

Petitions and Communications received from May 23, 2009, through June 1, 2009, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on June 9, 2009.

From Office of the Mayor, submitting the Mayor's proposed Budget for fiscal year ending June 30, 2010. (1)

From Budget Analyst, submitting the management audit of the SF Municipal Transportation Agency Proof of Payment Program. (2)

From Planning Department, regarding California Pacific Medical Center long-range Development Plan. Copy: Each Supervisor (3)

From State Department of Parks and Recreation, regarding the National Register of Historic Places for Roos House. Copy: Each Supervisor, Historic Preservation Commission (4)

From Office of the Treasurer, submitting the investment activity (for fiscal year to date) of the portfolios under Treasurer's management. (5)

From Office of the Controller, submitting report "The San Francisco Forty Niners owe the City more than half a million dollars in parking lot rent" dated May 27, 2009. (6)

From Law Offices of Daniel Reidy, submitting the Blue and Gold fleet's response to issues raised by complaint of the Golden Gate Bridge District, and the Golden Gate Bridge District's answer to complaint as permitted by ordering paragraph 4 of Administrative Law Judge's ruling issued May 13, 2009. (7)

From Kimo Crossman, regarding the Municipal Transportation Agency Budget controversy at the Board of Supervisors meeting on May 27, 2009. (8)

From Kimo Crossman, regarding ARRA Broadband application for San Francisco. (9)

From Human Services Agency, regarding proposed fiscal year 2009-2010 Human Services Care Fund Budget. Copy: Supervisors Avalos, Mirkarimi, Chu (10)

From Planning Department, submitting notice of availability of draft environmental impact report for the New Irvington Tunnel Project. (11)

From Capital Planning Commission, regarding recommendation on the November 2009 Safe Streets and Road Repair General Obligation Bond. (12)

From Municipal Accessibility Council, submitting strong support for continued Muni service to Laguna Honda Hospital. Copy: Each Supervisor (13)

From Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector, submitting the annual report of businesses that filed for tax credits for the 2008 calendar year. (14)

From Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector, submitting the annual report of businesses that filed for biotechnology exclusion for the 2008 calendar year. (15)

From Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector, submitting the annual report of businesses that filed for the clean energy technology business exclusion for the 2008 calendar year. (16)

From Planning Department, submitting public notice of the availability of draft environmental impact report for Sunol Valley Water Treatment Plant Expansion and Treated Water Reservoir project. (17)

From Parkmerced Residents Organization, submitting opposition to the urbanization and commercialization of the Parkmerced landscape. Copy: Each Supervisor (18)

From Human Services Agency, submitting report on the interim plan to coordinate all foster care placement improvement plans among Juvenile Probation, Department of Public Health and the Human Services Agency for children and youth in need of high-end residential treatment. File 081008. Copy: Each Supervisor (19)

From Department of Technology, submitting request for release of reserved funds in the amount of \$900,000, to support the creation of the Data Center at 200 Paul Street and to decommission the current One Market Plaza Data Center. (20)

From Aaron Goodman, regarding the lack of an overall historical analysis and review of the multiple libraries that are considered "modern" designed libraries by the firm Appleton & Wolfard. (21)

From GroundSpark, submitting notice that the Alameda School Board has approved their lgbt-inclusive bullying prevention curriculum. (22)

From concerned citizens, regarding the proposed amendments to the "Renter's Economic Relief Package." Files 090278 through 090281. Copy: Each Supervisor (23)

From Arthur Evans, submitting letter entitled "progressives fail to sink muni budget" dated May 27, 2009. (24)

From Dr. Ahimsa Sumchai, regarding her plans to file a complaint with Ethics about the underestimation of the gift the Board of Supervisors received from the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce for their trip to Washington D.C. (25)

From James Corrigan, commenting on the Board of Supervisors budget priorities. (26)

From J & R Stone, submitting opposition to charging admission to the botanical garden in Golden Gate Park. (27)

From Norman Rolfe, urging the Board of Supervisors to contact state and federal legislators and tell them that schools and health care are more important than spending money on freeways. (28)

From Public Utilities Commission, submitting request for release of reserved funds in the amount of \$1,300,000 for the Community Choice Aggregation Implementation Plan. (29)

From Office of Contract Administration, regarding request for a list of contracts under \$10 million issued by the Purchasing Division of the Office of the City Administrator in fiscal years 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10. (Reference No. 20090428-002) (30)

From Ray Lucas, submitting support for charging admission to the botanical garden in Golden Gate Park. (31)

From Department of Public Works, regarding status of removing graffiti from various locations in District 5. (Reference No. 20090505-006) (32)

From Department of Public Works, regarding status of removing graffiti from various locations in District 5. (Reference No. 20090512-006) (33)

From Human Services Agency, responding to request for a detailed accounting and breakdown of \$189 million reportedly spent by the City on homeless services. (Reference No. 20090428-001) (34)

From Department of Public Works, regarding status of removing graffiti from various locations in District 5. (Reference No. 20090414-003) (35)

From Department of Public Works, regarding status of removing graffiti from various locations in District 5. (Reference No. 20090331-006) (36)

From Department of Public Works, regarding status of removing graffiti from various locations in District 5. (Reference No. 20090324-007) (37)

From Department of Public Works, regarding status of removing graffiti from various locations in District 5. (Reference No. 20090324-005) (38)

From Francisco Da Costa, commenting that the United States Navy has an obligation to clean up the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. (39)

From Alexandra Post, regarding the water pollution in the San Francisco Bay from the sewage plant at Fisherman's Wharf. (40)

From State Fish and Game Commission, submitting notice of proposed regulatory action relating to waterfowl hunting. (41)

From State Fish and Game Commission, submitting notice of proposed regulatory action relating to commercial lobster permits. (42)

From International Association of Fire Fighters, submitting opposition to proposed Charter amendment that eliminates the 48.7-work week for fire fighters. File 090606. Copy: Each Supervisor (43)

**Office of the Mayor**  
City & County of San Francisco



orig Joy  
C:AC, Amneth  
Gavin Newsom

June 1, 2009

Angela Calvillo  
Clerk, San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.  
San Francisco CA, 94102

Madame Clerk,

On behalf of the Mayor, it is my pleasure to present to you the Mayor's Proposed June Budget Book for 2009-2010.

I look forward to working with you throughout the budget process. If I can be of any assistance, please do not hesitate to call upon me or my staff. I can be reached via phone at 554-6293.

Sincerely,

*Nani A. Coloretti*

Nani A. Coloretti  
Mayor's Budget Director

cc: Members of the Board of Supervisors

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

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO  
2009 JUN - 1 PM 1:42  
BY *dhg*


MAYOR'S 2009-2010

# Proposed Budget



CITY AND COUNTY OF  
**SAN FRANCISCO** CALIFORNIA

GAVIN NEWSOM MAYOR



RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO

2009 MAY 27 AM 9:50

BY

*JG*

2

**Management Audit**  
**of the**  
**San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency**  
**Proof of Payment Program**

**Prepared for the**  
**Board of Supervisors**  
**of the City and County of San Francisco**

**by the**  
**San Francisco Budget Analyst**

**May 27, 2009**

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

2



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

BOS-11 cpage  
AC,  
LL  
RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO

2009 MAY 27, 2009

BY

PN

AM 10:11  
1650 Mission St.  
Suite 400  
San Francisco,  
CA 94103-2479

Reception:  
415.558.6378

Fax:  
415.558.6409

Planning  
Information:  
415.558.6377

To Responsible Agencies, Trustee Agencies, and Interested Parties:

RE: CASE NO. 2005.0555E – CALIFORNIA PACIFIC MEDICAL CENTER (CPMC) LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND NOTICE OF PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the above-referenced project, described below, has been issued by the Planning Department. This notice is sent to you because you have been identified as potentially having an interest in the project or the project area. The NOP is either attached or is available upon request from Devyani Jain, whom you may reach at (415) 575-9051 or at the above address. A copy of the NOP can also be obtained for public review and comment at the Planning Department offices at 1660 Mission Street, 1st Floor Planning Information Center, or the report can be viewed on-line starting May 27, 2009 at [www.sfgov.org/planning/mea](http://www.sfgov.org/planning/mea). Case materials are available for review by appointment at the Planning Department's office at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400. (Please call (415) 575-9051 to schedule an appointment.)

3

## Project Description:

The proposed project is CPMC's multi-phased strategy to meet State seismic safety requirements for hospitals, expand medical facilities, and create a 20-year framework and Institutional Master Plan for its four existing medical campuses (Pacific Campus at Sacramento and Buchanan Streets; California Campus at Maple and California Streets; Davies Campus at Castro and 14th Streets; and St. Luke's Campus at Cesar Chavez and Valencia Streets), and a proposed new medical campus (Cathedral Hill Campus at Van Ness Avenue and Geary Boulevard) in San Francisco. The proposed Cathedral Hill Campus would include development of a 15-story, 555-bed hospital and two medical office buildings (MOBs). The new Cathedral Hill hospital would house acute care, women's and children's services, and primary emergency services. When completed (2015), Cathedral Hill Campus would allow CPMC to re-focus and renovate/redevelop its existing four campuses. Proposed development at Pacific Campus would include a new Ambulatory Care Center and underground parking. Proposed development at Davies Campus would include two new MOBs and parking improvements. Proposed development at St. Luke's Campus would include a new six-story, 86-bed replacement hospital (2014) and an expansion building. CPMC would sell California Campus by 2020 after relocation of its inpatient services to the new Cathedral Hill Hospital and other services to Pacific Campus. The proposed project would require General Plan Amendments, Planning Code Text and Map changes for creation of a subarea within the Van Ness Area Plan Special Use District (SUD) for Cathedral Hill Campus, and reclassification of existing Height and Bulk Districts for Cathedral Hill and St. Luke's Campuses; General Plan Referral and Encroachment permits for Cathedral Hill and St. Luke's Campuses; and Conditional Use authorization (CU) for Planned Unit Development (PUD) and exceptions related to building height, parking, and permitted use at some of its campuses.

The NOP reflects revisions to the proposed project that occurred following publication of the original NOP on July 1, 2006. The current proposal is similar to the original project, but also includes: (1) future hospital development at St. Luke's Campus per the City's "Blue Ribbon" panel; (2) reduction in size of the proposed Cathedral Hill Hospital and conversion of the 1375 Sutter Street office building to a MOB under Cathedral Hill Campus development; (3) development of the Neuroscience Institute (formerly

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

3

**OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION  
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

P.O. BOX 942896  
SACRAMENTO, CA 94296-0001  
(916) 653-6624 Fax: (916) 653-9824  
calshpo@ohp.parks.ca.gov



May 27, 2009

City and County of San Francisco  
Board of Supervisors  
City Hall, Room 244  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, California 94102-4689

**RE: National Register of Historic Places for  
Roos House**

Dear Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to the Certified Local Government Agreement between the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) and your governmental entity, we are providing you as the chief elected local official with a sixty (60) day review and comment period before the State Historical Resources Commission (SHRC) takes action on the above stated National Register of Historic Places (National Register) nomination at its next meeting. Details on the meeting are enclosed.

Please review the enclosed nomination and send your comments to OHP. Pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, we have also provided a copy of the nomination to your local preservation commission. Your local preservation commission may comment on whether or not the nominated property, in its opinion, meets the criteria for the National Register and forward their comments to you. Please transmit your local preservation commission's comments with your comments to California State Parks, Attn: Office of Historic Preservation, Milford Wayne Donaldson, FAIA, State Historic Preservation Officer, P.O. Box 942896, Sacramento, California 94296-0001. So that the SHRC may have adequate time to consider them, it is requested, but not required, that you provide written comments fifteen (15) days before the SHRC meeting. If you have questions or require further information, please contact the Registration Unit at (916) 653-6624.

As of January 1, 1993, all National Register properties are automatically included in the California Register of Historical Resources and afforded consideration in accordance with state and local environmental review procedures.

Supplemental information on the National Register is available on our website at the following address: [www.ohp.parks.ca.gov](http://www.ohp.parks.ca.gov).



Thank you for your assistance in this program.

Sincerely,

Milford Wayne Donaldson, FAIA  
State Historic Preservation Officer

Enclosures: Nomination, Meeting Notice

NR\_CLG County Local Notice\_Final.doc



United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places  
Registration Form

DRAFT

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and districts. See instructions in *How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form* (National Register Bulletin 16A). Complete each item by marking "x" in the appropriate box or by entering the information requested. If any item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions. Place additional entries and narrative items on continuation sheets (NPS Form 10-900a). Use a typewriter, word processor, or computer, to complete all items.

1. Name of Property

historic name Roos House

other names/site number \_\_\_\_\_

2. Location

street & number 3500 Jackson Street ☐ not for publication N/A

city or town San Francisco ☐ vicinity N/A

state California code CA county San Francisco code 075 zip code 94118

3. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1986, as amended, I hereby certify that this ☐ nomination ☐ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property ☐ meets ☐ does not meet the National Register Criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant ☐ nationally ☐ statewide ☐ locally. (☐ See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Signature of certifying official/Title

Date

California Office of Historic Preservation  
State or Federal agency and bureau

In my opinion, the property ☐ meets ☐ does not meet the National Register criteria. (☐ See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Signature of commenting or other official

Date

State or Federal agency and bureau

4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that this property is:

Signature of the Keeper

Date of Action

☐ entered in the National Register  
☐ See continuation sheet.

☐ determined eligible for the  
National Register

☐ See continuation sheet.

☐ determined not eligible for the  
National Register

☐ removed from the National  
Register

☐ other (explain): \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Roos House  
Name of Property

San Francisco, CA  
County and State

## 5. Classification

Ownership of Property  
(Check as many boxes as apply)

- ☒ private  
☐ public-local  
☐ public-State  
☐ public-Federal

Category of Property  
(Check only one box)

- ☒ building(s)  
☐ district  
☐ site  
☐ structure  
☐ object

Number of Resources within Property  
(Do not include previously listed resources in the count.)

Contributing	Noncontributing	
1	1	buildings
0	0	sites
0	0	structures
0	0	objects
1	1	Total

Name of related multiple property listing  
(Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing.)

N/A

Number of contributing resources previously listed in  
the National Register

0

## 6. Function or Use

Historic Functions  
(Enter categories from instructions)

DOMESTIC/single dwelling

Current Functions  
(Enter categories from instructions)

DOMESTIC/single dwelling

## 7. Description

Architectural Classification  
(Enter categories from instructions)

LATE 19<sup>TH</sup> & 20<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY REVIVALS  
Tudor Revival

Materials  
(Enter categories from instructions)

foundation WOOD  
roof STONE/Slate  
walls STUCCO  
other WOOD

## Narrative Description

(Describe the historic and current condition of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

Roos House  
Name of Property

San Francisco, CA  
County and State

## 8. Statement of Significance

### Applicable National Register Criteria

(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing)

- ☐ A Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- ☐ B Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- ☒ C Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.
- ☐ D Property has yielded, or is likely to yield information important in prehistory or history.

### Criteria Considerations

(Mark "X" in all the boxes that apply.)

Property is:

- ☐ A owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.
- ☐ B removed from its original location.
- ☐ C a birthplace or a grave.
- ☐ D a cemetery.
- ☐ E a reconstructed building, object, or structure.
- ☐ F a commemorative property.
- ☐ G less than 50 years of age or achieved significance within the past 50 years.

### Areas of Significance

(Enter categories from instructions)

Architecture

### Period of Significance

1909-1926

### Significant Dates

1913, 1926

### Significant Person

(Complete if Criterion B is marked above)

### Cultural Affiliation

### Architect/Builder

Maybeck, Bernard

## Narrative Statement of Significance

(Explain the significance of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

## 9. Major Bibliographical References

(Cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form on one or more continuation sheets.)

### Previous documentation on file (NPS):

- ☐ preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested.
- ☐ previously listed in the National Register
- ☐ previously determined eligible by the National Register
- ☐ designated a National Historic Landmark
- ☐ recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey # \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ recorded by Historic American Engineering Record # \_\_\_\_\_

### Primary Location of Additional Data

- ☐ State Historic Preservation Office
- ☐ Other State agency
- ☐ Federal agency
- ☒ Local government
- ☐ University
- ☐ Other

Name of repository:

San Francisco Planning Department

Roos House  
Name of Property

San Francisco, CA  
County and State

## 10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property Less than 1 acre.

### UTM References

(Place additional UTM references on a continuation sheet)

	Zone	Easting	Northing	Zone	Easting	Northing
1	10			3		
2				4		

☐ See continuation sheet.

### Verbal Boundary Description

(Describe the boundaries of the property on a continuation sheet.)

### Boundary Justification

(Explain why the boundaries were selected on a continuation sheet.)

## 11. Form Prepared By

name/title Caitlin Harvey, Architectural Historian

organization Page & Turnbull date November 14, 2008

street & number 724 Pine Street telephone (415) 593-3225

city or town San Francisco state CA zip code 94108

### Additional Documentation

Submit the following items with the completed form:

#### Continuation Sheets

#### Maps

A USGS map (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.

A Sketch map for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources.

#### Photographs

Representative black and white photographs of the property.

#### Additional items

(Check with the SHPO or FPO for any additional items)

### Property Owner

(Complete this item at the request of the SHPO or FPO.)

Name Jane Roos LeRoux

Street & number 3500 Jackson Street telephone \_\_\_\_\_

City or town San Francisco state CA zip code 94118

**Paperwork Reduction Act Statement:** This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.).

**Estimated Burden Statement:** Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18.1 hours per response including the time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Chief, Administrative Services Division, National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reductions Project (1024-0018), Washington, DC 20503.

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

# National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 7 Page 1

Roos House, San Francisco, California

## 7. Narrative Description

The Roos House is located on a rectangular-shaped lot on the northwest corner of Jackson and Locust streets in the Presidio Heights neighborhood, an upper middle-class subdivision of tree-lined streets in San Francisco, California. Designed by nationally prominent master architect, Bernard Maybeck and built in 1909, the Roos House is a three-story-over basement, wood frame, single-family residence designed in the Tudor style with half-timbering and Gothic ornamentation. Roughly T-shaped in plan, the two distinct sections of the house are each capped by a gable roof. A detached garage, in the same style and materials as the house, is located at the northwest corner of the property.

The primary facade of the house fronts south onto Jackson Street and is set behind foundation plantings and a landscaped lawn which slopes slightly toward the street. A loggia is located at the southeast corner of the house and extends under the second story along Locust Street. Large, fixed sash, diamond paned windows comprise the west wall of the loggia while the east side is an open arcade with a series of square columns. Flower boxes are situated in the spaces between the columns. The columns are replaced by a solid wall opposite the double doors at the main entrance. The entry doors feature an escutcheon incorporating the Roos' family crest designed by Maybeck.

To the west of the loggia, on the front facade, are two large, fixed sash, leaded-glass diamond paned windows that serve the dining room. A series of tall, narrow windows are located at the center of the facade. In the western bay of the facade, columns support a projection of the second story that overhangs a porte cochere.

A balcony is located at the second story level and to the west of the entry loggia between two projecting wing walls and extending over the front garden. The balcony rests on three projecting beams, the center beam supported by a diagonal brace anchored to the facade below. The balcony railing has a decorative carved quatrefoil design. The front wall of the dormer associated with the balcony is aligned with the plane of the front facade and has interrupted eaves supported by quatrefoil panels that rest on the sloped roof of the wing walls flanking the balcony. East of the balcony is a double-hung wood-sash window that overlooks a deck that is enclosed by flower boxes. The steeply pitched gable roof is clad in slate tiles and features one shed roofed dormer at the western end.

The secondary facade faces east and because of the sloping grade of Locust Street, the house gains an extra story at the rear. The southern portion of the facade is built to the property line and consists of the entry loggia at the first story. At the second story are three double hung wood sash windows, each with a flower box below capped by an asymmetrical low gabled roof that is supported by corbels embellished by quatrefoils. The northern portion of the east facade steps

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

# National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 7 Page 2

Roos House, San Francisco, California

## Narrative Description (continued)

back, allowing for foundation plantings. The center of the solid wall features an exterior chimney that rises from ground level and projects high above the roofline, terminating in a decorative gabled cap. At the main floor level a projection of the chimney supported on corbels indicates the firebox inside. The width of the chimney is gradually reduced by a series of tapers. The chimney is flanked by paired, fixed sash, leaded glass diamond paned windows with transoms on the main story level. Above this wing, a slate covered gable roof raises steeply, its ridge paralleling Locust Street.

The rear façade faces north and features a solid wall with one fixed sash window slightly above grade and an additional fixed sash window at basement level. The main story overhangs the lower story and is supported by beams. A large picture window is located at the main story level. A low pitched gable roof supported by corbels embellished with quatrefoils caps the bay which contains the picture window. A projection supported by diagonal braces and containing two diamond paned leaded glass windows is situated to the west of the picture window. This projection is also covered by a low pitched gable roof.

## Interior Description

The interior of the house is divided into three floors and a basement. The public rooms are located on the first floor and consist of an entry hall, living room and dining room, as well service rooms such as the kitchen, pantry and servant's dining room. The second floor contains family living quarters, including a "Morning Room" added in 1926. The third floor contains two guest bedrooms and a bathroom. The daylight basement contains a playroom (finished in the 1920s), servant's quarters and bathroom, and furnace and laundry rooms.

The wide, rectangular entry hall extends from the main entrance and runs east-west across the house. The floors are finished in oak and the walls and ceiling are covered in redwood paneling. The ceiling has a six-pane laylight fitted with translucent glass. Flush doors, including the main entry doors are covered in amethyst velvet.

On the south wall of the entry hall, a wide doorway leads to the dining room and a similar door in the north wall leads to the living room. The walls between these rooms are unusually thick, allowing for storage of hinged panels sheathed in velvet. The panels slide out to close off the dining and living rooms from the entry hall.

The dining room floor is covered in polished quarry tile. The walls and beamed ceiling are also clad in redwood panels. The perimeter of the dining room exhibits lowered ceilings that create alcoves. A cast stone fireplace is set in the alcove on the west wall. The east wall is occupied by the leaded-glass diamond pane windows looking onto the loggia and on the south wall are similar windows in an alcove, which contains a small fountain.

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

# National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 7 Page 3

Roos House, San Francisco, California

## Narrative Description (continued)

The large, rectangular living room is given a sense of monumentality by the beamed cathedral ceiling and massive cast stone fireplace rising from floor to ceiling on the center of the east wall. Leaded-glass diamond paned windows with transoms windows above flank the fireplace. Opposite the fireplace, steps lead to a landing which gives access to the upper floors. The north wall of the living room (fully fifty feet from the entrance), contains an alcove with a lower ceiling and contains a large rectangular, plate glass picture window, affording views of the nearby Presidio and San Francisco Bay beyond. To the left of the alcove, diamond paned French doors lead to a small sitting room that features leaded-glass diamond paned windows on the north and east walls and a beamed ceiling. The walls and ceiling of the living room are sheathed in redwood paneling and the floors are covered in oak planks.

Maybeck designed the light fixtures throughout the house. In the entry hall and dining room, sconces feature open metal work in three dimensions, while others are two dimensional plaques with open metal work revealing the same velvet as on the doors. In the living room suspended chandeliers are composed of cast metal from which tiers of exposed light bulbs are suspended several feet below. In addition, Maybeck designed much of the furniture and the fireplace irons in the living room, incorporating the Roos family crest.

The "Morning Room" is located on the second floor at the rear of the house. The arched entry alcove leads to a rectangular room that has an oak covered floor and a gabled ceiling clad in redwood board and batten. Tasseled light fixtures hang from the ceiling. Two plate glass picture windows are located opposite the entry and overlook the rear of the property. Windows line the west wall, while the east wall contains a fireplace with a ceramic surround. Redwood wainscoting lines the north and west walls below the windows.

A one-story garage, echoing the house in design and materials, is set at the northwest corner of the lot and is reached by a short driveway from Locust Street.

## Alterations

Since its construction, the property has undergone very few alterations, all of which were designed by the original architect, Bernard Maybeck. Alterations occurred in 1913, when a balcony on the first story at the rear of the house was enclosed to become the sitting room off the living room alcove. A garage, constructed in 1916, was later demolished in 1982 and rebuilt in the same style and materials as the house. A dressing room was added to the second floor in 1919. In 1926, the "Morning Room" was added onto the second story at the rear of the house. Alterations to two rooms and a bathroom located in the attic also occurred in 1926 and required the addition of a new dormer window.

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number 7 Page 4

Roos House, San Francisco, California

---

**Narrative Description (continued)**

Originally, the grounds extended behind the house to encompass a formal vegetable garden designed by Maybeck. Following the Loma Prieta earthquake in 1989, this rear portion of the property was sold to raise money for earthquake repairs.

The property is in excellent condition and appears much as it did at the time of its construction.

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

# National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 5

Roos House, San Francisco, California

## 8. Narrative Statement of Significance

The Roos House is an exceptional example of the work of nationally prominent master architect, Bernard Maybeck. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of Tudor Revival style of architecture as interpreted by Maybeck and possesses high artistic value in its complex massing and intricate Gothic decorative details. The Roos house meets National Register Criterion C in the area of Architecture and retains integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. The period of significance for the Roos House is 1909-1926, encompassing the original design and construction of the house, as well as all later alterations, which were also the work of Maybeck.

### History of Presidio Heights

Presidio Heights, which is the area roughly bounded by Presidio Avenue, California Street, Arguello Boulevard, and Pacific Avenue, is an affluent residential district in the western portion of San Francisco.

When the Spanish established the Presidio, the area immediately surrounding the settlement was a vast expanse of sand dunes and chaparral, and it remained relatively unsettled until well after the Gold Rush. In 1846, Pio Pico, the last Mexican governor, granted Rancho Punta de los Lobos to Benito Diaz. Diaz left his lands, which encompassed what is now the Richmond District, unimproved, and except for a few squatters, no one showed any interest in settling this remote part of the city until the 1870s.<sup>1</sup>

In the 1850s, the City annexed the Western Addition, a tract encompassing five hundred blocks between Larkin and Divisadero Streets, under the Van Ness Ordinance. This ordinance gave land ownership rights to squatters who had been living in the Western Addition, including what is now Pacific Heights (located just to the east of Presidio Heights). Between the 1850s and the 1870s, Pacific Heights was sparsely developed, and with only one graded street into the area, access was difficult until the early 1870s.

Hoping to further facilitate the development of the outer reaches of the city, the Board of Supervisors passed the Clement and Outside Lands Ordinances in 1866 and 1868, respectively. These ordinances provided means to settle land claims and set aside public lands for parks in all unsurveyed "outside lands" within the city's corporate boundaries, which included the Richmond, Mission, and Potrero Districts, among others. An "Official Map of the Outside Lands" was published in 1870, extending the street grid of downtown and the Western Addition into Presidio Heights and the Richmond.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Christopher VerPlanck, "Social and Architectural History of the Richmond District," *San Francisco Apartment Magazine* (December 2000).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places  
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 6

Roos House, San Francisco, California

Narrative Statement of Significance (continued)

By the turn of the century, San Francisco's rectangular street grid had been extended all the way to the ocean. However, transportation issues still hindered the development of the western neighborhoods. Public transportation was provided by Antoine Borel (1840-1915)—a Swiss immigrant who was one of the city's most successful early businessmen—and Adolph Sutro (1830-1898)—a banker and real estate magnate who served as the city's 24<sup>th</sup> mayor and owned most of the land west of Twin Peaks—each of whom had built electric railroad lines that extended to this part of the city by 1896.<sup>3</sup> Grading the streets was another important task that had to be completed before the western neighborhoods could become a fully populated residential district. In the late nineteenth century, the responsibility for grading and paving fell on the local landowners. According to a November 1, 1889, article in the *San Francisco Examiner*, Geary and Arguello boulevards were the first streets in the area to be paved. Sewage, water, and electricity soon followed, and by the turn of the century development was clustered around the principal transportation lines along California Street, Geary Boulevard, Arguello Boulevard, and others.<sup>4</sup>

After the 1906 Earthquake and Fire, most of downtown San Francisco, the South of Market Area, and parts of the Western Addition and the Mission were in ruins, and many San Franciscans sought refuge in the empty parcels on the city's western edge. Many parcels were subdivided after the disaster, and houses of all shapes and sizes began to appear in Presidio Heights and the Richmond District. Upscale development in Presidio Heights spread westward from Pacific Heights after the earthquake, and due to its proximity to good public transportation along California Street, Presidio Heights was established as an especially fashionable neighborhood.<sup>5</sup>

The increased popularity of the automobile also helped encourage the development of Presidio Heights and surrounding neighborhoods, such as Laurel Heights, Pacific Heights, Presidio Terrace, and the Richmond District, and by the late 1920s, these neighborhoods had been largely built out with single-family homes with automobile garages.

**Tudor Revival Style Architecture**

Tudor Revival was a popular architectural style in the United State in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Deriving its inspiration from early England, Tudor Revival buildings are reminiscent of buildings from the 16th-century Tudor monarchy. Tudor Revival buildings are known for steep, multi-gabled roofs that feature massive chimneys, constructed of brick or stone and capped with elaborate chimney pots. The exteriors are clad in brick, stone, or stucco and feature decorative half-timbering. Mullioned windows are grouped in two, three or four, and most often have

<sup>3</sup> Patrick McGrew, *Historic Houses of Presidio Terrace* (San Francisco: Presidio Terrace Association, 1995), 9-10.

<sup>4</sup> Christopher VerPlanck, "Social and Architectural History of the Richmond District," *San Francisco Apartment Magazine* (December 2000).

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places  
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 7

Roos House, San Francisco, California

Narrative Statement of Significance (continued)

casement sashes as opposed to double-hung. The windows are often glazed with leaded glass that is multi-paned, with panes sometimes arranged in a diamond pattern. The entryways are often arched and surrounded by decorative brick or stone work. The Roos House exhibits the characteristics of Tudor Revival style, however it is Maybeck's personal interpretation of this style, rather than a more faithful revival interpretation.

**Roos House**

The Roos House was a wedding present to Elizabeth Leslie Meyerfield from her father Morris Meyerfield, a partner in the Orpheum Theatre Circuit Company, upon her marriage to Leon L. Roos, partner in the San Francisco based Roos Brother's Clothing Company. Known for designing buildings that had a theatrical presence, Maybeck's flair for drama appealed to Elizabeth Meyerfield. She had accompanied her father on his travels to Europe in search of talent and these tours gave her a lasting enthusiasm for the theater and theatricality. To create the theatrical presence that Elizabeth Meyerfield desired, Maybeck "ranged over the architectural styles freely, picking and choosing forms and motifs"<sup>6</sup>, drawing inspiration from Tudor and Gothic architectural styles to create a "work that is unlike that of any other architect."<sup>7</sup>

Designed just three years after the 1906 San Francisco Earthquake and Fire, Maybeck and Leon Roos were extremely interested in seismic safety. The house was constructed with an extensive foundation of wooden piles driven into the hillside, an unusual type of foundation system for residential construction. Maybeck's engineer, Herman Kower, carefully calculated the dead loads on the wooden basement columns and the detailed drawings illustrate exactly how the columns were to be bolted to the foundation and tied to the upper floor.<sup>8</sup> The exterior gives no indication of the massive foundation within - all the engineering is hidden by decoration. The result is a building that exhibits sound engineering in conjunction with creative architecture.

**Bernard Ralph Maybeck**

Bernard Ralph Maybeck was born on February 7, 1862 in New York City. His father, a woodcarver, had immigrated to the United States from Germany in 1848 and his mother died when he was just three years old. After failing several subjects in school, at the age of seventeen Maybeck was apprenticed to a woodcarver for a short period of time and later went to work in his father's woodcarving shop. At eighteen Maybeck's father sent him to Paris, France to study furniture design. While there, Maybeck decided to enroll in the prestigious Ecole des Beaux-Arts to study architecture.

<sup>6</sup> McCoy, Esther, *Five California Architects* (Los Angeles: Hennessey and Ingalls, 1975), 5.

<sup>7</sup> Longstreth, Richard, *On the Edge of the World: Four Architects in San Francisco at the turn of the Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).

<sup>8</sup> Tobriner, Stephen, *Bracing for Disaster: Earthquake-Resistant Architecture and Engineering in San Francisco, 1838-1933* (Berkeley: Heyday Books, 2006) 260-231.

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places  
Continuation Sheet**

Section number 8 Page 8

Roos House, San Francisco, California

**Narrative Statement of Significance (continued)**

In 1886, after more than five years of training at the École des Beaux-Arts, Maybeck returned to New York and began working for former classmate, Thomas Hastings, at the newly founded firm of Carrère and Hastings. Maybeck worked closely with Hastings on the design of the Ponce de Leon Hotel in St. Augustine, Florida for Henry M. Flagler. The following year, Maybeck and Hastings designed a hotel, two churches and a residence in St. Augustine for Flagler.

In 1888, Maybeck and another former classmate, James Russell, established a practice in Kansas City. Because of the nationwide economic depression of the late 1880s, they were unable to obtain any commissions nor find work as draughtsmen in Kansas City. However, they did meet architects Willis Jefferson Polk and Mark White, who would later encourage Maybeck to move to San Francisco. While in Kansas City he was introduced to White's sister, Annie, whom he would marry in 1890.

Maybeck moved to San Francisco in 1889 and settled in Berkeley. He got a job as a draftsman in the office of A. Page Brown in 1891. In 1894, Maybeck accepted a teaching post at the University of California, Berkeley Department of Drawing where he taught descriptive geometry. In addition, he also held informal architectural courses at his house where he taught students such as Julia Morgan, John Bakewell, and Arthur Brown Jr. Out of this beginning grew the University's College of Architecture, of which he served as the first chair from 1898 through 1903. In 1901, Maybeck administered an international competition that was sponsored by Phoebe Apperson Hearst to design a master plan of the University.

In 1902 he opened an architectural office in San Francisco, specializing in houses, churches, and club buildings. In March 1930, Maybeck received an honorary doctorate from the University of California, Berkeley. The American Institute of Architecture honored Maybeck twice during his lifetime — with citation in 1913 and with a Gold Medal in 1951. Maybeck died in California on October 3, 1957 at the age of 95, one year after the death of his wife Annie.

Maybeck developed an eclectic and personal style combining Spanish mission, Gothic, and Japanese influences. Hallmarks of Maybeck's work include use of native woods, large windows, handcrafted details, masterful use of color, and integration with the landscape.

Not only did Maybeck experiment with different architectural forms, but he often chose materials that were unusual for his time, experimenting with cement, industrial steel sash windows and cement-asbestos insulation panels. He later tried untested "fireproof" materials such as bubblestone, a type of aerated cement, and burlap covered in cement gunite.

In addition, "Maybeck was profoundly influenced by the indigenous buildings he found in the Bay Area... Many of his practices came from the indigenous house, whose virtues of plan orientation, temperature control, and direct use of materials were to later influence a whole

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places  
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 9

Roos House, San Francisco, California

Narrative Statement of Significance (continued)

California school of architecture"<sup>9</sup>, known as the First Bay Tradition.

The First Bay Tradition is a unique architectural idiom of the San Francisco Bay Area and an expression of regional identity. In the late nineteenth century, Bay Area elites, including Bernard Maybeck, developed a sense of Bay Area living based on contact with and appreciation of the region's attractive landscapes and mild climate. From this emerged an architectural style that expressed eclecticism, cultivation, and appreciation for the physical environment. It incorporated modernist ideas but retained its essential identity through its use of native woods (particularly redwood), large windows, and open, airy spaces that allowed comfortable contact with the mild, clement outdoors.

Richard Longstreth writes that although "Maybeck gave no evidence of striving for distinctly regional architecture, his work was so unique that it came to be seen as a regional phenomenon. As such, it has influenced many architects in San Francisco up to the present day. Maybeck remains the figure with whom Bay Area design is most often identified."

Most of Maybeck's early domestic work exhibited a plan developed under a simple gable roof with exterior walls shingled in wide redwood board and batten. The Roos House can be seen as an evolution in Maybeck's personal forms, with an emphasis still on the gable roof but with a greater concentration of forms borrowed from historic styles as well as an abundance of ornament on wall surfaces and balcony railings. His use of natural materials and large windows in the Roos House shows appreciation for the physical environment.

Rather than rejecting the past, Maybeck consistently called upon its forms to give satisfying shape to the present<sup>10</sup> as he did in the Tudor Revival style architecture of the Roos House. At approximately 9,000 square feet, the Roos House is the largest Tudor Revival style residence designed by Maybeck.

Sally Woodbridge writes of Maybeck's designs in the early 1900s, "Maybeck's plans were often rectangular or L-shaped compositions that adjusted to the terrain and he became a master at stacking volumes of spaces in complex vertical masses. In these plans he frequently treated the living hall as a separate spatial volume to call attention to its importance. Maybeck obviously found the living hall indispensable to creating a congenial setting, for he used it over and over again in houses large and small, changing materials and colors as he saw fit."<sup>11</sup>

Maybeck later incorporated the use of vivid colors as decorative accents, for example the red

<sup>9</sup> McCoy, Esther, *Five California Architects* (Los Angeles: Hennessey and Ingalls, 1975), 5.

<sup>10</sup> Gray Brechin, Ph.D. <http://www.maybeck.org/scholars.html>

<sup>11</sup> Woodbridge, Sally and Richard Barnes, *Bernard Maybeck: Visionary Architect* (New York: Abbeville Press, 1992).

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

## National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 10

Roos House, San Francisco, California

### Narrative Statement of Significance (continued)

backing for some of the light fixtures and doorbell surround, as well as the amethyst velvet on the doors in the entry hall in the Roos House. He stained wooden structural members with color to deepen the tone of the shadow, as in the staining of the decorative Gothic quatrefoils used on the balcony of the Roos House.

The interior of the Roos House balances intimacy with grandeur by juxtaposing certain elements such as a monumental hearth and cathedral ceilings with intimate alcoves and fine-grain decorative details. The arrangement of light fixtures suspended at different levels in the living room gives the impression of the room being larger than it really is by creating drama in the upper area. The walls and ceilings of the public rooms on the first floor of the Roos House are clad in natural redwood, exemplifying the Maybeck's continued affinity for unadorned natural materials. Through the use of large windows in the public rooms, Maybeck creates a connection between indoor and outdoor space.

Bernard Maybeck's works listed on the National Register of Historic Places include the Faculty Club (1900), Berkeley, California; and the First Church of Christ Scientist (1900), Berkeley, California, which is considered Maybeck's masterpiece with its Gothic influences, brilliant color, and interior furnishings designed by the architect. Additional works listed on the National Register of Historic Places includes Hearst Gymnasium for Women (1927), Berkeley, California, designed in association with Julia Morgan; Panoramic Hill Historic District (1900-1949), Berkeley, California, a grouping of small Arts & Crafts residences designed in association with other architects; Swedenborgian Church (1895), San Francisco, California, in association with other architects; and the Principia College Historic District (1940), Elmhurst, Illinois, a fanciful interpretation of post medieval English village designed in association with Julia Morgan. The Roos House would be Maybeck's only Tudor Revival residence located in San Francisco to be listed on the National Register.

The Roos house meets National Register Criterion C in the area of Architecture and retains integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. The property retains integrity of location, as it has not been moved. It has undergone very few alterations, all of which were designed by the original architect to be compatible with the massing, arrangement of spaces, colors and materials of the building; therefore retains integrity of design. Although the rear portion of the lot was sold in 1989, the character of the setting remains. The use of redwood paneling throughout the first floor public rooms exemplifies the Maybeck's affinity for indigenous materials. The extensive foundation system, unusual in residential construction, is an example of regional building techniques. Workmanship is expressed in the ornamental detailing throughout the property. All these physical features taken together convey the property's historic character and give the property its unique feeling and clearly exhibit its association with Maybeck.

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

## National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 11

Roos House, San Francisco, California

---

### Narrative Statement of Significance (continued)

The Roos House is an exceptional example of the work of nationally prominent master architect, Bernard Maybeck, who was one of the key figures in introducing a new architectural movement to the West Coast. With its steeply pitched roof, massive chimney, decorative half-timbering and diamond paned windows, the Roos House embodies the distinctive characteristics of Tudor Revival style of architecture, as interpreted by Maybeck. It possesses high artistic value in its complex vertical massing and intricate Gothic decorative details found in the quatrefoils on the exterior, light fixtures in the interior and use of local redwood paneling in the public rooms.

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places  
Continuation Sheet

Section number 9 Page 12

Roos House, San Francisco, California

9. Major Bibliographical References:

Books

Cardwell, Kenneth H. *Bernard Maybeck: Artisan, Architect, Artist*. Santa Barbara: Peregrine Smith, Inc., 1996.

Gebhard, David, Robert Winter and Eric Sandweiss. *The Guide to Architecture in San Francisco and Northern California*. Layton, Utah: Gibbs-Smith, 1985.

Goff, Lee. *Tudor Style: Tudor Revival Houses in America from 1890 to the Present*. New York: Universe, 2002.

Longstreth, Richard. *On the Edge of the World: Four Architects in San Francisco at the Turn of the Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

Maddex, Diane. *Master Builders: A Guide to Famous American Architects*. Washington D.C.: Preservation Press, 1985.

McCoy, Esther. *Five California Architects*. Los Angeles: Hennessey and Ingalls, 1975.

Olmsted, Roger and T. H. Watkins. *Here Today, San Francisco's Architectural Heritage*. San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1969.

Tobriner, Stephen. *Bracing for Disaster, Earthquake Resistant Architecture and Engineering in San Francisco, 1838-1933*. Berkeley: Heyday Books, 2006.

Winter, Robert. *Craftsman Style*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2004.

Winter, Robert. *Toward a Simpler Way of Life: The Arts & Crafts Architects of California*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Woodbridge, Sally and Richard Barnes. *Bernard Maybeck: Visionary Architect*. New York: Abbeville Press, 1992.

Repositories

University of California, Berkeley, Environmental Design Library, Bernard Maybeck Collection

Websites

Maybeck Foundation, Internet: <[www.maybeck.org](http://www.maybeck.org)>

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

## National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 10 Page 13

Roos House, San Francisco, California

---

### 10. Geographical Data

#### Verbal Boundary Description

All of legal parcel number 0970002 extending 60 feet along Jackson Street and 127.69 feet along Locust Street.

#### Boundary Justification

The boundary includes the residence and garage that have historically been part of the Roos property. The rear portion of the parcel that originally encompassed the gardens designed by Maybeck is not included in the verbal boundary description because it was sold in 1989.

OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION  
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

P.O. BOX 942896  
SACRAMENTO, CA 94296-0001  
(916) 653-6624 Fax: (916) 653-9824  
calshpo@ohp.parks.ca.gov  
www.ohp.parks.ca.gov



MEETING NOTICE

**FOR:** State Historical Resources Commission Quarterly Meeting

**DATE:** July 31, 2009

**TIME:** 9:00 A.M.

**PLACE:** State Resources Building Auditorium  
1416 9<sup>th</sup> Street, First Floor  
Sacramento, California 95814

This room is accessible to people with disabilities. Questions regarding the meeting should be directed to the Registration Unit (916) 653-6624

## CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

## OFFICE OF THE TREASURER



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

José Cisneros  
TREASURER

PAULINE MARX  
Chief Assistant Treasurer

Newlin Rankin  
Chief Investment Officer

May 13, 2009

The Honorable Gavin Newsom  
Mayor of San Francisco  
City Hall, Room 200  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, Ca 94102-0917

The Honorable Board of Supervisors  
City and County of San Francisco  
City Hall, Room 244  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, Ca 94102-0917

Ladies and Gentlemen:

This correspondence and its attachments show the investment activity (for fiscal year to date) of the portfolios under Treasurer's management.

Portfolio Statistics from July 1, 2008 to April 30, 2009:

Interest Received	Pooled \$71,043,208	All \$72,765,013
Total Net Earnings	\$61,504,892	\$62,948,431
Earned Income Yield	2.487%	2.483%
Average Age of Portfolio	667 Days	660 Days

Total cost of the securities on hand as of April 30, 2009 was \$3,612,912,969 with a market value of \$3,614,551,425 plus fixed assets accrued interests of \$3,711,086. The earned yield for the month of April 2009 is 2.282%.

In accordance with provisions of California State Government Code Section 53646, we are forwarding herewith computer printouts detailing the City's investment portfolio as of April 30, 2009. These investments are in compliance with California Code and our statement of investment policy, and provide sufficient liquidity to meet expenditure requirements for the next six months.

Very truly yours,

José Cisneros  
Treasurer  
Enc.

cc: Harvey Rose, Budget Analyst (w/Enc.)  
Ben Rosenfield, Controller (w/Enc.)  
Controller – Internal Audit Division -YTD-All Funds, YTD-Pooled Funds  
Oversight Committee: R. Sullivan, Dr. Don Q. Griffin, J. Grazioli, T. Rydstrom, P. Marx  
Transportation Authority – David Murray, San Francisco Public Library – 2 copies  
Office Copy

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
2009 MAY 22 PM 4:05  
BY [Signature]

City Hall Rm.140, #1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA. 94102

(415) 554-4478

# City and County of San Francisco

Office of the Controller – City Services Auditor

## RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT:

**The San Francisco Forty Niners  
Owe the City More Than Half a  
Million Dollars in Parking Lot Rent**

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



May 27, 2009

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO

2009 MAY 27 PM 1:20

BY

*[Signature]*

*page  
Boy  
AC*

*6*

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF  
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

(7)

Application of RED & WHITE )  
FERRIES, INC. for a Certificate of )  
Public Convenience Necessity to )  
Establish and Operate Scheduled Vessel )  
Common Carrier Service Between )  
Sausalito, on the one hand, and )  
Fisherman's Wharf Ferry Terminal Pier )  
43 ½, on the other hand, and to establish )  
a Zone of Rate Freedom. )

Application A. 09-01-016

And Related Matter. )

Complaint C. 09-03-019

2009 MAY 25 PM 12:03  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO  
107

**BLUE & GOLD FLEET'S RESPONSE TO ISSUES  
RAISED BY THE COMPLAINT AND THE  
GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE DISTRICT'S ANSWER TO COMPLAINT  
AS PERMITTED BY ORDERING PARAGRAPH 4 OF  
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING ISSUED MAY 13, 2009**

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

Daniel F. Reidy, Esq.  
LAW OFFICES OF DANIEL F. REIDY,  
A PROFESSIONAL CORP.  
3701 Sacramento Street, # 386  
San Francisco, CA 94118  
Telephone: (415) 750-4210  
Facsimile: (415) 750-4214  
Email: [dfreidy@pacbell.net](mailto:dfreidy@pacbell.net)  
Attorney for  
BLUE & GOLD FLEET, L.P.

Date: May 22, 2009

(7)

Board of  
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV

05/28/2009 04:45 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: MTA Budget Horror Show

8



kimo <kimo@

Sent by:  
kimocrossman@

05/27/2009 07:15 PM

Please respond to  
kimo@

To Éric Brooks <brookse32@aim.com>, "Bruce Wolfe, M.S.W."  
<bmw@>, Doug Comstock  
<dougcoms Oliver Luby  
<oliverlear>, David Waggoner  
<dpwaggoner>, Rick Hauptman  
<rbhauptman>, Rick.Galbreath@sfgov.org, Ross  
Mirkarimi <Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org>, Board of Supervisors  
superdaly, <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, David Noyola  
<david.noyola@sfgov.org>

cc

Subject MTA Budget Horror Show

(From SFMike):


Went to the MTA budget meeting today at the Supes. It was really disgusting. Here's an account:

<http://sfciviccenter.blogspot.com/2009/05/mta-budget-controversy-at-supes.html>

**WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 2009**

The MTA Budget Controversy at the Supes

8



A special Board of Supervisors meeting was held at noon today to discuss whether or not to reject the Metropolitan Transit Authority's upcoming budget which relies on 25% fare hikes to its customers along with reduced service.



The new Board of Supervisors president David Chiu was the first to bring up the idea of rejection because the Mayor's Office has been using the MTA as its personal cash cow, authorizing work orders for everything from salaries for Newsom's "environmental" aides to \$80 million in compensation towards the San Francisco Police Department for vague, undefined, nonexistent security.




The board was split pretty evenly between those who don't give a damn about their constituents who ride Muni and those who do, so I asked Hope Johnson (above) what was going to happen. "It all comes down to Sophie Maxwell. She's the swing vote. Everything else is just posturing."



As usual, Hope was absolutely correct. Supervisor Avalos, who had marched over to Nathaniel Ford's offices a couple of weeks ago demanding a more transit-friendly budget, started off with a grandstanding speech about "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" which didn't make a lot of allegorical sense.




Then it was time for Nathaniel Ford, the \$350,000+ Executive Director of the MTA to tell us what had changed in the budget since last week's Board of Supervisors meeting, which turned out to be virtually nothing.




His mendacious presentation, delivered in fluent bureaucratese, was followed by a


presentation from MTA Board Chairman Tom Nolan, who is originally from the Peninsula where the car is king. (For some background on how we got here, click [here](#) for an article in Streetsblog by Bryan Goebel and click [here](#) for an article by Marc Norton on how the \$2 fare has been planned for years.)



After speeches by Supervisors Ross Mirkarimi, Eric Mar and David Campos on why the MTA budget was a disaster, Sophie Maxwell stood up and complimented her "colleagues on feeling so passionate about this subject." However, she had obviously been "persuaded" somehow before the meeting to vote with the old power structure, and she then proceeded to stab her colleagues and all of her constituents in the back.




Supervisor Chris Daly, sitting next to Maxwell, had kept his mouth shut throughout the entire meeting but his colleague's speech obviously stretched whatever patience he was displaying so he slipped around the back of the chamber and went to joke quietly with the press section.



As bad as Maxwell's speech was, the vote and speech from Board President David Chiu was worse. Since his initial challenge of the MTA budget, Mr. Chiu has been weaseling his votes this way and that in one committee or another, and today was no different. He started by proclaiming that he was the only one who didn't have a car and who depended on Muni for transportation, and that the Board had managed \$30 million in concessions during this MTA budget controversy which was a new record. In truth, he has been playing both sides against the middle, and who got shafted were the citizens of San Francisco ([click here](#) for Greg Dewar's rant on this point at N Judah Chronicles).



Whenever I go to City Hall to buy my 25% more expensive Fast Pass every month, I'll be sure to remember Mr. Chiu and Ms. Maxwell along with Supervisors Bevan Dufty, Sean Elsbernd, Carmen Chu, and Michaela Alioto-Pier who was smiling and giggling in her wheelchair during most of the meeting.



Above all, I will be thinking of our phony baloney environmental Mayor Newsom and his retinue of chauffeurs and guards.

Labels: Gavin Newsom, politics, SF Supervisors

POSTED BY SFMIKE AT 3:53 PM 



kimo <kimo:  
Sent by:  
kimocrossman:

05/27/2009 01:20 PM

Please respond to  
kimo:

To Brian Roberts <Brian.Roberts@sfgov.org>

cc Barry Fraser <Barry.Fraser@sfgov.org>, Chris Vein  
<chris.vein@sfgov.org>, dtis@sfgov.org, Emy Tseng  
<emy.tseng@sfgov.org>, Pro-SF

bcc

Subject Re: ARRA Broadband application for San Francisco

, John

9

Thank you for some reason I thought it was today.

My feedback so far is:

1. SF should advocate for a solution which preserves anonymous free speech - with library-like safeguards and no logging of activity nor login requirement. Note even the SF Library no longer requires a login for free WiFi usage.
2. SF should aim to create highspeed upload storefronts or locations in each library branch to allow people to upload media content which is currently difficult to upload media content with any reasonable speed from home on an asymmetric dsl or cable connection which has much higher download than upload speed. Facilities like this would be use to independent video makers, public access and anyone uploading content to the SF-based Internet Archive.org
3. Anywhere broadband is provided, wide usage of open access access points like Meraki should be required to allow people in the neighborhood to also use the free signal. In the same way that all receive benefit from good lighting outside a building.

On Wed, May 27, 2009 at 12:59 PM, Brian Roberts <[Brian.Roberts@sfgov.org](mailto:Brian.Roberts@sfgov.org)> wrote:

Dear Mr. Crossman:

The initial public meeting is scheduled for tomorrow 5/28 at the Chinatown Branch library.

The time and place for the second public meeting will be posted by the end of the week.

Note that Mr. Vein indicated that there would be a total of 2 or 3 public meetings.

Sincerely,  
Brian Roberts  
Policy Analyst  
Department of Technology  
City and County of San Francisco

9

Sup Avalos, Sup Mikarume  
Sup Chen  
RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO  
BT AC  
apage

MEMORANDUM

2009 MAY 22 PM 4:04

May 21, 2009

By *[Signature]*

10

TO: Benjamin Rosenfield, Controller of the City and County of San Francisco

FROM: Trent Rhorer, Executive Director  
Phil Arnold, Deputy Director for Administration *[Signature]*

SUBJECT: Proposed FY 2009-10 Human Services Care Fund Budget

This memo notifies the Office of the Controller that pursuant to Administrative Code Section 10.100-7(e), the Human Services Commission has approved the Department of Human Services' projection for the FY 2009-10 Human Services Care Fund budget.

**The Care Fund ordinance requires the Department of Human Services to submit to the Board of Supervisors a plan explaining how the department intends to spend Care Fund money when it submits any proposed appropriation ordinance in excess of the \$11.9 million cap. The Commission is then to adopt findings and transmit them to the Board of Supervisors and the Office of the Controller.**

The FY2009-10 Care Fund budget is based on a projected average monthly homeless caseload of 418. The Care Fund savings from reduction in CAAP homeless caseload is based on the following formula:  $(3,000 - 418) \times 12 \text{ months} \times \text{average maximum grant for each CAAP program}$ , where 3,000 is the baseline of total homeless CAAP clients established by CNC ordinance. The Care Fund savings from grant reductions is based on the following formula:  $\text{average amount reduced from CAAP grant} \times 12 \text{ months} \times 418 \text{ clients}$ .

Savings from caseload reduction	\$12,114,275
Savings from grant reduction	<u>\$ 1,552,106</u>
Total Care Fund	\$13,666,382

The proposed Human Services Care Fund spending plan of \$15,518,739 (see Attachment), which are supported by \$13,666,382 in projected FY09-10 revenues and \$1,852,357 in prior-year unspent revenues, are shown below:

Housing	\$14,387,608
Services	<u>\$ 1,131,131</u>
Total	\$15,518,739

10

FILE NO.

RESOLUTION NO.

[Approval of FY09-10 Expenditure Plan for the Human Services Care Fund]

**Resolution approving the FY09-10 Expenditure Plan for the Human Services Care Fund.**

WHEREAS, Administrative Code Section 10.100-77 established the Department of Human Services Care Fund for the purpose of providing housing, utilities, meals and other services for formerly homeless CAAP recipients; and,

WHEREAS, If planned annual expenditures from the Human Services Care Fund exceed \$11.9 million, Administrative Code Section 10.100-77(f) requires the Department of Human Services to submit to the Board of Supervisors a plan explaining how the Department intends to spend the money; and,

WHEREAS, The Administrative Code requires the Board of Supervisors to approve the expenditure plan by resolution before adopting the ordinance appropriating funds for these expenditures; and,

WHEREAS, The FY09-10 budget for the Department of Human Services includes proposed expenditures from the Human Services Care Fund in excess of \$11.9 million; and,

WHEREAS, The Department of Human Services has submitted to the Board of Supervisors a FY09-10 expenditure plan for the Human Services Care Fund; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors hereby approves the FY09-10 expenditure plan for the Human Services Care Fund as submitted by the Department of Human Services pursuant to Section 10.100-77(f) of the Administrative Code.



## Human Services Care Fund (Housing First Program) FY09-10 Expenditure Plan

This expenditure plan for the Human Services Care Fund for FY09-10 is submitted to the Board of Supervisors pursuant to Section 10-100.77(f) of the San Francisco Administrative Code. The Administrative Code requires the Department of Human Services to submit this expenditure plan if annual proposed appropriations from the Human Services Care Fund exceed \$11.9 million. This plan must include estimates of the amounts to be spent for various purposes, as well as an explanation of who is to benefit from these expenditures, how many people will benefit, and how the proposed benefits will be provided.

**Planned Expenditures:** The FY09-10 budget for the Department of Human Services includes proposed expenditures from the Human Services Care Fund of \$15,518,739 (see Attachment 1). The proposed expenditures are divided into two general categories: housing and services. The proposed expenditures are supported by \$13,666,382 in projected FY09-10 revenues and \$1,852,357 in prior-year unexpended revenues.

**Beneficiaries:** The Housing First Program is funded by the Human Services Care Fund. The beneficiaries of the proposed spending under this plan are homeless and formerly-homeless CAAP clients of the Department of Human Services. Since the beginning of the Housing First Program in May 2004, a total of 2,588 homeless and formerly-homeless CAAP clients have been placed into permanent supportive housing (as of April 24, 2009).

**How Benefits Are Provided:** Access to the Housing First Program is provided to any CAAP client listed as being homeless with their assigned CAAP worker. These clients are offered an opportunity to apply for housing if it is available. Until a housing placement is made, shelter is offered by the CAAP worker for the time between monthly homeless verification appointments. Each time the homeless CAAP clients see their eligibility worker for a monthly homeless verification appointment, their worker checks to see if housing is available. Additional outreach is done to homeless CAAP clients who have been using shelter for long periods. As housing opportunities are available, homeless CAAP clients are referred to the Housing Access Team that provides support through the screening and placement process. When a client is placed in housing, the Housing Access Team arranges with the CAAP worker for benefits to be adjusted and routed correctly, and then notifies both CAAP and Food Stamps of the client's new address.

# Human Services Agency

## Housing First Program FY09-10

Budget Items	FY09-10	Notes
<b>REVENUES</b>		
FY09-10 Care Fund Revenues	\$13,666,382	
Prior-Year Unspent Care Fund Revenues	\$1,852,357	
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>\$15,518,739</b>	
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>		
<b>Housing</b>		
Arlington (St. Vincent)	\$86,924	25 units. Summer 2003 start date.
Mary Elizabeth Inn (MEI)	\$252,864	33 units. 2/1/05 start date.
McAllister (Conard House)	\$1,039,659	80 units. 5/3/04 start date.
Alder (ECS)	\$1,268,107	116 units. 5/1/06 start date.
Coast Hotel (ECS)	\$1,232,567	124 units. 5/1/06 start date.
Elm (ECS)	\$1,064,356	81 units. 6/15/04 start date.
Hillsdale (ECS)	\$1,088,081	84 units. 3/28/05 start date.
Mentone (ECS)	\$1,041,045	71 units. 11/15/04 start date.
All Star (THC)	\$691,776	86 units. 8/1/04 start date.
Boyd (THC)	\$759,217	82 units. 2/15/2006 start date.
California Drake (THC)	\$169,183	51 units. 9/20/03 start date.
Elk (THC)	\$712,154	88 units. 6/1/06 start date.
Graystone (THC)	\$662,954	74 units. 5/3/04 start date.
Pierre (THC)	\$758,642	87 units. 9/6/04 start date.
Royan (THC)	\$661,036	69 units. Summer 2003 start date.
Union (THC)	\$652,388	60 units. 12/15/04 start date.
Aranda (TARC)	\$1,036,704	110 units. 12/15/2005 start date.
ML MPP Services (THC)	\$308,344	Modified Payment Program services provided in CNC hotels.
PMSS (THC)	\$621,607	Property management and support services provided in CNC hotels.
Capital Improvements projects	\$280,000	Hotel maintenance.
<b>Housing Sub-total</b>	<b>\$14,387,608</b>	
<b>Services</b>		
Behavioral Health Roving Team	\$489,179	Psychiatrist and Nurse Practitioners.
Citywide Case Management - Roving Team	\$581,758	Roving team includes 1 SW supervisor, 1 SW, 1 SW associate, 2 clinical supervisor, 1 subst abuse spec, 0.10 prgrm dir, 5 case managers, 0.20 clerk.
Methadone maintenance	\$40,194	Serves 7 clients at BAART.
Training	\$20,000	Training for shelter case mngrs&ML support counselor.
<b>Services Sub-total</b>	<b>\$1,131,131</b>	
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>\$15,518,739</b>	



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO

2009 MAY 27 AM 11:26

## PUBLIC NOTICE

### Notice of Availability of Draft Environmental Impact Report for the New Irvington Tunnel Project

#### Notice of Public Meetings

Planning Department Case No. 2005.0162E

State Clearinghouse No. 2006072085

1650 Mission St.  
Suite 400  
San Francisco,  
CA 94103-2479

Reception:  
415.558.6378

Fax:  
415.558.6409

Planning  
Information:  
415.558.6377

A Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared by the San Francisco Planning Department in connection with this project. A copy of the report is available for public review and comment at the Planning Department offices at 1660 Mission Street, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Planning Information Counter, and online at <http://www.sfplanning.org/mea>. Referenced materials are available for review by appointment at the Planning Department's office at 1650 Mission Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor (call 415-558-6378).

**Project Description:** The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) proposes the New Irvington Tunnel project. The project would be approximately 3.5 miles long, extending west from a new Alameda West Portal on the west side of the Sunol Valley to a new Irvington Portal in the City of Fremont. Construction would occur at four work areas: Alameda West Portal (in Sunol Valley), Sheridan Valley (along Sheridan Road), Vargas (along Vargas Road adjacent to I-680) and the Irvington Portal (along Mission Blvd in Fremont). The new tunnel would be located south and approximately parallel to the existing tunnel, separated by a distance of approximately 100 to 700 feet. The internal diameter of the tunnel would be between 8.5 and 10.5 feet. The depth of the tunnel would range from approximately 30 feet below ground surface at the portals to 700 feet below the ground surface of the uplands along the alignment. The tunnel would be excavated using conventional mining techniques. The tunnel would be excavated from three locations: west from the Alameda West Portal work area, both east and west from the Vargas work area, and east for an approximately 500-foot section from the Irvington Portal work area. The project would also include:

- new portals at the Alameda West Portal and the Irvington Portal work areas;
- construction of two pipelines (300 feet and 800 feet respectively) from the manifold pipe at the new Irvington Portal to connect to other parts of the water system;
- replacement of two existing bridges over Alameda Creek with new permanent bridges;
- ancillary project components including security improvements at the existing portals, permanent access roads; valves and valve lots; and new and replacement fencing;
- temporary construction facilities including temporary access roads and bridges, power lines, equipment staging areas, dewatering and water treatment facilities; and
- hauling and placement of excess tunnel and trench spoils.

The new tunnel would provide a redundant regional connection between the SFPUC's Alameda Siphons and Coast Range Tunnel (water pipelines) to the east in the Sunol Valley and the Bay Division Pipelines (BDPLs) system to the west in the City of Fremont.

This EIR tiers from the Program EIR (PEIR) prepared for the SFPUC's Water System Improvement Program (WSIP), State Clearinghouse No. 2005092026, available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94103 and online at [www.sfplanning.org/mea](http://www.sfplanning.org/mea). The proposed project is a component of the SFPUC's WSIP. As a component of the WSIP, it contributes to the impacts that the WSIP, as a program, may have on the environment.

The DEIR identified that significant impacts may occur to aesthetics; air quality; biological resources; cultural resources; geology, soils and seismicity; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; land use; noise and vibration; recreation; transportation and circulation; mineral and energy resources; agricultural resources; and utilities and service systems. Most impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels; however, a significant impact that may not be avoided through feasible mitigation measures was identified for paleontological resources. The DEIR identifies that, with mitigation, the project would not have cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts when viewed in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects.

As stated, the proposed project is one of several improvement projects that comprise the SFPUC's WSIP. Implementation of the WSIP would support growth in the SFPUC service area, thereby contributing indirectly to environmental impacts caused by that growth. Because the proposed project is part of the WSIP and would contribute to the WSIP's growth inducement impact, the project therefore would contribute to the significant and unavoidable program-level impacts associated with growth inducement. In addition, the proposed project as part of the WSIP, could contribute to the following significant and unavoidable impacts resulting from implementation of the WSIP: effects on fishery resources in Crystal Springs Reservoir in San Mateo County; and effects on stream flow in Alameda Creek between the diversion dam and the confluence with Calaveras Creek. All other impacts resulting from implementation of the WSIP can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

A **public hearing** on this Draft EIR and other matters has been scheduled by the City Planning Commission for **Thursday, July 9, 2009**, in Room 400, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, beginning at 1:30 p.m. or later. (Call 415-558-6422 the week of the hearing for a recorded message giving a more specific time). A public meeting will be held on: **Wednesday, June 24, 2009**, Fremont Main Library, Fukaya Room B, 2400 Stevenson Blvd., Fremont, CA 94538. The Fremont public meeting will begin promptly at 6:30 p.m. Representatives will be available to answer questions at the Fremont public meeting beginning at 6:00 p.m.

**Public comments** will be accepted from **June 1, 2009**, until **July 16, 2009**, at 5:00 p.m. Written comments should be addressed to Bill Wycko, Environmental Review Officer, San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103 or provided via fax to 415-558-6409, or by email to [steve.smith@sfgov.org](mailto:steve.smith@sfgov.org). Comments received at the public hearing and in writing will be responded to subsequently in a Comments and Responses document. If you have any questions about the **environmental review** of the proposed project, please call the EIR Coordinator, Steve Smith, at 415-558-6373.



Joy, G.J. copy


# Capital Planning Committee

Edwin M. Lee, City Administrator, Chair

## MEMORANDUM

May 18, 2009

**To:** Supervisor David Chiu, Board President  
**From:** Edwin M. Lee, City Administrator and Capital Planning Committee Chair  
**Copy:** Members of the Board of Supervisors  
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board  
Capital Planning Committee  
**Regarding:** Recommendation on the November 2009 Safe Streets & Road Repair General  
Obligation Bond



In accordance with Section 3.21 of the Administrative Code, on May 18, 2009, the Capital Planning Committee (CPC) reviewed one action item under consideration by the Board of Supervisors. The CPC's recommendations on these items are set forth below as well as a record of the members present.

**1. Board File Number 090585: Potential amendment to increase the principal amount of the Safe Streets and Road Repair Bond by \$20,000,000 to include Utility Undergrounding.**

**Recommendation:**

Recommend approval of the following:

- (1) Explicitly identify Utility Undergrounding as a possible element of streetscape improvements;
- (2) Establish policy in bond that any major streetscape improvement project will include undergrounding, where overhead wires exist; and
- (3) Increase total amount of streetscape funds in bond, and thereby the total amount of the bond, by \$20,000,000 to allow for more undergrounding capacity (up to 5 miles).

**Comments:**

The CPC recommends approval of this item by a vote of 7-0, with one abstention.

Committee members or representatives in favor include Edwin M. Lee, City Administrator; Nadia Sesay, Controller's Office; Gigi Whitley, Mayor's Office; Ed Reiskin, Department of Public Works; John Rahaim, Planning Department; Tina Olson, Port of San Francisco; and Cindy Nichols, San Francisco International Airport.

Committee members abstaining include David Chiu, Board of Supervisors President.

Handwritten number 12 in a circle

BOS-11

San Francisco Muni Accessibility Advisory Council  
c/o SFMTA

1 South Van Ness, 7<sup>th</sup> floor #7404, San Francisco, CA 94103

ph: (415) 701-4485

fax: (415) 701-4728

TTY: (415) 701-4730

May 26, 2009

(13)

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

Dear President Chiu:


I am writing today on behalf of the Muni Accessibility Advisory Committee regarding the proposed discontinuance of the 89 Laguna Honda. The Muni Accessibility Advisory Committee (MAAC) has been advising Muni for over 25 years on providing quality service to seniors and people with disabilities. Though we are strongly concerned about many of the proposed service cuts due to the fiscal emergency, we are particularly distressed by the lack of planning for the transference of the 89 Laguna Honda to Department of Public Health. To deny service to Laguna Honda would constitute a breach of faith with the senior and disabled community.

MAAC recognizes the severity of the budget constraints that Muni is facing, and we know that there are many difficult decisions that must be made. However, proposing the removal of the 89 without a plan for replacement service is unacceptable for our committee. For many MAAC members, the 89 is the only means of accessing our doctors and friends and providing service to the critically ill residents of Laguna Honda Hospital. Already, there are strong concerns about safe access to the hospital, as there are no sidewalks that are wide enough to accommodate the typical wheelchair, and requires mobility device users to share the roadway with cars. Further, for many, the hill is too steep to access for those using mobility devices, such as wheelchairs or scooters. The 89 is the only method of safely accessing the hospital for those who cannot or choose not to drive. Laguna Honda is a huge hospital that is used by many, including independent living facilities, long-term care residents, and Health at Home services. The 89 serves as a irreplaceable connection to the city both for all the residents and the people who come to assist them.

Roland Wong, a MAAC member and others have proposed a number of solutions that do not involve cutting the 89 line, including extending the 36 Teresita to Laguna Honda. MAAC would like to ensure that a replacement service is planned for and in place prior to the discontinuance of the 89, and strongly advocates that the Board of Supervisors supports the continuation of service to Laguna Honda Hospital and require that it is planned prior to any elimination of existing bus service. Please contact us at randallglock@gmail.com if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely yours,

  
Randall L. Glock, MAAC Chair

  
Elizabeth Dawson, MAAC Vice-Chair


cc: SFMTA Board  
Mayor's Office on Disability

(13)

# Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector

City and County of San Francisco

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 140  
San Francisco, CA 94102



JOSÉ CISNEROS, Treasurer

Phone: (415) 554-4478

GEORGE PUTRIS, Tax Administrator

Phone: (415) 554-4874

14

May 29, 2009

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

Subject: 2008 Tax Credit Annual Report

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

The Tax Administrator, pursuant to the provisions of the San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations Code, herewith submits the annual report of businesses that filed for tax credits for the 2008 calendar year. This year the report covers the Enterprise Zone Tax Credit only.

Schedule A of the report summarizes for the 2008 calendar year the number of firms filing for the credit, the total San Francisco employees, the number of eligible employees, and the amount of tax credit claimed. The total number of firms claiming the Enterprise Zone tax credits is 20. San Francisco firms reported 329 employees that qualify for this tax credit.

Schedule B of the report compares each of the tax credits by tax years from 2006 through 2008.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact me at (415) 554-4874.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "George W. Putris".

George W. Putris  
Tax Administrator

cc: José Cisneros  
San Francisco Public Library

Attachments

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO  
2009 MAY 29 PM 2:27  
BY [signature]

14

**TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT  
TAX CREDITS  
CALENDAR YEAR 2008**

Type of Tax Credit	No. of Firms Filing	Total SF Employees	No. of Eligible Employees	Total Tax Credit
Enterprise Zone (approved)	8	598	51	\$ 13,905
Enterprise Zone (pending approval)*	12	4,503	278	\$ 130,720
Total	20	5,101	329	\$ 144,625

\* Pending taxpayers submission of vouchers, signed affidavit, or worksheet to support their claim for the 2008 Enterprise Zone Tax Credit.

**TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT  
COMPARISON OF ENTERPRISE ZONE TAX CREDITS  
TAX YEARS 2006 THROUGH 2008**

Type of Tax Credit	Number of Firms Filing			Total Number of SF Employees			Number of Eligible Employees			Total Tax Credits		
	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008
Enterprise Zone reported in previous tax year	16	16		888	906		96	116		\$ 32,595	\$ 41,356	
Enterprise Zone filed in current year <sup>1</sup>	-	1	8	-	50	598	-	7	51	\$ -	\$ 7,738	\$ 13,905
Enterprise Zone - pending submission of documentation	-	-	12	-	-	4,503	-	-	278	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 130,720
<b>Total Enterprise Zone Tax Credit</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>888</b>	<b>956</b>	<b>5,101</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>329</b>	<b>\$ 32,595</b>	<b>\$ 49,094</b>	<b>\$ 144,625</b>

<sup>1</sup> Statements filed in 2008 for prior years

# Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector

City and County of San Francisco

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 140  
San Francisco, CA 94102



JOSÉ CISNEROS, Treasurer

Phone: (415) 554-4478

GEORGE PUTRIS, Tax Administrator

Phone: (415) 554-4874

15

May 29, 2009

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

Subject: 2008 Biotechnology Exclusion Annual Report

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

The Tax Administrator, pursuant to the provisions of the San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations Code, herewith submits the annual report of businesses that filed for the biotechnology exclusion for the 2008 calendar year.

Schedule A of the report summarizes for the 2008 calendar year the number of firms filing for the exclusion, their total San Francisco employees, the number of eligible employees, and the amount of biotechnology payroll exclusion claimed. Eight firms claimed the biotechnology exclusion in the amount of \$24,333,555. The San Francisco firms reported 231 employees that qualify for the exclusion. Compared to the preceding year, calendar year 2008 resulted in an increase of 16 jobs in the biotechnology business sector in the City. Schedule B of the report summarizes the biotechnology exclusion for calendar years 2006 through 2008.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact me at (415) 554-4874.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "George W. Putris".

George W. Putris  
Tax Administrator

cc: José Cisneros  
San Francisco Public Library

Attachments

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO  
2009 MAY 29 PM 2:26  
BY Handwritten initials, possibly "JCP", written over a horizontal line.

15

**TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT  
BIOTECHNOLOGY EXCLUSION  
CALENDAR YEAR 2008**

<b>Year</b>	<b>No. of Firms Filing</b>	<b>Total SF Employees</b>	<b>No. of New Eligible Employees</b>	<b>Total Biotechnology Exclusion</b>	<b>Payroll Tax Excluded</b>
<b>2008</b>	8	237	231	\$ 24,333,555	\$ 365,003
<b>2007</b>	7	215	215	\$ 21,274,886	\$ 319,123
<b>Increase</b>	1	22	16	\$ 3,058,669	\$ 45,880

**TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT  
BIOTECHNOLOGY PAYROLL EXCLUSION  
FOR CALENDAR YEARS 2006 THRU 2008**

<b>Year</b>	<b># of Firms Filing</b>	<b>Total S.F. Employees</b>	<b># of Eligible Employees</b>	<b>Biotechnology Payroll Exclusion</b>	<b>Payroll Tax Excluded</b>
<b>2006</b>	6	163	163	\$ 16,796,900	\$ 251,954
<b>2007</b>	7	215	215	\$ 21,274,886	\$ 319,123
<b>2008</b>	8	237	231	\$ 24,333,555	\$ 365,003

# Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector

## City and County of San Francisco

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 140  
San Francisco, CA 94102



JOSÉ CISNEROS, Treasurer

Phone: (415) 554-4478

GEORGE PUTRIS, Tax Administrator

Phone: (415) 554-4874

16

May 29, 2009

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

Subject: 2008 Clean Energy Technology Business Exclusion Annual Report

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

The Tax Administrator, pursuant to the provisions of the San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations Code, herewith submits the annual report of businesses that filed for the clean energy technology business exclusion for the 2008 calendar year. The clean energy technology exclusion was effective January 1, 2006.

Schedule A of the report summarizes for the 2008 calendar year the number of firms filing for the exclusion, their total San Francisco employees, the number of eligible employees, and the amount of clean energy exclusion claimed. Six firms claimed the clean energy technology business exclusion in the amount of \$15,127,037. The San Francisco firms reported an increase of 129 employees in the clean energy technology business sector compared to the previous calendar year. Schedule B of the report summarizes the clean energy exclusion for calendar years 2006 through 2008.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact me at (415) 554-4874.

Very truly yours,

*George Putris*

George Putris  
Tax Administrator

cc: José Cisneros  
San Francisco Public Library

Attachments

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO  
2009 MAY 29 PM 2:27  
BY *[Signature]*

16

**TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT  
CLEAN ENERGY TECHNOLOGY EXCLUSION  
CALENDAR YEAR 2008**

<b>Year</b>	<b>No. of Firms Filing</b>	<b>Total SF Employees</b>	<b>No. of Eligible Employees</b>	<b>Total Clean Energy Exclusion</b>	<b>Payroll Tax Excluded</b>
<b>2008</b>	6	167	160	\$ 15,127,037	\$ 226,906
<b>2007</b>	2	31	31	\$ 2,386,129	\$ 35,792
<b>Increase</b>	4	136	129	\$ 12,740,908	\$ 191,114

**TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT  
CLEAN ENERGY TECHNOLOGY EXCLUSION  
FOR CALENDAR YEARS 2006 THRU 2008**

<b>Year</b>	<b>No. of Firms Filing</b>	<b>Total S.F. Employees</b>	<b>No. of Eligible Employees</b>	<b>Total Clean Energy Exclusion</b>	<b>Payroll Tax Excluded</b>
<b>2006</b>	2	24	24	\$ 1,526,900	\$ 22,904
<b>2007</b>	2	31	31	\$ 2,386,129	\$ 35,792
<b>2008</b>	6	167	160	\$ 15,127,037	\$ 226,906



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

## PUBLIC NOTICE

### Availability of Draft Environmental Impact Report for Sunol Valley Water Treatment Plant Expansion and Treated Water Reservoir

Planning Department Case No. 2006.0137E

State Clearinghouse No. 2007082014

1650 Mission St.  
Suite 400  
San Francisco,  
CA 94103-2479

Reception:  
415.558.6378

Fax:  
415.558.6409

Planning  
Information:  
415.558.6377

A Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared by the San Francisco Planning Department in connection with this project. A copy of the report is available for public review and comment at the Planning Department offices at 1660 Mission Street, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Planning Information Counter, and online at <http://www.sfplanning.org/mea>. Referenced materials are available for review by appointment at the Planning Department's office at 1650 Mission Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor. (Call 415-558-6378)

**Project Description:** The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) proposes the Sunol Valley Water Treatment Plant (SVWTP) Expansion and Treated Water Reservoir project. The proposed project is located in an unincorporated portion of Alameda County in the Sunol Valley. The entire project site occurs on SFPUC managed land and is contained within the SFPUC's Alameda watershed. The nearest community is the Town of Sunol, located 4.8 miles north of the project site.

The primary components of the proposed project would include:

- construction of an additional flocculation and sedimentation basin, a new 17.5 million-gallon treated water reservoir, a new chlorine contact tank and associated water treatment facilities, and
- construction of new effluent pipelines within the SVWTP and a new 78-inch pipeline connecting the new treated water reservoir to the existing 78-inch plant discharge pipeline, which transports water from the plant to the existing Alameda Siphons (where treated water enters the water transmission system).

The proposed project would improve treatment reliability by increasing the plant's sustainable capacity to 160 million gallons per day. The proposed project would also meet the California Department of Public Health requirement for the SFPUC to provide additional treated water storage capacity at the plant.

This EIR tiers from the Program EIR (PEIR) prepared for the SFPUC's Water System Improvement Program (WSIP), State Clearinghouse No. 2005092026, available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94103 and online at [www.sfplanning.org/mea](http://www.sfplanning.org/mea). The proposed project is a component of the SFPUC's WSIP. As a component of the WSIP, it contributes to the impacts that the WSIP, as a program, may have on the environment.

(2)

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO  
2009 MAY 29 AM 11:57  
BY: CBT

17

The DEIR identified that significant impacts may occur to aesthetics, cultural resources, transportation and circulation, noise and vibration, air quality, recreation, utilities and service systems, biological resources, hydrology and water quality, hazards and hazardous materials, and agricultural resources. All impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels through the implementation of mitigation measures. Further, the DEIR identifies that with mitigation, the project would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts when viewed in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects.

As stated, the proposed project is one of several improvement projects that comprise the SFPUC's WSIP. Implementation of the WSIP would support growth in the SFPUC service area, thereby contributing indirectly to environmental impacts caused by that growth. Because the proposed project is part of the WSIP and would contribute to the WSIP's growth inducement impact, the project therefore would contribute to the significant and unavoidable program-level impacts associated with growth inducement. In addition, the proposed project as part of the WSIP, would contribute to the following significant and unavoidable impacts resulting from implementation of the WSIP: effects on fishery resources in Crystal Springs Reservoir in San Mateo County; and effects on stream flow in Alameda Creek between the diversion dam and the confluence with Calaveras Creek. All other impacts resulting from implementation of the WSIP can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

A **public hearing** on this DEIR and other matters will be held by the Planning Commission for **Thursday, July 9** in Room 400, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, beginning at 1:30 p.m. or later (call 415-558-6422, the week of the hearing for a recorded message giving a more specific time). An **additional public hearing** will be held at Sunol Glen Elementary School, 11601 Main Street, Sunol, CA 94586 on **June 30, 2009** at 7:00 pm. Representatives will be available to answer questions beginning at 6:30 p.m.

**Public comments** will be accepted from **June 3 to July 17, 2009**. Written comments should be addressed to: Bill Wycko, Environmental Review Officer, San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103 or provided via fax to 415-558-6409, or by email to [brett.becker@sfgov.org](mailto:brett.becker@sfgov.org). Comments received at the public hearing and in writing will be responded to subsequently in a comments and responses document. If you have any questions about the environmental review of the proposed project, please call the EIR Coordinator, Brett Becker, at 415-575-9045.

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO

2009 MAY 28 PM 4:13

BY <sup>gob</sup>  
**Parkmerced**

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Designed by Thomas Church  
With Robert Royston



**STOP!!!! THE RE\_URBANIZATION + COMMERCIALIZATION OF THE PARKMERCED LANDSCAPE!**

**SAY NO TO "GREEN-\$-GREED" AND DEMAND THE EQUAL DEVELOPMENT OF NEW AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING WITH OPEN SPACE AND AMMENITIES IN DEVELOPMENTS BEING BUILT CITYWIDE!!!!**

- **The Cultural Landscape Foundation (T.C.L.F.)** [www.tclf.org](http://www.tclf.org) President Charles Birnbaum –  
"The site is without question of national significance, and is likely eligible to the national register of historic places, + a potential national historic landmark candidate, an elite group of less than 2,600 such properties in america" Parkmerced was nominated as a "Marvel of Modernism" Landscapes @ Risk 2008.
- **DOCOMOMO – (Documentation of the Modern Movement)** Andrew Wolfram- issued a memo on the SFSU plan regarding the uniqueness of Parkmerced as "one of the most important modern movement sites in SF." Noting Parkmerced as a "rare" example of Thomas Churches largest public works, which is not found anywhere else in the country. He also noted that "scrapping" all the existing buildings, roads, and gardens cannot be called sustainable or green. "The urban landscape of parkmerced was created as an integral function to the primary use, housing. Its significance lies in the further development of the american version of the garden city ideas by Leonard Schultze in close cooperation with Thomas Dolliver Church, and church's designed integration of the individual sites, + execution of the garden courts, public open spaces, and street system using new forms and native plants in the individual and unique courtyards of parkmerced. The inclusion of parkmerced in our historical preservation sites of the country, will help raise awareness of the significance of modern landscape design, essential housing, and masterplanned communities in the united stats for our nation's cultural heritage"
- **The National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP) – Anthea Hartig PhD, Western Region Director -**  
"The national trust considers parkmerced a potentially significant example of mid twentieth century residential housing + landscape design, we believe that any projects proposed in the SFSU campus master plan with the potential to impact parkmerced should undergo further environmental analysis through a project EIR, rather tahn the programmatic cultural resource mitigation plan outlined in the environmental documents... The EIR for the SFSU Masterplan is limited in its acknowledgement of the potential historical significance of the parkmerced development, the document confines discussion of the property solely to buildings controlled by SFSU and offers no information about the potential for the entirety of parkmerced to constitute a historic district, similarly the document makes not mention of the potential significance of site planning or landscape features associated with parkmerced." - Memo to Ms. Roberta Achtenberg Chair CSU Board of Trustees –

**The Parkmerced Residents Organization (P.R.O.)** [www.parkmercedresidents.org](http://www.parkmercedresidents.org) - P.O. Box 27609 San Francisco, CA  
94127-0609 Voice Mail (415) 267.3961

- **+10,000,000 gross square feet proposed of increased density**
- **+240,000 gsf of commercial space** (SFSU Masterplan also proposes increased commercial on Holloway + Buckingham) We have Stonestown, Ocean Ave, West Portal, Westlake, Lakeside, Daly City? Do we really need more?
- **-400,000+ gsf of open space** Open space loss in the NOP is incorrectly noted by ignoring the lands sold off prior (Parkmerced was 191 acres) and the internal interior courtyards, both hardscape and softscape square footages that are not indicated as calculated in the overall gsf lost to development.
- **Unsustainable TOTAL tear-down of all town-house units even those that have been renovated, including the removal of all the landscape areas.**
- **No alternatives or options have been developed/proposed in 200 meetings to tenants and community organizations!!! (We have consistently asked for options that respect the original design and layout of the landscape designs.)**
- **Lack of new rental housing being built citywide** that includes open space, and amenities. The city is in non-compliance with the 2004 Housing Element and General Plan Section 8.1 that denotes the need for "options" in home ownership including RENTAL HOUSING!!!!!!
- **SFSU masterplan ignored community impacts on our community center, open space, housing, and transportation/parking in their EIR, and MOU negotiated with the city of SF.**
- The SFMTA Muni TEP consistently **erodes** public transit for parkmerced to instigate a new developer backed transit re-routing that does not improve the speed, capacity or efficiency of muni. The 17-Parkmerced is a lifeline for many seniors, families, students, working class citizens, and disabled residents and its reduction in services amount to non-compliance with the general plan and charter to provide communities with access to public transit.
- Both the SFSU Masterplan and the Parkmerced "vision" plan EIR's are **programmatic**, and ignore the effects on the masterplanned community of parkmerced in outlining only a portion of the overall masterplanned community of parkmerced, and have both ignored and not provided information on the current impact on rental housing in SF in the last 10 years due to SFSU land purchases, and citywide lack of rental housing in all neighborhoods being integrated and dispersed equally.
- Stellar Management states the deterioration is "beyond repair", yet they repainted and repaired units, without any proof or documentation of wide-spread deterioration. Proper maintenance preservation, restoration, and renovations which create high paying jobs and labor intensive work that can save these units for 20+ years.
- **The promotion by the Parkmerced owners of "life-style" change vs. substantive essential housing in SF.** Parkmerced management consistently advertises Parkmerced as "luxury living" We need essential housing not imagery and lifestyle improvements. The need to preserve parkmerced as what they were built for essential rental housing in SF, has not been shown as a concern by the city, developers, bankers (see Predatory Equity Lending) and the creation of housing by the SF architects and building community. The planning department consistently caters to these developments, and "better-neighborhood plans" at the expense of true neighborhood based plans, and planning that would provide the essential housing for our communities and future residents in a sustainable way. Providing options that discuss the partial demolition of units or careful added density through parking removal, and low-rise block insertion throughout parkmerced should be a mitigation measure, complete protection and local/state/national landmarking is also an option that should be reviewed adequately and given time to review and acquire. Demand an option, not complete demolition. Preserve Parkmerced, it represents the city of san francisco's initial response to transit oriented development and rental housing needs.
- **PLEASE ATTEND THE SCOPING HEARING + REMIND THE DEVELOPERS, INVESTORS, AND CITY OFFICIALS THAT PARKMERCED WAS BUILT BY THE PEOPLE AND FOR THE PEOPLE! ESSENTIAL HOUSING IS CRITICAL FOR LOCAL WORKING CITIZENS AND NOT PIED\_A\_TERRE'S FOR OUT\_OF\_TOWNERS. THE LANDSCAPE + OPEN SPACE IS THE ONE FEATURE THEY HAVE NOT RUINED TO DATE, BUT HAVE ALREADY STARTED WORKING ON!!!! DEMAND A HALT TO SUCH TACTICS AND PREVENT ONGOING SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISPLACEMENT OF TENANTS AND THE ADDITIONAL LOSS OF ESSENTIAL WELL BUILT RENTAL HOUSING IN SF, AND THE INTEGRITY OF A POSSIBLE NATIONAL LANDMARK CANDIDATE. THE SCOPING HEARING IS JUNE 8TH AT THE YMCA ANNEX @ STONESTOWN 6-8PM**

City and County of San Francisco



Gavin Newsom, Mayor

File 081008, Bos-11  
Human Services Agency

Department of Human Services  
Department of Aging and Adult Services

*cpag, file*  
Trent Rhorer, Executive Director

May 22, 2009

Angela Cavillo, Clerk  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, #244  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

On behalf of the San Francisco Task Force on Residential Treatment for Youth in Foster Care, and as required by Ordinance No. 241-08, Sec. 4.500 (c) (1), enclosed is the report on the interim plan to coordinate all foster care placement improvement plans among Juvenile Probation, Department of Public Health, and Human Services Agency for children and youth in need of high-end residential treatment. This is the first of two reports required by the Ordinance; the second report, which is due in October 2009, will outline a plan to coordinate the existing placement systems across the three public agencies for children in need of high-end residential treatment.

The Task Force has laid solid groundwork for continued agency collaboration in serving these children and youth. Please let me know if you have questions.

Sincerely,

Trent Rhorer  
Executive Director

Enclosure

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO  
2009 MAY 29 PM 4:35  
BY *lfr*  
19

19

	<h1>The San Francisco Task Force on Residential Treatment for Youth In Foster Care</h1>
--	---

*Providing the right help, at the right time, in the right place for San Francisco's children and youth with severe emotional and behavioral disabilities and their families*

## **Initial Report to the Board of Supervisors** May 6<sup>th</sup>, 2009

### **Introduction - The Instructions from the Board**

By Ordinance 241-08, the Board of Supervisors established the San Francisco Task Force on Residential Treatment for Youth in Foster Care to address care for San Francisco's higher need children and youth in the foster care system. The specific focus of the Task Force was to address the need for improving the safety, well-being and permanency of children and youth who are currently being placed outside of their homes in high-end group homes as required by both federal and state statutes through:

- A vision and a transition plan for a new baseline system of agency coordination that will improve San Francisco's out of home placement system and ensure the best possible out-of-home treatment and outcomes for San Francisco children and youth; and,
- Development of a staged implementation plan that will improve the out-of-home placement system through coordination among the Juvenile Probation Department, the Department of Public Health, the Human Services Agency, and the agencies that provide residential treatment services for youth.

In addressing these needs the Task Force was instructed to recognize that:

- There is a significant demand for specialized out-of-home treatment, including therapeutic foster care homes, short-term residential group home care, hospital diversion, and group homes to serve children and youth with higher need problems, including mental illness and debilitating emotional distress;
- The ultimate goal for all San Francisco out-of-home placements is to ensure that children and youth, wherever possible, are safely placed within their own community, that placements are individualized, family and youth guided, least restrictive, family and community based, clinically appropriate, and culturally and linguistically relevant;

- Family reunification and return to a safe home-like setting as soon as possible is the goal; and,
- That adequate support is provided to foster care parents and other foster care providers.

The Ordinance stated that the Task Force should consist of the following members:

- The Director of Juvenile Probation, or his or her designee;
- The Director of HSA, or his or her designee;
- The Director of DPH, or his or her designee;
- The Director of the City's Department of Children, Youth and Their Families, or his or her designee;
- The San Francisco Public Defender, or his or her designee;
- Six community members, who were to be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Board of Supervisors. Four were to be Executive Directors of San Francisco mental health service providers; with an emphasis on providers that serve youth in a residential setting designated as RCL level 12 or 14. The other two community members were to be former foster children, current or former foster parents, or the parents or guardians of current or former foster children.
- The remaining two positions on the Task Force were to be filled by inviting the Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District, or his or her designee, and the Supervising Judge of the Unified Family Court of the San Francisco Superior Court, or his or her designee, to participate as full voting members. If either or both of these officials were unable to participate, the Board of Supervisors was to appoint another individual with expertise in the relevant area – the operation of the SFUSD and the Unified Family Court – as necessary to fill the vacant seats on the Task Force.<sup>1</sup>

The Ordinance charged the Task Force with developing the following documents for review and possible adoption by the Board of Supervisors:

- Within six months of the effective date of the Ordinance, a report on an interim plan to coordinate all foster care placement improvement plans among Juvenile Probation, DPH, and HSA, a report on an interim plan to coordinate all placements made by Juvenile Probation, DPH and HSA for San Francisco children and youth in need of high-end residential treatment, and a progress report to inform the 2009-2010 budget process.

---

<sup>1</sup> A list of the current voting membership of the Task Force is included as Appendix A.

- Within nine months of the effective date of the Ordinance, a transition plan to bring San Francisco's higher need children and youth currently in higher level placements outside San Francisco back to their home communities whenever possible; and
- Within one year of the effective date of the Ordinance, a plan to coordinate existing placement system improvements in the foster care system, a permanent plan to coordinate all placements made by Juvenile Probation, DPH and HSA for San Francisco children and youth in need of high end residential treatment for mental illness and severe emotional distress, and a permanent maintenance plan for the new coordinated system of placement services for San Francisco youth.

The Ordinance was passed in its final form on October 21, 2008. The Task Force held its first meeting on December 3, 2008, and has continued to meet each month thereafter. In its deliberations the Task Force has reviewed data on San Francisco's patterns of group home utilization, contacted other counties to learn more about how they coordinate high-end placements and services, conducted a detailed analysis of the current placement coordination efforts in San Francisco, and developed a plan for streamlining placement coordination among and across DPH, HSA and Probation. Besides the monthly meetings of the Task Force as a whole, a smaller work group has been meeting regularly to prepare concepts and materials for Task Force review.

This document contains the three reports required by the Ordinance after the first six months of the Task Force's operations:

- An interim plan to coordinate the foster care placement improvement plans within Probation, DPH and HSA;
- An interim plan to coordinate all placements made by the three agencies in high-end residential treatment;
- A progress report to inform the budget process.

### **Overview – The Focus of this Initial Report to the Board**

The chain of events that leads to the recommendation to use an out of home placement to meet a child or youth's needs is different in each of San Francisco's child serving agencies. While some of the underlying behavioral health needs of children and youth in each of the systems are similar – especially for children and youth who are exhibiting the highest level of challenges - each agency has a different mandate, operates under different statutes and regulations, has different authority, and addresses different child and family situations.

For this reason, efforts to improve the effectiveness of each system's placement decision-making process must be grounded in the context of that particular system while taking into consideration that each of the three placement processes ultimately tap into the same pool of high-end resources.

Over the past year each of the three departments has devoted significant energy to improving its placement decision-making processes to insure that community-based interventions are used whenever possible, and that when placements are necessary children and youth and their families are matched with the resource most likely to help them achieve and sustain positive outcomes.

The effort is two pronged. First, the departments are working together to align and improve their individual decision-making processes, and to develop improved collaborative forums for making decisions about the best responses when children, youth and families have complex needs that span multiple systems. This work has been productive and is already resulting in more creative responses to the needs of individual child, youth and family situations. The new arrangements for inter-departmental review and decision-making are also providing a platform for long-term planning about system changes that will accomplish the ultimate goal of reuniting children and youth with their families and communities. The refinement and restructuring of the intra and inter-departmental planning about the use of high level placement and services is the focus of this initial report to the Board of Supervisors.

However, the departments realize that these enhanced decision-making and planning processes will only be effective on a large scale if the quality of the information available to those forums is also improved. To this end all three departments have also been gathering and analyzing data about where children and youth are placed, what their needs are, how many are out of county and out of state and why they could not have been placed in county, what the trends in placement and other resource utilization have been over the past 5 years and where they seem to be heading, and most importantly, what specific steps can be taken to decrease out of county and out of state placements and help San Francisco's children and youth with the highest level of needs achieve and sustain safe, stable and nurturing connections with their families and our community.

The next report requested by the Board of Supervisors, due in three months, will present this data and the plan for continuing the process of bringing San Francisco's remaining out of county and out of state children back home. That report will explain in more detail the nature of the needs and situations that still require placements far from San Francisco, and the resources that are being developed to respond to this challenge.

**Part One: The Interim Plan for Coordinating Foster Care Placement Improvement Plans within Probation, DPH and HSA.**

**DPH** – State and federal special education law and regulations control the means by which DPH through its Community Behavioral Health Services (CBHS) office implements high-end group home placements. The decision is based on an assessment and report prepared according the requirements of the special education Individual Education Plan (IEP) and the planning process established in AB 3632, can also be driven by advocacy by the parents of the child or youth, and is ultimately determined by an administrative hearing officer or a subsequent court action. DPH does not have the authority to change anything about the process itself. However, it has taken steps to make the process better informed by using

improved tools and techniques to assess the behavioral health needs of referred children, and by making more and better community-based resources available as alternatives to high-end, out of home and out of state placements.

Often at this level of need the question is how to provide an effective alternative to psychiatric hospitalization. CBHS has completed a significant reorganization in its structure, operations and resources to accomplish improvements in this area:

- It has redesigned its behavioral health crisis response system for children and youth to provide more rapid and effective services during the critical hours and days following a dramatic event in a child or youth's life. By providing immediate stabilization, assessment, triage, support and case management in these moments, the need for extended hospitalization or residential placement can frequently be avoided.
- CBHS has adopted a standardized, objective, and validated tool for assessing the emotional and behavioral needs of children and youth that allows a far more precise determination of the level and nature of services that match with those needs. The CANS (Child and Adolescent Need and Strengths Assessment) has demonstrated good reliability and validity in identifying and differentiating those children and youth whose needs can be met in the community from those who require residentially based treatment. CBHS has also linked with the child welfare and probation offices to improve consistency in behavioral health assessments across departments.
- The case management and intensive community support service components of CBHS have been restructured to increase consistency, coordination and effectiveness, so that families are better able to access the resources they need to keep children and youth with complex needs at home. In addition, several changes have been made to increase family voice and involvement, which has a direct impact on improving child and youth outcomes. Evidence-based practices such as Trauma-Focused Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy, Incredible Years, and Parent-Child Interaction Therapy have been promulgated through the outpatient services division and are helping to prevent placements or reduce the duration of placements. Therapeutic Behavioral Services have been made available to children and youth across all of the systems to help reduce the need for high level placements by working intensively with children, youth and their families to replace entrenched negative behaviors with pro-social alternatives.

Although CBHS is the primary case management resource for a number of children or youth and their families, more frequently the agency is a partner with Probation or HSA in helping to address the complex, multi-system needs that high level children and youth and their families in those systems present. This is because even if a child or youth is a ward or dependent of the court and under the supervision of Probation or HSA, the behavioral health components of that child's plan of care usually require that the provider have a contract with CBHS and develop and implement a treatment plan in compliance with the federal and MediCAL requirements. In addition, authorization by CBHS is required by

statute before a child or youth can be placed in an RCL level 14 group home, or in the Community Treatment Facility (CTF). CBHS has been working in collaboration with HSA and Probation to improve effectiveness in decision-making, communication and coordination in this area. These efforts will be discussed in Part Two of this report.

**Probation** – The juvenile probation department has three conjoint mandates: protect public safety, insure accountability for the misconduct committed by delinquent youth, and help youth acquire the competencies they need to become positive assets to their families and communities. Placement decision-making in the juvenile probation system is controlled by state statutes and is executed pursuant to the orders of the juvenile court.

The Juvenile Probation Department is in the midst of a formal improvement effort specifically designed to reduce placement rates. Supported by staff from the Bay Area Academy, they are examining their current practices related to placement decision-making, conducting four focus groups (judges, agency supervisors, community providers, and the agency's multi-disciplinary committee), researching the current literature for best practice alternatives, and conferring with peer consultants from other counties who have achieved significant reductions in their placement rates. The results of these efforts will be captured in a final report and system improvement plan that will be delivered to the Mayor for approval.

The department is also tightening up the internal multi-disciplinary review process on potential placements that takes place every Thursday to insure that decisions are based on accurate information and assessments. One element of this improvement is to require that every case presentation will include an assessment of the youth's needs using the YASI (Youth Assessment and Screening Instrument). This provides a standardized and objective framework for determining level and nature of needs and matching needs with services.

Because at present Probation must place a significant number of youth out of state to have their needs adequately addressed, the department is also increasing its use of intensive community services through an agency that has demonstrated the ability to deal with youth who have challenging behaviors that might in the past have resulted in out of home placement.

**HSA** – HSA, through its Family and Children's Services (FCS) office, has a unique double role among the three departments who make placements into high-end residential care facilities, because not only is it a placing agency for child welfare matters, it is also a resource management organization which manages the payment system for the providers who operate the group homes that are used for placements by all three departments.

Whichever agency makes the placement, FCS is responsible for coordinating payment and paying the agency for the board, care and supervision elements of the placement costs.<sup>2</sup>

Placements made by FCS are controlled by state statute and occur pursuant to the order of the juvenile court following formal court process.

FCS has recently completed installation of an agency-wide system to improve placement and other childcare intervention decision-making. Called Structured Decision Making (SDM), the process provides child welfare workers with the best tools possible to help in making critical case assessments and decisions, including assessment of safety and risk factors and whether to refer children and youth for placement in foster care and group homes. SDM is built on a set of assessment tools for use by front line child welfare workers and their supervisors that been shown through a series of evaluations to provide a reliable and valid prediction of the risk of future abuse and neglect. Use of these tools helps to reduce unnecessary and inappropriate out of home placement and counteract minority over-representation.

The department is also expanding the availability of Intensive Treatment Foster Care (ITFC) and Multi-Disciplinary Treatment Foster Care homes within San Francisco County so that fewer children and youth will have to be placed in out of county group homes because no appropriate therapeutic resource is available locally. The agency with a contract for developing the MDTFC resource for the county has opened its first in-county home and a child who otherwise would have been placed out of county is in placement there, and more homes are being recruited and brought on line. FCS and SFUSD have also developed a joint plan to recruit both regular and therapeutic foster homes through the schools that will start in September.

In addition, over the past year FCS has also coordinated a work group with DPH and Probation to improve collaborative decision-making regarding high-level placements that has provided the forum for carrying out the mandates of the Task Force. The focus of the work group has been on analyzing and streamlining the various interagency meetings that are currently in use, comparing the system used in San Francisco with those in other counties, and creating a model that is useful for all three departments that do placements. The recommendations of the work group were presented to the Task Force and are reflected in the proposed restructuring of the collaborative decision-making process that is outlined in Part Two of this report.

---

<sup>2</sup> California is unique in that group home placements for children with emotional and behavioral needs require two separate contracts and use two separate payment and oversight systems managed by two separate departments in each county. Behavioral health services are funded in large part through federal Title XIX dollars, which translate into the EPSDT component of MediCAL and are managed by DPH. Group home placements themselves – what are called board and care costs – are funded in part through the federal Title IV-E system, in part through a state addition to the IV-E payments, and in part by county revenue. For federally eligible children and youth – those whose families fall under certain income and asset tests, about 71% of the San Francisco children and youth who are in placement – roughly 50% of the costs are covered by federal dollars, 30% by county dollars and 20% by state dollars. For the remaining non-federally eligible children and youth, the county pays 60% of the cost and the state pays 40%. Board and care rates for group homes are fixed by state law based on the Rate Classification Level (RCL) of the group home, but San Francisco and most other counties must occasionally augment these rates to obtain placement for children and youth who present exceptional challenges.

Finally, this year FCS is mounting a major effort focusing on improving the adoption process. The goal is to shorten the length of time it takes for a youth to be adopted and to ensure that we have adoption plans for as many youths as possible.

The improvement resulting from these efforts by FCS and those of DPH and Probation will have a direct impact on placement by creating more options for children and youth who currently are in long term placement in both group and foster homes.

### **Interim plan for coordinating the individual department foster care placement improvement plans**

As noted above, each department must operate under the requirements of a different set of statutes and regulations when making placement recommendations, so the plans for improving the decision-making process in each of the departments cannot be identical. However, it is possible to apply the same principles to all three processes. This is the recommendation of the Task Force and is reflected in the interim plan outlined in Part Two of this report.

DPH, HSA and Probation are committed to the following six principles that will be used to align the intra-departmental placement decision-making process in across the three departments:

1. All placement recommendations should be based on one or more objective and validated tools and processes that provide a multi-dimensional assessment of the strengths and needs of each child or youth and his or her family. Each department should choose the tools that are most effective in identifying the strengths and needs of the population that department serves.
2. The purpose of placement is to help children and youth and their families achieve positive outcomes. Placement should never be the default option because no other course of action is available, and should always be chosen to achieve a specific and articulated goal or set of goals.
3. Whenever possible, placement decisions should be made with full family participation. Family team meetings are one example of a mechanism for insuring effective family voice and choice in the process.
4. Placement decisions should be made as a component of a comprehensive plan of care that respects the culture, individuality and humanity of children, youth and families. Placement is not a one size fits all option, and the question of the most appropriate placement goes beyond the question of the level of supervision provided by a particular group home.
5. Children and youth should not have to fall into the most appropriate service option. By appropriately assessing child and family strengths and needs, placing agencies should be able to match children and youth and their families with the resource most

likely to help them achieve the three critical outcomes of permanency, safety and well-being.

6. The process by which each department develops a recommendation for placement should be strength-based, family-driven, outcome-oriented and sufficiently transparent, subject to the requirements of confidentiality, so that family members and community stakeholders such as the courts and family and child advocates can understand the basis and criteria used in formulating the recommendation. The process should also include some means by which families and advocates can seek clarification or reconsideration of the recommendations if they feel inadequate or inaccurate information was relied upon, or that the recommendation is not in the best interests of the child or youth.

These principles will be incorporated in the training, supervision and support of the line staff that make the initial determination to refer children and youth for possible placement for residential treatment. They will also be applied during the internal meetings on those referrals, and in any interagency meetings that may be required to carry out a recommended placement. In addition the three departments will share information about the assessment instruments and criteria that each is using to insure maximum compatibility and consistency in their decision-making.


All three departments are using Wraparound to help improve coordination and outcomes when out of home placement is a possibility. By convening a child and family team, identifying the critical unmet needs that are the driving forces behind the behaviors and situations that are causing major disruptions in the lives of children, youth and families, and linking each family with a comprehensive array of services and supports to provide safety, stability and increased self-efficacy, the need for or duration of out of home placement is being greatly reduced.

An additional resource that all three departments are using to reduce the need for high-end group home placements is therapeutic foster care. By increasing the availability of Intensive Treatment Foster Care (ITFC) and Multi-Disciplinary Treatment Foster Care (MDTFC) homes, the departments are significantly reducing their reliance on group home placements. Research is showing that these new resources are able to produce positive outcomes more reliably than traditional long-term group home placement.

## **Part Two: An interim plan to coordinate all placements made by the three departments in high-end residential treatment**

As noted above, the plan for coordinating high-level placements was developed by a workgroup with representatives from all three departments as well as provider agencies and community stakeholders. They came to realize that the problem was not that meetings to coordinate resource access for high-level services weren't occurring, it was that over time San Francisco had developed a complex set of 5 inter-related meetings. Each meeting had been established at a different time to help manage one or more resources as they came on line. For example, one meeting related to the use of the Community Treatment Facility (CTF), another managed access

and utilization of SB 163 wraparound slots. The illustration below summarizes the situation as it evolved. Column one lists the agencies that participate in the current interagency meetings; the five meetings are listed in column two; and the primary resources considered in the meetings are listed in the third column:




Often the same people were coming to the various meetings, but the answer wasn't to simply consolidate the meetings. This was because there was so much work to be done, and the matters to be considered in the management of the various resources were different.

Another challenge was to go beyond simply making referral and intake decisions, to effectively managing the ongoing utilization of the high-level resources. In looking at the systems being used in other counties that was a critical discriminator. Many only focused on intake and lacked the staff time and data tools to examine the ongoing utilization and impact of the resources. As a result referrals were made somewhat blindly. Often the only information available to the interagency groups was whether there were open slots in the resource.

The goal was to establish a more proactive and consistent approach and structure for sharing information, planning collaboratively, and making decisions. The first challenge

was to create a framework within which the various types of meetings that are needed could be organized.

What the group ultimately realized was that the key was not the type of meeting, but the sequence of meetings. After looking at the various types of meetings that occur the group decided that all of them could be arranged in a simple, three-level progression:



Program improvement can then be accomplished by looking at best practices for accomplishing the outcomes that are desired in each level of collaboration, the information and participants that are needed for each of the meeting to be effective, and the type of process that will help the meetings function most effectively. This will allow the number of meetings to be reduced, the focus of the meetings to be tightened, and for the participants to better understand which meetings they should attend and their roles in each type of meeting.

*Level One* includes the meetings that occur within each department related to the decisions about referring children and youth for placement and providing oversight for the ongoing placements. Level one meetings provide the foundation for matching the needs of children, youth and families with the proper resources. These meetings usually involve not only the child or youth and family and their primary community supports, but also the line staff who work most closely with them and have the best understanding of and relationship with them as well as supervisors and specialists within the department. As discussed in Part One of this report, these meetings can be aligned across departments according to shared principles, but must be designed to fit the mandates, responsibilities and procedures particular to each agency. Many resources, such as community-based services and support, foster homes and lower level group homes can be accessed solely through these internal, level one meetings.

But when the internal decision is that certain higher-end resources that are shared among agencies are the best option for a child or youth and family, the matter must be brought forward for review by an interagency group to insure that resource utilization is coordinated across departments.

Thus the workgroup determined that the focus of *Level Two* meetings should be on coordination and communication between departments. These meetings help to manage shared resources like Intensive Treatment Foster Care, step down from higher-level placements, and referral for Therapeutic Behavioral Services. What the workgroup realized was that the way to make level two meetings more productive was to insure that the level one meetings brought forward key information about child and youth or family strengths and needs and the desired outcomes in a consistent manner. This would prevent the people at a level two meeting from having to revisit matters that were best resolved by those working most closely with the family.

The participants at level two meetings have a broader perspective of the systems of care, know the relationship between the various resources, and can make balanced recommendations about utilization management. In addition the workgroup realized that second level meetings also provide a forum for resolving complex issues regarding the best match between the strengths and needs in a child or youth and family situation and the range of available resources. Thus not only would second level meetings help to insure interagency coordination of the use of shared resources, they would also provide an opportunity for creative problem solving when internal agency teams were feeling stuck or were running into system barriers that could not be resolved at their level.

*Level Three* meetings are those in which formal authorization by representatives of the leadership from one or more of the departments is required for access to occur. The participants at these meetings have the responsibility for insuring that all of the statutory requirements for placement or enrollment in a particular resources. For example, state statutes require certification of need by a representative from CBHS before placement in an RCL level 14 group home can occur. Level three meeting are also needed when an exception requiring authorization by an administrator from one or more of the departments is needed. These meetings will also continue to oversee slot management and flex fund requests.

The illustration on the following page summarizes the focus of each of the meetings.

## Interagency Plan for Coordination of Residential Care Placements in San Francisco

<b>Level 1: Internal Meetings</b>	
<i>Functions:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Case Planning</li> <li>Identify Services/Strategies</li> <li>Review for special populations</li> <li>Multi-Disciplinary</li> <li>Level 12</li> </ul>
<i>Structure:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supervisor's reviews</li> <li>Administrative reviews</li> <li>TDM</li> <li>MDT</li> <li>Risk</li> <li>2 o'clock</li> </ul>
<i>Participants:</i>	Varies with agency

<b>Level 2: Inter-Agency Planning &amp; Consultation Meetings</b>	
<i>Functions:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Case Planning</li> <li>Triage services</li> <li>Service Approvals</li> <li>Step-down</li> <li>Substance Abuse Services</li> <li>Prevention of Placement Disruption</li> <li>Transitional Age Youth</li> </ul>
<i>Structure:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sub-Acute Review</li> <li>IAPC</li> <li>WRAP</li> </ul>
<i>Participants:</i>	<u>Supervisors &amp; Managers</u> SFUSD (year round) CBHS FCS JPD Providers Parent Partners

<b>Level 3: Interagency Placement Committee</b>	
<i>Functions:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State Mandated Authorization</li> <li>Reauthorization of placements</li> <li>Review of lower level of care</li> <li>Slot Management</li> <li>Flex fund oversight</li> <li>Out-of-State function</li> <li>CTF (every 3 months)</li> <li>Tracking of               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Caseload, Length of stay, Discharge plan, authorizations, contracts</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<i>Structure:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MTFC</li> <li>ITFC level determination</li> </ul>
<i>Participants:</i>	<u>Manager or designee (with authority to give approval)</u> SFUSD CBHS HSA JPD

To summarize, the workgroup recommended to the Task Force, and the Task Force is recommending to the Board of Supervisors, that a more structured progression of decision-making regarding access to high-end resources be adopted. At the first level would be the internal decision-making meetings that are appropriate to each department. They would manage access to the majority of resources using objective assessments of strengths and needs, family involvement, and a thoughtful matching of help to need.

If the first level meeting process reaches the conclusion that the best match is with a higher-end resource that requires interagency collaboration for access, then the level one team would prepare a summary of the information and analysis they have relied upon in forming their recommendation and bring it to a level two meeting. Additionally, if the team meeting at level one found itself unable to come up with a good match between help and need, then they could bring the issues that were stymieing them to the level two meeting for help in resolution.

Finally, if the recommendation of the level two meeting were for the use of a resource that requires a statutory authorization, or one that would require flexibility that can only be granted at the administrative level, then those issues would be brought to a level three meeting for consideration.

The workgroup and the Task Force are in the process of resolving the details of the plan for restructuring the system for interdepartmental coordination of all high-end resources and placements, but the members of the Task Force have approved the basic framework for the new approach. Some of details yet to be resolved include:

- Developing a consistent form that can be used by level one teams from any of the departments to present the needed information at a level two meeting. This would include provisions for summarizing the child and family situation, the basis for their recommendation that a high-end resource be used, and the outcomes they hope to achieve through placement or enrollment in this resource.
- Clarifying the specific matters that can be resolved in level one, level two and level three meetings.
- Analyzing workload issues to make sure that the proper amount of time, structure and administrative assistance are in place to support the required data collection, communication and coordination, and to insure that access to needed resources takes place in a timely fashion. For example, the new structure will have to include the capacity to respond immediately in emergency situations.
- Determining the proper personnel to have attend each of the meetings, resolving the multiple scheduling issues that arise in making sure that the named personnel or their designees will be available for the meetings, and providing sufficient staff support to insure that the meetings operate quickly and efficiently.

- Developing methods to insure transparency, child, youth and family, and stakeholder input into the decision-making process, while protecting confidentiality, fairness, accuracy and efficiency.

The workgroup and Task Force are resolving these questions and should be able to begin testing the new format by June of this year. It is assumed that additional adjustments will have to be made over the next few months, and that a final plan for interdepartmental coordination will be prepared and implemented by the end of the year.

### **Part Three: Progress report to inform the budget process**

The efforts to date have been carried out within the existing budget parameters. Once the details for implementing the new three level placement decision-making system are worked out, some workforce and resource issues may arise. Possible future budgetary considerations might stem from the need to use reliable and validated assessment instruments, and collecting and maintaining accurate information on resource utilization and outcomes. Added costs to accomplish these goals would be generated by staff training, information technology improvements, and the additional staff time needed to carry out the assessments and to maintain the upgraded utilization database. Providing administrative support for a more effective interagency resource management system may also produce some added expenses.

The directive from the Board of Supervisors that is likely to have the most significant budgetary impact will be designing a system of care that eliminates or greatly reduce the need for out of county and especially out of state placements. These issues will be explored in greater detail over the next three months in anticipation of preparing the Task Force's second deliverable.

### **Next Steps**

As noted in the overview of this report the three departments are actively gathering and analyzing the data needed to develop a plan for reducing out of county and out of state placements. Although we know that overall the number of children and youth in placement has been declining steadily over the past 10 years, we must drill down further so that we understand more about who the children remaining in out of county/out of state placement are and what specific needs they present that cannot be addressed through either intensive community based services or local placement.

The needs of children and youth placed by CBHS through the AB 3632 process, those of children and youth placed by the Department of Probation and the juvenile court, and those of children and youth placed by FCS through the family court, and the needs and situations of the families of each of these groups of children are different. The work groups of the Task Force members are using the newly organized decision-making forums described in this report, in combination with the data analysis units of each of the departments to begin putting faces on the numbers, so that the next report to the Board of Supervisors can outline

in detail the specific procedural and organizational changes and the new resources that will be needed to shorten the length of time children and youth must spend in high-end residential placement and bring home the children and youth who are in out of county/out of state group homes in a way that is safe, appropriate, effective and sustainable.

### **Summary**

The Task Force has developed an interim plan for improving the internal placement decision-making processes used in the three departments and the coordination of placements among the three departments. Each of the departments is in the process of implementing its own internal system improvement plans. These plans will result in parallel decision-making structures that apply the same principles to guide assessing child, youth and family strengths and needs and matching them with the appropriate services and supports. In addition, the three departments are designing a new three level approach to coordinating the utilization of high-level placements and hope to begin testing it within the next two months.

## Appendix A – Voting Membership of the Task Force

Department, Agency or Role	Name
Department of Public Health	Robert Cabaj
Human Services Agency	Debby Jeter
Department of Probation	Gary Levene
Department of Children, Youth and Families	Maria Su
The San Francisco Public Defender	Rebecca Marcus
Alternative Family Services	Jay Berlin
Edgewood Center for Children and Families	Nancy Rubin
St. Vincent's	Kent Eagleson
Seneca Center	Ken Berrick
Parent Representative	Lanita Mims
Foster Parent Representative	Ruth Samson
San Francisco Unified School District	Maya Webb

BOS-11  
GAIL  
AC, c page



City & County of San Francisco  
**Department of  
Technology**  
*Powered by Innovation*

One South Van Ness Avenue, 2nd Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94103-0948  
Office: 415-581-4001 • Fax: 415-581-4002

May 26, 2009

20

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

Honorable Supervisor John Avalos  
Chair, Budget and Finance Committee  
Board of Supervisors  
City and County of San Francisco  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
2009 MAY 26 PM 4:11  
BY *[Signature]*

Dear President Chiu and Chair Avalos,

Funding for the replacement of the City's Data Center of \$1,188,443 was placed on reserve during the FY 2008-2009 budget hearings by the Board of Supervisors pending a report back to the Budget and Finance Committee with expenditure details. While the Department of Technology respectfully requested the release of \$754,129 in funding for Data Center equipment on March 18, 2009, the Department recognizes that it did not meet the Committee's requirements for the release of reserve. The Department acknowledges the concerns voiced by the Committee at the March 18<sup>th</sup> meeting.

The Department understands the primary concerns of the Committee to be threefold:

- the length of time it has taken for the planning, review, and identification of a new permanent Data Center location,
- the cost associated with running two primary Data Centers in parallel, and
- the cost of first moving to an interim location followed by the additional cost of moving to a permanent Data Center.



20

Accordingly, the Department has taken several actions to ensure fiscal accountability while at the same time ensuring the City's ability to operate mission critical information systems and support the technology of projects already underway. As a point of reference, approximately \$700 million in payments are processed monthly through the City's Data Center, or \$970,500 an hour.

After the March 18<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Department provided fiscal data and information on current Data Center project options to the Controller's Office in order for them to conduct an analysis comparing the One Market Plaza Data Center, the 200 Paul Street co-location site, and a City-owned data center facility. The results of that study, which is attached, demonstrate that it is in the best short term interest of the City to locate equipment at the 200 Paul co-location site for the next 5 to 10 years.


The 200 Paul Street Data Center location was selected after a competitive bid process and an analysis that considered other locations within the City. One of the reasons that the planning, review, and identification of a permanent Data Center location has taken three years was the continuous review and analysis of new options as they came forward. All of this time has allowed the Department the ability to thoroughly vet all possibilities and to develop from a cost and operational perspective the best plan going forward.

With the conclusion of the Controller's report, the Department has developed a plan for rapid closure over the next six months of the existing Data Center at One Market Plaza in order to achieve savings that can be allocated to operating a new Data Center at a co-location site at 200 Paul Street. Accordingly, the Department will not be requesting additional capital funds to construct a new facility, but instead will focus on consolidating City data center facility operations at the 200 Paul site.

In order to facilitate this move as quickly as possible, the Department is now requesting a partial release of the reserves in the amount of \$900,000 to support the creation of the Data Center at 200 Paul and to decommission the current One Market Plaza Data Center. The amount requested would fund the procurement of hardware and professional services necessary at the new Data Center location and coordination of the move itself. The Department recommends that the remaining funds be left on reserve pending the outcome of the policy decisions related to the consolidation of Citywide information technology.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Jon Walton, Deputy Chief Information Officer at 581-3928.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'CW', with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Chris Vein  
Chief Information Officer  
Department of Technology

cc: Supervisor David Campos  
Supervisor Carmen Chu  
Supervisor Bevan Dufty  
Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi  
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board  
Nani Coloretti, Mayor's Budget Director  
Harvey Rose, Budget Analyst  
Ben Rosenfield, Controller  
Monique Zmuda, Deputy Controller



# MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Supervisor David Chiu and  
Members, Board of Supervisors

**FROM:** Ben Rosenfield, Controller

**DATE:** May 13, 2009

**SUBJECT:** Data Center Options Analysis (Reference Number 20090331-001)

---

Per your request, the Controller's Office has completed a cost-benefit analysis of site alternatives the City's Department of Technology is considering with respect to its current data center located at One Market Plaza (OMP). Our findings and recommendations are summarized below.

*Summary of Findings:*

- The department had previously proposed maintaining its current leased site at OMP and locating additional data space needs at a leased site at Paul Street. The department would then pursue a long-term relocation to a City-owned site while operating these two sites.
- We recommend a full relocation to Paul Street of all operations currently housed at OMP, given our review of different site alternatives and after adjusting for capital investments at each site to create required and comparable functionality. Our analysis indicates that full relocation to Paul Street would be the most cost-effective option during the coming ten years. The City can then pursue a long-term relocation plan from this single site.
- A future relocation to a City-owned site may prove more cost-effective when considered over a twenty-year horizon. However; this alternative requires considerable time to develop – including identification, development, and build-out of a suitable site – and will benefit from a comprehensive plan to relocate other departments' data centers into this future site. We recommend that the Committee on Information Technology (COIT) develop such a plan upon relocation of current operations to the Paul Street site.
- Other operational requirements should be met prior to a relocation from the OMP to the Paul Street site. These include (1) development of an alternate recovery site to support the City's financial, payroll, purchasing, and criminal justice systems in the event that the primary site is compromised in a disaster, and (2) the relocation of mainframe check printing to an alternate location or to a private check-printing vendor.

### ***Options Considered:***

Our analysis reviewed four site alternatives, adjusting for different levels of capital and technology upgrades at each site required to make each site comparable while meeting recommended operational requirements. These options are summarized below:

**Option A.** Continue current operations at OMP with sufficient system and capital upgrades to allow for expansion of this site for all anticipated data center needs. In this option, no relocation of any functions to Paul Street would be required and the department would continue to operate a single data center site, once the City invested in significant capital improvements.

**Option B.** This option represents the department's previous proposal to continue leasing at OMP with additional data center needs met through a limited use of the Paul Street site. In this option, the department would operate two data center sites.

**Option C.** A full relocation of current data center operations at OMP to the Paul Street site, with additional data center needs met at this site. In this option, the department would continue to operate a single data center site.

**Option D.** A full relocation of current data center operations to an undetermined City-owned site. This option is not immediately available, and would require identification, development, and build-out of a single site.

Our cumulative cost projections at each of these sites are summarized in the table below and in Attachment 1. Our office finds that a full relocation to the Paul Street site (Option C) is the most cost-effective in the short and mid-term, while relocation to a future owned site is likely to be the most cost-effective over a longer twenty year horizon (Option D). Over all time horizons, OMP (Option A) is the least cost effective alternative on a present value basis.

#### **Data Center Options: Cumulative Present Value Costs**

<u>Site Alternatives</u>	<b>5-Year</b>	<b>10-Year</b>	<b>20-Year</b>
	<u>2009 - 2014</u>	<u>2009 - 2019</u>	<u>2009 - 2029</u>
A. One Market Plaza	20,500,000	37,700,000	52,000,000
B. One Market Plaza + Paul St.	14,700,000	27,400,000	49,900,000
C. Paul St.	9,400,000	19,200,000	43,700,000
D. Future Owned Site	12,300,000	21,900,000	28,100,000


***Key Projection Assumptions:***

- Our projections assume site improvements at both OMP and at a future owned site to meet operational needs for emergency power, energy capacity, and other technical needs. The department estimates these costs at \$16.8 million and \$11.0 million, respectively. Our projections assume that these costs would be financed over the ten year useful life of these improvements. The Paul Street site meets these baseline needs without improvements.
- Our projections assume current market rates at both OMP and the Paul Street sites, with these costs rising in future years by 3.0% annually. Given the facility improvements noted above, we have assumed that the City can reduce its occupied square footage at each site to approximately 2,000 square feet.
- Equipment replacement costs during this time horizon have been excluded from all projections, given that these investments will be required in any relocation scenario and therefore will not change the overall findings regarding comparative costs.
- Our projections do not assume additional colocation of other City data centers at any of these sites. However, strategic colocation at any site will reduce overall City costs given shared physical improvement needs. We recommend that COIT develop a strategic plan regarding these options, which could be pursued as part of a long-term strategy to relocate to a City-owned facility.

# Attachment A. Data Center Options: Projected One-Time (Fixed) Costs and Ongoing Annual Present Value Costs.

	A. One Market Plaza (OMP)	B. OMP + Paul St.	C. Paul St.	D. Future Owned Site
One-time tenant improvements				
DT Improvements	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,000,000
Mechanical	11,000,000	-	-	-
Electrical	5,800,000	-	-	-
Subtotal	16,800,000	-	-	11,000,000
Other (moving, equipment, etc.)				
Computer equipment	\$ 450,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000
Installation	-	173,750	162,400	-
Moving	-	60,000	60,000	60,000
Subtotal	450,000	533,750	972,400	810,000
One-time Total	<u>\$ 17,250,000</u>	<u>\$ 533,750</u>	<u>\$ 972,400</u>	<u>\$ 11,810,000</u>
Approximate square feet	20,000	-	1,800	1,800
Annual lease \$/psf	49.87	-	360.00	35.00
Fiscal Year				
2009	PV 400,000	PV 1,000,000	PV 200,000	PV 300,000
2010	4,000,000	2,800,000	2,400,000	2,900,000
2011	4,200,000	2,800,000	1,600,000	2,500,000
2012	4,100,000	2,700,000	1,700,000	2,300,000
2013	4,000,000	2,700,000	1,700,000	2,200,000
2014	3,800,000	2,600,000	1,800,000	2,100,000
2015	3,700,000	2,600,000	1,800,000	2,100,000
2016	3,600,000	2,600,000	1,900,000	2,000,000
2017	3,500,000	2,500,000	2,000,000	1,900,000
2018	3,400,000	2,500,000	2,000,000	1,900,000
2019	3,000,000	2,400,000	2,100,000	1,700,000
2020	1,500,000	2,400,000	2,100,000	700,000
2021	1,500,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	700,000
2022	1,500,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	600,000
2023	1,400,000	2,300,000	2,400,000	600,000
2024	1,400,000	2,200,000	2,500,000	600,000
2025	1,400,000	2,200,000	2,600,000	600,000
2026	1,400,000	2,100,000	2,600,000	600,000
2027	1,400,000	2,100,000	2,700,000	600,000
2028	1,400,000	2,100,000	2,800,000	600,000
2029	1,300,000	2,100,000	2,800,000	600,000
Total	<u>52,000,000</u>	<u>49,900,000</u>	<u>43,700,000</u>	<u>28,100,000</u>

Attachment B. Data Center Options: Graphic representation of Annual Present Value Costs.



Attn: Bill Wycko  
San Francisco Planning Dept.  
1650 Mission St. Suite 400  
San Francisco, CA 94103

*Cy page*

(21)

Case No. 2008.0968E North Beach Public Library + Joe Dimaggio Playground Masterplan Project  
(Parkside Library Rennovations [in progress] and the Merced Branch Library scheduled for remodel)

Mr. Wycko, SF Planning Dept.

The Parkmerced Residents Organization representing over 3,400 apartments, and 10,000 renters in the district 7 neighborhood write to you in regards to the lack of an overall historical analysis and review of the multiple libraries that are considered "modern" designed libraries by the firm Appleton & Wolfard. The Merced branch being our most adjacent public library is also slated for re-design and enlargement on a fast-track process, without adequate input on the effects and loss of these buildings, that ruins the original boomerang roof, and open space elements, and the exquisite exterior/interior relationships.

These libraries are considered possible modern landmarks due to the age, and repeated designed and detailed work of one local architecture office in the bay area. Why there has not been adequate hearings, and review of the library projects, and the effects large scale on the multiple libraries designed by one firm, in the western districts, is beyond my comprehension. There should be a significant survey of modern buildings and sites in the western neighborhoods in coordination with DOCOMOMO prior to further ongoing development pressures. There should be a halt on all library renovations until an adequate public survey and review of these buildings is properly conducted.

The photos of these libraries are available on the SF Public Library system, and show considerable similar qualities and features of the modern movement in the bay area. (Some example photos of the merced branch scheduled for closing and renovation work are attached)

We are concerned that like Parkmerced these libraries and the open spaces they provide in relation to reading areas is being circumvented through fast-track processes at the planning dept. and library agencies involved in there renovations, and re-design additions.

Please review all such projects in entirety due to multiple projects being affected, and the lack of a sustainable, and preservation based alternative to the majority of these fine examples of modern library design

Sincerely

Aaron Goodman VP @ PRO  
[www.parkmercedresidents.org](http://www.parkmercedresidents.org)



cc: Howard Wong AIA [wongaia@aol.com](mailto:wongaia@aol.com), [angela.calvillo@sfgov.org](mailto:angela.calvillo@sfgov.org) (all SF BOS),  
[sfpreservationconsortium@yahoo.com](mailto:sfpreservationconsortium@yahoo.com), [andrew.wolfram@perkinswill.com](mailto:andrew.wolfram@perkinswill.com) Docomomo; PRO File.

BY *llc*

2009 JUN - 1 PM 11:20

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO



(21)



# **MERCED BRANCH LIBRARY SAN FRANCISCO CALIFORNIA**

The proposed addition connects directly to the winged form, and changes the relationship from the interior to exterior courtyards.

Please see Memo from A.Goodman on the NOP/EIR in relation to the North Beach Library, and ongoing Library renovations and the lack of overall review of the modern design of these projects by Appleton and Wolfrard Architects.



#### MERCED BRANCH LIBRARY SAN FRANCISCO CALIFORNIA

The proposed addition connects directly to the winged form, and changes the relationship from the interior to exterior courtyards. Interior photos show the initial "fluorescent" lights, curtains, open space, and furniture that at the time was considered "cutting edge modern". The large open spaces clean and open area within the library.

Please see Memo from A.Goodman on the NOP/EIR in relation to the North Beach Library, and ongoing Library renovations and the lack of overall review of the modern design of these projects by Appleton and Wolfrard Architects.



## SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

### Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report

Date: April 29, 2009  
Case No.: 2008.0968E  
Project Title: North Beach Public Library and Joe DiMaggio Playground Master Plan Project  
BPA Nos.: N/A  
Zoning: North Beach Neighborhood Commercial (NCD), Public (P) Use Districts 40-X and Open Space (OS) Height and Bulk Districts  
Block/Lot: Block 74 / Lot 1; Block 75 / Lot 1  
Lot Size: 4,116 square feet (Block 74 / Lot 1); 109,701 square feet (Block 75 / Lot 1); 9,861 square feet (Mason Street right-of-way)  
Project Sponsor: San Francisco Public Library and San Recreation and Park Department; Mindy Linetzky, (415) 557-4354  
Lead Agency: San Francisco Planning Department  
Staff Contact: Michael Jacinto - (415) 575-9033  
michael.jacinto@sfgov.org

1650 Mission St.  
Suite 400  
San Francisco,  
CA 94103-2479

Reception:  
415.558.6378

Fax:  
415.558.6409

Planning  
Information:  
415.558.6377

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project sponsors, the San Francisco Public Library and Recreation and Park Department, propose to demolish the existing North Beach Branch Library and construct a new library and upgrade recreational facilities at the Joe DiMaggio Playground. The project site comprises two parcels and the Mason Street right-of way on a site bounded by Lombard Street to the north, Powell Street to the east, Greenwich Street to the south and Columbus Avenue to the west in San Francisco's North Beach neighborhood. Assessor's Block 74, Lot 001 is a triangular parcel surface parking at 701 Lombard Street. Assessor's Block 75, Lot 001 is an irregularly shaped parcel at 2000 Mason Street / 661 Lombard Street that comprises library and recreation space. The project's first phase would involve full or partial vacation of a portion of Mason Street to vehicular traffic, landscaping improvements in the former Mason Street right-of-way, construction of a new 8,500 sf branch library on the 701 Lombard Street parcel and a portion of the right-of-way, and demolition of the existing library. The project's second phase would include excavation, renovation and reorganization of the playground features. The project would result in a total net increase of approximately 3,200 sf of library floor area and about 12,100 sf of new open space. The project would require rezoning of Block 74, Lot 001 to a Public (P) use designation, General Plan and Priority Policy conformity findings, as well as approval by the Library and Recreation and Park Commissions, Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors.

### FINDING

This project may have a significant effect on the environment and an Environmental Impact Report is required. This determination is based upon the criteria of the State CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15063 (Initial Study), 15064 (Determining Significant Effect), and 15065 (Mandatory Findings of Significance), and for the reasons documented in the Environmental Evaluation (Initial Study) for the project, which is attached.

### PUBLIC SCOPING PROCESS

Written comments will be accepted until the close of business on May 29, 2009. Written comments should be sent to Bill Wycko, San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103.

If you work for a responsible State agency, we need to know the views of your agency regarding the scope and content of the environmental information that is germane to your agency's statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Your agency may need to use the EIR when considering a permit or other approval for this project. Please include the name of a contact person in your agency.

April 27, 2009  
Date

Bill Wycko

Environmental Review Officer

www.sfplanning.org

Board of  
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV

05/27/2009 05:35 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: Alameda Approves Bullying Curriculum!!!



"GroundSpark"  
<GroundSpark@mail.vresp.co  
m>

05/27/2009 04:46 PM

Please respond to  
"GroundSpark"  
<reply-2c75db726d-a91f7995d  
c-1a5b@u.cts.vresp.com>

To board\_of\_supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us

cc

Subject Alameda Approves Bullying Curriculum!!!

22



**GROUNDSPARK**  
IGNITING CHANGE THROUGH FILM

*Forward this to a friend*

Dear friend of GroundSpark,

We are writing with thrilling news from the Alameda School Board. Last night, the board approved their lgbt-inclusive bullying prevention curriculum, despite the outspoken conservative critics from outside the district who flooded their town hall meetings. Their approval contains no opt-out provision, which means every student in the district will receive instruction on learning empathy and respect for difference. While opponents of the curriculum are now threatening lawsuits, the board heard support from folks like you, and knows they have the strength of their community to move forward creating classrooms that are safe and welcoming for every student.

You can read more about the decision in today's San Francisco Chronicle.

All the best,



Ryan Schwartz  
National Outreach and Media Relations Manager

Sign Up for our Newsletter

GroundSpark

22

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO

2009 MAY 28 AM 11:14

BY Q96

C: BOS-11, AF

File

090278-281

page



San Francisco  
Association of  
REALTORS®

Opening the Door  
to Your Success

May 28, 2009

23

Board of Supervisors  
City and County of San Francisco  
Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, California 94102-4689

301 Grove Street  
San Francisco  
CA 94102

Re: Supervisor Daly's Renters Economic Relief Package

P: 415.431.8500  
F: 415.553.3968

Dear Supervisors:

Supervisor Chris Daly has proposed amendments to city law that would:

- Prohibit rent increases and evictions based on the addition of occupants where the total number of occupants is within the limits of Housing Code Section 503;
- Provide relief from rent increases where the increase would result in the renter's total rent exceeding 33 percent of the renter's gross income; and
- Limit the total amount of annual and banked rent increases that may be imposed in any one year to eight percent of the renter's base rent.

Supervisors Daly's proposed ordinance, if passed, would have severe adverse consequences for renters and rental property owners alike.

The proposed ordinance, by the sheer numbers it will allow to occupy rental units in the city, has the potential for disturbing the peace and quiet currently enjoyed by renters in many areas of the city. It also would exacerbate parking conditions in areas of the city that have heavy concentrations of rental housing.

May 28, 2009

www.sfrealtors.com

23

May 28, 2009

Page 2

The proposed ordinance, by prohibiting rental property owners from imposing allowable rent increases when the increase will cause a renter's rent to exceed 33 percent of his or her gross income, will cause owners to become more circumspect about qualifying applicants for rental units. This will make it more difficult for typical San Franciscans to qualify to rent units in the city.


And, the proposed ordinance, by limiting the amount of banked increases that may be imposed in any year, will discourage banking any increases—to the detriment of the renter population.

We believe Supervisor Daly's proposed ordinance is reckless and will hurt the very renters it is purporting to help. His assertion that rents in San Francisco are overinflated is without foundation and should not be viewed as a justification for making the city's rent control ordinance evermore stringent.

San Francisco should have a balanced housing policy—not one that always favors renters at the expense of rental property owners.

We urge you to reject Supervisor Daly's proposed ordinance.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'James C. Fabris', written over a circular stamp or seal.

James C. Fabris  
Chief Financial Officer

cc: Mayor Gavin Newsom

05/29/2009 13:23 4158852225

BILL QUAN

File 090276-279  
PAGE 02/03

BOS-11

Cpage  
L. Laws

2009 MAY 29 PM 1:42

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO

May 29, 2009

David Chiu, President of the SF Board of Supervisors  
Supervisors Alioto-Pier, Avalos, Campos, Chu, Daly, Dufty, Elsbernd, Mar, Maxwell,  
and Mirkarimi  
1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA. 94102

RE: Supervisor Chris Daly's Proposed Renters Economic Relief Legislation

Dear Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to vote against the subject proposed legislation. Supervisor Daly stated at the Land Use Committee meeting that one of the reasons for the proposed legislation was that although homeowners who took out subprime mortgage loans have been/are being helped by the federal government there has been no similar aid for renters. Well, renters did not take out subprime loans, etc. to pay their rents; so Supervisor Daly's analogy is not apt. Also, Supervisor Daly stated that rents have not come down as much as housing prices, but it shouldn't have as the exuberance, if you will, has been on the houses for sale side.

A perusal of the Rent Board minutes regarding financial hardships petitions shows that the numbers for 2006 and 2007 were about the same, but perhaps 50% higher in 2008, but it appears then in the last four months of 2008 and the first four months of 2009 that the numbers have dropped to the levels of 2006 and 2007- you might want to have Rent Board staff verify this.

The Controller's economic impact report as it relates to the proposed Daly legislation contains a few misleading statements. The report implies that the City gave the property owners vacancy decontrol; of course, that came about via state law, Costa-Hawkins. The report uses 2005-2007 to determine apartment turnovers. Of course, the recession didn't start until December 2007; now the turnovers are basically those units that are close to or at market rents. Therefore, in this down market the housing providers do not recoup any rent lost to those units that rented well below market. In fact, the property owners come out behind.

Supervisor Daly's bid to cap banked rent increases at 8% is really unfair when the annually allowable rent increases is only at 60% of the CPI. Additionally, a tenant benefits when the property owner does not raise the rent annually because of the present value of money and the rent increases are not compounded. That is, banked rent increases are not compounded from year to year, but is merely the sum of the allowable annual rent increases. Finally, there could be many instances where an eight percent increase is still way below Supervisor Daly's 33% income standard.

05/29/2009 13:23

4158852225

BILL QUAN

PAGE 03/03

Regarding Supervisor Daly's 33% income standard, that is going to dissuade me from renting to people based on 40% of income and those with no income, but have cosigners. I have had no problems with these categories of tenants, especially the latter, who tend to be students or people between jobs. For some tenants, the 33% standard amounts to a rent cap. Finally, this standard may violate a housing provider's ability to raise rent to market rates as allowed by state law when the last remaining original tenant leaves, but other occupants remain.

As for the Daly proposal to allow tenants to bring in roommates up to what the city's Housing Code allows that would probably cause some environmental impact because of increased traffic congestion. Even though the proposed legislation has been amended to allow property owners to recover increased utility costs, the proposal would still be very problematic, especially when it comes to usage of hot water or lack thereof. I could imagine that some tenants, especially those who have not taken into additional roommates may complain that they have insufficient hot water for showering and bathing. Then the housing providers might be hit with petitions to the rent board for rent reductions due to a decrease in housing services. Finally, I cannot see how a housing provider can pass on increased utility costs to any particular unit if additional roommates don't have to be reported. Because these additional roommates are not on any lease they can come and go so I think it would be maddening for housing providers to keep track of increased utility costs based on additional roommates. This could also make it even more tempting for Master Tenants to cheat the property owners by renting to people for more than what he/she is paying to the housing provider. In fact, I have been a victim of this scam. Also, I have seen Master Tenants who paid a disproportionate share of their rent, which could also decrease turnovers of units. In fact, I think that this proposal will have the effect of limiting vacancy decontrol; sunseting it won't help here.

I found it puzzling that at both the Land Use Committee meeting, which I attended, and the Governmental Audit and Oversight Committee meeting, which I saw a rerun of, that no so called low income tenants and their supporters who spoke talked about availing themselves of the Section 8 program for low income renters. The Section 8 program is funded by all taxpayers; that is the approach we should take and not single out one sector, a minority sector, the housing providers to solve a societal problem.

In conclusion, there hasn't been any hard data for the Daly proposals. In fact, Rent Board hardship data seem to indicate otherwise. Furthermore, the proposals are unfair, would violate state law in certain situations, make it more difficult for some people to rent, would make it difficult for the housing providers to recoup their costs and lost rents through vacancy decontrol which might have the unintended consequence of reducing the rental stock.

Sincerely,

*Bill Quan*

Bill Quan

DalyRenterEconomicReliefPackageMay2009CommentsToBdofSupervisors.wd

Board of  
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV

05/27/2009

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: Progressives Fail to Sink Muni Budget

24



**aevans**

05/27/2009 03:55 PM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

cc

Subject Progressives Fail to Sink Muni Budget

Dear Friends and Neighbors,

The progressive contingent at the board of supes failed today (Wednesday, May 27) to sink Muni's budget for the next fiscal year. At a special meeting held today for that sole purpose, they were able to garner only five of the board's eleven votes.

A week ago, Sophie Maxwell had joined the board's six progressives (all men) in threatening to torpedo the budget. But today, Maxwell changed her mind, as did progressive David Chiu.

That left only five supporters of the torpedo effort (John Avalos, David Campos, Chris Daly, Eric Mar, and Ross Mirkarimi).

John Avalos wielded an ideological sword in attacking what he termed "this crappy budget." He charged that it did not do enough "to de-incentivize car driving" and fight global warming.

Although Muni made some changes as a result of criticisms made last week from the supes, Avalos said "it's disrespectful that we didn't get more changes. "There's nothing here, nothing at all," he added.

Ross Mirkarimi agreed. He said "a stronger message must still be sent out" about the dangers of global warming and the importance of the transit-first principle.

David Campos, for his part, complained that "I wasn't consulted" about the changes made since last week. "The only way this budget can be meaningfully changed is through rejection," he said.

In response, Sophie Maxwell said she changed her mind because "there has been a ten million dollar improvement" since last week. Critics, she said, were not looking at the whole picture.

David Chiu agreed. "We actually have come quite a bit" since last week, he said. "The board of supervisors has had a major impact. It's time to move this conversation on." He noted that he is

24

the only supe who doesn't have a car.

This latest squabble over Muni has a familiar ring. It has occurred in various forms again and again in recent years.

In the meantime, many buses continue to be garbage cans on wheels. They smell of urine or worse, and are splattered with graffiti and litter. Their schedules are works of fiction, and drivers commonly have the social skills of porcupines.

That's because the mayor is M.I.A. at City Hall, the general director of Muni is a pompous hack, the management is ineffective, the union is greedy, and the supervisors are ideological dreamers.

Too bad there isn't an option on the ballot to require all the ones who own cars to use Muni as their principal form of transportation.

Don't count on it any time soon.

Yours for rationality in government,

Arthur Evans

\* \* \* \* \*

---

Dinner Made Easy - Get meal ideas and money-saving coupons! [Get Recipe Ideas!](#)

**Board of  
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV**

05/27/2009 03:01 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: #09014\_Dr. Ahimsa Sumchai v COB/BOS

25



**"Dr. Ahimsa Sumchai"**

05/26/2009 06:13 PM

To Ethics Commission <ethics.commission@sfgov.org>, John St.Croix <john.st.croix@sfgov.org>, Ahimsa Sumchai <asumchai@sfbayview.com>, Sunshine Task Force <sotf@sfgov.org>, Frank Darby <frank.darby@sfgov.org>, angela Calvillo <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>, Board Supervisors <board\_of\_supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us>, <david.chui@sfgov.org>, <home@

cc

Subject #09014\_Dr. Ahimsa Sumchai v COB/BOS

The Sunshine Ordinance Task Force took action on this matter and while finding no violation will be sending a letter to the BOS requesting clarification on majority members traveling together. I will be coming in on Thursday the 28th to file a complaint with Ethics about the underestimation of the gift the supervisors received from the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce for airfare, accommodations and travel. The CityTrip 2009 announcement states costs per participant were \$4,500. The supervisors who reported travels expenses reported amounts under \$1000.

**AHIMSA PORTER SUMCHAI, M.D.**

25

**Board of  
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV**

05/28/2009 04:47 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: Budget Priorities



**JAMES CORRIGAN**

05/27/2009 09:59 PM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

cc

Subject Budget Priorities

26

Dear Supervisors:

After listening to the Public Comments from the May 18th Public Safety Committee meeting, I have come to a conclusion.

If some Health & Human Services programs are cut and the Chief's Drivers jobs in the San Francisco Fire Department remain in the budget, it would constitute an immoral act.

San Francisco needs Supervisors to stand up for the weak and it needs Supervisors to stand "up to" the strong and politically connected.

Sincerely yours,

Jim Corrigan

26

**Board of  
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV**  
05/28/2009 04:49 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
cc  
bcc  
Subject Fw: opposed to charging admission to the botanical garden



rickstone  
05/28/2009 01:08 PM

To <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>  
cc  
Subject opposed to charging admission to the botanical garden

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

We are opposed to charging admission to the botanical garden. This is a public space and should stay that way.

A study should be done to identify how much it will cost to construct and man the admission booth and how much would be brought in. We question its money making potential, and think few people will pay to attend in general.

I am a native San Franciscan and my husband has lived here for over 30 years. We would just time our visits when the admission booth is closed as we do at the Japanese Tea Garden. We get free admission at the tea garden but rarely carry our cards. Our spontaneous visits are thus greatly restricted.

If you do decide to charge, perhaps only charge at peak periods and RESIDENTS SHOULD ALWAYS BE FREE. Please do not complicate our lives by forcing us to carry another id card. Isn't a drivers license enough. How fat is a wallet supposed to be?

Please keep it simple,

Jocelynn Herrick Stone and Rick Stone

(members of both the sf parks trust and the sf botanical garden, and I am a park guide at the tea garden)

---

eKit - the global phonecard with more!

Spend less on overseas calls, receive messages worldwide.  
Visit <http://www.ekit.com/> for details.

27

27



**Norman Rolfe**

05/28/2009 02:32 PM

To: Michela Alioto-Pier <Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org>, John Avalos <John.Avalos@sfgov.org>, David Campos <David.Campos@sfgov.org>, David Chiu

cc

bcc

Subject: Misplaced Priorities

28

The state is robbing cities and counties of the funds they are, or at least were, entitled to. As a result schools, transit, childcare, health care, et al are suffering and will probably be subjected to severe cuts.


Meanwhile, there seems to be no shortage of funds to build freeways. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission is pushing a Regional Transportation Plan that calls for freeway expansion. The powers that be are pushing a freeway through the Presidio of San Francisco that will cost \$1.4 billion at last reports. Money is available for them. The people pushing these freeways will say these are committed funds that must be spent that way. We suggest this be reexamined with a view to unearmarking these funds and then using them to provide humanitarian services. The powers that be could do this if they really wanted to. But they will probably take the attitude that freeways are more important than schools, health, etc. It is time to do a lot of reviewing of how decisions are made.

I urge you to contact state and federal legislators and tell them that schools and health care are more important than freeways.

Norman Rolfe

28

orig-Joy  
c: c page



## SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

1155 Market St., 11th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103 • Tel. (415) 554-3155 • Fax (415) 554-3161 • TTY (415) 554.3488



29

May 29, 2009

**GAVIN NEWSOM**  
MAYOR

**ANN MOLLER CAEN**  
PRESIDENT

**F.X. CROWLEY**  
VICE PRESIDENT

**FRANCESCA VIOTOR**  
COMMISSIONER

**JULIET ELLIS**  
COMMISSIONER

**ED HARRINGTON**  
GENERAL MANAGER

Angela Calvillo  
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors  
401 Van Ness Avenue, Room 308  
San Francisco, CA 94102

**Subject: Project CUH947 Sustainable Energy Account Release of Reserve, \$1,300,000**

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
GAVIN NEWSOM  
2009 MAY 29 PM 12:11  
BY [signature]

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

I would like to request your assistance to have calendared a release of reserve on the SFPUC Sustainable Energy Account Project CUH947.

As part of the FY 2007 – 08 Hetch Hetchy Capital Project Budget, \$3,173,500 was placed on reserve pending the SFPUC status report on the Community Choice Aggregation Implementation Plan.

This \$1,300,000 release is requested as spending on the CCA program is anticipated in the FY 2009-10. Funding is needed for staff support and outside consulting expertise to assist with analytical and technical support.

Regards,

[Signature]  
Ed Harrington  
General Manager

29

**Board of  
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV**

05/29/2009 05:13 PM

To Rana Calonsag/BOS/SFGOV, Alistair Gibson/BOS/SFGOV,  
Lolita Espinosa/BOS/SFGOV,

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY No.  
20090428-002 Revised Report

30

**Naomi  
Kelly/ADMSVC/SFGOV**

05/29/2009 01:48 PM



To Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, David  
Campos/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV

cc Edwin Lee/ADMSVC/SFGOV@SFGOV, Linda  
Yeung/ADMSVC/SFGOV@SFGOV, Starr  
Terrell/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Ben  
Rosenfield/CON/SFGOV@SFGOV, Monique  
Zmuda/CON/SFGOV@SFGOV, Bill  
Jones/OCA/SFGOV@SFGOV, Sheila Chung  
Hagen/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Lynn  
Khaw/OCA/SFGOV@SFGOV, Jaci  
Fong/ADMSVC/SFGOV@SFGOV, Annette  
Reardon/CON/SFGOV@SFGOV

Subject BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY No. 20090428-002  
Revised Report

In response to your request for a list of all contracts awarded between \$10,000 and \$1 million during fiscal year 07-08, please find the attached revised report. Due to a clerical error, the original submittal inadvertently included purchases made under the Computer Store and Technology Store contracts, which was a competitively bid as needed contract with Board of Supervisor approvals. The vendors excluded from the report are as follows:

**For expenditures through December 31, 2008 -**

Central Computer, Approved as amended 6/11/08, BOS Resolution 255-08  
Ciber, Approved as amended 9/25/05, BOS Resolution 691-05  
Pyramid/Cornerstone JV, 1/1/2004 Approved under authority of the Purchaser  
EnPointe, Approved as amended 6/2/08, BOS Resolution 254-08  
MicroMenders/GC Micro JV, Approved as amended 6/11/08, BOS Resolution 253-08  
Xtech, Approved as amended 6/11/08 Resolution 252-08

**For expenditures in 2009 - All approved 12/9/08 by BOS Resolution 508-08**

ComputerLand of Silicon Valley Two contracts  
Cornerstone JV  
Enpointe Two contracts  
Xtech Two contracts



PO for Svcs Excl CompStr FY07-08&08-09Thru5-26-09.xls



BPO for Svcs Excl CompStr FY07-08&08-09Thru5-26-09.xls

Naomi Kelly  
Director/Purchaser  
Office of Contract Administration  
(415) 554-6743

30

**Board of  
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV**

05/28/2009 04:51 PM

To Rana Calonsag/BOS/SFGOV, Alistair Gibson/BOS/SFGOV,  
Lolita Espinosa/BOS/SFGOV,

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY No.  
20090428-002



**Naomi  
Kelly/ADMSVC/SFGOV**

05/28/2009 03:39 PM

To Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Edwin  
Lee/ADMSVC/SFGOV@SFGOV, David  
Campos/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV

cc Sheila Chung Hagen/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Linda  
Yeung/ADMSVC/SFGOV@SFGOV, Starr  
Terrell/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Bill  
Jones/OCA/SFGOV@SFGOV, Lynn  
Khaw/OCA/SFGOV@SFGOV

Subject BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY No. 20090428-002

This e-mail is in response to the Board of Supervisors inquiry No. 20090428-002. The request was for a list of contracts under \$10 million issued by the Purchasing Division in fiscal years 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10. With further clarifications with Supervisor Campos' Office, it was decided that the reports should be for services only and between the thresholds of \$10,000 to \$10 million that are approved or competitively bid by the Purchasing Division. The reports do not include public works contracts. There are no reports for FY 2009-10 because this fiscal year has not begun. For FY 2008-09, the report end date is May 26, 2009.

Attached, please find Purchase Orders reports and Blanket Purchaser Orders reports by fiscal year.

Please contact me if you have any questions.



PO for Svcs Reports 10K-1M FY07-08 & 08-09 Thru 5-26-09.xls



BPO for Svcs Reports 10K-1M FY07-08 & 08-09 Thru 5-26-09.xls

Naomi Kelly  
Director/Purchaser  
Office of Contract Administration  
(415) 554-7738  
(415) 554-4337 (fax)

----- Forwarded by Naomi Kelly/ADMSVC/SFGOV on 05/28/2009 03:31 PM -----

----- Forwarded by Edwin Lee/ADMSVC/SFGOV on 05/01/2009 09:36 AM -----

From: Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV  
To: edwin.lee@sfgov.org  
Cc: david.campos@sfgov.org  
Date: 05/01/2009 09:33 AM  
Subject: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY**  
For any questions, call the sponsoring supervisor

30

TO: Ed Lee  
City Administrator

FROM: Clerk of the Board  
DATE: 5/1/2009  
REFERENCE: 20090428-002  
FILE NO.

Due Date: 5/31/2009

This is an inquiry from a member of the Board of Supervisors made at the Board meeting on 4/28/2009.

Supervisor Campos requests the following information:

*Requesting a list of contracts under \$10 million issued by the Purchasing Division of the Office of the City Administrator in fiscal years 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10.*

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

Your response to this inquiry is requested by 5/31/2009

San Francisco, Ca 94117-1110  
May 23, 2009

Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi  
City Hall  
1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, Ca 94102-4689  
Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi

31

Dear Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi:

I am writing in **support of the proposal to charge an admission fee** to the Botanical Garden in Golden Gate Park.

The Botanical Garden, just like the Conservatory of Flowers, is a very special attraction that needs to be preserved.

It is already operating with significant deferred maintenance, as well as an insufficient number of staff.

Botanical gardens in other cities charge admission.

If those opposed to admission fees - either for all visitors, or only for non-residents - are unable to suggest an alternative source of revenue, then the process to establish a fee of some amount should begin immediately.

Thank you for your consideration,

Ray Lucas

31

**Board of  
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV**

05/26/2009 05:10 PM

To Rana Calonsag/BOS/SFGOV, Lolita Espinosa/BOS/SFGOV,  
Alistair Gibson/BOS/SFGOV,

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY # 20090505-006

Complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Satisfaction form by clicking the link below.  
[http://www.sfgov.org/site/bdsupvrs\\_form.asp?id=18548](http://www.sfgov.org/site/bdsupvrs_form.asp?id=18548)

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 05/26/2009 05:11 PM -----



**"Vaing, Jonathan"**  
**<Jonathan.Vaing@sfdpw.org>**  
>

05/26/2009 04:17 PM

To Board of Supervisors <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>

cc "Black, Sue" <SBlack@sfgov.org>, "Brown, Vallie"  
<Vallie.Brown@sfgov.org>, "Galbreath, Rick"  
<Rick.Galbreath@sfgov.org>, "Galli, Phil"  
<Phil.Galli@sfdpw.org>, "Hines, Timothy"  
<Timothy.Hines@sfdpw.org>, "Lee, Frank W"  
<Frank.W.Lee@sfdpw.org>, "Nuru, Mohammed"  
<Mohammed.Nuru@sfdpw.org>, "Pollock, Jeremy"  
<Jeremy.Pollock@sfgov.org>, "Reiskin, Ed"  
<Ed.Reiskin@sfdpw.org>, "Rodis, Nathan"  
<Nathan.Rodis@sfdpw.org>, "Stringer, Larry"  
<Larry.Stringer@sfdpw.org>

Subject RE: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY # 20090505-006

Here's the status of removing graffiti from the following public property locations:

**Utility Boxes:**

Southeast corner Golden Gate & Scott- SR# 918447- Abated 5/7/09  
Southwest corner Stanyan and Haight- SR# 918452- Abated 5/7/09  
Northeast corner McAllister and Scott- SR# 918453- Abated 5/7/09

**Bus Shelters:**

Southwest corner Pierce & Haight-  
SR# 918458 e-mail to 311 for Clear Channel

Southside of street at Haight & Buena Vista West-  
SR# 918459 e-mail to 311 for Clear Channel

Fillmore and Haight (all 4 bus stops, graffiti and grime)-  
SR# 918460 e-mail to 311 for Clear Channel

**Emergency Boxes:**

Southwest corner Golden Gate and Gough-SR# 918461- Abated 5/7/09

Jonathan C. Vaing  
SF-DPW Graffiti Unit  
Operation Act. Supervisor II  
Office: 415-695-2181

Fax: 415-641-2640  
Jonathan.Vaing@sfdpw.org

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

From: Rodis, Nathan  
Sent: Thursday, May 07, 2009 2:33 PM  
To: Vaing, Jonathan  
Cc: Nuru, Mohammed; Stringer, Larry  
Subject: FW: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY # 20090505-006

Jonathan,

Please respond directly to the Board of Supervisors and copy Supe. Mirkarimi. Please use the reference number in your reply title, and copy Frank W. Lee and myself because we are tracking these requests.

Thank you!

Nathan Rodis  
Assistant to the Director's Office  
Department of Public Works  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
City Hall, Room 348  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Ph: (415) 554-6920 Fax: (415) 554-6944

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

From: Board of Supervisors  
Sent: Thursday, May 07, 2009 11:27 AM  
To: Reiskin, Ed  
Subject: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY  
For any questions, call the sponsoring supervisor

TO: Edward Reiskin  
Public Works

FROM: Clerk of the Board  
DATE: 5/7/2009  
REFERENCE: 20090505-006  
FILE NO.

Due Date: 6/6/2009

This is an inquiry from a member of the Board of Supervisors made at the Board meeting on 5/5/2009.

Supervisor Mirkarimi requests the following information:

Requesting the Department of Public Works to report on the status of removing graffiti from the following public property locations:  
Utility Boxes

Southeast corner Golden Gate & Scott  
Southwest corner Stanyan and Haight  
Northeast corner McAllister and Scott  
Bus Shelters  
Southwest corner Pierce & Haight  
Southside of street at Haight & Buena Vista West  
Fillmore and Haight (all 4 bus stops, graffiti and grime)  
Emergency Boxes  
Southwest corner Golden Gate and Gough

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

Your response to this inquiry is requested by 6/6/2009

Board of  
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV

05/29/2009 05:10 PM

To Rana Calonsag/BOS/SFGOV, Alistair Gibson/BOS/SFGOV,  
Lolita Espinosa/BOS/SFGOV,

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY # 20090512-006

33



"Vaing, Jonathan"  
<Jonathan.Vaing@sfdpw.org>

>

05/29/2009 09:01 AM

To Board of Supervisors <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>

cc "Black, Sue" <SBlack@sfgov.org>, Board of Supervisors  
<Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, "Brown, Vallie"  
<Vallie.Brown@sfgov.org>, "Galbreath, Rick"  
<Rick.Galbreath@sfgov.org>, "Galli, Phil"  
<Phil.Galli@sfdpw.org>, "Hines, Timothy"  
<Timothy.Hines@sfdpw.org>, "Lee, Frank W"  
<Frank.W.Lee@sfdpw.org>, "Nuru, Mohammed"  
<Mohammed.Nuru@sfdpw.org>, "Pollock, Jeremy"  
<Jeremy.Pollock@sfgov.org>, "Reiskin, Ed"  
<Ed.Reiskin@sfdpw.org>, "Rodis, Nathan"  
<Nathan.Rodis@sfdpw.org>, "Stringer, Larry"  
<Larry.Stringer@sfdpw.org>

Subject RE: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY # 20090512-006

Here's the status of removing graffiti from the following locations:

Garbage Cans:

Northwest corner Haight & Fillmore-	SR# 922071-	Abated	5/20/09
Southeast corner Turk & Pierce-	SR# 922078-	Abated	5/20/09
Southeast Page & Fillmore-	SR# 922120-	Abated	5/20/09
Northeast Waller & Scott-	SR# 922141-	Abated	5/20/09

Mailboxes:

Northeast corner Laguna & Fulton-	SR# 922156-	Abated	5/20/09
Southeast corner Gough & Grove-	SR# 922173-	Abated	5/20/09

Jonathan C. Vaing  
SF-DPW Graffiti Unit  
Operation Act. Supervisor II  
Office: 415-695-2181  
Fax: 415-641-2640  
Jonathan.Vaing@sfdpw.org

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

From: Rodis, Nathan  
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2009 8:53 AM  
To: Vaing, Jonathan  
Cc: Nuru, Mohammed; Stringer, Larry  
Subject: FW: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY # 20090512-006

33

Jonathan,

Please respond directly to the Board of Supervisors and copy Supe. Mirkarimi. Please use the reference number in your reply title, and copy Frank W. Lee and myself because we are tracking these requests.

Thank you!

Nathan Rodis  
Assistant to the Director's Office  
Department of Public Works  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
City Hall, Room 348  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Ph: (415) 554-6920 Fax: (415) 554-6944

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

From: Board of Supervisors  
Sent: Friday, May 15, 2009 9:52 AM  
To: Reiskin, Ed  
Subject: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY  
For any questions, call the sponsoring supervisor

TO: Edward Reiskin  
Public Works

FROM: Clerk of the Board  
DATE: 5/15/2009  
REFERENCE: 20090512-006  
FILE NO.

Due Date: 6/13/2009

This is an inquiry from a member of the Board of Supervisors made at the Board meeting on 5/12/2009.

Supervisor Mirkarimi requests the following information:

Requesting the Department of Public Works to report on the status of removing graffiti from the following locations:

Garbage Cans  
Northwest corner Haight & Fillmore  
Southeast corner Turk & Pierce  
Southeast Page & Fillmore  
Northeast Waller & Scott

Mailboxes  
Northeast corner Laguna & Fulton  
Southeast corner Gough & Grove

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

the Supervisor(s) noted above.

Your response to this inquiry is requested by 6/13/2009

**Board of  
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV**

06/01/2009 01:44 PM

To John Avalos/BOS/SFGOV,

cc Rana Calonsag/BOS/SFGOV, Alistair Gibson/BOS/SFGOV,  
Lolita Espinosa/BOS/SFGOV,

bcc

Subject Fw: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY



**Tiffany Wong**  
**<Tiffany.Wong@sfgov.org>**

05/29/2009 05:29 PM

To Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

cc Derek Chu <Derek.Chu@sfgov.org>

Subject Fw: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY

34

Please find attached response to Board of Supervisors inquiry (reference:  
20090428-001 ).

(See attached file: Housing and Homeless Budget 2009.05.29.xls)

Tiffany Wong  
Senior Administrative Analyst  
San Francisco Human Services Agency  
Office: 415.557.5617  
Fax: 415.431.9270

----- Forwarded by Trent Rhorer/DHS/CCSF on 05/11/2009 10:06 PM -----

Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV

05/01/2009 09:33 AM

To  
trent.rhorer@sfgov  
.org

cc

Subject

BOARD OF  
SUPERVISORS  
INQUIRY

34

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY  
For any questions, call the sponsoring supervisor

TO: Trent Rhorer  
Human Services

FROM: Clerk of the Board  
DATE: 5/1/2009  
REFERENCE: 20090428-001  
FILE NO.

Due Date: 5/31/2009

This is an inquiry from a member of the Board of Supervisors made at the Board meeting on 4/28/2009.

Supervisor Avalos requests the following information:

Inquiring of the Human Services Agency a detailed accounting and breakdown of \$189 million reportedly spent by the City on homeless services.

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

Your response to this inquiry is requested by 5/31/2009



Housing and Homeless Budget 2009.05.29.xls

Board of  
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV

05/26/2009 05:09 PM

To Rana Calonsag/BOS/SFGOV, Alistair Gibson/BOS/SFGOV,  
Lolita Espinosa/BOS/SFGOV,

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY # 20090414-003

33

Complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Satisfaction form by clicking the link below.

[http://www.sfgov.org/site/bdsupvrs\\_form.asp?id=18548](http://www.sfgov.org/site/bdsupvrs_form.asp?id=18548)

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 05/26/2009 05:11 PM -----



"Vaing, Jonathan"

<Jonathan.Vaing@sfdpw.org

>

05/26/2009 04:40 PM

To Board of Supervisors <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>

cc "Black, Sue" <SBlack@sfgov.org>, "Brown, Vallie"  
<Vallie.Brown@sfgov.org>, "Galbreath, Rick"  
<Rick.Galbreath@sfgov.org>, "Galli, Phil"  
<Phil.Galli@sfdpw.org>, "Hines, Timothy"  
<Timothy.Hines@sfdpw.org>, "Lee, Frank W"  
<Frank.W.Lee@sfdpw.org>, "Nuru, Mohammed"  
<Mohammed.Nuru@sfdpw.org>, "Pollock, Jeremy"  
<Jeremy.Pollock@sfgov.org>, "Reiskin, Ed"  
<Ed.Reiskin@sfdpw.org>, "Rodis, Nathan"  
<Nathan.Rodis@sfdpw.org>, "Stringer, Larry"  
<Larry.Stringer@sfdpw.org>

Subject RE: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY # 20090414-003

Here's the status of removing graffiti from the following public property locations:

Utility Boxes:

Southeast corner Post and Broderick  
Southwest corner Bush and Divisadero  
Southwest corner Broderick and Fulton  
Northeast corner Laguna and Oak  
Southwest corner Geary and Webster  
Southwest corner Scott and Haight  
Northwest corner Waller and Scott

SR# 910855 Abated 4-19-09  
SR# 910884 Abated 4-19-09  
SR# 910891 Abated 4-19-09  
SR# 910895 Abated 4-19-09  
SR# 910902 Abated 4-19-09  
SR# 910904 Abated 4-19-09  
SR# 910905 Abated 4-19-09

Bus Shelters:

Southwest corner Pierce & Haight  
Clear Channel  
Southside Haight & Buena Vista West  
Clear Channel  
Fillmore and Haight (all 4 bus stops,  
Clear Channel

SR# 918458 sent to 311 for  
SR# 918459 sent to 311 for  
SR# 918460 sent to 311 for

Emergency Boxes:

Southeast corner Scott & Oak

SR# 910261 Abated 4-19-09

Jonathan C. Vaing  
SF-DPW Graffiti Unit  
Operation Act. Supervisor II

33

Office: 415-695-2181  
Fax: 415-641-2640  
Jonathan.Vaing@sfdpw.org

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

From: Rodis, Nathan  
Sent: Friday, April 17, 2009 11:21 AM  
To: Vaing, Jonathan  
Cc: Nuru, Mohammed; Stringer, Larry  
Subject: FW: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY # 20090414-003

Jonathan,

Please respond directly to the Board of Supervisors and copy Supe. Mirkarimi.  
Please use the reference number in your reply title, and copy Frank W. Lee and myself because we are tracking these requests.

Thank you!

Nathan Rodis  
Assistant to the Director's Office  
Department of Public Works  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
City Hall, Room 348  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Ph: (415) 554-6920 Fax: (415) 554-6944

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

From: Board of Supervisors  
Sent: Thursday, April 16, 2009 4:21 PM  
To: Reiskin, Ed  
Subject: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY  
For any questions, call the sponsoring supervisor

TO: Edward Reiskin  
Public Works

FROM: Clerk of the Board  
DATE: 4/16/2009  
REFERENCE: 20090414-003  
FILE NO.

Due Date: 5/16/2009

This is an inquiry from a member of the Board of Supervisors made at the Board meeting on 4/14/2009.

Supervisor Mirkarimi requests the following information:

Requesting the Department of Public Works to report on the status of removing graffiti from the following public property locations:

Utility Boxes

Southeast corner Post and Broderick  
Southwest corner Bush and Divisadero  
Southwest corner Broderick and Fulton  
Northeast corner Laguna and Oak  
Southwest corner Geary and Webster  
Southwest corner Scott and Haight  
Northwest corner Waller and Scott

Bus Shelters

Southwest corner Pierce & Haight  
Southside of Street at Haight & Buena Vista West  
Fillmore and Haight (all 4 bus stops, graffiti and grime)

Emergency Boxes

Southeast corner Scott & Oak

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

Your response to this inquiry is requested by 5/16/2009

Board of  
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV

05/22/2009 01:02 PM

To Lolita Espinosa/BOS/SFGOV, Rana Calonsag/BOS/SFGOV,

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - DUE NOTICE #  
20090331-006

36

Complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Satisfaction form by clicking the link below.  
[http://www.sfgov.org/site/bdsupvrs\\_form.asp?id=18548](http://www.sfgov.org/site/bdsupvrs_form.asp?id=18548)

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 05/22/2009 01:03 PM -----



"Vaing, Jonathan"  
<Jonathan.Vaing@sfdpw.org>  
>

05/22/2009 12:49 PM

To Board of Supervisors <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>

cc "Black, Sue" <SBlack@sfgov.org>, Board of Supervisors  
<Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, "Brown, Vallie"  
<Vallie.Brown@sfgov.org>, "Galbreath, Rick"  
<Rick.Galbreath@sfgov.org>, "Galli, Phil"  
<Phil.Galli@sfdpw.org>, "Hines, Timothy"  
<Timothy.Hines@sfdpw.org>, "Lee, Frank W"  
<Frank.W.Lee@sfdpw.org>, "Nuru, Mohammed"  
<Mohammed.Nuru@sfdpw.org>, "Pollock, Jeremy"  
<Jeremy.Pollock@sfgov.org>, "Reiskin, Ed"  
<Ed.Reiskin@sfdpw.org>, "Rodis, Nathan"  
<Nathan.Rodis@sfdpw.org>, "Stringer, Larry"  
<Larry.Stringer@sfdpw.org>

Subject RE: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - DUE NOTICE #  
20090331-006

Here's the status of removing graffiti at the following private property locations:

130 Hugo (posted 100 Hugo)  
-Graffiti Abated 4-28-09  
600 Irving  
-Graffiti Abated 4-29-09  
999 Oak  
-Graffiti Abated 4-15-09  
644 Cole  
-Graffiti Abated 4-23-09  
901 Haight  
-Graffiti Abated 4-17-09  
1301 Haight  
-Graffiti Abated 4-08-09  
1401 Haight  
-Graffiti Abated 3-28-09  
1584 Haight  
-Second Notice Due 6-11-09  
448 Haight  
-Second Notice Due 6-11-09  
706 Buchanan  
799 Haight  
-Graffiti Abated 4-18-09  
1213 Fell

SR# 906386

Notice Posted

SR# 896797

Notice Posted

SR# 906392

Notice Posted

SR# 906393

Notice Posted

SR# 906394

Notice Posted

SR# 902158

Notice Posted

SR# 899674

Notice Posted

SR# 905292

Notice Posted

SR# 906399

Notice Posted

SR# 906400 Nothing Found 4-8-09

SR# 906401

Notice Posted

SR# 903693

Notice Posted

36

-Graffiti Abated 5-08-09		
514 Haight	SR# 906405	Notice Posted
-Second Notice Due 6-11-09		
525 Haight	SR# 900480	Notice Posted
-Second Notice Due 6-11-09		
546 Haight	SR# 896252	Notice Posted
-Abatement due 05/25/09		
535 Haight	SR# 906406	Notice Posted
-Second Notice Due 6-11-09		
593 Haight	SR# 900490	Notice Posted
-Second Notice Due 6-11-09		
609 Haight	SR# 890208	Notice Posted
-Second Notice Due 6-11-09		
681 Haight	SR# 900505	Notice Posted
-Graffiti Abated 4-08-09		

Jonathan C. Vaing  
 SF-DPW Graffiti Unit  
 Operation Act. Supervisor II  
 Office: 415-695-2181  
 Fax: 415-641-2640  
 Jonathan.Vaing@sfdpw.org

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

From: Rodis, Nathan  
 Sent: Monday, May 18, 2009 9:22 AM  
 To: Vaing, Jonathan  
 Cc: Nuru, Mohammed; Stringer, Larry  
 Subject: FW: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - DUE NOTICE # 20090331-006

Jonathan,

Please respond directly to the Board of Supervisors and copy Supe. Mirkarimi.  
 Please use the reference number in your reply title, and copy Frank W. Lee and myself because we are tracking these requests.

Thank you!

Nathan Rodis  
 Assistant to the Director's Office  
 Department of Public Works  
 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
 City Hall, Room 348  
 San Francisco, CA 94102  
 Ph: (415) 554-6920 Fax: (415) 554-6944

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

From: Board of Supervisors  
 Sent: Friday, May 15, 2009 9:53 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: 5/15/2009  
REFERENCE: 20090331-006  
FILE NO.

Due Date: 5/2/2009  
Reminder Sent: 5/1/2009

The inquiry referenced above from Supervisor Mirkarimi was made at the Board meeting on 3/31/2009 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](mailto: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 Department of Public Works to report on the status of removing graffiti at the following private property locations:

130 Hugo  
600 Irving  
999 Oak  
644 Cole  
901 Haight  
1301 Haight  
1401 Haight  
1584 Haight  
448 Haight  
706 Buchanan  
799 Haight  
1213 Fell  
514 Haight  
525 Haight  
546 Haight  
535 Haight  
593 Haight  
609 Haight  
681 Haight

Board of  
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV

05/22/2009 01:13 PM

To Rana Calonsag/BOS/SFGOV, Lolita Espinosa/BOS/SFGOV,

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY # 20090324-007



"Vaing, Jonathan"  
<Jonathan.Vaing@sfdpw.org>  
>

05/22/2009 01:14 PM

To Board of Supervisors <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>

cc "Black, Sue" <SBlack@sfgov.org>, Board of Supervisors  
<Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, "Brown, Vallie"  
<Vallie.Brown@sfgov.org>, "Galbreath, Rick"  
<Rick.Galbreath@sfgov.org>, "Galli, Phil"  
<Phil.Galli@sfdpw.org>, "Hines, Timothy"  
<Timothy.Hines@sfdpw.org>, "Lee, Frank W"  
<Frank.W.Lee@sfdpw.org>, "Nuru, Mohammed"  
<Mohammed.Nuru@sfdpw.org>, "Pollock, Jeremy"  
<Jeremy.Pollock@sfgov.org>, "Reiskin, Ed"  
<Ed.Reiskin@sfdpw.org>, "Rodis, Nathan"  
<Nathan.Rodis@sfdpw.org>, "Stringer, Larry"  
<Larry.Stringer@sfdpw.org>

Subject RE: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY # 20090324-007

Here's the status of removing graffiti from the following private property locations:

542 Haight	SR# 909357	-Second Notice Due 6-11-09
378 Fulton	SR# 909358	-Nothing Found 4-11-09
999 Oak	SR# 909359	-Nothing Found 4-11-09
598 Laguna	SR# 909360	-Nothing Found 4-11-09
1689 Fillmore	SR# 909362	-Nothing Found 4-11-09
803 Fillmore	SR# 909374	-Nothing Found 4-11-09
349 Fillmore	SR# 909360	-Notice Posted-Graffiti Abated 4-18-09
339 Fillmore	SR# 909360	-Notice Posted-Graffiti Abated 4-22-09
600 Page	SR# 909374	-Nothing Found 4-08-09
601 Haight	SR# 909374	-Nothing Found 4-11-09
500 Fillmore	SR# 909374	-Nothing Found 4-11-09
573 Fillmore	SR# 909360	-Notice Posted-Graffiti Abated 5-10-09
279 Fillmore	SR# 909360	-Notice Posted-Graffiti Abated 4-30-09
926 Divisadero	SR# 905628	-Second Notice Due 6-11-09

Jonathan C. Vaing  
SF-DPW Graffiti Unit  
Operation Act. Supervisor II  
Office: 415-695-2181  
Fax: 415-641-2640  
Jonathan.Vaing@sfdpw.org

-----Original Message-----  
From: Rodis, Nathan

Sent: Wednesday, April 01, 2009 2:46 PM  
To: Vaing, Jonathan  
Cc: Nuru, Mohammed; Stringer, Larry  
Subject: FW: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY # 20090324-007

Jonathan,

Please respond directly to the Board of Supervisors and copy Supe. Mirkarimi.  
Please use the reference number in your reply title, and copy Frank W. Lee and myself because we are tracking these requests.

Thank you!

Nathan Rodis  
Assistant to the Director's Office  
Department of Public Works  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
City Hall, Room 348  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Ph: (415) 554-6920 Fax: (415) 554-6944

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

From: Board of Supervisors  
Sent: Friday, March 27, 2009 9:04 AM  
To: Reiskin, Ed  
Subject: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY  
For any questions, call the sponsoring supervisor

TO: Edward Reiskin  
Public Works

FROM: Clerk of the Board  
DATE: 3/27/2009  
REFERENCE: 20090324-007  
FILE NO.

Due Date: 4/26/2009

This is an inquiry from a member of the Board of Supervisors made at the Board meeting on 3/24/2009.

Supervisor Mirkarimi requests the following information:

Requesting the Department of Public Works to report on the status of removing graffiti from the following private property locations:

542 Haight  
378 Fulton  
999 Oak  
598 Laguna (on the Linden Alley side)  
1689 Fillmore  
803 Fillmore  
349 Fillmore  
339 Fillmore

600 Page  
601 Haight  
500 Fillmore  
573 Fillmore  
279 Fillmore  
926 Divisadero

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

Your response to this inquiry is requested by 4/26/2009

Board of  
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV

05/29/2009 05:10 PM


To Alistair Gibson/BOS/SFGOV, Rana Calonsag/BOS/SFGOV,  
Lolita Espinosa/BOS/SFGOV,

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - DUE NOTICE #  
20090324-005

38



"Vaing, Jonathan"  
<Jonathan.Vaing@sfdpw.org>  
>

05/29/2009 09:11 AM

To Board of Supervisors <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>

cc "Black, Sue" <SBlack@sfgov.org>, Board of Supervisors  
<Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, "Brown, Vallie"  
<Vallie.Brown@sfgov.org>, "Galbreath, Rick"  
<Rick.Galbreath@sfgov.org>, "Galli, Phil"  
<Phil.Galli@sfdpw.org>, "Hines, Timothy"  
<Timothy.Hines@sfdpw.org>, "Lee, Frank W"  
<Frank.W.Lee@sfdpw.org>, "Nuru, Mohammed"  
<Mohammed.Nuru@sfdpw.org>, "Pollock, Jeremy"  
<Jeremy.Pollock@sfgov.org>, "Reiskin, Ed"  
<Ed.Reiskin@sfdpw.org>, "Rodis, Nathan"  
<Nathan.Rodis@sfdpw.org>, "Stringer, Larry"  
<Larry.Stringer@sfdpw.org>

Subject RE: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - DUE NOTICE #  
20090324-005

Here's the status of removing graffiti from the public property at the  
following locations:

Utility Boxes:

Southwest Post & Scott-	SR# 918129- Abated 5/7/09
Northeast corner Post & Steiner-	SR# 918133- Abated 5/7/09
Northeast corner Baker & Turk-	SR# 918139- Abated 5/7/09
Southeast corner Scott & Fillmore-	SR# 918142- Abated 5/7/09
Southwest corner Broderick & Fulton-	SR# 918140- Abated 5/7/09
In front of 1589 Haight-	SR# 918144- Abated 5/7/09

Bus Shelters:

Southwest corner Pierce & McAllister-	SR# 918154 E-mail to 311 for Clear
Channel	
Northwest corner Divisadero & Ellis-	SR# 918157 E-mail to 311 for Clear
Channel	
Northeast McAllister & Buchanan-	SR# 918159 E-mail to 311 for Clear
Channel	
Fillmore & Haight (all 4 bus stops)-	SR# 918175 E-mail to 311 for Clear
Channel	

Emergency Boxes:

Southeast corner Page & Steiner-	SR# 918186- Abated 5/7/09
Northeast corner Divisadero & Page-	SR# 918195- Abated 5/7/09

Jonathan C. Vaing  
SF-DPW Graffiti Unit

38

Operation Act. Supervisor II  
Office: 415-695-2181  
Fax: 415-641-2640  
Jonathan.Vaing@sfdpw.org

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

From: Rodis, Nathan  
Sent: Thursday, May 07, 2009 2:39 PM  
To: Vaing, Jonathan  
Cc: Nuru, Mohammed; Stringer, Larry  
Subject: FW: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - DUE NOTICE # 20090324-005

Jonathan,

Please respond directly to the Board of Supervisors and copy Supe. Mirkarimi.  
Please use the reference number in your reply title, and copy Frank W. Lee and myself because we are tracking these requests.

Thank you!

Nathan Rodis  
Assistant to the Director's Office  
Department of Public Works  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
City Hall, Room 348  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Ph: (415) 554-6920 Fax: (415) 554-6944

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

From: Board of Supervisors  
Sent: Thursday, May 07, 2009 11:28 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: 5/7/2009  
REFERENCE: 20090324-005  
FILE NO.

Due Date: 4/26/2009  
Reminder Sent: 4/23/2009

The inquiry referenced above from Supervisor Mirkarimi was made at the Board meeting on 3/24/2009 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](mailto: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 Department of Public Works to report on the status of removing graffiti from the public property at the following locations:

Utility Boxes

Southwest Post & Scott  
Northeast corner Post & Steiner  
Northeast corner Baker & Turk  
Southeast corner Scott & Fillmore  
Southwest corner Broderick & Fulton  
In front of 1589 Haight

Bus Shelters

Southwest corner Pierce & McAllister  
Northwest corner Divisadero & Ellis  
Northeast McAllister & Buchanan  
Fillmore & Haight (all 4 bus stops)

Emergency Boxes

Southeast corner Page & Steiner  
Northeast corner Divisadero & Page



Francisco Da Costa

06/01/2009 09:35 AM

To Mark Leno <mark.leno@sen.ca.gov>, "Forrest, Linda"  
<Linda.Forrest@sen.ca.gov>, Leland Yee  
<leland.yee@sen.ca.gov>, "Djibril V. Diop"

cc

bcc

Subject The U.S. Navy has an obligation to clean up the Hunters  
Point Naval Shipyard.

39

All the land that we call San Francisco and more belongs to the Muwekma Ohlone. They are the First People of San Francisco. Two hundreds years ago the area now called Bayview Hunters Point was pristine. Today it is a toxic cesspool. Those that polluted the area must clean it.

The was stolen from the Ohone. The land comes under the First People and under their

Patrimonial Jurisdiction: [www.muwekma.org](http://www.muwekma.org) Those in Sacramento must also remember this. You are in Sacramento to represent not to desecrate and violate the rights of the constituents.

At Hunters Point Naval Shipyard - that is a Superfund Site there are many radiological hot spots. The worst areas are Parcel E and E2. The entire Hunters Point Naval Shipyard must be clean - abated and mitigated to Residential Standards. Proposition P passed by eighty seven percent of San Francisco mandates the entire area be clean to RESIDENTIAL Standards.

All of you involved in the decision making must read the Final Historical Radiological Report on Hunters Point. I know for sure that Senator Mark Leno has not read it. If he did he would not agree to initiate the faulty Senate Bill 792. It is NOT too late to do the right thing.

Now, Senator Mark Leno in his ignorance and haste has initiated Senate Bill 792. SB 792 sent a wrong message to those that should clean the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard - it gives them a chance to talk about capping and conveying the land without a through cleanup.

Pushing for Senate Bill are the Pacific Heights Mafia - the likes of Diane

39

Feinstein, Nancy Pelosi, Richard Blum, Gavin Newsom and I could name more.

What makes this matter even worse is giving it to Lennar that has wasted over \$1 Billion of CALPERS money. Lennar is Rogue Developer that has thousands of law suits all over the Nation.

Lennar is into Land Banking and has no intention what so ever to build good homes and should not be building any homes in the middle of Chernobyl.

Here is what I want to express to you all and please take me seriously. Before the year 2012 there

will be a disaster at Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. If before that the over 2 million tons of toxic dirt mostly radiological in nature is not removed and hauled away - the entire San Francisco area will be adversely impacted and thousands of San Franciscans will DIE.

This is the final CLARION call. Do not say you were NOT warned. Those of you that do not stop this faulty BILL will have BLOOD on your hands.

Lennar is a Rogue Developer and after 10 years declared Bankruptcy at Mare Island. It promised to build 10,000 and did nothing. In Southern California linked to LandSource it wasted over \$1 Billion yes BILLION - CALPERS money.

You all have an opportunity to first clean up the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. Then, review a through Environmental Impact Report, then get the approvals from the State and Federal Regulatory Agencies - let us agree to sign a sound Record of Decision.

Senator Mark Leno has been misled and must either REMOVE his faulty bill or thoroughly amend it. We cannot trade the Candlestick State Park for areas like E and E2. We are not stupid.

The Bayview Hunters Point community does not trust Lennar.

Senator Mark Leno has NOT had one single meaningful dialog on the matter linked with SB 792 in the community. Senator Mark Leno cannot fool all the people all the time.

[www.hunterspointnavalshipyard.com](http://www.hunterspointnavalshipyard.com)

Francisco Da Costa  
Muwekma Ohlone Tribe  
Base Closure and Infrastructure Projects

San Francisco  
California 94124

**Board of  
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV**

06/01/2009 01:29 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: Bay Pollution by the City of San Francisco Sewage Plant  
at Fisherman's Wharf



**"Alexandra Post, Ph.D."**

05/29/2009 08:04 AM

To David.Chiu@sfgov.org, SF Supervisors  
<board\_of\_supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us>, Pelosi Nancy  
<sf.nancy@mail.house.gov>, Commonwealth Club  
<club@commonwealthclub.org>, Gavin Newsom  
<Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org>, Letters to the Editor  
<letters@sfchronicle.com>, Wade Crowfoot  
<Wade.Crowfoot@sfgov.org>, Tom Ammiano  
<tom.ammiano@sfgov.org>, Ed Epstein  
<eepstein@sfchronicle.com>, Jason Van Derbeken  
<jvanderbeken@sfchronicle.com>,  
lyzferguson, eferguson@bayareacouncil.org,  
Aron Peskin <aaron\_peskin@ci.sf.ca.us>,  
custsvc@ebmud.com, jgrubb@bayareacouncil.org, Reinhold  
Ziegler

cc

Subject Bay Pollution by the City of San Francisco Sewage Plant at  
Fisherman's Wharf

The SF Bay water pollution by the older, art deco sewage plant at Bay and Kearny Streets is so bad that it smells like human waste in at least three places:

1. On the front East Corner of Pier 39 by the children's jungle gym where tourists enter Fisherman's Wharf (particularly early am at high tide on rainy days)
2. From the gutters, particularly at Lombard and Montgomery Streets, after rain.
3. In the Butterfly Restaurant, a commercial food establishment operating according to SF City health standards. It is so bad that the front end of the restaurant smells similar to inside a stand-alone construction-site toilet. One can sit near the bar and watch the birds dive for food in the same waters. Human detritus is probably not so bad; but the drugs that people take and chemicals they dump down their toilets are surely endangering wildlife on this Pacific migratory path. Butterfly Restaurant management has spoken several times to the SF Port Authority to no avail.

Thanks for your help.

Alexandra Post, PhD  
CEO

**UNITED SYNERGY LLC**

*design and integration of renewable energy systems*

111 Chestnut Street Suite 501

San Francisco, CA 94111

main 415-434-4342

direct 415-434-4340

[apost@unitedsynergylc.com](mailto:apost@unitedsynergylc.com)

or: [alexisgp@me.com](mailto:alexisgp@me.com)

[www.unitedsynergylc.com](http://www.unitedsynergylc.com)

**COMMISSIONERS**  
Cindy Gustafson, President  
Tahoe City  
Jim Kellogg, Vice President  
Concord  
Richard Rogers, Member  
Carpinteria  
Michael Sutton, Member  
Monterey  
Daniel W. Richards, Member  
Upland

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER



JOHN CARLSON, JR.  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
1416 Ninth Street  
Box 944209  
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090  
(916) 653-4899  
(916) 653-5040 Fax  
fgc@fgc.ca.gov

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
**Fish and Game Commission**

May 27, 2009

TO ALL AFFECTED AND INTERESTED PARTIES:

This is to provide you with a copy of the notice of proposed regulatory action relative to Section 502, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to waterfowl hunting, which will be published in the California Regulatory Notice Register on May 29, 2009.

Please note the dates of the public hearings related to this matter and associated deadlines for receipt of written comments.

Dr. Eric Loft, Chief, Wildlife Branch, Department of Fish and Game, phone (916) 445-3555, has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations.

Sincerely,

*Sherrie Fonbuena*

Sherrie Fonbuena  
Associate Governmental Program Analyst

Attachment

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO  
2009 JUN - 1 AM 11:57  
BY *[Signature]*

**TITLE 14. Fish and Game Commission**  
**Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations**

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that the Fish and Game Commission (Commission), pursuant to the authority vested by sections 202 and 355 of the Fish and Game Code and to implement, interpret or make specific sections 202, 355, and 356 of said Code, proposes to amend Section 502, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to waterfowl hunting.

**Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview**

Current regulations in Section 502, Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR), provide definitions, hunting zone descriptions, season opening and closing dates, and establish daily bag and possession limits. In addition to the five proposals contained herein, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), after analysis of waterfowl population survey and other data, may change federal regulations; if this occurs changes in existing and proposed regulations in California may be necessary. Changes in federal regulations for season opening and closing dates, elimination or creation of special management areas, season length, and daily bag limits for migratory birds may occur. Item 4 requires changes in the federal regulations and must be approved by the Pacific Flyway Council at its meeting on July 24, 2009. Item 5 (including the table below) provides a proposed range of season dates and bag limits for waterfowl. The Service will consider recommendations from the Flyway Council at their meeting on July 30, 2009. At this time, the California Breeding Pair Survey has not been conducted and the Service has not established federal regulation "frameworks" which will occur in August after the analysis of current waterfowl population survey, other data, input from the Flyway Councils and the public. Also, minor editorial changes are proposed to clarify and simplify the regulations and to comply with existing federal frameworks.

The Department's proposals are as follows:

1. Increase the white-fronted goose daily bag limit to 6 geese per day in the Northeastern, Southern San Joaquin Valley, and Balance of State zones. Also, the white-fronted goose, Large and Small Canada goose daily bag limits will be collectively called dark geese in the Southern San Joaquin Valley and Balance of State zones.
2. Increase the Large Canada goose daily bag limit to 6 per day in the Southern San Joaquin Valley and Balance of State zones. Also, the white-fronted goose, Large and Small Canada goose daily bag limits will be collectively called dark geese in the Southern San Joaquin Valley and Balance of State zones.
3. Change the name of the Youth Hunting Days section to Youth Waterfowl Hunting Days.
4. Modify the opening date of the Sacramento Valley (West) Special Management Area to open concurrently with the general goose season in the Balance of State Zone. This proposal requires approval by the Pacific Flyway Council and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
5. Provide a range of waterfowl hunting season lengths (which may be split into two segments) between 38 and 107 days for all hunting methods. A range of daily bag limits is also given for ducks in all zones. Also, federal regulations require that California's hunting regulations conform to those of Arizona in the Colorado River Zone. See the following table for season and bag limit ranges.

AREA	SPECIES	SEASONS	DAILY BAG & POSSESSION LIMITS
Statewide	Coots & Moorhens	Concurrent w/duck season	25/day. 25 in possession
Northeastern Zone <i>Season may be split for Ducks, Pintail, Canvasback and Scaup.</i>	Ducks	Between 38 & 105 days	4-7/day, no more than 3-7 mallards, no more than 1-2 hen mallards, 0-3 pintail, 0-3 canvasback, 0-2 redheads, 0-7 scaup. Possession limit double the daily bag.
	Pintail	Between 0 & 105 days	
	Canvasback	Between 0 & 105 days	
	Scaup	Between 0 and 105 days	
	Geese	86-100 days	8/ day, up to 6 white geese, up to 4-6 white-fronts, up to 2 Large Canada geese, only 1 Small Canada goose. Possession limit double the daily bag.
Southern San Joaquin Valley Zone <i>Season may be split for Ducks, Pintail, Canvasback and Scaup.</i>	Ducks	Between 38 & 105 days	4-7/day, no more than 3-7 mallards, no more than 1-2 hen mallards, 0-3 pintail, 0-3 canvasback, 0-2 redheads, 0-7 scaup. Possession limit double the daily bag.
	Pintail	Between 0 & 105 days	
	Canvasback	Between 0 & 105 days	
	Scaup	Between 0 & 105 days	
	Geese	86-100 days	8/ day, up to 6 white geese, up to 4-6 white-fronts, up to 4-6 Large Canada geese, up to 6 Small Canada geese (up to 6 dark geese). Possession limit double the daily bag.
Colorado River Zone	Ducks	Between 38 & 101 days	4-7/day, no more than 3-7 mallards, no more than 1-2 hen mallards or Mexican-like ducks, 0-3 pintail, 0-3 canvasback, 0-2 redheads, 0-7 scaup. Possession limit double the daily bag.
	Pintail	Between 0 & 101 days	
	Canvasback	Between 0 & 101 days	
	Scaup	Between 0 & 101 days	
	Geese	101 days	6/ day, up to 6 white geese, up to 3 dark geese. Possession limit double the daily bag.
Southern California Zone <i>Season may be split for Ducks, Pintail, Canvasback and Scaup.</i>	Ducks	Between 38 & 100 days	4-7/day, no more than 3-7 mallards, no more than 1-2 hen mallards, 0-3 pintail, 0-3 canvasback, 0-2 redheads, 0-7 scaup. Possession limit double the daily bag.
	Pintail	Between 0 & 100 days	
	Canvasback	Between 0 & 100 days	
	Scaup	Between 0 & 100 days	
	Geese	86-100 days	8/day, up to 6 white geese, up to 3 dark geese. Possession limit double the daily bag.
Balance of State Zone <i>Season may be split for Ducks, Pintail, Canvasback and Scaup.</i>	Ducks	Between 38 & 100 days	4-7/day, no more than 3-7 mallards, no more than 1-2 hen mallards, 0-3 pintail, 0-3 canvasback, 0-2 redheads, 0-7 scaup. Possession limit double the daily bag.
	Pintail	Between 0 & 100 days	
	Canvasback	Between 0 & 100 days	
	Scaup	Between 0 & 100 days	
	Geese	86-100 days	8/ day, up to 6 white geese, up to 4-6 white-fronts, up to 4-6 Large Canada geese, up to 6 Small Canada geese (up to 6 dark geese). Possession limit double the daily bag.
SPECIAL AREA	SPECIES	SEASON	DAILY BAG & POSSESSION LIMITS
North Coast	All Canada Geese	Between 0 & 105 days, except for Large Canada geese which can not exceed 100 days or extend beyond the last Sunday in January.	6/day, only 1 may be a Large Canada goose. Possession limit double the daily bag.
Humboldt Bay South Spit	All species	Closed during brant season	
Sacramento Valley (West)	White-fronted geese	Open concurrently with general goose season through Dec 14	2/day. Possession limit double the daily bag.
Morro Bay	All species	Open in designated areas only	Waterfowl season opens concurrently with brant season.
Martis Creek Lake	All species	Closed until Nov 16	
Northern Brant	Black Brant	Between 0 & 30 days, must end by Dec 15	2/day. Possession limit double the daily bag.
Balance of State Brant	Black Brant	Between 0 & 30 days, must end by Dec 15	2/day. Possession limit double the daily bag.
Imperial County	White Geese	Between 0 and 102 days	6/day. Possession limit double the daily bag.
YOUTH WATERFOWL HUNTING DAYS	SPECIES	SEASON	DAILY BAG & POSSESSION LIMITS
Northeastern Zone	Same as regular season	The Saturday fourteen days before the opening of waterfowl season extending for 2 days.	Same as regular season
Southern San Joaquin Valley Zone		The Saturday following the closing of waterfowl season extending for 2 days.	
Southern California Zone		The Saturday following the closing of waterfowl season extending for 2 days.	
Colorado River Zone		The Saturday following the closing for waterfowl season extending for 2 days.	
Balance of State Zone		The Saturday following the closing of waterfowl season extending for 2 days.	
FALCONRY OF DUCKS	SPECIES	SEASON	DAILY BAG & POSSESSION LIMITS
Northeastern Zone	Same as regular season	105 days	3/ day, possession limit 6
Balance of State Zone		Between 38 and 107 days	
Southern San Joaquin Valley Zone		Between 38 and 107 days	
Southern California Zone		Between 38 and 107 days	
Colorado River Zone		Between 38 and 107 days	

**NOTICE IS GIVEN** that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held at the Yolo Fliers Club, Ballroom, 17980 County Road 94B, Woodland, California, on Thursday, June 25, 2009 at 8:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard.

**NOTICE IS ALSO GIVEN** that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held at the Yolo Fliers Club, Ballroom, 17980 County Road 94B, Woodland, California, on Thursday, August 6, 2009, at 8:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard. It is requested, but not required, that written comments be submitted on or before July 31, 2009 at the address given below, or by fax at (916) 653-5040; or by e-mail to [FGC@fgc.ca.gov](mailto:FGC@fgc.ca.gov). Written comments mailed, faxed or e-mailed to the Commission office, must be received before 5:00 p.m. on August 3, 2009. All comments must be received no later than August 6, 2009, at the hearing in Woodland, CA. If you would like copies of any modifications to this proposal, please include your name and mailing address.

The regulations as proposed in strikeout-underline format, as well as an initial statement of reasons, including environmental considerations and all information upon which the proposal is based (rulemaking file), are on file and available for public review from the agency representative, John Carlson, Jr., Executive Director, Fish and Game Commission, 1416 Ninth Street, Box 944209, Sacramento, California 94244-2090, phone (916) 653-4899. Please direct requests for the above mentioned documents and inquiries concerning the regulatory process to John Carlson, Jr., or Sherrie Fonbuena at the preceding address or phone number. **Dr. Eric Loft, Wildlife Branch, Department of Fish and Game, phone (916) 445-3555, has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations.** Copies of the Initial Statement of Reasons, including the regulatory language, may be obtained from the address above. Notice of the proposed action shall be posted on the Fish and Game Commission website at <http://www.fgc.ca.gov>.

#### Availability of Modified Text

If the regulations adopted by the Commission differ from but are sufficiently related to the action proposed, they will be available to the public for at least 15 days prior to the date of adoption. Circumstances beyond the control of the Commission (e.g., timing of Federal regulation adoption, timing of resource data collection, timelines do not allow, etc.) or changes made to be responsive to public recommendation and comments during the regulatory process may preclude full compliance with the 15-day comment period, and the Commission will exercise its powers under Section 355 of the Fish and Game Code. Regulations adopted pursuant to this section are not subject to the time periods for adoption, amendment or repeal of regulations prescribed in Sections 11343.4, 11346.4 and 11346.8 of the Government Code. Any person interested may obtain a copy of said regulations prior to the date of adoption by contacting the agency representative named herein.

If the regulatory proposal is adopted, the final statement of reasons may be obtained from the address above when it has been received from the agency program staff.

#### Impact of Regulatory Action

The potential for significant statewide adverse economic impacts that might result from the proposed regulatory action has been assessed, and the following initial determinations relative to the required statutory categories have been made:

- (a) Significant Statewide Adverse Economic Impact Directly Affecting Business, Including the Ability of California Businesses to Compete with Businesses in Other States:

The proposed action will not have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states. The proposed regulations are intended to provide additional recreational opportunity to the public. The response is expected to be minor in nature.

- (b) Impact on the Creation or Elimination of Jobs within the State, the Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses, or the Expansion of Businesses in California: None.

- (c) Cost Impacts on a Representative Private Person or Business:

The Commission is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.

- (d) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State: None.

- (e) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies: None.

- (f) Programs Mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts: None.

- (g) Costs Imposed on any Local Agency or School District that is Required to be Reimbursed Under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4, Government Code: None.

- (h) Effect on Housing Costs: None.

#### Effect on Small Business

It has been determined that the adoption of these regulations may affect small business. The Commission has drafted the regulations in Plain English pursuant to Government Code sections 11342.580 and 11346.2(a)(1).

#### Consideration of Alternatives

The Commission must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the Commission, or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Commission, would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action.

FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

Dated: May 19, 2009

John Carlson, Jr.  
Executive Director

**COMMISSIONERS**  
Cindy Gustafson, President  
Tahoe City  
Jim Kellogg, Vice President  
Concord  
Richard Rogers, Member  
Carpinteria  
Michael Sutton, Member  
Monterey  
Daniel W. Richards, Member  
Upland

**ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER**



**JOHN CARLSON, JR.**  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
1416 Ninth Street  
Box 944209  
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090  
(916) 653-4899  
(916) 653-5040 Fax  
fgc@fgc.ca.gov

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
**Fish and Game Commission**

May 27, 2009

TO ALL AFFECTED AND INTERESTED PARTIES:

This is to provide you with a copy of the notice of proposed regulatory action relative to Section 122, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to commercial lobster permits, which will be published in the California Regulatory Notice Register on May 29, 2009.


Please note the dates of the public hearings related to this matter and associated deadlines for receipt of written comments.

Mr. Rob Allen, Enforcement Branch, Department of Fish and Game, phone (916) 651-9953, has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations.

Sincerely,

  
Sheri Tiemann  
Staff Services Analyst

Attachment

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SANTAMONICA  
2009 JUN - 1 PM 11:47  
BY 

**TITLE 14. Fish and Game Commission**  
**Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations**

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that the Fish and Game Commission (Commission), pursuant to the authority vested by sections 1050, 8254 and 8259, of the Fish and Game Code and to implement, interpret or make specific sections 1050, 2365, 7852.2, 8043, 8046, 8250-8259, 9002-9006 and 9010 of said Code, proposes to amend Section 122, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to lobsters, permits to take.

**Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview**

Under current regulations (Section 122, T-14, CCR) there is a listing of the classes of commercial lobster permits and stipulates the requirements for obtaining and renewing lobster permits. The regulation also describes the transferable lobster operator permit qualification criteria and procedures; procedures and deadline for permit renewal and forfeiture of non-renewed permits; and the procedures timelines and initial limit on permit transfers. Current wording specifically lists equipment/activities that are illegal as well as equipment/activities that are a mandatory part of the commercial harvesting of lobster. Restricted lobster fishing areas are listed in the regulation.

The proposed regulation clarifies current wording by mandating traps used to commercially take lobster must meet the requirements of Fish and Game Code Section 9010. The amendment clarifies that lobster traps may only be used in Districts 18, 19, 20A, and that part of District 20 southerly of Santa Catalina Island between southeast Rock and China Point. The current intent is for the listed districts to be the exclusive areas for the legal commercial take of lobster but sentence structure does not fully support this intent. Editorial changes are proposed to improve the clarity and consistency of the regulations.

The proposal mandates that all lobster permit holders shall maintain lobster trap buoys in such a condition that buoy identification numbers are clearly readable. The purpose of marked buoys is to establish what permittee is utilizing a specific lobster trap. Ineffective methods of placing numbers on buoys or inadequate maintenance of buoys hinders the ability of enforcement officers to identify the permittee using the trap. The proposal will specifically stipulate that the numbers on the buoy will be clearly readable so that the regulatory purpose of the buoy identification number is met.

**NOTICE IS GIVEN** that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held at the Yolo Fliers Club, Ballroom, 17980 County Road 94B, Woodland, California, on Thursday, June 25, 2009, at 8:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard.

**NOTICE IS ALSO GIVEN** that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held at the Yolo Fliers Club, Ballroom, 17980 County Road 94B, Woodland, California, on Thursday, August 6, 2009, at 8:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard. It is requested, but not required, that written comments be submitted on or before July 30, 2009 at the address given below, or by fax at (916) 653-5040, or by e-mail to [FGC@fgc.ca.gov](mailto:FGC@fgc.ca.gov). Written comments mailed, faxed or e-mailed to the Commission office, must be received before 5:00 p.m. on August 4, 2009. All comments must be received no later than August 6, 2009, at the hearing in Woodland, CA. If you would like copies of any modifications to this proposal, please include your name and mailing address.

The regulations as proposed in strikeout-underline format, as well as an initial statement of reasons, including environmental considerations and all information upon which the proposal is based (rulemaking file), are on file and available for public review from the agency representative, John Carlson, Jr., Executive Director, Fish and Game Commission, 1416 Ninth Street, Box 944209, Sacramento, California 94244-2090, phone (916) 653-4899. Please direct requests for the above mentioned documents and inquiries concerning the regulatory process to John Carlson, Jr., or Sheri Tiemann at the preceding address or phone number. **Mr. Rob Allen, Enforcement Branch, Department of Fish and Game,**

**(916) 651-9953 has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations.** Copies of the Initial Statement of Reasons, including the regulatory language, may be obtained from the address above. Notice of the proposed action shall be posted on the Fish and Game Commission website at <http://www.fgc.ca.gov>.

#### **Availability of Modified Text**

If the regulations adopted by the Commission differ from but are sufficiently related to the action proposed, they will be available to the public for at least 15 days prior to the date of adoption. Circumstances beyond the control of the Commission (e.g., timing of Federal regulation adoption, timing of resource data collection, timelines do not allow, etc.) or changes made to be responsive to public recommendation and comments during the regulatory process may preclude full compliance with the 15-day comment period, and the Commission will exercise its powers under Section 202 of the Fish and Game Code. Regulations adopted pursuant to this section are not subject to the time periods for adoption, amendment or repeal of regulations prescribed in Sections 11343.4, 11346.4 and 11346.8 of the Government Code. Any person interested may obtain a copy of said regulations prior to the date of adoption by contacting the agency representative named herein.

If the regulatory proposal is adopted, the final statement of reasons may be obtained from the address above when it has been received from the agency program staff.

#### **Impact of Regulatory Action**

The potential for significant statewide adverse economic impacts that might result from the proposed regulatory action has been assessed, and the following initial determinations relative to the required statutory categories have been made:

- (a) **Significant Statewide Adverse Economic Impact Directly Affecting Business, Including the Ability of California Businesses to Compete with Businesses in Other States:**

The proposed action will not have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states. The proposal clarifies and strengthens the enforceability of portions of the current regulation.

- (b) **Impact on the Creation or Elimination of Jobs within the State, the Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses, or the Expansion of Businesses in California:** None.
- (c) **Cost Impacts on a Representative Private Person or Business:**
- The Commission is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.
- (d) **Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State:** None.
- (e) **Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies:** None.
- (f) **Programs Mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts:** None.
- (g) **Costs Imposed on any Local Agency or School District that is Required to be Reimbursed Under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4, Government Code:** None.
- (h) **Effect on Housing Costs:** None.

### Effect on Small Business

It has been determined that the adoption of these regulations may affect small business. The Commission has drafted the regulations in Plain English pursuant to Government Code sections 11342.580 and 11346.2(a)(1).

### Consideration of Alternatives

The Commission must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the Commission, or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Commission, would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action.

FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

Dated: May 19, 2009

John Carlson, Jr.  
Executive Director



# INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FIRE FIGHTERS®

HAROLD A. SCHAITBERGER  
General President

File 090606

orig: Under Wom  
C: BOS-11  
C: C page

May 27, 2009

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

RE: File Number 090606  
Eliminating the 48.7-hour work week for fire fighters

Dear Supervisors:

I write on behalf of the International Association of Fire Fighters, representing more than 295,000 professional fire fighters and emergency medical personnel in all 50 states, to oppose the above referenced Charter Amendment. We respectfully ask that you vote NO on placing this measure on the ballot.

There are reasons for our opposition:

**Replaces collective bargaining with a ballot measure.**

This ballot measure undermines the basic principle that public employers should meet with unions and asks voters to instead set the minimum work week. There is a legitimate public safety goal in having a maximum work week. Setting a minimum work week on the ballot simply to save money is an unwise precedent.

**Eliminates binding arbitration.**

In order to accomplish this goal, the Charter Amendment would eliminate binding arbitration, a widely accepted and very effective method of dispute resolution. Since the Charter Amendment would set a minimum 52 hours, but no maximum, it is unclear how a dispute would be resolved.

**San Francisco fire fighters work the longest hours already.**

When compared to comparable cities (more than 350,000 population and more than 10,000/sq. mile) San Francisco fire fighters work the longest hours today.

We hope you will choose the placement of the measure on the ballot so we can focus on our shared goals of protecting lives and property.

Sincerely,

Harold A. Schaitberger  
General President

RECEIVED  
SFOA OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO  
2009 JUN -1 PM 11:18  
BY *[initials]*

43

43