Petitions and Communications received from September 15, 2009, through September 28, 2009, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on October 6, 2009.

From Willie Kennedy, submitting letter supporting the re-appointment of Ms. Kim Brandon to the Port Commission. File No. 090877  (1)

From Aaron Goodman, submitting letter regarding the September 10, 2009, Planning Commission meeting.  (2)

From Department of Public Health, regarding the impact of the enrollment freeze in the Healthy Families Program on San Francisco’s children and youth. (Reference No. 20090721-007)  (3)

From Budget Analyst, regarding status of the Marina Yacht Harbor Fund Audit. (Reference No. 20090728-001)  (4)

From Office of the Controller, submitting supplemental appropriation de-appropriating $510,006 of the General Fund restorations to the Department of Children, Youth and Their Families to restore reductions to Grants for the Arts in the General Services Agency, City Administrator for FY 2009-2010. (Reference No. 20090721-001)  (5)

From Clerk of the Board, submitting Form 700 Statement of Economic Interest for Victor Lim, Assuming Office, Legislative Aide to Supervisor Chiu.  (6)

From Capital Planning Committee, submitting recommendations for the following resolutions: adopting Local Goals and Policies for Mello-Roos Districts; (2) accepting and expending American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 Energy Efficiency Conservation and Block Grant Funds; and (3) accepting and expending American Recovery and Reinvestment Act grant funds for Runway Overlay and Reconstruction. Copy: Each Supervisor, Budget and Finance Clerk (7)

From Office of the Controller, regarding the audit review for the Office of Citizens Complaints. Copy: Each Supervisor  (8)

From Dr. Ahimsa Sumchai, regarding the State law that requires all fitness and recreation centers to maintain an automatic defibrillator. (9)

From Arts Commission, responding to inquiry on the possibility of providing a long-term or permanent display of the statue of Thomas Starr King in City Hall. (Reference No. 20090609-003)  (10)

From Office of the Treasurer, submitting the investment activity (for fiscal year to date) of the portfolios under the Treasurer’s management.  (11)
From Denise D’Anne, regarding Para Transit and our air quality in San Francisco. (12)

From Office of the Controller, submitting their monthly overtime report listing the five City departments using the most overtime in the preceding month. Copy: Each Supervisor, Budget and Finance Clerk (13)

From Office of the Sheriff, submitting letter advising the Board of Supervisors that the daily prisoner population in the county jails has increased almost seven percent in less than a month and over twelve percent since the beginning of the fiscal year. (14)

From Office of the Controller, submitting memo updating the August 4, 2009, preliminary report on the estimated City General Fund impact from adoption of the State budget, in compliance with Section 9.3 of the FY 2009-2010 Annual Appropriation Ordinance. Copy: Each Supervisor (15)

From Department of Public Health, regarding the impact of the enrollment freeze in the Healthy Families Program on San Francisco’s children and youth. (Reference No. 20090721-007) Copy: Supervisor Alito-Pier (16)

From Aaron Goodman, urging the Board of Supervisors to address the inconsistencies in the proposed St. Francis Circle changes, so adequate overall improvements in the M-Line and K-Line trains are implemented so that speed, safety, and reliability do not impact negatively the numerous people whom rely on these transit systems daily. Copy: Each Supervisor (17)

From Roger Rublick, regarding ways to keep Muni safe. (18)

From Patrick Monette-Shaw, submitting opposition to proposal to cut SNF beds until the number of SNF bed cuts at Laguna Honda is revealed. (19)

From Department of the Environment, regarding the Green Purchasing Program in San Francisco. (20)

From Ahimsa Porter Sumchai, regarding the proposed tax on carbonated beverages in San Francisco. (21)

From Francisco Da Costa, regarding endorsing the Precautionary Principle. (22)

From concerned citizens, submitting support for restoring Sharp Park to a natural area. 2 letters (23)

From concerned citizens, submitting support for preserving the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course. 5 letters (24)
From Office of the Mayor, submitting appointment of JD Beltran as a member of the Arts Commission, term ending January 15, 2012. Copy: Each Supervisor (25)

From Abdullah Megahed, submitting copy of letter sent to Mayor Newsom regarding business practices at 990 Polk Street. (26)

From Planning Department, submitting notice of a public hearing on October 15, 2009, regarding California Pacific Medical Center. Copy: Each Supervisor (27)


From Thomas Cole, regarding animal welfare in the Bay Area. (27)

From Bill Quan, submitting opposition to proposed legislation that would prohibit owner move-in evictions of households with a child under the age of 18. File No 090835 (28)

From Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board, submitting the department’s annual statistical report. Copy: Each Supervisor (29)

From State Public Utilities Commission, submitting notice that PG&E has filed an application to recover costs involved with 2011 gas transmission and storage. (30)

From US Army Corps of Engineers, submitting public notice that the US Army Corps of Engineers has re-issued the Army Regional General Permit to authorize fill and dredging activities and work associated with the repair and protection of structures and property, threatened with damage during emergency conditions. (31)

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to the moving $80 million dollars from the public safety budget into other services. (32)

From State Fish and Game Commission, submitting notice of proposed regulatory actions relative to “Sport Fishing Regulations” in California. (33)

From T-Mobile, submitting notification letters regarding placement of cellular site antennas at the following sites: (34)

3097 Turk Street
1502 Noe Street
4400 Pacheco Street
3634-23rd Street
927 Sanchez Street
190-23rd Street
357 Athens
1298 Funston Avenue
1651 Church Street
1594 La Playa Street
2301 Lincoln Way
2379-32\textsuperscript{nd} Avenue
2256 Cabrillo Street
2001 Noriega Street
1290 Clayton Street
2595 Harrison Street
1486-40\textsuperscript{th} Avenue
500 Grove Street
590-4\textsuperscript{th} Avenue
396 Arleta Avenue
735-7\textsuperscript{th} Avenue
1400 La Playa Street
1288-11\textsuperscript{th} Avenue
2209-48\textsuperscript{th} Avenue
2601-46\textsuperscript{th} Avenue
1801-16\textsuperscript{th} Avenue
310 Congo Street
Supervisor Daly,

I am asking you to consider the re-appointment of Ms. Kim Brandon to the Port Commission. She has done an admiral job. I firmly believe that the Port Commission needs experienced people on its commission, people who are dedicated to keeping the port as a viable resource for the city.

The city needs her experience and dedication. She has and will continue to make the city proud of its most beautiful resource. Please reappoint her to the Port Commission.

Thank You,

Willie Kennedy
SF Planning Commissioners, HPC Commissioners, SF Board of Supervisors, SF City Attorney

I will not be able to attend the Thursday Sept. 9th 2009, 1:30pm meeting of the SF Planning Commission. I wanted to submit comments as an individual resident in District 7, in regards to Agenda Item #1 that deals with the review of Demolition Ordinance and Policies. My concerns are;

1) SFSU/CSU masterplan www.sfsumasterplan.org proposes to demolish and affect the masterplanned community of parkmerced. The National Trust for Historic Preservation submitted a memo to the CSU regents in regards to there proposed demolition that it was programmatic, and not project specific to the sites affecting parkmerced as a possible national register candidate.

2) Institutional growth affects neighborhoods in drastic ways, court cases have determined that "fair-share" impacts must be assessed on institutions when they affect communities. This includes HOUSING, OPEN SF TRANSIT, TRAFFIC, TRANSPORTATION etc. The MOU's negotiated between city agencies and SFSU/C ignored the fact that the sale of our prior open space and ammenities, constitutes a "loss-of-use" to the comm No notification or renumeration of any kind was assessed against the SFSU/CSU organization, though we co to have lost a prized ammenity to our community including a neighborhood community building. SFSU impo population in the Parkmerced and Stonestown neighborhoods has not been assessed physically. We noted consistently a large increase in student population, and advertisement by Parkmerced that focused solely on acquiring additional student residents. These impacts are a concern based on housing laws, and equal opportunity statutes, but also the impact on communities when they are not physically ascertainment by city agencies. Parkmerced's increase in student population is noticeable yearly based on the increased enrollment cap, increased costs of UC system programs, and larger "commer" based attendance at universities that affect our infrastructure and neighborhood (parking/traffic/transit/openspace).

3) Demolitions of the size and scale proposed by SFSU/CSU and Parkmerced's "Vision" project www.parkmercedvision.com represent a large scale environmental issue that requires sincere review based on "green" environmental laws passed in regards to adaptive re-use, and preservation as a sustainable alternative to demolition. To date meetings held by SFSU/CSU and Parkmerced have not looked seriously at the adaptive re-use of buildings on site, and any promotion of integrated design into the existing fabric of buildings and sites surrounding and within Parkmerced. To date only one option shown to residents of this community (un-translated) and lacking in visual information to residents has been forwarded by the SF Planning Department to community members to date (2) page document (SF Planning Document was about 73 pages with image/drawings). See also SF Green Building Legislation Passed, as this must be ascertained in terms of affects and determination of waste, based on capital improvements implemented recently, and the total environmental waste produced through demolition immediately after rennovations of units. To date claims have been made by owners of parkmerced on the condition ofthe units, however no formal review or report has been published on the
condition and issues requiring demolition.

4) Discretionary review, would require a building check to determine the tear-down of buildings or housing on site, and there condition. I as an individual and other tenants of parkmerced, cannot file multiple site conditional review or discretionary review filings due to the cost impact alone. It should be reviewed by SF Planning to determine what condition these units are in, since the noted renovations of numerous units by Parkmerced Investors LLC. These renovated units if demolished would only add to environmental issues based on the impact of totally tearing down this area.

5) The need to adequately assess the impacts on rent-control laws, and the affect on units must be determined legally, based on challenges to affordability laws (15% affordable) and other pre-noted projects (Trinity Apartments) where existing tenants were given alternatives that did not provide for equal or similar units, or quality locations in the new buildings built. There would be deep concern for the fact that the Housing Element 2004-2009 updates, and total lack of rental housing being built citywide create a severe problem in relation to providing equal access to the option of rental vs. for-sale units in SF. If we only are building for-sale units, and rental units are not factored into the housing equations at affordable base initial rental levels, we are losing a balanced approach to housing our general population. Parkmerced's proposal for rental units, does not mention the issue of whether they will be perpetual turn-over of units and deregulation of rent-control. Numerous seniors would be given equal units, but there longevity in terms of affordability is in question. The SFSU/CSU impact on Parkmerced and Stonestown apartments has not been reviewed in terms of loss-of renters, and impacts on the rental prices in this district. SFSU students in 2007 came back after summer break to vastly increased prices due to Parkmerced's renovations, which in essence allowed for market rate jumps in prices of rentals, and no de-control standards that would minimize impacts on community or students when people move out and prices are adjusted by the landlord over the base rent-increse amounts set by the rent board.

Institutional Growth, in this district has had a severe negative effect on the communities of parkmerced and stonestown apartments. This effect was never mitigated or negotiated with community representatives. The SF City Attorney can provide a copy or link to the negotiated MOU with SFSU/CSU, which ignores housing, and open space impacts on a residential community. The SFSU Masterplan ignored the overall masterplan of Parkmerced, and the Parkmerced "vision" does the exact opposite by ignoring lands and sites sold off to SFSU/CSU. The complete area of Parkmerced, its total open space, and density, and landscape design by Thomas Dohler Church is unique to San Francisco, and is the most integrated landscape/housing rental housing project built. That institutional growth is being allowed without proper review, and assessment of alternatives and influence on the capital planning for our cities future by the city organizations responsible is critical to ensure adequate review and attention to the effects are ascertained. It is critical to assess and review such demolition and growth concerns, and ensure neighborhood organizations have a say, and impact on the decisions of SF Planning Dept. Committee's to ensure the viability and livability of our communities. Parkmerced and Stonestown represented a large rental population of the city, and essential housing for this district and the western side of SF. It is critical that demolition of sound units such as those in Parkmerced be given extreme review, so that alternatives, and possible equity density issues are addressed so that one neighborhood is not adversely affected by the quantity of growth proposed in one district.
Thank you for seriously considering these issues in your discussion on the demolition ordinance and loss of dwelling units to institutional growth. If SFSU/CSU, and other major institutions are not placed in "check" in regards to their impacts, than what space is left for working class communities, and neighborhoods in SF?

Sincerely

Aaron Goodman (Resident District 7, Parkmerced)

Note: I have attached an article for your review and distribution among, the SF Planning Commissioners, Historic Preservation Commission and SF Board of Supervisors. That further provides educational information on Parkmerced and the modern landscapes nationwide that are affected by demolition. It truly was a saddening issue that a public forum such as Architecture and the City (AlA-SF) had the "gardens are for people" tour cancelled due to requests by developers/architects involved in Parkmerced. Educational information on the loss of this site needs to be adequately conveyed to the public, and city, and with most organizations and non-profits strapped by the financial meltdown, its even more important to convey the issues to the public through our elected representatives to ensure adequate review and information be distributed.
Anne Kronenberg
Director of Policy and Planning
Deputy Director of Health
101 Grove Street, Room 310
San Francisco, CA. 94102
415-554-2898
----- Forwarded by Anne Kronenberg/DPH/SFGOV on 09/17/2009 02:41 PM -----

Mitch Katz/DPH/SFGOV
09/17/2009 01:56 PM

To: Anne Kronenberg/DPH/SFGOV@SFGOV
cc: mitch.katz@sfdph.org

Subject: Fw: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - SECOND PAST DUE NOTICE

----- Forwarded by Mitch Katz/DPH/SFGOV on 09/17/2009 01:55 PM -----

Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
09/17/2009 01:37 PM

To: mitch.katz@sfdph.org

Subject: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - SECOND PAST DUE NOTICE

---

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - SECOND PAST DUE NOTICE

If you have already responded, please disregard this notice.
For any questions, call (415) 554-7708.

TO: Mitchell Katz, M.D.
Health
FROM: Clerk of the Board
DATE: 9/17/2009
REFERENCE: 20090721-007

-----

Anne Kronenberg/DPH/SFGOV
09/17/2009 02:44 PM

To: Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Michela Alioto-Pier
cc: mitch.katz@sfdph.org

Subject: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - 20090721-007

---

Anne Kronenberg
Director of Policy and Planning
Deputy Director of Health
101 Grove Street, Room 310
San Francisco, CA. 94102
415-554-2898

sorry for the delay in our response. Attached is Dr. Katz letter responding to Supervisor Alioto-Pier's inquiry.

response to 20090721-007.pdf

-----

Mitch Katz/DPH/SFGOV
09/17/2009 01:56 PM

To: Anne Kronenberg/DPH/SFGOV@SFGOV
cc: mitch.katz@sfdph.org

Subject: Fw: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - SECOND PAST DUE NOTICE

----- Forwarded by Mitch Katz/DPH/SFGOV on 09/17/2009 01:55 PM -----

Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
09/17/2009 01:37 PM

To: mitch.katz@sfdph.org

Subject: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - SECOND PAST DUE NOTICE

---
September 17, 2009

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

Reference Number: 20090721-007

In response to Supervisor Alioto-Pier’s inquiry into the impact of the enrollment freeze in the Healthy Families Program on San Francisco’s children and youth, I am pleased to report that the issue has been resolved at the State level. First Five California contributed 81 million dollars to cover all children statewide ages 0-5. In addition AB 1422 passed the legislature on September 4, 2009 making the program whole through June 30, 2010. Yesterday, at its regular board meeting the Managed Risk Medical Insurance Board directed its single point of entry to start processing applications for children on the wait list starting today. They anticipate it will take 20 days to get through the backlog of 88,000 wait listed kids. Happily, this issue has been resolved at the State, and children in San Francisco will continue to be eligible for comprehensive health insurance.

Sincerely,

Mitchell H. Katz, MD
Director of Health
Healthy Families Update

This morning the Managed Risk Medical Insurance Board voted to drop the waiting list, estimated at 88,000 for the Healthy Families Program, finding that the last minute passage of AB 1422 (Bass) will provide enough money to fund the program at current levels. A $194 million budget cut caused MRMIB to put a freeze on new clients on July 17, and to vote in August to start disenrolling children from Healthy Families. The California First Five Commission attempted to stem the red ink tide by voting to give $18.4 million to Healthy Families. Much of the credit for the successful negotiation of provisions in AB 1422 go to Alameda County’s Dave Kears, who also chairs the state First Five Commission. The legislation raises money by creating a 2.35 percent tax on the gross premiums of companies that manage Medi-Cal insurance plans. The Governor is expected to sign the bill in coming days, which paved the way for this morning’s action by MRMIB. The budget cuts to HF were seen as untenable, unmanageable, short-sighted, and detrimental to children’s health care throughout the state. California’s kids have dodged another bullet, but prepare for another difficult funding round next year.

If you need additional information or have questions, please contact us.

SUTER, WALLAUCH, CORBETT AND ASSOCIATES
I am responding to the "due notice" for the referenced request. I have attached the memorandum from Supervisor Alioto-Pier extending the deadline for this request. We are working with Supervisor Alioto Pier's office on the revised date for responding to the request.

Severin Campbell
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Budget Analyst's Office
(415) 554-7642, ext.230

 Memo from Alioto-Pier.pdf

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

TO: Harvey Rose
Budget Analyst's Office

FROM: Clerk of the Board

DATE: 9/17/2009

REFERENCE: 20090728-001

FILE NO.

Due Date: 8/30/2009
Reminder Sent: 9/17/2009

The inquiry referenced above from Supervisor Alioto-Pier was made at the Board meeting on 7/28/2009 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 and send a copy to the Supervisor(s) noted above.

For your convenience, the original inquiry is repeated below.

Requesting the Budget Analyst to prepare a report on the status of recommendations of its management audit of the Marina Yacht Harbor dated March 10, 2008.
The inquiry referenced above from Supervisor Alioto-Pier was made at the Board meeting on 7/21/2009 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 and send a copy to the Supervisor(s) noted above.

For your convenience, the original inquiry is repeated below.

Please share with us the impact of the enrollment freeze in the Healthy Families Program on San Francisco’s children and youth, and provide policy options to address these impacts.
MEMORANDUM

To: Harvey Rose
   Budget Analyst

From: Michela Alioto-Pier
      Supervisor for District 2

CC: Phil Ginsburg, Recreation and Park Department
    Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Re: Update on Status of Marina Yacht Harbor Fund Audit

Date: August 7, 2009

On July 28, I asked the Budget Analyst to provide a status update on recommendations contained in its management audit on the Marina Yacht Harbor Fund. The Clerk’s Office sent a letter asking for this report to be completed by August 30, 2009.

I hope that the Recreation and Park Department has taken meaningful steps toward implementing your recommendations, so I will convene a meeting with the Department and your staff to discuss these issues prior to publication of the update.

Based on discussions between my staff and your office, I understand that more time will be needed because various employees are unavailable. Therefore, I would ask that we set a new due date after our meeting with Recreation and Park.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Bill Barnes at 415-554-7752.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Clerk of the Board

FROM: Maura Lane, Controller's Office

DATE: Sept. 17, 2009

SUBJECT: Reference # 20090721-001, dated Sept. 17, 2009

To Whom It May Concern:

Supervisor Dufty requested that the Controller prepare a supplemental appropriation to restore Reductions to various Grants for the Arts funded organizations.

The attached legislation was approved by Dennis J. Herrera, City Attorney and the funds certified by Ben Rosenfield, Controller, on July 27, 2009.

Please feel free to contact me at 415-554-7502 if additional information or clarification is required.
Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The uses of funding outlined below are herein de-appropriated to reflect the funding available for Fiscal Year 2009-2010.

### USES De-appropriation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Index Code</th>
<th>Subobject</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1G AGF AAA – GF-</td>
<td>255015</td>
<td>03801 Community</td>
<td>Community Based</td>
<td>$510,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Project-Controlled</td>
<td></td>
<td>03801 Community</td>
<td>Based Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>03801 Community</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total USES De-appropriation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$510,006</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2. The uses of funding outlined below are herein appropriated in the Subobject 03801, Community Based Organization Services, and reflects the projected uses of funding to support Grants for the Arts for the General Services Agency, City Administrator for Fiscal Year 2009-2010.
### USES Appropriation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Index Code / Project Code</th>
<th>Subobject</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1G AGF AAA-</td>
<td>700024</td>
<td>03801</td>
<td>Community Based Organization Services</td>
<td>$510,006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total USES Appropriation** $510,006

Section 3. Pursuant to Section 3.15 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, the appropriation in Section 2 above was previously reduced by the Board of Supervisors during the adoption of the Fiscal Year 2009-10 budget and, therefore, requires a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors for passage.

**Funds Available**

**APPROVED AS TO FORM:**

DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney  
By: [Signature]

Controller  
By: [Signature]  
Date: July 27, 2009

**Supervisor Dufty**  
Board of Supervisors
Date: September 16, 2009

To: Members of the Board of Supervisors

From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Subject: Form 700

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

Victor Lim - Legislative Aide - Assuming
MEMORANDUM

September 14, 2009

To: Supervisor David Chiu, Board President

From: Edwin Lee, City Administrator & Capital Planning Committee Chair

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

Regarding: Recommendation on (1) Resolution Adopting Local Goals & Policies for Mello-Roos Districts; (2) Resolution to Accept-Expend American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) Energy Efficiency Conservation and Block Grant Funds; and (3) Resolution to Accept-Expend ARRA Grant Funds for Runway Overlay and Reconstruction

In accordance with Section 3.21 of the Administrative Code, on September 14, 2009, the Capital Planning Committee (CPC) reviewed materials from the Controller's Office of Public Finance, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), and San Francisco International Airport. The CPC's recommendations are set forth below.

1. Board File Number TBD: Resolution adopting local goals and policies for Mello-Roos Community Facilities Districts and Special Tax Financing Districts.

   Recommendation:
   Support adoption of the resolution, with the following amendment:

   The Street lighting item in the bulleted list of eligible public facilities at the top of page 2 of the Local Goals & Policies document (Board File # _____) be revised to “Street lighting, pedestrian amenities.”

   Comments:
   The CPC recommends approval of this item with the aforementioned amendment by a vote of 10-0.

   Committee members or representatives in favor include: Edwin Lee, City Administrator; Gary Hoy, Department of Public Works; Darton Ito, Municipal Transportation Agency; Alicia John-Baptiste, Planning Department; Harlan Kelly, SFPUC; Cindy Nichol, San Francisco International Airport; Tina Olson, Port of San Francisco; Rhoda Parhams, Recreation and Parks Department; Nadia Sesay, Controller's Office; and Greg Wagner, Mayor’s Budget Director.
2. Board File Number TBD:  Resolution authorizing SFPUC to accept-expend $7,739,300 in ARRA Energy Efficiency & Conservation Block Grant Funds.

Recommendation: Support adoption of the accept-expend resolution.

Comments: The CPC recommends approval of this item by a vote of 9-0.

Committee members or representatives in favor include: Edwin Lee, City Administrator; Gary Hoy, Department of Public Works; Darton Ito, Municipal Transportation Agency; Harlan Kelly, SFPUC; Cindy Nichol, San Francisco International Airport; Tina Olson, Port of San Francisco; Rhoda Parhams, Recreation and Parks Department; Nadia Sesay, Controller’s Office; and Greg Wagner, Mayor’s Budget Director.

3. Board File Number 091035: Resolution authorizing San Francisco International Airport to accept-expend $11,000,000 in ARRA grant funds for the overlay and reconstruction of Runway 1R-19L.

Recommendation: Support adoption of the accept-expend resolution.

Comments: The CPC recommends approval of this item by a vote of 9-0.

Committee members or representatives in favor include: Edwin Lee, City Administrator; Gary Hoy, Department of Public Works; Darton Ito, Municipal Transportation Agency; Harlan Kelly, SFPUC; Cindy Nichol, San Francisco International Airport; Tina Olson, Port of San Francisco; Rhoda Parhams, Recreation and Parks Department; Nadia Sesay, Controller’s Office; and Greg Wagner, Mayor’s Budget Director.
Lennar meets first SNAG before the SF - Bay Conservation and Development Commission:

AUDIT FOLLOW-UP MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 17, 2009

TO: Joyce M. Hicks, Executive Director, Office of Citizen Complaints

FROM: Tonia Lediju, Director of Audits, City Services Auditor

SUBJECT: Results of Follow-up Review for Audit of the OCC

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Controller’s City Services Auditor (CSA) Division issued an audit report in January 2007, Weak Case Management and Organizational Issues Degrade the OCC’s Performance, on which it followed up in 2009. In response to the follow-up, the Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC) indicates that it has fully or partially implemented the majority of the 45 audit recommendations made by the Controller’s City Services Auditor (CSA) Division, including the 38 recommendations directed solely to the OCC. In April 2009, the OCC reported progress indicating that it had fully implemented 18 (47 percent), partially implemented 11 (29 percent), and not yet implemented 9 (24 percent) of these 38 recommendations.

Of the 8 selected recommendations for which this follow-up assessed evidence of implementation, 4 are fully implemented and 4 are partially implemented. As a result of the audit recommendations being implemented, the OCC’s operations should be more efficient, effective, transparent, and compliant with City laws and policy.

BACKGROUND & METHODOLOGY

The OCC was established in 1983 as the result of a voter-initiated charter amendment that was adopted in November 1982. The OCC’s main functions are to receive, investigate, and make findings on complaints against members of the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD).

In accordance with Government Auditing Standards, Section 8.05, promulgated by the United States Government Accountability Office (GAO), CSA conducted a follow-up review of the agreed-upon recommendations for the audit report of January 24, 2007, Weak Case Management and Organizational Issues Degrade the OCC’s Performance. Section 8.05 states the purposes of audit reports include facilitating follow-up to determine whether appropriate corrective actions have been taken. This follow-up determined whether the OCC has taken the corrective actions needed to implement the audit report’s...
recommendations, with the goal of improving the OCC’s performance. CSA requested that the OCC report its progress on each recommendation, and the OCC’s director did so in writing. This follow-up then verified the OCC’s reported progress on eight judgmentally selected recommendations that address a variety of OCC responsibilities. CSA did not test the OCC’s compliance with all of its newly implemented procedures. However, future audits of the OCC will incorporate review of its compliance with these new procedures.

To conduct the follow-up, CSA met with key OCC personnel to discuss the status of the corrective actions taken to date and, for the eight recommendations selected for this follow-up, obtained documentary evidence, verified the existence of processes that have been established, and documented the results of our fieldwork.

RESULTS

In its 2007 response to the audit report, the OCC concurred or partially concurred with all 45 of the report’s recommendations, including 7 recommendations not directed solely to the OCC. (These 7 recommendations are directed to the Police Commission, SFPD, or to both the commission and SFPD.) Of the 38 recommendations directed solely to the OCC, it concurred with 36 and partially concurred with 2 in 2007.

In response to this follow-up, the OCC reported to CSA implementation progress for each recommendation as of April 2009. For the audit’s 38 recommendations directed solely at the OCC, CSA interpreted the information the OCC provided to indicate that the OCC has:

- Fully implemented 18 (47 percent) of the recommendations.
- Partially implemented 11 (29 percent) of the recommendations.
- Not implemented 9 (24 percent) of the recommendations.

Of the 8 recommendations assessed in this follow up:

- 4 have been fully implemented.
- 4 have been partially implemented.

See the attached schedule for details of the status of the 8 recommendations for which CSA performed detailed follow-up work.

We extend our appreciation to you and your staff who spent time working with us to answer our questions. If you have any questions or concerns, please call or e-mail Audit Manager Mark Tipton at (415) 554-7660 or Mark.Tipton@sfgov.org.

cc: Police Commission
    Ben Rosenfield, Controller
    Robert Tarsla, Deputy Audit Director
    Mark Tipton, Audit Manager
    Edvida Moore, Associate Auditor
ATTACHMENT A: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit Report Rec. #</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>2009 Status per OCC</th>
<th>Auditor’s Follow-up Work</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To avoid potential legal challenges, the OCC and SFPD should complete the investigation and discipline notification process within the one-year statute of limitations. The OCC should aim to complete investigations within nine months (the guideline for sustained cases in San Francisco Charter Section 4.127), and no later than ten months.</td>
<td>The OCC’s chief investigator and senior investigators are routinely using the case-tracking system to monitor ... cases approaching the six- and eight-month mark. The OCC is unable to complete investigations of some cases within nine months because of factors beyond its control, such as “tolling provisions” in state law that create exceptions to the one-year statute of limitations.</td>
<td>Reviewed charts in the OCC’s 2008 Annual Report concerning the time it took to close all cases and the time it took to close cases in which an allegation was sustained (“sustained cases”).</td>
<td>Partially implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The OCC reports that it uses its best efforts to complete sustained investigations and submit cases to the SFPD within nine months, but does not do so for two-thirds of sustained cases. Of the total of 1,095 cases the OCC reports that it closed in 2008, 830 cases (76 percent) were closed within nine months, while 265 cases (24 percent) took more than nine months to close. Of these 265 cases, 138 (13 percent) took more than a year to close. In contrast, of the 43 sustained cases reported as closed in 2008, only 14 (33 percent) were closed within nine months, while 29 (67 percent) took more than nine months to close. Of these 29 sustained cases, 8 (19 percent of all sustained cases) took more than a year to close.
To meet the notification requirements of San Francisco Charter Sec. 4.127, the OCC should:

a. Develop a standard notification letter to send the SFPD when cases will take longer than nine months. If the investigation will close soon and it will be less efficient to send files in advance of the case, the letter should specify when information will be sent to the SFPD.

b. Develop a centralized system (using the case tracking system, if practicable) to keep a record that the SFPD was notified at the nine-month point for sustained cases taking more than nine months to close.

Note: Charter Sec. 4.127 requires that, if the OCC is unable to finish its investigation within nine months of receiving the complaint, the OCC, within the 9-month period, must provide the police chief with the reasons why, along with evidence from the investigation.

The OCC has developed a standard letter to give the police chief advance notice that a sustained case will not be closed within nine months of when the OCC received it.

Reviewed OCC file containing copies of 12 notification letters.

The casework summaries are now linked to the database and can be accessed through the database.

Observed while an OCC employee used an OCC computer to demonstrate that the OCC's case summaries are now linked to its case-tracking system database.

The OCC reports that all investigators have access to the database, and there is a link to a digital voice-recorder that allows them to hear taped interviews.

Partially implemented

The OCC developed a standard notification letter and files copies of them once sent, but has not sent them promptly. As of April 27, 2009, the OCC had issued 12 such letters, 6 dated in 2008 and 6 dated in 2009. According to the OCC director, the intent was to give the police chief notice, at least three months before the one-year statute of limitations expires, that a pending sustained case will not be resolved within the required nine-month period. However, only two of the 12 letters were dated within nine months of the complaint. The other 10 letters were dated from 260 days (9.3 months) to 338 days (11.3 months) after the complaint date.

Implemented
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit Report Rec. #</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>2009 Status per OCC</th>
<th>Auditor's Follow-up Work</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The Police Commission should amend Res. 97-04, to require that the OCC add to the Keane Report the length of time each case has been open. The report should list the cases chronologically.</td>
<td>The Keane Report is made to the Police Commission quarterly. It provides the length of time each case has been open, and is organized from the oldest to the newest case.</td>
<td>Reviewed Keane Report dated March 31, 2009;</td>
<td>Partially implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although this recommendation was not addressed to the OCC, it made efforts to implement it. The Keane Report shows cases opened by calendar year. It includes open and closed cases. The cases are listed chronologically, and the number of days to close a case is shown. For all cases, the report shows the number of days between key milestones (i.e., complaint received, intake done, review done, and director’s signature). However, the length of time each open case has been open is not shown. The OCC can fully implement this recommendation simply by adding a column to the report showing the number of days cases have been open.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit Report Rec. #</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>2009 Status per OCC</th>
<th>Auditor's Follow-up Work</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>The OCC should schedule and conduct annual performance goal setting and appraisals of its employees.</td>
<td>By the fall of 2008, the OCC had adopted performance plans for all employees for calendar year 2008. The OCC will have all employees' appraisals completed by April 30, 2009.</td>
<td>Consulted Controller's data showing the OCC's 36 budgeted full-time equivalent positions, by job class, for fiscal year 2008-09. On May 6, 2009, the OCC provided a list of the 34 employees it considered subject to the calendar year 2008 performance goal setting and appraisal process. The list was reasonable in that it only excluded the director and an employee who, according to the OCC, was on an extended leave. Reviewed the signature page of each completed appraisal for 2008. Also reviewed the current performance plans of the OCC's active employees.</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The OCC finished 2008 appraisals for all but four of its employees, and there were reasonable explanations for those four. Specifically, one employee was hired late in 2008 so was not yet due for an evaluation, two employees were on medical leave, and one employee's performance plan was being "modified to reflect accommodations." As of fall 2008, the OCC had adopted performance plans for all its active employees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit Report Rec. #</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>2009 Status per OCC</th>
<th>Auditor's Follow-up Work</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>The OCC should comply with its reporting requirements, and post the reports on its website as they are issued.</td>
<td>The OCC complies with its reporting requirements and posts its reports on its website.</td>
<td>Reviewed OCC’s website. Reports posted there include: 1. 2008 Annual Report (includes the Keane Report). 2. Quarterly Comprehensive Statistical Reports to the Board of Supervisors, mayor, Police Commission, and police chief. Note: the quarterly report meets most of the OCC’s reporting requirements. It includes the number and type of complaints filed – as incorporated in the Keane Report (per Sec. 4.127 of the City Charter). It also addresses policy recommendations to the SFPD (per Police Commission resolution 27-06).</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In addition to the reports on its website, the OCC provides to the SFPD quarterly reports for the Early Warning System; however, those are not posted on-line because they contain confidential information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Report Rec. #</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>2009 Status per OCC</td>
<td>Auditor’s Follow-up Work</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>The OCC should develop and present to the Police Commission an annual outreach strategic plan that identifies: (a) Planned outreach efforts. (b) Strategies for reaching targeted audiences. (c) Strategies for measuring its outreach success.</td>
<td>The OCC created an annual community outreach strategic plan in 2008. The OCC director reports at least monthly on the OCC’s outreach activities. The OCC will report on its progress in achieving its 2008 goals in its 2009 annual Community Outreach Strategic Plan.</td>
<td>Reviewed the OCC’s 2008 Community Outreach Strategic Plan, dated April 2008.</td>
<td>Partially implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>The OCC should include in its annual report data from its intake log on the language spoken by complainants.</td>
<td>The OCC reports data on complainants’ language spoken in its annual report. See the 2008 annual report, page 19 of Appendix A.</td>
<td>Reviewed the OCC 2008 Annual Report.</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The plan identifies the OCC's outreach goals and planned efforts, and strategies for reaching its target audiences, including means of communicating, publicity, and distribution. However, the plan does not identify strategies for measuring the success of its outreach efforts. The plan states that the "OCC will design and implement tools to measure the effectiveness of its outreach program" and "...will evaluate its outreach efforts, and set goals and strategies for the upcoming year."

Verified that Appendix A, page 19, of the OCC 2008 Annual Report lists all the languages in which complaints were made to the OCC in 2008. These were English, Cantonese, Mandarin, Spanish, and Russian.
ATTACHMENT B: OCC'S RESPONSE

THE POLICE COMMISSION
OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Joyce M. Hicks
Executive Director

September 4, 2009

Ms. Tonia Lediju, Director of Audits
City Services Auditor
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Rm 316
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Re: OCC Response to the Controller's August 27, 2009 Draft Memorandum on the Results of the Follow-up Review of Audit of the OCC

Dear Ms. Lediju:

Introduction

This letter serves to respond to the Controller’s August 27, 2009 draft memorandum on the follow-up review of the January 27, 2007 audit of the OCC. This letter will only address the four recommendations identified by the Auditor as partially implemented. The OCC appreciates the work of the City Services Auditor in evaluating OCC's progress toward achieving compliance with recommendations made in the Auditor’s January 27, 2007 report on the operations of the Office of Citizen Complaints. I began my tenure with the OCC on November 27, 2007 and from that time I have overseen a comprehensive implementation of those recommendations. As interpreted by the auditor, the OCC has fully or partially implemented 75% of the auditor’s recommendations. The OCC will continue to address the implementation of the auditor’s recommendations.

By distilling the 35 recommendations in the 2007 audit report, 37 of which apply directly to the OCC, I determined that the three largest challenges for OCC were leadership, staffing and case management. I have vigorously responded to those challenges. On April 26, 2008 the OCC held an all staff retreat to focus on its charter mandated mission to promptly, fairly and without bias investigate civilian complaints of police misconduct. I implemented weekly management meetings and regular staff meetings. Additionally, by the end of 2008, after an aggressive recruiting effort I hired five new investigators. The OCC investigator staff grew from 12 to 17. Finally the OCC implemented performance plans and appraisals in 2008.

1. Case Management – Audit Report Recommendation #2
   In 2008, the OCC had only 12 veteran investigators. Although the OCC hired five new
investigators in 2008, they did not achieve full caseloads until the second quarter of 2009 because they were provided several months of training. The OCC received 1021 complaints in 2008 and had a backlog of cases that included three year old cases. The 12 veteran investigators had an average caseload of 64 cases. The January 27, 2007 audit report refers to a best practices caseload of 16 cases per investigator. Despite these challenges, in 2008 the OCC cleared its backlog of old cases from 2005, 2006 and 2007. By the end of 2008, the OCC also closed 61% of its 2008 cases.

The follow-up audit report relies on the 2008 annual report data to measure the OCC's compliance with timeliness for closing cases and issuing sustained reports. At the time of the follow-up audit, the OCC's first quarter 2009 statistical report was available but not analyzed by the auditor and it reflects a very different picture. It shows that 87% of OCC's closed cases were closed within 270 days and that 54% of its sustained cases were closed within 270 days. No sustained cases were closed after 365 days. The second quarter 2009 statistical report was not available during the review period as the audit review period concluded prior to June 30, 2009. The improvement in the second quarter of 2009 is nearly equal to the first quarter of 2009 with 83% of the cases closed closing within 270 days and 57% of its sustained cases closing within 270 days. No sustained cases were closed past 365 days.

2. Notification Letters for Sustained Cases Older Than 270 Days – Audit Report Recommendation #8

The OCC agrees that sustained report notification letters for sustained cases older than 270 days must be sent by the 270th day. The excessive caseloads of the investigators during 2008 interfered with their ability to identify some sustainable cases in a timely manner. The OCC continues to refine its case management through closer supervision and the use of its database's 6 month and 8 month aging reports to identify sustainable cases. The OCC has revised its database to include an entry for the date the notification letter was sent and it also identifies the date of the ninth month on the front of its case files. Also, with a trained staff of 17 investigators in 2009, the OCC was able to provide these letters to the police chief in an average of 9.3 months as compared to an average of 10.1 months in 2008.


The OCC has fully implemented the auditor’s recommendations to enhance the Keene Report. The cases are listed chronologically and the number of days to close a case is shown as are the number of days between key milestones. The OCC revised the Keene Report on August 28, 2009 to include a column showing the number of days cases have been open. A copy of the revised report is attached.

4. Community Outreach Strategic Plan – Audit Report Recommendation #35

In 2008 the OCC developed its first community outreach strategic plan. The plan incorporated the recommendations in the 2007 audit recommendations. The 2009 plan describes which 2008 goals were accomplished. The 2009 plan is available on the OCC's website. The 2008 plan provides that the OCC will develop survey tools to measure the
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effectiveness of its outreach efforts and set goals for the next year. By using an instructor
evaluation form, for several years, the OCC has measured its effectiveness at the Police
Academy course it teaches on OCC functions. The OCC has developed two additional survey
tools, one a self evaluation when the outreach does not lend itself to audience
evaluation and another evaluation to be completed by the audience if the outreach is in
a classroom setting. The OCC will use these tools to assess the effectiveness of its
outreach and provide the results in its 2010 community outreach strategic plan.

Conclusion

The OCC will continue its implementation of the recommendations contained in the 2007
audit report to assist it in achieving its Charter mandate of conducting prompt, fair and unbiased
investigations of civilian complaints of police misconduct and making policy recommendations
on police policies and practices.

Sincerely,

Joyce M. Hicks
Executive Director
Office of Citizen Complaints

cc: Mark Tipton
From: asumchai@live.com
To: jdiaz@sfchronicle.com; letters@sfchronicle.com; forum@sfchronicle.com; asumchai@live.com; home@pros.forg; communityfirstcoalition@yahoogroups.com
Subject: NCAA: Right track...wrong direction!
Date: Mon, 14 Sep 2009 20:27:06 -0700

The NCAA is on the right track in its efforts to mandate preparticipation physical exams (PPE's) and screenings for high risk conditions in college athletes. Wrong direction though if they are focused on a genetic trait that resulted in nine deaths over the last decade. Genetic screening tests cost about a thousand dollars a run. They raise ethical issues of ethnic and racial discrimination that are the substance of science fiction novels.

Sudden cardiac death claims the lives of about 100 young athletes each year in the United States. It is most often due to hypertrophic cardiac myopathy, an enlargement of the inner wall of the ventricle that obstructs the outflow of blood and lead to cardiac arrest. While that number seems small these deaths are often witnessed by thousands of spectators and claim the lives of our nation's finest athletes. There are several others causes of sudden cardiac death among athletes and the good news is that we can save almost all of them! Over 75% of the conditions that cause cardiac arrest in athletes can be detected on a simple EKG...a study that costs about $50. Athletes in cardiac arrest can be saved if colleges, fitness centers and recreational centers invest in a simple device...
called an automatic defibrillator that costs about $1200.

In Italy, home of the ancient Olympiad, not only are PPE's and screening EKG's mandatory, if a young athlete dies of a cardiac arrest civil and criminal consequences can be pursued.

Ahimsa Porter Sumchai, M.D., NSCA-CPT
Sports Medicine and General Practice
Certified Nutrition Consultant
319 West Portal Avenue
San Francisco, Calif. 94127
(415) 835-4763

AHIMSA PORTER SUMCHAI, M.D.
Board of Supervisors Inquiry - Reference: 20090609-003

Original Inquiry:

Requesting that the Art Commission and City Hall Preservation Advisory Commission to report to the Board of Supervisors on the possibility of providing a home to the statue of Thomas Starr King that was recently removed from the U.S. Capitol.

The statue of Thomas Starr King is slated to be displayed in the U.S. Capitol through 2010 and then its future to be determined.

Could the statue be brought to City Hall for long-term or permanent display?

Response:

Thomas Starr King (1824-1864) was a San Francisco Unitarian minister, abolitionist and patriot whose fiery eloquence is credited with helping keep California in the Union during the run-up to the Civil War. San Francisco already has a significant monument to Thomas Starr King in the Civic Art Collection, which is similar in character to the work at the U.S. Capitol. Dedicated in 1892, the existing monument is the work of sculptor Daniel Chester French (the same artist created the Abraham Lincoln monument in D.C.). The S.F. sculpture is located prominently at the entrance to the Music Concourse at Golden Gate Park, and an image is attached below.

The sculpture from the U.S. Capitol is quite large, and locating it within City Hall would be difficult as well as costly. There are questions as to whether the flooring could support the weight of a life-sized bronze
sculpture with marble plinth. In addition, the Arts Commission in conjunction with the City Hall Preservation Committee, recently passed guidelines stating that the city will only accept commemorative busts and not full figure sculptures permanently sited within City Hall.

San Francisco is charged with taking care of its existing monuments and art collection within an extremely limited maintenance budget. The Arts Commission receives approximately $15,000 annually to maintain the 3,500 artworks in the Civic Art Collection. A loan or gift of this magnitude would have to be accompanied by a significant maintenance endowment in order to allow for the artworks care. Given that two other monuments to Thomas Starr King already exist in San Francisco, and the possible financial constraints, recommending the acceptance of a third monument (even given the historical significance of the figure) is challenging.

Allison Cummings  
Senior Registrar  
Civic Art Collection  
San Francisco Arts Commission  
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 240  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
415-252-2559  
DSCN8904.JPG  
DSCN8906.JPG
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 for 8/31/2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pooled Fund</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest Received</td>
<td>5,333,957</td>
<td>5,963,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Earnings</td>
<td>4,905,843</td>
<td>5,472,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eearned Income Yield</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Age of Portfolio in Days</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funds in the Current Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pooled Fund</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Securities *</td>
<td>2,716,492,145</td>
<td>2,909,252,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Value **</td>
<td>2,718,647,264</td>
<td>2,911,405,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Interest</td>
<td>13,460,829</td>
<td>14,548,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eearned Income Yield</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Cost of Securities" = Current Amortized Book Value
** Less Cash

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 August 31, 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

cc: Harvey Rose, Budget Analyst (w/Enc.)

Ben Rosenfield, Controller (w/Enc.)
Controller – Internal Audit Division - YTD-All Funds, YTD-Pooled Funds
Oversight Committee: J. Grazloll, Dr. Don Q. Griffin, Ben Rosenfield, T. Rydstrom, R. Sullivan
Transportation Authority – Cynthia Fang, San Francisco Public Library – 2 copies
Office Copy
Whether we realize it or not we all need clean air to stay healthy. Some agencies of the city find this idea laughable. One in particular that I have consistently asked to stop destroying our air is Para Transit. Their van drivers have the habit of idling their vehicles while they search out their clients. These very same clients are most in need of clean air as they are old and have multiple problems some relating to breathing.

But here I am concerned about all of humanity having to suffer under our present “do what you like rules”.

All I get from Para Transit are excuses not “we will look for a solution”, but covering your you know what. Bad way to run a society.

All the best,

Denise D'Anne
San Francisco, Ca 94103

CLEAN UP DAYS

Has anyone asked the question who benefits from Community and Beach Cleanup Days: Not you, but the corporations who provide packaging material. These corporations happily support these cleanup days to keep you tethered to their wasteful practices. Corporations need to pay at the front end to discourage excess packaging.
TO: Members, Board of Supervisors
Mayor Gavin Newsom

FROM: Ben Rosenfield, Controller

DATE: September 21, 2009

SUBJECT: Monthly Overtime Report (Administrative Code Section 18.13-1)

Administrative Code Section 18.13-1, enacted through Ordinance No. 197-08, requires the Controller to submit a monthly overtime report to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor's Budget Director listing the five City departments using the most overtime in the preceding month.

**July 2009**
The five City departments using the most overtime for July 2009 were: (1) Municipal Transportation Agency; (2) Fire; (3) Police; (4) Public Health; and (5) Sheriff. Collectively, these five departments averaged 6.7% overtime versus regular hours and accounted for 88.6% of the total Citywide overtime for the month. This data includes pay periods ending July 10, 2009 and July 24, 2009.

**August 2009**
The five City departments using the most overtime for August 2009 were: (1) Municipal Transportation Agency; (2) Fire; (3) Public Health; (4) Police; and (5) Sheriff. Collectively, these five departments averaged 7.1% overtime versus regular hours and accounted for 88.1% of the total Citywide overtime for the month. This data includes pay periods ending August 7, 2009 and August 21, 2009.

**Fiscal Year 2009-10 To-Date**
The five City departments using the most overtime cumulatively for the fiscal year were: (1) Municipal Transportation Agency; (2) Fire; (3) Public Health; (4) Police; and (5) Sheriff. Collectively, these five departments averaged 6.9% overtime versus regular hours and accounted for 88.3% of the total Citywide overtime for the two month period from July 2009 through August 2009. The attached graph shows overtime hours for these five departments from July 2008 through August 2009.

**A Note about Regular Hours**
In FY 2008-09, "Regular Hours" only included hours for those employees that worked overtime during the given pay period. Beginning FY 2009-10 (pay period ending 7/10/09), "Regular Hours" includes hours for all employees within a given department, (i.e. those who did and did not work overtime). There has been no change in the way overtime hours and overtime pay are calculated.
Please contact me at (415) 554-7500 if you have any questions regarding this overtime information.

cc: Greg Wagner, Mayor’s Budget Director
Harvey Rose, Budget Analyst
Gail Johnson, Clerk, Board of Supervisors’ Budget and Finance Committee
Sonali Bose, Finance Director, Municipal Transportation Agency
Ken Bukowski, Finance Director, Police Department
Deborah Landis, Senior Analyst, Police Department
Gary Massetani, Deputy Chief of Administration, Fire Department
Mark Corso, Budget Manager, Fire Department
Gregg Sass, Finance Director, Department of Public Health
Jenny Louie, Budget Manager, Department of Public Health
Maureen Gannon, Budget Manager, Sheriff
### Appendix 1: Monthly Overtime Report

#### July 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Regular Hours</th>
<th>Overtime Hours</th>
<th>Percentage Overtime vs. Regular Hours</th>
<th>Percent of Total Citywide Overtime</th>
<th>Overtime Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>655,925</td>
<td>63,804</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>2,994,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>250,518</td>
<td>31,655</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>2,099,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>382,784</td>
<td>12,551</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>1,058,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>807,147</td>
<td>11,972</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>552,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>144,681</td>
<td>8,688</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>521,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,241,054</strong></td>
<td><strong>128,850</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>88.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,227,104</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### August 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Regular Hours</th>
<th>Overtime Hours</th>
<th>Percentage Overtime vs. Regular Hours</th>
<th>Percent of Total Citywide Overtime</th>
<th>Overtime Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>733,610</td>
<td>77,954</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>3,692,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>286,750</td>
<td>38,428</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>2,529,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>941,332</td>
<td>15,694</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>733,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>438,137</td>
<td>13,966</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>1,335,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>166,324</td>
<td>10,613</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>947,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,566,154</strong></td>
<td><strong>156,854</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>88.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,938,030</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Fiscal Year 2009-10 Total To-Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Cumulative Regular Hours</th>
<th>Cumulative Overtime Hours</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage Overtime vs. Regular Hours</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent of Total Citywide Overtime</th>
<th>Cumulative Overtime Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>1,389,232</td>
<td>141,724</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>6,656,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>536,284</td>
<td>70,062</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>4,629,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>1,747,643</td>
<td>27,666</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>1,285,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>819,023</td>
<td>26,517</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>2,394,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>310,941</td>
<td>19,681</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>1,169,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,803,122</strong></td>
<td><strong>285,669</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>88.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,165,134</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overtime Hours by Department, July 2008 to August 2009

- MTA
- Fire
- Public Health
- Police
- Sheriff

Number of Overtime Hours (in thousands)
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Dear President Chiu and Supervisors:

I write to advise you that the daily prisoner population in the county jails has increased almost seven percent in less than a month and over twelve percent since the beginning of the fiscal year. The jails are now regularly housing three hundred more prisoners daily than when the fiscal year began. This has required me to open additional housing units in the jail system since a U.S. District Court case decision rendered in September 2007, prohibits housing prisoners on the floor in any county jail.

The budget approved by the Board of Supervisors was based on the premise that six (6) housing units would remain closed the entire fiscal year. On July 1, 2009, seven (7) housing units accounting for three hundred eight-four jail beds were closed. On August 7, 2009, I ordered a forty-eight (48) bed unit opened. Since late August, I have opened four (4) additional housing units, which is an additional two hundred sixteen jail beds. I currently have two (2) sixty-person dormitories closed.

The increase in the daily jail population is attributable to more arrests and fewer releases. The Police Department and the District Attorney’s Office may be able to provide you with more specific information about these trends.

This dramatic increase in the jail population will not only necessitate the release of the reserve placed on my budget but will almost assuredly require supplemental funding to safely operate the jails and staff the additional housing units.
I will work with the Mayor’s Office to determine our budget needs based on the increased jail population. I am available to discuss these issues with you at anytime.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL HENNESSEY
Sheriff

enclosures:

cc: George Gascon, Chief of Police
    Kamala Harris, District Attorney
    Rebekah Krell, Mayor’s Budget Office
    Ben Rosenfield, Controller
    Greg Wagner, Budget Director
Jul 1  1828
Jul 2  1815
Jul 3  1806
Jul 4  1841
Jul 5  1889
Jul 6  1933
Jul 7  1891
Jul 8  1869
Jul 9  1828
Jul 10 1834
Jul 11 1836
Jul 12 1867
Jul 13 1912
Jul 14 1911
Jul 15 1883
Jul 16 1862
Jul 17 1864
Jul 18 1861
Jul 19 1901
Jul 20 1927
Jul 21 1904
Jul 22 1899
Jul 23 1899
Jul 24 1904
Jul 25 1876
Jul 26 1902
Jul 27 1936
Jul 28 1909
Jul 29 1904
Jul 30 1894
Jul 31 1888
average  1880

SF County Jail Population
July 2009

- SF County Jail Population
- 1988 = maximum capacity without CJ #5 West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul 1</td>
<td>1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2</td>
<td>1815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 3</td>
<td>1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 4</td>
<td>1841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 5</td>
<td>1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 6</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 7</td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 8</td>
<td>1869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 9</td>
<td>1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 10</td>
<td>1834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 11</td>
<td>1836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 12</td>
<td>1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 13</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 14</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 15</td>
<td>1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 16</td>
<td>1862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 17</td>
<td>1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 18</td>
<td>1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 19</td>
<td>1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 20</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 21</td>
<td>1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 22</td>
<td>1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 23</td>
<td>1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 24</td>
<td>1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 25</td>
<td>1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 26</td>
<td>1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 27</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 28</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 29</td>
<td>1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 30</td>
<td>1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 31</td>
<td>1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>1880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SF County Jail Population
August 2009

- SF County Jail Population
- 1988 = maximum capacity without CJ #5 West

Aug 1 1868
Aug 2 1904
Aug 3 1949
Aug 4 1934
Aug 5 1933
Aug 6 1932
Aug 7 1965
Aug 8 1942
Aug 9 1987
Aug 10 2011
Aug 11 1980
Aug 12 1973
Aug 13 1931
Aug 14 1937
Aug 15 1914
Aug 16 1977
Aug 17 2018
Aug 18 2003
Aug 19 1995
Aug 20 1967
Aug 21 1973
Aug 22 1963
Aug 23 2013
Aug 24 2075
Aug 25 2052
Aug 26 2060
Aug 27 2037
Aug 28 2028
Aug 29 2022
Aug 30 2079
Aug 31 2139
average 1986
SF County Jail Population
September 2009

- SF County Jail Population

1988 = maximum capacity without CJ #5 West

| Sep 1  | 2120 |
| Sep 2  | 2113 |
| Sep 3  | 2060 |
| Sep 4  | 2057 |
| Sep 5  | 2045 |
| Sep 6  | 2095 |
| Sep 7  | 2138 |
| Sep 8  | 2186 |
| Sep 9  | 2194 |
| Sep 10 | 2137 |
| Sep 11 | 2135 |
| Sep 12 | 2106 |
| Sep 13 | 2145 |
| Sep 14 | 2175 |
| Sep 15 | 2182 |
| Sep 16 | 2171 |
| Sep 17 | 2172 |
| Sep 18 | 2169 |
| Sep 19 | 2155 |
| Sep 20 | 2187 |
| Sep 21 | 2223 |
| Sep 22 |
| Sep 23 |
| Sep 24 |
| Sep 25 |
| Sep 26 |
| Sep 27 |
| Sep 28 |
| Sep 29 |
| Sep 30 |
| average| 2141 |
This memo updates our August 4, 2009 preliminary report on the estimated City General Fund impact from adoption of the State budget, in compliance with Section 9.3 of the FY 2009-10 Annual Appropriation Ordinance (AAO).

As shown in the attachment, our updated estimate of the State budget impact to general fund programs is $26.5 million, down from $36.7 million in our draft report. The reduced projected impact is primarily due to updated figures on the formulas used to allocate cuts to Human Services programs, and updated information on program reductions received by the Department of Public Health. In addition, the California Legislature acted to restore funding for the Healthy Families program, eliminating a potential requirement of $2.2 million to backfill those services in San Francisco.

The FY 2009-10 budget includes a set-aside of $18.0 million for potential State revenue reductions. Accordingly, net additional local budget solutions of $8.5 million would be required if the City chose to reinstate all services impacted by the State budget reductions.

The State’s plan to shift Redevelopment property tax increment funds was listed in our preliminary report as having a potential general fund impact of $14.3 million. This proposal is the subject of litigation by the California Redevelopment Association. In any case, based on conversations with staff, we anticipate that the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency would be able to make the payment from fund balance and through financing options without requiring additional current property tax increment funds or other general fund support. However, spending on some Agency programs planned in the current year might be delayed.

The State’s plan to borrow 8% of property tax funds from local jurisdictions under the provisions of Proposition 1A was listed in the preliminary report as having a potential general fund impact of $71.2 million, with additional potential impacts to the MTA of $9.0 million, and to the Library Fund, Children’s Fund and Open Space Fund of a combined total of $13.7 million. Plans by the State to make financing available through a joint powers authority have progressed, and we believe that the interest rate authorized by the State of up to 8% (tax-exempt) is likely to be more than sufficient to attract market interest. Accordingly, we are currently confident that the property tax borrowing can be financed at little or no City general fund cost. Such financing would require Mayor and Board approval. Therefore, this report projects no impact from the borrowing of...
property tax to the general fund, Municipal Transportation Authority or special funds (Library, Children’s Fund and Open Space Fund).

In accord with the Administrative Provisions of the Annual Appropriation Ordinance (AAO), the Mayor’s Office is required to issue a report to the Board of Supervisors outlining a plan to address the shortfall within 21 days of the date of this report (by Monday, October 5th). The Controller’s Office will submit an ordinance reflecting reductions to appropriations proposed by the Mayor’s plan. The AAO provides that reductions proposed by the Mayor in his plan shall not take effect for 45 days during which the Board of Supervisors is in session, to allow for the Board to adopt or amend the ordinance or to take no action.

Note that the Controller’s Office will provide updated projections for other major revenue streams supporting the City’s budget, including property taxes, payroll taxes, sales tax and hotel tax, in our Six Month Report, scheduled for early February 2010. We may provide earlier ad-hoc notifications to the Mayor and Board of significant changes to those projections as circumstances require.

If you have any questions, please contact me or Monique Zmuda, Deputy Controller, at (415) 554-7500.

Attachment
# FY 2009-10 Estimated Local Impact of July 2009 State Budget Adjustments

## General Fund Savings/(Cost), $M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>8/4/09 Preliminary</th>
<th>9/14/09 Update</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Medi-Cal reductions</td>
<td>(8.6)</td>
<td>(8.1)</td>
<td>This includes 3 components: miscellaneous Medi-Cal reimbursement reductions totaling $6.0M, a 50% State Department of Mental Health Managed Care allocation reduction totaling approximately $1.3M, and a 10% cut in reimbursements for drug and alcohol programs, totaling approximately $800K, and a $33K cut for perinatal Medi-cal services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Office of AIDS reductions</td>
<td>(4.6)</td>
<td>(4.2)</td>
<td>Includes $2.4M cut in State funding for HIV Education and Prevention (out of a total budget of $2.9M), plus cuts in State funding and reallocation of federal Ryan White funding for HIV Health Services netting to $1.8M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminates funding for Prop 36 Substance Abuse Treatment &amp; Substance Abuse Offender Treatment</td>
<td>(2.9)</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
<td>The State funding reduction is $2.9M, which is expected to be partially offset with new federal (Byrne) funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced state support state support for Healthy Families</td>
<td>(2.2)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>This State action would have cut insurance for 600K children statewide. However, the program now appears to be restored statewide to its prior level, from a combination of $81M committed by First Five California, along with new funds recently restored by the Legislature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elimination of Prop. 99 funds for County Health Services</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>This reduction represents a passthrough from the State to the San Francisco emergency room physicians. Based on estimated prior year actuals, the funding includes $867K to community physicians (i.e., all emergency rooms other than San Francisco General Hospital (SFGH)), and $217K to University of California physicians who work in SFGH's emergency room. There is also a reduction of $100K in administrative overhead paid to DPH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elimination of funds for Immunization Program; Maternal, Child and Adolescent Health Program; and Children's Dental Disease Prevention Program</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
<td>This reduction includes all State general fund support for the Immunization Program ($250K); Maternal, Child, and Adolescent Health programs ($280K); and Children’s Dental Disease Prevention ($60K). In addition, the MCAH program funding is used to draw down $300K in federal Medi-Cal funding which was not reflected in the preliminary estimate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal - Public Health (20.1) (16.4)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>8/4/09 Preliminary</th>
<th>9/14/09 Update</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IHSS eligibility reductions.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
<td>The initial estimated savings of $4.1M GF savings (offset by $1M in lost DPH funding) was based on a reduction in IHSS service hours by approximately 2 million hours, effective September 1, 2009. As of mid-September, however, the State has done nothing to implement the reduction. As a result, we can not quantify savings to the General Fund at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalWORKs: Welfare to Work employment services and childcare services cuts</td>
<td>(9.0)</td>
<td>(2.9)</td>
<td>Based on updated information on funding formulas, the Department has reduced their forecast of the anticipated impact to $2.9M, of which $2.8M is related to a 26% reduction in the State allocation for CalWORKs Stage 1 Childcare direct subsidies and other provider assistance, with the remaining $100K cut coming from the Employment Services allocation. The Department anticipates that direct childcare subsidy cuts could be met by voluntary reductions for some families who meet exemption categories. The other provider support funds are currently spent on Mental Health Child Care Consultation to Centers ($1.5M), Health Consultation (through DPH) ($500K), Facilities Fund administration and center start-up grants ($700K), Capacity Grants for Peer Support ($72K), and other provider support programs ($72K).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANF Shelter Funds and Subsidized Employment - Maintenance of Effort Requirement</td>
<td>(2.8)</td>
<td>(3.5)</td>
<td>This item is related to State budget language limiting the amount of maintenance-of-effort (MOE) funds that the State would supply to meet requirements to draw down federal stimulus funds. The State has not provided final figures as to the remaining potential County MOE requirement, but the Department estimates the potential impact at $1.4M of family shelter funds, $1.4M in rental assistance funds and $0.7M in subsidized employment funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS: Child Welfare Services Allocation reduction and adjustments to provider rates</td>
<td>(4.5)</td>
<td>(2.9)</td>
<td>Based on updated information on the State's funding formulas, the Department has reduced the anticipated State impact for these items to $2.9M, including a $1.7M reduction to the State's Child Welfare Services (CWS) allocation (equivalent to approximately 30 social worker positions when loss of federal matching funds is also taken into account), a reduction of $540K to the Transitional Housing Program-Plus adjustments to provider rates for emancipated foster youth (equivalent to annual funding for 23 youth out of 127 currently served), and an estimated $1.1M in reduced payments to adoptive parents, foster care group homes and foster family agency providers serving approximately 800 youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medi-cal Administration 6.7% Cut and potential cuts to CalWIN and CWS/CMS welfare information systems maintenance allocations</td>
<td>(2.4)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>HSA now expects no impact as CWDA predicts the cut will offset caseload-driven allocation growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate California Department of Aging support for Linkages case management program and Community Based Services Programs, including Alzheimer's Day Resource Center, Brown Bag, Respite Purchase of Services and Senior Companion Programs</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>Based on more recent information, the Department has reduced the estimated impact of these State cuts from $500K to $300K. This includes the entire State allocation of $160K for the period beginning October 1, 2009 for the Linkages case management program currently serving 157 clients, and $240K in reductions for the other community-based services programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Human Services Agency</td>
<td>(16.1)</td>
<td>(9.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Item</td>
<td>8/4/09 Preliminary</td>
<td>9/14/09 Update</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court furloughs 1 day/month - Security Services Contract</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td>Court furloughs reduce need for Sheriff’s security services, and thus reduces the work order recovery available to the Sheriff from the Court. The estimated impact to the Sheriff’s budget is a loss of ~$500K. The impact may be reduced if the Sheriff can redeploy resources to jails to reduce overtime requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court furloughs 1 day/month - Impact on jail population</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Court furloughs will increase the amount of time certain individuals will need to be held in jail pending court hearings. The fiscal impact is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State reductions to Corrections budget that may result in earlier releases</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>As of this writing, the California Legislature has not passed a specific plan to meet reduction targets for the State Corrections budget. However, based on current proposals, the Sheriff’s Department does not anticipate significant increased general fund costs directly related to this item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of prisoners to county jails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Excluding Property Tax Shifts</td>
<td>(36.7)</td>
<td>(26.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Redevelopment Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redirect $29 million in property tax increment from Redevelopment Agencies</td>
<td>(14.3)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>This provision would shift $28.7 million in FY 09-10 and $6 million in FY 10-11 from San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA) property tax increment funds to support State funding for schools, and also extends existing redevelopment areas by one year to support financing of the payments from the additional future property tax increment. The California Redevelopment Association has sued, challenging the legality of the fund shift under the State constitution. The SFRA reports that even if the State prevails and the shift goes forward, they would be able to make the payment through use of existing fund balance and borrowing without requesting additional current property tax increment or City General Fund support. However, SFRA has stated they are considering delaying projects to free up financing capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8% Property Tax Borrowing by State under Proposition 1A authority</td>
<td>(71.2)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>As of this writing, the preparations for financing through a joint powers authority appear to be sound, and the State has authorized a maximum interest rate (up to 8.0%, tax-exempt) that appears to be more than high enough to attract sufficient market interest. Accordingly, we are confident this item can be financed without significant cost to the general fund or other funds benefitting from property taxes. The City may finance an additional $13.7 million for property tax set-asides to the MTA, Library Fund, Children’s Funds and Open Space Fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROJECTED CITY IMPACT</td>
<td>(122.2)</td>
<td>(26.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In response to Supervisor Alioto-Pier’s inquiry into the impact of the enrollment freeze in the Healthy Families Program on San Francisco’s children and youth, I am pleased to report that the issue has been resolved at the State level. First Five California contributed 81 million dollars to cover all children statewide ages 0 – 5. In addition AB 1422 passed the legislature on September 4, 2009 making the program whole through June 30, 2010. Yesterday, at its regular board meeting the Managed Risk Medical Insurance Board directed its single point of entry to start processing applications for children on the wait list starting today. They anticipate it will take 20 days to get through the backlog of 88,000 wait listed kids. Happily, this issue has been resolved at the State, and children in San Francisco will continue to be eligible for comprehensive health insurance.

Sincerely,

Mitchell H. Katz, MD
Director of Health
To sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org  
cc cac@sfmta.org, roberta.boomer@sfmta.org, mtaboard@sfmta.org, board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org, olivia.scanlon@sfgov.org  
bcc


Supervisor Sean Elsbernd, SFMTA, SFMTA CAC, and SF Board of Supervisors;

Due to a prior meeting scheduled by the PRO board we will be unable to attend the meetings of the SFMTA scheduled for the 15th, and the noted meeting invite from Supervisor Elsbernd for Sept.17th. I am writing to you as an individual resident of this district, and not as a member of the PRO Board of Directors, to ensure our comments are incorporated and adequate comments and principals of the issues we have, with the proposed changes, and cuts in our service are addressed.

It is a critical point that we have submitted on more than one occasion, the issue of access, frequency, capacity, and safety the issues related to the M-Line and 17-Parkmerced Bus line as a critical lifeline for many seniors, students, and working families in district 7. Many disabled tenants have been affected by the 17-parkmerced bus cuts. Transit shelters, are lacking or non-existent, and there is no direct noted accessible route to the SF Muni platform, due to lacking curb-cuts from multiple areas of the Parkmerced site.

The delays caused by this construction will affect many people who rely on transit to pick up children, and get to essential services in this area.

We have noted prior based on reports and media notices the lack of adequate services on the M-Line and 17-Parkmerced, both of which are proposed for cut-backs in services based on the SF Muni TEP project. I have addressed this issue to Supervisor Elsbernd prior, and the concerns and need for systemwide review in the western district neighborhoods is required (north-south) direction especially since 19th avenue is the only notable route connecting residents north to south in the sunset.

We feel we as a community are being adversely targeted, and affected by these consistent cuts, and negotiations (such as the MOU with SFSU/CSU) that ignore the impacts of these institutional growth, and masterplanning projects.

When transit is cut from service on the 17-Bus and other lines that provide access to cultural and local community/commercial areas, business suffers, and community members resort to automobiles as a last resort.

It is key to address such issues as the "right-of-way" of transit across 19th Ave (M-Line) towards SF State and Parkmerced as part of the "speed-up" of trains in this area. The St.Francis Circle and right of way for trains at Ocean Ave and 19th needs to be addressed along with the extension of the rail to the Daly City Bart at the 1952 Interchange at Brotherhood Way and...
Junipero Serra Blvd.
The proposed shift of these lines within Parkmerced represents something that the majority of neighborhoods in SF would be distinctly opposed to based on noise, and impacts on the community.

The safety issues alone at SFSU/Parkmerced are a severe issue that has not garnered the full attention of the SFMTA Board, or Supervisor. The ticket purchase booths are frequently out of order, and the lines for purchasing tickets, often lead to congestion and hazardous situations for riders. We had suggested prior shifting the ticket purchase locations to both sides of 19th Avenue at least temporarily, or providing relied on the platform by opening the opposite end to a cross walk (similar to the downtown stations). This would relieve the passenger congestion and extremely unsafe conditions for seniors, families, children and students on the platform at rush hour.

Such basic changes need to be implemented, along with any major change, or maintenance program for the tracks. The lack of any mention of the "right-of-way" signaling and improvements that could be done simultaneously on 19th ave, due to the current upgrading of light traffic features seems the most obvious component lacking from the improvements implemented.

Please address these inconsistencies in the proposed St.Francis Circle changes, so that adequate overall improvements in the M-Line and K-Line trains is implemented so that speed, safety, and reliability does not impact negatively the numerous people whom rely on these transit systems daily..

The number and scale of development projects and proposals should not be the only "Option" in terms of transit and proposed benefit to the public. It should be a plan deemed supportive of community needs in these neighborhoods.

Sincerely

Aaron Goodman (resident Parkmerced, District 7)
To
Board of Supervisors
San Francisco, California

Regarding, Keep Muni Safe

Roger Rublick
San Francisco, Calif.
September 15, 2009

The Municipal Transit System should check
terminal points for vehicles, driver rest areas,
and remove alcohol from these rooms as
needed. It should never be there.

The women who create these conditions
try to push alcohol onto the drivers. They
ask them if they would like a drink. These
women are from all races and from OT
to 0%.

Sometimes the drivers, men or women, are in such
a condition that they cannot do their work.
They do not turn up for their roles.

The Police should share an interest in keeping
these places straight. Pour out the alcohol.

The People of the city also have an interest in
keeping alcohol out of such places.

This is a public offense, a disturbance
of driver safety conditions. The people who do
this should be arrested and detained and
removed from the state.

The Stewart Street Terminal is the baddest
one. There are more than five such places.

Keep Muni Safe,

Roger Rublick
September 16, 2009

San Francisco Planning Commission and Health Commission:

Enclosed is my testimony to the Planning Commission regarding CPMC's plans to drastically curtail its skilled nursing bed presence in San Francisco. Before the Planning commission makes any decisions, I hope you will read the enclosed testimony and attachments.

Notably ...

San Francisco’s Health Commission — relying too heavily on the Mayor’s Long-Term Care Coordinating Council’s recommendation to convert LHH from a medical model of care to a “social wellness” model of care — appears to be abdicating its responsibility to fully assess the capacity of skilled nursing beds needed in San Francisco.

They plan to do this in the absence of forming a special "Blue Ribbon Committee for LHHs Future" to consider the impacts, and mistakes, of further cutting LHHs skilled nursing beds.

If Laguna Honda converts another 120 beds to other behavioral-health "mixed" uses and CPMC is permitted to eliminate 178 of its SNF beds, San Francisco stands to lose almost 300 SNF beds at a critical moment in City history.

I strongly urge the Planning Commission to reject CPMC’s plans to eliminate 178 of its SNF beds from San Francisco’s critically-ill and dwindling stock of hospital-based and free-standing skilled nursing facility beds. CPMCs plans to close 178 SNF beds should not be approved until the Planning Commission is informed about just how many additional SNF beds at LHH will be converted into “behavioral health” beds.
After all, just how many skilled nursing beds can be cut year in and year out, before we don't have enough left at all to care for San Franciscans who need them?

Sincerely,

Patrick Monette-Shaw
To BaS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
--- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 09/22/2009 12:20 PM ----- 

"Chris Geiger & Jessian Choy, SF Dept. of Environment"  
<jessian.choy@sfgov.org>
09/21/2009 01:23 PM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject SF Green Purchasing Program News: Disinfectants, Food, Toner, Fertilizers, Computers and more

If you cannot click hyperlinks in this email, visit:

SF Green Purchasing Program News from SF Dept. of Environment

1. What is "SF APPROVED"?
2. New requirements for City Deps. for computers and computer servers.
3. Mayor's Executive Order on Healthy and Sustainable Foods
4. New products to try: compost & fertilizer, toners, reusable moving boxes, disinfectants,
5. Summary of All SF Approved Green Products & Services
6. Battery recycling bins & posters: How to recycle almost everything
7. Sign up for a green purchasing presentation

1. What is "SF APPROVED"?
The San Francisco Department of the Environment maintains the SF APPROVED Catalog as one-stop shop for over 1,000 green products, city-approved vendors, and summaries of City mandates. We choose the best of the best ecolabels and environmental specifications, based on the City's commitment to the Precautionary Principle and extensive input from City staff. Many of you tested and approved those products.

Our criteria for SF Approved products are:

1) Performance. We usually rely on reports/requests from City staff, or reviews by other agencies to tell whether a product really works or not.
2) Impact (Environmental and Health.) We set the bar high for environmental and public health protection.
3) Cost. We don't review prices ourselves. But many SF Approved products are listed on citywide contracts, which means they have been subject to a competitive bidding process.

Although specifically intended for City & County of San Francisco government purchasers, everyone is welcome to use what we've found. According to SF's Precautionary Purchasing Ordinance (2005), and Executive Order 08-02, City funds (including Delegated Departmental "Prop Q" purchases) may only be used for Approved products & services listed in the SF Approved Green Catalog (sfenvironment.orq/sfapproved).
2. New Requirements for Computers & Servers
In March 2009, SF became the first city to require City Depts. to buy energy-efficient servers that meet Climate Savers and/or Energy Star standards which would help slow climate change. Laptops, desktops, monitors must meet the EPEAT Gold standard for energy-efficiency and use of less toxic & more recyclable materials. Order through vendors on the citywide term contract by calling the SF Purchasing Dept. at (415) 554-6743.

3. Mayor's Executive Order on Healthy and Sustainable Foods
In July 2009, Mayor Newsom announced the first comprehensive food policy for the City which addresses, hunger, healthy food planning and procurement for City Depts., food production on city owned land and more. The Executive Order and supporting materials are available here. SF City Depts. purchasing food for events or meetings using city funds are required to use guidelines for purchasing healthy, locally produced and/or sustainably certified foods to the maximum extent possible. Click here for city-approved vendors & caterers of local organic food: sf.gov/site/uploadedfiles/sffood/policy_reports/cityvendorlist1008.pdf

4. New Products City Depts. Are Encouraged To Try
City Depts. are encouraged (but not required) to try “Suggested” products in the SF Approved Green Catalog, such as compost & fertilizer, toners, moving services, disinfectants. Suggested products mean that we've reviewed them and they're safer and more environmentally preferable than comparable products.

Compost & Fertilizer from recovered organic materials from yard & food waste, manure, biosolids compost can improve soil quality and productivity as well as prevent and control erosion. Use compost produced by your department or buy locally-produced compost made from recovered organic materials. Click for compost vendors (ask if they are city-approved): epa.gov/epawaste/conserve/tools/compdatabase.htm

Several of you asked us to research safer fertilizers. We suggest that you buy fertilizers certified by OMRI, which are based on the USDA National Organic Program Rule. These products do not include high levels of heavy metals or concentrated chemical fertilizers, lowers the risk of groundwater pollution, and are healthier for soils. Click for fertilizer vendors (ask if they are city-approved): omri.org/OMRI_products_list.php

Remanufactured Toner Cartridges
They help reduce landfill waste and save money. Laserlink International has been awarded Term Contract 96704-C for all new and remanufactured toner and inkjet cartridges, for all departments (excluding the Mayor’s Office). Click here to order: https://dl.getdropbox.com/u/492461/toner%20contract%206704-C%20%28How%20to%20order%29%208-24-09.doc

Reusable Moving Boxes
If you're planning to move your office, using reusable plastic crates can reduce the time and cost to order and recycle cardboard boxes. Thanks to the SF Real Estate Dept. for letting us know this service worked out well for one of their moves. City-approved vendor(s) include Rent-A-Crate, 800-427-2832; possibly others.

Safer Disinfectants
Disinfectants are among the most hazardous cleaning products. Hydrogen peroxide-based disinfectants and thyme oil-based products show the highest potential for reducing risks to workers and the environment. Based on positive experiences by the SF Unified School District and other agencies, SFE added three peroxide-based disinfectants by Johnson Diversey:
5. Summary of All SF Green Products & Services

Check out the Catalog ([sfenvironment.org/esfapproved](http://sfenvironment.org/esfapproved)) to find vendors for:

1. **Automotive Equipment & Supplies** - (e.g., degreasers, reusable shop towels, lead-free wheel weights)
2. **Automotive Vehicles**
3. **Batteries** - Try hybrid rechargeables, which can last up to a year between charges, much longer than ordinary rechargeables. Rechargeables must be used unless batteries are needed as backup for emergency equipment.
4. **Building Materials**
5. **Computer Equipment**
6. **Copiers, Printers, Faxes, Scanners**
7. **Food**
8. **Foodware** (compostable or recyclable) - Styrofoam is prohibited because it is not easily recycled and contains suspected carcinogens.
9. **Fuel, Lubricants, Oil**
10. **Furniture**
11. **Janitorial Cleaners**
12. **Janitorial Equipment**
13. **Janitorial Papers**
14. **Janitorial Services**
15. **Landscaping Products**
16. **Lighting** (bulbs/lamps, ballasts, fixtures)
17. **Machinery Parts Degreasers** (for generator parts, air pumps, HVAC & compressor parts)
18. **Moving Services & Boxes**
19. **Office Paper** (Copier & Bond - 100% postconsumer recycled, and processed chlorine-free). Chlorine bleaching can release carcinogenic dioxins and furans into wastewater.
20. **Office Supplies** - Try markers that are less toxic and can replace permanent & whiteboard markers; keyboard dusters that do not contain greenhouse gases that can cause climate change.
21. **Paint & Lacquer Thinners**
22. **Paint/Graffiti Removers**
23. **Paints**
24. **Pest Management** - Check out updated tips; who to call for pest problems; SF Reduced Risk Pesticide List (for anyone using pesticides for properties owned by or leased from the City).
25. **Toner Cartridges**
26. **Water Dispensers**
27. **Wood**

6. Battery Recycling Bins & Posters For Who to Call to Recycle Almost Everything

Wonder who can recycle your department's appliances, automotive products, batteries, chemicals, electronics, lighting, toner cartridges? They are illegal to put in the trash. [Click here](https://sfetoxicsreduction.wufoo.com/forms/order-form-for-signs-bins-for-sf-city-depts) to order bins & posters, or find out who to call.

7. Tell us how we can meet your needs.
• Sign-up for an interactive presentation on green purchasing and/or hazardous waste management:  http://sfetoxicsreduction.wufoo.com/forms/training-on-green-purchasing-recycling-toxics
• Take this survey:  http://sfetoxicsreduction.wufoo.com/forms/survey-to-improve-the-sf-green-purchasing-program

Spread the word
• Forward this email to people that need this information.
• If someone forwarded this email to you, click here to receive important news and events.

Questions? Check out the SF Approved Catalog (page 6) to find out who to contact.

Thank you for protecting our health and environment.

Jessian Choy & Chris Geiger
Green Purchasing, Integrated Pest Management, Toxics Disposal Program for City of SF Depts.
SF Dept. of Environment
(415) 355-3700
Dear Supervisor Elsbernd,

I would like to work with your office toward implementation of the tax on carbonated beverages that has been offered by Mayor Newsom, an idea I campaigned on during my run for Mayor in 2007. The "fat tax" proposal was documented on the candidate interview web sites of the SF Bay Guardian and the San Francisco Chronicle newspaper. I am disappointed that the mayor continues to engage in self promotion of ideas proposed by others. This legally constitutes plagiarism. From the plastic bag legislation, to Healthy San Francisco and Sunday Streets, the mayor has a clear track record of using the ideas of others to promote his political agenda.

AHIMSA PORTER SUMCHAI, M.D.

---

Dear Editors,

I wish to correct you on the misinformation you included in the article, "Study reignites push for soda fee", dated 9/18/09. Mayor Newsom did not "first pitch the fee idea in 2007". The proposal for a "fat tax" on foods with low nutritional value including carbonated beverages was a key plank in my platform for Mayor of San Francisco in 2007. As a certified nutritionist, physician and personal trainer, I posted my platform issues on my web page and the specific idea to enact a "fat tax" was documented on the San Francisco Chronicle web site and discussed during a candidate interview with the editorial board.

The "fat tax" was not my brain child, nor was it the brilliant creation of Mayor Newsom who has a track record of stealing and implementing the ideas and constructs of other and claiming to be their creator.

The British Parliament enacted a "fat tax" on unhealthy foods in 2006.
Do we really embrace and endorse the Precautionary Principle when it comes to our children?


Francisco Da Costa
Thank you for taking the first step to transform our publicly owned land at Sharp Park from an exclusive, underused, and budget-breaking golf course into a community-centered model for endangered species recovery, natural flood control, outdoor recreation, and sustainable land use.

I strongly support Supervisor Mirkarimi's proposed ordinance to transfer Sharp Park to the National Park Service as part of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area or to jointly manage the park with the Park Service. The ordinance would also require the city's Recreation and Parks Department to develop a plan, schedule, and budget for restoring Sharp Park habitat for endangered species on the site, a welcome change from the mismanagement of recent years. I urge the city and county of San Francisco to restore Sharp Park as a coastal lagoon and wetland habitat for endangered species. Please follow through by passing this important legislation.

Sharp Park Golf Course has a long history of environmental problems because of its poor design and unfortunate placement on a coastal lagoon. The course has had problems with flooding and drainage ever since opening, and the Department has created new and significant environmental impacts. The current operation of the golf course harms wetland habitat and causes illegal take of two federally listed species, the California red-legged frog and the San Francisco garter snake.

The golf course is a significant money-loser for San Francisco that makes no sense to maintain at a time when the city has cut the Recreation and Parks Department staff and the long-term golf prospects at the site are slim. Combine that with the problems with endangered species, wetland destruction, flooding, and sea-level rise, and it is clear that restoration of Sharp Park to a natural state is the best option for the area.

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

San Francisco's 2004 recreational study shows that the number-one recreational demand in San Francisco is more hiking and biking trails -- and golf came in 16th. San Francisco already has six public golf courses, and about 50 other golf courses are within a 45-minute drive of Sharp Park. Restoring Sharp Park will help meet recreational demand through hiking and biking trails, picnicking spots, camping facilities, a world-class nature center, a gateway to the San Mateo County Golden Gate National Recreation Area lands, and educational opportunities sorely needed in San Mateo County. Restoration will also ensure the continued existence and abundance of endangered species at Sharp Park.

Please transfer Sharp Park to the National Park Service or jointly manage the property with the Service to restore Sharp Park as a coastal lagoon and wetland habitat for endangered species.
Robin Davis
West Chester, PA 19382
To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
subject Restore Sharp Park

As a former resident of Pacifica (40 years), I urge you to restore Sharp Park golf course as "a sustainable use" so that humans, the garter snake, and the red-legged tree frog may live in peace with each other.

I have taken part in several ecological drives, most recently the transferal of Mori's Point to the Golden Gate National Seashore. Far too many other proposed projects proved stalking horses for residential or business development. A number of them have pillaged Pacifica's natural beauty.

The present proposals for Sharp Park golf course strike me as being among the latter.

[I can think of no more absurd use for Sharp Park golf course than . . . a camp ground! With the narrow accesses into the golf course? You must be joking!]

Bring ordinary people to the golf course, and make sure that the habitat is maintained.

[Again, the Golden Gate National Seashore would seem a better idea.]

Sincerely,

Alex Fraser
San Francisco, CA 94109
Dear Mayor Newsom, Mayor Lancelle, Honorable Supervisors and Commissioners,

I am a San Mateo resident, and associate Editor of a major California Golf Magazine. I have written and published on the Sharp Park historical treasure. I join thousands in the Bay Area in writing to urge you to preserve the historic 18-hole Sharp Park Golf Course.

Sincerely Robert Weisgerber, Golf Today Magazine. Thank you!

[INSERT PERSONALIZED MESSAGE HERE]
MEMORANDUM

Date: September 24, 2009
To: Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors
From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Subject: APPOINTMENT BY THE MAYOR

The Mayor has submitted an appointment to the following Commission:


Under the Board’s Rules of Order, a Supervisor can request a hearing on an appointment by notifying the Clerk in writing.

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

Please notify me in writing by 2:00 p.m., Tuesday, September 29, 2009, if you wish this appointment to be scheduled.

Attachments
September 23, 2009

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

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Pursuant to the Charter Section 3.100 (17), I have appointed JD Beltran as a member of the Arts Commission effective today, September 23, 2009. JD Beltran will fill a seat that was previously held by Alex Lloyd, and the term of JD Beltran will expire on January 15, 2012.

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

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

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom  
Mayor
September 23, 2009

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

I hereby appoint JD Beltran to serve as member of the Arts Commission for a 4-year term commencing September 23, 2009, in accordance with the 1996 Charter, Section 3.100, (17).

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

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

Gavin Newsom
Mayor
JD Beltran
531 Utah Street
San Francisco, CA 94110
415.864.0444 studio, 415.786.6906 cell
jdbeltran@moc.com
website: www.jdbeltran.com

Education
B.S., University of Oregon
J.D., University of California, Berkeley
School of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston
M.F.A., San Francisco Art Institute, May 1998

Awards and Residencies

2009 Award by Public Art Network: "Downtown Mirror," commissioned by the City of San Jose, recognized as one of the most outstanding Public Art Projects in the United States for 2009
2009 Creative Quarterly Award in Photography, to be published in CQ issue 17
2009 Marcus Visual Arts Fellowship and Residency, Montalvo Arts Center, Saratoga, California
2009 Selected to write "City Brights," blog column on art and culture for the San Francisco Chronicle online version, sfgate.com
2008 Selection for Central Subway Artist's Pool, San Francisco Arts Commission Public Projects
2007-09 Individual Artist Commission, Cultural Equity Grants, San Francisco Arts Commission
2007 Nominee, Eureka Fellowship, Fleishhacker Foundation
2006-08 Public Art Commission for "Who's on First, What's on Second" City of San Jose Public Art Project
2007 Graduate Faculty Award, Most Outstanding Graduate Faculty Member 2006-2007, San Francisco Art Institute
2007 Artist's Pool (Pre-Qualified), San Francisco Arts Commission Public Projects
2005 Nominee, SECA Award, San Francisco Museum of Modern Art
2004 Nominee, Eureka Fellowship, Fleishhacker Foundation
2003 Nominee, SECA (called INSITE) Award, San Francisco Museum of Modern Art
2002 Silver Award, 2002 Interactive Media Design Review, Installation Category, I.D. Magazine
2002 Teaching Residency, the Oxbow School, Napa, California
2002 Finalist, Bay Area Award Show, New Langton Arts, San Francisco, California
2002 Nominee, SECA Award, San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, San Francisco, California
2001 Artist in Residence and Solo Exhibition, Bellevue Art Museum, Bellevue, Washington
2001 Associate Artist, Atlantic Center for the Arts, New Smyrna, Florida
2000 Holter Museum of Art Annual Juried Exhibition Honorable Mention, Helena, Montana
1999 Artadia (then called ArtCouncil) Artist's Grant, San Francisco, California
1998 Skowhegan School of Painting and Sculpture, Summer Residency, Skowhegan, Maine
1998 David McMillan Award for Most Outstanding Exhibition, San Francisco Art Institute Master of Fine Arts Exhibition
1998 Judith Banks Memorial Award, San Francisco Art Institute

Academic Experience

2002-present Chair, Post-Baccalaureate Program, San Francisco Art Institute, San Francisco, CA
2007-present Faculty, San Francisco Art Institute, Film, New Genres, Interdisciplinary Studies, Critical Studies, and Urban Studies Programs
2009-present Columnist, "Art & Culture Fix," City Brights Blog for online edition of the San Francisco Chronicle, SFGate.com
2004-2005 Video Arts and Fine Arts instructor, TODCO, San Francisco, CA
2003 Visiting artist lecturer, California College of Art, Oakland, CA
2002-03 Art Instructor, The Arc, San Francisco, CA
2002 Visiting artist lecturer, The Oxbow School, Napa, CA (May)
2001 Visiting artist lecturer, Bellevue Art Museum, Bellevue, WA (September)
2001 Guest lecturer, University of California, Berkeley Fine Art Department, M.F.A. program, Berkeley, CA (May)
2000 Visiting artist lecturer, San Francisco Art Institute Friday Lecture Series, San Francisco, CA (March)
1998-98 Adjunct Faculty, Golden Gate University School of Law, San Francisco, CA
Selected Solo Exhibitions

2010  Material Language, Meridian Gallery (first floor), San Francisco, California (January – April)
2009  The Magic Story Table: Cleveland (installation) Public Art Installation commissioned by the Cleveland IngenuityFest
2009  The Magic Story Table: 49 Stories (installation), Public Art Installation commissioned by the City of San Francisco, shown at 826 Valencia, San Francisco, California (February-March)
2007-09 Downtown Mirror (installation), Public Art Installation, City of San Jose (October 2007 through December 2008)
2003  Twenty-One Secrets (installation), Mezzanine Gallery, San Francisco, California (July)
2000  Portraits, Blue, Byron C. Cohen Gallery, Kansas City, Missouri (September-November)
1999  Details, Haines Gallery, San Francisco, California (November-December)
1999  Portraits, San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery, San Francisco, California (August)

Selected Group Exhibitions

2010  Unexpected Reflections, Meridian Gallery, San Francisco, California (January)
2009  The Best of New York, Part 1, New York, New York (September)
2008  IngenuityFest, Cleveland, Ohio (July)
2008  subZero, San Jose, California (June)
2008  Cantocore: Free On Board, Mission 17 Gallery, San Francisco, California (Feb-April)
2007  Plant Lives, Garages Biennale, San Francisco, California (curatorial project) (November-December)
2007  Downtown Mirror, San Jose California (temporary public art installation for the City of San Jose), (October 2007 -2008)
2007  Mastercopies, Colorline, Oslo, Norway (permanent installation) (June – present)
2007  The Ingenuity Festival, July 19-22, Cleveland, Ohio (July)
2007  SFAI Now, Market Street Gallery, San Francisco, California (May)
2006  San Francisco Camerawork, [Annual Auction], San Francisco, CA (December)
2005  Stanlee's Brain, Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, Annual Artist Ball and Auction, San Francisco, CA (October)
2005  ISEA/ZeroOne Festival, C4F3, San Jose Museum of Art, ISEA 2006- Zero One San Jose Festival, San Jose, California (August)
2005  Bedtime Stories, Limn Gallery, San Francisco, CA (August)
2005  Alien Presence H - [handmade echo], First Draft Gallery, in conjunction with the Sydney Biennale, Australia (June)
2005  Momentum, Southern Exposure Auction and Exhibition, San Francisco, CA (May)
2005  Peer Pleasure 1, (reading), Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, San Francisco, California (February)
2004  Biennale for Electronic Arts, Perth, Australia (September-November)
2004  San Francisco Arts Commission Exhibition and Benefit 2004, San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery, CA (Oct.)
2004  Creature Comforts, New Langton Arts, San Francisco, CA (December)
2004  San Francisco Art Institute Art Auction 2004, San Francisco Art Institute, San Francisco, California (March)
2004  Love and Other Difficulties, Axon Theatre (independent Exposure Series), Houston, TX (Feb)
2004  Main Street Micrcinemas, Houston Downtown Entertainment Development Association Screening, Houston, TX (Feb)
Images of Desire 3, Artwalk Amsterdam, Platform Jonas Sniider, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, (June-August)

Self-Projected: The Moving Image as Self Portrait, (three-screen video installation), Mezzanine Gallery, San Francisco, California (June)

Single Channel: Collaborating with the Moving Image, The Blaffer Gallery, The Art Museum of the University of Houston (April)

ID/Entity: Portraits in the 21st Century, interactive self-portrait installation commissioned by the MIT Media Lab, Cambridge, MA and The Kitchen, New York, NY (curated by Christina Yang and Judith Donath); shown as an interactive DVD at The Beall Center for Art and Technology, University of California, Irvine, and San Francisco Camerawork, San Francisco, CA (January to March)

Self/Projected: The Moving Image As Self Portrait, (video screening), San Francisco Camerawork, San Francisco, CA (March)

Shifting Perspectives: Modern and Contemporary Art from the Collection, Ulrich Museum, Wichita State University (March-present)

New Langton’s 18th Annual Auction and Exhibition, New Langton Arts, San Francisco, CA (December)

Cite Des Ondes Fifth Manifestation Internationale Video Et Art Electronique, Montreal, Canada (September)

The One? (Evening of performances, readings, video and film produced and co-curated with Po Bronson), Grotto Nights, San Francisco Main Library, Koret Auditorium, San Francisco, CA (September)

Independent Exposure, (video screening), Fire Station Gallery, Houston, TX (August)

Independent Exposure, (video screening), 111 Minna Gallery, San Francisco, CA (August)

Yourself - Autoritratto (Self-Portraits), Sesto Senso, Bologna, Italy (July)

Mirror at the Bottom - Artists Portraying Themselves, Le Musee Di-Visioniste, Online Project, NewMediaArtProjectNetwork (July-October)

Identity of Desire 2, The Fields Gallery, Amsterdam, The Netherlands (June-July)

Hi Tech/Low Tech Hybrids: Art in a Digital Age, Bedford Gallery, Dean Lesher Regional Center for the Arts, Walnut Creek, CA (curated by Carrie Lederer) (March to June)

Sixth Annual National Exhibition, Nexus Gallery, New York, NY (curated by Craig Houser, Guggenheim Museum) (May-June)

Art Auction 2002, San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, San Francisco, CA (May)

SoExquisite, Southern Exposure Auction and Exhibition, San Francisco, CA (April-May)

Cinergy 5, The Coach House, Santa Barbara, California (video screening) (March)

All Media Invitationa 2002, Perlod Gallery, Omaha, NE (February)

2001


San Francisco on Edge, The Grotto Series (video screening), San Francisco Main Library, San Francisco, CA (November)

Many Moons, The Hammond Museum, North Salem, New York (curated by Barbara Bloemink) (September to October)

Skowhegan Alumni Exhibition and Auction, Knoedler Gallery, New York, New York (September)

Art Equinox 2001, Paris Gibson Square Museum of Art, Great Falls, MT (August to October)

Realism 01, Perlod Gallery, Omaha, NE (July)

InsideOUT, Atlantic Center for the Arts, New Smyrna Beach, Florida (June)

SYNESTHESIA, Southern Exposure Exhibition and Auction, San Francisco, California (June)

San Francisco Art Institute Art Auction 2001, San Francisco Art Institute, San Francisco, California (March)

ArtCommunication, Sonoma Museum of Visual Art Exhibition and Benefit Auction, Sonoma, California (February-March)

Video and Filmography

2009-10 Material Language [8 mm film, video, currently in progress]
2009 The Magic Story Table: Cleveland (video, sound, digital media)
2009 Airplanes (Cantocore) (16mm film, sound, digital media)
2009 The Magic Story Table: 49 Stories (video, sound, digital media)
2008 Airplanes (16mm film, sound, digital media)
2007-8 Politics, Mud, and Ketchup (video, digital media, sound)
2007-8 Downtown Mirror (video, digital media)
2007-8 Forbidden Fruit (video collaboration) (video, digital media, sound)
2007-8 Mastercopies (video installation, video, digital media, sound)
2007-8 Telephone Story, Redux: A Portrait (interactive artwork) (video, digital media, sound)
2006 Secrets (video installation) (video, sound, digital media)
2006 Alien Presence H – [handmade echo] (international collaboration for an exhibition in conjunction with the Sydney Biennial)
2005 Sixth Street Story (video, digital media, sound)
2004 untitled (sebastien) [Musicbox Portrait Series] (video, sound, digital media)
2003 “I wish to remain anonymous,” (video, digital media, sound)
2003 Twenty-One Secrets (video installation, video, digital media, sound)
2003 Telephone Story: A Portrait (Interactive DVD) (video, digital media, sound)
2002 Telephone Story: A Portrait (Short Version Film) (video, digital media, sound)
2002 The One? (video, digital media, found footage)
Selected Bibliography

2009


“Full Immersion: Public Art Network’s Favorite Bay Area Pieces,” Danielle Sommer, KOED Arts (online), August 8, 2009

“IngenuityFest returns to Playhouse Square,” Bedford Times Register, July 2, 2009

“Notables” at The Chronicle,” Jane Kim, Columbia Journalism Review, May 22, 2009


“cantocore: theory versus reality,” Tanner Menard, Tanner Menard, March 12, 2009

“49 Stories,” The Data Stream (National Association of Artists Organizations web site), March 5, 2009

“Reimagining Public Space - JD Beltran, Johanna Poethig and Matthew Passmore (Rebar),” Networked Performance (research blog), February 11, 2009


“Viewpoint,” Teri Cohn, Artweek, November 2008


“OBAMA WINS! Now the work begins...,” Annie Buckley, zeroDearessart.com, November 5, 2008


“Picks for the Best of 01SJ,” Julia Bradshaw, ArtsHift on San Jose (online publication), June 1, 2008


“Charles Guice and JD Beltran,” Interview by Zefrey Throwell, Frank Prattle, February 2, 2008


“San Jose Debuta Major Temporary Public Art Initiative,” Sys-Con Media, October 25, 2007


“Adding Cool Technology to the Ingenuity Fest,” Karen Sandstrom, The Plain Dealer, April 19, 2007

“JD Beltran and Michael Arcega,” Interview by Zefrey Throwell, Frank Prattle, March 10, 2007

“Secrets Series” goes 4-wheelin”, Susie Gerhard, SF360, February 5, 2007

“ZeroOne/SEIA ///Entre nous,” Susie Gerhard, SF360, August 9, 2006

“ZeroOne Exhibits Get An Early Start,” Jaweed Kalleem, San Jose Mercury News, August 8, 2005


“Ten Astonishing Reasons to Find Your Way to San Jose This Summer,” Marketwire, June 22, 2006


“Artist Goes to Bat for Local Musicians,” Kenneth Baker, San Francisco Chronicle, December 13, 2005

“Losing It,” Christina Ducklow, SFGate.com, Culture Blog, June 23, 2005

“The Oxbow School,” Spark, KOED Television, first aired June 2004

“Buzz Town,” Beth Lillic, SF Gate, July 9, 2003

“Hooked on Classics: New Tech Art is No Longer Just About Technology” Glen Heifand, San Francisco Chronicle, SF Gate, February 27, 2003

“ID/Entity” Images,” Mark Mardon, Bay Area Reporter, February 13, 2003

“Face Forward,” Alison Bing, SFGate.com, February, 2003

“The Message is Medium-Small,” Rebecca Schoenkopf, Orange County Weekly, January 17-23, 2003

2002

"Report From San Francisco," Stephanie Cash, Art In America, November 2002
"Une maison des arts sous le pont Jacques-Cartier," Stephane Baillargeon, Le Devoir, September 10, 2002
"La petite maison sous le pont Jacques-Cartier - sera sauvee," Francois Cardinal, Le Devoir, July 7, 2002
"High Tech/Low Tech Hybrids at Bedford Gallery," Marisa S. Olson, Artweek, June 2002
"Idiot Savant," Marisa Olson, Mule, March 2002
"ID/entity", Barbara Pollack, ArtNews, March 2002
"Mirror, Mirror," Hana Iverson, Afterimage, January/February 2002

2001

"Arise, Armchair Readers!", David Kipen, San Francisco Chronicle, November 11, 2001
"Some Have Turned to Art as Solace," Regina Hackett, Seattle Post-Intelligencer, October 11, 2001

2000

"Thinking Outside the Frame: Artists Explore Extra Room with Electronics, Video and More"
Robin Trafon, Kansas City Star, October 19, 2000

"Bay Area Now II, " kult avanguardie creative, (Italian publication) February 2000

Boards, Panels, and Juries

Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, Board of Directors, May 2007 to present
San Francisco Writers' Grotto, member, April 2002 to present
Artist Legacy, panelist, "The Professional Artist," San Francisco Art Institute, October 2008
Murphy & Cadoghan Award, judge and panelist, June 2007
Bay Area Art Alliance, founding member, January 2006 to 2007
San Francisco Camerawork, Board of Directors, and member, Program Committee, April 2003 to December 2007
San Francisco Media Arts Council (SMAC), Board of Directors, July 2002 to 2005
Murphy Cadoghan Award, judge and panelist, selection committee, May 2007
San Francisco Photo Alliance, panelist, "Are We All Photographers Now?" May 2007
San Francisco Art Commission Gallery, Individual Artist Grant Panel, July 2005
San Francisco Art Commission Gallery, Board of Directors, Exhibition Committee Chair, Sept. 2000 - June 2003
San Francisco Art Institute, Strategic Planning Steering Committee, Curriculum Task Force Chair, June 2002
San Francisco International Art Fair, panelist, January 2002
Emerge 2001, juror, selection committee, spring 2001
San Francisco Art Institute/ArtSpan, panelist, The Professional Artist, May 2001
September 23, 2009

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

Re: Discriminatory Business Practices at 990 Polk Street

Dear Mayor,

I want to give you credit for supporting the efforts of diverse individuals to begin small businesses in the San Francisco.

My name is Abdalla Megahed, the man who has spent 25 years of his life fighting for the homeless who can’t fight for themselves, and a community activist who attempts to draw attention to wrongs committed against the homeless. I have a business partner, Ibrahim Abuyahya, who has a history of successful businesses and access to financing, and the business will be in his name and under his control. My business partner and I are attempting to start a new business at 990 Polk Street that will consist of a restaurant.

Mr. Abuyahya and I made the first application to rent the business locations in the building where I reside, 990 Polk Street in February and March of this year. The agent of the property owner, Baily Williams, attempted to frustrate our efforts as much as possible. For example, from the beginning, contrary to regulations, the corner store at Geary and Polk had no toilet facilities. Initially we offered a rental of $4,000 per month for both business premises and we received a letter of intent which we used to begin making investments to support the business including making arrangements for employees, purchasing equipment and making business promotions. I negotiated with Mr. Chris Schulman and Ms. Martha Inez regarding the requirements for business licenses and zoning in the neighborhood.

I request that an investigation be initiated to determine if we have been discriminated against because of our ethnic background. I believe Mr. Williams backed out of the business deal in a discriminatory fashion because we were in touch with City Hall regarding the requirements and criteria for business practices.

Very truly yours,

Abdullah Megahed

cc: Clerk, Board of Supervisors
    Human Rights Commission
    Planning Commission
Notice is hereby given to the general public that an Institutional Master Plan involving the institution described below has been filed with the Planning Department as set forth in the Planning Code. The Planning Commission will hold a PUBLIC HEARING on this item and on other matters on Thursday, October 15, 2009, beginning at 1:30 p.m. or later at City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 400.

2008.14091 – CALIFORNIA PACIFIC MEDICAL CENTER – Notification by the Zoning Administrator of filing of an Institutional Master Plan for California Pacific Medical Center. Pursuant to Planning Code Section 304.5, the Planning Commission must hold a public hearing upon receiving a completed Institutional Master Plan. This public hearing is for receipt of public testimony only; receipt of this Institutional Master Plan does not constitute acceptance or approval of any proposed project contained therein.

The IMP contains information on the nature and history of the institution, the location and use of affiliated buildings, and institution’s development plans. The IMP is available for viewing on the Planning Department’s website (from www.sfplanning.org click on “Publications & Reports” and then “Institutional Master Plans”). The Institutional Master Plan is also available for public viewing at the Planning Department’s Public Informational Counter at 1660 Mission Street as well as all San Francisco Public Libraries.

Property owned or occupied by this Institution is within a 300-foot radius of your property.

For further information, please contact Elizabeth Watty, Planning Department staff, at (415)558-6620 or Elizabeth.Watty@sfgov.org and ask about the California Pacific Medical Center (CPMC) Institutional Master Plan (Case No. 2008.14091); or contact CPMC’s Community Relations Manager, Paula Lykins, at (415)600-7482 or LykinsP@sutterhealth.org.

Persons who are unable to attend the scheduled Planning Commission hearing may submit written comments regarding this case to Elizabeth Watty at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103. Comments received by 12:00 p.m. (Noon) on the day of the hearing will be made a part of the official record and will be brought to the attention of the Planning Commission.

Comments that cannot be delivered to the Planning Commission by noon on the day of the hearing may be taken directly to the hearing at the location listed above. Comments received at 1650 Mission Street after the noon deadlines will be placed in the project file, but probably cannot be brought to the attention of the Planning Commission at, or prior to, the public hearing.

Pursuant to Government Code §65009, if you challenge, in court, the approval of a conditional use permit or any other permit, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Commission, at, or prior to, the public hearing.

Lawrence B. Badiner
Zoning Administrator

www.sfplanning.org
MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 23, 2009

TO: SFMTA Board of Directors
    Tom Nolan, Chairman
    Rev. Dr. James McCray Jr., Vice Chairman
    Cameron Beach, Director
    Shirley Breyer Black, Director
    Malcolm Heinicke, Director
    Jerry Lee, Director
    Bruce Oka, Director

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

RE: Update on SFMTA American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Projects

This memorandum is intended to update you on the status of the SFMTA ARRA transit formula fund projects. As previously reported, the SFMTA received $67.2 million in ARRA transit formula funds to complete 12 critical fleet, infrastructure and facilities rehabilitation projects.

The SFMTA provides this information on the ARRA funded projects to show that it continues to make significant progress to meet the various reporting and contract award deadlines. Attached please find the updated SFMTA ARRA Project Status table. To date, the SFMTA has bid out close to $38 million dollars in ARRA projects. We have completed the contract award processes for 8 of the 12 projects or nearly 67% of the projects. We anticipate finalizing the award processes for the remaining projects during the month of October.

If you have any questions about the status of these projects, please do not hesitate to contact me directly at 415.701.4720.

Attachment

c: Mayor Gavin Newsom
   San Francisco Board of Supervisors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>ARRA Funding</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. LRV Doors and Steps Reconditioning</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>Awarded Pending BOS Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Preventive Maintenance</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
<td>Project Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Motor Coach Component Life Cycle</td>
<td>$16,055,979</td>
<td>Awarded Pending BOS Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Central Control &amp; Communications Interim</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Management Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ATCS Inductive Loop Cable in the Muni</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Subway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Capital Planning and Grant Management</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>SFMTAB Award Scheduled 10/20/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Bus Yard Workstation Replacement</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cable Car Kiosks</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>SFMTAB Award Scheduled 10/20/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Change Machines</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Miscellaneous Preventative Maintenance</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Track Switches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Replace Fare Collection Equipment</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td>Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure and Facility Enhancement &amp;</td>
<td>$4,050,000</td>
<td>Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventive Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Clerk of the SF Board of Supervisors
FROM: Bill Quan

DATE: September 24, 2009

RE: Additional Comments on Supervisor Mar’s Proposal to Classify Families as a Protected Class under Owners’ Move-ins.

PAGES TO FOLLOW: 1

COMMENT:

Please distribute a copy of the following letter to each supervisor.
Thank you.
September 24, 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 Eric Mar’s Proposed Legislation To Classify Families as a Protected Class under Owners’ Move-ins; Additional Comments

Dear Supervisors:

I had previously sent you a letter dated August 29, 2009 with comments against the proposed subject legislation. In that letter, I argued the case that OMIs account for as a miniscule factor for the relocation of families in San Francisco. In this letter, I offer data/information that further minimizes that “miniscule factor”. Proponents have argued that the uprooting of school age children is deleterious, but they fail to point out a large segment of our student population, our high schoolers, have a high drop out rate. Per kids data.org San Francisco had a 21% high school dropout rate in 2008. In fact, student mobility is widespread in the United States. In a 1998 National Assessment of Educational Progress publication it was reported that “one-third of fourth graders, 19 percent of eighth graders, and 10 percent of twelfth graders changed schools at least once in the previous two years.” Furthermore, in a May 13, 2009 article by San Francisco Chronicle staff writer Nanette Assimov entitled “California’s high school dropout rate at 20%” it states that more than 2 million high school students were enrolled in 2007-2008, but in grades nine to twelve 1.4 million students changed schools. Not all the reasons are voluntary there are involuntary ones as well such as changed school policies on low grades, poor attendance, misbehavior, etc., the so called schooled initiated causes of mobility among students. In addition, there is a high truancy rate, where per the San Francisco District Attorney’s website 10% of the entire school population are habitual/chronic truants, students who have unexcused absences totaling 10 to 20 or more days. Also, there is a growing segment, increasing at 8% per year, of population of school age children who are home schooled.

Supervisor Mar’s proposed legislation fails to address the issue of families that have joint custody of school age children. For example, if the child goes to school in Napa County, but has a joint custody parent in San Francisco is that living situation protected?

I respectively suggest that Supervisor Mar needs to have the Legislative Analyst go back and do a more thorough study, one that would meet professional journal standards.

Sincerely,

Bill Quan

MarFamilyProtectedLegislation-Sept2009AdditionalCommentsBdOfSupervisors.wd
Ms. Calvillo,

As a former resident of San Francisco I became fascinated with the controversy over the Bay Area’s efforts to achieve no-kill status in your animal shelters. I read the recent scathing Northside article (http://www.northsidesf.com/sep09/features_coverstory.html) and Nathan Winograd’s article (http://www.examiner.com/x-16635-SF-Animal-Shelters-Examiner~y2009m9d14-S cathing-editorial-breathes-new-life-in-SF-nokill-reform-effort). Through that work I was made aware of your city’s struggles with breed-specific legislation, rising concern over vicious animals, increasing numbers of animals killed, etc.

After extensive research and much thoughtful reflection I decided to put my recommendations on paper. I am sending my vision to you for your review and comments and hope that you make it available to the city supervisors and their Commission on Animal Control & Welfare.

Of special note is the call for a massive free sterilization (spay/neuter) program for all dogs and cats in the Bay Area. Also, indiscriminate backyard breeding of animals must be stopped - resulting in a flood of unwanted animals and dangerous genetic mutations.

I hope this provides a better understanding of the failings of the current “system” and offers help leading to what I would call true no-kill status for San Francisco. I hope you find it interesting and stimulating. I’d really appreciate any feedback you have.

I look forward to hearing from you. And I thank you in advance for taking your valuable time to read through the attached outline.

Respectfully,
Thomas Cole
September 22, 2009

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

Re: Rent Board Annual Statistical Report 2008-09

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

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

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

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Delene Wolf, Executive Director
Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board

encl.

cc: Supervisor Michela Alioto-Pier
    Supervisor John Avalos
    Supervisor David Campos
    Supervisor David Chiu, Board President
    Supervisor Carmen Chu
    Supervisor Chris Daly
    Supervisor Bevan Dufty
    Supervisor Sean Elsbernd
    Supervisor Eric Mar
    Supervisor Sophie Maxwell
    Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi
NOTIFICATION OF APPLICATION FILING BY
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (PG&E): TO RECOVER IN RATES COSTS INVOLVED WITH 2011 GAS TRANSMISSION AND STORAGE

(GT&S 2011)

The "Gas Accord" market structure, approved by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) in 1998 by Decision (D) 97-08-055, set the rates, terms and conditions of service for Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E)'s natural gas transmission and storage services. The currently effective rates were approved by the CPUC in September 2007, for a three-year term (2008-2010), under a previous all-party settlement known as "Gas Accord IV" (D. 07-09-045). Thus, the rates have been in effect since 2008.

On September 16, 2009, PG&E filed an Application with the CPUC requesting changes to its Gas Transmission and Storage (GT&S) rates effective January 1, 2011. This application is known as the 2011 GT&S Rate Case Application (Application). In this Application, PG&E proposes a four-year adjustment to rates for 2011 through 2014. PG&E also presents its forecasts of expected demand and system usage for 2011 through 2014, as well as how the costs to operate its transmission and storage business will be assigned to each customer class.

This Application does not address distribution (gas lines handling reduced pressure) rates or the commodity costs of gas. Rates for PG&E's gas distribution services, and the rates PG&E charges for natural gas itself, are set in separate CPUC proceedings.

Will Gas Rates Increase?

Yes, if approved, gas rates and bills will increase. Rates for bundled residential gas customers, (customers who receive gas distribution and natural gas procurement services from PG&E), will increase by 1.4 percent, and bundled small and large commercial gas rates will increase by 1.6 percent and 1.7 percent, respectively.

For 2011, PG&E is seeking to collect a total of $529.1 million, an increase of $57.3 million, or less than one percent compared to the 2010 total company projected revenues, in gas transmission and storage revenue requirements from all of PG&E's gas customers. PG&E also requests gas transmission and storage revenue requirements for 2012, 2013 and 2014 of $561.5 million, $592.2 million and $614.8 million, respectively. This money will be used to operate PG&E's gas transmission and storage assets in a safe, reliable manner, comply with government regulations and provide a reasonable return to investors.

If the CPUC approves PG&E's request, a typical residential customer using 37 therms per month would see an average monthly gas bill increase of $0.74, from $51.26 to $52.00. A typical small business customer using 286 therms per month would see an average monthly gas bill increase of $5.50, from $341.15 to $346.65. Individual customers' bills may differ.

PG&E will provide a more illustrative allocation of the potential rate increases among customer classes under this proposal, in a bill insert to be mailed directly to customers in October.

THE CPUC PROCESS

The CPUC's Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) will review this Application. DRA is an independent arm of the CPUC, created by the Legislature to represent the interests of all utility customers throughout the state and obtain the lowest possible rate for service consistent with reliable and safe service levels. DRA has a multi-disciplinary staff with expertise in economics, finance, accounting, and engineering. DRA's views do not necessarily reflect those of the CPUC. Other parties of record will also participate.

The CPUC may hold evidentiary hearings where parties of record present their proposals in testimony and are subject to cross-examination before an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ). These hearings are open to the public, but only those who are parties of record can present evidence or cross-examine witnesses during evidentiary hearings. Members of the public may attend these hearings, but are not allowed to participate, only listen.

After considering all proposals and evidence presented during the hearing process, the ALJ will issue a draft decision. When the CPUC acts on this application, it may adopt, or modify it or deny the application. The CPUC's final decision may be different from PG&E's proposed application filing.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

For more details call PG&E at 1-866-PGE-5000
For TDD/TTY (speech/hearing impaired) call 1-888-689-8483
You may request a copy of the application and exhibits by writing to:
Pacific Gas and Electric Company, (Gas Transmission and Storage 2011 Application) Application P.O. Box 7442, San Francisco, CA 94120.

You may contact the CPUC's Public Advisor with comments or questions as follows:
Public Advisor's Office
505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 2103
San Francisco, CA 94102
1-415-703-2074 or 1-888-849-5380 (toll free)
TTY 1-415-703-5285, TTY 1-866-836-7825 (toll free)
E-mail to public.advvisor@cpuc.ca.gov

If you are writing a letter to the Public Advisor's Office, please include the name of the application to which you are referring. All comments will be circulated to the Commissioners, the assigned Administrative Law Judge and the Energy Division staff.

Reviewed by the California Public Utilities Commission.

1. Revenue is a technical term used to describe the total amount of money customers pay in rates for the gas services they receive.
Public Notice

Project: EMERGENCY REPAIRS (RGP 5)

Number: 28218S  
Date: September 10, 2008

Project Manager: Greg Brown  
Phone: 415-503-6791  
Email: Gregory.G.Brown@usace.army.mil

Regional General Permit for Repair and Protection Activities in Emergency Situations

The San Francisco District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has re-issued the attached Department of the Army Regional General Permit (RGP) to authorize fill and dredging activities and work associated with the repair and protection of structures and property threatened with damage during emergency conditions. This RGP has been re-issued under the authority of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act. This RGP will now expire on August 31, 2014.

In order for a project to qualify for authorization under this RGP, the applicant must comply with the General Conditions specified. The following list highlights, and therefore should not be considered a complete listing of, the steps which need to be followed to receive Corps’ authorization under this RGP.

1. The situation must meet the criteria of an “emergency” as set forth in the RGP.

2. The applicant must submit a request containing the basic details outlining the situation and the remedies proposed to correct the situation. A copy of that request must also be sent to the State Water Resources Control Board and to the appropriate Regional Water Quality Control Board. A $77 processing fee must also be paid to the State Water Resources Control Board at this time.

3. The District Engineer (through the Regulatory Branch) will consult with appropriate resource agencies to obtain their timely input regarding the proposed project.

4. The project must have not cause more than a minimum impact to the aquatic environment after considering proposed mitigation. The District Engineer (or a person delegated to do so) will consider the applicant’s submittal, information provided by other agencies, staff knowledge of the area and other applicable requirements and make a prompt decision whether to authorize the activity (with or without additional site specific conditions) or not to allow the project to proceed as proposed.

5. The District Engineer’s decision will be communicated to the applicant as promptly and efficiently as possible. NOTE: The applicant must not start work until receiving proper authorization unless he determines that the consequences of not starting work outweigh the concern of proceeding without proper authorization.
Supervisors,

I just learned of your intention to move $80 million dollars from the public safety budget into other services. While I know that difficult budget decisions need to be made in these hard economic times, I am urging you not to compromise public safety services. Please do not compromise our safety in a city with increased fire danger from wood frame buildings and earthquakes.

The fire department is only 3% of the proposed budget. The fire department does not take away from health/human services; it provides these services with medical response and transport.

I do not support closure of fire stations or decreasing.

F

4 11 6
TO ALL INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES

This is to provide you with a copy of the continuation notices of proposed regulatory actions relative to “Sport Fishing Regulations,” in the sections identified in Title 14, California Code of Regulations, which will appear in the California Regulatory Notice Register on September 25, 2009. These documents as well as supporting documents will also be made available on the Commission’s website at:


Please note the dates of the public hearing related to this matter and associated deadlines for receipt of written and oral comments, found on pages 18 and 19.

This notice reflects the Department of Fish and Game recommendations of proposed sport fishing regulation changes reflecting the editorial and additional changes suggested by the Fish and Game Commission, the Department of Fish and Game and members of the public. The continuation notice is added to the department recommendations published in the August 28, 2009, Register 2009, No. 35-Z; as discussed at the Commission Meeting of August 6, 2009.

Scott Barrow, Department of Fish and Game, phone (916) 445-7600, has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations.

Sincerely,

Jon D. Shellstrom
Associate Government Program Analyst

Attachment
September 24, 2009

Anna Horn  
Consumer Protection and Safety Division  
California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: T-Mobile West Corporation as successor in interest to Omnipoint Communications, Inc. d/b/a T-Mobile (U-3056-C) Notification Letter for T-Mobile Site No. SF53308A

This letter provides the Commission with notice pursuant to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California (CPUC) that with regard to the project described in Attachment A:

- (a) T-Mobile has obtained all requisite land use approval for the project described in Attachment A.

- (b) No land use approval is required because

A copy of this notification letter is being sent to the local government agency identified below for its information. Should there be any questions regarding this project, or if you disagree with the information contained herein, please contact Joni Norman, Senior Development Manager, for T-Mobile, at (925) 521-5987, or contact Ms. Anna Hom of the CPUC Consumer Protection and Safety Division at (415) 703-2699.

Sincerely,

Joni Norman  
Sr. Development Manager  
T-Mobile West Corporation  
a subsidiary of T-Mobile USA Inc.

Enclosed: Attachment A

cc: City of San Francisco, Attn: City Manager, 1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102  
City of San Francisco, Attn: City Clerk, 1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102  
City of San Francisco, Attn: City Planning Director, 1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102