfill this proposal for Lincoln Park?

The present Lincoln staff have done their best to remove old tree limbs and repair the course as best they can with old equipment. A course over 100 years needs "Tender, Loving Care". The staff has done their best but they need help from San Francisco.

Preserve Lincoln Park as an 18-hole Golf Course

Very truly yours,
Rosemary B. Jones

cc: San Francisco Public Golf Alliance
    Supervisor Sean Elsbernd
    Shoreview Manor Homeowners Association
    Lincoln Park Neighborhood Association
    Lincoln Park Golf Course Association
    Lincoln Park Homeowners Association
    Seacliffe Property Association
    Lake Street Neighbors
Dear Mr. Luellen,

Yesterday they just started defacing this registered historic Victorian building and moved dirt, shrubs, bricks, pipes and hauled them away.

They punched a huge hole in front in order to excavate the entire crawl space area, it is obvious they intend to creating a garage as stated in their permit application # 200804026810, "garage under separate permit." First by creating a basement without the benefit of a permit and later by applying for a permit to convert to a garage. There is a huge concrete/brick planner box 4 feet high across the front of this building which adds to the character and design, they will remove this planner without the benefit of a permit to create their basement. This is exterior work and change of design.

NOTICE OF PLANNING DEPARTMENT REQUIREMENTS dated November 28, 2006 to the owner's architect Bob Mittelstadt,

Item 3: "Proposed Garage: Our records show that 2650 Hyde Street was constructed prior to 1900 and is included in HERE TODAY are in the 1976 Architectural Survey. Further, many of the buildings on the block have been included in this survey, indication that there is a potential historic district in the neighborhood.

The Planning Department considers that the structure to be a historic resource. Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) any alterations to the building's exterior must be reviewed according to the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

The proposal to install a new garage opening at the base of the building does not meet the Secretary of The Interior's Standards. The proposal calls for the removal of the lower portion of the projecting bay at the ground floor, which is a character-defining feature of the building and will have a significant adverse impact on the historic resource. The elimination of the lower portion of the bay window and installation of a garage door cannot be approved. For further information regarding CEQA and the Department's review of historic resources, please refer to Preservation Bulletin #16, available at
http://www.sfgov.org/site/planning
index.asp?id=24996.”

We talked to the preservation people in Sacramento and
they informed us that you are the person to notify.

It is up to you to preserve this property. Please
investigate and take the necessary actions.

Thank you.

Please see NOTICE OF PLANNING DEPARTMENT REQUIREMENTS
letter and pictures as attachments.
UCSF is proud to join a growing number of healthcare institutions across the country that have become 100% smoke-free environments. Effective November 20, 2008, UCSF will become a 100% smoke-free workplace to protect the health of our patients, visitors, and staff from the dangers of secondhand smoke.

In a 2006 report, The Health Consequences of Involuntary Exposure to Tobacco Smoke, the U.S. Surgeon General concluded that the "Scientific evidence indicates that there is no risk-free level of exposure to secondhand smoke. Breathing even a little secondhand smoke can be harmful to your health." As a health sciences institution, we have a responsibility to assume a leadership role in reducing the health hazards related to secondhand smoke. In accordance with policy, smoking will not be permitted on any property leased or owned by UCSF. Designated smoking areas on Parnassus and at Mt. Zion will be removed.

We recognize that the inability to smoke on campus will be difficult for some people. For this reason, UCSF is committed to offering the best tobacco treatment for patients and staff. UCSF has redesigned the in-patient tobacco treatment program and offers programs to help staff and visitors who smoke. Information and resources are available on the "Smoke Free Workplace" website: http://ucsfhr.ucsf.edu/index.php/general/article/ucsf-a-smoke-free-workplace/. Policy enforcement continues to be the responsibility of managers and supervisors. However, the security units for both the Campus and Medical Center have agreed to assist in an education effort by distributing information cards to individuals they see smoking in areas not permitted by policy.

It is hoped that employees will be respectful and supportive of this important smoke-free effort. Questions or concerns may be directed to Labor Relations Coordinator Mark Gottas, Human Resources, at mgottas/hr.ucsf.edu or 514-2452.

------ End of Forwarded Message
MEMORANDUM

Date: October 20, 2008
To: Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors
From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Subject: APPOINTMENTS BY THE MAYOR

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

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

Please notify me in writing by Noon, Thursday, October 23, 2008, if you wish any appointment to be scheduled before the Rules Committee.

Attachments
October 20, 2008

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

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Pursuant to the Charter Section 3.100 (17), I have reappointed Matthew Tuchow as a member of the Environment Commission effective today, October 20, 2008, and the term of Matthew Tuchow will expire on October 5, 2012.

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

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

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom
Mayor
Notice of Appointment

October 20, 2008

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

I hereby reappoint Matthew Tuchow to serve as member of the Environment Commission for a 4-year term commencing October 20, 2008, in accordance with the 1996 Charter, Section 3.100, (17).

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

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

[Signature]
Gavin Newsom
Mayor
MATTHEW NOAH TUCHOW

San Francisco, CA 94118
Tel: (________)________
Fax: (________)________
Email: tuchow@________

SUMMARY OF EXPERTISE:
Broad public policy, political, legal and cross-cultural experience. Successful advocate and public speaker. Comfortable working with diverse interest groups; proven ability to build consensus and to resolve new and different challenges. Results oriented.

EDUCATION:

- **Harvard Law School**, J.D., 1988
  - Honors: Third year paper on international environmental law.

- **Yale University**, B.A., 1983
  - Cum Laude, Distinction in History.
  - Awarded Yale-China Teaching Fellowship, Hong Kong, 1983-1985

- **Sorbonne (Universite de Paris V)**, Spring 1979, study of French language, History, Culture and Art

- **Oxford University (Lincoln College)**, Oxford, England, Fall 1978; “Experiment in International Living” program

EXPERIENCE:

2006- present

- **Mckesson Corporation**, San Francisco, CA
  - Vice President, Global Compliance and Ethics and Assistant General Counsel
  - Senior Counsel (2006-2008)
    - Head, global compliance and ethics function
    - Head, records and information management function
    - Advising on international, federal and state compliance and corporate ethics
    - Focus on strategic planning and program management

2003 - 2006

- **Tuchow Associates**, San Francisco, CA
  - Principal
    - Teaching corporate social responsibility and international institutions as Visiting Professor at the University of Geneva (Switzerland 2005), Guest Lecturer at Berkeley Haas School of Business (2003), University of Michigan Business School (2006), Hastings College of Law (2006).
    - Resolving diverse international regulatory and commercial issues
    - Drafting and negotiating contracts, licenses, resolving disputes and counseling on international compliance and policy issues.

2002

- **United States Representative Sander Levin**, Washington, D.C.
  - Senior Advisor for Global Affairs
    - Developed and implemented office strategy for the Congressional Executive Commission on China. Drafted, edited and built bipartisan consensus for Commission recommendations to Congress and to the President on international trade, CSR, human rights and rule of law issues. Prepared briefings, press statements, strategy memos and public statements.
1994 - 2001

The Gap, Inc., San Francisco, CA
Senior Attorney.
- Honored with Operational Excellence Award for developing and implementing a successful compliance program for sourcing from China that saved the company millions.
- Earned President’s award for key role in resolving all legal and regulatory obstacles to opening a chain of stores in Japan.
- Developed strategy, programs and procedures for industry leading program that promotes compliance with labor, environmental, health and safety laws in China and over 30 other countries.
- Resolved disputes, negotiated with U.S. and foreign government officials, monitored legislation and handled diverse public policy and regulatory issues that applied to the international business of the company.

1991 - 1994

Pillsbury, Madison, & Sutro, San Francisco, CA
Associate Attorney.
- Selected to serve as Assistant to Chair of US-Canada Free Trade Agreement Extraordinary Challenge Committee. Drafted seminal Committee opinion.
- Persuaded INS to grant political asylum to Chinese pro-democracy activist.
- Successfully defended City and County of San Francisco in jury trial.
- Handled litigation and managed support staff for small and large commercial, securities and antitrust cases.
- Founder/Chair, Asian Practice Committee, San Francisco Barristers’ Club.

1989 - 1990

Yanagida & Nomura, Tokyo, Japan
Foreign Associate Attorney.

1983 - 1985

Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China
Recipient of Yale-China Teaching Fellowship

COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP (partial list):
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee (2005-2008)
Candidate, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 1 (2004)
Newsom for Mayor- Precinct Captain/Transition Policy Team (2003)
California Democratic Party Platform Committee (2002-2008)
San Francisco Transportation Authority Advisory Committee (2003-2004)
San Francisco Park and Open Space Advisory Committee (1999-2002)
Senior Board Member, Raoul Wallenberg Jewish Democratic Club (1992-2008)
Richmond District Democratic Club Board (2005-2007)
Richmond District Neighborhood Center Advisory Board (2005-2007)
Planning Association for the Richmond Board (2000-2008)
Alamo School Foundation Board Member (2000-2002)
McKesson Corporation Regional Grants Committee Member (2006-2007)
Yale China Fellow, Chinese University of Hong Kong (1983-1985)
Founder/Chair, Asian Practice Committee, San Francisco Barristers’ Club
Member, Pacific Council on International Policy (2000-2008)

LANGUAGES: Chinese, French, Japanese, Spanish
MEMORANDUM

Date: October 20, 2008
To: Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors
From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Subject: APPOINTMENTS BY THE MAYOR

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

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

Please notify me in writing by Noon, Thursday, October 23, 2008, if you wish any appointment to be scheduled before the Rules Committee.

Attachments
October 17, 2008

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

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Pursuant to the Charter Section 3.100 (17), I have appointed Mr. Douglas Shoemaker as a member of the Treasure Island Development Authority effective today, October 17, 2008. Mr. Shoemaker will fill a seat that was previously held by Mr. Matt Franklin, and the term of Mr. Shoemaker will expire on February 26, 2012.

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

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

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom
Mayor
Notice of Appointment

October 17, 2008

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

I hereby appoint Mr. Douglas Shoemaker to serve as member of the Treasure Island Development Authority for a 4-year term commencing October 17, 2008, in accordance with the 1996 Charter, Section 3.100, (17).

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

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

Gavin Newsom
Mayor
Douglas Shoemaker
Deputy Director, San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing

Doug Shoemaker has served as Deputy Director of the Mayor's Office of Housing (MOH) since February 2006. At MOH, Mr. Shoemaker has a range of management responsibilities covering housing policy, housing development, and asset management for the 35-person City agency.

Mr. Shoemaker oversees project and program development of HOPE SF, San Francisco's initiative to revitalize eight public housing sites through mixed-income development. In particular, he coordinates the activities of the housing development teams that have been selected to redevelop these sites as well as manages the partnerships among City agencies. In a related capacity, he serves as a member of the Mayor's Transition Team for the San Francisco Housing Authority with oversight responsibilities for development and capital planning.

Mr. Shoemaker also works extensively on zoning and planning issues that impact housing development. Directly after joining MOH in February 2006, Mr. Shoemaker led the City's effort to update its inclusionary housing ordinance. San Francisco's inclusionary ordinance is now among the most aggressive and successful programs of any large city in the country. He is currently working on the housing plan for the Eastern Neighborhoods plans, a significant rezoning of the City's industrial areas.

Prior to joining MOH, Mr. Shoemaker served as Deputy Director of the Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California, a 500-member affordable housing trade association. From 2001 to 2006, he directed NPH's policy and advocacy work in the State Legislature as well as regional advocacy work on inclusionary housing. A highlight of this work was serving as the Northern California campaign coordinator for Proposition 46, a successful $2.1 billion affordable housing bond passed by voters in 2002. In addition, Mr. Shoemaker directed NPH's policy research and co-authored numerous reports and articles including "Inclusionary Housing in California: 30 Years of Innovation."

Mr. Shoemaker started his career in housing as a project manager for Mission Housing Development Corporation, a community-based housing developer in San Francisco. At MHDC from 1995-2000, he developed the first affordable housing community in the Mission Bay neighborhood of San Francisco and helped to develop numerous supportive housing developments in the Mission District and South of Market. Mr. Shoemaker’s first project for MHDC was actually the revitalization of the 16th BART plazas.

Mr. Shoemaker has also served as a lecturer on housing policy at the Department of City and Regional Planning at the University of California at Berkeley. He received his Masters in Latin American History from the University of California at Berkeley in 1995. He graduated with a Bachelors Degree in Comparative Area Studies from Duke University in 1992. Mr. Shoemaker lives in San Francisco with his wife and two children.
October 23, 2008

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

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

Please find enclosed a copy of the San Francisco Graffiti Advisory Board’s 12-Month Report for the period of July 2007 through June 2008. This report summarizes and documents our proceedings and accomplishments for the past fiscal year, which include:

- Implemented the Graffiti Rewards Fund;
- Reviewed the Legislative Analyst’s Report on Municipal Anti-Graffiti Programs;
- Supported passage of AB1786 that requires a minimum of 24 hours community service for graffiti offenders who settle their case through civil compromise;
- Researched best practices in anti-graffiti education; and
- Discussed the need for a Blight Ordinance.

Over the past year, we have seen a decrease in the amount of street level graffiti due to stepped up enforcement and the efforts of graffiti contractors hired by the City to abate graffiti on 40 merchant corridors throughout the City. However, rooftop and sidewalk graffiti have become more prevalent as the vandals seek locations which are more difficult to abate. Board members have also expressed a concern about the graffiti on trees, historic monuments and commercial vehicles that are parking in our neighborhoods.

In FY 2008-2009, we would like to see the introduction of an anti-graffiti education program by the school district and the appointment of a dedicated Superior Court judge to preside over all graffiti cases. We are also planning to hold a graffiti summit to recruit new leaders in the fight against graffiti vandalism.

In closing, we want to thank you for the support and attention that you have given to this important quality-of-life issue that detracts from the beauty and well being of our City. We look forward to working with you on developing new strategies to defeat graffiti in the coming year.

Sincerely,

Mohammed Nuru
The San Francisco Graffiti Advisory Board

2007-2008 Annual Report

Submitted on October 23, 2008

Document is available at the Clerk's Office Room 244, City Hall
October 20, 2008

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

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Pursuant to the Charter Section 3.100 (17), I have reappointed Matthew Tuchow as a member of the Environment Commission effective today, October 20, 2008, and the term of Matthew Tuchow will expire on October 5, 2012.

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

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

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom
Mayor
Office of the Mayor
City & County of San Francisco

Gavin Newsom

Notice of Appointment

October 20, 2008

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

I hereby reappoint Matthew Tuchow to serve as member of the Environment Commission for a 4-year term commencing October 20, 2008, in accordance with the 1996 Charter, Section 3.100, (17).

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

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

Gavin Newsom
Mayor
SUMMARY OF EXPERTISE:
Broad public policy, political, legal and cross-cultural experience. Successful advocate and public speaker. Comfortable working with diverse interest groups; proven ability to build consensus and to resolve new and different challenges. Results oriented.

EDUCATION:

Harvard Law School, J.D., 1988
Honors: Third year paper on international environmental law.
East Asian Legal Studies Program.

Yale University, B.A., 1983
Cum Laude. Distinction in History,
Awarded Yale-China Teaching Fellowship, Hong Kong, 1983-1985

Sorbonne (Universite de Paris V), Spring 1979, study of French language,
History, Culture and Art

Oxford University (Lincoln College), Oxford, England, Fall 1978;
“Experiment in International Living” program

EXPERIENCE:

McKesson Corporation, San Francisco, CA
2006- present
Vice President, Global Compliance and Ethics and Assistant General Counsel
Senior Counsel (2006-2008)
- Head, global compliance and ethics function
- Head, records and information management function
- Advising on international, federal and state compliance and corporate ethics
- Focus on strategic planning and program management

Tuchow Associates, San Francisco, CA
2003 - 2006
Principal
- Teaching corporate social responsibility and international institutions as Visiting Professor at the University of Geneva (Switzerland 2005), Guest Lecturer at Berkeley Haas School of Business (2003), University of Michigan Business School (2006), Hastings College of Law (2006).
- Resolving diverse international regulatory and commercial issues
- Drafting and negotiating contracts, licenses, resolving disputes and counseling on international compliance and policy issues.

United States Representative Sander Levin, Washington, D.C.
2002
Senior Advisor for Global Affairs.
- Developed and implemented office strategy for the Congressional Executive Commission on China. Drafted, edited and built bipartisan consensus for Commission recommendations to Congress and to the President on international trade, CSR, human rights and rule of law issues. Prepared briefings, press statements, strategy memos and public statements.
1994 - 2001

**The Gap, Inc.,** San Francisco, CA
Senior Attorney.
- Honored with Operational Excellence Award for developing and implementing a successful compliance program for sourcing from China that saved the company millions.
- Earned President’s award for key role in resolving all legal and regulatory obstacles to opening a chain of stores in Japan.
- Developed strategy, programs and procedures for industry leading program that promotes compliance with labor, environmental, health and safety laws in China and over 30 other countries.
-Resolved disputes, negotiated with U.S. and foreign government officials, monitored legislation and handled diverse public policy and regulatory issues that applied to the international business of the company.

1991 - 1994

**Pillsbury, Madison, & Sutro,** San Francisco, CA
Associate Attorney.
- Selected to serve as Assistant to Chair of US-Canada Free Trade Agreement Extraordinary Challenge Committee. Drafted seminal Committee opinion.
- Persuaded INS to grant political asylum to Chinese pro-democracy activist.
- Successfully defended City and County of San Francisco in jury trial.
- Handled litigation and managed support staff for small and large commercial, securities and antitrust cases.
- Founder/Chair, Asian Practice Committee, San Francisco Barristers’ Club.

1989 - 1990

**Yanagida & Nomura,** Tokyo, Japan
Foreign Associate Attorney.

1983 - 1985

**Chinese University of Hong Kong,** Hong Kong, China
Recipient of Yale-China Teaching Fellowship

**COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP** (partial list):
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee (2005-2008)
Candidate, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 1 (2004)
Newsom for Mayor- Precinct Captain/Transition Policy Team (2003)
California Democratic Party Platform Committee (2002-2008)
San Francisco Transportation Authority Advisory Committee (2003-2004)
San Francisco Park and Open Space Advisory Committee (1999-2002)
Senior Board Member, Raoul Wallenberg Jewish Democratic Club (1992-2008)
Richmond District Democratic Club Board (2005-2007)
Richmond District Neighborhood Center Advisory Board (2005-2007)
Planning Association for the Richmond Board (2000-2008)
Alamo School Foundation Board Member (2000-2002)
McKesson Corporation Regional Grants Committee Member (2006-2007)
Yale China Fellow, Chinese University of Hong Kong (1983-1985)
Founder/Chair, Asian Practice Committee, San Francisco Barristers’ Club
Member, Pacific Council on International Policy (2000-2008)

**LANGUAGES:**
Chinese, French, Japanese, Spanish