Petitions and Communications received from December 29, 2009, through January 4, 2010, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on January 12, 2010.

From Jaime Moran, regarding the gas station at 4199 Mission Street. (1)

From Office of the Mayor, submitting notice that Mayor Newsom will be out of state from December 30, 2009, until January 4, 2010. Supervisor Elsbernd will serve as Acting Mayor. Copy: Each Supervisor, City Attorney (2)

From S.F. Labor Council, submitting resolution in support of keeping the Public Community Access Station open. Copy: Each Supervisor (3)

From Department of Public Works, submitting an attendance report for the Board of Supervisor's six appointees to the Graffiti Advisory Board for FY 2008/2009. (4)

From Ivan Pratt, regarding the environment. (5)

From concerned citizens, regarding the Central Subway Project. (6)

From David Black, submitting opposition to proposed plan to restrict parking in North Beach. (7)

From Ahimsa Sumchai, regarding the Hunters Point Shipyard. (8)

From Eve Harris, regarding pets in public places. (9)

From Ziggy Tomcich, regarding the price of a Muni Fast Pass. (10)

From State Public Utilities Commission, submitting notice that Pacific Gas and Electric Company has filed an application for a fare hike in January 2011. Copy: Each Supervisor (11)
To Mr. Putra:

I am writing to you regarding the alteration to be done at this gas station (4199 Mission St). I am concerned since I live right across the gas station. My main concern is regarding traffic/parking of vehicles around this location. By altering this service station, I think traffic/noise pollution might get even worst. We already got a big source of traffic/noise in the neighborhood (Manila supermarket located right next to this gas station). By altering this gas station, I think the traffic/noise might get even worst. This service gas station does not provide any parking space for people wanting to buy food or beverages only. Parking spaces at this location are being leased to ZipCar.com. The only space available to park for people while buying food or beverages is while gas refueling thus slowing traffic around our neighborhood. People wanting to buy food/beverages only from this gas station tend to park anywhere including our driveways. I really would appreciate if my concerns are taken into consideration when this alteration is being studied.

Sincerely: Jaime Moran
18 Ney St
San Francisco, CA 94112

Hotmail: Trusted email with Microsoft’s powerful SPAM protection. Sign up now.
December 29, 2009

Ms. Angela Calvillo
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94109

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Pursuant to Charter Section 3.100, I hereby designate Supervisor Sean Elsbernd as Acting-Mayor from the time I leave the state of California at 9:00AM on Wednesday, December 30, 2009, until 9:35PM Monday, January 4, 2010.

In the event I am delayed, I designate Supervisor Elsbernd to continue to be the Acting-Mayor until my return to California.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

cc: Mr. Dennis Herrera, City Attorney
December 15, 2009

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Enclosed please find a copy of the resolution support of the keeping SF Public Community Access Station open. It was adopted by the executive committee of the San Francisco Labor Council on December 14, 2009.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions regarding this resolution.

Sincerely,

Tim Paulson
Executive Director

opus3afl-cio(11)
MOTION TO KEEP SF PUBLIC COMMUNITY ACCESS STATION OPEN TO PROTECT ACCESS FOR WORKING PEOPLE AND LOW INCOME RESIDENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO

Whereas, the San Francisco Labor Council has already taken action to support the defense of public community access in a resolution on January 12, 2009 and for use of this resource for low income and all working people; and

Whereas, labor input was influential in achieving a $375,000 settlement with Comcast through hearings and resolutions introduced by Supervisor Mirkarimi and supported by the Board of Supervisors; and

Whereas, the City of San Francisco through pass through of Comcast funding has spent over $1 million constructing the San Francisco community access center at 1720 Market St. San Francisco and this construction took over two years and contains excellent production facilities; and

Whereas, the San Francisco Department of Technology will be receiving a settlement of $375,000 from Comcast that can be used for the continued rental of the space at 1720 Market St. where the lease does not expire until April 30, 2010; and

Whereas, there is no other available space that includes a main studio and other facilities similar to 1720 Market St. station for local producers of labor related programs who need continuing use of a production studio in order to continue to communicate labor's message to the SF community; and

Whereas, the City of San Francisco and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors have said they are in favor of keeping this important community access resource; and

Whereas, the importance of democratic communication and the opportunity for labor and community groups and individuals to produce media is important in this time of economic crisis and;

Whereas, the City of San Francisco has allocated $200,000 for the dismantlement of the station and;

Whereas, the need to prevent the privatization of public spaces and centers is vital to protect the interests of labor and the community and;

Whereas, the station may be closed on December 18, 2009 without adequate facilities for the public use by the community and residents of San Francisco;

Therefore be it Resolved the San Francisco Labor Council opposes the closure of the San Francisco community station on 1720 Market and calls on the Mayor of San Francisco and the Board of Supervisor direct the Department of Technology to allocate
the $375,000 for continued use of the 1720 Market facility and to not expend the $200,000 for demolition, and

Be in Finally Resolved this Council will send a letter to the Mayor of San Francisco and members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to express our opposition to the closure of the 1720 Market St. community access station.


Respectfully,

Tim Paulson
Executive Director

OPEIU3 AFL-CIO 11
----- Forwarded by Angela Calvillo/BOS/SFGOV on 12/29/2009 11:29 AM -----

From: "Goldstone, Merle" <Merle.Goldstone@sfdpw.org>
To: "Calvillo, Angela" <Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: "Nuru, Mohammed" <Mohammed.Nuru@sfdpw.org>, "Reiskin, Ed" <Ed.Reiskin@sfdpw.org>
Date: 12/29/2009 10:51 AM
Subject: Graffiti Advisory Board attendance reports

Attached are the attendance reports for the Board of Supervisor's six appointees to the Graffiti Advisory Board for FY 2008/2009. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Have a Happy New Year!

Merle Goldstone
Public Information Officer
DPW Operations
Tel.: 415-641-2625
e-mail: merle.goldstone@sfdpw.org

Sign The Pledge and help eliminate graffiti in San Francisco!
For more information visit http://www.zerograffiti.sf.org

Paul Giusti attendance report.doc  Nino Parker attendance report.doc  Michael Cashion attendance report.doc

Rebecca Delgado Rottman attendance report.doc  Jana Lord attendance report.doc  Leigh Ann Baughman attendance report.doc
December 29, 2009
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
#1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Subject: Annual Attendance Report from July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009 – Graffiti Advisory Board member Paul Giusti (Seat 15).

In accordance with Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 0502-06 and the Graffiti Advisory Board attendance policy calling for an annual attendance report to be submitted to the appointing authority at the end of each fiscal year, we are submitting an attendance report for Paul Giusti.

### Graffiti Advisory Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Appointed By</th>
<th>Number of Meetings Held from July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009</th>
<th>Number Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul Giusti</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>11*including Huddle</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Law Enforcement Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Appointed By</th>
<th>Number of Meetings Held from July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009</th>
<th>Number Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul Giusti</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have any questions, please contact Merle Goldstone, Recording Secretary to the Graffiti Advisory Board at 415-641-2625 or by email at merle.goldstone@sfdpw.org.

Cc: Ed Reiskin, Director of Public Works
Mohammed Nuru, Deputy Director for Operations
December 29, 2009

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

Subject: Annual Attendance Report from July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009 – Graffiti Advisory Board member
Nino Parker (Seat 12).

In accordance with Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 0502-06 and the Graffiti Advisory Board attendance policy calling for an annual attendance report to be submitted to the appointing authority at the end of each fiscal year, we are submitting an attendance report for Nino Parker.

### Graffiti Advisory Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Appointed By</th>
<th>Number of Meetings Held from July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009</th>
<th>Number Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nino Parker</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>11* including Huddle</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Law Enforcement Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Appointed By</th>
<th>Number of Meetings Held from July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009</th>
<th>Number Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nino Parker</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have any questions, please contact Merle Goldstone, Recording Secretary to the Graffiti Advisory Board at 415-641-2625 or by email at merle.goldstone@sfdpw.org.

Cc: Ed Reiskin, Director of Public Works
Mohammed Nuru, Deputy Director for Operations
December 29, 2008

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


In accordance with Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 0502-06 and the Graffiti Advisory Board attendance policy calling for an annual attendance report to be submitted to the appointing authority at the end of each fiscal year, we are submitting an attendance report for Michael Cashion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graffiti Advisory Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board Member</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Cashion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abatement Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board Member</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Cashion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have any questions, please contact Merle Goldstone, Recording Secretary to the Graffiti Advisory Board at 415-641-2625 or by email at merle.goldstone@sfdpw.org.

Cc: Ed Reiskin, Director of Public Works
Mohammed Nuru, Deputy Director for Operations
December 29, 2009

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

Subject: Annual Attendance Report from July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009 – Graffiti Advisory Board member Rebecca Delgado Rottman (Seat 16).

In accordance with Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 0502-06 and the Graffiti Advisory Board attendance policy calling for an annual attendance report to be submitted to the appointing authority at the end of each fiscal year, we are submitting an attendance report for Rebecca Delgado Rottman.

Graffiti Advisory Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Appointed By</th>
<th>Number of Meetings Held from July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009</th>
<th>Number Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Delgado Rottman</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>11* including Huddle</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Appointed By</th>
<th>Number of Meetings Held from July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009</th>
<th>Number Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Delgado Rottman</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have any questions, please contact Merle Goldstone, Recording Secretary to the Graffiti Advisory Board at 415-641-2625 or by email at merle.goldstone@sfdpw.org.

Cc: Ed Reiskin, Director of Public Works
Mohammed Nuru, Deputy Director for Operations
December 29, 2009

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

Subject: Annual Attendance Report from July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009 – Graffiti Advisory Board member Jana Lord (Seat 17)

In accordance with Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 0502-06 and the Graffiti Advisory Board attendance policy calling for an annual attendance report to be submitted to the appointing authority at the end of each fiscal year, we are submitting an attendance report for Jana Lord.

Graffiti Advisory Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Appointed By</th>
<th>Number of Meetings Held from July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009</th>
<th>Number Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jana Lord</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>11* including Huddle</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Appointed 11/08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Appointed By</th>
<th>Number of Meetings Held from July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009</th>
<th>Number Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jana Lord</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have any questions, please contact Merle Goldstone, Recording Secretary to the Graffiti Advisory Board at 415-641-2625 or by email at merle.goldstone@sfdpw.org.

Cc: Ed Reiskin, Director of Public Works
Mohammed Nuru, Deputy Director for Operations
TRANSMITTED BY E-MAIL 12/29/09

December 29, 2009

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


In accordance with Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 0502-06 and the Graffiti Advisory Board attendance policy calling for an annual attendance report to be submitted to the appointing authority at the end of each fiscal year, we are submitting an attendance report for Leigh Ann Baughman.

Graffiti Advisory Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Appointed By</th>
<th>Number of Meetings Held from July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009</th>
<th>Number Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leigh Ann Baughman</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>11* including Huddle</td>
<td>3 (as appointee)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Appointed By</th>
<th>Number of Meetings Held from July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009</th>
<th>Number Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leigh Ann Baughman</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3 (as appointee)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have any questions, please contact Merle Goldstone, Recording Secretary to the Graffiti Advisory Board at 415-641-2625 or by email at merle.goldstone@sfdpw.org.

Cc: Ed Reiskin, Director of Public Works
    Mohammed Nuru, Deputy Director for Operations
Internet Advocacy Folk,

Had to make some serious schedule editing to the previous environmental alert I sent you, which was poorly done. However, I have made corrections and created some clarity in this Previously Sent Environmental Alert:

TURNING THE TIDE 2010 January 2 2009

Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy: Turning The Tide: A Signature Program, WebPage:

http://www.parksconservancy.org/our-work/igg/turning-the-tide/?AddInterest=1145

It is very obvious to all people by now, or at least it should be made obvious that sustainable systems environment ecology as advocation practice to protect the planet earths human environment is not an exclusive social status, it is a hands on, daily individual participation in all social levels of society not only in the United States but the entire cosmopolitan society. You notice I said cosmopolitan society, that is because in truth for four-billion years of Earths existence, the Planet is a community, and it is time to regard the Planet Earth as a singular community if we humans in truth are going to conserve energy, and create innovative ways to create energy.
The challenge, if it wasn’t so complicated, is in actuality very simple, protecting the global earth environment is an individual daily habit reality for people; not just the wealthy, well educated, or even just the poor or indigent or those special people who live in another country or continent – all people.

Social psychological complacency in these issues of environmental conservation is no longer some nice something you do on a Sunday after-noon in order to be socially hip and pass some time, mother nature herself has given all life on earth a dead line to get our acts together, starting off by getting along with our fellow human being, which in truth is the focus of why us humans need to start finding ways to create alternative clean energy. We humans can no longer talk about our stock options in oil investment, and pretend it away in the name of making money, because we are making a financial killing with oil stock investments. Energy conservation, and inventive innovation in creating new ways of creating energy is largely a human social psychology in question, that should be addressed and questioned.

In being a member of the human race, therefore part of the Earth Singular Community of all sought of other living creatures, just being here on earth, and attending events like this is a tremendous statement. What you’re saying when you attend this type of event involving the preservation of the natural environment by creating alternative and innovative energy is simple, "I care about my fellow man and woman, I care about my fellow living creature that shares this environment with me; and I’m here today to see if I can at least contribute something to the environmental problems humans have created in destroying the Earths natural environment".
I have made a remark that all people, wealthy, poor, young and old, ugly and beautiful, etc. etc. etc. should act as a cosmopolitan community in order to preserve the environment. Not all of us on this earth, because we are so greedy and have as a results destroyed even our international economy, has $800.00 for a 'Cavalla Point Lodge Golden Gate Park', sorry it’s the reality of living as a human being on earth that is in question on earth in relation to preserving the earth sustainable systems environmental ecology. One of the big problems with creating a practical and total human involvement in the advocacy of environmental preservation is that the problem is not exclusively for the individual who can provide $800.00 during an inflationary financial global problem – and this in and of itself is the problem with creating any practicality in creating energy conservation and invention.

I would imagine, or at least from reading the rhetoric on the 'Webpage, Turning The Tide 2010', that since I live in a HUD SRO Low Income Housing' in the Tenderloin of San Francisco, and I don’t have $800.00 to give anyone, and certainly I don’t have $1000.00 annually to give 'Institute of Golden Gate Park or Marin County' that this must also exclude me from being a member of the human race in addressing this problem of energy conservation and innovation. These kind of contradictions in the advocacy of sustainable systems environmental ecology is going to create complacency amongst all members of the human community in taking seriously involvement in the social psychological participation of preserving the natural environment – in this question of environmental protection there are no exclusive communities anymore, and it is this human attitude that is creating the environmental problem and question, humans tendency to think itself exclusive even amongst its own fellow human being.
Dear Supervisor Chiu,

You are the Supervisor of District 3. Your district encompasses two vital elements of San Francisco's commercial culture; namely Chinatown and North Beach. Both are threatened by the Central Subway. As former San Francisco Planning Director Allan B. Jacobs put it: If the Central Subway is built "...in terms of scale these neighborhoods will never be the same again".

Sure, there's a transportation problem on Stockton Street*, a problem that has been exacerbated by the singularly inappropriate TRIP demand that ALL buses from northeastern San Francisco be routed along that beleaguered thoroughfare. Over confident amateurs can sometimes be as destructive as myopic public officials.

The Central Subway would help virtually no one. Moreover it would damage and destroy hundreds of small businesses along Stockton and, by encouraging land speculation, eventually lead to the decimation of what now is a vibrant and world-renowned part of San Francisco.

People tried to stop the Redevelopment Agency from bull-dozing away the lively and much beloved old Fillmore District. To no avail. Over 40 years later the ultimate result of that disastrous program is now before us. It consists of a few dozen ticky-tacky townhouses and a lifeless Japantown.

Chinatown is similarly vulnerable. The Central Subway would do it in. Muni has enormous unmet capital needs. There is therefore currently an opportunity for you and the other Supervisors to show some courage and demand that the Central Subway money be put to better use.

Hangston Giles,
Ben Lou
Amy Huang

* The best and most expeditious way of alleviating the current Stockton Street transportation nightmare would be to improve the flow of surface buses. There are a number of ways in which this could be done, some similar to what's recently been applied to Market Street.
Please note I am strongly opposed to David Ciu's plan which would restrict parking in North Beach! I am a North Beach resident and we need more parking, not less!

Sincerely, David Black
SHOWDOWN HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD 2010

"When I go home at night as a single parent, being involved with POWER, being involved with the EIR, being involved with this battle, it's fulfilling. I can look at my child and know that I'm fighting for his future."

Nyese Joshua - Bayview Organizing Project Leader, POWER
www.peopleorganized.org

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) was enacted in 1970 in response to the awareness that the environmental impacts of a development project in planning must be carefully considered to avoid hazardous, costly and unanticipated damage to human health, safety, property and the environment.

CEQA is California's, "bedrock environmental protection law." It guarantees that citizens have a right to examine projects, their environmental impacts, and challenge government decisions if they believe negative impacts have not been properly analyzed or mitigated (lessened).

In the ideal world, CEQA provides the public and government decision makers an objective analysis of immediate, long term and cumulative impacts of a proposed project. The CEQA environmental review must offer mitigation measures to lessen negative environmental impacts identified in a published document called the Environmental Impact Report or EIR. If negative impacts to human safety or the environment cannot be mitigated, CEQA requires that a statement of overriding considerations be submitted.

In San Francisco the CEQA environmental review is conducted by the Planning Departments Major Environmental Analysis Division (MEA). Any project with the potential to result in physical change of magnitude to the environment requires an EIR.

If an MEA investigation reveals a land use associated with hazardous materials is located within the proposed development site, a hazardous materials study is required to gauge the potential for site contamination and the level of human and ecological exposure risk associated with the project.

Uses of particular concern include federal and state designated superfund sites, underground storage tanks, gas stations and vehicle garages, dry cleaners, heavy manufacturing and toxic industries.

All of these hazardous land uses are present within the project area defined by the Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) published on November 12, 2009.

The transportation and circulation chapter alone identifies 30 significant unmitigated impacts including a 12 freeway onramps that will be congested by traffic in the region. These negative impacts will most certainly contribute to increasing pedestrian, bicyclist and motorists injury and death in a city that has seen a skyrocketing epidemic of pedestrian fatalities linked to automobile congestion in it's eastern sectors.

Additionally, the project area lies within a region designated as a 100 year flood hazard zone and in a region the U.S. Geological Survey documents as a seismically unstable earthquake liquefaction zone.

On November 22, 2009 scientists released the analysis of NASA satellite data which
determines that sea level rise in Bayview Hunters Point and Mission Bay will approach 6.5 feet this century. The Hydrology and Water Quality chapter of the Phase II DEIR identifies all impacts related to sea level rise in the project area as less than significant and mitigated. Additionally, the Phase II DEIR identifies all seismic impacts as being less than significant.

All of these potentially life threatening hazardous conditions have been identified in previous environmental reviews including the Hunters Point Shipyard FEIR certified on 2/8/00 and Addendum I and 2 published in 2003 and 2006. Indeed, the shipyard EIR's predicted that residents and workers would be exposed to naturally occurring asbestos by excavation and construction activities but identified the impact as less than significant and mitigated.

The shipyard EIR's and the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan EIR were certified with a CEQA statement of overriding considerations which stated that the economic benefits of the project outweighed risks to human health, safety and the environment.

CEQA has come under legal attack in recent years by large development interests and was weakened by a 2005 U.S. Supreme Court Decision -Kelo vs. the city of New London - that upheld eminent domain in the seizure of property for economic development.

In December 2008, the governor demanded that ten road and highway projects be exempted from CEQA review as a way to create jobs in the declining economy. Environmentalists convinced California Senate President pro Tempore Darrell Steinberg to delay a vote and force Caltrans and other parties in active litigation, to settle the lawsuits. The strategy was successful but established a dangerous precedent of legislative interference in court cases.

Of relevance to the Phase II DEIR was a bill that passed the California Legislature in 2009, AB 81X3 (Hall) that proposed a CEQA exemption for a 75,000 spectator football stadium in Los Angeles leveraged by a billionaire developer. Two lawsuits filed by citizens under CEQA were overturned. The bill trumped respect for the rule of law with promises of new construction jobs and a new NFL football team.

"Implementation of the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires or conflict with emergency response or evacuation plans." Phase II DEIR Impact HZ-27 Hazards and Hazardous Materials ES-66

The San Francisco Fire Department is responsible for protecting life and property from fires, natural disasters and hazardous materials incidents and for providing emergency medical services throughout the city. According to the Fire and Emergency Services section of the DEIR (III.0-13), "No SFFD stations are located within the Project site." Of the five stations in southeast San Francisco, none has a drive time to the Shipyard Phase II development site under 8 minutes. The SFFD target response time goal for a Code 3 life threatening fire and medical emergency is 4.5 minutes.

Additionally, the Executive Summary of the DEIR identifies as less than significant that "construction activities associated with the project would not result in a need for new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain acceptable response times for fire protection and emergency medical services." Phase II construction is expected to occur from 2010 through 2023 according to the Approval Requirements section (page II-80) of the DEIR.

The proposal for the early (dirty) transfer of shipyard Parcels D and E, the most hazardous of the six land regions on the former naval base, means that, as early as 2010, the Federal Fire Department will no longer claim jurisdiction over radiation impacted property containing an active landfill and soils contaminated with lead, asbestos, toxic metals, pesticides and PCB's.

Construction of a new fire station on 0.5 acres of land designated for community services along with the provision of additional firefighters is identified as necessary to maintain acceptable response times during the implementation of the project at full build
out in 2030! Upon completion the project proposes a new mixed use community with a wide range of land uses including 10,500 residential units and an associated population of 24,465 residents.

A major component of the project is a new 69,000 seat 49ers stadium sited on shipyard Parcel D in a region that is the site of radiation contaminated soils, buildings, animal kennels and laboratories—remnants of the post World War II premier radiation laboratory in the U.S. - the Naval Radiological Defense Laboratories.

Also sited on a crane on Parcel D as documented in the Biological Resources chapter of the DEIR are a nesting breeding pair of American Peregrine falcons who have raised several broods at this location over the past years. The American peregrine falcon was a state listed endangered species and a fully protected species pursuant to Section 3511 of the California Fish and Game Code. It was recently delisted on August 6, 2009.

The most sensitive receptors in the region, as designated by U.S. Navy remediation documents including the Draft Final Historical Radiological Assessment, are 17 schools and daycare centers located within a one mile radius of the shipyard. The Phase II DEIR offers scant analysis of potential adverse impacts on children who are known to be more sensitive to the toxic effects of pesticides and air contaminants including asbestos, lead and particulates.

The Hazards and Hazardous materials section, Impact HZ-24 states, "Areas designated for research and development uses within HPS Phase II would not pose a human health risk as a result of hazardous air emissions within one quarter mile of a school. This impact is identified as less than significant with mitigation.

The Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development plan Project Draft EIR is a very callous, negligent and dangerous document that identifies numerous life threatening and potentially disastrous impacts to human health and the environment. From dangerous underestimated sea level rises, to the pretense that endangered avian species will be preserved during shoreline construction and the erection of a bridge over an ecological and archeological niche and burial site for the original people who inhabited this region - the Ohlone Indians.

**Most dangerous of all is a chapter of Hazards and Hazardous materials that lists as less than significant all of the potential construction activities at a federal superfund site listed as one of the most toxic properties in the nation!**

Working with land use attorney Sue Hestor, People Organized to Win Employment Rights has held education and strategy sessions to challenge the Phase II DEIR. In collaboration with a "Hail Mary Pass" coalition of environmental activists, POWER succeeded in extending the public comment period of the 4,400 page DEIR that was released as a deceptive strategy during the December holiday season to January 12, 2010. On January 5, 2010 in City Hall, Room 416, the final Redevelopment Commission Hearing will be held to address the inadequacies of the EIR.

Mayor Gavin Newsom and his office of Workforce Development headed by Michael Cohen and his Black puppet Tiffany Bohee, plan to bulldoze the DEIR through to a final vote by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors by June of 2010. They are pretending that they have a chance to beat Santa Clara out of their bid to build a 49ers stadium, despite the fact that the team has demonstrated little interest in the shipyard stadium proposal and has been offered a better second opportunity in Los Angeles.

Environmental activists must employ new and alternative strategies as underdogs to win leverage and political power in this life and death struggle.

**AHIMSA PORTER SUMCHAI, M.D.**
 Apparently I’m not the only San Franciscan who is fed up with the so-called service animals in restaurants, stores and Muni. Response to today’s Chronicle column by Chuck Nevius has been dramatic both for its volume (almost 300 comments at this writing) and the level of agreement among respondents.

I truly believe my rights to public conveyances are being infringed on by the presence of animals. They disgust me and they frighten my partner. I urge you to fix this!

Eve Harris  
San Francisco District 8  
415-505-6961
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Dear Board of Supervisors

I am a San Francisco resident of Nob Hill, and I'm horrified at the $15 price hike for Muni fast passes while at the same time employees of Muni are receiving bonuses of $3000 each. The extra money brought in by the fare hike just about covers the bonuses. This is not acceptable. In every other sector of work, employees are seeing our hours and our pay rate cut. Why is Muni hiking fares to pay for bonuses? This is ROBBERY!

-Ziggy Tomcich
1110 Jackson St #4
San Francisco CA  94133
boyziggy@funcrunch.org
WHAT IS A GRC?

GRC stands for General Rate Case. Every three or four years, investor-owned utilities such as Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) are required to file a GRC in which the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) sets annual revenue levels. Annual revenue is the total amount of money a utility collects through rates in a given year for specific purposes.

On December 21, 2009, PG&E filed an application asking the CPUC to increase the revenue that PG&E uses to distribute gas and electricity and to generate electricity. While the CPUC will determine the total amount of money PG&E can collect in rates, the design of the actual rates themselves (that is, the levels of prices charged to customers) will be determined in separate proceedings to be held in the future with the CPUC.

At the time of the GRC, PG&E is also proposing changes to the operating hours for certain of its customer service centers at its local offices. Specifically, PG&E requests that the CPUC authorize PG&E to standardize business hours at all 76 local offices, such that all would open at 8:30 a.m. and close at 6:00 p.m. (Monday through Friday).

PG&E REQUESTS A TOTAL INCREASE OF $1.101 BILLION FOR GAS AND ELECTRIC SERVICE EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 2011.

PG&E is requesting a total revenue increase of $1.101 billion over the currently authorized revenues for electric distribution and generation and gas distribution for 2011, with such increase to be effective on January 1, 2011. This increase consists of the following:

- An increase in electric revenues of $896 million over the currently authorized levels for 2011. This increase is made up of two elements: (1) the cost of delivering electricity to PG&E’s customers ($597 million); and (2) the cost of operating PG&E’s power plants ($299 million). This increase does not include the cost of electricity procured for PG&E’s customers, as such costs are recovered in a separate proceeding.

- An increase in gas revenues of $213 million over the currently authorized level for 2011. This increase does not include the cost of gas procured for PG&E’s customers, as such costs are also recovered in a separate proceeding.

PG&E is also requesting approval for additional revenue in 2012 and 2013 to cover increasing costs due to plant investment and inflation. PG&E estimates that these increases will total $275 million in 2012 and $343 million in 2013, subject to adjustment if certain fees and taxes paid by PG&E increase or decrease in these years.

REASONS WHY PG&E IS ASKING FOR INCREASES ARE:

- To continue to invest in and maintain the power plants, poles, wires, pipes and equipment needed to deliver electricity and gas to PG&E’s customers; and

- To maintain the support structure necessary to keep PG&E operating and to provide PG&E’s customers with safe, reliable and responsive customer service.

During the proceedings, updated information may be introduced that could change the amounts PG&E has requested. What the CPUC adopts may differ from what PG&E has requested.

ESTIMATED IMPACT OF THIS REQUEST ON ELECTRIC AND GAS RATES

The actual distribution of the increase to each customer class depends on the CPUC’s decision on the PG&E’s request for additional revenue. While the GRC will determine the total amount of money PG&E can collect in rates, the design of the actual rates (that is, the levels of prices charged to customers) will be determined in separate proceedings to be held in the future with the CPUC.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION HEARINGS (PPHs)

The CPUC welcomes the public's participation. Before acting on PG&E’s application, the CPUC will hold PPHs to provide customers with an opportunity to express their views before a CPUC Administrative Law Judge (ALJ). Notifiers of these hearings will be sent to you either by a separate mailing, or included as a bill insert. The notice will identify all of the locations where the PPHs are being held for your convenience and planning.

Those customers who cannot attend a hearing may submit written comments to the CPUC at the address listed below. All such correspondence to the CPUC should include a reference to PG&E’s 2011 GRC application.

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.

In addition to public participation hearings, the CPUC will hold evidentiary hearings for the GRC application in 2010 where parties of record present their proposals in testimony and are subject to cross-examination before an 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, but not participate in these hearings.

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 all or part of PG&E’s request, amend or modify it or deny the application. The CPUC's final decision may be different from PG&E's application.

If you would like to participate in the evidentiary hearings as a party of record, please contact the CPUC’s Public Advisor at the address below.

The Public Advisor
California Public Utilities Commission
500 Van Ness Avenue, Room 2103
San Francisco, CA 94102
415-703-2074
1-800-540-2300 (toll free)
TTY 415-703-5252
TTY 666-636-7236 (toll free)
Email: public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov

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

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

For more details call PG&E at 1-800-PG&E-5000
Para rate detalle llama 1-800-660-4789
Para en español 1-800-493-4585

For TDD/TTY (speech hearing impaired) call 1-800-652-4712

If you have questions regarding the GRC application, please contact PG&E at the phone numbers noted above. If you would like a copy of the application and exhibits, please write to PG&E at the address listed below:

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
2011 General Rate Case application
P.O. Box 7442, San Francisco, CA 94112
A copy of PG&E’s 2011 GRC application and exhibits are also available for review at the California Public Utilities Commission, 200 Van Ness Ave., San Francisco, CA 94102.