

File 100396

Petitions and Communications received from March 23, 2010, through March 29, 2010, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on April 6, 2010.

From concerned citizens, submitting support for proposed legislation concerning the sit/lie law. File No. 100233, 4 letters (1)

From John Wyatt, submitting opposition to re-naming Third Street to "Willie Brown Boulevard" in San Francisco. File No. 090325 (2)

From Capital Planning Commission, regarding recommendations on the FY2010-2011 and FY2011-2012 capital budget requests for the Port, Airport, and Public Utilities Commission. Copy: Each Supervisor (3)

From Office of the Controller, submitting the January 2010 Economic Barometer Report. (4)

From Mike Boom, regarding the recology dump site at Ostrom Road in Wheatland, CA. (5)

From John, regarding the monthly critical mass bicycle ride in San Francisco. (6)

From Socialist Viewpoint, regarding the March 20, 2010, march and rally against the war. (7)

From Cheryl Arnold, submitting copy of letter sent to the Recreation and Park Commission regarding the proposal to install new soccer fields at the western end of Golden Gate Park. File No. 100053 (8)

From James Corrigan, regarding how the Fire Department can help solve the City and County deficit. (9)

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to public power in San Francisco. 6 letters (10)

From Elisa Duggan, submitting support for public power in San Francisco. (11)

From Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector, submitting the February 2010 Pooled Fund Report. (12)

From Clerk of the Board, the following individuals have submitted a Form 700 Statement of Economic Interest: (13)

Harvey Rose – Annual

Debra Newman – Annual

Arthur Louie – Annual

Severin Campbell – Annual

Sean Elsbernd – Annual

April Veneracion – Annual

Tom Jackson – Annual

Erasmus Vazquez – Annual

Ohn Myint – Annual

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to proposed ordinance increasing heights on some parcels in the Upper Market Street Historic District. File No. 091476, Copy: Each Supervisor, 2 letters (14)

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to extending the hours of the parking meters in the Marina District. 16 letters (15)

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to proposed new craft markets in Justin Herman Plaza. 2 letters (16)

From Liane Orlando, urging the Board of Supervisors to assist in stopping the closure of Children's Village at 250-10th Street. (17)

From Daniel Ki, requesting a proclamation for Hepatitis B Awareness Week. (18)

From Joel Chapman, regarding Police Chief George Gascon. (19)

From Emile Lawrence, submitting opposition to increasing fees at San Francisco International Airport for taxi drivers. (20)

From Denise D'Anne, submitting letter regarding non-taxable solutions for San Francisco's financial woes. (21)

From Kenton Louie, regarding using his Translink card on MUNI. (22)

From Office of the Controller, submitting the February 2010 Economic Barometer Report. (23)

cc - Page
File 100233



Barbara Super
<besuper@prodigy.net>
03/24/2010 07:38 PM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
bcc

Subject Proposed sit/lie law

I am a homeowner in the Haight and have been so since 1981. I have gotten so I never walk down Haight Street if I can help it, taking Page or Waller to the block I need before venturing onto Haight Street itself due to the gauntlet of young thugs I must pass to do my business. This is my neighborhood, I would like to take it back! The proposed sit/lie law will help us do so. Please pay attention to your constituents. They are people like me, not the transients.

Thank you.

Barbara Super
Waller Street
San Francisco

①

orig: File 10023
cc: Page



maura mccarthy
<mauracmccarthy@gmail.com
>

03/24/2010 03:08 PM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc Ted Loewenberg <tedlsf@sbcglobal.net>
bcc
Subject please pass sit/lie

Hello Supervisors,

I just tried to buy hangars at my local hardware store on Haight and had to step over a man passed out in his own excrement, and step into the street to walk around an intimidating pack of early 20s kids sitting with signs, dogs, and skateboards- who were upset when I wouldn't give them money to 'blackout' as their sign requested. I would, at this point, rather drive to an out-of-neighborhood store to buy something- and I can only imagine that the economic impact of hundreds of tiny decisions like this a day. As a homeowner, tax payer, and a liberal living in the neighborhood, I am imploring you to pass a sit/lie law.

Thanks,
Maura

mauracmccarthy@gmail.com



Carl Noe
<carlnoe@gmail.com>
03/28/2010 10:42 AM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
bcc
Subject Sit and Lie Ordinance

I'm emailing to voice my support for passage of a Sit or Lie Ordinance.
tia and regards,
Carl

--

you never know until you know
—noe



AEvans604@aol.com
03/27/2010 05:13 PM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
bcc
Subject The Haight: High Public Insecurity + Many Social Services

Dear Friends and Neighbors,

According to a Controller's report, just issued, the Haight-Ashbury has shown a significant increase in residents' feeling of nighttime insecurity, compared to residents of other neighborhoods. At the same time, the Haight has the highest concentration of alcohol-recovery services in the city (link below).

This information is relevant to the push for a sit-lie law, which originated in the Haight. Residents of the Haight complained of increasingly hostile behavior on the part of the neighborhood's many migratory alcoholics and addicts.

These have become aggressive colonizers of public spaces, which they use as bases of operation for drug dealing and other forms of anti-neighborhood behavior. Yet the Haight generously offers them ample services.

Homelessness Inc scoffs at the concerns of residents of the Haight. It calls the proposed sit-lie law "an attack on the homeless" and "a war on the poor."

Here's the link:

<http://www.sfexaminer.com/local/Haight-at-center-of-sit-lie-debate-89335512.html>

Yours for rationality in politics,

Arthur Evans

* * * *

File 090325-
c: Page



"John Wyatt"
<john_wyatt@pacbell.net>
03/25/2010 01:04 AM

To <thirdst.namechange@sfdpw.org>
cc <gavin.newsom@sfgov.org>,
<board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
bcc
Subject Don't rename Third Street

I grew up in Bayview/Hunters Point (Topeka Ave and Quint), and I can tell you I am disgusted by the idea to rename Third Street after the corrupt charlatan Willie Brown. Willie Brown did NOTHING for the African American community while lining the pockets of his corporate masters.

Please list Brown's 'accomplishments.' What did he do for San Francisco that deserves renaming a major street?

Other than being a corporate shill, I can't think of anything.

Joe DiMaggio does not have a street named after him. Joe Montana does not have a street named after him. Willie Mays has PART of a street named after him. And those are people who are well liked.

I don't see a Dianne Feinstein Street, or a Frank Jordan Street, or an Art Agnos Street or a Nancy Pelosi Street. Explain why Brown is bigger than they are.

Newsom's idea to rename the street was simply political butt-kissing, which he thought would help his failing campaign for governor. That didn't work out so well, did it?

Brown has no political juice and is simply a talkative old man who likes to drop names in his column, dispensing political 'wisdom,' which is invariably wrong and uninformed. (Let's re-read his column about Rod Blagoyevich again, shall we?)

Leave Third Street alone. It has enough graffiti without plastering Brown's name on it.

John Wyatt
1137 Hyde Street # 10
San Francisco, CA 94109
Tele: (415) 673-6239
Cell: (415) 279-6239
Fax: (415) 673-6239

2



Capital Planning Committee

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

BSS-11
bail
Claf

2010 MAR 24 PM 12:02

Edwin M. Lee, City Administrator, Chair

BY AK

MEMORANDUM

March 23, 2010

To: Supervisor David Chiu, Board President

From: Edwin M. Lee, City Administrator and Capital Planning Committee Chair *WLL*

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

Regarding: Recommendations on the FY 2010-2011 and FY 2011-12 capital budget requests for the Port of San Francisco (Port), the San Francisco International Airport (Airport), and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC)

In accordance with Section 3.21 of the Administrative Code, on March 22, 2010, the Capital Planning Committee (CPC) reviewed three action items under consideration by the Board of Supervisors. The CPC's recommendations on these items are set forth below as well as a record of the members present.

1. Board File Number TBD: Appropriating \$129,503,259 in non-General Fund sources in FY 2010-2011 and \$161,806,471 in FY 2011-2012 for SFPUC capital improvement projects.

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

Committee members or representatives in favor include Edwin Lee, City Administrator; Brad Benson, Port of San Francisco; Ed Harrington, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission; Dawn Kamalanathan, Recreation & Parks Department; Cindy Nichol, San Francisco International Airport; Ed Reiskin, Department of Public Works; John Rahaim, Planning Department; Nadia Sesay, Controller's Office; and Rick Wilson, Mayor's Budget Office.

2. Board File Number TBD: Appropriating \$25,913,881 in non-General Fund sources in FY 2010-2011 and \$12,543,000 in FY 2011-2012 for Port capital improvement projects.

Recommendation: The CPC recommends approval of this item by a vote of 9-0 and suggests the Port remove projects funded by the 2008 Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond from its annual appropriation request resubmit them as a supplemental appropriation request. This approach is consistent with other departments and recent

3

recommendations by the Budget Analyst on handling bond funds that may artificially inflate the annual budget.

Committee members or representatives in favor include Amy Brown, Deputy City Administrator; Brad Benson, Port of San Francisco; Ed Harrington, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission; Dawn Kamalanathan, Recreation & Parks Department; Cindy Nichol, San Francisco International Airport; Ed Reiskin, Department of Public Works; John Rahaim, Planning Department; Nadia Sesay, Controller's Office; and Rick Wilson, Mayor's Budget Office.

3. Board File Number TBD:

Appropriating \$54,889,231 in non-General Fund sources in FY 2010-2011 and \$90,921,576 in FY 2011-2012 for Airport capital improvement projects.

Recommendation:

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

Committee members or representatives in favor include Amy Brown, Deputy City Administrator; Brad Benson, Port of San Francisco; Ed Harrington, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission; Dawn Kamalanathan, Recreation & Parks Department; Cindy Nichol, San Francisco International Airport; Ed Reiskin, Department of Public Works; John Rahaim, Planning Department; Nadia Sesay, Controller's Office; and Rick Wilson, Mayor's Budget Office.



To:
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Fw: Controller's Office Monthly Economic Barometer - January 2010

From: Controller Reports/CON/SFGOV
To: CON-Barometer/CON/SFGOV, CON-Media Contact/CON/SFGOV,
CON-EVERYONE/CON/SFGOV, CON-CCSF Dept Heads/CON/SFGOV, CON-Finance
Officers/CON/SFGOV
Date: 03/24/2010 10:16 AM
Subject: Controller's Office Monthly Economic Barometer - January 2010
Sent by: Debbie Toy

Attached please find the most recent release of the Controller's Monthly Economic Barometer:

<http://co.sfgov.org/webreports/details.aspx?id=1108>

Summary:

This issue of the Monthly Economic Barometer introduces seasonally-adjusted recent change information, to better highlight trends in the data that can be obscured by seasonal factors. This seasonal adjustment is performed by the Office of Economic Analysis and is not related to official seasonal adjusted figures released by other government agencies, such as EDD or the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

San Francisco's January unemployment rate of 10.3% was the highest reported for the recession to date, but January is historically a weak employment month. On an adjusted basis, January's unemployment was actually somewhat stronger than the disappointingly weak December holiday season. Nevertheless, the city's job market remains in limbo, with few signs of a sustainable recovery in employment.

The hotel industry has also lost whatever momentum it had in the fall of 2009, with disappointing months in both November and December. While airport traffic continues to be healthy, particularly on the domestic side, the growth in ridership is not yet leading to any recovery in San Francisco hotels. The two most timely retail indicators, Union Square BART and parking data, continue to show declines as well, though the drops are much shallower than what we saw earlier in the recession.

Like the hotel industry, home sales prices have also shown renewed declines since October, reversing several months of slight increases dating back to last spring. Median sales prices as low as January's have not been seen since last April. Asking rents for one-bedrooms on Craigslist reached their lowest point of the recession in January, although the steepest monthly drops appear to be behind us. All in all, San Francisco's economy appears to be at a trough, with few indicators getting seriously worse, but little sign of imminent recovery.

4



"Mike Boom"
<Mike@Boomfamily.net>
03/22/2010 06:07 PM

To <David.Assmann@sfgov.org>
cc <environment@sfgov.org>,
<board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
bcc

Subject San Francisco Commission on Environment Public Hearing

I am a Yuba County Resident and I do not want the trash from San Francisco dumped at the Ostrom Road Landfill which is ran by Recology/Norcal. I have expressed my opposition at the City of Wheatland City Council and am now doing so as I cannot attend the meeting in San Francisco tomorrow.

Please understand I am a neighbor and do not want this trash in my back yard. There have not been any environmental impact studies, no outreach to us from Recology and I understand Recology does not even have all the permits which are required. Keep the trash where it was created!

Please help keep our environment clean and healthy to grow our rice! I appreciate your help!

Let me know if you need any additional input.

Mike Boom
Boom Ranch (Rice Growers)
2095 State Hwy 65
Wheatland, CA 95692

5



john <jj2000mm@yahoo.com>

03/22/2010 02:31 PM

To george.gascon@sfgov.org

cc board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org, gavin.newsom@sfgov.org,
sfpdnorthernstation@sfgov.org, sfpd.online@sfgov.org,
sfpd.commission@sfgov.org, letters@sfchronicle.com,

bcc

Subject Critical mass, etc.

Mr. Gascon,

I heard recently on KGO that you are planning a crackdown on critical mass in SF. Are you joking? Does the SFPD have nothing better to do than pick on once/month cyclists who are exercising, going green and auto-free down a horribly congested street in a supposedly transit-first city?

Here are some suggestions of how you can use your time and resources much more appropriately and efficiently.

- 1) Instead of bikes, please crackdown on red-light runners up and down Market. Autos threaten and kill us. Put a squad or 2 anywhere along the street, esp. at 2nd and 3rd Sts., and you'll reap HUNDREDS of violations. This will not only keep us safer but think of the revenue you'll produce for the City.
- 2) Enforce the hands-free driving laws. Right now, virtually EVERY motorist ignores it and talks or texts with one hand while driving. Don't believe me? Put a squad or 2 on Market, or virtually anywhere else in SF, and just watch.
- 3) Enforce the rampant drug-dealing laws, bust the crack houses, clean up the mess along Market and elsewhere in SF. You started a crackdown in the Tenderloin...what happened? Did you give up already? It appears to be the same old shithole as it has always been.
- 4) Put the foot patrols (a very short-lived venture from last year) back on the street along Market, and elsewhere, so they can enforce the no smoking, no panhandling, no drug-and-alcohol laws that exist and help make the street less ugly, dangerous, unhealthy and dirty, as it has been for so long now.

Want more suggestions? Maybe I can meet with you sometime to point out exactly where these infractions (redlight running, cellphone while driving, drug dealing, etc.) are occurring, in case you're unaware, since they continue to perpetuate with absolutely no police intervention. Please make an attempt to earn your enormously inflated salary of \$300K/year in a City so strapped for cash.

How much do you and the SFPD need to be paid in order to enforce these laws?

Leave the cyclists alone. Encourage MORE bikes and fewer autos.

6

SOCIALIST VIEWPOINT

60 - 29th Street, #429, San Francisco, CA 94110, (415) 824-8730

info@socialistviewpoint.org

Tuesday, March 23, 2010

CIVIL LIBERTIES VIOLATIONS AT MARCH 20, MARCH AND RALLY AGAINST THE WARS AT THE CIVIC CENTER, SAN FRANCISCO, CA

An Open Letter to:

Mayor Gavin Newsom
City Hall, Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
gavin.newsom@sfgov.org

Board of Supervisors
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca 94102-4689
Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department Park Rangers
McLaren Lodge & Annex
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117
Park.patrol@sfgov.org

San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117
recpark.commission@sfgov.org

Chief of Police - George Gascón
850 Bryant Street, #525
San Francisco, CA 94103

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2010 MAR 24 PM 12:38

BY





7

I am writing this in my capacity as an Editorial Board Member of *Socialist Viewpoint* magazine.

At the 11:00 A.M. antiwar rally at Civic Center Plaza in San Francisco, March 20, 2010, the Recreation and Parks department Park Rangers enforced a new regulation prohibiting the sale or acceptance of donations for political, printed material.

Specifically, my sister and I set up a table for *Socialist Viewpoint* magazine. We had approximately 25 copies each of the latest two issues of the bi-monthly magazine on the table; and five copies of our publication, the book, *FIGHTBACK: A Collection of Socialist Essays by Sylvia Weinstein*. We had a small sign on the table suggesting a donation of \$1.25 for the magazine as well as a small collection can with the same sign on it. There was no sign for the book.

While I was sitting at the table before the march began I noticed a row of about 8 or 9 Park Rangers coming toward our table from the direction of Larkin Street. I noticed the Rangers walking by all the tables at my left. When they came to our table, a female Park Ranger pulled out a camera and took some close-up photographs of the table and me, without asking permission, and told me to "pack it up," that I was not allowed to sell our magazine.

My sister came up as they were leaving and I told her what had happened.

Before "packing it up" I decided to speak to one of the security people from the coalition sponsoring the demonstration at the stage. The coalition person I spoke to approached the head of the Park Rangers standing by the stage. I approached them both as the Ranger was telling her "donations constitute sales and sales were prohibited."

I went back to our table but instead of "packing it up," I simply put the sign and the can away.

To prohibit the sale, or even asking for donations, for a newspaper or magazine or book is a flagrant violation of the First Amendment of the Constitution, which guarantees the right of free speech. And the photographs taken by the Park Rangers of me without my permission were an invasion of my privacy. It is unacceptable and I protest vehemently.

Public protest is not a festival, NGO, or non-profit venture. It's the public display of opinion and a right of every person in this country. That opinion can be expressed in a myriad of forms from spoken word, to printed matter, through arts and crafts and music and food, marches and rallies or die-ins. Protestors can number from one to millions. Everyone in this country has the same inalienable rights of free speech and assembly!

The people who come together to protest also come together to exchange ideas and methods of expression. We saw on the stage children from Glide Church holding up the startlingly beautiful paintings they created. Indigenous Americans danced their ceremonial dance. Political and social justice organizations brought their voices to the platform and their material to share with all those in attendance. We all have a right to exist, express ourselves and ask for support for our political

ideas and help in the form of sales of our materials, or the collection of donations from the public, as long as they are not extorted.

The City and County and the Recreation and Parks and the Police Department have no right to prohibit these expressions of free speech and assembly. No laws were broken by any of us at the demonstration.

The Recreation and Parks Department Saturday, March 20th, 2010 broke the law! They invaded my privacy and threatened, by the prohibition of sales or even accepting donations, our right to publish and express our ideas!

This cannot be tolerated in San Francisco.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bonnie Weinstein", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Bonnie Weinstein, Editorial Board Member, Socialist Viewpoint, www.socialistviewpoint.org

60 – 29th Street, #429

San Francisco, CA 94110

415-824-8730

P.S., Policing tables at an antiwar rally is a giant waste of taxpayer's dollars!

Cheryl C. Arnold
751 47th Avenue – San Francisco, CA 94121-3205
Telephone (415) 387-1305 FAX (415) 387-0357
Email: CherylCArnold@comcast.net

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 MAR 26 AM 8:26
BY MF

March 23, 2010

Mr. Mark Buell, President
San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Buell:

With sincere respect for your office and responsibilities, I am heartened that your environmental/civic expertise is now in the service of the Recreation and Park Commission. Thus, I feel compelled to write of my dismay over recent statements by the Recreation and Park Department General Manager, Phil Ginsburg, as reported by C.W. Nevius in the San Francisco Chronicle (Tuesday, March 9, 2010).

Regarding the controversy over major changes planned for the soccer fields at the western edge of Golden Gate Park, Mr. Ginsburg said "that the Audubon Society thinks 'the lights are going to make the birds dizzy' and 'I'm just hoping I don't have to wait to see my grandchildren play on these fields.'"

Such remarks do not convey the professionalism and courtesy that foster civil discourse. Somehow, an EIR for this project was waived without public knowledge. Now that the word is getting out, a growing list of respected organizations (such as the Audubon Society) are speaking to the need for an EIR, and controversy is widening. Mr. Ginsburg seems certain that the new fields will be built, but that a thorough investigation could delay them for a generation. Such comments do not inspire trust in a community process.

At a recent public meeting, Mr. Ginsburg related how he and his children currently enjoy the recreational offerings of Golden Gate Park, near their Sunset District home. The existing soccer fields are for daytime use, and are usually animated by the sounds of children playing. However, the proposed changes are primarily for adults – bright lighting till 10:00 p.m. daily, higher-impact artificial turf, amenities, etc.

This proposal represents major changes to the western end of Golden Gate Park and its pastoral priorities in the park Master Plan. Many serious issues are being raised – "the birds" being only one. However, the migratory and nesting needs of birds are not to be taken lightly. In this year 2010, how can any of us be unaware of the connections between the survival of birds and our grandchildren?

We are stewards of the crown jewel in a huge park system, spotlighted in a world-class city at the edge of a continent. The Pacific Ocean is across the street from the soccer fields. We must also wonder if the Department is considering government studies on Ocean Beach -- data that document already-dramatic erosion and forecast escalating incursion of seawaters in the near future.

Commissioner Buell, thank you for your consideration of these matters. I hope that you will use your good offices to promote an open, civil, and legitimate investigation into the Golden Gate Park soccer fields controversy.

Sincerely,

Cheryl C. Arnold

Copies to:
Mayor Gavin Newsom
Board of Supervisors
Recreation and Park Commission
Phil Ginsburg, R/P General Manager

Coalition to Save Ocean Beach
Friends of Sutro Heights Park
GG Park Preservation Alliance
SF Tomorrow





JAMES CORRIGAN
<marylouc@mac.com>
03/24/2010 01:10 PM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
bcc

Subject Taxpayer Study on just how the SFFD can contribute to solving our City's huge, Budget deficit.

1 attachment



GrandJuryPaper3_26_10***.pdf

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

As a means to reducing our Budget deficit in San Francisco, I contribute to you and to all San Francisco taxpayers, a plan to reduce our City's budget by many millions of dollars.

My suggestions are contained in the attached PDF file.

Sincerely yours,

James J. Corrigan

9

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

March 24, 2010

Dear San Francisco Tax Payers:

Could it be that some measures, though not illegal, have the same devastating effects on the quality of services for all San Franciscans, as if thieves were stealing millions from our Treasury?

Showing you that it is not only possible, but giving you concrete examples of such, is the goal of this letter.

I believe that during the last 15 years, since the economic circumstances of the dot.com boom era generated the largesse of "Premium Bonus Pay" into our firefighters' contracts; and our politicians joining at the hip with Local # 798 to insure elections and reelections;¹ a failure on the part of Chiefs of Department to reign in runaway Overtime Costs where it was possible; the reluctance to civilianize those firefighter positions such as data entry, light mechanical jobs and in the field of Inspection; and the general public's unawareness of lucrative Memorandums of Understanding that write in concrete, unnecessary positions² at mandatory staffing levels thus generating millions of dollars in Overtime shifts for firefighters. These abuses all amount to the equivalent of theft, thereby reducing the City's ability to fund many services required by our population.

I am not attempting to sell you on anything. However, what is contained in this booklet, should cause "red flags" to wave, especially in front of those committed to seeing the City of San Francisco do better with its precious, but limited resources.

I thank you for your time and consideration to this most important matter that confronts us as we move toward a better San Francisco.

Sincerely yours,

¹ Former Assembly Speaker Willie Brown, a well-known liberal voice, recently wrote this in the San Francisco Chronicle: "The deal used to be that civil servants were paid less than private sector workers in exchange for an understanding that they had job security for life. But we politicians—pushed by our friends in labor—gradually expanded pay and benefits . . . while keeping the job protections and layering on incredibly generous retirement packages. . . . [A]t some point, someone is going to have to get honest about the fact."

<http://volokh.com/2010/01...employee-pension-problem/>

² **Featherbedding provisions in labour contracts require the employer to employ workers who are not needed. This may result from the continuation of work rules that were once efficient but that have become obsolete. A union may insist on the continuation of such work rules to protect the job security of its members.**

How can the San Francisco Fire Department help solve our \$522 million deficit?

Without Closing or browning out a firehouse.

Without reducing man power on Engines or Trucks.

Without increasing response times.

Without extending the work week.

Without selling Real Estate.

Solutions:

Reduce the number of Fire Suppression Chiefs each day from 12 to 7 in the new MOU. San Francisco now averages one structural fire per day.

Eliminate the 6 Chief's Drivers Positions each day in the new MOU.

Renegotiate the MOU's Premium Bonus Pay costing taxpayers \$24 million in 2009.

Eliminate the 2 firefighter positions in the 'Stress Unit,' who serve as full-time addiction counselors.

Civilianize the Bureau of Equipment and the Personnel Office of the S.F.F.D. We should not be paying firefighter salaries for those positions performing data entry tasks and light duty mechanics such as towing and jumping batteries.

Civilianize the Bureau of Inspection, sending trained firefighters back to the firehouse.

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
03/26/2010 03:36 PM

To Ross Mirkarimi/BOS/SFGOV, Jeremy Pollock/BOS/SFGOV,
Jason Fried/BOS/SFGOV, CleanPowerSF@sfwater.org, ,
cc
bcc
Subject No on CCA



Rhea Bogdanoff
<rheabogd@earthlink.net>
03/21/2010 02:30 PM

To <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
Subject No on CCA

Once again I hear the SF Board of Supervisors is considering forming a CCA. This was voted down once before with good reason. It's a bad idea for San Francisco. Yes, I know PG&E opposes this, but so do I. Please do not set up a CCA.

Rhea Bogdanoff
SF Voter

10

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
03/26/2010 03:42 PM

To Ross Mirkarimi/BOS/SFGOV, Jeremy Pollock/BOS/SFGOV,
Jason Fried/BOS/SFGOV, CleanPowerSF@sfwater.org, ,
cc
bcc
Subject CCA, Please Stop



"Glen Schreitmueller"
<glenschreit@yahoo.com>
03/25/2010 03:56 PM

To <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
Subject CCA, Please Stop

I have been reading about the proposal to have San Francisco get into the energy business. This is not a function of city government in my opinion and I don't want to see my tax dollars committed for an expansion of our government into this area. We have plenty to do here in SF already. Please stop this CCA initiative and hubris. I do not wish to be auto-enrolled in your program and do not feel that SF will offer me a more compelling service, cost, or reliability than what could be made available privately with the same capital.

Sincerely,

Glen Schreitmueller
2533 Folsom
San Francisco, CA 94110

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
03/26/2010 03:42 PM

To Ross Mirkarimi/BOS/SFGOV, Jeremy Pollock/BOS/SFGOV,
Jason Fried/BOS/SFGOV, CleanPowerSF@sfgov.org, ,
cc
bcc
Subject Please opt out of CCA



maryann kirchner
<makirchner4@gmail.com>
03/25/2010 03:05 PM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject Please opt out of CCA

Hi,

I believe San Francisco cannot afford Community Choice Aggregation.
Please vote "No!" on this measure.

Best,

Missy Kirchner

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
03/26/2010 03:35 PM

To Ross Mirkarimi/BOS/SFGOV, Jeremy Pollock/BOS/SFGOV,
Jason Fried/BOS/SFGOV, CleanPowerSF@sfgov.org, ,
cc
bcc
Subject Fw: opt out CCA



ning aguirre
<ningna@sbcglobal.net>
03/20/2010 01:48 PM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject opt out CCA

BofS,
opt out Community Choice
Aggregation.
by SF legal resident, a voter

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
03/26/2010 03:32 PM

To Ross Mirkarimi/BOS/SFGOV, Jeremy Pollock/BOS/SFGOV,
Jason Fried/BOS/SFGOV, CleanPowerSF@sfwater.org,
cc
bcc
Subject Fw: I don't want CCA!!!!



"CleanPowerSF"
<CleanPowerSF@sfwater.org
>
03/19/2010 05:15 PM

To "Board of Supervisors" <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
Subject RE: I don't want CCA!!!!

Dear Resident,

Thank you for your inquiry about CleanPowerSF, the City's community choice aggregation (CCA) program.

CleanPowerSF's goal is to provide electricity that is significantly greener and cleaner than the energy that residents and businesses in San Francisco currently receive at rates that are competitive with PG&E. Best of all, participation in CleanPowerSF is completely voluntary; consumers will be given four separate opportunities over four months to freely select who they want as their energy provider. We hope you will consider choosing the energy provider that offers the most stable rates and the cleanest, most renewable energy.

CleanPowerSF provides a choice for San Franciscans. Instead of one energy supplier, residents and businesses will have a choice between two energy suppliers. Ultimately, the choice is yours; consumers will only benefit by finally having a real and meaningful choice in their electric energy supply.

CleanPowerSF will not cost the City taxpayers anything. The program will be funded entirely by participating ratepayers. PG&E will continue to bill energy customers in the City, but the generation component of the energy will come from CleanPowerSF. Our goal is that CleanPowerSF's rates be competitive with PG&E. Specifically, CleanPowerSF aims at providing two things that PG&E currently lacks - long-term rate stability and a cleaner energy portfolio.

CleanPowerSF will be administered by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), the City's water, sewer and municipal power utility. You probably already know that everyday the SFPUC provides the pristine Hetch Hetchy water delivered by gravity to your tap and award-winning sewage treatment that protects our local waterways. You may not be aware though, that the SFPUC already generates 20% of the City's energy needs through renewable resources like solar power and hydropower that produce zero greenhouse gas emissions.

San Franciscans will see no change when they turn on a light switch or plug in their appliances. PG&E will continue to provide all of the services you have received from them in the past-CleanPowerSF will just be providing PG&E with a cleaner mix of power for you. CleanPowerSF's

goal is to ensure that the energy to power our homes and businesses becomes increasingly renewable. CleanPowerSF is the best opportunity for our City to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and make San Francisco a greener, cleaner place to live and work.

Thank you for your inquiry, please let us know if you have any further questions.

CleanPowerSF
cleanpowersf@sfwater.org
415-554-3289

I want no part of this. I don't want to be automatically enrolled into an energy scheme.

Please spend your time on lowering taxes, cutting waste and getting businesses back to the City.

--

Daniel Barringer, PE
4428 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94118
(415) 863-8900 Office
(415) 946-3345 Fax

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
03/29/2010 05:02 PM

To Ross Mirkarimi/BOS/SFGOV, Jeremy Pollock/BOS/SFGOV,
Jason Fried/BOS/SFGOV, CleanPowerSF@sfgov.org,
cc
bcc
Subject opt out of CCA



"Lynn Ramsey"
<lynn@streetrestaurant.com>

03/28/2010 08:40 AM

To <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
Subject opt out of CCA

San Francisco can't afford community choice aggregation.

Lynn Ramsey

2033 Larkin Street
San Francisco, CA 94109
415.775.2418

10

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
03/26/2010 03:35 PM

To Ross Mirkarimi/BOS/SFGOV, Jeremy Pollock/BOS/SFGOV,
Jason Fried/BOS/SFGOV, CleanPowerSF@sfgov.org, ,
cc
bcc
Subject I support public power



elisa duggan
<elisaduggan@gmail.com>
03/20/2010 05:12 PM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject I support public power

I think Community Choice Aggregation sounds like a good idea.
I do not like PG&E and would prefer to have public power and
utilities even if it meant an increase in costs.

Sincerely,
Elisa J Duggan
resident of
San Francisco, CA 94107

11

Newlin Rankin/TTX/SFGOV
03/24/2010 02:41 PM

To Greg Wagner/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Pauline
Marx/TTX/SFGOV@SFGOV, Jose

cc

bcc

Subject February 2010 Pooled Fund Report



Monthly Portfolio Report 02.28.2010.pdf

Newlin Rankin
Chief Investment Officer
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall - Room 140
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4638
415/554-4487 (phone)
415/518-1540 (cell)
415/554-5660 (fax)
newlin.rankin@sfgov.org

12

Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector
City and County of San Francisco



José Cisneros, Treasurer

Pauline Marx, Chief Assistant Treasurer
Newlin Rankin, Chief Investment Officer

Investment Report for the month of February, 2010

March 24, 2010

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

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

Ladies and Gentlemen,

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

(in \$ millions unless specified)

INCOME	Fiscal Year to Date		Month Ending 2/28/2010	
	Pooled Fund	All Funds	Pooled Fund	All Funds
Interest Received	28.12	30.69	4.06	4.26
Total Net Earnings	29.63	29.99	4.80	4.94
Earned Income Yield (in %)	1.42%	1.42%	1.91%	1.88%
Current Yield to Maturity (in %)	n/a	n/a	1.41%	1.40%
PRINCIPAL				
Current Book Value *	n/a	n/a	3,165	3,325
Amortized Book Value	n/a	n/a	3,162	3,321
Market Value **	n/a	n/a	3,174	3,334
Accrued Interest	n/a	n/a	13	13
Total Value (Market Value + Accrued Interest)	n/a	n/a	3,187	3,348
Average Daily Balance	3,122	3,166	3,274	3,423
Average Age of Portfolio (in days)	715	714	712	711

* Original Book Value on purchase date

** Less Cash in Bank Accounts

In accordance with provisions of California State Government Code Section 53646, we forward this report detailing the City's investment portfolio as of 2/28/2010. 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
Ben Rosenfield, Controller
Controller - Internal Audit Division: Tania Lediju
Oversight Committee: J. Grazioli, Dr. Don Q. Griffin, Ben Rosenfield, T. Rydstrom, R. Sullivan
Transportation Authority - Cynthia Fong, San Francisco Public Library - 2 copies


All Funds

Investment Type	Par Value %	\$ in millions	
		Par Value	Current Book Value
Collateralized CD's	3.8%	125.00	125.00
Commercial Paper: Discount			
Commercial Paper: Interest Bearing			
Commercial Paper: Interest Bearing, Act/365			
Federal Farm Credit Bank: Discount Notes			
Federal Farm Credit Bank: Fixed	8.9%	293.23	297.85
Federal Farm Credit Bank: Float			
Federal Home Loan Bank: Discount Notes			
Federal Home Loan Bank: Fixed	5.9%	195.14	195.13
Federal Home Loan Bank: Float			
Federal Home Loan Bank: Float Monthly			
Federal Home Loan Bank: Multi Step	3.1%	102.75	102.72
Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp.: Discount Notes			
Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp.: Fixed	18.7%	617.60	620.48
Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp.: Float, Monthly, Act/360			
Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp.: Float, Quarter, Act/360	2.1%	70.00	70.00
Federal National Mortgage Assn.	14.6%	481.00	482.45
Federal National Mortgage Assn.: Multi Step			
Federal National Mortgage Assn.L Discount Notes			
Negotiable Certificates of Deposit			
Public Time Deposit: Monthly Pay			
Public Time Deposit: Quarterly Pay	2.0%	65.10	65.10
Treas. Liquidity Guarantee Program: Fixed	21.7%	717.31	725.79
Treas. Liquidity Guarantee Program: Float	1.5%	50.00	50.07
Treasury Bills	2.1%	68.00	67.93
Treasury Notes	15.7%	520.00	522.62
	100.0%	3,305.12	3,325.14

Par Value of All Funds



Trailing 12 Month Key Interest Rates





Run Date: 3/3/2010 3:39:07 PM

Asset Allocation

Investments Outstanding As Of Date: 2/28/2010

Assets (000's)	Current Par	Current Book	Market	MKT/Book	Un Gain/Loss	Yield
TREASURY BILLS F	50,000.00	49,991.29	50,000.00	100.02 %	0.78	0.06 %
TREASURY NOTES F	470,000.00	472,340.64	473,284.38	100.20 %	943.74	0.70 %
TREASURY LGP F	706,000.00	714,203.93	719,935.29	100.80 %	5,995.49	1.55 %
TLGP FLOATER F	50,000.00	50,074.05	50,250.00	100.35 %	175.95	0.39 %
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK F	175,140.00	175,136.00	175,316.87	100.10 %	180.87	1.94 %
FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASS	480,996.00	482,453.52	483,236.97	100.16 %	974.98	1.60 %
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK F	275,000.00	279,693.70	279,726.56	100.01 %	32.86	1.45 %
FHLMC Bonds F	597,600.00	598,623.87	599,128.38	100.08 %	504.50	1.87 %
FHLB MULTI STEP F	102,750.00	102,717.90	102,922.03	100.20 %	225.33	1.17 %
FHLMC FLOAT QTR 30/360 F	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,156.25	100.31 %	156.25	0.80 %
PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT F	65,100.00	65,100.00	65,100.00	100.00 %	0.00	0.83 %
COLLATERAL C Ds F	125,000.00	125,000.00	125,000.00	100.00 %	0.00	1.30 %
Totals(000's)	3,147,586.00	3,165,334.90	3,174,056.73	100.28 %	9,190.75	1.41 %

February 28, 2010
Inventory by Market Value

City & County of San Francisco



Run Date: 3/3/2010 3:39:07 PM

Investments Outstanding As Of Date: 2/28/2010

Inv. No.	Description	CUSIP	Purchase Maturity	Coupon YTM TR	Current Par /Share Current Book	Market Value Market Price	Curr Accr Int Price Source	Unrealized Gain Unrealized Loss
Fund: 100 POOLED FUNDS								
42358	B 3 11 10	912795T68	11/19/2009	.000000	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	7,933.33	777.78
			03/11/2010	.056010	49,991,288.89	100.000000	SUNGARD	0.00
Inv Type: 11 TREASURY BILLS								
				.000000	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	7,933.33	777.78
				.056010	49,991,288.89	100.000000		0.00
42298	T 0.875 02 28 11	912828KE9	09/04/2009	.875000	50,000,000.00	50,265,624.00	1,188.86	85,936.50
			02/28/2011	.632110	50,179,687.50	100.531248	SUNGARD	0.00
42301	T 1.375 2 15 12	912828KC3	09/16/2009	1.375000	50,000,000.00	50,578,124.00	26,588.40	378,905.25
			02/15/2012	1.206843	50,199,218.75	101.156248	SUNGARD	0.00
42325	T 1 08 31 11	912828LV0	10/29/2009	1.000000	100,000.00	100,687.50	2.72	371.09
			08/31/2011	.825969	100,316.41	100.687504	SUNGARD	0.00
42326	T 1 08 31 11	912828LV0	10/29/2009	1.000000	99,900,000.00	100,586,816.50	2,714.67	386,336.03
			08/31/2011	.834541	100,200,480.47	100.687504	SUNGARD	0.00
42341	T 1 7 31 11	912828LG3	11/19/2009	1.000000	120,000,000.00	120,862,502.40	96,132.60	60,939.90
			07/31/2011	.603979	120,801,562.50	100.718752	SUNGARD	0.00
42348	T 0.875 1 31 11	912828JY7	12/07/2009	.875000	100,000,000.00	100,500,000.00	70,096.69	19,531.24
			01/31/2011	.455342	100,480,468.76	100.500000	SUNGARD	0.00
42352	T 1.125 12 15 11	912828KA7	12/09/2009	1.125000	50,000,000.00	50,390,624.00	117,445.05	11,717.75
			12/15/2011	.745625	50,378,906.25	100.781248	SUNGARD	0.00
Inv Type: 12 TREASURY NOTES								
				1.013316	470,000,000.00	473,284,378.40	314,168.99	943,737.76
				.703484	472,340,640.64	100.698804		0.00
42165	J P MORGAN CHASE TL	481247AK0	03/24/2009	2.200000	25,000,000.00	25,560,125.00	116,111.11	441,125.00
			06/15/2012	2.046890	25,119,000.00	102.240500	UPRICE	0.00
42166	GENL ELEC CAP CORP	36967HAN7	03/24/2009	2.250000	35,000,000.00	35,820,312.50	369,687.50	635,162.50
			03/12/2012	2.065123	35,185,150.00	102.343750	SUNGARD	0.00
42170	MORGAN STANLEY FDIC	61757UAF7	03/16/2009	2.000000	25,000,000.00	25,507,812.50	220,833.33	470,062.50
			09/22/2011	1.938237	25,037,750.00	102.031250	SUNGARD	0.00
42177	BAC 2.375 06.22.12	06050BAJ0	04/14/2009	2.375000	50,000,000.00	51,390,625.00	227,604.06	705,625.00
			06/22/2012	1.930142	50,685,000.00	102.781250	SUNGARD	0.00
42181	C 2.125 04.30.12 TL	17313UAE9	04/02/2009	2.125000	25,000,000.00	25,525,250.00	178,559.03	407,750.00
			04/30/2012	1.966916	25,117,500.00	102.101000	UPRICE	0.00
42182	BK OF THE WEST.BNP	064244AA4	04/02/2009	2.150000	5,000,000.00	5,111,718.75	45,986.11	84,768.75



Run Date: 3/3/2010 3:39:07 PM

Investments Outstanding As Of Date: 2/28/2010

Inv. No.	Description	CUSIP	Purchase Maturity	Coupon YTM TR	Current Par /Share	Market Value	Curr Accr Int	Unrealized Gain
					Current Book	Market Price	Price Source	Unrealized Loss
			03/27/2012	1.962752	5,026,950.00	102.234375	SUNGARD	0.00
42183	BK OF THE WEST.BNP	064244AA4	04/02/2009	2.150000	20,000,000.00	20,446,875.00	183,944.44	338,875.00
			03/27/2012	1.962877	20,108,000.00	102.234375	SUNGARD	0.00
42191	BAC 2.1 04.30.12 TL	06050BAG6	04/02/2009	2.100000	25,000,000.00	25,533,525.00	176,458.33	440,525.00
			04/30/2012	1.974869	25,093,000.00	102.134100	UPRICE	0.00
42195	GE 1.625 01.07.11 T	36967HAG2	04/16/2009	1.625000	25,000,000.00	25,276,050.00	60,937.50	108,550.00
			01/07/2011	1.230907	25,167,500.00	101.104200	UPRICE	0.00
42196	GE 1.625 01.07.11 T	36967HAG2	04/16/2009	1.625000	25,000,000.00	25,276,050.00	60,937.50	110,300.00
			01/07/2011	1.235002	25,165,750.00	101.104200	UPRICE	0.00
42197	C 1.625 03.30.11 TL	17314JAA1	04/16/2009	1.625000	50,000,000.00	50,555,050.00	340,798.61	330,050.00
			03/30/2011	1.390825	50,225,000.00	101.110100	UPRICE	0.00
42198	GS 1.625 07.15.11 T	38146FAF8	04/16/2009	1.625000	50,000,000.00	50,596,000.00	103,819.61	391,500.00
			07/15/2011	1.439098	50,204,500.00	101.192000	UPRICE	0.00
42211	USSA CAPITAL CO	90390QAA9	04/28/2009	2.240000	16,000,000.00	16,330,000.00	150,328.89	204,400.00
			03/30/2012	1.962025	16,125,600.00	102.062500	SUNGARD	0.00
42258	CITIGROUP FDG INC G	17313YAC5	06/29/2009	1.250000	50,000,000.00	50,359,375.00	152,777.39	402,375.00
			06/03/2011	1.295193	49,957,000.00	100.718750	SUNGARD	0.00
42259	CITIGROUP FDG INC G	17313YAC5	06/29/2009	1.250000	50,000,000.00	50,359,375.00	152,777.39	402,375.00
			06/03/2011	1.295193	49,957,000.00	100.718750	SUNGARD	0.00
42274	GE TLGP 3 12 09 11	36967HAD9	07/30/2009	3.000000	50,000,000.00	51,877,250.00	341,666.67	274,750.00
			12/09/2011	1.609053	51,602,500.00	103.754500	UPRICE	0.00
42299	HSBC 3.125 12 16 11	4042EPAAS	09/16/2009	3.125000	50,000,000.00	52,007,300.00	325,520.83	37,750.00
			12/16/2011	1.341284	51,969,550.00	104.014600	UPRICE	0.00
42317	C 1.625 03.30.11 TL	17314JAA1	10/22/2009	1.625000	35,000,000.00	35,388,535.00	238,559.02	0.00
			03/30/2011	.777608	35,458,256.94	101.110100	UPRICE	-34,965.00
42328	MS 2.25 3 13 12	61757UAP5	11/04/2009	2.250000	20,000,000.00	20,459,375.00	210,000.00	27,575.00
			03/13/2012	1.316899	20,495,550.00	102.296875	SUNGARD	0.00
42331	MS TLGP 2.25 03 13	61757UAP5	11/06/2009	2.250000	50,000,000.00	51,148,437.50	525,000.00	64,437.50
			03/13/2012	1.310906	51,249,625.00	102.296875	SUNGARD	0.00
42332	GE TLGP 2.125 12 21	36967HAV9	11/06/2009	2.125000	25,000,000.00	25,406,250.00	103,298.61	152,500.00
			12/21/2012	1.789291	25,253,750.00	101.625000	SUNGARD	0.00
Inv Type: 15 TREASURY LGP				2.045518	706,000,000.00	719,935,291.25	4,285,605.93	6,030,456.25
				1.545231	714,203,931.94	101.973837		-34,965.00
42242	MORGAN STANLEY FDIC	61757UAN0	03/19/2009	.454250	25,000,000.00	25,132,812.50	24,289.63	92,487.50
			03/13/2012	.382131	25,040,325.00	100.531250	SUNGARD	0.00

February 28, 2010
Inventory by Market Value

City & County of San Francisco



Run Date: 3/3/2010 3:39:07 PM

Investments Outstanding As Of Date: 2/28/2010

Inv. No.	Description	CUSIP	Purchase Maturity	Coupon YTM TR	Current Par /Share		Market Value Market Price	Curr Accr Int Price Source	Unrealized Gain	
					Current Book				Unrealized Loss	
42306	Union Bank TLGP Flo	905266AA0	03/23/2009	.453750	25,000,000.00		25,117,187.50	23,632.81		83,462.50
			03/16/2012	.393499	25,033,725.00		100.468750	SUNGARD		0.00
Inv Type: 16 TLGP FLOATER				.454000	50,000,000.00		50,250,000.00	47,922.44		175,950.00
				.387814	50,074,050.00		100.500000			0.00
42315	FHLB 2 10 29 12 3NC	3133XVC66	10/29/2009	2.000000	35,140,000.00		35,216,868.75	238,171.11		76,868.75
			10/29/2012	2.000000	35,140,000.00		100.218750	SUNGARD		0.00
42349	FHLB 1.85 12 21 12	3133XW6C8	12/21/2009	1.850000	100,000,000.00		100,062,500.00	359,722.22		62,500.00
			12/21/2012	1.850000	100,000,000.00		100.062500	SUNGARD		0.00
42368	FHLB 2.1 2 26 13 3N	3133XWWE5	02/26/2010	2.100000	40,000,000.00		40,037,500.00	11,666.67		41,500.00
			02/26/2013	2.103457	39,996,000.00		100.093750	SUNGARD		0.00
Inv Type: 22 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK				1.937189	175,140,000.00		175,316,868.75	609,560.00		180,868.75
				1.937979	175,136,000.00		100.100987			0.00
42208	F N M A	31398AWY4	04/29/2009	1.700000	50,000,000.00		50,093,750.00	288,055.56		93,750.00
			04/29/2011	1.700000	50,000,000.00		100.187500	SUNGARD		0.00
42295	FNMA 2.15 09 10 12	31398AZA3	09/10/2009	2.150000	52,546,000.00		52,940,095.00	536,626.03		246,966.20
			09/10/2012	2.053284	52,693,128.80		100.750000	SUNGARD		0.00
42333	FNMA 1.625% 2.5NC6	3136FJRF0	11/10/2009	1.625000	75,000,000.00		75,164,062.50	375,781.25		164,062.50
			05/10/2012	1.625000	75,000,000.00		100.218750	SUNGARD		0.00
42335	FNMA 1.75 3 23 11	31398AVQ2	11/19/2009	1.750000	50,000,000.00		50,671,875.00	384,027.78		0.00
			03/23/2011	.598014	50,906,111.11		101.343750	SUNGARD		-98,125.00
42338	FNMA 1.75 3 23 2011	31398AVQ2	11/20/2009	1.750000	20,000,000.00		20,268,750.00	153,611.11		0.00
			03/23/2011	.571204	20,370,016.67		101.343750	SUNGARD		-45,850.00
42350	FNMA FIXED 1.75 3NC	3136FJZT1	12/28/2009	1.750000	100,000,000.00		100,343,750.00	306,250.00		343,750.00
			12/28/2012	1.750000	100,000,000.00		100.343750	SUNGARD		0.00
42353	FNMA 3NC6 1.80% fix	31398AB50	12/21/2009	1.800000	58,450,000.00		58,450,000.00	204,575.00		0.00
			12/21/2012	1.772500	58,496,760.00		100.000000	SUNGARD		-46,760.00
42366	FNMA 3NC1.5 1X 1.80	31398AF23	02/08/2010	1.800000	50,000,000.00		50,203,125.00	57,500.00		203,125.00
			02/08/2013	1.800000	50,000,000.00		100.406250	SUNGARD		0.00
42367	FNMA 3NC1.5 1X	31398AF23	02/08/2010	1.800000	25,000,000.00		25,101,562.50	28,750.00		114,062.50
			02/08/2013	1.817201	24,987,500.00		100.406250	SUNGARD		0.00
Inv Type: 23 FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSN				1.782908	480,996,000.00		483,236,970.00	2,335,176.73		1,165,716.20
				1.598578	482,453,516.58		100.465902			-190,735.00
42312	FFCB 2.02 4 20 12 2	31331GTK5	09/28/2009	2.020000	50,000,000.00		50,109,375.00	367,527.78		0.00

February 28, 2010
Inventory by Market Value

City & County of San Francisco




Run Date: 3/3/2010 3:39:07 PM

Investments Outstanding As Of Date: 2/28/2010

Inv. No.	Description	CUSIP	Purchase Maturity	Coupon YTM TR	Current Par /Share Current Book	Market Value Market Price	Curr Accr Int Price Source	Unrealized Gain Unrealized Loss	
			04/20/2012	1.804704	50,268,000.00	100.218750	SUNGARD	-158,625.00	
42330	FFCB Bullet 2.125 6	31331GYP8	11/03/2009	2.125000	100,000,000.00	102,156,250.00	430,902.78	383,050.00	
			06/18/2012	1.434006	101,773,200.00	102.156250	SUNGARD	0.00	
42342	FFCB Bullet 3.875 8	31331YZ86	11/19/2009	3.875000	50,000,000.00	52,296,875.00	32,291.67	0.00	
			08/25/2011	.784911	52,705,000.00	104.593750	SUNGARD	-408,125.00	
42370	FFCB 1.67 11 19 12	31331JDN0	02/19/2010	1.670000	75,000,000.00	75,164,062.50	41,750.00	216,562.50	
			11/19/2012	1.696475	74,947,500.00	100.218750	SUNGARD	0.00	
Inv Type: 28 FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK					2.313973	275,000,000.00	279,726,562.50	872,472.23	599,612.50
				1.448647	279,693,700.00	101.718750		-566,750.00	
42190	FHLMC 3 SNC1	3128X8WF5	04/21/2009	3.000000	50,000,000.00	50,171,875.00	541,666.67	171,875.00	
			04/21/2014	3.000000	50,000,000.00	100.343750	SUNGARD	0.00	
42206	F H L M C	3128X8WF5	04/21/2009	3.000000	30,000,000.00	30,103,125.00	325,000.00	103,125.00	
			04/21/2014	3.000000	30,000,000.00	100.343750	SUNGARD	0.00	
42207	F H L M C	3128X8WF5	04/21/2009	3.000000	50,000,000.00	50,171,875.00	541,666.67	171,875.00	
			04/21/2014	3.000000	50,000,000.00	100.343750	SUNGARD	0.00	
42215	F H L M C	3128X8SK9	05/28/2009	2.500000	50,000,000.00	50,062,500.00	548,611.11	0.00	
			03/23/2012	2.102915	50,540,000.00	100.125000	SUNGARD	-477,500.00	
42260	FHLMC 2 3 16 11	3128X8QH8	07/10/2009	2.000000	35,000,000.00	35,021,875.00	320,833.33	0.00	
			03/16/2011	1.465911	35,309,400.00	100.062500	SUNGARD	-287,525.00	
42322	FHLMC 1.67 4 30 12	3128X9LH1	10/30/2009	1.670000	75,000,000.00	75,140,625.00	420,979.17	140,625.00	
			04/30/2012	1.670000	75,000,000.00	100.187500	SUNGARD	0.00	
42346	FHLMC 1.125 12 30 1	3128X9PW4	12/30/2009	1.125000	50,000,000.00	49,984,375.00	95,312.50	0.00	
			12/30/2011	1.130071	49,995,000.00	99.968750	SUNGARD	-10,625.00	
42347	FHLMC 1.125 12 21 1	3128X9PG9	12/21/2009	1.125000	54,000,000.00	54,033,750.00	118,125.00	33,750.00	
			12/21/2011	1.125000	54,000,000.00	100.062500	SUNGARD	0.00	
42351	FHLMC Fixed 1.75 3N	3128X9RH5	12/28/2009	1.750000	100,000,000.00	100,375,000.00	306,250.00	375,000.00	
			12/28/2012	1.750000	100,000,000.00	100.375000	SUNGARD	0.00	
42356	FHLNC 1.125 6 1 11	3128X8P22	11/20/2009	1.125000	28,600,000.00	28,805,562.50	80,437.50	26,091.78	
			06/01/2011	.712000	28,779,470.72	100.718750	SUNGARD	0.00	
42371	FHLMC 1.8 2 25 13 3	3128X9ZK9	02/25/2010	1.800000	75,000,000.00	75,257,812.50	22,500.00	257,812.50	
			02/25/2013	1.800000	75,000,000.00	100.343750	SUNGARD	0.00	
Inv Type: 30 FHLMC Bonds					1.957139	597,600,000.00	599,128,375.00	3,321,381.95	1,280,154.28
				1.872679	598,623,870.72	100.255752		-775,650.00	
42282	FHLB 1.5 3NC1 step-	3133XUM83	08/27/2009	1.500000	50,000,000.00	50,046,875.00	8,333.33	46,875.00	

February 28, 2010
Inventory by Market Value

City & County of San Francisco



Run Date: 3/3/2010 3:39:07 PM

Investments Outstanding As Of Date: 2/28/2010

Inv. No.	Description	CUSIP	Purchase Maturity	Coupon YTM TR	Current Par /Share Current Book	Market Value Market Price	Curr Accr Int Price Source	Unrealized Gain Unrealized Loss
			08/27/2012	1.500000	50,000,000.00	100.093750	SUNGARD	0.00
42283	FHLB 1.5 3NC1 step-	3133XUM83	08/27/2009	1.500000	4,300,000.00	4,304,031.25	716.67	4,031.25
			08/27/2012	1.500000	4,300,000.00	100.093750	SUNGARD	0.00
42318	FHLB 0.75 9 29 11 2	3133XUVP5	10/20/2009	.750000	48,450,000.00	48,571,125.00	153,425.01	174,420.00
			09/29/2011	.807171	48,417,901.88	100.250000	SUNGARD	0.00
Inv Type: 38 FHLB MULTI STEP				1.146474	102,750,000.00	102,922,031.25	162,475.01	225,326.25
				1.173423	102,717,901.88	100.167427		0.00
42354	FHLMC 3nc1 float st	3128X9DK3	09/10/2009	.801880	50,000,000.00	50,156,250.00	90,211.50	156,250.00
			09/10/2012	.801880	50,000,000.00	100.312500	SUNGARD	0.00
Inv Type: 40 FHLMC FLOAT QTR 30/360				.801880	50,000,000.00	50,156,250.00	90,211.50	156,250.00
				.801880	50,000,000.00	100.312500		0.00
42212	BANK OF SAN FRANCIS		05/18/2009	1.600000	100,000.00	100,000.00	266.67	0.00
			05/17/2010	1.600000	100,000.00	100.000000	USERPR	0.00
42277	CD FIRST NATL BANK		07/31/2009	1.750000	5,000,000.00	5,000,000.00	14,583.33	0.00
			07/31/2010	1.750000	5,000,000.00	100.000000	USERPR	0.00
42316	UBOC PTD 0.7 10 13		10/13/2009	.700000	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	43,750.00	0.00
			10/13/2010	.700000	50,000,000.00	100.000000	USERPR	0.00
42365	FIRST NATL PTD 01 1		01/18/2010	1.000000	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	11,666.67	0.00
			01/18/2011	1.000000	10,000,000.00	100.000000	USERPR	0.00
Inv Type: 1010 PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT				.828111	65,100,000.00	65,100,000.00	70,266.67	0.00
				.828111	65,100,000.00	100.000000		0.00
42203	B O A COLLATERIZED		04/14/2009	1.450000	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	555,833.33	0.00
			04/14/2010	1.450000	100,000,000.00	100.000000	USERPR	0.00
42294	B of A CD 0.72 09 0		09/02/2009	.720000	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	44,500.00	0.00
			09/02/2010	.720000	25,000,000.00	100.000000	USERPR	0.00
Inv Type: 1012 COLLATERAL C Ds				1.304000	125,000,000.00	125,000,000.00	600,333.33	0.00
				1.304000	125,000,000.00	100.000000		0.00
Subtotal				1.691854	3,147,586,000.00	3,174,056,727.15	12,717,508.11	10,758,849.77
				1.412965	3,165,334,900.65	100.840985		-1,568,100.00
Grand Total			Count 68	1.691854	3,147,586,000.00	3,174,056,727.15	12,717,508.11	10,758,849.77
				1.412965	3,165,334,900.65	100.840985		-1,568,100.00

February 28, 2010
DETAIL TRANSACTION REPORT - FIXED INCOME

City & County of San Francisco




Run Date: 3/3/2010 3:20:26 PM

From Date: 2/1/2010 To Date: 2/28/2010

Inv.	Description	CUSIP	TXN	Par Value	Book Value	(Interest)	(Gain) / Loss	Fund	Settled	Prem / (Disc)	Amort / (Accret)	Settlement
Fund: 100 POOLED FUNDS												
42341	T 1 7 31 11	912828LG3	INTR	0.00	-361,956.54	-238,043.46	0.00	100	02/01/2010	0.00	0.00	600,000.00
42348	T 0.875 1 31 11	912828JY7	INTR	0.00	-306,725.54	-130,774.46	0.00	100	02/01/2010	0.00	0.00	437,500.00
42301	T 1.375 2 15 12	912828KC3	INTR	0.00	-59,782.61	-283,967.39	0.00	100	02/15/2010	0.00	0.00	343,750.00
42352	T 1.125 12 15 11	912828KA7	PSAL	-50,000,000.00	-50,378,906.25	-101,991.76	56,640.62	100	02/19/2010	-378,906.25	0.00	50,424,257.39
42298	T 0.875 02 28 11	912828KE9	INTR	0.00	-4,834.25	-213,915.75	0.00	100	02/28/2010	0.00	0.00	218,750.00
42325	T 1 08 31 11	912828LV0	INTR	0.00	-162.98	-337.02	0.00	100	02/28/2010	0.00	0.00	500.00
42326	T 1 08 31 11	912828LV0	INTR	0.00	-162,820.44	-336,679.56	0.00	100	02/28/2010	0.00	0.00	499,500.00
Inv Type: 12 TREASURY NOTES				-50,000,000.00	-51,275,188.61	-1,305,709.40	56,640.62			-378,906.25	0.00	52,524,257.39
42327	FHLB 3NC3 1x 2% fix	3133XVG47	CALL	-100,000,000.00	-100,000,000.00	0.00	0.00	100	02/09/2010	0.00	0.00	100,000,000.00
42327	FHLB 3NC3 1x 2% fix	3133XVG47	INTR	0.00	0.00	-500,000.00	0.00	100	02/09/2010	0.00	0.00	500,000.00
42296	FHLB 2 9 24 12 3NC6	3133XUTD	SALE	-50,000,000.00	-50,000,000.00	-419,444.44	-77,000.00	100	02/25/2010	0.00	0.00	50,496,444.44
		5										
42297	FHLB 2 9 24 12 3NC6	3133XUTD	SALE	-25,000,000.00	-25,000,000.00	-209,722.22	-38,500.00	100	02/25/2010	0.00	0.00	25,248,222.22
		5										
42320	FHLB 1.625 11 21 12	3133XVEM	SALE	-100,000,000.00	-99,648,000.00	-424,305.56	-852,000.00	100	02/25/2010	352,000.00	0.00	100,924,305.56
		9										
42363	FHLB 1 07 26 11 1.5	3133XWME	CALL	-72,300,000.00	-72,300,000.00	-60,250.00	0.00	100	02/26/2010	0.00	0.00	72,360,250.00
		6										
42368	FHLB 2.1 2 26 13 3N	3133XWWE	PURC	40,000,000.00	39,996,000.00	0.00	0.00	100	02/26/2010	-4,000.00	0.00	-39,996,000.00
		5										
Inv Type: 22 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK				-307,300,000.00	-306,952,000.00	-1,613,722.22	-967,500.00			348,000.00	0.00	309,533,222.22
42366	FNMA 3NC1.5 1X 1.80	31398AF23	PURC	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	0.00	0.00	100	02/08/2010	0.00	0.00	-50,000,000.00
42367	FNMA 3NC1.5 1X	31398AF23	PURC	25,000,000.00	24,987,500.00	0.00	0.00	100	02/08/2010	-12,500.00	0.00	-24,987,500.00
Inv Type: 23 FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSN				75,000,000.00	74,987,500.00	0.00	0.00			-12,500.00	0.00	-74,987,500.00
42370	FFCB 1.67 11 19 12	31331JDNO	PURC	75,000,000.00	74,947,500.00	0.00	0.00	100	02/19/2010	-52,500.00	0.00	-74,947,500.00
42342	FFCB Bullet 3.875 8	31331YZ86	INTR	0.00	-452,083.33	-516,666.67	0.00	100	02/25/2010	0.00	0.00	968,750.00
Inv Type: 28 FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK				75,000,000.00	74,495,416.67	-516,666.67	0.00			-52,500.00	0.00	-73,978,750.00
42334	FHLMC 3.875 6 29 11	3137EABN8	SALE	-50,000,000.00	-52,552,500.00	-172,222.22	268,000.00	100	02/01/2010	-2,552,500.00	0.00	52,456,722.22
42337	FHLMC 3.875 6 29 11	3137EABN8	SALE	-50,000,000.00	-52,592,852.50	-172,222.22	308,352.50	100	02/01/2010	-2,592,852.50	0.00	52,456,722.22
42371	FHLMC 1.8 2 25 13 3	3128X9ZK9	PURC	75,000,000.00	75,000,000.00	0.00	0.00	100	02/25/2010	0.00	0.00	-75,000,000.00
Inv Type: 30 FHLMC Bonds				-25,000,000.00	-30,145,352.50	-344,444.44	576,352.50			-5,145,352.50	0.00	29,913,444.44
42282	FHLB 1.5 3NC1 step-	3133XUM8	INTR	0.00	0.00	-375,000.00	0.00	100	02/27/2010	0.00	0.00	375,000.00
		3										
42283	FHLB 1.5 3NC1 step-	3133XUM8	INTR	0.00	0.00	-32,250.00	0.00	100	02/27/2010	0.00	0.00	32,250.00
		3										
Inv Type: 38 FHLB MULTI STEP				0.00	0.00	-407,250.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	407,250.00

February 28, 2010
DETAIL TRANSACTION REPORT - FIXED INCOME

City & County of San Francisco



Run Date: 3/3/2010 3:20:26 PM

From Date: 2/1/2010 To Date: 2/28/2010

Inv.	Description	CUSIP	TXN	Par Value	Book Value	(Interest)	(Gain) / Loss	Fund	Settled	Prem / (Disc)	Amort / (Accret)	Settlement
Subtotal				-232,300,000.00	-238,889,624.44	-4,187,792.73	-334,506.88			-5,241,258.75	0.00	243,411,924.05
Fund: 9704 SFUSD BONDS 2006B												
42369	FHLB 2.1 2 26 13 3N	3133XWWE	PURC	20,000,000.00	19,998,000.00	0.00	0.00	9704	02/26/2010	-2,000.00	0.00	-19,998,000.00
		5										
Inv Type: 22 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK				20,000,000.00	19,998,000.00	0.00	0.00			-2,000.00	0.00	-19,998,000.00
42156	FANNIE MAE	3136FHAA3	CALL	-20,000,000.00	-20,000,000.00	0.00	0.00	9704	02/11/2010	0.00	0.00	20,000,000.00
42156	FANNIE MAE	3136FHAA3	INTR	0.00	0.00	-200,000.00	0.00	9704	02/11/2010	0.00	0.00	200,000.00
Inv Type: 23 FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSN				-20,000,000.00	-20,000,000.00	-200,000.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	20,200,000.00
Subtotal				0.00	-2,000.00	-200,000.00	0.00			-2,000.00	0.00	202,000.00
Grand Total				-232,300,000.00	-238,891,624.44	-4,387,792.73	-334,506.88			-5,243,258.75	0.00	243,613,924.05
		Count 26										

CITY / COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
 MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487

(EIS / ERNEIS)

EARNED INCOME SUMMARY
 07/01/09 THROUGH 02/28/10
 SORT KEYS ARE FUND
 FUND: 100 POOLED FUNDS

PAGE: 1
 RUN: 03/16/10 10:04:09

INV NO.	PURCHASE DATE	COUPON RATE	DESCRIPTION	TICKER / MATURITY DATE	SHARES / SCHEDULED PAR VALUE	SCHEDULED BOOK VALUE	YIELD/ 365	DATE SOLD/MAT	INCOME RECEIVED THIS PER	TOTAL/NET EARNINGS
41862	10/23/07	4.6250	T NOTE	07/31/09	5,100,000.00	5,100,000.00	3.888	MATURED	52,394.53	16,508.56
41916	12/07/07	.4760	F H L B FLOATER	11/23/09	50,000,000.00	49,984,700.00	.711	07/10/09	37,228.33	8,759.14
41916	12/07/07	.2220	F H L B FLOATER	11/23/09	15,000,000.00	14,995,410.00	.545	09/23/09	26,304.12	16,784.12
41937	01/09/08	.2220	F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT	11/23/09	50,000,000.00	50,010,000.00	.386	09/23/09	62,380.55	44,477.34
41938	01/09/08	.2220	F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT	11/23/09	50,000,000.00	50,010,000.00	.386	09/23/09	62,380.55	44,477.34
41939	01/09/08	.2220	F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT	11/23/09	4,500,000.00	4,500,900.00	.386	09/23/09	5,614.25	4,002.96
41994	03/31/08	2.0000	T NOTE	02/28/10	25,000,000.00	25,151,367.19	4.913	09/14/09	322,071.39	253,914.36
42044	07/16/08	3.9000	MISSION NATIONAL BANK PU	07/16/09	100,000.00	100,000.00	3.639	MATURED	173.33	149.56
42055	07/31/08	2.7500	FIRST NATIONAL BANK CD	07/31/09	5,000,000.00	5,000,000.00	2.788	MATURED	46,215.27	11,458.33
42065	08/26/08	.7700	FFCB FLOATER QTR	10/26/09	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	.781	MATURED	195,708.33	125,124.12
42076	09/18/08	.1810	F H L B FLOATER MONTHLY	12/28/09	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	.177	09/23/09	10,681.25	10,206.25
42095	10/29/08	1.4800	T BILL	10/22/09	50,000,000.00	49,264,111.11	1.716	10/09/09	735,256.95	231,645.84
42107	11/03/08	1.0000	MISSION AREA CREDIT UNIO	11/02/09	100,000.00	100,000.00	1.022	MATURED	347.23	347.22
42110	12/04/08	1.2000	F N M A DISCOUNT NOTE	08/17/09	50,000,000.00	49,573,333.33	1.227	MATURED	426,666.67	78,333.33
42117	12/09/08	2.3200	US BANK COLLATERAL	11/23/09	15,000,000.00	15,000,000.00	2.352	MATURED	337,366.67	140,166.67
42119	12/09/08	2.3900	US BANK COLLATERALIZE CD	12/08/09	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	2.423	MATURED	833,180.55	531,111.11
42120	12/09/08	2.3900	US BANK COLLATERALIZE CD	12/08/09	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	2.423	MATURED	833,180.55	531,111.11
42121	12/09/08	2.3900	US BANK COLLATERALIZE CD	12/08/09	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	2.423	MATURED	833,180.55	531,111.11
42126	12/22/08	4.1200	F N M A	05/06/13	50,000,000.00	51,050,000.00	-1.168	11/06/09	-20,000.00	-209,064.33
42127	12/22/08	4.1200	F N M A	05/06/13	50,000,000.00	51,050,000.00	-1.168	11/06/09	-20,000.00	-209,064.33
42128	12/22/08	4.1200	F N M A	05/06/13	20,000,000.00	20,420,000.00	-1.168	11/06/09	-8,000.00	-83,625.73
42130	12/30/08	4.3300	F N M A	07/28/11	50,000,000.00	50,947,850.00	-15.946	07/28/09	134,650.00	-600,946.76
42131	12/30/08	4.3300	F N M A	07/28/11	30,000,000.00	30,568,710.00	-15.946	07/28/09	80,790.00	-360,568.05
42132	01/02/09	4.3300	F N M A	07/28/11	20,000,000.00	20,376,080.00	-15.849	07/28/09	56,920.00	-238,884.11
42133	01/02/09	4.3300	F N M A	07/28/11	50,000,000.00	50,940,200.00	-15.849	07/28/09	142,300.00	-597,210.27
42134	12/31/08	4.8750	T NOTE	08/15/09	25,000,000.00	25,707,031.25	.376	07/21/09	-103,699.07	5,298.87
42135	12/31/08	4.8750	T NOTE	08/15/09	50,000,000.00	51,414,062.50	.376	07/21/09	-207,398.14	10,597.74
42148	01/23/09	1.9700	F H L M C	01/23/12	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	1.962	10/23/09	738,750.00	306,444.44
42149	01/23/09	1.9700	F H L M C	01/23/12	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	1.962	10/23/09	738,750.00	306,444.44
42150	01/23/09	1.9700	F H L M C	01/23/12	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	1.962	10/23/09	738,750.00	306,444.44
42151	01/30/09	2.3000	FHLMC Bonds	01/30/12	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	2.293	10/30/09	862,500.00	380,138.89
42163	03/06/09	1.3200	COLLATERAL C Ds	09/02/09	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	1.338	MATURED	165,000.00	57,750.00
42165	03/24/09	2.2000	J P MORGAN CHASE TLGP	06/15/12	25,000,000.00	25,119,000.00	2.046		275,000.00	342,139.96
42166	03/24/09	2.2500	GENL ELEC CAP CORP FDIC	03/12/12	35,000,000.00	35,185,150.00	2.064		367,500.00	483,494.98
42170	03/16/09	2.0000	MORGAN STANLEY FDIC GTD	09/22/11	25,000,000.00	25,037,750.00	1.940		250,000.00	323,362.41
42171	03/02/09	4.0000	T - NOTE	08/31/09	25,000,000.00	25,005,434.78	.512	MATURED	64,877.72	21,744.73
42172	03/02/09	4.0000	T - NOTE	08/31/09	50,000,000.00	50,010,869.57	.512	MATURED	129,755.43	43,489.45
42177	04/14/09	2.3750	BAC 2.375 06.22.12 TLGP	06/22/12	50,000,000.00	50,685,000.00	1.923		593,750.00	648,786.84
42178	04/14/09	2.1250	JPM 2.125 12.26.12 TLGP	12/26/12	25,000,000.00	24,992,250.00	5.839	11/06/09	519,590.28	511,764.69
42181	04/02/09	2.1250	C 2.125 04.30.12 TLGP	04/30/12	25,000,000.00	25,117,500.00	1.966		265,625.00	328,764.09
42182	04/02/09	2.1500	BK OF THE WEST.BNP 2.15	03/27/12	5,000,000.00	5,026,950.00	1.962		52,256.94	65,658.54
42183	04/02/09	2.1500	BK OF THE WEST.BNP 2.15	03/27/12	20,000,000.00	20,108,000.00	1.961		209,027.78	262,589.59
42184	04/13/09	1.2000	FEDERAL FARM CR BKS GLOB	10/13/10	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	1.217	07/13/09	150,000.00	20,000.00
42190	04/21/09	3.0000	FHLMC 3 5NCL	04/21/14	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	3.004		750,000.00	1,000,000.00

CITY / COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
 MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487

(EIS / ERNEIS)

EARNED INCOME SUMMARY
 07/01/09 THROUGH 02/28/10
 SORT KEYS ARE FUND
 FUND: 100 POOLED FUNDS

PAGE: 2
 RUN: 03/16/10 10:04:09

INV NO.	PURCHASE DATE	COUPON RATE	DESCRIPTION	TICKER / MATURITY DATE	SHARES / SCHEDULED PAR VALUE	SCHEDULED BOOK VALUE	YIELD/ 365	DATE SOLD/MAT	INCOME RECEIVED THIS PER	TOTAL/NET EARNINGS
42191	04/02/09	2.1000	BAC 2.1 04.30.12 TLGP	04/30/12	25,000,000.00	25,093,000.00	1.975		262,500.00	329,894.13
42195	04/16/09	1.6250	GE 1.625 01.07.11 TLGP	01/07/11	25,000,000.00	25,167,500.00	1.231		294,531.25	206,328.58
42196	04/16/09	1.6250	GE 1.625 01.07.11 TLGP	01/07/11	25,000,000.00	25,165,750.00	1.235		294,531.25	207,002.51
42197	04/16/09	1.6250	C 1.625 03.30.11 TLGP	03/30/11	50,000,000.00	50,225,000.00	1.390		370,138.89	464,983.64
42198	04/16/09	1.6250	GS 1.625 07.15.11 TLGP	07/15/11	50,000,000.00	50,204,500.00	1.439		607,118.05	481,065.17
42199	01/18/09	2.6500	FIRST NATIONAL BANK P	01/18/10	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	2.687	MATURED	148,694.44	147,958.31
42203	04/14/09	1.4500	B O A COLLATERIZED	04/14/10	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	1.470		737,083.33	978,749.99
42205	04/15/09	1.2000	UBOC COLLATERIZED	10/13/09	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	1.217	MATURED	603,333.33	346,666.66
42206	04/21/09	3.0000	F H L M C	04/21/14	30,000,000.00	30,000,000.00	3.004		450,000.00	600,000.00
42207	04/21/09	3.0000	F H L M C	04/21/14	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	3.004		750,000.00	1,000,000.00
42208	04/29/09	1.7000	F N M A	04/29/11	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	1.702		425,000.00	566,666.67
42211	04/28/09	2.2400	USSA CAPITAL CO	03/30/12	16,000,000.00	16,125,600.00	1.958		151,324.44	210,329.02
42212	05/18/09	1.6000	BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO CD	05/17/10	100,000.00	100,000.00	1.622		817.78	1,080.01
42214	05/18/09	1.2500	F N M A MULTI STEP BOND	11/18/11	29,825,000.00	29,825,000.00	1.240	11/18/09	186,406.25	141,875.87
42215	05/28/09	2.5000	F H L M C	03/23/12	50,000,000.00	50,540,000.00	2.095		399,305.56	705,935.28
42217	05/05/09	2.1250	FHLMC 2.125 5 4 12	05/04/12	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	2.103	11/04/09	264,149.31	181,510.42
42235	06/04/09	.1100	1 of 2	07/08/09	25,000,000.00	24,997,402.78	.112	MATURED	2,597.22	534.72
42236	06/04/09	.1100	2 of 2	07/08/09	50,000,000.00	49,994,805.56	.112	MATURED	5,194.44	1,069.44
42237	06/01/09	2.8750	ffcb 2.875 5 6 13	05/06/13	22,000,000.00	22,043,923.61	2.841	09/25/09	200,291.66	147,583.33
42238	06/02/09	.8750	T 0.875 5 11	05/31/11	50,000,000.00	49,916,453.21	2.965	07/08/09	44,953.90	28,381.66
42238	06/02/09	.8750	T 0.875 5 11	05/31/11	25,000,000.00	24,958,226.61	30.866	07/09/09	42,621.89	21,105.50
42239	07/13/09	2.0000	FHLMC 2 7 13 11 2NC3mo	07/13/11	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	1.984	10/13/09	250,000.00	250,000.00
42241	06/18/09	.1200	F H L B	07/07/09	50,000,000.00	49,996,833.33	.122	MATURED	3,166.67	1,000.00
42242	03/19/09	.4543	MORGAN STANLEY FDIC GTD	03/13/12	25,000,000.00	25,040,325.00	.540		83,989.84	90,074.12
42243	06/30/09	.5000	FHLB MULTI STEP	06/30/10	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	.499	12/30/09	125,000.00	124,305.56
42244	06/25/09	0.0000	B 7 23 09 1 of 4	07/23/09	50,000,000.00	49,995,138.89	.127	MATURED	4,861.11	3,819.44
42245	06/25/09	0.0000	b 7 23 09 2 of 4	07/23/09	50,000,000.00	49,995,138.89	.127	MATURED	4,861.11	3,819.44
42246	06/25/09	0.0000	b 7 23 09 3 of 4	07/23/09	50,000,000.00	49,995,138.89	.127	MATURED	4,861.11	3,819.44
42247	06/25/09	0.0000	b 7 23 09 4 of 4	07/23/09	25,000,000.00	24,997,569.44	.127	MATURED	2,430.56	1,909.73
42255	06/30/09	4.3750	T 4.375 12 15 10	12/15/10	50,000,000.00	52,718,557.89	1.821	11/02/09	327,175.12	326,130.62
42256	06/30/09	4.3750	T 4.375 12 15 10	12/15/10	50,000,000.00	52,718,557.89	1.821	11/02/09	327,175.12	326,130.62
42257	06/30/09	4.3750	T 4.375 12 15 10	12/15/10	25,000,000.00	26,359,278.95	1.821	11/02/09	163,587.56	163,065.31
42258	06/29/09	1.2500	CITIGROUP FDG INC GTD TL	06/03/11	50,000,000.00	49,957,000.00	1.297		267,361.11	431,508.22
42259	06/29/09	1.2500	CITIGROUP FDG INC GTD TL	06/03/11	50,000,000.00	49,957,000.00	1.297		267,361.11	431,508.22
42260	07/10/09	2.0000	FHLMC 2 3 16 11	03/16/11	35,000,000.00	35,309,400.00	1.461		128,333.33	331,252.00
42261	07/20/09	2.1250	FHLB 2.125 7.20.12 2nc3m	07/20/12	19,000,000.00	18,976,250.00	2.359	01/20/10	225,625.00	225,625.00
42262	07/16/09	0.0000	FHLB disc 08.06.09	08/06/09	50,000,000.00	49,995,625.00	.152	MATURED	4,375.00	4,375.00
42263	07/16/09	0.0000	FHLB disc 08.06.09	08/06/09	25,000,000.00	24,997,812.50	.152	MATURED	2,187.50	2,187.50
42269	07/23/09	0.0000	B 8 20 09	08/20/09	50,000,000.00	49,994,127.78	.153	MATURED	5,872.22	5,872.22
42270	07/23/09	0.0000	B 8 20 09	08/20/09	50,000,000.00	49,994,127.78	.153	MATURED	5,872.22	5,872.22
42272	07/23/09	0.0000	B 8 20 09	08/20/09	25,000,000.00	24,997,063.88	.153	MATURED	2,936.12	2,936.12
42273	07/23/09	0.0000	b 8 20 09	08/20/09	50,000,000.00	49,994,127.78	.153	MATURED	5,872.22	5,872.22
42274	07/30/09	3.0000	GE TLGP 3 12 09 11	12/09/11	50,000,000.00	51,602,500.00	1.587		537,500.00	481,330.24
42275	07/28/09	4.5000	T 4.5 11 15 10	11/15/10	50,000,000.00	52,929,008.15	1.740	09/28/09	156,419.84	156,419.84

CITY / COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487

(EIS / ERNEIS)

EARNED INCOME SUMMARY
07/01/09 THROUGH 02/28/10
SORT KEYS ARE FUND
FUND: 100 POOLED FUNDS

PAGE: 3
RUN: 03/16/10 10:04:09

INV NO.	PURCHASE DATE	COUPON RATE	DESCRIPTION	TICKER / MATURITY DATE	SHARES / SCHEDULED PAR VALUE	SCHEDULED BOOK VALUE	YIELD/365	DATE SOLD/MAT	INCOME RECEIVED THIS PER	TOTAL/NET EARNINGS
42276	07/28/09	4.5000	T 4.5 11 15 10	11/15/10	50,000,000.00	52,929,008.15	1.606	11/02/09	225,883.15	225,883.15
42277	07/31/09	1.7500	CD FIRST NATL BANK OF NO	07/31/10	5,000,000.00	5,000,000.00	1.783		37,187.50	52,013.88
42278	08/18/09	1.7500	T 1.75 8 15 12	08/15/12	50,000,000.00	50,304,008.15	15.897	08/19/09	21,908.97	21,908.97
42279	08/18/09	1.7500	T 1.75 8 15 12	08/15/12	50,000,000.00	50,304,008.15	8.811	08/19/09	10,954.49	12,143.35
42279	08/18/09	1.7500	T 1.75 8 15 12	08/15/12	25,000,000.00	25,152,004.08	9.004	09/10/09	137,695.32	136,506.45
42280	08/19/09	1.0000	T 1 7 31 11	07/31/11	50,000,000.00	50,010,190.22	5.811	09/09/09	167,204.49	167,204.49
42281	08/19/09	1.0000	T 1 7 31 11	07/31/11	50,000,000.00	50,010,190.22	3.158	11/02/09	324,558.42	324,558.42
42282	08/27/09	1.5000	FHLB 1.5 3NC1 step-up	08/27/12	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	1.504			383,333.33
42283	08/27/09	1.5000	FHLB 1.5 3NC1 step-up	08/27/12	4,300,000.00	4,300,000.00	1.504			32,966.67
42284	08/20/09	0.0000	B 09 17 09	09/17/09	50,000,000.00	49,996,033.33	.103	MATURED	3,966.67	3,966.67
42285	08/20/09	0.0000	B 09 17 09	09/17/09	50,000,000.00	49,996,033.33	.103	MATURED	3,966.67	3,966.67
42286	08/20/09	0.0000	B 09 17 09	09/17/09	50,000,000.00	49,996,033.33	.103	MATURED	3,966.67	3,966.67
42287	08/20/09	0.0000	B 09 17 09	09/17/09	25,000,000.00	24,998,016.67	.103	MATURED	1,983.33	1,983.33
42293	08/26/09	0.0000	B 9 10 09	09/10/09	50,000,000.00	49,998,645.83	.066	MATURED	1,354.17	1,354.17
42294	09/02/09	.7200	B of A CD 0.72 09 02 10	09/02/10	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	.730		45,500.00	90,000.00
42295	09/10/09	2.1500	FNMA 2.15 09 10 12 3NC1	09/10/12	52,546,000.00	52,693,128.80	2.068			513,536.47
42296	09/24/09	2.0000	FHLB 2 9 24 12 3NC6MO	09/24/12	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	2.353	02/25/10	496,444.44	496,444.44
42297	09/24/09	2.0000	FHLB 2 9 24 12 3NC6MO	09/24/12	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	2.353	02/25/10	248,222.22	248,222.22
42298	09/04/09	.8750	T 0.875 02 28 11	02/28/11	50,000,000.00	50,179,687.50	.638			156,092.85
42299	09/16/09	3.1250	HSBC 3.125 12 16 11 TLGP	12/16/11	50,000,000.00	51,969,550.00	1.340		390,625.00	317,917.69
42300	09/16/09	1.8750	FNMA 1.875 04 20 2012	04/20/12	50,000,000.00	50,462,000.00	4.547	11/02/09	297,041.67	297,041.67
42301	09/16/09	1.3750	T 1.375 2 15 12	02/15/12	50,000,000.00	50,199,218.75	1.195		283,967.39	273,061.10
42302	09/17/09	0.0000	B 10 29 09	10/29/09	50,000,000.00	49,996,791.67	.056	MATURED	3,208.33	3,208.33
42303	09/17/09	0.0000	B 10 29 09	10/29/09	50,000,000.00	49,996,791.67	.056	MATURED	3,208.33	3,208.33
42304	09/17/09	0.0000	B 10 29 09	10/29/09	50,000,000.00	49,996,791.67	.056	MATURED	3,208.33	3,208.33
42305	09/17/09	0.0000	B 10 29 09	10/29/09	25,000,000.00	24,998,395.83	.056	MATURED	1,604.17	1,604.17
42306	03/23/09	.4538	Union Bank TLGP Float 03	03/16/12	25,000,000.00	25,033,725.00	.549		83,949.97	91,470.08
42307	09/23/09	4.5000	FFCB 4.5 10 17 12	10/17/12	25,000,000.00	27,009,525.00	4.657	11/02/09	139,350.00	139,350.00
42308	09/23/09	4.5000	FFCB 4.5 10 17 12	10/17/12	25,000,000.00	27,009,525.00	4.657	11/02/09	139,350.00	139,350.00
42309	09/23/09	4.5000	FFCB 4.5 10 17 12	10/17/12	25,000,000.00	27,009,525.00	4.657	11/02/09	139,350.00	139,350.00
42310	09/23/09	4.5000	FFCB 4.5 10 17 12	10/17/12	25,000,000.00	27,009,525.00	4.657	11/02/09	139,350.00	139,350.00
42312	09/28/09	2.0200	FFCB 2.02 4 20 12 2.5NC6	04/20/12	50,000,000.00	50,268,000.00	1.813		61,722.22	385,108.82
42313	08/24/09	1.5000	CA GO CP 10 06 09	10/06/09	12,500,000.00	12,500,000.00	1.500	MATURED	22,089.04	22,089.04
42314	10/06/09	.5000	CA GO CP 12 07 09	12/07/09	16,715,000.00	16,715,000.00	.500	MATURED	14,196.30	14,196.30
42315	10/29/09	2.0000	FHLB 2 10 29 12 3NC6mo	10/29/12	35,140,000.00	35,140,000.00	2.011			238,171.11
42316	10/13/09	.7000	UBOC PTD 0.7 10 13 10	10/13/10	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	.710		91,388.89	135,138.89
42317	10/22/09	1.6250	C 1.625 03.30.11 TLGP	03/30/11	35,000,000.00	35,458,256.94	.782			98,735.29
42318	10/20/09	.7500	FHLB 0.75 9 29 11 2NC1 s	09/29/11	48,450,000.00	48,417,901.88	.812			142,150.47
42319	10/28/09	1.0000	FHLB 2nc3m Step	10/28/11	50,000,000.00	49,962,500.00	1.290	01/28/10	162,500.00	162,500.00
42320	11/02/09	1.6250	FHLB 1.625 11 21 12	11/21/12	100,000,000.00	99,648,000.00	4.338	02/25/10	1,362,069.44	1,362,069.44
42322	10/30/09	1.6700	FHLMC 1.67 4 30 12 2.5NC	04/30/12	75,000,000.00	75,000,000.00	1.679			420,979.17
42323	10/27/09	1.6500	FHLMC 1.365 04 27 12 2.5	04/27/12	20,665,000.00	20,625,736.50	2.395	01/27/10	124,506.62	124,506.62
42324	10/29/09	0.0000	B 11 27 09	11/27/09	175,000,000.00	174,995,065.98	.035	MATURED	4,934.02	4,934.02
42325	10/29/09	1.0000	T 1 08 31 11	08/31/11	100,000.00	100,316.41	.832		-162.98	281.74

CITY / COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487

(EIS / ERNEIS)

EARNED INCOME SUMMARY
07/01/09 THROUGH 02/28/10
SORT KEYS ARE FUND
FUND: 100 POOLED FUNDS

PAGE: 4
RUN: 03/16/10 10:04:09

INV NO.	PURCHASE DATE	COUPON RATE	DESCRIPTION	TICKER / MATURITY DATE	SHARES / SCHEDULED PAR VALUE	SCHEDULED BOOK VALUE	YIELD/365	DATE SOLD/MAT	INCOME RECEIVED THIS PER	TOTAL/NET EARNINGS
42326	10/29/09	1.0000	T 1 08 31 11	08/31/11	99,900,000.00	100,200,480.47	.841		-162,820.44	284,313.61
42327	11/09/09	2.0000	FHLB 3NC3 1x 2% fixed co	11/09/12	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	1.984	02/09/10	500,000.00	500,000.00
42328	11/04/09	2.2500	MS 2.25 3 13 12	03/13/12	20,000,000.00	20,495,550.00	1.332			87,505.12
42329	11/03/09	1.5000	T 1.5 10 31 10	10/31/10	50,000,000.00	50,545,277.97	.661	12/22/09	44,878.72	44,878.72
42330	11/03/09	2.1250	FFCB Bullet 2.125 6 18 1	06/18/12	100,000,000.00	101,773,200.00	1.449		265,625.00	478,116.92
42331	11/06/09	2.2500	MS TLGP 2.25 03 13 12	03/13/12	50,000,000.00	51,249,625.00	1.326			214,083.62
42332	11/06/09	2.1250	GE TLGP 2.125 12 21 12	12/21/12	25,000,000.00	25,253,750.00	1.806		66,406.25	144,129.71
42333	11/10/09	1.6250	FNMA 1.625% 2.5NC6 Ameri	05/10/12	75,000,000.00	75,000,000.00	1.648			375,781.25
42334	11/19/09	3.8750	FHLMC 3.875 6 29 11	06/29/11	50,000,000.00	52,552,500.00	1.113	02/01/10	119,500.00	119,500.00
42335	11/19/09	1.7500	FNMA 1.75 3 23 11	03/23/11	50,000,000.00	50,906,111.11	.614			87,303.17
42337	11/20/09	3.8750	FHLMC 3.875 6 29 11 Bull	06/29/11	50,000,000.00	52,592,852.50	.696	02/01/10	73,765.55	73,765.55
42338	11/20/09	1.7500	FNMA 1.75 3 23 2011 Bull	03/23/11	20,000,000.00	20,370,016.67	.587			33,082.55
42341	11/19/09	1.0000	T 1 7 31 11	07/31/11	120,000,000.00	120,801,562.50	.597		238,043.46	202,093.06
42342	11/19/09	3.8750	FFCB Bullet 3.875 8 25 1	08/25/11	50,000,000.00	52,705,000.00	.812		516,666.67	120,526.66
42345	11/27/09	0.0000	B 12 24 09	12/24/09	175,000,000.00	174,992,125.00	.061	MATURED	7,875.00	7,875.00
42346	12/30/09	1.1250	FHLMC 1.125 12 30 11 2NC	12/30/11	50,000,000.00	49,995,000.00	1.146			95,730.31
42347	12/21/09	1.1250	FHLMC 1.125 12 21 11 2NC	12/21/11	54,000,000.00	54,000,000.00	1.141			118,125.00
42348	12/07/09	.8750	T 0.875 1 31 11	01/31/11	100,000,000.00	100,480,468.76	.452		130,774.46	104,777.40
42349	12/21/09	1.8500	FHLB 1.85 12 21 12 3NC1	12/21/12	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	1.876			359,722.22
42350	12/28/09	1.7500	FNMA FIXED 1.75 3NC1 1X	12/28/12	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	1.774			306,250.00
42351	12/28/09	1.7500	FHLMC Fixed 1.75 3NC1 1X	12/28/12	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	1.774			306,250.00
42352	12/09/09	1.1250	T 1.125 12 15 11	12/15/11	100,000,000.00	100,757,812.50	.640	02/19/10	63,793.76	127,174.14
42352	12/09/09	1.1250	T 1.125 12 15 11	12/15/11	50,000,000.00	50,378,906.25	.859			11,849.57
42353	12/21/09	1.8000	FNMA 3NC6 1.80% fixed	12/21/12	58,450,000.00	58,496,760.00	1.797			201,588.50
42354	09/10/09	.7559	FHLMC 3nc1 float step-up	09/10/12	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	.786		100,235.00	185,278.25
42356	11/20/09	1.1250	FHLNC 1.125 6 1 11	06/01/11	28,600,000.00	28,779,470.72	.725		9,831.25	57,783.91
42357	11/19/09	0.0000	B 12 31 09	12/31/09	30,000,000.00	29,998,915.00	.031	MATURED	1,085.00	1,085.00
42358	11/19/09	0.0000	B 3 11 10	03/11/10	50,000,000.00	49,991,288.89	.057			7,933.33
42363	01/26/10	1.0000	FHLB 1 07 26 11 1.5NC1mo	07/26/11	72,300,000.00	72,300,000.00	.981	02/26/10	60,250.00	60,250.00
42365	01/18/10	1.0000	FIRST NATL PTD 01 18 11	01/18/11	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	1.014			11,666.67
42366	02/08/10	1.8000	FNMA 3NC1.5 1X 1.80	02/08/13	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	1.999			57,500.00
42367	02/08/10	1.8000	FNMA 3NC1.5 1X	02/08/13	25,000,000.00	24,987,500.00	2.016			28,989.51
42368	02/26/10	2.1000	FHLB 2.1 2 26 13 3NC1mo	02/26/13	40,000,000.00	39,996,000.00	3.552			11,677.62
42370	02/19/10	1.6700	FFCB 1.67 11 19 12 2.75N	11/19/12	75,000,000.00	74,947,500.00	2.059			42,272.91
42371	02/25/10	1.8000	FHLMC 1.8 2 25 13 3NC1	02/25/13	75,000,000.00	75,000,000.00	2.737			22,500.00
SUBTOTAL (FUND) 100 POOLED FUNDS				- ASSETS	712 DAYS	3147586000.00	3165334900.65		28,123,772.53	28,279,185.07
SUBTOTAL (FUND) 100 POOLED FUNDS				- NET		3147586000.00	3165334900.65		28,123,772.53	28,279,185.07

CITY / COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
 MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487

(EIS / ERNEIS)

EARNED INCOME SUMMARY
 07/01/09 THROUGH 02/28/10
 SORT KEYS ARE FUND
 FUND: 100 POOLED FUNDS

PAGE: 5
 RUN: 03/16/10 10:04:09

INV NO.	PURCHASE DATE	COUPON RATE	DESCRIPTION	TICKER / MATURITY DATE	SHARES / SCHEDULED PAR VALUE	SCHEDULED BOOK VALUE	YIELD/ 365	DATE SOLD/MAT	INCOME RECEIVED THIS PER	TOTAL/NET EARNINGS
---------	---------------	-------------	-------------	------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------	------------	---------------	--------------------------	--------------------

FUND STATISTICS		ASSETS	LIABILITIES
AVERAGE DAILY INVESTMENT BALANCE	:	2,987,798.069.18	
EARNED INTEREST YIELD THIS PERIOD	:	1.422	.000
WEIGHTED AVG YIELD AT END OF PERIOD	:	1.478	.000
TOTAL INTEREST EARNED FOR FUTURE RECEIPT:	:	10,315,412.05	

CITY / COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
 MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487

(EIS / ERNEIS)

EARNED INCOME SUMMARY
 07/01/09 THROUGH 02/28/10
 SORT KEYS ARE FUND
 FUND: 9703 SFUSD TRANS 08-09

PAGE: 6
 RUN: 03/16/10 10:04:09

INV NO.	PURCHASE DATE	COUPON RATE	DESCRIPTION	TICKER / MATURITY DATE	SHARES / SCHEDULED PAR VALUE	SCHEDULED BOOK VALUE	YIELD/365	DATE SOLD/MAT	INCOME RECEIVED THIS PER	TOTAL/NET EARNINGS
42118	12/09/08	2.3200	US BANK COLLATERAL	11/23/09	35,000,000.00	35,000,000.00	2.352	MATURED	787,188.89	327,055.56
SUBTOTAL (FUND) 9703 SFUSD TRANS 08-09- ASSETS 0 DAYS					.00	.00			787,188.89	327,055.56
SUBTOTAL (FUND) 9703 SFUSD TRANS 08-09- NET					.00	.00			787,188.89	327,055.56

FUND STATISTICS		ASSETS	LIABILITIES
AVERAGE DAILY INVESTMENT BALANCE	:	20,884,773.66	
EARNED INTEREST YIELD THIS PERIOD	:	2.352	.000
WEIGHTED AVG YIELD AT END OF PERIOD	:	.000	.000
TOTAL INTEREST EARNED FOR FUTURE RECEIPT:			

CITY / COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
 MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487

(EIS / ERNEIS)

EARNED INCOME SUMMARY
 07/01/09 THROUGH 02/28/10
 SORT KEYS ARE FUND
 FUND: 9704 SFUSD BONDS 2006B

PAGE: 7
 RUN: 03/16/10 10:04:09

INV NO.	PURCHASE DATE	COUPON RATE	DESCRIPTION	TICKER / MATURITY DATE	SHARES / SCHEDULED PAR VALUE	SCHEDULED BOOK VALUE	YIELD/365	DATE SOLD/MAT	INCOME RECEIVED THIS PER	TOTAL/NET EARNINGS
42156	02/11/09	2.0000	FANNIE MAE	02/11/11	20,000,000.00	20,000,000.00	1.983	02/11/10	400,000.00	244,444.44
42159	02/06/09	2.8000	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT	01/28/14	18,225,000.00	18,152,100.00	2.896		498,960.00	349,949.42
42160	02/06/09	.5190	T BILL	01/14/10	50,000,000.00	49,757,750.00	.520	MATURED	242,250.00	139,541.67
42161	02/06/09	.5190	T BILL	01/14/10	20,000,000.00	19,903,100.00	2.818	09/09/09	87,727.78	107,561.12
42176	02/06/09	.9000	FREDDIE MAC DISCOUNT	01/08/10	20,000,000.00	19,832,000.00	.920	MATURED	168,000.00	95,500.00
42221	05/12/09	1.7500	FNMA 1.75 3 23 11	03/23/11	30,000,000.00	30,359,458.33	8.130	07/21/09	185,525.00	135,243.14
42264	07/21/09	1.1250	T 1.125 06.30.11	06/30/11	30,000,000.00	30,093,750.00	.956		149,490.49	175,942.77
42355	09/10/09	.7559	FHLMC 3nc1 float step-up	09/10/12	20,000,000.00	20,000,000.00	.786		40,094.00	74,111.30
42359	01/08/10	1.2500	T 1.25 11 30 10	11/30/10	20,000,000.00	20,183,035.71	.375			10,790.98
42360	01/14/10	5.7500	FHLMC 5.75 01 15 12	01/15/12	20,000,000.00	21,855,220.00	1.212		3,194.44	33,394.53
42361	01/15/10	2.7500	RF 2.75 12 10 10	12/10/10	11,310,000.00	11,584,240.48	.446			6,367.95
42362	01/14/10	0.0000	B 01 13 11	01/13/11	18,000,000.00	17,938,484.00	.344			7,774.00
42369	02/26/10	2.1000	FHLB 2.1 2 26 13 3NC1mo	02/26/13	20,000,000.00	19,998,000.00	3.552			5,838.80
SUBTOTAL (FUND) 9704 SFUSD BONDS 2006B- ASSETS				691 DAYS	157,535,000.00	159,804,830.19			1,775,241.71	1,386,460.12
SUBTOTAL (FUND) 9704 SFUSD BONDS 2006B- NET					157,535,000.00	159,804,830.19			1,775,241.71	1,386,460.12

FUND STATISTICS	ASSETS	LIABILITIES
AVERAGE DAILY INVESTMENT BALANCE	: 156,863,340.80	
EARNED INTEREST YIELD THIS PERIOD	: 1.328	.000
WEIGHTED AVG YIELD AT END OF PERIOD	: 1.336	.000
TOTAL INTEREST EARNED FOR FUTURE RECEIPT:	301,726.80	

GRAND TOTAL 100.00%(C) 711 DAYS 3305121000.00 3325139730.84 1.423 30,686,203.1329,992,700.75

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 544-5227

Date: March 29, 2010

To: Members of the Board of Supervisors

From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board *AC*

Subject: Form 700

This is to inform you that the following individuals have submitted a Form 700 Statement:

Harvey Rose – Annual

Debra Newman – Annual

Arthur Louie - Annual

Severin Campbell – Annual

Sean Elsbernd – Annual

April Veneracion – Annual

Tom Jackson – Annual

Erasmio Vazquez – Annual

Ohn Myint - Annual

13

BOS-11
cpage
File 091476

30 March 2010

Board of Supervisors
City Hall
Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, C 94102-4689

**Re: Proposed Ordinance Amending Heights in Upper Market Street
Historic District – File No. 091476**

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed amendment to heights in the Upper Market Street Historic district.

I have lived in this neighborhood for over twenty years and am concerned that the increased building height would have a negative impact on the ambiance and quality of life in the neighborhood. Allowing structures of sixty-five feet will limit the amount of light and possibly create a wind-tunnel effect. I am also worried about the impact of the additional housing that the added height would bring. This neighborhood is already quite congested; it is very difficult to find street parking now and the extra housing would only make the problem worse.

One of the things that makes San Francisco a wonderful place to live is the diversity and unique feel of each neighborhood. Most of the buildings in the Upper Market Street Historic District are three or four stories tall giving a feeling of cohesiveness to the area. Building structures that are six stories high will drastically affect the ambiance of the neighborhood, so I ask that you reject the proposed height increase.

Sincerely,



Susan Stevens
160B Sanchez Street
San Francisco, CA 94114

BY _____
AK

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 MAR 29 PM 12:41

14

005-11, copy
File 091476

Bill Jaeck

From: Richard Winchester [rwinchester@iii.com]
Sent: Monday, March 29, 2010 11:53 AM
To: Bill Jaeck
Cc: rwinchester@iii.com
Subject: RE: FILE 091476

B

To Whom It May Concern RE: File 091476

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposal to amend the height restrictions along Market Street between Church and Noe to 65'. While I am not opposed to new construction along this busy corridor, the new height limit is excessive and out of character with the neighborhood, its existing architecture and land use. Irreparable damage to the quality of life of the area will be done if these oversized buildings are allowed to be built, benefitting no one other than the developers of such projects.

Richard Winchester
152 Sanchez
San Francisco, CA 94114

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 MAR 29 PM 12:41

BY AK



"Nan Haynes"
<NHaynes@ParksConservan
cy.org>

03/29/2010 10:23 AM

To <MTABoard@sfmta.com>, <Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org>,
<Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>

cc

bcc

Subject Please Do Not Increase Parking Meter Use in the Marina

Ladies and Gentlemen,

With due respect, I would like to register my opposition to extending the hours of the parking meters, initiating Sunday meters and increasing the already expensive meter fees in the Marina District or anywhere else in San Francisco.

These changes would be disastrous to small businesses and a burden on neighbors and visitors. It is not fair to continually use those of us already struggling to afford living in this glorious City to solve your fiscal mistakes and deficits. Please stop.

Thank you for your consideration.

Nan Haynes

15



taylor knight
<tck428@yahoo.com>
03/29/2010 11:02 AM

To mtaboard@sfmta.com, gavin.newsom@sfgov.org,
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

cc

bcc

Subject Meter Changes

Hello-

I would like to state that I am against any time changes and extentions on the meters in the Marina and around the city. If we were to change the times, business would slowly stop. People love coming out to the Marina on Sundays because of the no meter time. If they were to extended to 10pm, people would not want to come out and support the small businesses. Also if the times did change it would take a toll on the neighborhood around Chestnut and Union streets, lots of crowding and unhappy people. Plus its expensive enough to park in the meters, 3.25 and hour is simply ridiculous. Please do the right thing and DO NOT make any changes. Thank You!



Michelle Persing
<michellepersing@gmail.com
>

03/27/2010 04:59 PM

To MTABoard@sfmta.com, gavin.newsom@sfgov.org,
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

cc

bcc

Subject No changes to meters

I do not want any changes to the meters. No extended time any day and no increase in meter fees.
Thank you.



Stephane de Bord
<stephane.debord@gmail.com>

03/27/2010 04:21 PM

To MTABoard@sfmta.com, Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org,
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

cc

bcc

Subject Save small business - no extended parking meters, no parking meters on sunday, and no raised meter rates in san francisco.

I am a resident of San Francisco, and i am strongly against any proposal to increase parking meter rates, hours or days of operation. It's expensive enough to live in this city between the high tax rates, the high every day living costs and parking tickets. Everyone is hurting in this economy and has to learn to adjust with doing more with less. The city government is no different. It's time that government stop expecting that anytime they are in a pinch, they can just increase taxes and fees on the taxpayers. The whole attitude that government has towards fees and taxes is out of hand. Government should do well when taxpayers are doing well and when taxpayers are not doing well then government needs to learn how to tighten its belt. The government is suppose to be for the people and by the people not for themselves at the cost of the people. Please do not introduce a change in parking, rates or meter schedules.

Regards,

Stephane



Chris Houston
<sfmodernartifacts@gmail.com>
m>

03/28/2010 08:22 PM

To MTABoard@sfmta.com, Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org,
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
cc patriciavaughey@att.net

bcc

Subject Parking Meter proposals for the Marina District

Dear Sir/Madame,

I am not convinced that active Parking meters on Sunday, extended meters in the evening and a general increase in meter fares will benefit the businesses in the Marina.

For this reason, I am asking that your offices postpone or simply reject the proposals mentioned here until this city has demonstrated that San Francisco takes seriously it's interest in making public transportation a viable alternative to driving a car in our fair city.

People should not be provoked and prodded to move their cars around more often. More active and expensive meters simply put more cars into motion. Knowing that there won't be any parking will encourage people to cab, catch a train or take a bus. All the city needs to do is make those options more effective.

Hiking parking fares sounds like a swipe at car culture but if it does, in fact, make parking easier, it seems to me to be a boon to car culture.

The city can't have it both ways here.

Regards,

Chris Houston

Modern Artifacts

www.modernartifacts.net

415.255.9000

sfmodernartifacts@gmail.com

1639 Market Street

San Francisco, CA 94103



Cory McCabe
<CORYMCCABE@COMCAS
T.NET>

03/28/2010 03:28 PM

To MTABoard@sfmta.com

cc Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

bcc

Subject Save small businesses, don't change parking meters!

Please!

No extended time on any days
No meters on Sunday
No increases in meter fares

Please!

Cory E McCabe
3125 Scott St
SF CA 94123

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
03/29/2010 05:05 PM

To Michela Alioto-Pier/BOS/SFGOV,
cc
bcc
Subject Extended Parking meters



dianed2@aol.com
03/28/2010 01:40 PM

To MTAboard@sfmta.com, Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org,
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject Extended Parking meters

To All,

As a long time resident and home owner in the Marina, I am STRONGLY opposed to any changes in the parking meters in the area.

I do not want any changes to the current meter policy, i.e.

- * **No extended time any day**
- * **No Meters on Sunday**
- * **No increases in meter fees**

At the recent neighborhood meeting held on March 22, 2010 at the Palace of Fine Arts, there was no support for these changes.

Please listen to and adhere to the requests of the residents in the Marina,

Sincerely,
Diane Downing
155 Alhambra Street
SF 94123
415-931-5112

To whom it may concern:

As a long time resident and business person in Cow Hollow I want to express my concern over recently proposed parking meter changes in our neighborhood. For anyone that has lived and/or worked here for the last few years, we have seen our movie theater, local pharmacies and many long time shop owners close their doors.

Increased parking fees and extended hours may in theory add to the city operating budget in the short run. In the end, however, it is detrimental to the businesses struggling to survive and an irritant to those trying to shop in the area.

We are opposed to:

- Extending metered time periods
- To meters on Sunday
- To increased meter fees

Thanking you in advance,

Jim Caldwell
Manager, Prudential Realty
2200 Union Street



Victoria Libin
<victoria@a16sf.com>
03/27/2010 09:42 AM

To mtaboard@sfmta.com, gavin.newsom@sfgov.org,
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

cc

bcc

Subject No changes to parking meters on Chestnut

Increasing the hours or days of parking meters will hurt Chestnut businesses like A16 and in turn hurt the city. If our customers get parking tickets they will stop coming for dinner which will lower our revenue which in turn will mean less sales tax and payroll taxes for the city. This seems like another poorly thought out measure by the city to be penny wise and dollar foolish.

Sincerely,

Victoria Libin

The information in this message is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, or believe that you have received this communication in error, please do not print, copy, retransmit, forward or otherwise use the information. Also, please indicate to the sender that you received this e-mail in error and delete the copy you received. Thank you.



William Dito
<roseman12@sbcglobal.net>
03/27/2010 09:27 AM

To Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org
cc Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
bcc
Subject MARINA DISTRICT METER RATES

I don't care how you rationalize the increase/extended time of traffic meter rates in the Marina District, it is obviously a way to get more dollars in the city coffers. Also, quite obvious, is the fact that it will be bad for business in the district. You have already raised the traffic fine fees to an outrageous level. And look at these times!!! Businesses are closing all over the place!! If you want to help business and the little man, forget about any changes to the meter rates/times. Forget the spin. Just do it.

Bill Dito
roseman12@sbcglobal.net



Anais Radonich Galvin
<anaisrg@gmail.com>

03/26/2010 06:05 PM

To mtaboard@sfmta.com, gavin.newsom@sfgov.org,
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

cc

bcc

Subject Re: meter rates

> I do not want any changes to the meters.
>
> Please do not extend the meter times any day.
>
> No meters on Sundays.
>
> No increases in meter fees.
>
> thanks,
>
> Anais Radonich Galvin



Liza Shaw
<shawliza@gmail.com>

03/26/2010 04:28 PM

To mtaboard@sfmta.com, gavin.newsom@sfgov.org,
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc Andrew Mosblech <andrew.mosblech@gmail.com>, Ross
Wunderlich <rosswun@gmail.com>, Kellie Holmes
<kellie@a16sf.com>, Collin Leaver

bcc

Subject meter rates

I do not want any changes to the meters.

Please do not extend the meter times any day.

No meters on Sundays.

No increases in meter fees.

thanks,

Liza Shaw



kat@katanderson.net

03/26/2010 01:33 PM

To MTABoard@sfmta.com, gavin.newsom@sfgov.org,
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc bond.yee@sfmta.com

bcc

Subject Protest of Marina/Cow Hollow Parking Pilot Program: Save small business - no extended parking meters, no parking meters on sunday, and no raised meter rates in san francisco.

Dear Board Members, Mayor Newsom, and project manager, Bond Yee:

I am a 15-year resident of the Marina, a lawyer, and a property owner one block off of Chestnut Street. I am on the Board of Directors of the Marina Community Association, and a candidate for District 2 Supervisor. I write to object to the parking meter proposal cited below.

The March 22, 2010 annual meeting of the Cow Hollow Neighbors in Action and the Marina-Cow Hollow Neighbors and Merchants received the parking pilot presentation for Marina/Cow Hollow from Jay Primus. Apparently, great expense will be incurred to change meter mechanisms and domes to enable meters to accept multiple forms of payment. While we think that this kind of convenience is all right, we object to everything else that was proposed from extending metering hours, requiring metering on Sundays, and increasing meter fees without the concomitant act of decreasing parking fines.

We find that SF is trying to create more "junk revenue" by pursuing this pilot program, and that there will NOT be added convenience to residents and merchants. The notion that this program will cut down on double parking and drivers circling is not well-considered, or proven. In addition, as drivers opt not to park at the meters, the neighborhoods will be forced to deal with impacts due to more cars looking for parking around our houses.

It appears that the City is trying to break the backs of us residents and merchants, desperately grasping for more forms of revenue. Basically, what the SFMTA proposes is an auto tax, another fee, and is punitive to the residents and working class people who come here for jobs such as construction, home improvement, cleaning, and the like. **THIS PROPOSAL ALIENATES THE VERY PEOPLE YOU ARE SUPPOSED TO BE SERVING!!** The idea of metering on Sundays is especially repugnant as it is the one day that people can count on using their cars to make multiple errands without having to worry about incurring a \$53 or more parking fine.

During the March 22, 2010 meeting, more than 239 persons representing businesses and households

voted not to support

changes in meters to 10 P.M. on any day of the week and no meters on Sunday and no increases in

meter fees within San Francisco. Also, we took a hand vote in front of Mr. Primus whether we wanted

these things. About 100 people were still in the room. Not a single person voted for extended

metering hours. Only one person voted for metering on Sunday. Please do not ignore this information.

When the SFMTA board considers this on March 30, we urge the board not to go forward with this plan. Mr. Primus told us that an intern worked on this in the summer with some oversight from him, gathering comparative data from other large cities. We urge you to consider that such an idea was ill-conceived - how do you expect us to find the data acceptable when it was obtained by someone who was not a professional in transportation and/or urban planning? Please withdraw the proposal.

We do not want any changes to the meters.

No extended time any day.

No meters on Sunday

No increases in meter fees.

Very truly yours,

Kat Anderson

www.katanderson.net

kat@katanderson.net



sloduca@weolive.com
03/29/2010 04:15 PM

To mtaboard@sfmta.org, gavin.newsom@sfgov.org,
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

cc

bcc

Subject Marina Parking Meters

Hello,

As the manager of a small business in the Marina of San Francisco, I do not want any changes made to the current meter system.

This includes: Not extending the meter on any day, No meters on Sunday, and no increases to meter fees.

Small business (like my own) are already suffering enough. Business is slow and meters are already a deterrance for people visiting the Marina.

Thank you,
Stephanie Lo Duca
We Olive
415-673-3669



daniel flores solano
<danielflores79@hotmail.com>

>
03/29/2010 02:44 PM

To <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

cc

bcc

Subject that you do not want any changes to the meters

No extended time any day. No meters on sunday. No increases in meter fees

Con Hotmail siempre estás conectado con quien quieres



"Raine DAUFELDT"
<2lulushoehead@msn.com>

03/26/2010 06:26 PM

To <MTAboard@sfmta.com>, <Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org>,
<Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>

cc

bcc

Subject PARKING "COFFEE" PARTY

"This \$30.00 T-Shirt now costs me \$90.00...I will never shop on Chestnut Street again."

This is a true statement from a customer and one of many comments that I hear everyday.

Business on Chestnut Street is hard enough and Sunday is one of our best days due to the fact that people can shop without worrying about their meter and a ticket. Those shoppers keep us in business, which I don't need to tell you, has been extremely challenging for the last year and a half.

Our small business can not take any more reasons for people not coming, shopping and of course dining.

Extending the meter time to 10pm will hurt not only the restaurants but would hurt me too in that the restaurants bring the people into the Marina and thus see our store and come back.(Hopefully)

Therefore, I am pleading with you to keep the meters FREE on Sunday, No increase in meter fees, and DO NOT extend the metering time into the evening hours..You just try to eat a dinner or see a movie in ONE HOUR. You

may want to go out in the middle of a movie or dinner to replugin your meter or move your car...(I wonder, did you

even think about that.) Also we are not Fisherman's Wharf so you are hurting the locals as well as the tourists.

Please reconsider these options. These proposals may put more money in your coffers but it will be on the backs of your small independent merchants.

Raine Daufeldt

Manager, Rabat 2080 Chestnut

and a resident of the Marina for 33 yrs.



"Hal Wahlborg"
<h.wahlborg@att.net>
03/25/2010 05:11 PM

To <Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>,
<Chris.Daly@sfgov.org>, <Nicole.Avril@sfgov.org>,
"Howard Lazar" <Howard.Lazar@sfgov.org>,
cc
bcc
Subject new craft market

To whom it may concern,

As an artist, I started selling my artwork at the Santa Barbara Beach Art Show in 1970. So for forty years I have made a living as an artist. Mostly I have sold glass blown objects of different kinds during this time. Four years ago I picked the Street Artist Program as a good venue for my artwork (see photo). However, sales have steadily declined since Oct. of 2008 when the economy collapsed. I find it hard to believe the Parks and Rec. seriously believes that another crafts market would be successful at this time.

If I find this new crafts market decreases my income even further, I will seriously consider going elsewhere, and I believe there are many other real artists in the Street Artist Program that will also leave.

You could actually lose money by putting this crafts market in place. We already see in the Street Artists Program participants that are not artists but merely commercial salespeople of items they buy wholesale. This is unfair competition and makes JHP look like a flea market in places. With advent of this new crafts market the real artists that are still trying to make a living will be surrounded by flea market salespeople. Please reconsider your decision to put this craft market at JHP.

Hal Wahlborg
Street Artist 7210

16



madelinemarrow@comcast.net

03/29/2010 01:00 PM

To pj@pjcommunications.com, Luis Cancel
<Luis.Cancel@sfgov.org>, Howard Lazar
<Howard.Lazar@sfgov.org>, sherene melania

cc

bcc

Subject proposal for public markets on Park and Rec properties

To whom it may concern:

I am writing in regards to your proposal for public markets at Justin Herman Plaza, Candlestick Park, and Civic Center Plaza.

I understand the Department of Parks and Recreation is having a budgetary crisis, and is looking for ways to increase revenue. Your plan for Candlestick Park parking lot sounds like it might be feasible since that location is underutilized. Also, Civic Center Plaza has its merits as there is available parking and public transit options. Both of these areas have little to no businesses that would compete with a new market.

However, Justin Herman Plaza is an already congested area with very limited parking and loading and unloading options. It has numerous businesses both in the Ferry Building and the Embarcadero Center, the Farmer's Market, and the existing street artists.

Why would you want to put these already established enterprises at risk by subjecting them to unfair competition, especially in the street artists case since they are required to hand make their goods? As I understand it, your proposed vendors would not be required to be craftspeople, but could sell handmade items made in another country.

As San Franciscans and Americans, shouldn't we be supporting our local artists and craftspeople and already established local businesses? While I feel for people who are struggling in other countries, our own are struggling here.

I suggest another location could be found. I think the music concourse in Golden Gate Park, between the De Young museum and the Academy of Sciences, would be ideal. There are already a lot of people in that area, but no shopping opportunities except for the museum gift shops.

I urge you to reconsider this ill-conceived plan.

Sincerely,

Madeline Marrow
229 1/2 3rd Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94118

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
03/29/2010 04:55 PM

To Chris Daly/BOS/SFGOV,
cc
bcc
Subject Children's Village



liane orlando
<lianeorlando@hotmail.com>
03/27/2010 01:16 AM

To <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
Subject Children's Village

To the Board of Supervisors,

Please assist the working families and stop the closure of Children's Village at 250 10th Street. It is a wonderful place where my son absolutely loves. The entire staff is nurturing and the grounds are amazing.

Thank you,
Liane Orlando
41 Stanford Heights Avenue
SF, CA 94127

Hotmail is redefining busy with tools for the New Busy. Get more from your inbox. [Sign up now.](#)

17



Daniel Ki
<danielrki@gmail.com>
03/27/2010 04:55 PM

To "gavin.newsom" <gavin.newsom@sfgov.org>,
"board.of.supervisors" <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
bcc

Subject Hepatitis B Awareness Week

1 attachment



Hepatitis B Awareness Week Proclamation Request.docx

Dear Mayor Newsom and The Board of Supervisors,

On behalf of the Jade Ribbon Youth Council of the Asian Liver Center at Stanford University, I am writing to request a proclamation for Hepatitis B Awareness Week in the city of San Francisco. During Hepatitis B Awareness Week, the Jade Ribbon Campaign at the Asian Liver Center will concentrate on propagating awareness and education for hepatitis B, a worldwide epidemic that kills one million people every year. The Jade Ribbon Youth Council will unite with other high schools, businesses, and community organizations in the Bay Area to help fight hepatitis B and liver cancer worldwide. We thank the city of San Francisco for its support of the Jade Ribbon Campaign through the SF Hep B Free Program and hope to add San Francisco to a growing list of over 22 cities, including San Jose and Oakland, which have recognized Hepatitis B Awareness Week already. Through your support, we hope to further the fight against this deadly disease.

Please see the attached document for more information and thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Daniel Ki
Jade Ribbon Youth Council Member

18



Joel Chapman
<oldbookman@gmail.com>
03/28/2010 12:49 AM

To sfpdcommunityrelations@sfgov.org
cc board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org, gavin.newsom@sfgov.org
bcc
Subject Chief George Gascon

To Whom It May Concern:

I am appalled that the chief of the San Francisco Police Department does not have the social awareness to hold, much more, publically speak such unacceptable racist and biased remarks. I well imagine this negative trait must well include contemptuous beliefs about all people of color. As such, he is definitely NOT representative of normal San Franciscan citizens. The City would do well to be rid of him. He is not welcome here.

Yours,

Joel McKee Chapman
1839 15th St., Unit 461
San Francisco CA 94103-2282

19



Emile Lawrence
<emilelawrence@yahoo.com
>

03/25/2010 08:53 PM

To jean.caramatti@flysfo.com, mtaboard@sfmta.com,
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc sfpd.commission@sfgov.org
bcc

Subject DAJA attempting to raise fees at SFO for taxi drivers, again

1 attachment



SFO II Henry Thompson.doc

This is a letter that I have sent to DAJA at SFO. The letter relates to SFO/SFPD, DAJA a job bank for ex-Mayor Willie Brown's friends, the SFO Commission, and Richard Blum Senator Feinstein's investor husband who controls baggage carts at SFO, under another slippery contract and taxi fees. Taxi drivers comply with awesome rules in the City and County, but get ripped by almost each and every agency in the City.

20



Denise D Anne
<ddanne1@sbcglobal.net>
03/26/2010 02:53 PM

To Board of Supervisors <boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org>
cc Denise D'Anne <ddanne1@sbcglobal.net>
bcc
Subject ANOTHER REMINDER

from the dark past:

June 30, 2008

NON-TAXABLE SOLUTIONS FOR CITY FINANCIAL WOES

By Denise D'Anne

We are increasingly hearing about how important it is to change our lifestyles if we are to defeat global warming consequences. So does this mean my continuing harangue about material waste and practices in City government will get a hearing? After all part of changing one's lifestyle is to change how we view material consumption where we work as well as in our homes.

It has been acknowledged, by commendations, both by SF local government and some community organization (e.g.. San Francisco Tomorrow), that I have been a pioneer in raising the conscientiousness about the environment especially in bringing the recycling ethic to our City government. Early in 1970's I began to establish recycling programs both to the Department of Health and later to the Department of Social Services (now known as the Department of Human Service (DHS)). In fact half way into my services at DHS, I established the

21

first and only Resources Conservation Program in the City. Along with this program I established a very popular earth day event in the plaza of the administrative building of DHS.

The program I established literally saved hundreds of thousands of dollars for the department and changed people's views on how we can save our material resources. While saving money and resources, the department finally was able to hire some people with the surplus. Fulfilling the ideal of reducing waste going to landfills, protecting our dwindling resources and creating jobs.

The City is again in its periodic dilemma of providing services and maintaining its present work force due to a shortfall in the budget. Many solutions have been proposed but none of them to look into the unconscionable waste of material and human creativity in most city departments.

There is the problem of how we provide services to how we use material. For instance, in DHS, despite the ubiquity of computers it still uses pencil and paper by the trainload to provide Food Stamps and GA client services starting with the Intake process. That is, clients use pencils and wade through paper application forms to get seen. Most of the application forms are not filled out properly or are illegible and thus have to be redone by Intake worker. The Intake worker also has to spend time in front of a copy machine to record proof of residency papers, such as IDs and utility bills. I have proposed solutions to all these problems that were cost effective and

introduced an element of efficiency.

The free use of city owned or leased parking spaces are another issue, along with hundreds if not thousands of SOV (single occupancy vehicles) used by some city department's daily. Would a van service be more efficient and cost effective or even hiring taxis? I would say yes.

We are just touching the surface, along with my experience and those already working in city service, we could generate \$20 million or more without the bother of unreliable ballot measures for increased taxes.

Denise D'Anne

351 Guerrero St.

San Francisco, CA 94103-3331

415-431-4172

ddanne1@sbcglobal.net



Kenton Louie
<klouie7724@yahoo.com>
03/26/2010 12:36 PM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
bcc
Subject POP

History: This message has been forwarded.

Supervisors Mar, Chu and Maxwell, Government Audit and Oversight Committee:

I understand the concept of Muni personnel checking the various transit options (one-day Passport, three-day Passport, seven-day Passport, A Premium inclusive of (BART usage, cable car usage, express usage and F-Historic streetcar usage), Citipass, Disabled, Lifeline, M Muni-Only exclusive of (BART usage, cable car usage, express usage and F-Historic streetcar usage), Senior, Translink and Youth for proof of payment.

My only disagreement is with my trial usage of Translink card. Muni fare inspectors inform that their handheld card reader can't verify its validity through plastic cardholder because it is not comparable to the Translink card readers on coaches. That is not the passengers' fault. Customers have to remove their Translink for validity. Make handheld card reader comparable to actual Translink card readers.

I find this very intrusive and inconvenience. All the sources below do not indicate that customers have to remove their Translink® card from anything for validity. Customers place their Translink cards into holders to

protect the card from the elements. A loose Translink card in a pocket, hip pocket, back pocket and purse is subject to being lost.

All of the above transit options exclusive of Translink can be displayed (flash) with no action (for validity) taken by the holders. I would rather tag the vehicle Translink card reader again to indicate the Translink card was already processed. There should be equality among the transit options.

Free Translink® cards for all Muni customers!

Source: <http://www.sfmta.com/cms/mfares/TransLink.htm>

Translink users must tag their cards when entering the fare gates at Muni Metro stations or when boarding a Muni bus, streetcar or light rail vehicle.

Muni fare inspectors or other authorized personnel may request a customer's Translink® card to verify its validity.

POP-- Muni fare inspectors or other authorized personnel may issue citations to customers who fail to *display* valid proof of payment upon request.

Source: Available at all transit shelters with transit maps.

Should I ask for a transfer when I board a Muni vehicle?

How can I prove that I paid?

TransLink will automatically calculate the 90-minute transfer period on Muni, so you are not required to carry a paper transfer. You must tag your card each time you transfer and enter a vehicle so that the card reader can confirm the transfer period is still in effect. The card reader will beep and show a green light to indicate that your transfer is valid. Transit fare inspectors have handheld card readers and conduct random checks of TransLink customers to ensure that they have tagged their cards properly. The handheld card reader only confirms that you have proper payment; it does not affect your card balance.

Source: <http://www.translink.org/TranslinkWeb/muni/faq.do;jsessionid=4F32DAA1CA0EAB27ECD583215>

Performance
Con/CON/SFGOV
Sent by: Andrew Murray

03/29/2010 09:41 AM

To George Gascon/SFPD/SFGOV@SFGOV, Joanne
Hayes-White/SFFD/SFGOV@SFGOV, Michael
Hennessey/SFSD/SFGOV@SFGOV, Ben
cc Andy Maimoni/311/SFGOV@SFGOV, Patty
Herrera/DBI/SFGOV@SFGOV, Martha
Knutzen/DA/SFGOV@SFGOV, Grace
bcc

Subject Government Barometer February 2010

Colleagues,

This is an internal distribution to key City contacts of the Office of the Controller's February 2010 Government Barometer (file below). The report will be distributed to the public on Tuesday March 30th.

The purpose of the report is to share key performance and activity information with the public in order to increase transparency, create dialog, and build the public's confidence regarding the City's management of public business. The report lists measures in major service areas, such as public safety, health and human services, streets and public works, public transit, recreation, environment, and customer service. This is a recurring report issued bimonthly. The report will be posted to the Controller's homepage and the Citywide Performance Measurement Program webpage.



CDN Government Barometer 2010 February final.pdf

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

City Services Auditor, Citywide Performance Measurement Program
Email: Performance.CON@sfgov.org
Intranet: <http://budget.sfgov.org/>
Internet: www.sfgov.org/controller/performance

23

City and County of San Francisco
 Controller's Office
 Government Barometer (February 2010)



Activity or Performance Measure	Feb-2009	Dec-2009	Feb-2010	Period-to-Period		Year-to-Year	
				% Change	Trend	% Change	Trend
Public Safety							
Total number of serious violent crimes reported (homicide, forcible rape, robbery and aggravated assault, per 100,000 population)	45.8	52.7	56.5	7.2%	Negative	23.4%	Negative
Total number of serious property crimes reported (burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson, per 100,000 population)	295.7	340.6	292.3	-14.2%	Positive	-1.1%	Neutral
Percentage of fire/medical emergency calls responded to within 5 minutes	91.0%	90.9%	88.1%	-3.1%	Negative	-3.2%	Negative
Average daily county jail population	1,954	2,004	2,002	-0.1%	Neutral	2.5%	Neutral
Percentage of 9-1-1 calls answered within 10 seconds	93%	93%	92%	-1.1%	Negative	-1.1%	Neutral
Average 9-1-1 daily call volume	1,220	1,328	1,399	5.3%	Negative	14.7%	Negative
Health, Human Services, and Employment							
Average daily population of San Francisco General Hospital	397	398	415	4.3%	Negative	4.5%	Negative
Average daily population of Laguna Honda Hospital	788	758	761	0.4%	Neutral	-3.4%	Positive
Total number of Healthy San Francisco participants	36,622	49,359	50,768	2.9%	Positive	38.6%	Positive
New patient wait time in days for an appointment at a DPH primary care clinic	15	29	25	-13.8%	Positive	66.7%	Negative
Percentage of all available homeless shelter beds used	91.8%	86.0%	89.0%	3.5%	Positive	-3.1%	Negative
Average nightly homeless shelter bed use	1,042	1,057	1,091	3.2%	Negative	4.7%	Negative
Total number of children in foster care	1,489	1,404	1,363	-2.9%	Positive	-8.5%	Positive
Streets and Public Works							
Average score of streets inspected using street maintenance litter standards (1 = acceptably clean to 3 = very dirty)	2.32	2.08	2.10	1.0%	Neutral	-9.5%	Positive
Percentage of street cleaning requests responded to within 48 hours	92.1%	88.0%	92.0%	4.5%	Positive	-0.1%	Neutral
Percentage of graffiti requests on public property responded to within 48 hours	48.3%	27.0%	13.0%	-51.9%	Negative	-73.1%	Negative
Percentage of pothole requests repaired within 72 hours	77.6%	48.1%	30.0%	-37.6%	Negative	-61.3%	Negative

City and County of San Francisco
 Controller's Office
 Government Barometer (February 2010)



Activity or Performance Measure	Feb-2009	Dec-2009	Feb-2010	Period-to-Period		Year-to-Year	
				% Change	Trend	% Change	Trend
Public Transit							
Percentage of MUNI buses and trains that adhere to posted schedules	72.7%	76.0%	72.9%	-4.1%	Negative	0.3%	Neutral
Average daily number of MUNI customer complaints regarding safety, negligence, discourtesy, and service delivery	71.1	68.3	71.1	4.1%	Negative	0.0%	Neutral
Recreation, Arts, and Culture							
Average score of parks inspected using park maintenance standards	88.0%	91.0%	91.0%	0.0%	Neutral	3.4%	Positive
Total number of individuals currently registered in recreation courses	11,307	7,093	7,093	0.0%	Neutral	-37.3%	Negative
Total number of park facility (picnic tables, sites, recreation facilities, fields, etc.) bookings	9,027	11,258	11,258	0.0%	Neutral	24.7%	Positive
Total number of visitors at public fine art museums (Asian Art Museum, Legion of Honor, de Young)	158,737	165,262	225,437	36.4%	Positive	42.0%	Positive
Total circulation of materials at main and branch libraries	753,851	880,506	839,752	-4.6%	Negative	11.4%	Positive
Environment, Energy, and Utilities							
Drinking water reservoirs storage as a percentage of normal for this month	95.5%	120.0%	122.0%	1.7%	Positive	27.8%	Positive
Energy use by City departments (in million kilowatt hours)	68.1	74.2	67.6	-8.9%	Positive	-0.7%	Neutral
Water use by City departments (in million gallons)	94.5	125.6	81.4	-35.2%	Positive	-13.9%	Positive
Average daily water usage by PUC residential customer accounts (in gallons)	352	392	334	-14.8%	Positive	-5.1%	Positive
Average daily tons of garbage going to landfill	1,133.3	1,077.0	1,020.4	-5.3%	Positive	-10.0%	Positive
Percentage of total solid waste diverted from landfill through curbside recycling	48.6%	55.6%	53.2%	-4.3%	Negative	9.5%	Positive

City and County of San Francisco
 Controller's Office
 Government Barometer (February 2010)



Activity or Performance Measure	Feb-2009	Dec-2009	Feb-2010	Period-to-Period		Year-to-Year	
				% Change	Trend	% Change	Trend
Permitting and Inspection							
Value (estimated cost, in millions) of construction projects for which new building permits were issued	\$45.0	\$94.9	\$64.4	-32.2%	Negative	43.3%	Positive
Percentage of all building permits involving new construction and major alterations review that are approved or disapproved within 60 days	51%	69%	55%	-20.3%	Negative	7.8%	Positive
Percentage of all applications for variance from the Planning Code decided within 120 days	33%	44%	30%	-31.8%	Negative	-9.1%	Negative
Percentage of life hazard or lack of heat complaints responded to within one business day	96.0%	85.0%	100.0%	17.6%	Positive	4.2%	Positive
Percentage of customer-requested construction permit inspections completed within two business days of requested date	99.0%	95.0%	95.0%	0.0%	Neutral	-4.0%	Negative
Customer Service							
Average daily number of 311 calls	11,115	8,806	8,742	-0.7%	Neutral	-21.3%	Negative
Percentage of 311 calls answered by call takers within 60 seconds	78.9%	74.3%	73.3%	-1.4%	Negative	-7.1%	Negative
Quality score of 311 call takers	97%	98%	97%	-1.3%	Negative	0.0%	Neutral

Notes:

The barometer is currently issued every other month, covering even months.

The period-to-period change reflects the change since the last even month (e.g., for the February 2010 barometer, change since December 2009).

The year-to-year change reflects the change since the same month last year (e.g., for the February 2010 barometer, change since February 2009).

A period-to-period change of less than or equal to +/-1% and a year-to-year change of less than or equal to +/-3% is considered "Neutral."

Data reported for the most recent month is either data for that month or the most recent data available. See the measure details for more information.

For additional detail on measure definitions and department contact information, please see www.sfgov.org/controller/performance

City and County of San Francisco
 Controller's Office
 Government Barometer Measure Details



Activity or Performance Measure	Department	Performance Pattern	Measure Description	Measure Technical Description
Public Safety				
Total number of serious violent crimes reported (homicide, forcible rape, robbery and aggravated assault, per 100,000 population)	Police	Trending down is positive	Number of offenses divided by 100,000 population. Uniform Crime Report (UCR) violent crimes are: homicide, forcible rape, robbery and aggravated assault.	Collection Method: Number of UCR Violent Part I crimes divided by current San Francisco population and multiplied by 100,000. Population FY 2008: 829,848, FY 2009 & FY 2010: 842,625 (CA Dept of Finance E-2 Report). Timing: Monthly.
Total number of serious property crimes reported (burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson, per 100,000 population)	Police	Trending down is positive	Number of crimes divided by 100,000 population. UCR Part I property crimes are burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft and arson.	Collection Method: Number of Part I Property crimes divided by current San Francisco population and multiplied by 100,000. Population FY 2008: 829,848, FY 2009 & FY 2010: 842,625 (Source: CA Department of Finance, E-2 Report). Timing: Monthly.
Percentage of fire/medical emergency calls responded to within 5 minutes	Fire	Trending up is positive	Percentage of all incidents responded to in under five minutes (total response time (critical response interval (CRI)) from call intake to arrival on scene of first unit). Includes all calls the Department responds to with lights and sirens, not just those requiring possible medical care.	Raw data is stored at Department of Emergency Management and aggregated at Fire Department headquarters.
Average daily county jail population	Sheriff	Trending down is positive	Overcrowding creates security and safety issues for the Department and drives costs in many directions. Approximately 75% of those jailed are pretrial felony prisoners, who either cannot be released or cannot make bail. Housing such prisoners can require greater security precautions. An average daily population above the rated capacity can also drive demand for additional facilities.	Collection Method: Average Daily Population (ADP) is compiled by Sheriff's staff from reports issued daily from each jail. Records are located in City Hall, Room 456. Timing: Data available 5am daily. Population represents all in-custody people.
Percentage of 9-1-1 calls answered within 10 seconds	Emergency Management	Trending up is positive	The State of California 9-1-1 Office recommends that all 9-1-1 calls are answered within 10 seconds. There is no state or federal mandate. Our Center strives to answer 90% of all 9-1-1 calls within 10 seconds.	Collection Method: All calls introduced through the 9-1-1 State switch are captured in an automatic telephone call distribution system produced by Nortel Networks. This system analyzes the time it takes from the call to hit the message switch, then time it takes for our call takers to answer and process the call for service. All equipment housed at 1011 Turk.
Average 9-1-1 daily call volume	Emergency Management	Trending down is positive	This number represents the number of 9-1-1 telephone calls received and presented to the San Francisco Division of Emergency Communications on a daily basis.	Our statistics are continuously collected by our Nortel Network equipment. This information is collated daily and composed into weekly, monthly, and annual reports to reflect the call volume thus allowing us to allocate staff as needed.
Health, Human Services, and Employment				
Average daily population of San Francisco General Hospital	Public Health	Trending down is positive	The daily count of patients at SFGH (aka: Average Daily Census or ADC) is the number of admitted inpatients at SFGH at approximately 12 midnight, when the census is taken. This measure totals the daily census for a month, divided by the number of days in the month. The measure separates the average monthly census by services (acute medical/surgical, acute psychiatry, skilled nursing, and long-term behavioral health) and also provides the total for the hospital.	The daily count is tracked by the Hospital's computer system - SMS Invision Clinical Data System; maintained by DPH Community Health Network/SFGH. The reporting database is updated monthly, within 10 days of the following month. The data is 99% reliable within one month. Reports are run on an ad hoc basis.
Average daily population of Laguna Honda Hospital	Public Health	Trending down is positive	Laguna Honda Hospital (LHH) is a long-term care facility that provides a residential setting for physically or cognitively impaired individuals who require continuous nursing assistance, rehabilitation services, medical care, and monitoring. LHH also offers acute care for those patients whose condition changes to require this level of care. The daily count of patients (aka: Average Daily Census or ADC) is the total number of residents in-house at LHH at the time the census is taken each day.	Admissions, discharges, and transfers (relocations) are entered into the Invision Clinical Data System when any of these activities occur. Reports for ADC data (from Invision) can be generated for daily, monthly and/or quarterly basis. Numbers are drawn from the Monthly Average Census Report, using the SNF Occupied + M7A + L4A columns.
Total number of Healthy San Francisco participants	Public Health	Trending up is positive	This number represents enrollees in the Healthy San Francisco program (HSF). HSF is a comprehensive health coverage program for uninsured San Francisco residents, age 18 through 64 years old. Enrollment first began in July 2007 for lower income residents and has grown as more health clinic sites joined and as enrollment requirements expanded. This measure was added to the system in January 2009	The enrollment number is derived from the One-E-App program. One-E-App is a web-based eligibility and enrollment application and system of record for Healthy San Francisco. Reports are run monthly and ad hoc.

City and County of San Francisco
 Controller's Office
 Government Barometer Measure Details



Activity or Performance Measure	Department	Performance Pattern	Measure Description	Measure Technical Description
New patient wait time in days for an appointment at a DPH primary care clinic	Public Health	Trending down is positive	This measure shows the number of calendar days that a new patient would have to wait for a routine primary care appointment and/or examination. This assumes that the patient is not reporting any health issue and is not yet established with a primary care provider. The Healthy San Francisco program has set a goal of 60 calendar days for a new enrollee to wait for a primary care appointment.	This data is collected manually by a DPH staff person who searches the DPH computerized appointment system (Invision) for the first possible routine appointment at each primary care clinic or, if required, calls the clinic to inquire about next appointment availability for a new & routine patient appointment. The report represents a point in time, the day the report is done. To obtain one monthly number for the measure, the wait for each clinic is added together and divided by the number of clinics (13).
Percentage of all available homeless shelter beds used	Human Services	Trending up is positive	This is the average percentage of shelter beds (single adult) available that have been reserved and used on a nightly basis.	Data for this measure is derived from the CHANGES shelter bed reservation system.
Average nightly homeless shelter bed use	Human Services	Trending down is positive	The numbers reported here represent the average number of beds (single adult) used during the month.	Data for this measure is reported via the CHANGES system, but the actual number of beds available is based upon negotiated contracted obligations.
Total number of children in foster care	Human Services	Trending down is positive	This measure provides a count of the number of children with an open case in foster care at the end of each month that data is being reported.	The data source for this measure is the Child Welfare Services Case Management System (CWS/CMS). CWS/CMS is a longitudinal statewide database that can be queried for current and historical data.
Streets and Public Works				
Average score of streets inspected using street maintenance litter standards (1 = acceptably clean to 3 = very dirty)	Public Works	Trending down is positive	Average score of the inspection results of selected routes for the street cleanliness standard 1.1, which is based on a scale from 1 to 3. (For each 100 curb feet, 1 = under 5 pieces of litter; 2 = 5 - 15 pieces of litter; and 3 = over 15 pieces of litter). See maintenance standards manual for details.	For selected blocks, an inspector assigns a score from 1 to 3 to each 100 curb feet, for blocks of selected routes. Block and route averages are calculated. This measure provides the average of routes inspected for the selected time period. It includes only DPW inspections. Inspections were conducted on a combination of 11 residential and 11 commercial routes. Clean Corridors routes are excluded. Data collection: Data source are MNC Excel files, and summaries are generated by the Controller's Office. Data for these "district" inspections, are available every other month.
Percentage of street cleaning requests responded to within 48 hours	Public Works	Trending up is positive	DPW receives requests to address street cleaning issues primarily through 311. Our goal is to resolve these issues within 48 hours of receiving the request.	Collection Method: Dated services requests and action taken data is entered into the Bureau of Street Environmental Services' 28 Clean Access database. Timing: Data is available on a daily basis.
Percentage of graffiti requests on public property responded to within 48 hours	Public Works	Trending up is positive	DPW receives calls from the public to report graffiti, primarily through 311. DPW crews respond to these calls and abate the graffiti on public property. Our goal is to abate within 48 hours. If the graffiti is on private property, the property owner is notified to abate. This metric only measures abatements on public property.	Collection Method: Dated service requests and action taken data is logged into the Bureau of Street Environmental Services' 28 Clean Access database. Timing: Data is available on a daily basis.
Percentage of pothole requests repaired within 72 hours	Public Works	Trending up is positive	DPW receives calls from the public reporting potholes. Our goal is to repair these potholes within 72 hours.	Collection Method: Dated service requests and action taken data is entered into the Bureau of Street and Sewer Repair's Pothole database daily. Timing: Data is available on a monthly basis.
Public Transit				
Percentage of MUNI buses and trains that adhere to posted schedules	Municipal Transportation Agency	Trending up is positive	Definition: Each line is checked at least once in each six month period. Such checks are conducted no less often than 10 weekdays and weekends per period. An annual checking schedule is established for the routes. The order in which the routes are checked is determined monthly through a random selection process. To the extent automated systems can be substituted at less cost for such checks, or the measurement of any performance standard, such systems will be used.	Method: Check the designated lines using criteria of -1/+4 minutes. Periods of time includes morning rush (6am-9am), midday (9am-4pm), evening rush (4pm-7pm), and night (7pm-1am). Supervisors conduct a one-hour check at a point at mid-route during all four time periods stated above. Timeframe: Data is available approximately 60 days after each quarter closes. The annual goal for the forthcoming fiscal year is traditionally approved by the SFMTA Board of Directors in April or May. For the barometer report, data is reported on a quarterly basis.
Average daily number of MUNI customer complaints regarding safety, negligence, discourtesy, and service delivery	Municipal Transportation Agency	Trending down is positive	Definition: Customers may provide feedback regarding Muni services through 311, sfmta.com, by mail, and by fax.	Method: Feedback data is pulled from the Trapeze system on a monthly basis and divided by the number of days in the month to come up with the average daily number of complaints.

City and County of San Francisco
 Controller's Office
 Government Barometer Measure Details



Activity or Performance Measure	Department	Performance Pattern	Measure Description	Measure Technical Description
Recreation, Arts, and Culture				
Average score of parks inspected using park maintenance standards	Recreation and Parks	Trending up is positive	The average rating for neighborhood parks category only (i.e. an average of the neighborhood parks' percentages for meeting parks standards). The ratings for Neighborhood Parks have been chosen to be included as a performance measure as they represent the majority of RPD property types, include almost all park features rated, and are geographically dispersed throughout the City	Collection Method: RPD staff conducts quarterly park evaluations. Hard copies turned in to clerical staff for data entry into Park Evaluations database. Hard copies kept on file by clerical staff. Data Location: Park Evaluations Database. "Neighborhood Parks" is an established category of City parks and broken out in the current database reports (BY PARK TYPE BY DISTRICT REPORT). Timing: This data is available quarterly, no more than 30 days after the previous quarter end. For the barometer report, data is reported on a quarterly basis and 1 month in arrears.
Total number of individuals currently registered in recreation courses	Recreation and Parks	Trending up is positive	Measure indicates number of program participants for all age categories. It includes all recreation programs except aquatics programs. This number will establish a baseline standard that needs to be tracked in order to understand participation trends in programs overall. We will also be able to calculate the proportion of program participants by each age category.	Collection Method: CLASS recreation management software records all individuals (termed clients within the CLASS system) registered for any kind of program RPD offers. Timing: CLASS implementation launched in January 2007, with preliminary data available in May 2007. Data is now available quarterly, based on RPD's new annual program calendar with 4 sessions (Spring, Summer, Fall, Winter). Baseline data will be captured in FY 08 and 09 and the Department will begin to set targets in FY 10. For the barometer report, data is reported on a quarterly basis and 1 month in arrears.
Total number of park facility (picnic tables, sites, recreation facilities, fields, etc.) bookings	Recreation and Parks	Trending up is positive	Measure indicates number of park facilities being booked.	Collection Method: CLASS recreation management software currently only has the capacity to measure field permitting. Information about picnic table rentals, indoor recreation center bookings, and other types of facility rentals will be available in CLASS beginning in 2010. For the barometer report, data is reported on a quarterly basis and 1 month in arrears.
Total number of visitors at public fine art museums (Asian Art Museum, Legion of Honor, de Young)	Fine Arts Museums and Asian Art Museum	Trending up is positive	This measure aggregates data from 3 separate measures for the Asian Art Museum, Legion of Honor, and de Young Museum.	CON to manually calculate measure from data entered directly into PM system.
Total circulation of materials at main and branch libraries	Public Library	Trending up is positive	Number of items (books and other materials) circulated to the public (children, youth & adults) from all libraries.	Collection Method: Statistics generated from the Library's automated circulation system; Information Technology Division. Timing: Reports are generated monthly. For barometer, add both branch & main library measures together.
Environment, Energy, and Utilities				
Drinking water reservoirs storage as a percentage of normal for this month	Public Utilities Commission	Trending up is positive	Beginning of month total system storage (i.e. Hetch Hetchy, Cherry, Eleanor, Water Bank, Calaveras, San Antonio, Crystal Springs, San Andreas, Pilarcitos) as percentage of long-term median (water year 1968 to 2007).	The long-term median of total system storage at the beginning of the month was calculated using data stored in Form 11 for Hetch Hetchy Division and in WISKI database for Water Supply & Treatment Division for water years 1968 to 2007 (40-year period). 1968 was selected as the first year for the calculation to include San Antonio Reservoir. The current beginning of month total system storage is reported as a percentage of the long-term median.
Energy use by City departments (in million kilowatt hours)	Public Utilities Commission	Trending down is positive	Energy use by City departments in kilowatt hours (kWh) in millions for month billed	Energy use by City departments in kilowatt hours (kWh) for month billed maintained in our Electric Billing System
Water use by City departments (in million gallons)	Public Utilities Commission	Trending down is positive	Water use by City Departments in gallons, in millions.	Total billed consumption by the Water and Sewer System billing system and reported on MGT 740 Charges and Consumption by Revenue Class
Average daily water usage by PUC residential customer accounts (in gallons)	Public Utilities Commission	Trending down is positive	Average daily water use billed to all PUC residential accounts in San Francisco (does not include wholesale customers). "Residential customer" refers to one of 75,352 retail accounts in San Francisco whose meters were read this period out of a total of 150,078 current residential accounts. Of those accounts whose meters were read, 31,914 are multi-family buildings, and 43,438 are single family units.	Total billed consumption by the Water and Sewer System billing system and reported on MGT 240 Charges and Consumption by Revenue Class. For the barometer, data is reported on a bimonthly basis.
Average daily tons of garbage going to landfill	Environment	Trending down is positive	Average daily tons of garbage going to landfill.	Total materials San Francisco sends to landfill, calculated by dividing the monthly tonnage by the number of days in the month. Universe is municipal, residential, commercial, industrial.
Percentage of total solid waste diverted from landfill through curbside recycling	Environment	Trending up is positive	Percentage of total solid waste diverted from landfill through curbside recycling.	Percentage of recycling (blue cart) and compostables (green cart) collected, factored against disposal tonnage (black cart). Universe is residential and small commercial customers.

City and County of San Francisco
 Controller's Office
 Government Barometer Measure Details



Activity or Performance Measure	Department	Performance Pattern	Measure Description	Measure Technical Description
Permitting and Inspection				
Value (estimated cost, in millions) of construction projects for which new building permits were issued	Building Inspection	Trending up is positive	The construction valuation is driven by customer demand, the number of projects approved for construction, major developments, and the overall economic climate. This construction valuation or number of permits issued for construction cannot be estimated.	Collection Method: This is a new measure for DBI. The data entered for April 2008 and April 2009 is actual data, not estimated cost as indicated on Column C. The data is collected through our automated Permit Tracking System and is based on the fees collected for permits issued. Timing: Available on a weekly/monthly basis.
Percentage of all building permits involving new construction and major alterations review that are approved or disapproved within 60 days	Planning	Trending up is positive	When a member of the public wants to conduct major physical improvements to existing construction or to develop property, the proposal comes to the Planning Department for review to ensure the project conforms with existing land use requirements as specified in the Planning Code.	Collection Method: Data is stored in the Department of Building Inspection's permit tracking database, housed at 1650 Mission Street. Timing: Data updates are available on a monthly basis.
Percentage of all applications for variance from the Planning Code decided within 120 days	Planning	Trending up is positive	A variance allowing a project to vary from the strict quantitative standards of the Planning Code may be granted after a public hearing before the Zoning Administrator. Variances are typically requested for projects that do not meet the Planning Code standards for rear yards, front setbacks, parking requirements, and open space requirements. The 4 month target is based on a reasonable time to complete the lowest priority applications.	Collection Method: Data stored in Department's case intake database, housed at 1650 Mission Street. Timing: Data updates are available on a monthly basis.
Percentage of life hazard or lack of heat complaints responded to within one business day	Building Inspection	Trending up is positive	This measure addresses response time for complaints received from the public regarding life hazards or lack of heat. Complaints are received in person, by phone, email, through the internet, and mail. Response consists of contacting person making complaint and visiting the building. Measure changed in FY 02-03 to reflect 24-hour turnaround instead of 48 hours, but the data reflecting the 24-hour target was reported for the first time in FY 07. Definition of life hazard includes abandoned buildings, which may not need an inspection.	Collection Method: Staff in Housing Inspection Services utilize the Complaint Tracking System to maintain a record of complaints received and responded to. Response data is compiled into monthly, quarterly and annual reports. Timing: Statistics are available two weeks after the end of the month (i.e., statistics for September will be available on October 15th.)
Percentage of customer-requested construction permit inspections completed within two business days of requested date	Building Inspection	Trending up is positive	Customers request inspection of construction to meet permit requirements. Customers contact inspection divisions via phone to set up appointments. Inspections are completed when inspectors visit sites to conduct inspection.	Collection Method: Daily logs are entered into Oracle database; this information is compiled into monthly, quarterly and annual reports. Timing: Statistics are available two weeks after the end of the month (i.e., statistics for September will be available on October 15th.)
Customer Service				
Average daily number of 311 calls	Administrative Services	Trending up is positive	The average daily number of calls received at 311 which includes those calls that were "answered" and those that were "abandoned." An "abandoned" call is defined as a call that comes into 311, but the caller decides to hang up because of a long wait time or other reasons.	Calculation: The total number of calls received which includes "answered" and "abandoned" divided by the number of days in that particular month. Source: The CMS application is used to track call volumes at 311. Frequency: Call volumes are reported on a daily basis with data for the previous day.
Percentage of 311 calls answered by call takers within 60 seconds	Administrative Services	Trending up is positive	The percentage of calls answered within 60 seconds versus the total number of calls received on a monthly basis. This metric of answering 50% of calls in 60 seconds was developed in July 2008 as a performance measure for 311.	Calculation: The number of calls answered within 60 seconds divided by the total number of calls received during the measurement interval. Data Source: Avaya's Call Management System (CMS) will be utilized to determine the number of calls answered within 60 seconds and the total number of calls received. Frequency: Monthly.
Quality score of 311 call takers	Administrative Services	Trending up is positive	The quality assurance rating for 311 is determined by conducting observations of randomly selected calls into the call center by a quality manager and supervisors. The monitoring will cover all 8 key critical main elements: greeting, listening, speaking, call handling, problem process, resource utilization, and closing. This metric was developed in July 2008 as a performance measure for 311.	Calculation: The number of accurate activities conducted on a call divided by the number of possible activities (Checklist). Source: The NICE application will be utilized to score a minimum of 5 calls per month per customer service representative. Frequency: Monthly

Performance Pattern Notes:
 Trending up is positive: The trend of a measure is positive when the current value is above the prior value.
 Trending down is positive: The trend of a measure is positive when the current value is below the prior value.