

File No. 100514

Petitions and Communications received from April 13, 2010, through April 19, 2010, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on April 27, 2010.

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to re-naming Third Street to "Willie Brown Boulevard" in San Francisco. 5 letters (1)

From SF Ocean Edge, regarding the Beach Chalet soccer fields project in Golden Gate Park. 2 letters (2)

From Planning Department, submitting Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for 121 Golden Gate Avenue. Copy: Each Supervisor (3)

From Emael Haasalum, regarding "Celebrate San Francisco" at the Mission Cultural Center for Latino Arts from September 8, 2010, to October 9, 2010. (4)

From Greg Ganji, requesting traffic be redirected along the Great Highway, south of Sloat Boulevard, so that one lane is open going south, and one lane is open going north, until the permanent solution is completed. (5)

From Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board, submitting the Annual Report on Eviction Notices from March 1, 2009, through February 28, 2010. Copy: Each Supervisor (6)

From Monika Weiler, regarding MUNI. (7)

From Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector, submitting the March 2010 Investment Report. Copy: Each Supervisor (8)

From Sarah Slaughter, regarding proposal for a Trader Joe's at the Noe/Market Street Center. (9)

From Joshua Arce, regarding the Sunset Reservoir Solar Project. (10)

From Gabe Parsons, regarding the new digital body scanners at all major airports. (11)

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to approval of the Conditional Use Application on property located at 725 Taraval Street. File No. 100382, 2 letters (12)

From Friends of Redwood Park, urging the Board of Supervisors to uphold the Environmental Impact Report for 555 Washington Street. File No. 100443, Approximately 2200 letters (13)

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to the Environmental Impact Report for 555 Washington Street. File No. 100443, 12 letters (14)

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to the Municipal Transportation Agency's proposed changes to parking meters in the City. 12 letters (15)

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to the proposed cell tower at Miraloma Community Church. (16)

From Matt, submitting opposition to public power in San Francisco. (17)

From Office of the Controller, submitting results of the follow-up review for an audit of the Hertz Corporation. Copy: Each Supervisor (18)

From concerned citizens, submitting concerns with the approval of an 18-hole Disc Golf course at McLaren Park. 2 letters (19)

From Francsico Da Costa, regarding the Lennar Corporation. (20)

From Tommy Escarega, submitting an amendment to the Board of Supervisors Voting Rights Resolution. (21)

From Office of the Controller, regarding the Community-based Long-term Care Fiscal Analysis. (22)

From S.F. Labor Council, submitting resolution urging the California Labor Federation to oppose Proposition 16 on the June 8, 2010, ballot. Copy: Each Supervisor (23)

From the Gray Panthers, urging the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to oppose Proposition 16. Copy: Each Supervisor (24)

From Annie Paradise, regarding the Bayview Library. (25)

From Southeast Jobs Coalition, submitting support for the Hunter's View Tenants Association and Hunter's View residents seeking further, more meaningful engagement in the rebuilding of their community. (26)

From Antonio Robles, submitting opposition to the project located at 2462 – 27th Avenue. File No. 100151, Copy: Each Supervisor (27)

From US Army Corps of Engineers, regarding providing recipients with the choice of whether to continue to receive paper copies or to start receiving electronic mail notification of Public Notices. (28)

From Malcolm Dudley, regarding the Masonic Auditorium hearing on May 4, 2010. (29)

From David Mendenhall, regarding "Meatless Mondays" in San Francisco. (30)

From Recreation and Parks Department, regarding the extensive renovation of Garfield Swimming Pool. (31)

From concerned citizen, submitting opposition to California Pacific Medical Center's "Master Plan" for St. Luke's Hospital and the new Cathedral Hill facility. (32)



Chuck Harris
<chuck@chuckharris.com>
04/16/2010 11:55 PM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
bcc
Subject Renaming 3rd Street

Please do not rename 3rd street. It's called third as it comes out of downtown where it's 3rd. I'm a Dogpatch homeowner and I like the connection of the relation to SOMA and Downtown. It's a little like branding when you do this kind of thing anyway. Why not call it Pepsi street.

I get that he deserves recognition for his contribution, but keep it to a smaller street. Why not keep it in Mission Bay and dedicate a smaller street.

Chuck Harris

1



Holly Trytten
<holly@zeuscat.com>
04/14/2010 10:35 PM

To thirdst.namechange@sfdpw.org
cc gavin.newsom@sfgov.org, board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
bcc
Subject Attn: Street Renaming Proposal

Hello,

The proposal of naming 3rd street to Willie Brown Jr. Boulevard has several issues:

- The numbered naming system of the north/south streets will no longer be consistent.
- The name 'Willie Brown Jr. Boulevard' is long and awkward. Imagine living on that street and being continually required to write that down as your address. Imagine having to give your address over the phone. As someone who just purchased a place in Dogpatch, I'm hugely relieved that my place isn't on 3rd street.
- Frankly, a lot of people are not fond of Willie Brown. While I don't have much opinion of him either way, amongst many people he's a somewhat controversial figure. Surely there are other more important figures we could name our streets after.
- Naming a street, landmark, or building after someone who is still alive seems a bit questionable.

I strongly feel that if 3rd street is renamed, it will be doing the residents who live along that street a great disservice. The streets will become less navigable and for no good reason. If we want to show appreciation towards Willie Brown, surely we can find a better way to do it.

Another option is to move to a model where a street is not actually renamed, but given an additional 'honorary' name or names. If you happen to visit Chicago sometime, you'll see honorary names sprinkled everywhere. For example:

http://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&q=cache:4ideXNkvYR0J:www.chicagoancestors.org/downloads/honorary.pdf+honorary+street+names+chicago&hl=en&gl=us&pid=bl&srcid=ADGEESilXZY5td5ED-16KEFVi0-969p4Y1KQic22vzAak43proQQkPQXHnnWDIjveYvo0Lw625ajSU2Nf8fgAQxbHE7130In_twuRxnIMDhNDC59yGhaanacr1t8ChRHfQhiZjPm4Qpd&sig=AHIEtbSBG1Rgocr9LD38v81DgkDR8rbe7g

If you look at the doc, you'll probably note that the honorary names have gotten a bit out of hand.

What's to stop the renaming of streets in San Francisco from getting out of hand? Please don't do this. I'd prefer my tax dollars go to better use.

Sincerely,
Holly Trytten



Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
04/15/2010 04:08 PM

To Sophie Maxwell/BOS/SFGOV, Jon Lau/BOS/SFGOV, Alice
Guidry/BOS/SFGOV,
cc
bcc
Subject Renaming 3rd Street



Chuck Harris
<chuck@chuckharris.com>
04/14/2010 11:00 PM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject Renaming 3rd Street

Please do not rename 3rd street. It's called third as it comes out of downtown where it's 3rd. I'm a Dogpatch homeowner and I like the connection of the relation to SOMA and Downtown. It's a little like branding when you do this kind of thing anyway. Why not call it Pepsi street.

I get that he deserves recognition for his contribution, but keep it to a smaller street. Why not keep it in Mission Bay and dedicate a smaller street.

Chuck Harris

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
04/15/2010 03:22 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject 3rd Street name



Dick Millet
<milletdick@yahoo.com>
04/15/2010 10:13 AM

To gavin.newsom@sfgov.org, boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org,
david chiu <david.chiu@sfgov.org>, eric L mar
<eric.L.mar@sfgov.org>, Board of Supervisors
<sophie.maxwell@sfgov.org>, Board of Supervisors
<chris.daly@sfgov.org>, Board of Supervisors
<bevan.dufty@sfgov.org>, Board of Supervisors
<carmen.chu@sfgov.org>, Board of Supervisors
<michela.alioto-pier@sfgov.org>, Board of Supervisors
<sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>, Board of Supervisors
<ross.mirkarimi@sfgov.org>, david.campos@sfgov.org,
john.avalos@sfgov.org

cc
Subject 3rd Street name

Dear Supervisor:

On the subject of renaming 3rd Street to Willie Brown Blvd. "I'M
AGAINST".

I find it foolish, unimportant, a waste of money!! If San Franciscans want to
name
anything in his honor, let's make it a citywide wish and let's wait till he's
DEAD.

SINCERELY, Richard C. Millet, Potrero Hill



Andrea Firpo
<ilovefirpo@yahoo.com>
04/15/2010 07:59 AM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
bcc
Subject Fw: I do not want Third Street's Name Changed...

Andrea Firpo
900 Minnesota Street, #314
San Francisco, CA 94107
408.483.5299


--- On Thu, 4/15/10, Andrea Firpo <ilovefirpo@yahoo.com> wrote:

From: Andrea Firpo <ilovefirpo@yahoo.com>
Subject: I do not want Third Street's Name Changed....
To: thirdst.namechange@sfdpw.org
Date: Thursday, April 15, 2010, 7:52 AM

As a new home owner in Espirit Park, in the Dogpatch community, I would like to keep Third Street as it is a Willie Brown.

Thank you.

Andrea Firpo
900 Minnesota Street, #314
San Francisco, CA 94107
408.483.5299



"SF Ocean Edge"
<sfoceanedge@earthlink.net
>

04/15/2010 12:30 PM

To <recpark.commission@sfgov.org>
cc <margaret.mcarthur@sfgov.org>, "Bevan Dufty"
<Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org>, <Chris.Daly@sfgov.org>,
<Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>,
bcc

Subject Testimony re Beach Chalet soccer fields project, Rec and
Park Commission, April 15th

Mark Buell, President
Recreation and Park Commission
McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1898

cc: BOS

Pursuant to San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance Section 67.16, Minutes, please find below my written public testimony of 150 or fewer words that I am requesting be included verbatim in the published minutes of the Recreation and Park Commission's April 15, 2010 meeting. Please also forward via e-mail my 150-word testimony to all Recreation and Park Commissioners prior to commencement of the Commission meeting.

Katherine Howard, SF Ocean Edge.

This hearing today is not about soccer. It is about the future of Golden Gate Park. Will Golden Gate Park be continuously fragmented into smaller and smaller pieces, until it is no longer recognizable as the park envisioned by its creators?

What is that vision? In 1873, William Hammond Hall said, " A park..should be an agglomeration of hill and dale, meadow, lawn, wood and coppice, presenting a series of sylvan and pastoral views, calculated to banish all thought of urban objects...."

This describes the Recreation Field. This is the essence of Golden Gate Park.

You are called on today to uphold the vision of the Park as it was conceived and as it has been beloved by San Franciscans for over 140

2

years.

Fix the natural grass playing fields. Find other playing fields for soccer.
But, please, do not destroy Golden Gate Park.



"SF Ocean Edge"
<sfoceanedge@earthlink.net
>

04/14/2010 12:41 PM

To "Bevan Dufty" <Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org>, "Bevan Dufty"
<Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org>, <Chris.Daly@sfgov.org>,
<Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>,

cc

bcc

Subject Telegraph Hill Dwellers Resolution - requesting an EIR for
the Beach Chalet soccer fields

1 attachment



THD resolution.pdf

Mayor Gavin Newsom
Board of Supervisors
Recreation and Park Commission
Recreation and Park General Manager

Attached please find a resolution from the Telegraph Hill Dwellers, expressing concern over the impact of the Beach Chalet soccer field project on Golden Gate Park and recommending that a full Environmental Impact Report be completed for this project.

cc:

California Preservation Foundation
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coalition to Save Ocean Beach / Friends of Sutro Park
Friends of Lands End
Golden Gate Audubon Society
HALS - Historic American Landscape Survey
In Defense of Animals
PAR - Planning Association for the Richmond
SFAA - San Francisco Amateur Astronomers
San Francisco Animal Welfare and Animal Control Commission
San Francisco Architectural Heritage
San Francisco Beautiful
San Francisco Tomorrow
San Francisco Tree Council
Sierra Club, Northern California Chapter
SPEAK - Sunset/Parkside Education and Action Committee
SDNC - Sunset District Neighborhood Coalition
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

TELEGRAPH HILL DWELLERS

Golden Gate Park

Beach Chalet Soccer Fields

Resolution of concern about environmental impacts and requesting a full EIR

Motion adopted unanimously by the Board of Directors of Telegraph Hill Dwellers on April 13, 2010:

Resolved, that the Telegraph Hill Dwellers are concerned about the impacts of the Recreation and Park Department's proposal to introduce the highly urbanized artificial turf fields into Golden Gate Park, removing topsoil and replacing natural plantings with fake grass, increasing paving in the Park, degrading wildlife habitat, increasing traffic to the Park and through the neighborhoods, decreasing the quality of the night sky, infringing on the wild nature of Ocean Beach, and changing the overall character of the western edge of the park from a sylvan retreat to a developed sports complex. THD recommends that a full Environmental Impact Report be completed on this project so that the public can be informed of the extent of this project, the impacts can be better understood, and alternatives can be proposed.



**SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

Bos 11 -
COB
RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 APR 16 PM 4:18

April 14, 2010

BY AK

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

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

Subject: Distribution of Notice of Availability of an Initial Study to the Board of
Supervisors
121 Golden Gate Avenue
Department File No. 2005.0869E

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

Enclosed please find 12 copies of the Notice of Availability of the 121 Golden Gate Avenue Initial Study. Please note that this document does not pertain to any item currently calendared before the Board, but is being distributed pursuant to the San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 31. A Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is being prepared for this project.

If you have any questions related to this project's environmental evaluation, please call me at 575-9072.

Sincerely,

Jeanie Poling
Environmental Planner

enclosures



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2010 APR 16 PM 4:13
April 14, 2010

To Responsible Agencies, Trustee Agencies, and Interested Parties:

RE: CASE NO 2005.0869E: 121 GOLDEN GATE AVENUE BY AK
NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the above-referenced project, described below, has been issued by the Planning Department. The NOP/Notice of Public Scoping Meeting is either attached or is available from Jeanie Poling, whom you may reach at (415) 575-9072 or at the above address. It is also available online at <http://www.mea.sfplanning.org>. This notice is being sent to you because you have been identified as potentially having an interest in the project or the project area.

Project Description:

The approximately 14,156-square-foot project site is located on the southwest corner of Golden Gate Avenue and Jones Street in the Downtown/Civic Center Neighborhood (Block 0349 and Lot 001). The proposed project consists of the demolition of an existing 40-foot high, two-story building that contains the St. Anthony dining hall/social services; and the construction of a 99-foot-high, ten-story building containing approximately 109,375 gross square feet (gsf). The new building would contain the St. Anthony Foundation dining hall/philanthropic services and 90 affordable senior housing units. No off-street parking would be removed or provided with the project. There would be pedestrian entries on both Golden Gate Avenue and Jones Street. Constructed in 1912, the existing building is a historic resource based on its association with known historical events and a contributor to Uptown Tenderloin National Register Historic District.

The Planning Department has determined that an EIR must be prepared for the proposed project prior to any final decision regarding whether to approve the project. The purpose of the EIR is to provide information about potential significant physical environmental effects of the proposed project, to identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and to describe and analyze possible alternatives to the proposed project. Preparation of an NOP or EIR does not indicate a decision by the City to approve or to disapprove the project. However, prior to making any such decision, the decision makers must review and consider the information contained in the EIR.

Written comments will be accepted until the close of business on May 14, 2010. Written comments should be sent to Bill Wycko, San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103.

If you work for an agency that is a Responsible or a Trustee Agency, we need to know the views of your agency as to the scope and content of the environmental information that is relevant to your agency's statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Your agency may need to use the EIR when considering a permit or other approval for this project. We will also need the name of the contact person for your agency. If you have questions concerning environmental review of the proposed project, please contact Jeanie Poling at (415) 575-9072.



emael@haasalum.berkeley.edu
04/15/2010 07:21 PM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc David.Chiu@sfgov.org, Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org,
Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org, Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org,
Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org, "supervisor chris daly"
bcc

Subject Celebrate! San Francisco™: September 8th - October 9th

1 attachment



ECO FRIENDLY VERSION of CELEBRATE SAN FRANCISCO - call for submissions.doc

Hello there San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I hope this email finds you all doing well.

On September 8th from 6:00 - 9:30 PM, Celebrate! San Francisco™ will open with a Private Viewing for project participants, sponsors and the press at the Mission Cultural Center for Latino Arts (MCCLA). Celebrate! San Francisco™ will take place during Latino Heritage Month and as MCCLA's annual Mes Latinoamericano Exhibition. Given the relatively short lead time, we are particularly invested in building excitement around the project with like-minded individuals and organizations. We recently requested that Mayor Gavin Newsom attend the Private Viewing on September 8th and are awaiting his reply. It is our hope that his involvement will help raise awareness and appreciation of the creative communities working in San Francisco.

I include the Call for Submissions we are using so that you may have a better understanding of the Exhibition; please feel free to forward it to people who may be interested; I have added it as an attachment just in case you want a printer-friendly version. Just to let you know, we are also looking for project sponsors; should you have any interest or suggestions, I welcome discussing the matter with you in person at your earliest convenience. It is our sincere belief that now more than ever, San Francisco would benefit greatly from an event that showcases our culture and civic pride. We hope that you can share in our enthusiasm.

Thank you for your time and energy.

Gratefully,
emael

Project Director.
Celebrate! San Francisco™
415-503-7586

Celebrate! San Francisco™
CALL for SUBMISSIONS: OPEN THROUGH JULY 10th.
FIELDS of INTEREST: ART, BUSINESS, DANCE, DESIGN, FILM, MUSIC, SOCIAL
CHANGE

4

In addressing the countless concerns the world has today, Celebrate! San Francisco™ (also referred to as "the Exhibition") is offered as a creative solution to the negativity presently plaguing mainstream media outlets. The Exhibition is a pilot project that will launch in San Francisco at the Mission Cultural Center in September of 2010 focusing on two very simple questions: How are locals celebrating the human experience given present circumstances; and, what transformations are taking place in local communities/industries that would best serve a larger audience?

In times of uncertainty and crisis, most people tend to support the tried and tested formulas of the past rather than invest the time in developing new strategies to pressing social circumstances. This however has still not offered us a way out of present global conditions. Celebrate! San Francisco™ favors a world where new visions and strategies are made possible. By meaningfully engaging the dynamic talent from the diverse creative industries in this city, we hope gallery visitors will have greater cause to celebrate the life and culture of San Francisco.

COMPONENTS

Gallery: 19+1=20

Nineteen projects/pieces are sought for inclusion in the gallery component of the Exhibition. Innovation, collaboration, play, risk-taking and beauty are strongly encouraged. One play/listening station will be included as a permanent installation (pending sponsorship). DJ's are strongly encouraged to propose line-ups or listening parties during normal gallery hours for the duration of the Exhibition.

The Exhibition will be taking place during Latino Heritage Month. The number 20 is inspired by the Mayan numeral system which is vigesimal (i.e., base-20). THE EXHIBITION IS OPEN TO ALL PEOPLE.

Important Dates

July 10: Call for Submissions closes at 11:59 PM.

July 17: Decisions are sent out.

September 1-3: Drop off work.

September 8: Private Viewing.

September 9: Exhibition opens to the public.

September 15: Reception for Exhibition Participants.

September 22: Theater available from 6:00-9:30 PM for proposed Programming.*

September 29: Peak Experiences* Panel discussion moderated by D. Scot Miller.

October 6: One Day I Will* David Molina hosts an evening of music and performance.

October 9: Exhibition Closes

*Event titles and schedule subject to change before going to press.

SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Submissions received after JULY 10 will not be considered. All work must be completed in 2010. Email your resume/CV and cover letter describing your work, interest in the Exhibition and any requirements to email, Project Director, at inquiries@icelebratemycity.com. Please limit project proposals to two pages. Although links to your work are preferred, other arrangements can be made to view your work if requested before June 19. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Celebrate! San Francisco™ is emael's first project since completing his book, the last american icon, in 2008. He has spent the last two years meditating on art, commerce and love, emerging from the experience with a call for celebration. The five pointed green star is his service mark and logo, representing his personal mantra: "Put your money where your heart is." For past examples of emael's work, please visit www.loveemael.com. Thank you.



Greg Ganji
<gganji@hotmail.com>
04/15/2010 08:19 PM

To <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
bcc
Subject Great Highway closure south of Sloat St

Hello,

I'm writing with a request to redirect traffic along Great Highway south of Sloat St so that one lane is open going south and one lane is open going north. Currently 2 lanes are open northbound and no southbound lanes are open due to the winter storms. This problem can be temporarily fixed easily and quickly, and so many San Franciscans would appreciate it. It's a huge inconvenience to have to head southbound on Great Highway, then have to take the lengthy detour at Sloat, especially during heavier traffic hours. It just seems unfair that noone seems to care enough about us residents in the outer avenues that need this precious roadway open to get around efficiently. PLEASE HELP! I simply ask that someone from DPT take a look, and put up some cones or whatever to redefine traffic flow to allow traffic to move in both directions, until the permanent solution is completed.

Thank you
Greg Ganji

The New Busy think 9 to 5 is a cute idea. Combine multiple calendars with Hotmail. Get busy.

5

BOS-11

City and County of San Francisco

Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board



April 13, 2010

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 APR 16 PM 3:02
BY [Signature]

Re: Rent Board Annual Report on Eviction Notices

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

Pursuant to Section 37.6(j) of the Rent Ordinance, Chapter 37 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, the Rent Board is providing its annual report on the number of eviction notices filed with the Department. During the period from March 1, 2009 through February 28, 2010, a total of 1,269 eviction notices were filed with the Department. This figure includes 106 notices given due to failure to pay rent, which are not required to be filed with the Department. The number of notices filed with the Department this year represents a 11.3% decrease from last year's total filings of 1,430. The largest decrease was in Ellis eviction notices which decreased by 78% from 192 to 43 notices. Temporary capital improvement eviction notices decreased by 38% to 21 notices and owner or relative move-in eviction notices decreased by 27% to 116.

The list on the following page gives the total number of eviction notices filed with the Department, the stated reason for the eviction and the applicable Ordinance section.

6



Page 2
 Rent Board Annual Eviction Report

<u>Number</u>	<u>Reason</u>	<u>Ordinance Section</u>
106	non-payment of rent	37.9(a)(1)
72	habitual late payment of rent	37.9(a)(1)
399	breach of rental agreement	37.9(a)(2)
287	committing a nuisance	37.9(a)(3)
37	illegal use of rental unit	37.9(a)(4)
13	failure to renew agreement	37.9(a)(5)
16	failure to permit landlord access	37.9(a)(6)
23	unapproved sub-tenant	37.9(a)(7)
116	owner/relative move-in	37.9(a)(8)
0	condo conversion sale	37.9(a)(9)
33	demolish or remove from housing use	37.9(a)(10)
21	capital improvement work	37.9(a)(11)
0	substantial rehabilitation	37.9(a)(12)
43	Ellis (withdrawal of unit)	37.9(a)(13)
2	lead remediation	37.9(a)(14)
27	roommate eviction	37.9(b)
74	other or no reason given	
1,269	Total Eviction Notices	

The increase or decrease since last year for each just cause (excluding categories for which the Department did not receive at least ten notices in both years) is as follows:


<u>Just Cause Reason</u>	<u>2008/09</u>	<u>2009/10</u>	<u>Percent Decrease/ Increase</u>
Ellis withdrawal of unit	192	43	-78%
Capital improvement	34	21	-38%
Owner or relative move-in	159	116	-27%
Habitual late payment	83	72	-13%
Illegal use of rental unit	42	37	-12%
Nuisance	311	287	-7%
Roommate eviction	28	27	-4%
Demolish or remove from housing use	34	33	-3%
Failure to permit landlord access	16	16	0%
Breach of rental agreement	357	399	+12%
Unapproved sub-tenant	18	23	+28%

Rent Board Annual Eviction Report

During the period March 1, 2009-February 28, 2010, tenants filed a total of 450 Reports of Alleged Wrongful Eviction with the Rent Board. Of the 450 reports filed, 54 reports or 12% involved school-age children, with 36 reports or 8.0% relating to evictions occurring during the school term. Of the 450 total reports, 37 reports specifically objected to no-fault evictions, and 5 of these 37 reports or 13.5% involved school-age children, with all 5 reports relating to evictions occurring during the school term.

This eviction report can also be found on our web site under "Statistics", Annual Eviction Report. A monthly breakdown of all eviction filings by category is also enclosed with this report. Please call me at 252.4650 should you have any questions concerning this report.

Very truly yours,



Delene Wolf
Executive Director
Rent Stabilization and
Arbitration Board

Mayor Gavin Newsom
Supervisor David Chiu
Supervisor Michela Alioto-Pier
Supervisor John Avalos
Supervisor David Campos
Supervisor Carmen Chu
Supervisor Chris Daly
Supervisor Bevan Dufty
Supervisor Sean Elsbernd
Supervisor Eric Mar
Supervisor Sophie Maxwell
Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi
Commissioner David G. Gruber
Commissioner Brooks Beard
Commissioner Deborah Henderson
Commissioner Jim Hurley
Commissioner Amelia Yaros
Commissioner Polly Marshall
Commissioner Cathy Mosbrucker
Commissioner Neveo Mosser
Commissioner Bartholomew Murphy
Library Documents Dept.



Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
City & County Of San Francisco

Annual Eviction Notice Report

3/1/2009 Through 2/28/2010

	<u>Mar</u>	<u>Apr</u>	<u>May</u>	<u>Jun</u>	<u>Jul</u>	<u>Aug</u>	<u>Sep</u>	<u>Oct</u>	<u>Nov</u>	<u>Dec</u>	<u>Jan</u>	<u>Feb</u>	<u>Total</u>
No-Pay	9	13	9	12	9	7	11	8	8	9	4	7	106
Late Pay	11	5	11	4	8	6	6	6	2	4	7	2	72
Breach	30	32	26	40	38	36	56	46	16	31	19	29	399
Nuisance	24	18	16	24	32	18	14	30	23	23	16	49	287
Illegal	1	1	2	1	10	9	0	5	1	3	0	4	37
Agreemt.	0	1	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	13
Access	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	4	1	1	4	1	16
Sub	1	3	2	1	3	1	1	3	2	3	0	3	23
Own-Occ	7	11	9	7	12	5	14	18	6	12	8	7	116
Condo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Demol	6	1	1	3	2	3	4	2	4	2	1	4	33
CI	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	3	0	1	11	1	21
Rehab	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W-Draw	0	0	0	4	4	0	5	4	5	5	11	5	43
Roommate	4	1	3	1	1	3	1	2	1	4	2	4	27
Lead	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Other	5	2	4	4	3	2	8	10	2	14	8	12	74
Development	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	99	88	88	102	127	95	120	141	71	112	94	132	1269



Monika Weller
<MWeiler@MPBF.com>
04/16/2010 08:19 AM

To "board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org"
<board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
bcc
Subject Fix Muni Now

Attention: Supervisor Sean R. Elsbernd

Good morning,

This email is in response to the article in the Thursday issue of The Examiner.

I persinally know a Muni train operator who works a seven day week, so he can get compensated double Over Time for the two days he is supposed to be off. By his own account is annual gross income is about \$140k. I would love to have his job. It is incoprehensible to me that something like this is going on, regardless of the fact that Muni has been in the red for many years. I wish you the best of luck with the Fix Muni Now project.

Thank you
[mailto:\[monimani@comcast.net\]](mailto:monimani@comcast.net)

CONFIDENTIALITY - This e-mail message and any attachments thereto are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and contains a private, confidential communication protected by the attorney client privilege and the attorney work product doctrine. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you.

7

BOS-11
page

Newlin Rankin/TTX/SFGOV
04/16/2010 09:19 AM

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

cc

bcc

Subject March 2010 Investment Report



Monthly Portfolio Report 03312010.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

8

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 March, 2010

April 16, 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 3/31/2010	
	Pooled Fund	All Funds	Pooled Fund	All Funds
Interest Received	34.24	36.88	6.12	6.19
Total Net Earnings	32.30	34.16	4.02	4.17
Earned Income Yield (in %)	1.33%	1.32%	1.46%	1.44%
Current Yield to Maturity (in %)	n/a	n/a	1.35%	1.34%
PRINCIPAL				
Current Book Value *	n/a	n/a	3,577	3,737
Amortized Book Value	n/a	n/a	3,574	3,733
Market Value **	n/a	n/a	3,577	3,737
Accrued Interest	n/a	n/a	12	13
Total Value (Market Value + Accrued Interest)	n/a	n/a	3,589	3,750
Average Daily Balance	3,018	3,193	3,252	3,412
Average Age of Portfolio (in days)	680	679	681	679

* 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 3/31/2010. 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


Pooled Fund Maturities



Given that interest rates are so low from 1 day to 1 year on the yield curve, we have allocated more maturities to the 1-3 year part of the curve.

Change in Asset Allocation 03/2005 to present


The chart below shows the total size of the Pooled Fund and the relative investments by type.




All Funds

Investment Type	Par Value %	\$ in millions	
		Par Value	Current Book Value
Collateralized CD's	3.4%	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	8.2%	305.28	308.53
Federal Farm Credit Bank: Float			
Federal Home Loan Bank: Discount Notes			
Federal Home Loan Bank: Fixed	9.6%	355.37	355.32
Federal Home Loan Bank: Float			
Federal Home Loan Bank: Float Monthly			
Federal Home Loan Bank: Multi Step	2.8%	102.75	102.70
Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp.: Discount Notes			
Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp.: Fixed	16.3%	607.60	609.63
Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp.: Float, Monthly, Act/360			
Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp.: Float, Quarter, Act/360	1.9%	70.00	70.00
Federal National Mortgage Assn.	12.9%	481.00	482.26
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	1.8%	65.10	65.10
Treas. Liquidity Guarantee Program: Fixed	21.3%	792.31	803.54
Treas. Liquidity Guarantee Program: Float	1.3%	50.00	50.07
Treasury Bills	9.2%	343.00	342.69
Treasury Notes	11.3%	420.00	422.52
	100.0%	3,717.40	3,737.37

Par Value of All Funds



Trailing 12 Month Key Interest Rates



March 31, 2010
Inventory by Market Value

City & County of San Francisco



Run Date: 4/12/2010 2:53:46 PM

Asset Allocation

Investments Outstanding As Of Date: 3/31/2010

Assets (000's)	Current Par	Current Book	Market	MKT/Book	Un Gain/Loss	Yield
TREASURY BILLS F	343,000.00	342,694.97	342,705.00	100.00 %	-10.90	0.17 %
TREASURY NOTES F	420,000.00	422,517.96	422,259.38	99.94 %	-92.98	0.75 %
TREASURY LGP F	792,310.00	803,542.89	807,158.54	100.45 %	4,083.74	1.50 %
TLGP FLOATER F	50,000.00	50,074.05	50,195.31	100.24 %	121.26	0.39 %
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK F	355,370.00	355,321.43	353,958.40	99.62 %	-1,356.22	1.84 %
FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASS	480,996.00	482,261.99	481,730.40	99.89 %	-531.59	1.60 %
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK F	305,275.00	308,533.87	307,432.60	99.64 %	-883.30	1.45 %
FHLMC Bonds F	607,600.00	609,629.69	608,332.56	99.79 %	-1,297.13	1.84 %
FHLB MULTI STEP F	102,750.00	102,696.71	102,874.78	100.17 %	178.08	1.17 %
FHLMC FLOAT QTR 30/360 F	70,000.00	70,000.00	70,153.13	100.22 %	153.13	0.76 %
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)	3,717,401.00	3,737,373.56	3,736,900.10	99.99 %	364.07	1.34 %

March 31, 2010
Inventory by Market Value

City & County of San Francisco




Run Date: 4/12/2010 2:53:46 PM

Investments Outstanding As Of Date: 3/31/2010

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								
42383	B 04.22.10	912795UN9	03/25/2010	.000000	75,000,000.00	75,000,000.00	1,925.00	5,775.00
			04/22/2010	.132014	74,992,300.00	100.000000	SUNGARD	0.00
42386	B 6.10.10	912795UT6	03/24/2010	.000000	200,000,000.00	199,937,504.00	5,466.67	0.00
			06/10/2010	.123033	199,946,700.00	99.968752	SUNGARD	-14,662.67
42393	B 031011	912795V99	03/31/2010	.000000	50,000,000.00	49,812,500.00	530.56	0.00
			03/10/2011	.383399	49,817,488.89	99.625000	SUNGARD	-5,519.45
Inv Type: 11 TREASURY BILLS				.000000	325,000,000.00	324,750,004.00	7,922.23	5,775.00
				.165047	324,756,488.89	99.923078		-20,182.12
42298	T 0.875 02 28 11	912828KE9	09/04/2009	.875000	50,000,000.00	50,203,124.00	38,043.48	23,436.50
			02/28/2011	.632110	50,179,687.50	100.406248	SUNGARD	0.00
42325	T 1 08 31 11	912828LV0	10/29/2009	1.000000	100,000.00	100,468.75	86.96	152.34
			08/31/2011	.825969	100,316.41	100.468752	SUNGARD	0.00
42326	T 1 08 31 11	912828LV0	10/29/2009	1.000000	99,900,000.00	100,368,283.25	86,869.57	167,802.78
			08/31/2011	.834541	100,200,480.47	100.468752	SUNGARD	0.00
42341	T 1 7 31 11	912828LG3	11/19/2009	1.000000	120,000,000.00	120,637,497.60	198,895.03	0.00
			07/31/2011	.603979	120,801,562.50	100.531248	SUNGARD	-164,064.90
42352	T 1.125 12 15 11	912828KA7	12/09/2009	1.125000	50,000,000.00	50,218,752.00	165,350.27	0.00
			12/15/2011	.745625	50,378,906.25	100.437504	SUNGARD	-160,154.25
42382	T 1.5 07.15.12	912828LB4	03/23/2010	1.500000	50,000,000.00	50,390,624.00	157,458.56	0.00
			07/15/2012	1.112438	50,580,218.40	100.781248	SUNGARD	-50,782.25
Inv Type: 12 TREASURY NOTES				1.068007	370,000,000.00	371,918,749.60	646,703.87	191,391.62
				.758154	372,241,171.53	100.518581		-375,001.40
42165	J P MORGAN CHASE TL	481247AK0	03/24/2009	2.200000	25,000,000.00	25,490,975.00	161,944.44	371,975.00
			06/15/2012	2.046890	25,119,000.00	101.963900	UPRICE	0.00
42166	GENL ELEC CAP CORP	36967HAN7	03/24/2009	2.250000	35,000,000.00	35,743,750.00	41,562.50	558,600.00
			03/12/2012	2.065123	35,185,150.00	102.125000	SUNGARD	0.00
42170	MORGAN STANLEY FDIC	61757UAF7	03/16/2009	2.000000	25,000,000.00	25,421,875.00	12,500.00	384,125.00
			09/22/2011	1.938237	25,037,750.00	101.687500	SUNGARD	0.00
42177	BAC 2.375 06.22.12	06050BAJ0	04/14/2009	2.375000	50,000,000.00	51,226,562.50	326,562.39	541,562.50
			06/22/2012	1.930142	50,685,000.00	102.453125	SUNGARD	0.00
42181	C 2.125 04.30.12 TL	17313UAE9	04/02/2009	2.125000	25,000,000.00	25,457,650.00	222,829.86	340,150.00

March 31, 2010
Inventory by Market Value

City & County of San Francisco



Run Date: 4/12/2010 2:53:46 PM

Investments Outstanding As Of Date: 3/31/2010

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
			04/30/2012	1.966916	25,117,500.00	101.830600	UPRICE	0.00
42182	BK OF THE WEST.BNP	064244AA4	04/02/2009	2.150000	5,000,000.00	5,095,312.50	1,194.44	68,362.50
			03/27/2012	1.962752	5,026,950.00	101.906250	SUNGARD	0.00
42183	BK OF THE WEST.BNP	064244AA4	04/02/2009	2.150000	20,000,000.00	20,381,250.00	4,777.78	273,250.00
			03/27/2012	1.962877	20,108,000.00	101.906250	SUNGARD	0.00
42191	BAC 2.1 04.30.12 TL	06050BAG6	04/02/2009	2.100000	25,000,000.00	25,460,375.00	220,208.33	367,375.00
			04/30/2012	1.974869	25,093,000.00	101.841500	UPRICE	0.00
42195	GE 1.625 01.07.11 T	36967HAG2	04/16/2009	1.625000	25,000,000.00	25,239,150.00	94,791.67	71,650.00
			01/07/2011	1.230907	25,167,500.00	100.956600	UPRICE	0.00
42196	GE 1.625 01.07.11 T	36967HAG2	04/16/2009	1.625000	25,000,000.00	25,239,150.00	94,791.67	73,400.00
			01/07/2011	1.235002	25,165,750.00	100.956600	UPRICE	0.00
42197	C 1.625 03.30.11 TL	17314JAA1	04/16/2009	1.625000	50,000,000.00	50,508,250.00	2,256.94	283,250.00
			03/30/2011	1.390825	50,225,000.00	101.016500	UPRICE	0.00
42198	GS 1.625 07.15.11 T	38146FAF8	04/16/2009	1.625000	50,000,000.00	50,563,350.00	171,527.95	358,850.00
			07/15/2011	1.439098	50,204,500.00	101.126700	UPRICE	0.00
42211	USSA CAPITAL CO	90390QAA9	04/28/2009	2.240000	16,000,000.00	16,250,000.00	995.56	124,400.00
			03/30/2012	1.962025	16,125,600.00	101.562500	SUNGARD	0.00
42258	CITIGROUP FDG INC G	17313YAC5	06/29/2009	1.250000	50,000,000.00	50,289,062.50	204,860.72	332,062.50
			06/03/2011	1.295193	49,957,000.00	100.578125	SUNGARD	0.00
42259	CITIGROUP FDG INC G	17313YAC5	06/29/2009	1.250000	50,000,000.00	50,289,062.50	204,860.72	332,062.50
			06/03/2011	1.295193	49,957,000.00	100.578125	SUNGARD	0.00
42274	GE TLGP 3 12 09 11	36967HAD9	07/30/2009	3.000000	50,000,000.00	51,669,750.00	466,666.67	67,250.00
			12/09/2011	1.609053	51,602,500.00	103.339500	UPRICE	0.00
42299	HSBC 3.125 12 16 11	4042EPAA5	09/16/2009	3.125000	50,000,000.00	51,765,050.00	455,729.17	0.00
			12/16/2011	1.341284	51,969,550.00	103.530100	UPRICE	-204,500.00
42317	C 1.625 03.30.11 TL	17314JAA1	10/22/2009	1.625000	35,000,000.00	35,355,775.00	1,579.86	0.00
			03/30/2011	.777608	35,423,500.00	101.016500	UPRICE	-67,725.00
42328	MS 2.25 3 13 12	61757UAP5	11/04/2009	2.250000	20,000,000.00	20,406,250.00	22,500.00	0.00
			03/13/2012	1.316899	20,431,800.00	102.031250	SUNGARD	-25,550.00
42331	MS TLGP 2.25 03 13	61757UAP5	11/06/2009	2.250000	50,000,000.00	51,015,625.00	56,250.00	0.00
			03/13/2012	1.310906	51,084,000.00	102.031250	SUNGARD	-68,375.00
42332	GE TLGP 2.125 12 21	36967HAV9	11/06/2009	2.125000	25,000,000.00	25,328,125.00	147,569.44	74,375.00
			12/21/2012	1.789291	25,253,750.00	101.312500	SUNGARD	0.00
42379	GS 3.25 06.15.12 TL	38146FAA9	03/22/2010	3.250000	50,000,000.00	52,134,800.00	478,472.22	0.00
			06/15/2012	1.229916	52,652,847.22	104.269600	UPRICE	-80,200.00
42380	GE TLGP 2% 09.28.20	36967HBB2	03/22/2010	2.000000	25,000,000.00	25,339,843.75	4,166.67	0.00

March 31, 2010
Inventory by Market Value

City & County of San Francisco



Run Date: 4/12/2010 2:53:46 PM

Investments Outstanding As Of Date: 3/31/2010

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
			09/28/2012	1.405839	25,366,000.00	101.359375	SUNGARD	-26,156.25
Inv Type: 15 TREASURY LGP				2.124099	781,000,000.00	795,670,993.75	3,398,599.00	4,622,700.00
				1.519904	791,958,647.22	101.878488		-472,506.25
42242	MORGAN STANLEY FDIC	61757UAN0	03/19/2009	.454250	25,000,000.00	25,097,656.25	5,678.00	57,331.25
			03/13/2012	.382131	25,040,325.00	100.390625	SUNGARD	0.00
42306	Union Bank TLGP Flo	905266AA0	03/23/2009	.453750	25,000,000.00	25,097,656.25	5,041.67	63,931.25
			03/16/2012	.393499	25,033,725.00	100.390625	SUNGARD	0.00
Inv Type: 16 TLGP FLOATER				.454000	50,000,000.00	50,195,312.50	10,719.67	121,262.50
				.387814	50,074,050.00	100.390625		0.00
42315	FHLB 2 10 29 12 3NC	3133XVC66	10/29/2009	2.000000	35,140,000.00	35,172,943.75	296,737.78	32,943.75
			10/29/2012	2.000000	35,140,000.00	100.093750	SUNGARD	0.00
42349	FHLB 1.85 12 21 12	3133XW6C8	12/21/2009	1.850000	100,000,000.00	99,625,000.00	513,888.89	0.00
			12/21/2012	1.850000	100,000,000.00	99.625000	SUNGARD	-375,000.00
42372	FHLB 1.875 3NC3 Fix	3133XXJ40	03/25/2010	1.875000	50,000,000.00	49,734,375.00	15,625.00	0.00
			03/25/2013	1.875000	50,000,000.00	99.468750	SUNGARD	-265,625.00
42378	FHLB 2.75 NC 1month	3133XXH91	03/26/2010	1.820000	100,000,000.00	99,375,000.00	25,277.78	0.00
			12/26/2012	1.820000	100,000,000.00	99.375000	SUNGARD	-625,000.00
42388	FHLB 1.875 03.22.13	3133XXN37	03/24/2010	1.875000	50,000,000.00	49,890,625.00	23,437.50	0.00
			03/22/2013	1.902594	49,965,208.33	99.781250	SUNGARD	-69,375.00
Inv Type: 22 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK				1.864235	335,140,000.00	333,797,943.75	874,966.95	32,943.75
				1.868349	335,105,208.33	99.599554		-1,335,000.00
42208	F N M A	31398AWY4	04/29/2009	1.700000	50,000,000.00	50,046,875.00	358,888.89	46,875.00
			04/29/2011	1.700000	50,000,000.00	100.093750	SUNGARD	0.00
42295	FNMA 2.15 09 10 12	31398AZA3	09/10/2009	2.150000	52,546,000.00	52,857,991.88	65,901.44	164,863.08
			09/10/2012	2.053284	52,693,128.80	100.593750	SUNGARD	0.00
42333	FNMA 1.625% 2.5NC6	3136FJRF0	11/10/2009	1.625000	75,000,000.00	75,070,312.50	477,343.75	70,312.50
			05/10/2012	1.625000	75,000,000.00	100.093750	SUNGARD	0.00
42335	FNMA 1.75 3 23 11	31398AVQ2	11/19/2009	1.750000	50,000,000.00	50,562,500.00	19,444.44	0.00
			03/23/2011	.598014	50,770,000.00	101.125000	SUNGARD	-207,500.00
42338	FNMA 1.75 3 23 2011	31398AVQ2	11/20/2009	1.750000	20,000,000.00	20,225,000.00	7,777.78	0.00
			03/23/2011	.571204	20,314,600.00	101.125000	SUNGARD	-89,600.00
42350	FNMA FIXED 1.75 3NC	3136FJZT1	12/28/2009	1.750000	100,000,000.00	99,843,750.00	452,083.33	0.00
			12/28/2012	1.750000	100,000,000.00	99.843750	SUNGARD	-156,250.00




Run Date: 4/12/2010 2:53:46 PM

Investments Outstanding As Of Date: 3/31/2010

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
42353	FNMA 3NC6 1.80% fix	31398AB50	12/21/2009	1.800000	58,450,000.00	58,194,281.25	292,250.00	0.00
			12/21/2012	1.772500	58,496,760.00	99.562500	SUNGARD	-302,478.75
42366	FNMA 3NC1.5 1X 1.80	31398AF23	02/08/2010	1.800000	50,000,000.00	49,953,125.00	132,500.00	0.00
			02/08/2013	1.800000	50,000,000.00	99.906250	SUNGARD	-46,875.00
42367	FNMA 3NC1.5 1X	31398AF23	02/08/2010	1.800000	25,000,000.00	24,976,562.50	66,250.00	0.00
			02/08/2013	1.817201	24,987,500.00	99.906250	SUNGARD	-10,937.50
Inv Type: 23 FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSN				1.782921	480,996,000.00	481,730,398.13	1,872,439.63	282,050.58
				1.598979	482,261,988.80	100.152683		-813,641.25
42312	FFCB 2.02 4 20 12 2	31331GTK5	09/28/2009	2.020000	50,000,000.00	50,046,875.00	451,694.44	0.00
			04/20/2012	1.804704	50,268,000.00	100.093750	SUNGARD	-221,125.00
42342	FFCB Bullet 3.875 8	31331YZ86	11/19/2009	3.875000	50,000,000.00	52,125,000.00	193,750.00	0.00
			08/25/2011	.784911	52,705,000.00	104.250000	SUNGARD	-580,000.00
42370	FFCB 1.67 11 19 12	31331JDNO	02/19/2010	1.670000	75,000,000.00	74,859,375.00	146,125.00	0.00
			11/19/2012	1.696475	74,947,500.00	99.812500	SUNGARD	-88,125.00
42373	FFCB 2 Year Bullet	31331JGD9	03/09/2010	.950000	17,050,000.00	16,991,390.63	11,698.19	0.00
			03/05/2012	1.051355	17,017,870.22	99.656250	SUNGARD	-24,679.87
42374	FFCB 2 Year Bullet	31331JGD9	03/09/2010	.950000	58,000,000.00	57,800,625.00	39,794.44	0.00
			03/05/2012	1.043195	57,899,982.22	99.656250	SUNGARD	-93,235.00
42385	FFCB 1.875 12.07.12	31331G2R9	03/26/2010	1.875000	37,000,000.00	37,185,000.00	219,687.50	0.00
			12/07/2012	1.532399	37,543,422.08	100.500000	SUNGARD	-148,370.00
Inv Type: 28 FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK				1.971547	287,050,000.00	289,008,265.63	1,062,749.57	0.00
				1.360480	290,381,774.52	100.682204		-1,155,534.87
42190	FHLMC 3 5NC1	3128X8WF5	04/21/2009	3.000000	50,000,000.00	50,078,125.00	666,666.67	78,125.00
			04/21/2014	3.000000	50,000,000.00	100.156250	SUNGARD	0.00
42206	F H L M C	3128X8WF5	04/21/2009	3.000000	30,000,000.00	30,046,875.00	400,000.00	46,875.00
			04/21/2014	3.000000	30,000,000.00	100.156250	SUNGARD	0.00
42207	F H L M C	3128X8WF5	04/21/2009	3.000000	50,000,000.00	50,078,125.00	666,666.67	78,125.00
			04/21/2014	3.000000	50,000,000.00	100.156250	SUNGARD	0.00
42322	FHLMC 1.67 4 30 12	3128X9LH1	10/30/2009	1.670000	75,000,000.00	75,070,312.50	525,354.17	70,312.50
			04/30/2012	1.670000	75,000,000.00	100.093750	SUNGARD	0.00
42346	FHLMC 1.125 12 30 1	3128X9PW4	12/30/2009	1.125000	50,000,000.00	49,781,250.00	142,187.50	0.00
			12/30/2011	1.130071	49,995,000.00	99.562500	SUNGARD	-213,750.00
42347	FHLMC 1.125 12 21 1	3128X9PG9	12/21/2009	1.125000	54,000,000.00	53,865,000.00	168,750.00	0.00
			12/21/2011	1.125000	54,000,000.00	99.750000	SUNGARD	-135,000.00

March 31, 2010
Inventory by Market Value

City & County of San Francisco




Run Date: 4/12/2010 2:53:46 PM

Investments Outstanding As Of Date: 3/31/2010

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
42351	FHLMC Fixed 1.75 3N	3128X9RH5	12/28/2009	1.750000	100,000,000.00	99,750,000.00	452,083.33	0.00
			12/28/2012	1.750000	100,000,000.00	99.750000	SUNGARD	-250,000.00
42356	FHLNC 1.125 6 1 11	3128X8P22	11/20/2009	1.125000	28,600,000.00	28,751,937.50	107,250.00	0.00
			06/01/2011	.712000	28,779,470.72	100.531250	SUNGARD	-27,533.22
42371	FHLMC 1.8 2 25 13 3	3128X9ZK9	02/25/2010	1.800000	75,000,000.00	74,718,750.00	135,000.00	0.00
			02/25/2013	1.800000	75,000,000.00	99.625000	SUNGARD	-281,250.00
42377	FHLMC 1.8 03 25 13	3128X9S50	03/25/2010	1.800000	75,000,000.00	74,554,687.50	22,500.00	0.00
			03/25/2013	1.800000	75,000,000.00	99.406250	SUNGARD	-445,312.50
Inv Type: 30 FHLMC Bonds				1.887835	587,600,000.00	586,695,062.50	3,286,458.34	273,437.50
				1.868045	587,774,470.72	99.845994		-1,352,845.72
42282	FHLB 1.5 3NC1 step-	3133XUM83	08/27/2009	1.500000	50,000,000.00	50,031,250.00	70,833.33	31,250.00
			08/27/2012	1.500000	50,000,000.00	100.062500	SUNGARD	0.00
42283	FHLB 1.5 3NC1 step-	3133XUM83	08/27/2009	1.500000	4,300,000.00	4,302,687.50	6,091.67	2,687.50
			08/27/2012	1.500000	4,300,000.00	100.062500	SUNGARD	0.00
42318	FHLB 0.75 9 29 11 2	3133XUVP5	10/20/2009	.750000	48,450,000.00	48,540,843.75	2,018.75	144,138.75
			09/29/2011	.807171	48,396,705.00	100.187500	SUNGARD	0.00
Inv Type: 38 FHLB MULTI STEP				1.146556	102,750,000.00	102,874,781.25	78,943.75	178,076.25
				1.173498	102,696,705.00	100.121442		0.00
42354	FHLMC 3nc1 float st	3128X9DK3	09/10/2009	.755940	50,000,000.00	50,109,375.00	22,048.25	109,375.00
			09/10/2012	.755940	50,000,000.00	100.218750	SUNGARD	0.00
Inv Type: 40 FHLMC FLOAT QTR 30/360				.755940	50,000,000.00	50,109,375.00	22,048.25	109,375.00
				.755940	50,000,000.00	100.218750		0.00
42212	BANK OF SAN FRANCIS		05/18/2009	1.600000	100,000.00	100,000.00	404.44	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	22,118.06	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	73,888.89	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	20,277.78	0.00

March 31, 2010
Inventory by Market Value

City & County of San Francisco



Run Date: 4/12/2010 2:53:46 PM


Investments Outstanding As Of Date: 3/31/2010

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
			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	116,689.17	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	680,694.44	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	15,000.00	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	695,694.44	0.00
				1.304000	125,000,000.00	100.000000		0.00
			Subtotal	1.577037	3,559,636,000.00	3,576,850,886.11	12,073,934.87	5,817,012.20
				1.348603	3,577,350,505.01	100.483614		-5,524,711.61

Fund: 9704 SFUSD BONDS 2006B

42362	B 01 13 11	912795UX7	01/14/2010	.000000	18,000,000.00	17,955,000.00	13,013.00	3,503.00
			01/13/2011	.339159	17,938,484.00	99.750000	SUNGARD	0.00
Inv Type: 11 TREASURY BILLS				.000000	18,000,000.00	17,955,000.00	13,013.00	3,503.00
				.339159	17,938,484.00	99.750000		0.00
42264	T 1.125 06.30.11	912828LF5	07/21/2009	1.125000	30,000,000.00	30,215,625.60	84,841.16	121,875.60
			06/30/2011	.962195	30,093,750.00	100.718752	SUNGARD	0.00
42359	T 1.25 11 30 10	912828JS0	01/08/2010	1.250000	20,000,000.00	20,125,000.00	83,791.20	0.00
			11/30/2010	.372619	20,183,035.71	100.625000	SUNGARD	-31,250.00
Inv Type: 12 TREASURY NOTES				1.175180	50,000,000.00	50,340,625.60	168,632.36	121,875.60
				.725517	50,276,785.71	100.681251		-31,250.00
42361	RF 2.75 12 10 10	7591EAAA1	01/15/2010	2.750000	11,310,000.00	11,487,544.38	95,899.37	0.00
			12/10/2010	.354116	11,584,240.48	101.569800	UPRICE	-66,457.56
Inv Type: 15 TREASURY LGP				2.750000	11,310,000.00	11,487,544.38	95,899.37	0.00
				.354116	11,584,240.48	101.569800		-66,457.56
42384	FHLB 1.42 fixed 2.5	3133XXME4	03/26/2010	1.420000	20,230,000.00	20,160,459.38	5,585.73	0.00

March 31, 2010
Inventory by Market Value



Run Date: 4/12/2010 2:53:46 PM

Investments Outstanding As Of Date: 3/31/2010

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
			09/24/2012	1.451121	20,216,221.12	99.656250	SUNGARD	-54,165.82
Inv Type: 22 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK				1.420000	20,230,000.00	20,160,459.38	5,585.73	0.00
				1.451121	20,216,221.12	99.656250		-54,165.82
42159	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT	31331GLL1	02/06/2009	2.800000	18,225,000.00	18,424,335.94	89,302.50	272,235.94
			01/28/2014	2.886754	18,152,100.00	101.093750	SUNGARD	0.00
Inv Type: 28 FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK				2.800000	18,225,000.00	18,424,335.94	89,302.50	272,235.94
				2.886754	18,152,100.00	101.093750		0.00
42360	FHLMC 5.75 01 15 12	3134A4JT2	01/14/2010	5.750000	20,000,000.00	21,637,500.00	242,777.78	0.00
			01/15/2012	1.056940	21,855,220.00	108.187500	SUNGARD	-217,720.00
Inv Type: 30 FHLMC Bonds				5.750000	20,000,000.00	21,637,500.00	242,777.78	0.00
				1.056940	21,855,220.00	108.187500		-217,720.00
42355	FHLMC 3nc1 float st	3128X9DK3	09/10/2009	.755940	20,000,000.00	20,043,750.00	8,819.30	43,750.00
			09/10/2012	.755940	20,000,000.00	100.218750	SUNGARD	0.00
Inv Type: 40 FHLMC FLOAT QTR 30/360				.755940	20,000,000.00	20,043,750.00	8,819.30	43,750.00
				.755940	20,000,000.00	100.218750		0.00
Subtotal				1.945096	157,765,000.00	160,049,215.30	624,030.04	441,364.54
				1.041213	160,023,051.31	101.447859		-369,593.38
Grand Total			Count 82	1.592796	3,717,401,000.00	3,736,900,101.41	12,697,964.91	6,258,376.74
				1.335442	3,737,373,556.32	100.524536		-5,894,304.99

CITY / COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
M R . NEWLIN RANKIN 4 1 5 - 5 5 4 - 4 4 8 7

(EIS / ERNEIS)

EARNED INCOME SUMMARY
07/01/09 THROUGH 03/31/10
SORT KEYS ARE FUND
FUND: 100 POOLED FUNDS

PAGE: 1
RUN: 04/01/10 14:15:57

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	MISSION 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	PFCB 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	2.041		275,000.00	384,844.36
42166	03/24/09	2.2500	GENL ELEC CAP CORP FDIC	03/12/12	35,000,000.00	35,185,150.00	2.059		761,250.00	543,825.10
42170	03/16/09	2.0000	MORGAN STANLEY FDIC GTD	09/22/11	25,000,000.00	25,037,750.00	1.935		500,000.00	363,757.07
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	1.917		593,750.00	729,517.70
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	1.961		265,625.00	369,794.26
42182	04/02/09	2.1500	BK OF THE WEST.BNP 2.15	03/27/12	5,000,000.00	5,026,950.00	1.957		106,006.94	73,850.40
42183	04/02/09	2.1500	BK OF THE WEST.BNP 2.15	03/27/12	20,000,000.00	20,108,000.00	1.956		424,027.78	295,351.37
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 5NC1	04/21/14	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	2.997		750,000.00	1,125,000.00

CITY / COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 4 1 5 - 5 5 4 - 4 4 8 7

(EIS / ERNEIS)

EARNED INCOME SUMMARY

07/01/09 THROUGH 03/31/10

SORT KEYS ARE FUND

FUND: 100 POOLED FUNDS

PAGE: 2
RUN: 04/01/10 14:15:57

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	1.970		262,500.00	371,079.18
42195	04/16/09	1.6250	GE 1.625 01.07.11 TLGP	01/07/11	25,000,000.00	25,167,500.00	1.228		294,531.25	231,953.75
42196	04/16/09	1.6250	GE 1.625 01.07.11 TLGP	01/07/11	25,000,000.00	25,165,750.00	1.232		294,531.25	232,713.65
42197	04/16/09	1.6250	C 1.625 03.30.11 TLGP	03/30/11	50,000,000.00	50,225,000.00	1.387		776,388.89	522,909.36
42198	04/16/09	1.6250	GS 1.625 07.15.11 TLGP	07/15/11	50,000,000.00	50,204,500.00	1.435		607,118.05	541,042.41
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	1,103,611.10
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	2.997		450,000.00	675,000.00
42207	04/21/09	3.0000	F H L M C	04/21/14	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	2.997		750,000.00	1,125,000.00
42208	04/29/09	1.7000	F N M A	04/29/11	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	1.698		425,000.00	637,500.00
42211	04/28/09	2.2400	USSA CAPITAL CO	03/30/12	16,000,000.00	16,125,600.00	1.953		330,524.44	236,546.58
42212	05/18/09	1.6000	BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO CD	05/17/10	100,000.00	100,000.00	1.622		817.78	1,217.78
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	1.055	03/23/10	484,305.56	387,547.47
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	.525		112,380.47	98,706.26
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	1.294		267,361.11	485,485.01
42259	06/29/09	1.2500	CITIGROUP FDG INC GTD TL	06/03/11	50,000,000.00	49,957,000.00	1.294		267,361.11	485,485.01
42260	07/10/09	2.0000	FHLMC 2 3 16 11	03/16/11	35,000,000.00	35,309,400.00	.700	03/16/10	168,933.33	168,933.33
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	1.581		537,500.00	548,699.73
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 03/31/10
 SORT KEYS ARE FUND
 FUND: 100 POOLED FUNDS

PAGE: 3
 RUN: 04/01/10 14:15:57

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	1.782		37,187.50	59,548.61
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	1.500		375,000.00	445,833.33
42283	08/27/09	1.5000	FHLB 1.5 3NC1 step-up	08/27/12	4,300,000.00	4,300,000.00	1.500		32,250.00	38,341.67
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		90,500.00	105,500.00
42295	09/10/09	2.1500	FNMA 2.15 09 10 12 3NC1	09/10/12	52,546,000.00	52,693,128.80	2.059		564,869.50	603,519.89
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	.636		213,915.75	182,670.14
42299	09/16/09	3.1250	HSBC 3.125 12 16 11 TLGP	12/16/11	50,000,000.00	51,969,550.00	1.328		390,625.00	373,758.13
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	2.241	03/22/10	577,000.88	577,000.88
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	.534		112,309.22	100,278.16
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	1.805		61,722.22	460,389.92
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	2.001			296,737.78
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	165,277.78
42317	10/22/09	1.6250	C 1.625 03.30.11 TLGP	03/30/11	35,000,000.00	35,423,500.00	.774		249,618.06	121,076.74
42318	10/20/09	.7500	FHLB 0.75 9 29 11 2NC1 s	09/29/11	48,450,000.00	48,396,705.00	.808		160,490.62	174,761.96
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	1.671			525,354.17
42323	10/27/09	1.6500	FHLMC 1.655 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	.829		337.02	351.36

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

(EIS / ERNEIS)

EARNED INCOME SUMMARY
 07/01/09 THROUGH 03/31/10
 SORT KEYS ARE FUND
 FUND: 100 POOLED FUNDS

PAGE: 4
 RUN: 04/01/10 14:15:57

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	.838		336,679.56	354,586.40
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	20,431,800.00	1.317		161,250.00	109,440.23
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	2.646	03/22/10	1,028,286.11	1,028,286.11
42331	11/06/09	2.2500	MS TLGP 2.25 03 13 12	03/13/12	50,000,000.00	51,084,000.00	1.311		396,875.00	268,668.12
42332	11/06/09	2.1250	GE TLGP 2.125 12 21 12	12/21/12	25,000,000.00	25,253,750.00	1.792		66,406.25	181,506.36
42333	11/10/09	1.6250	FNMA 1.625% 2.5NC6 Ameri	05/10/12	75,000,000.00	75,000,000.00	1.636			477,343.75
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	50,770,000.00	.601		301,388.89	111,405.93
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	20,314,600.00	.574		119,583.33	42,264.39
42341	11/19/09	1.0000	T 1 7 31 11	07/31/11	120,000,000.00	120,801,562.50	.600		238,043.46	264,712.62
42342	11/19/09	3.8750	FFCB Bullet 3.875 8 25 1	08/25/11	50,000,000.00	52,705,000.00	.785		516,666.67	151,775.37
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	1.133			142,817.64
42347	12/21/09	1.1250	FHLMC 1.125 12 21 11 2NC	12/21/11	54,000,000.00	54,000,000.00	1.129			168,750.00
42348	12/07/09	.8750	T 0.875 1 31 11	01/31/11	100,000,000.00	100,480,468.76	.790	03/08/10	198,259.78	198,259.78
42349	12/21/09	1.8500	FHLB 1.85 12 21 12 3NC1	12/21/12	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	1.857			513,888.89
42350	12/28/09	1.7500	FNMA FIXED 1.75 3NC1 1X	12/28/12	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	1.755			452,083.33
42351	12/28/09	1.7500	FHLMC Fixed 1.75 3NC1 1X	12/28/12	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	1.755			452,083.33
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	.774			43,795.42
42353	12/21/09	1.8000	FNMA 3NC6 1.80% fixed	12/21/12	58,450,000.00	58,496,760.00	1.779			287,940.91
42354	09/10/09	.7559	FHLMC 3nc1 float step-up	09/10/12	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	.780		194,727.50	216,775.75
42356	11/20/09	1.1250	FHLMC 1.125 6 1 11	06/01/11	28,600,000.00	28,779,470.72	.717		9,831.25	74,625.81
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	MATURED	8,711.11	8,711.11
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			20,277.78
42366	02/08/10	1.8000	FNMA 3NC1.5 1X 1.80	02/08/13	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	1.860			132,500.00
42367	02/08/10	1.8000	FNMA 3NC1.5 1X	02/08/13	25,000,000.00	24,987,500.00	1.878			66,843.07
42368	02/26/10	2.1000	FHLB 2.1 2 26 13 3NC1mo	02/26/13	40,000,000.00	39,996,000.00	2.412	03/26/10	74,000.00	74,000.00
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	1.761			148,268.92
42371	02/25/10	1.8000	FHLMC 1.8 2 25 13 3NC1	02/25/13	75,000,000.00	75,000,000.00	1.877			135,000.00
42372	03/25/10	1.8750	FHLB 1.875 3NC3 Fixed	03/25/13	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	1.629			15,625.00
42373	03/09/10	.9500	FFCB 2 Year Bullet .95 C	03/05/12	17,050,000.00	17,017,870.22	1.023			10,971.89
42374	03/09/10	.9500	FFCB 2 Year Bullet Fixed	03/05/12	58,000,000.00	57,899,982.22	1.015			37,030.16
42376	03/08/10	0.0000	B 03 25 10	03/25/10	100,000,000.00	99,995,938.88	.087	MATURED	4,061.12	4,061.12
42377	03/25/10	1.8000	FHLMC 1.8 03 25 13 3NC3m	03/25/13	75,000,000.00	75,000,000.00	1.564			22,500.00
42378	03/26/10	1.8200	FHLB 2.75 NC 1month 1.82	12/26/12	100,000,000.00	100,000,000.00	1.538			25,277.78
42379	03/22/10	3.2500	GS 3.25 06.15.12 TLGP	06/15/12	50,000,000.00	52,652,847.22	.934			13,480.39
42380	03/22/10	2.0000	GE TLGP 2% 09.28.2012	09/28/12	25,000,000.00	25,366,000.00	1.220		8,333.33	8,526.06
42382	03/23/10	1.5000	T 1.5 07.15.12	07/15/12	50,000,000.00	50,580,218.40	1.118			13,945.04

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

(EIS / ERNEIS)

EARNED INCOME SUMMARY
 07/01/09 THROUGH 03/31/10
 SORT KEYS ARE FUND
 FUND: 100 POOLED FUNDS

PAGE: 5
 RUN: 04/01/10 14:15:57

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
42383	03/25/10	0.0000	B 04.22.10	04/22/10	75,000,000.00	74,992,300.00	.134			1,925.00
42385	03/26/10	1.8750	FPCB 1.875 12.07.12	12/07/12	37,000,000.00	37,543,422.08	1.233			7,608.85
42386	03/24/10	0.0000	B 6.10.10	06/10/10	200,000,000.00	199,946,700.00	.125			5,466.67
42388	03/24/10	1.8750	FHLB 1.875 03.22.13	03/22/13	50,000,000.00	49,965,208.33	1.691			18,521.67
42393	03/31/10	0.0000	B 031011	03/10/11	50,000,000.00	49,817,488.89	.389			530.56
SUBTOTAL (FUND) 100 POOLED FUNDS - ASSETS				681 DAYS	3559636000.00	3577350505.01			34,241,925.79	32,300,745.04
SUBTOTAL (FUND) 100 POOLED FUNDS - NET					3559636000.00	3577350505.01			34,241,925.79	32,300,745.04

FUND STATISTICS		ASSETS	LIABILITIES
AVERAGE DAILY INVESTMENT BALANCE	:	3,017,691,460.73	
EARNED INTEREST YIELD THIS PERIOD	:	1.426	.000
WEIGHTED AVG YIELD AT END OF PERIOD	:	1.328	.000
TOTAL INTEREST EARNED FOR FUTURE RECEIPT:	:	8,541,803.88	

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

(EIS / ERNEIS)

EARNED INCOME SUMMARY
 07/01/09 THROUGH 03/31/10
 SORT KEYS ARE FUND
 FUND: 9703 SFUSD TRANS 08-09

PAGE: 6
 RUN: 04/01/10 14:15:57

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 :	18,521,897.81	
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 4 1 5 - 5 5 4 - 4 4 8 7

(EIS / ERNEIS)

EARNED INCOME SUMMARY
 07/01/09 THROUGH 03/31/10
 SORT KEYS ARE FUND
 FUND: 9704 SFUSD BONDS 2006B

PAGE: 7
 RUN: 04/01/10 14:15:57

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	2.889		498,960.00	393,718.17
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	.958		149,490.49	200,745.61
42355	09/10/09	.7559	FHLMC 3nc1 float step-up	09/10/12	20,000,000.00	20,000,000.00	.780		77,891.00	86,710.30
42359	01/08/10	1.2500	T 1.25 11 30 10	11/30/10	20,000,000.00	20,183,035.71	.375			17,224.05
42360	01/14/10	5.7500	FHLMC 5.75 01 15 12	01/15/12	20,000,000.00	21,855,220.00	1.096		3,194.44	50,552.33
42361	01/15/10	2.7500	RF 2.75 12 10 10	12/10/10	11,310,000.00	11,584,240.48	.385			9,295.64
42362	01/14/10	0.0000	B 01 13 11	01/13/11	18,000,000.00	17,938,484.00	.344			13,013.00
42369	02/26/10	2.1000	FHLB 2.1 2 26 13 3NCLmo	02/26/13	20,000,000.00	19,998,000.00	2.412	03/26/10	37,000.00	37,000.00
42384	03/26/10	1.4200	FHLB 1.42 fixed 2.5 NC 1	09/24/12	20,230,000.00	20,216,221.12	1.231			4,090.85
SUBTOTAL (FUND) 9704 SFUSD BONDS 2006B- ASSETS				641 DAYS	157,765,000.00	160,023,051.31			1,850,038.71	1,534,640.32
SUBTOTAL (FUND) 9704 SFUSD BONDS 2006B- NET					157,765,000.00	160,023,051.31			1,850,038.71	1,534,640.32

FUND STATISTICS		ASSETS	LIABILITIES
AVERAGE DAILY INVESTMENT BALANCE	:	157,200,915.61	
EARNED INTEREST YIELD THIS PERIOD	:	1.300	.000
WEIGHTED AVG YIELD AT END OF PERIOD	:	1.024	.000
TOTAL INTEREST EARNED FOR FUTURE RECEIPT:	:	376,705.92	

GRAND TOTAL 100.00%(C) 680 DAYS 3717401000.00 3737373556.32 1.425 36,879,153.3934,162,440.92



Sarah Slaughter
<docs17@mindspring.com>
04/16/2010 11:31 AM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
bcc
Subject Trader Joe's threat to Market St.

To whom it may concern,

I am a city resident who lives on 16th St. between Castro and Noe, a block away from the Noe/Market Center. I am concerned about the back door political dealings of the Trader Joe's project. I feel that the City powers are already assuming that this project is a go, without due diligence.

Most disturbing is the news that the Office of Economic Development is entering into negotiations to have Radio Shack move. This is a small neighborhood retail formula store. It has been in this location since the building was built. Why would the Mayor's OOED intervene for a corporation whose owners are wealthier than the Walmart family? The traffic study is not done, the terms of formula retail moving into a neighborhood have been passed over!

The DNTA was supposed to be involved with the review of the traffic study before the final scope of project was approved. It was not. Glaring omissions have been noted. One being the delivery trucks. When are deliveries to take place? There is no loading dock for this building. It is near a vibrant night life with pedestrians who are coming from bars. How can you ask Radio Shack to move if you aren't thinking of ignoring due process?

The traffic report is not including the impact of other intersections that most likely will become backed up because of the traffic generated. This is not a walk/bike store. Groceries are heavy and TJ attracts people from all over the city. They will drive, even neighbors say they will drive because of buying heavy bulk items.

The parking lot that was accessible for their patrons is not available. Since Radio Shack is "in the way" of TJ, hourly parking is no more in this popular parking lot. For now there is parking on the street but witness the popular Wed. afternoon farmer's market and a glimpse of the possible future traffic. Most people walk to this farmer's market as there are no bulk items for sale, even though there is a traffic snarl from 3 to 7 on Wed afternoons. Also small neighborhood businesses have noted a 2/3 drop in income on Wed. since this popular market started because people cannot find parking. And this Farmer's Market is a mostly a walk/bike market.

Also another disturbing note is the climate of animosity that has been directed to small businesses in the area. The passage of a bill by the citizens of San Francisco specifically states that the impact of formula retail should not affect the small businesses in the area. There are

9

businesses via Yelp and Save the Castro that have been attacked after not conforming to Bevan Duffy's "pledge to Trader Joe's" to move to this particular space. Phone numbers of employees have been posted and vicious confrontations in the place of businesses by devotees of Trader Joe's have been witnessed . It is a disturbing phenomena. Where is the non-biased leadership of this city for its citizens and tax payers?

Sincerely a voter, property owner and tax payer for fair government, Sarah Slaughter



Joshua Arce
<josh@brightlinedefense.org>
>

04/16/2010 01:29 PM

To "Ed Harrington (EHarrington@sfgov.org)"
<EHarrington@sfgov.org>, "TRYdstrom@sfgov.org"
<TRYdstrom@sfgov.org>
cc "Sup. Carmen Chu (Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org)"
<Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org>, "Sup. Eric Mar
(Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org)" <Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org>, "Sup.
bcc Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
Subject sunset reservoir local hiring report

1 attachment



Sunset Reservoir Solar Project - Ordinance.pdf

General Manager Harrington,

I just wanted to make sure that you're aware of the provision in the attached Sunset Reservoir Solar Ordinance that requires the PUC to "include a summary of compliance with the First Source Hiring Agreement" on the Reservoir Project as part of "each PUC budget submission." (See page 7 starting at line 20 to page 8, line 4).

I am CC'ing members of the Board Budget & Finance Committee, as well as project sponsors Sup. Carmen Chu and Eric Mar, to make sure they're prepared to receive this data, data that many stakeholders are curious about. In addition, I'm CC'ing OEWD's Rhonda Simmons and CityBuild's Guillermo Rodriguez because they've been working with the Southeast Jobs Coalition and other groups to get community workers out on the project.

Thank you,

Josh

Joshua Arce
Executive Director
Brightline Defense Project
www.brightlinedefense.org

10



sun cycle
<ecostar79797@gmail.com>
04/13/2010 02:37 PM

To ecostar774@usa.com
cc
bcc Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
Subject Naked Body Scanners

Naked Digital Body Scanners at our Airports...

For those who are not aware, every major airport in the country is beginning to install and use naked digital body scanners that reveal and record our private parts to TSA government officials.

This is not only a massive violation of personal privacy, but a direct violation of our constitutional 4th amendment right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures.

Once these scanners are installed at over 350 major airports across the USA by the beginning of 2011, you will be treated as a criminal if you refuse to follow scanner protocol in order to get on a plane. That is, they will then give you the temporary reprieve- and I emphasize "temporary", once everyone has been acculturated- of having to submit to a highly intrusive bodily pat-down as is done when someone is arrested by the police.

This is all being done to psychologically prepare the American people to surrender their rights, liberties and freedoms and embrace a fascist Nazi police state headed by Homeland Security and the Pentagon.

Its time to stand up and say "no" to this level of tyranny in our nation. Contact your local airports and airlines and voice your opposition to this insanity. The only "terrorists" are those who are pushing to implement this new illegal policy at our airports.

Gabe Parsons

Market Street

San Francisco, California

11

#100382

File 100382

Sirs:

Monday, April 19, 2010

page

We strongly appose the upcoming phone generation station not more than a block from where we live!

The effects on our health from being constantly subjected to EMR (electromagnetic radiation) are not at all determined – and most likely will be very harmful. What we do know is the periodic radiation from cell phones held next to one's head, can contribute to brain tumors. While the generation station is not right next to our head, it is much more concentrated, much more powerful, and it will be constant. The effect of low dosages of the EMR has not been tested thoroughly let alone the constant high dosages that we will be subjected to if this station is allowed to continue.

We have children, aging people, and everything in-between in our neighborhood. It feels really bad and morally wrong to subject my family, neighbors, and friends to this unnecessary risk!

My guess is the politicians & businessmen who stand to gain financially from this station will NOT be subjected to the levels of EMR that we will be subjected to.

Finally, at the first part of this year, when the subject first came up, we experienced a throbbing beating sound in our home intercoms. We have two, and they both exhibited the same symptoms. This went on for several days, then stopped. I cannot help but suspect it was from this station.

For these reasons, we strongly appose this phone generation station.

[Signature] 2460 16th Ave 94116

Paula Buiuz 2446 16th Ave. 94116 Park Rivers

BY AK

2010 APR 20 AM 11:01

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SANTA MONICA

12

100382

Use In 725 Tavares St

File 100382

Sirs:

Monday, April 19, 2010

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

cpage

We strongly appose the upcoming phone generation station not more than a block from where we live!

BY AK

The effects on our health from being constantly subjected to EMR (electromagnetic radiation) are not at all determined – and most likely will be very harmful. What we do know is the periodic radiation from cell phones held next to one's head, can contribute to brain tumors. While the generation station is not right next to our head, it is much more concentrated, much more powerful, and it will be constant. The effect of low dosages of the EMR has not been tested thoroughly let alone the constant high dosages that we will be subjected to if this station is allowed to continue.

We have children, aging people, and everything in-between in our neighborhood. It feels really bad and morally wrong to subject my family, neighbors, and friends to this unnecessary risk!

My guess is the politicians & businessmen who stand to gain financially from this station will NOT be subjected to the levels of EMR that we will be subjected to.

Finally, at the first part of this year, when the subject first came up, we experienced a throbbing beating sound in our home intercoms. We have two, and they both exhibited the same symptoms. This went on for several days, then stopped. I cannot help but suspect it was from this station.

For these reasons, we strongly appose this phone generation station.

M. Johnson Marc Johnson 2455 16th Ave

Hwei-Li Chou 2455 16th Ave. Hwei-Li Chou
Dee-Li 2459 16th Avenue S.F. Irina Spivak
[Signature] 2459 16th Ave. S.F. CA Y. Keglinskiy
[Signature] 2462 16th AVE S.F. CA, FRITZ VIEBENGA

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
04/19/2010 12:23 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject File 100443- Uphold EIR Certification- 555 Washington


The Clerk's office is in receipt of the following letters, petitions and postcards in support of the 555 Washington proposal and expansion of Redwood Park.
In the attachment , please find a sample of the approx. 2200 letters received.
All the support information has been put into the file.



File 100443 - 555 Washington -EIR Certification Support.pdf

Complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form by clicking [HERE](#).

13



**FRIENDS OF
REDWOOD PARK**
A BIGGER REDWOOD PARK FOREVER

File 100443

BY

RN

2010 APR 19 AM 11:37

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

TO: SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

FROM: FRIENDS OF REDWOOD PARK

DATE: April 19, 2010

RE: CERTIFICATION OF THE EIR FOR 555 WASHINGTON

Friends of Redwood Park supports the 555 Washington EIR as a thorough and complete document that provides ample decision making-information for City officials. **We urge you to uphold certification of the EIR.**

Attached for your review are more than 2,200 letters, petitions and postcards in support of the 555 Washington proposal and expansion of Redwood Park. The majority are from local residents and, merchants and community organizations in the surrounding neighborhoods. Please feel free to contact Friends of Redwood Park chair Sarah Stocking at 203-2373 if you have any questions.

YES! I support Redwood Park!

I support a new public park and revitalization of the Transamerica Block. Redwood Park will be expanded and permanently protected as San Francisco's newest public park. At less than half the height of the adjacent Transamerica Pyramid, the plan for a slender 400 foot high-rise residential tower at 555 Washington fits within the context of the downtown skyline and adds vitality to our neighborhood while creating sustainable, energy-efficient homes in a new "green" building. The added residential use enhances public safety and provides an economic boost to local merchants, while also increasing open space by 80%. The redwoods will be preserved with new trees added. The park will be open to the public 7 days a week with maintenance permanently provided at no cost to the City.

Please join the Jackson Square Historic District Association, North Beach Neighbors and the North Beach Chamber of Commerce and so many others in supporting the 555 Washington plan and a new public park for our neighborhood!

PRINTED Name Jessica Maura
Address 1191 Vallejo St
City, State S a n F r a n c i s c o , C a l i f o r n i a
Zip Code 941104 Phone - -
Email
Signature Jessica Maura

PRINTED Name Charles M. Lane
Address 1600 Markum #429
City, State S a n F r a n c i s c o , C a l i f o r n i a
Zip Code 94109 Phone - -
Email
Signature Charles M Lane

PRINTED Name Karl Raymond
Address 903 Pine
City, State S a n F r a n c i s c o , C a l i f o r n i a
Zip Code 94108 Phone - -
Email
Signature Karl Raymond

PRINTED Name KATHLEEN B. HILL
Address 1499 California St Apt 322
City, State S a n F r a n c i s c o , C a l i f o r n i a
Zip Code 94109 Phone - -
Email
Signature Kathleen B Hill

YES! We Support the Plan for 555 Washington Street

555 Washington is a plan to revitalize the City's special Transamerica Pyramid block with a new public park, more open space, and a thriving pedestrian plaza. The plan will use the latest environmentally-responsible "green" building techniques and include *sustainable housing* located near transit, jobs and shops. 555 Washington includes a new city-owned park totaling at least 18,000 square feet and over 10,000 square feet of new plaza and open space for the public to enjoy.

Printed Name: ROBERT WONG

Organization/Business: CA CA

Address: 1044 Stockton City: S.F. Zip: 94137

Daytime Telephone: 279 8182 Home Telephone: _____

Email and/or fax: Ron316@YAHOO.COM

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Please add my name to the list of people who support the 555 Washington plan!

- I will attend a meeting to support 555 Washington Street. Please send me more information when the meeting is scheduled.
- I will send a letter of support or e-mail to City Hall. Please keep me informed.

Fernando Guanill
CAL. I.D. # NG131913
402 Broadway St, #51
S.F. CA. 94133 79

September 23, 2009

President David Chiu
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, California
94102

Dear President Chu and Supervisors:

I support housing projects that bring tax revenue into San Francisco, that provide millions of dollars for affordable housing, that revitalize and improve parks, and that help make parts of the Financial District also a residential neighborhood.


What is proposed for 555 Washington and Redwood Park, behind the TransAmerica pyramid, is just such a project. In addition, I like the increased sunlight from the expanded park.

I urge it be approved.

Sincerely,

Fernando R. Guanill 9-24-09

Cc: San Francisco Planning Commission
Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors



JAN - FEB 1969
PLANNING + URBAN RESEARCH
ASSOCIATION

654 Mission Street
San Francisco, California
94105

415.781.8726 t
415.781.7291 f

www.spur.org

8 December 2009

Co-Chairs
Andy Barnes
Tom Hart

Executive Director
Gabriel Metcalf

Urban Center Director
Diane Filippi

Vice Chairs
Lisa Feldstein
Linda Jo Fritz
Bob Gamble
Jim Salinas, Sr
Libby Seifel
Lydia Tan

Treasurer
Terry Micheau

Secretary
Jean Fraser

Immediate Past Chair
Vince Hoenigman

Advisory Council
Co-Chairs
Paul Sedway
Michael Wilmar

Board Members
Michael Alexander
Jim Andrew Jr
David Baker
Fred Blackwell
Lee Blich
Margo Bradish
Pamela Brewster
Larry Burnett
Michaela Cassidy
Emilio Cruz
Charmaine Curtis
Gia Daniller
Kelly Dearman
Shelly Doran
Oz Enckson
Luisa Ezquerro
Norman Fong
Frank Fudem
Gillian Gillett
Chris Gruwell
Dave Hartley
Laurie Johnson
Ken Kirkey
Travis Kiyota
Patricia Klitgaard
Rik Kunnath
Ellen Lou
Janis MacKenzie
John Madden
Jacinta McCann
Mary McCue
John McNulty
Chris Meany
Ezra Mersey
Peter Mezey
Leroy Monshita
Dick Morten
Tomiquia Moss
Mary Murphy
Paul Okamoto
Brad Paul
Tim Paulson
Chris Poland
Teresa Rea
Byron Rhett
Bill Rosetti
Victor Seeto
Chi-Hsin Shao
Raphael Sperry
Bill Stouder
Michael Teitz
Michael Thénault
James Tracy
Will Travis
Jeff Tumlin
Brooks Walker, III
Debra Walker
Paul Zeger

Mr. Jeffrey Heller, FAIA
Heller Manus Architects
221 Main Street, Suite 940
San Francisco, CA 94105

Re: Proposed Development at 555 Washington Street

Dear Mr. Heller:

On behalf of the members of the SPUR Project Review Committee, we would like to thank your team for bringing the proposed development at 555 Washington Street to our group for consideration and review at our November 2009 meeting.

The mission of the SPUR Project Review Committee is to consider projects that are of citywide importance and to evaluate them according to criteria related to land use, public realm interface, building design and environmental effects. In all cases, we are seeking a combination of excellent planning and design solutions that will ensure the positive contribution of each project to a safe, visually appealing, and vibrant urban setting for the people who live and work in San Francisco.

In general, after our review and discussion, the committee was impressed with both the design and intended use of the 555 Washington Street project. We provide the following specific comments for your information and action:

Land Use

Located on the southwest corner of Washington and Sansome streets, the project proposes a 38-story (400' height) building providing market-rate residential and ground floor restaurant and retail. The development comprises 248 residential units, including in lieu fee for the equivalent of 42 affordable units, expansion of adjacent Redwood Park, donation of Redwood Park to the City as publicly owned/private maintained open-space, and environmentally sustainable design and upgrades for the entire block, including the Transamerica Pyramid.

The committee strongly supports high-rise development at this location, which is directly adjacent to the 858 foot Transamerica Pyramid. The committee agrees that the project, within the downtown high-rise district, will provide a contextually sensitive balance to the Transamerica Pyramid and may re-energize the immediate environs. The proposed expansion of both area and hours of access for Redwood Park is a very welcome improvement to the City's downtown green-space.

Public Realm Interface and the Promotion of a Pedestrian-Oriented Environment

Overall, the committee agrees with the orientation of the building, its integration with Redwood Park, Mark Twain Alley and the Transamerica Pyramid. The extensive shadow studies of the slender silhouette of the proposed 400 ft. building, as compared to the form allowed by the Planning Code, satisfy the committee that a taller, more slender building is more desirable for this location.

We are especially pleased with the proposal to unbundle parking and to tailor the parking usage to occupancy requirements, starting initially at .50 per unit capacity and requesting a maximum of .80 spaces per unit. Valet parking integrated with stackers, Car Share inclusion, and bike parking are all enthusiastically approved by the committee.

There was some discussion among the committee members regarding the integration of the Park with Mark Twain Alley and the proposed restaurants within the development. We agree that the Park and restaurants will do much to improve the pedestrian environment, though we encourage the project sponsors to review whether the proposed "pop-out" area of the restaurant within 555 Washington into the Park is necessary. We also agree that this restaurant space is perhaps large enough to accommodate more than one tenant.

The committee also expressed a desire to preserve the plaque commemorating Bummer and Lazarus, Emperor Norton's dogs and fixtures of popular culture in the early 1860's, currently located within the Park.

Building & Landscape Design

The committee agrees that the proposed building design makes a strong positive statement for the neighborhood. The graduated cylindrical shape and the proposed clear glass skin present a complementary balance to the iconic Transamerica Pyramid which shares the block. We are impressed with the thoughtful design and attention to detail.

We encourage the project sponsors to commit to the use of high-quality materials, especially for the glass envelope. A light, transparent glass is essential to counter balance the concrete structure of the adjacent Pyramid.

As stated earlier in this review, the committee is very pleased with the proposed redesign and expansion of Redwood Park. We believe the generous gift to the City of the Park and its maintenance in perpetuity provides a win-win-win situation for the project sponsors, the tenants and the public. The proposed re-design with water feature, additional seating and retractable gates will enhance what is already a beautiful restful retreat. Expanding the hours of access to seven-days is an added bonus.

We understand that the maintenance of Redwood Park will be the responsibility of the building owners and we appreciate the generosity of that gesture. The committee supports the commitment to adequate maintenance throughout the life of Park.

Environmental Effects

SPUR believes it is essential for projects to build environmental sustainability into their design and function, and we appreciate the project sponsor's goals to achieve LEED Gold Certification for the entire block, a "green island" including both 555 Washington and the Transamerica Pyramid. This is a unique opportunity and we are very supportive of the project sponsor's efforts in this area.

We are looking forward to inventive use of sustainable materials and practices throughout the project.

Conclusion

The SPUR Project Review Committee finds the proposed project at 555 Washington Street to be an appropriate use of the site. The dense residential development will enliven and enhance the neighborhood. We are very pleased to see such a high level of design and creativity in what is already a high-profile City block.

We thank you for committing your time and resources to the presentation at SPUR, appreciate the fact that you have presented your proposal to us at an early stage in its development so that you may take our recommendations into consideration. We will follow further refinements of this project with great interest and invite you to keep us informed on its progress.

Consideration for Endorsement

Should you intend to request SPUR to consider this project for endorsement, you should contact the Committee co-chairs at the appropriate time. Endorsement by SPUR is reserved for projects of the highest quality and significance to the city. Consideration for endorsement begins with a formal response by projects sponsors to this review letter, including an update on any significant changes to the project program or design since the project was initially presented at SPUR. The project is then taken up for discussion by an endorsement subcommittee of SPUR board members who serve on committees in the areas of project review, urban policy, housing, sustainability, and transportation. We normally require a month's lead-time to schedule a meeting of the endorsement subcommittee.

Please do not hesitate to contact us for questions/clarifications.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signatures of Charmaine Curtis and Reuben Schwartz.

Charmaine Curtis
SPUR Project Review Committee Co-Chairs

Reuben Schwartz

For :

Mary Beth Sanders

cc: SPUR Board of Directors



CHINATOWN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT GROUP

1524 Powell Street
San Francisco, California 94133
TEL: (415) 756-1898 - FAX: (415) 399-0551

March 16, 2010

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

Honorable Supervisors,

This letter is to indicate our approval of the proposal for new homes at 555 Washington and the new public park in the Transamerica Pyramid Block.

Because of our interest in boosting Chinatown's economy, we naturally always support a vibrant community for small businesses. Adding more residents to the area as this proposal does will do just that, because it means more customers from the new families and their out-of-town visitors and friends. Businesses in the area, whether small or medium-sized will employ members of our community.

Located just over a block away from Chinatown, the new homes and block renovation will help promote the area. The building that 555 Washington replaces is of no particular architectural note; we will be glad to see the very attractively designed slender tower with a half-twist take its place next to the Transamerica Pyramid.

Additionally, the new tax/fee revenues for the City are especially welcome, instead of additional taxes and fees on businesses that drive jobs from the City.

Finally, we support the expansion of the park by 49%, as well as the opening of the park on weekends and holidays. To have it maintained forever at no expense to the City of San Francisco is great!

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Dan", written over a horizontal line.

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
04/19/2010 11:46 AM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject File 100443: 555 Washington



susan vaughan
<susan_e_vaughan@yahoo.c
.om>
04/16/2010 09:54 PM

To David.Chiu@sfgov.org, Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org,
Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org, Chris.Daly@sfgov.org,
David.Campos@sfgov.org, Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org,
John.Avalos@sfgov.org, Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org,
Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org, Sophie.Maxwell@sfgov.org,
Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org,
president@thd.org
cc
Subject 555 Washington

Dear Supervisors,

I urge to grant the appeal of 555 Washington Street. This proposed development is exactly what is not needed and contributing to the congestion on city streets. Not to mention the fact that the developers are requesting a Please up hold this appeal.

Sue Vaughan
District 1

14



"Herb Kosovitz"
<hkosovitz@sbcglobal.net>
04/17/2010 10:41 PM

To <David.Chiu@sfgov.org>, <Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org>,
<Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org>, <Chris.Daly@sfgov.org>,
<David.Campos@sfgov.org>, <Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org>,
cc
bcc
Subject 555 Washington Street

Supervisors:

Please reject the 555 Washington EIR.

Very truly yours,
Herb Kosovitz

14

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
04/19/2010 01:42 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject File 100443 please reject the 555 Washington EIR



"Mary Etta Moose"
<maryetta@edmoose.com>
04/17/2010 03:49 PM

To "Angela Calvillo" <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
Subject please reject the 555 Washington EIR

Dear Supervisors,

I beseech you to reject the 555 Washington EIR, and support the Telegraph Hill Dwellers Appeal.

The EIR fails to adequately analyze the impacts from this project that would require spot re-zoning of a single parcel to double the height limit; violate the City's General Plan; cast additional shadows on 4 parks (Ferry Park, Maritime Plaza, Sidney Walton Park and Redwood Park); ignore the voter mandated Proposition K (which bans additional shadows on public parks); increase wind impacts above what the Planning Code allows; add more cars than allowed by the Code.

This project would require a public street (Mark Twain Alley/Merchant Street) to be vacated and added to the development site, and require numerous other exceptions and variances from the Code.

Respectfully,

Mary Etta Moose
1962 Powell St
94133
415 398 0808

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
04/19/2010 11:48 AM

To
cc
bcc

Subject File 100443 - 555 Washington - Please reject this EIR

Complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form by clicking [HERE](#).

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 04/19/2010 11:51 AM -----



mooreurban@aol.com
04/16/2010 11:19 PM

To David.Chiu@sfgov.org, Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org,
Ross.Mikarami@sfgov.org, Chris.Daly@sfgov.org,
David.Campos@sfgov.org, Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org,
John.Avalos@sfgov.org, Sophie.Maxwell@sfgov.org,
Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org, Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org
cc Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Subject 555 Washington - Please reject this EIR

Honorable Supervisors:

As a Planning Commissioner and as a citizen of San Francisco, I write to urge you to reject the flawed 555 Washington EIR.

As with all other EIRs that I review, I have looked for adequacy, completeness and a good-faith effort for full disclosure; the EIR for 555 Washington fails on all scores.

In addition to extensive, subjective interpretations and innuendos, this project as proposed and it's EIR:

1. fails to adequately analyze the impacts of the proposed project that would require 'spot' re-zoning of a single parcel to double the height limit from 200 feet to 400 feet;
2. contradicts the City's General Plan;
3. casts additional shadows on 4 parks (Ferry Park, Maritime Plaza, Sidney Walton Park and Redwood Park);
4. ignores the voter-mandated Proposition K (which bans additional shadows on public parks);
5. increases wind impacts above what the Planning Code allows;
6. adds more cars than allowed by Code;
7. requires the vacating and conveyance of a public street (Mark Twain Alley) to be added to the development site; and
8. requires numerous other frivolous exceptions and variances from the Code

It is my professional opinion that the City should not allow case-by-case zoning. Further, we should not allow tall buildings in zones other than what the Urban Design Plan prescribes... instead we should add density to the Core, not the edge.

I respectfully ask that you reject this EIR,
Kathrin Moore
Planning Commissioner



mooreurban@aol.com
04/16/2010 11:19 PM

To David.Chiu@sfgov.org, Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org,
Ross.Mikarami@sfgov.org, Chris.Daly@sfgov.org,
David.Campos@sfgov.org, Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org,
cc Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

bcc

Subject 555 Washington - Please reject this EIR

Honorable Supervisors:

As a Planning Commissioner and as a citizen of San Francisco, I write to urge you to reject the flawed 555 Washington EIR.

As with all other EIRs that I review, I have looked for adequacy, completeness and a good-faith effort for full disclosure; the EIR for 555 Washington fails on all scores.

In addition to extensive, subjective interpretations and innuendos, this project as proposed and it's EIR:

1. fails to adequately analyze the impacts of the proposed project that would require 'spot' re-zoning of a single parcel to double the height limit from 200 feet to 400 feet;
2. contradicts the City's General Plan;
3. casts additional shadows on 4 parks (Ferry Park, Maritime Plaza, Sidney Walton Park and Redwood Park);
4. ignores the voter-mandated Proposition K (which bans additional shadows on public parks);
5. increases wind impacts above what the Planning Code allows;
6. adds more cars than allowed by Code;
7. requires the vacating and conveyance of a public street (Mark Twain Alley) to be added to the development site; and
8. requires numerous other frivolous exceptions and variances from the Code

It is my professional opinion that the City should not allow case-by-case zoning. Further, we should not allow tall buildings in zones other than what the Urban Design Plan prescribes... instead we should add density to the Core, not the edge.

I respectfully ask that you reject this EIR,

Kathrin Moore
Planning Commissioner

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
04/19/2010 02:23 PM

To
cc
bcc
Subject File 100443 Please Reject the 555 Washington EIR



katie hopkins
<hopkins.katie@gmail.com>
04/18/2010 12:52 PM

To David.Chiu@sfgov.org, Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org,
Ross.Mikarami@sfgov.org, Chris.Daly@sfgov.org,
David.Campos@sfgov.org, Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org,
John.Avalos@sfgov.org, Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org,
Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org, Sophie.Maxwell@sfgov.org,
Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org
cc Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, THD-President
<president@thd.org>
Subject Please Reject the 555 Washington EIR

The EIR for 555 Washington fails to adequately analyze the impacts from this project that would require "spot" re-zoning of a single parcel to double the height limit from 200 feet to 400 feet; violate the City's General Plan; cast additional shadows on 4 parks (Ferry Park, Maritime Plaza, Sidney Walton Park and Redwood Park); ignore the voter mandated Proposition Kc(which bans additional shadows on public parks); increase wind impacts above what the Planning Code allows; add more cars than allowed by the Code; require the vacation and conveyance of a public street (Mark Twain Alley/Merchant Street) to be added to the development site; and require numerous other exceptions and variances from the Code.

Katie Hopkins
Resident



Katherine Petrin
<katherine@argsf.com>
04/18/2010 09:33 PM

To "David.Chiu@sfgov.org" <David.Chiu@sfgov.org>,
"Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org" <Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org>,
"Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org" <Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org>,
cc "Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org"
<Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
bcc
Subject Please REJECT the 555 Washington Environmental Impact
Report EIR

Dear Supervisor:

I am writing in support of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers appeal on the proposed project at 555 Washington and ask you to please reject this badly flawed Environmental Impact Report.

I have serious concerns about the proposed project and I see little to like. The 15 March article in the Architect's Journal, which may have come to your attention (see link below), provides an excellent analysis of the potential detriment that this proposed project poses to the urban fabric of the surrounding neighborhoods not to mention its broader implications.

http://archpaper.com/e-board_rev.asp?News_ID=4338

Apart from the obvious worrying issues associated with this project, such as case-by-case zoning, "spot zoning," doubling of the height limit, shadows on public parks and the flouting of other zoning regulations, this potential project in would demolish a nine-story office building at 545 Sansome Street which actually does a very good job at contributing to the urban scene and streetscape, mediating the heights of the larger buildings in the Financial District to the south with the lower scale designated historic district to the north. The existing building is of the right scale at that location.

I hope the Board of Supervisors will see fit to deny this project and to ensure that any future project proposed on that site respects the existing height limits and other regulations set forth in the Planning Code.

Sincerely,

Katherine T. Petrin, Architectural Historian & District 3 Resident



"Dee Whalen"
<deew@att.net>
04/18/2010 11:14 PM

To "David.Chiu@sfgov.org" <mailto: David.Chiu@sfgov.org>,
<Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org>, <mailto:
Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org>, <Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org>,
cc <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>

bcc

Subject Please don't fall for the 555 Washington EIR

I don't like the many many evils of the project: the 400' height [Ugh!], the spot-zoning, the thumbing-of-nose of the General Plan, the increased cars -- and more. I urge you to keep our city on track. Please reject this project!

Dee Whalen

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV

04/19/2010 02:28 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,

cc

bcc

Subject The 555 Washington EIR



Tanya Hoffmoen
<tanyaohoffmoen@yahoo.co
m>

04/19/2010 07:38 AM

To Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

cc

Subject The 555 Washington EIR

Dear Board of Supervisors:
Please reject the 555 Washington EIR.

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
04/19/2010 02:31 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Reject the 555 Washington EIR & support the THD appeal



"Arthur Levy"
<arthur@yesquire.com>
04/19/2010 09:18 AM

To <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
Subject FW: Reject the 555 Washington EIR & support the THD appeal

From: Arthur Levy [mailto:arthur@yesquire.com]
Sent: Monday, April 19, 2010 9:17 AM
To: 'Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org'; 'Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org'; 'Chris.Daly@sfgov.org';
'David.Campos@sfgov.org'; 'Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org'; 'John.Avalos@sfgov.org'; 'Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org';
'Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org'; 'Sophie.Maxwell@sfgov.org'; 'Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'mailto:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org'
Subject: Reject the 555 Washington EIR & support the THD appeal

Dear President Chiu and Supervisors:

I am writing to ask you to reject the flawed EIR for 555 Washington as a basis for informed decision making for this project.

The inability of the Planning Department and the project sponsor to provide the Board full, fair, and level-headed evaluations of the numerous negative environmental impacts of this project only underscores that it is bad for San Francisco, its people, and their future.

Send the sponsor back to the drawing board to provide the Board a truly accountable document so that you can make an informed decision on this project.

San Francisco is not an inexhaustible resource. You are the guardians of the future of our fragile urban environment. When a truly dangerous project like this one comes along, we need your full dedication to the quality of life in our City to resist the powerful forces who would cash it in for huge short-term personal gain.

You hold the power: Vote YES on the appeal, NO on the EIR.

Sincerely,
Arthur D. Levy



Gerald Hurtado
<gphurtado@yahoo.com>

04/19/2010 10:03 AM

To David.Chiu@sfgov.org, Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org,
Ross.Mikarami@sfgov.org, Chris.Daly@sfgov.org,
David.Campos@sfgov.org, Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org,
cc Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, president@thd.org

bcc

Subject Please Reject the 555 Washington EIR

Dear Supervisor:

Regarding the EIR for the proposed new development at 555 Washington Street,
this is to request you to grant the appeal and reject this badly flawed EIR.

Sincerely,
Gerry Hurtado
P.O. Box 330324
San Francisco, CA
94133-0324

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
04/19/2010 11:42 AM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject File 100443 Please Reject the 555 Washington EIR



"Michael Schoolnik"
<Michael@storypr.com>
04/16/2010 09:44 PM

To <David.Chiu@sfgov.org>
cc <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, <president@thd.org>
Subject Please Reject the 555 Washington EIR

Supervisor Chiu,

The EIR fails to adequately analyze the impacts from this project that would require spot re-zoning of a single parcel to double the height limit: from 200 feet to 400 feet; violate the City's General Plan; cast additional shadows on 4 parks (Ferry Park, Maritime Plaza, Sidney Walton Park and Redwood Park); ignore the voter mandated Proposition K (which bans additional shadows on public parks); increase wind impacts above what the Planning Code allows; add more cars than allowed by the Code; require the vacation and conveyance of a public street (Mark Twain Alley/Merchant Street) to be added to the development site; and require numerous other exceptions and variances from the Code.

I am asking you to please Reject the 555 Washington EIR & support the THD appeal.

Respectfully,

Michael Schoolnik

1569 Clay Street

SF, CA 94109

File 100443



WongAIA@aol.com
04/18/2010 03:11 AM

To David.Chiu@sfgov.org, bevan.dufty@sfgov.org,
Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org, Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org,
carmen.chu@sfgov.org, chris.daly@sfgov.org,
cc Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, president@thd.org

bcc

Subject 555 WASHINGTON: EXISTING ZONING HAS
COMPELLING LOGIC

TO: Honorable Board of Supervisors
RE: REJECT THE 555 WASHINGTON EIR
BELOW: Previous Communications

Equitable application of code and law needs to override special interests on a single parcel.

At the 555 Washington's prime location, almost any design would be extremely profitable. Actually, a prior owner had proposed a code-complying mid-rise building at the same site---adhering to zoning, height, bulk, shadow restrictions....

If any other average citizen were to propose multiple variances, pre-conditions, transfer development rights (over open space) and "possible" acquisition of a city street (at bargain prices) for a larger and taller building, the project would likely not be given any credence.

Zoning compliance would generate jobs more quickly.

With universal support and code-compliance, the project could simplify design, approvals and financing.

A city planning process needs to be independent of political planning.

It is bad precedence for developers with financial means to organize political/ community support, in order to circumvent multiple zoning requirements.

Existing zoning has a history of evolution and logic.

North of Market, the SF General Plan and the Chinatown Plan established a stepping down of height from Market St. to Washington St. Partly, it was a transition to the Mediterranean-scale of North Beach/ Chinatown/ Jackson Square. But it was also a form of zoning protection against the economic pressures to push tall buildings northward, e.g. Telegraph Hill highrises, International Hotel Tower, City College, 555 Colombo Building site, 555 Washington etc. For the last previous decades, and many future decades to come, powerful development interests will ALWAYS probe for ways to maximize profits in some of the most desirable real estate in the world.

Zoning protects San Francisco's major tourist attractions, neighborhood scale/ character/ uniqueness, affordability, diversity, writers, artists etc.

Regards,
Howard Wong, AIA

* * * * *

555 WASHINGTON: NAGGING DOUBTS ABOUT PREMISES

TO: Honorable Members of the Planning Commission and Recreation & Parks Commission
CC: John Rahaim, Planning Director, Phil Ginsburg (GM Rec-Park) and Board President Chiu
RE: 555 WASHINGTON----NAGGING DOUBTS ABOUT PREMISES

First, I do grasp the proposed benefits of the Project---having seen three design presentations and having visited the site with the Project Sponsors. In my previous communiqué (see below "**Both Sides Can be Right**"), I stressed that alternative designs could satisfy both the Project Sponsors and neighborhood organizations.

But like magicians who frame the conditions for a magic act, I had nagging doubts about the debate's premises. These premises of planning, code and legality can help clarify projects.

- Washington Street was intended to be the boundary street for the Chinatown Plan---curbing gentrification of Chinatown's poorer residents and merchants.

- Washington Street has historically been and referenced as the transition boundary to the lower-scaled Jackson Square Historic District and North Beach. Existing zoning reinforces a stepping down of scale from the Financial District to the northern neighborhoods.
- Currently, there exists a one-story building (with Sai's Restaurant) fronting Washington St., next to the Pyramid and Redwood Park. This stepping-down scale DOES FIT WELL into the neighborhood.
- The Transamerica Pyramid has become an icon, and necessitates visibility from all vantage points. The proposed 555 Washington Tower blocks iconic views from the Embarcadero along Washington St. to Columbus Ave.
- Allowable Floor Areas for the **site as a whole** need to be evaluated. The two existing high-rises each met **legal mandates for their individual approvals**. The Planning Department should study how previous Floor Areas were calculated---the assumed building footprints, approvals derived from Redwood Park, any conditions established for code exceptions or variances....
- In calculating its Floor Areas/ FAR, the proposed 555 Washington Project should not assume a **false footprint** that includes city-owned Merchant Street, previously dedicated open space or previously assumed footprints of other existing buildings.
- The purchase of Merchant Street appears necessary for the proposed project's increased bulk and height---not merely an homage to open space, which can be added in any other design scheme.
- Incrementally over time, additional shadow impacts on multiple city parks would make the Shadow Ordinance inconsequential---and a violation of law.
- Sunlight is also a function of zoning, with the stepping-down of scale along Washington St. assuring sunlight to Jackson St., Merchant St. and adjoining neighborhoods.
- If Merchant Street were to remain city-owned property, a lease option could generate much needed long-term revenue for the City.
- **If a series of benefits for a single Project Sponsor were to be initiated, this would constitute a political planning process rather than a City Planning process---especially when win-win designs exist.**

Yours Truly,
 Howard Wong, AIA
 Ph: 982-5055

* * * * *

555 WASHINGTON: BOTH SIDES CAN BE RIGHT

TO: Honorable Members of the Planning Commission
 CC: John Rahaim, Planning Director and President Chiu, Board of Supervisors
 RE: 555 WASHINGTON---A MORE BALANCED CONTEXTUAL VIEW

BOTH SIDES CAN BE RIGHT

As an architect and neighborhood advocate, I find that sometimes both sides of land-use debates can be right. Digging down to fundamentals, more elegant design solutions can emerge---relatively satisfying to all "combatants".

DESIGN OF 555 WASHINGTON

The architectural design has evolved nicely: Larger open space, activated Merchant Street, a slender glassy tower, good separation/ contrast to the iconic Pyramid, long-term maintenance package.... The controversy is multiple variances, and the historical threats of large-scale development into Jackson Square, Chinatown, North Beach and northward. As in many cities, there is great anguish about neighborhood affordability, character, scale, historicism, uniqueness... Incrementally over time, perhaps moving so slowly as to lull complacency, such development has occurred, e.g. the International Hotel Tower, City College Chinatown Campus, Ellis Act evictions, height/ density rezonings.... There's sound urban design logic in stepping heights downward at Washington Street---per existing zoning codes and the San Francisco General Plan.

HEIGHT VARIANCE

The question remains: Does a lower height necessarily negate all of the Project's proposed benefits and the Project Sponsor's goals?

In this case, NO. Even with a larger building footprint, Redwood Park can still be enlarged with the

removal of the conference center and restaurant additions. Merchant Street can still be redesigned as a pedestrian realm. The tower can still taper at the upper floors. The building's location still commands high market values.

SHADOW IMPACTS

Over a long period of time, the cumulative impacts of "small", "harmless" variances and spot rezonings will be detrimental---unless variances are reserved for extremely rare situations that have no other possible alternatives. In the case of 555 Washington, there are design alternatives.

SEEKING ELEGANT DESIGN SOLUTIONS

For 555 Washington, the Project Sponsor's goals can be achieved with a building of less height; and more importantly, maintain the objectives of zoning and neighborhood preservation.

Architectural design and height can take different forms---all of which can be attractive, profitable, socially responsible, compatible with surrounding neighborhoods, filled with local art, sustainable, green etc. A lower tower, with projecting bay windows, can take an interesting form and step back from the Pyramid and the Jackson Square Historic District. Merchant Street can be covered with glass Parisian canopies, creating year-round space. At this site, a transparent glass mid-rise building would command high prices. The proposed design can evolve---because all stakeholders will benefit, without prolonged debates and delays---for the long-term betterment of San Francisco.

Best Regards,
Howard Wong, AIA



Julian Standen
<julianstanden@sbcglobal.net>

04/17/2010 07:37 PM

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

cc

bcc

Subject: Parking Meters

I object to proposed increases in parking meters.

Cut the bureaucracy, don't raise fees.

Mayor Newsome, why do you think I'd vote for someone who increases taxes?

Julian Standen
3525 Broderick
SF

15



Guri Walia
<guri_walia@yahoo.com>
04/17/2010 09:01 PM

To mtaboard@sfmta.com, gavin.newsom@sfgov.org,
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc cangri_naje@yahoo.com, raviwalia@yahoo.com,
punkpenquin@yahoo.com, xnychick718x@aol.com, guri
walia <guri_walia@yahoo.com>, john@circasf.com,
bcc

Subject Chestnut Street Parking Meters

We do not want
-Any increase in fees on meters
-Extended meters
-Meters on Sunday

Thank You,

Guri

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
04/19/2010 02:42 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject NO to Sunday meters



Frank Lee
<movie4star@gmail.com>
04/19/2010 11:22 AM

To MTABoard@sfmta.com, Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org,
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject NO to Sunday meters

Please DO NOT extend meters to 10pm and have meters active on Sunday's!!! This will hurt businesses in all SF neighborhoods. Thank you.

Frank Lee
Lee Neighborhood Theaters, SF



ggwood@aol.com
04/19/2010 10:55 AM

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

cc

bcc

Subject Parking Meter Fee Abuse!

Mayor Newsom, MTA Board and Supervisors:

The public that parks on San Francisco's streets every day is more than happy to help offset some of the lost City revenue and failure to adhere to a reasonable budget. But, we are not going to constantly carry the entire brunt of irresponsible government management. Many bus routes have been eliminated or have had service reduced and parking fees have already been raised by over 10%.

When the the MTA supervisors and staff have reduced staffing and their pay 10%, cut their vacation and benefits 10%; when the Supervisors reduce the City spending across the board by 10%; when the Mayor's office also cuts it's staff and services and staff pay and benefits by 10% so that we have a 10% ACROSS-THE-BOARD reduction in ALL City costs, then the public will be happy to participate in the next 5% or 10% reduction in services or increase in parking fees.

Geoff Wood
Baker Street

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
04/19/2010 02:42 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject opposed to parking meters increase



Patricia Houden
<phouden@mac.com>
04/19/2010 11:09 AM

To MTAboard@sfmta.com, gavin.newsom@sfgov.org,
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject opposed to parking meters increase

I am a homeowner in San Francisco and I am opposed to parking meter
fee and time increases.

Instead, why don't we actively fine people who do not comply with the
dog ordinance. It would provide employment, generate city revenue, and
clean up our streets and beaches and make them safer.

Pat Houden
2780 Filbert Street



kat@katanderson.net
04/19/2010 10:40 AM

To mtaboard@sfmta.com, gavin.newsom@sfgov.org,
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
bcc
Subject Resident of the Marina, and Board member of Marina
Community Association protests extended meter hours and
Sunday meter hours

1 attachment



chnia-parking alert.pdf

Dear Honorable Newsom, MTA Board and members of San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I am Kat Anderson, a 22-year resident of San Francisco, a resident of District 2 and the Marina, a property owner and a businesswoman in District 2:

I protest the extension of parking meter hours beyond 6 pm. I protest the extension of metering hours to Sundays. We do not need such extensions in the Chestnut Street business district.

If the MTA imposes such extensions, it will cause negative impacts on the residents of the Marina living close to the Chestnut Street business district. People will opt to park in the neighborhoods rather than pay more fees for parking. They already do so during the day. At night, after 6 pm, we residents actually experience a break because folks can park free on Chestnut, and the turnover is good because they are having a meal or doing a little shopping and moving on.

Please know that residents parking in the business district is NOT an issue. We park in our homes or in front of our homes as much as we can. We do not opt to park at meters. Such a notion is ridiculous.

Merchants' and restaurateurs' businesses will be harmed by extended metering hours. People will make less trips or they will learn to avoid the area that has "too much" metering. I urge you as a resident and as a member of the board of directors of the Marina Community Association not to implement such changes.

Please note that when Mr. Jay Primus of the MTA attended a neighborhood meeting in late March at the Palace of the Fine Arts theatre, over 100 people in attendance voted NOT to extend hours. In fact, when the group was polled, not one person wanted metering hours extended and only one person voted to have Sunday hours. It was stark proof that the neighbors do not want these proposed changes.

Sincerely,

Kat Anderson
65 Avila Street (one block N of Chestnut Street)
SF, CA 94123
(415)776-3645

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

Subject: Have you sent these?
From: patricia vaughey <patriciavaughey@att.net>
Date: Mon, April 19, 2010 9:18 am
To: alextourk@gmail.com, kae amphi <kae@amphi.com>

Have you sent your email in to the MTA, Gavin and the Board of supervisors

per attached information?

Have you sent this information to your friends and requested for them to send emails also?

Patricia vaughey



Bfbone1@aol.com
04/19/2010 10:26 AM

To MTABoard@sfmta.com
cc Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
bcc
Subject (no subject)

Dear Sir:

I am strongly opposed to the proposed changes in the parking meters on Chestnut Street. Specifically, I am opposed to the following:

- extending meter time on any day
- using meters on Sunday
- any increases in meter fees

Please support me in this opposition. It will only make parking worse. Barry Bone



Mary Smith
<flynn8@sbcglobal.net>


04/19/2010 09:59 AM

Please respond to
Mary Smith
<flynn8@sbcglobal.net>

To: MTABoard@sfmta.com, Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org,
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
cc: Kelly Keiser <kelly@kellykeiserdesign.com>

bcc

Subject: Neighborhood Merchants and parking





"Pina, Jesse"
<Jesse.Pina@crunch.com>
04/19/2010 09:08 AM

To "MTABoard@sfmta.com" <MTABoard@sfmta.com>,
"Gavin.Newsome@sfgov.org"
<Gavin.Newsome@sfgov.org>,
cc "Pacumio, Jackie" <Jackie.Pacumio@crunch.com>,
"Cotruvo, Kate" <Kate.Cotruvo@crunch.com>,
"pinadj2000@yahoo.com" <pinadj2000@yahoo.com>,
bcc

Subject your meter proposals

Hello,

I am a person who works in the Marina district and your proposed idea to raise the meter fees and extend them onto Sundays is an idea that will only create more chaos and frustration as many of us who work in the service industry cannot and will not afford such increases and changes to our parking options. I can only hope this idea does not come to fruition, otherwise, my vote in future elections as a resident in this fair city will be scrutinized and applied to those who can better serve my community and others as well without having to divert hard earned income to supplement your pay.

Thanks,

Jesse Pina
Front Desk MOD

Crunch
2324 Chestnut Street
San Francisco, CA 94123
Direct: 415-292-8470
Fax: 415-292-8473

The information contained in this email message is intended only for use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by email (postmaster@crunch.com), and destroy the original message. Thank You.



dominic maionchi
<dm567@pacbell.net>

04/19/2010 08:44 AM

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

cc Kathy Maionchi <km250@pacbell.net>, Patricia Vaughey
<patriciavaughey@att.net>

bcc

Subject Parking meters

Dear MTA Board, Mr. Newsom, and Board of Supervisors,

When will insanity stop? Even considering running meters until 10 pm and on Sunday is crazy. Raising fees beyond the already excessive fees is just as crazy.

There will eventually be repercussions to such acts that are against the best interests of SF residents. People will eventually get angry and rightfully so in my opinion. I am already angry. You can fix your problems by NOT SPENDING SO MUCH. Don't fix the problems on the backs of SF residents!

Regards,

dominic maionchi
dm567@pacbell.net



Ariella Elia
<ariella.elia@gmail.com>
04/18/2010 11:22 AM

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

cc

bcc

Subject parking meter extension alert

I, Ariella Elia, have been informed that the San Francisco Department of Parking and Traffic are trying to extend meters until 10 PM, have meters on Sunday, and raise the fees up to \$6.00 an hour. This is ridiculous. You are already raising prices everywhere, and raising fees up to \$6.00 an hour is getting out of hand. Even if you're trying to get people to ride public transportation, this is doing way too much. Give us a break, at this point we're just trying to survive. So please, we're begging you do NOT raise / extend fees and meter times.

-Ariella Elia



Walden Jay
<wjay@pacbell.net>
04/19/2010 11:56 AM

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

cc

bcc

Subject Street Meters

History:  This message has been forwarded.

Please reconsider the terrible idea of extending the parking meter hours and increasing the cost per hour. People are already taking the parking situation into consideration when deciding whether to go to SF or elsewhere for shopping, entertainment, etc. This would only serve to make things worse for the City that apparently has forgotten how to serve its citizens.



Julie Holliday Roehm
<julie.holliday@gmail.com>
04/12/2010 10:47 PM

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

Subject Objection to T-Mobile Tower on Miraloma Church Building

Dear Ms Calvillo and Supervisors,

I object to allowing Miraloma Community Church to become a cell-tower site for the following reasons

1. Miraloma Church and Miraloma Park Neighborhood is zoned RH-1, this cell tower does not comply with zoning regulations. This will effect the property value of my home, and could impact the health of my child, my neighbors, and all of the children attending the elementary school that is only two blocks away.

2. Miraloma Community Church has no congregation and does not support the local community. The impacted community, children and neighbors receive no benefits from this deal, only negatives.

Thank you,

Julie Roehm

16

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
04/15/2010 03:52 PM

To Ross Mirkarimi/BOS/SFGOV, Jeremy Pollock/BOS/SFGOV,
Jason Fried/BOS/SFGOV, CleanPowerSF@sfgov.org,
cc
bcc
Subject NO CORE AGGREGATION!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!



mulcase2@comcast.net
04/15/2010 03:28 PM

To "gavin.newsom." <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
Subject NO CORE AGGREGATION!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

I'm afraid your version is called SLAMMING.
It was outlawed during the failure of Direct Access, have you forgotten??? The very
action we all detested as utility rate payers when "suppliers' transferred customers
without their knowledge.

If I want it, it WILL be MY choice to opt in, You have it backwards! you DON'T know
what is best for me and my energy bills.

Vote Yes on Prop 16.

*A government big enough to supply everything you need is big enough to take
everything you have.....the course of history shows that as government grows,
liberty decreases...*

Thomas Jefferson.

Matt C

17



**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER**

To: Angela Calvillo,
Clerk of the Board
From: Office of the Controller
City Services Auditor

BOS-11
page

Ben Rosenfield
Controller

Monique Zmuda
Deputy Controller

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

BY
2010 APR 13 PM 12:10
PN

AUDIT FOLLOW-UP MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 13, 2010
TO: John Martin, Airport Director
FROM: Tonia Lediju, Director of Audits, City Services Auditor
SUBJECT: Results of Follow-up Review for Audit of The Hertz Corporation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Controller's City Services Auditor (CSA) Division issued an audit report on June 13, 2008, titled, *Concession Audit of The Hertz Corporation*, on which it followed up in writing in 2009. In response to our follow-up of the report's 11 recommendations, the Airport Department (Airport) indicated that it disagreed with two recommendations, fully implemented eight, and partially implemented one.

CSA assessed evidence of the Airport's implementation of the 11 recommendations, and determined that two were no longer applicable, eight were fully implemented, and one was partially implemented. The Airport's actions to implement the recommendations are summarized on pages 2 and 3, and the recommendations themselves and the implementation status of each are presented in the attached table.

BACKGROUND & METHODOLOGY

The Hertz Corporation (Hertz) had a 10-year agreement with the Airport Commission of the City and County of San Francisco (City) to operate an automobile rental service at the rental car facility at San Francisco International Airport. Although the agreement expired on December 29, 2008, the Airport Commission and Hertz entered a new five-year agreement, which expires on December 31, 2013. The agreement requires Hertz to pay the Airport the greater of a minimum annual guarantee or 10 percent of its gross revenues. The minimum annual guarantee was \$676,908 from the start of the prior agreement through December 29, 2003, and was modified to \$609,218 for the period through the expiration of the prior agreement.

In accordance with Government Auditing Standards, Section 8.05, promulgated by the United States Government Accountability Office (GAO), CSA conducted a follow-up review of the agreed-upon recommendations for the audit report of June 13, 2008, *Concession Audit of The Hertz Corporation*. Section 8.05 states that the purposes of audit reports include facilitating follow-up to determine whether appropriate corrective actions have been taken. This follow-up determined whether the Airport has taken the corrective actions needed to implement the audit report's recommendations. In the case of recommendations

18

calling for new procedures, CSA both verified that the procedures were created and considered examples of the department's compliance with them.

To conduct the follow-up, CSA contacted key Airport personnel to discuss the status of the corrective actions taken to date, verified the existence of the procedures and processes that have been established, and documented the results of the fieldwork.

RESULTS

In its March 2009 follow-up response to the audit report, the Airport reported that of the eleven recommendations, it disagreed with two recommendations, fully implemented eight, and partially implemented one, giving specific information for each recommendation (see attached table). CSA considered the information the Airport provided, reviewed supporting documentation, and verified that eight recommendations have, in fact, been implemented and one partially implemented. The Airport disagreed with two recommendations based on its interpretation of a lease agreement provision between Hertz and the Airport, which differed from the audit team's interpretation. Subsequent to this audit, the lease agreement expired and the Airport Commission and Hertz entered a new lease agreement, which included a revised definition of gross revenues which both the Airport and the audit team interpret similarly.

The results are presented below by subject area.

Recommendations 1 and 4: Collect From Hertz Local Rental Fees of \$518,371 and Commercial Discount Fees of \$295,594

The Airport disagreed with these two recommendations.

Conclusion: Since the Airport disagreed with these two recommendations, it did not collect these fees from Hertz. Therefore, the recommendations are no longer applicable. However, the new lease agreement between Hertz and the Airport Commission clarifies the definition of gross revenues subject to fees.

Recommendations 2, 3, and 5: Collect From Hertz Employee Business Rental Fees of \$5,106, Satellite Radio Rental Fees of \$7,145, and Revenue Adjustment Fees of \$72,058

As recommended, Airport collected these fees from Hertz in January 2009.

Conclusion: Recommendations 2, 3, and 5 have been implemented.

Recommendation 6: Review Hertz's Account to Determine How the Application of the \$270,764 Credit Failed to Result in an Outstanding Credit Balance if Hertz Paid the Full Monthly Fee for the Months in Question

The former accounting manager reviewed Hertz' account and determined that the annual true-up process captured any appropriate credits, and that the \$270K credit was simply a correction to the accounting system to reverse the initial erroneous entries.

Conclusion: Recommendation 6 has been implemented.

Recommendation 7: Collect From Hertz Interest of \$494,255 and Audit Costs of \$87,300

Since the Airport disagreed with recommendations 1 and 4, it recalculated, adjusted, and collected interest of \$43,935. Also, as a result of the reduction of fees owed, the Airport was no longer required to collect the \$87,300 cost of the audit.

Conclusion: Recommendation 7 has been implemented.

Recommendation 8: Document the Dates the Airport Receives the Certified Annual Reports of Gross Revenues

The Airport began using a property management billing system software package in the fall of 2008, which features, among other things, a tickler system. This will help the Airport ensure that reports are presented on time. Further, Airport Revenue Development and Management staff will review Annual Certified Statements for correct format. However, Hertz forwarded the 2008 certified year-end statement to the Airport and the Airport documented its receipt on April 2, 2009, or two days late.

Conclusion: Recommendation 8 has been implemented. However, the Airport should ensure that it receives its certified year-end statements before March 31st, as required by the agreement.

Recommendation 9: Work With Hertz to Determine the Fees Owed From Local Rental Revenue, Employee Business Rental Revenue, Satellite Radio Revenue, Commercial Discount Deductions, and Adjustment Deductions for the Period Before and After the Audit Period

The Airport collected from Hertz fees owed from satellite radio rentals for the relevant periods before and after the audit period. However, no fees have been collected for employee business rental revenue or for adjustment deductions. Since the Airport disagreed with recommendations 1 and 4 on local rentals and commercial discounts, it did not collect any fees for these revenue types.

Conclusion: Recommendation 9 has been partially implemented.

Recommendations 10 and 11: Require Hertz to Include in Gross Revenue Local Rentals and Satellite Radio, and to Discontinue Deducting Employee Business Rentals, Commercial Discounts, and Adjustments from Gross Revenues. Include in the New Agreement with Hertz a Comprehensive Definition of Gross Revenues and Exclusions to Gross Revenues

The Airport now has a new lease agreement with Hertz, which became effective on January 1, 2009. The new lease does include an all-inclusive definition of gross revenues. It also includes a few very clearly stated deductions. Any transaction that is not specifically allowed as a deduction will be considered gross revenues for which fees will be assessed.

Conclusion: Recommendations 10 and 11 have been implemented.

Page 4 of 4
Memo to the Airport
April 13, 2010

CSA extends its appreciation to you and your staff who assisted with this follow-up. If you have any questions or concerns, please call or e-mail Audit Manager Elisa Sullivan at (415) 554-7654 or elisa.sullivan@sfgov.org.

cc: Cheryl Nashir, Associate Deputy Airport Director, Airport
John Reeb, Sr. Principal Property Manager, Airport
Matthew McCormick, Principal Property Manager, Airport
Ben Rosenfield, Controller
Robert Tarsia, Deputy Audit Director, CSA
Vivian Chu, Associate Auditor, CSA

ATTACHMENT A: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Audit Report Rec #	Recommendation	December 2009 Status Per Airport	Auditor's Follow-up Work	Results
1	The Airport Department should collect from Hertz the following fees owed: local rental fees of \$518,371.	Under the Lease, Hertz must pay "Gross Revenue" for "all vehicles rented at the Airport." (Lease Article 3.01.a) The Lease defines vehicles rented at the Airport if "the rental car <i>customer is an air passenger</i> who rents a vehicle within 24 hours of arriving at the Airport." (Lease Article 30.1.a.iii) Taken together, the Airport interprets this language to require Hertz to only calculate gross revenue for those vehicles rented by air passengers arriving at the Airport within 24 hours. Thus, Hertz is not required to calculate gross revenue for certain "Local Rentals," those customers who are not air passengers arriving within the last 24 hours. Provided Hertz adequately documents these "Local Rentals," the Airport considers said rentals as not included in the calculation of gross revenue.	Not applicable, since the Airport disagreed with the recommendation. However, the new lease agreement between Hertz and the Airport Commission, which became effective January 1, 2009, clarifies the definition of gross revenues subject to fees.	Not applicable.
2	Collect from Hertz the following fees owed: employee business rental fees of \$5,106.	Completed.	Obtained copy of payment check.	Implemented.
3	Collect from Hertz the following fees owed: satellite radio rental fees of \$7,145.	Completed.	Obtained copy of payment check.	Implemented.

Audit Report Rec #	Recommendation	December 2009 Status Per Airport	Auditor's Follow-up Work	Results
4	Collect from Hertz the following fees owed: commercial discount fees of \$295,594.	The Airport has consulted with the City Attorney's Office and believes the language stated in Lease Article 3.01.a, "without deduction or offset" does not include any commercial or promotional discounts offered by Hertz to third parties. While the language may cause confusion, the Airport maintains that Hertz must pay Gross Revenues based on the amount received.	Not applicable, since the Airport disagreed with the recommendation. However, the new lease agreement between Hertz and the Airport Commission, which became effective January 1, 2009, clarifies the definition of gross revenues subject to fees.	Not applicable.
5	Collect from Hertz the following fees owed: revenue adjustment fees of \$72,058.	Completed.	Obtained copy of payment check.	Implemented.
6	Review Hertz' account to determine how the application of the \$270,764 credit failed to result in an outstanding credit balance if Hertz paid the full monthly fee for the months in question.	Completed.	The Airport confirmed that it had reviewed Hertz' payment history shortly after the audit was completed in June 2008, and is confident that the credit was properly accounted for as a correction to the initial erroneous entries.	Implemented.
7	Collect from Hertz interest of \$494,255 and audit costs of \$87,300.	Hertz paid an adjusted amount for interest based upon the comments above. Collection of audit costs are no longer required based on the reduced amount collected.	Obtained copy of payment check. Verified that Hertz paid \$43,935 interest on an adjusted amount, which does not include the two amounts (\$518,371 and \$295,594) in recommendations 1 and 4 that the Airport did not agree with.	Implemented.

Audit Report Rec #	Recommendation	December 2009 Status Per Airport	Auditor's Follow-up Work	Results
8	Document the dates that it receives the annual reports of gross revenues and ensure the annual reports are certified by a certified public accountant as required by the lease.	Completed.	Obtained sample of screen print of billing system tickler. Also, obtained documentation of the Airport's receipt of Hertz' 2008 certified report on April 2, 2009, or 2 days late. The lease agreement requires that Hertz submit its certified annual report by March 31st of each year.	Implemented, but the Airport should ensure that it receives its certified annual report by the required date.
9	Work with Hertz to determine the fees owed from local rental revenue, employee business rental revenue, satellite radio revenue, commercial discount deductions, and adjustment deductions for the periods before and after our audit period.	This process is underway.	The Airport disagreed with collection of local rental revenue and commercial discount deductions (see recommendations 1 and 4), so it did not request payment for those amounts. In October 2007, Hertz remitted satellite fees for the periods November 15, 2002, through December 29, 2002 (satellite fees did not exist prior to November 15, 2002) and January 1, 2006, through September 30, 2007 in the amount of \$6,872.75 and then began paying it monthly beginning October 2007. The Airport has requested, but Hertz has not provided, documentation to show that Hertz submitted (or does not owe) fees for employee business rental revenue or adjustment deductions for the periods before and after the audit period.	Partially Implemented.
10	Require Hertz to include in gross revenues local rentals and satellite radio, and to discontinue deducting employee business rentals, commercial discounts, and adjustments from gross revenues.	Completed.	Obtained new lease that became effective January 1, 2009. Found that it does include an all-inclusive definition of gross revenues. Gross revenues does exclude all non-revenue rentals made to Hertz employees.	Implemented.

Audit Report Rec #	Recommendation	December 2009 Status Per Airport	Auditor's Follow-up Work	Results
11	Include in its new agreement with Hertz a comprehensive definition of gross revenues and exclusions to gross revenues that both parties agree to and understand.	Completed.	Obtained new lease that became effective January 1, 2009. Found that it does include an all-inclusive definition of gross revenues and exclusions to gross revenues that both parties agreed to.	Implemented.

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
04/19/2010 02:26 PM

To John Avalos/BOS/SFGOV,
cc
bcc
Subject Fw: Attn: Supervisor John Avalos RE: McLaren Park



Kelly Seldan
<ks@kellyseldan.com>
Sent by:
kellyseldan@gmail.com
04/18/2010 11:55 PM

To Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject Attn: Supervisor John Avalos RE: McLaren Park

Greetings Supervisor Avalos,

I just received an email from a friend concerned about the approved 18-hole Disc Golf course at McLaren Park. She tells me it was approved without community input. If this is the case, I think the project should be reconsidered and that the community should be involved in the discussions. I am also deeply concerned about the environmental impact of this change!

I would like to strongly encourage you to re evaluate this project and help to protect the voices of the community and the health of the park!!

Thank you for your attention.

Best,

Kelly Seldan, Resident of District 13

--

Kelly Seldan
kellyseldan.com
ks@kellyseldan.com
415.994.9699

19

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
04/19/2010 11:50 AM

To John Avalos/BOS/SFGOV,
cc Sophie Maxwell/BOS/SFGOV,
bcc
Subject Supervisor Avalos



GinaNRamos@aol.com
04/17/2010 02:00 PM

To Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject Supervisor Avalos

Dear Supervisor Avalos,

I am writing you regarding McLaren Park and the approved proposal by SF Park & Rec to incorporate an 18-hole Disc Golf course. I am voicing my concerns due to the following reasons:

- The Disc Golf course was approved without community knowledge or input.
- The proposed 18-hole course is too large, taking up possibly 1/3 or 1/4 of the park's natural habitat of open and untouched fields.
- Natural habitat and wildlife would be disturbed.
- Open fields of grass, plants and trees would be destroyed as the players run through the area.
- The inherent serenity and beauty of the park would be greatly reduced by the placement of 18 metal baskets, as well as signs marking Disc Golf rules and boundaries.
- This is a game played by a small percentage of people with the advantage of taking up so much of the park's open fields.
- No other activity takes up so much acreage; unlike soccer, basketball, baseball, football or playground areas, which have smaller and clearer field boundaries and uses.
- With Disc Golf's proposed marked boundaries, it is certain the boundaries will be crossed by players chasing frisbees.
- No other activity has its players freely run through open fields, which are meant to be open fields for trees, plants and wildlife.
- The park's wildlife need protection and natural beauty require preservation.

My questions:

- How was this approved without the surrounding communities' knowledge or input?
- What are the benefits?
- What are the costs to the environment?
- What are the possible solutions to preserve McLaren?
- Is compromise possible?

Some of Disc Golf players promises and response:

- To pick up garbage:
 - There is no garbage left on the open spaces and fields of McLaren. Garbage is only left in designated picnic areas and park entrances.
- Redtail Hawks and Owls are 'thriving' in Golden Gate Park:
 - McLaren's wildlife are not accustomed to people and their sport activities.
- To give way to pedestrians, dogs and children:
 - Pedestrians are respecting McLaren's beauty by staying on pathways and the players are not? Something is wrong with this scenario.
- There is not cost to SF. The work will be done by volunteers.

19

- It may not be a monetary cost for SF, but it will cost us in loss of quality of life and preservation of the park.

McLaren is a haven of nature. Please protect it.

Thank you for your time, attention and consideration in this matter.

Gina N. Ramos



750 Persia Avenue
SF, CA 94112

CC: Sophie Maxwell

Attention!

Total 100% local natural beauty of McLaren Park
and what about disc golf course?

Disc Golf Course

Amateur disc golf course has been approved (without community input) to be located nearby from the amphitheater to the Rocking Crossing dog area, grassy meadows and wood. This is a concern for hikers, joggers, bikers and wildlife.

There are two scheduled meetings for the community concerning the design of the course, development and rules of etiquette for new golf players to be in use. The hikers, joggers and bicyclists who must pass through the disc course.

Please attend these meetings
It's our park too. We need your voice!

Saturday, April 10, 1PM
Curtis Amphitheater Parking Lot
(on the approved course)

Tuesday, April 20, 6:30PM
Cricket Amateur Clubhouse
(free and accessible)
1000 16th Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94114
1000 16th Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94114
1000 16th Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94114

DONT LET YOUR PARK BE THE NEXT

VICTIM

OF
DISC GOLF

- ~~GOLDEN GATE PARK~~
- ~~MILLER PARK~~
- ~~DE LA VILLA PARK~~
- ~~LAGOON VALLEY PARK~~
- ~~MORAGA COMMONS PARK~~
- ~~GREENS WILDERNESS PARK~~
- ~~STAFFORD LINE PARK~~
- ~~AQUATIC PARK~~
- ~~CHURCH PARK~~
- MCLAREN PARK

PLEASE HELP FIGHT TO PRESERVE THE
NATURAL BEAUTY OF MCLAREN PARK

YOUR PARK NEEDS A VOICE SO PLEASE
ATTEND THE FOLLOWING DATES!

SATURDAY, APRIL 10TH, 11 AM
GARCIA AMPHITHEATER PARKING LOT
NORTH OF THE PROSPECT DRIVE

TUESDAY, APRIL 20TH, 6:30 PM
ANDERSON AMAZON CLUBHOUSE
1000 S. 10TH ST.

THINK AND CHANGE TO HEAR FOR
THE PARK AND ITS BEAUTY!





This email may contain confidential and/or privileged material for the sole use of the above designated recipient(s). Any review, use, distribution and/or disclosure by or to others not designated or authorized to receive this email is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and delete all copies of this message.



Francisco Da Costa
<fdc1947@gmail.com>
04/18/2010 11:26 AM

To: Francisco Da Costa <fdc1947@gmail.com>
cc:
bcc: Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
Subject: Lennar swimming in the cesspool of its own creation.

Lennar swimming in the cesspool of its own creation:

<http://www.franciscodacosta.org/articles/environ124.html>

Francisco Da Costa

20



Get Out The Jail Vote
<getoutthejailvotepct@gmail.com>

04/13/2010 02:49 PM

Please respond to
getoutthejailvotepct@gmail.com

To Ross Mirkarimi <ross.mirkarimi@sfgov.org>, Ross Mirkarimi
<jeremy.pollock@sfgov.org>, Vallie Brown
<vallie.brown@sfgov.org>, Rick Galbreath

cc

bcc

Subject Re: request for friendly amendments to the DRAFT SF
Board of Supervisors Voting Rights Resolution

History: This message has been forwarded.

1 attachment



041310 Input to DRAFT by GOTJV Proposed SF Board of Supervisors Voting Rights Resolution 040710.doc

Please see attached draft for friendly amendments request for the Proposed SF Board of Supervisors Voting
Resolution # 040710.

Right

Thank you, Tommy Escarcega 510.409.1662

21

1 [Urging the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's Corrections Standards
2 Authority to Implement Guidelines to Ensure Voting Access for Eligible Offenders.]

3 **Resolution Urging the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's**
4 **Corrections Standard Authority to Adopt Specific Guidelines for County Sheriffs and**
5 **Departments of Corrections, in Order to Facilitate Voting Among Eligible Incarcerated**
6 **Individuals.**

7
8 WHEREAS, the right to vote is fundamental – and a critical way that individuals
9 participate in our democratic society; and

10 WHEREAS, California courts have specifically held that convicted felons who are
11 sentenced to county jail or placed on probation are entitled to vote; and

12 WHEREAS the San Francisco Sheriff's Department has implemented model protocols
13 and procedures for ensuring that all inmates who are eligible to vote can do so; and

14 WHEREAS these critical steps have not been taken in other counties, resulting in the
15 disenfranchisement of eligible voters – and a fundamental barrier to civic engagement for
16 these individuals; and

17 WHEREAS the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's Corrections
18 Standards Authority (CDCR/CSA), which oversees all county jails, has been silent on this
19 issue; therefore be it

20 RESOLVED, that the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco
21 hereby urges the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's Corrections
22 Standard Authority (CDCR/CSA) to adopt specific guidelines for county sheriff's custody
23 divisions and county departments of corrections, in order to facilitate ensure the option of
24

25
Supervisor Mirkarimi
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

1 voluntary, unobstructed, timely, confidential, and informed access to voting among eligible
2 incarcerated individuals.

3
4 RESOLVED, that the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco
5 herby urges the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's Corrections
6 Standards Authority (CDCR's/CSA) to issue a memorandum of these guidelines to all sheriffs
7 and custody divisions within their jurisdiction.

From: Controller Reports/CON/SFGOV
To:
Date: 04/12/2010 01:34 PM
Subject: Memorandum Issued: Community-based Long Term Care Fiscal Analysis
Sent by: Patti Erickson

The Office of the Controller, City Services Auditor, has released the results of its analysis of the City's community-based long term care (LTC) spending. Conducted at the request of community stakeholders and sponsored by the Human Services Agency and Department of Public Health, the project compiled three years of spending for home and community-based services where funding is administered by the City and County of San Francisco. The analysis showed a total of \$726 million in community-based LTC spending for FY 2009-2010 including federal and state resources.

To view the memo, please visit our website at:
<http://co.sfgov.org/webreports/details.aspx?id=1117>

This is a send only email address.

22

SFLC San Francisco Labor Council



BOS-11

1188 Franklin Street, Suite 203, San Francisco, CA 94109 • Phone: (415) 440-4809 • Fax: (415) 440-9297 • www.sflaborcouncil.org

- EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
TIM PAULSON
- PRESIDENT
MIKE CASEY
UNITE HERE 2
- SECRETARY TREASURER
JOSIE MOONEY
SEIU 1021
- VICE PRESIDENT FOR POLITICAL ACTIVITIES
CONNOR FORD
OPEIU 3
- VICE PRESIDENT FOR AFFILIATE SUPPORT
LARRY MAZZOLA, SR.
Plumbers 38
- CE PRESIDENT FOR COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES
HOWARD WALLACE
Pride at Work
- EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
ALAN BENJAMIN
OPEIU 3
- RAFAEL CABRERA
TWU 250-A
- FX. CROWLEY
IATSE 16
- DAMITA DAVIS-HOWARD
SEIU 1021
- OSCAR DE LA TORRE
Laborers 261
- ALLAN FISHER
AFT 2121
- ART GONZALEZ
IAM 1414
- JOHN HANLEY, III
Firefighters 798
- MICHAEL HARDEMAN
Sign & Display 510
- DENNIS KELLY
United Educators of San Francisco
- GUNNAR LUNDEBERG
Sailors Union of the Pacific
- ROSA FAYE MARSHALL
CLUW
- FRANK MARTIN DEL CAMPO
LCLAA
- LARRY MAZZOLA, JR.
Plumbers 38
- OLGA MIRANDA
SEIU 87
- ROBERT MORALES
Teamsters 350
- JOHN O'ROURKE
IBEW 6
- FRED PECKER
ILWU 6
- CRISS ROMERO
IFPTE 21
- MICHAEL SHARPE
UFCW 648
- MICHAEL THERIAULT
SF Building Trades Council
- JOHN ULRICH
UFCW 101
- JAMES WRIGHT
SEIU 1877
- SERGEANT AT ARMS
HEENE KELLY
United Educators of San Francisco
- TRUSTEES
VAN BEANE
Teamsters 856
- HOWARD GRAYSON
SEIU UHW
- CLAIRE ZVANSKI
IFPTE 21
- SECRETARY TREASURER EMERITUS
WALTER L. JOHNSON

April 8, 2010

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Enclosed please find a copy of the resolution urging the California Labor Federation to oppose Proposition 16 on the June 8, 2010 ballot. It was adopted at the San Francisco Labor Council's executive committee meeting on April 5, 2010.

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

Sincerely,

Tim Paulson
Executive Director

opeiu3afl-cio(11)

BY _____ AK

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 APR 13 PM 3:41

23



SFLC San Francisco Labor Council



1188 Franklin Street, Suite 203, San Francisco, CA 94109 • Phone: (415) 440-4809 • Fax: (415) 440-9297 • www.sflaborcouncil.org

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
TIM PAULSON

PRESIDENT
MIKE CASEY
UNITE HERE 2

SECRETARY TREASURER
JOSIE MOONEY
SEIU 1021

VICE PRESIDENT FOR POLITICAL ACTIVITIES
CONNY FORD
OPEIU 3

VICE PRESIDENT FOR AFFILIATE SUPPORT
LARRY MAZZOLA, SR.
Plumbers 38

VICE PRESIDENT FOR COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES
HOWARD WALLACE
Pride at Work

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
ALAN BENJAMIN
OPEIU 3

RAFAEL CABRERA
TWU 250-A

F.X. CROWLEY
IATSE 16

DAMITA DAVIS-HOWARD
SEIU 1021

OSCAR DE LA TORRE
Laborers 261

ALLAN FISHER
AFT 2121

ART GONZALEZ
IAM 1414

JOHN HANLEY, III
Firefighters 758

MICHAEL HARDEMAN
Sign & Display 510

DENNIS KELLY
United Educators of San Francisco

GUNNAR LUNDEBERG
Sailors Union of the Pacific

ROSA FAYE MARSHALL
CLUW

FRANK MARTIN DEL CAMPO
LCLAA

LARRY MAZZOLA, JR.
Plumbers 38

OLGA MIRANDA
SEIU 87

ROBERT MORALES
Teamsters 350

JOHN O'ROURKE
IBEW 6

FRED PECKER
ILWU 6

CRISS ROMERO
IFPTE 21

MICHAEL SHARPE
UFCW 648

MICHAEL THERIAULT
SF Building Trades Council

JOHN ULRICH
UFCW 101

JAMES WRIGHT
SERJ 1877

SERGEANT AT ARMS
HENE KELLY
United Educators of San Francisco

TRUSTEES
VAN BEANE
Teamsters 806

HOWARD GRAYSON
SEIU UHW

CLAIRE ZVANSKI
IFPTE 21

SECRETARY TREASURER EMERITUS
WALTER L. JOHNSON

Resolution Urging the California Labor Federation to Actively Oppose Proposition 16 on the California June 8, 2010 State Ballot

Whereas, a private utility corporation, PG&E, has placed an initiative Proposition 16 on the June 8, 2010 California State Ballot to insure its own monopoly control of the market from Eureka to Bakersfield against any attempt by any public agency to offer residents and businesses any alternative source of energy unless they can garner support from two-thirds of the affected residents and voters, but only requires 50% + 1 to pass; and

Whereas, Proposition 16 would further imprint the tyranny of the minority two-thirds voting requirement in the California State Constitution, and further weaken the effort to establish majority rule; and

Whereas, PG&E has spent nearly \$30 million to date using the same deceptive advertising and lobbying for Proposition 16 as US employers used to oppose the Employee Free Choice Act, claiming their initiative for monopoly control is instead a voters' rights issue; and

Whereas, PG&E is allowed to spend unlimited rate payer monies promoting its own self-serving initiative, while competing public power agencies are not permitted to spend their money to say what's wrong with Proposition 16; and

Whereas, Proposition 16 would force local utilities like Palo Alto, Silicon Valley Power, and Sacramento Municipal Utility District to get two-thirds voter approval in a costly election process to expand their services while PG&E would be able to spend unlimited money to fight such competition; and

Whereas, the San Francisco Labor Council is on record in support of majority rule and opposing the two-thirds voting requirement for levying taxes and adopting the state budget; and

Therefore Be It Resolved, the San Francisco Labor Council communicate this resolution to Art Pulaski and urge the California Labor Federation to actively oppose Proposition 16 on the June 8, 2010 State Ballot, PG&E's deceptive propaganda that it is a voting rights issue, and Prop. 16's undemocratic two-thirds voting requirement, as further undermining the effort to establish majority rule at the ballot box; and

Be It Further Resolved, the SFLC immediately send this resolution to its affiliates in a blast fax, and to its sister Labor Councils in the Greater Bay Area, Sacramento, Los Angeles and San Diego areas urging they act without delay to urge the State Federation of Labor to oppose Proposition 16 at the upcoming State Labor Convention and,

Be It Finally Resolved, that the SFLC also send this resolution to the Mayor, each member of the Board of Supervisors, six of whom are already signatory to a resolution from the Board opposing Proposition 16.

Submitted by Denis Mosgofian, GCC-IBT 4N/388M; Ron Dicks, IFPTE 21; Tom Edminster, UESF; Roger Scott, AFT 2121; Maria Guillen, SEIU 1021; Howard Wallace, Pride At Work; and Tami Bryant, CSEA 1000 and adopted by the Executive Committee of the San Francisco Labor Council on April 5, 2010.

Respectfully,


Tim Paulson
Executive Director

OPEIU3 AFL-CIO 11

UNITY IS STRENGTH!



Gas: done

GRAY PANTHERS

OF SAN FRANCISCO

1182 Market Street, Room 203
San Francisco, CA 94102
Telephone: (415) 552-8800

Ed Harrington, General Manager, Public Utilities Commission
1155 Market Street, 11th floor
San Francisco, California 94102
Dear Ed Harrington,

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 APR 15 PM 1:51
BY U

We, the Gray Panthers of San Francisco, believe that residents of our city are best served by having customer choice for an alternative electricity provider. We also believe that the barrage of mailings supporting Prop 16 and funded primarily by PGE are misinforming the public and distorting facts about community choice programs. These mailings state that ratepayers who choose an alternative source of electricity will pay higher rates than currently under PG&E. In fact, in areas which have adopted alternative suppliers, rates have usually decreased. As elders we are financially distressed by constant PG&E rate increases.

The CPUC serves the public interest by protecting consumer and insuring the provision of safe, reliable utility service and infrastructure, reasonable rates with a commitment to environmental enhancement and a healthy California economy. CPUC recently adopted a resolution telling PG&E that it cannot refuse to supply electricity to community choice aggregators, which is a violation of the 2002 law that offers ratepayers a choice in our public power.

Ratepayers deserve a choice in selecting an alternative provider. Proposition 16 would lock in our state constitution requirements making our ability to select cleaner, more alternative sources of electricity more difficult. The Gray Panthers along with SF Gray Panthers is joining the AARP, the Sierra Club, the California Nurses Association and Calpirg urge the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to oppose Proposition 16.

Sincerely,
Michael Lyon
Lisa Fromer
Co-Chairs
Gray Panthers of San Francisco
CC: San Francisco Board of Supervisors; Michael Peevey, Diane Grueneich, John Bohn, Timothy Alan Simon and Mary Ryan Karen Miller

24





Annie Paradise
<annieparadise@yahoo.com>

04/15/2010 03:36 PM

To gavin.newsom@sfgov.org, board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
bcc
Subject Regarding Bayview Library

History:  This message has been forwarded.

Dear Mayor Gavin Newsom and Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing because I support the position that the Bayview Library must be built by the community it serves, and it is my hope that you will facilitate the issuance of bonding to the local contractors and crews, specifically, Liberty Builders-Bona Tech Engineering Joint Venture.

I believe unemployment and police presence are linked and produce violence, and employment reduces police presence.

I have followed the history of racially discriminatory contract awards in Bayview, like the Third Street Light Rail Project, and see this history as a blight on San Francisco that needs to be addressed.

I come from the small rural community of Jackman, Maine on the US/Quebec border, which is being devastated by decisions that prioritize security and law enforcement over sustainable community employment. I understand that policies and practices that prioritize security and law enforcement are crushing communities and ruining lives across the US.

I note a visible and glaring lack of African American laborers on job sites. I understand that bonding has been an obstacle that has contributed to this notable absence.

It is extremely important to me as a voting and active citizen of San Francisco, proudly living in Supervisor Eric Mar's Richmond District, that the proposals of Black local contractors be supported in the building of Bayview Branch Library.

I also understand that unemployment and incarceration rates are related, and am concerned with the disproportionate rates of incarceration from communities of color, particularly Af

Thank you for your time and attention,

Annie Paradise
501 38th Ave. Apt. 201
San Francisco, California 94121

25



Southeast Jobs Coalition
<southeastjobscoalition@gmail.com>

04/15/2010 09:37 AM

To douglas.shoemaker@sfgov.org, fred.blackwell@sfgov.org

cc alvarezh@sfha.org, rhonda.simmons@sfgov.org,
guillermo.rodriguez@sfgov.org,
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org, leev@sfha.org,

bcc

Subject SJC Letter re Hunters View Rebuild

1 attachment



2010-04-15 SJC Letter to MOH and SFRA re Hunters View Rebuild.pdf

April 15, 2010

Doug Shoemaker
Director
Mayor's Office of Housing
One South Van Ness, Fifth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

Fred Blackwell
Executive Director
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency
One South Van Ness, Fifth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: *Supporting the Rebuild of Hunters View*

Dear Directors Shoemaker and Blackwell:

We write to express our support for the Hunters View Tenants Association and Hunters View residents seeking further, more meaningful engagement in the rebuilding of their community. The recent groundbreaking at Hunters View highlighted the accomplishment of at last moving this project forward, yet concerns from our Hunters View brothers and sisters linger, suggesting the need for greater community unity before work on the Hunters View rebuild accelerates later in the year.

It is clear to us that the relationship between Hunters View tenants and the Parent University service connector is broken. The lack of a committed investment in workforce development, in true community-driven barrier removal, job preparedness, case management, and services that address the underlying issues that years of neglect have brought to Hunters View will certainly haunt the project when the rebuild goes vertical and residents have not yet been trained for opportunities beyond abatement and demolition.

We ask to join you in a meeting with the Hunters View Tenants Association and your agency partners to discuss changes that will be made to the City's current approach to engaging the Hunters View community, changes that will bring the community together for the next phase of work at Hunters View and rebuild a sense of trust that has been lost.

26

Sincerely,

Derek Toliver
YCD

Jesse Mason
Arc Ecology

Terry L. Anders
Anders & Anders

Gregory Reed
APRI

Karen Gilbert
VVCDC

Naim Harrison
Positive Directions

Cc: San Francisco Housing Authority, Office of Economic and Workforce
Development, CityBuild, Board of Supervisors, Hunters View Tenants
Association, Hunters View Mothers Committee

BOS-11 copies - 4/13/10
by request
File 100151
c-page

*****ANTONIO A. ROBLES*****
2442 -26th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94116

San Francisco, March 15 2010

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


Ref.: Opposition to Case No. 2009.0797E

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

As a resident living in the Sunset – Parkside district for over 20 years and having the pleasure of helping raise 2 grandchildren in a single family house, I STRONGLY OPPOSE to the project located at 2462 – 27th Avenue the way it has been presented to the Planning Department.

It is hard to believe that a single family home needs 7 Bedrooms and 4 Bathrooms! Besides, the project does not fit the character of the neighborhood, and I am certain it will become an eyesore in this residential area.

Sincerely yours.


Antonio A. Robles

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 MAR 15 PM 3:09
BY le

(27)



US Army Corps
of Engineers.

Regulatory Division
1455 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94103-1398

SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT

PUBLIC NOTICE

Public Notice Notification Change

Date: 9 April 2010

The San Francisco Regulatory Division is in the process of updating and confirming the recipients of our Public Notices and providing recipients with the choice of whether to continue to receive paper copies or to start receiving electronic mail (email) notification of Public Notices as they become available on our website.

Public Notices are the primary method of advising interested public agencies and private parties of a proposed activity and soliciting comments and information to evaluate the potential impacts. Public notices are issued by the Department of the Army for Individual Permits, Regional General Permits, and other activities conducted by the Regulatory Division that merit public feedback on potential impacts to waters of the U.S., including wetlands. Comment periods typically last for 15 or 30 days, depending on the complexity of the project.

Public Notices are and will continue to be available on the San Francisco District Website for up to one year from date of publication at:

<http://www.spn.usace.army.mil/regulatory/currpn.htm>

If you are currently on our mailing list and wish to continue receiving either a paper copy or email notification of our Public Notices, you **will need to resubmit** your mailing information by June 1, 2010. Please indicate which county(ies) you are interested in (see Figure 1), and whether you would like to receive a hard copy of the Public Notice and/or be notified by e-mail. You will no longer receive Public Notices if you do not provide us with confirmation that you wish to continue receiving Public Notices by June 1, 2010.

You may submit your request by regular mail or e-mail to the following addresses:

Via mail: SPN Regulatory Division
Office Automation Technician
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
1455 Market Street, 16th Floor
San Francisco, California 94103-1398

Via email: laura.e.costa@usace.army.mil

Contact information to provide includes:

- Name and Affiliation (if applicable)
- Street Address, including City, County, and Zip Code
- Email address
- Preference for digital and/or paper notification

If you are on our updated, confirmed mailing list and your contact information changes, please notify our Office Automation Technician and provide your new and old addresses. Hard copies or e-mails returned due to a non-functioning address will be deleted from our mailing list system.

RECEIVED
 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
 SAN FRANCISCO
 2010 APR 13 PM 3:46
 BY AK

28

Figure 1



**California Map of U.S. Army
Corps of Engineers Regulatory Boundaries**





Malcolm Dudley
<mhdudley@pacbell.net>
04/17/2010 09:39 PM

To Honorable Eric Mar <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
bcc

Subject Masonic Auditorium - Hearing on Tuesday, May 4th

History:

↳ This message has been forwarded.

Dear Honorable Supervisor Mar:

My wife and I are extremely concerned about Live Nation's plans to convert the Masonic Auditorium into a Rock Concert Hall. This would completely transform this entire neighborhood, removing 1,500 seats to allow for a capacity of 4,000 general admission standing room only audiences, create more serious traffic problems, exasperate parking problems, negatively impact Huntington Park and add to pollution and noise created by tour buses idling for hours on California Street and buses and trailers parking overnight in front of the Masonic Auditorium and Grace Cathedral.

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), government agencies are required to consider the environmental consequences of their actions before approving plans and policies or committing to a course of action on a project. In enacting CEQA, the legislature explained that this process is intended to: (1) inform government decision makers and the public about the potential environmental effects of proposed activities; (2) identify the ways that environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced; (3) prevent significant, avoidable environmental damage by requiring changes in projects, either by the adoption of alternatives or imposition of mitigation measures; and (4) disclose to the public why a project was approved if the project would have significant environmental effects.

The negative environmental impacts identified above would seriously impact the quality of life for the entire Nob Hill neighborhood. Based upon these environmental impacts, and the requirements of CEQA (Pub. Res. Code 21002.1, 21061, and 21080.1) we request that the city require an EIR, with members of the Nob Hill Neighborhood Organization, Protect Nob Hill, involved in the choice of consultants. We realize that there would be no direct communication between parties and the consultant, after the consultant has been chosen by the city, but we respectfully request that Protect Nob Hill members be involved in the selection of a consultant.

We request that this Conditional Use Permit be denied; on the basis that it is not an appropriate use for this residential neighborhood. In lieu of a denial, we would request a list of conditions for issuance of the Conditional Use Permit, as required under CEQA. We request that mitigation measures include: Parking be restricted to neighborhood owners, using a parking permit system. Require Live Nation to provide a shuttle system. Parking on the Grace Cathedral side of California Street be restricted to use by

29

congregants of Grace Cathedral. Require Live Nation to pay for special police officers to maintain the public health and the general welfare of the neighborhood. Require Live Nation to pay for a number of hotel rooms to accommodate the performers and deny their request to add restaurant and bar service.

The San Francisco Police testified at the Planning Commission that they were opposed to the conversion of the Masonic Auditorium into a Rock Concert Hall, as they would not have the man power to properly police these activities.

We have a highly decorated veteran living in our building who is seriously disabled, because of his service in the military. He is strongly opposed to the proposal to convert the disabled entry into an entrance for moving equipment. This is not in compliance with state law, which protects disabled facilities.

As a resident of Nob Hill we urge you to please grant the Appeals for the Categorical Exemption and conditional Use Authorization for the California Masonic Memorial Temple. (Case #2008.1072EC and Case #2008.1072)

Sincerely,
Malcolm Dudley
1255 California Street, Unit 704, San Francisco 94109

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
04/19/2010 02:14 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Meatless Mondays



"David Mendenhall"
<naomi@turbonet.com>
04/18/2010 09:12 AM

To <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
Subject Meatless Mondays

Angela Calvillo,

Dear Madam,

To make an endorsement based on erroneous UN Climate data is one thing, but I do not fault someone who has recieved bad information from a supposed Authority who was mis-informed by a group with an Agenda sponsored by crooks and thieves.

The following quote is an excerpt from a study that would show your project "Meatless Mondays" has the potential to be 300 times more lethal to the enviroment than any "Mondays WITH Meat" could ever be.

For all of its ecological baggage, synthetic nitrogen does one good deed for the environment: it helps build carbon in soil. At least, that's what scientists have assumed for decades.

If that were true, it would count as a major environmental benefit of synthetic N use. At a time of climate chaos and ever-growing global greenhouse gas emissions, anything that helps vast swaths of farmland sponge up carbon would be a stabilizing force. Moreover, carbon-rich soils store nutrients and have the potential to remain fertile over time--a boon for future generations.

The case for synthetic N as a climate stabiliizer goes like this. Dousing farm fields with synthetic nitrogen makes plants grow bigger and faster. As plants grow, they pull carbon dioxide from the air. Some of the plant is harvested as crop, but the rest--the residue--stays in the field and ultimately becomes soil. In this way, some of the carbon gobbled up by those N-enhanced plants stays in the ground and out of the atmosphere.

Well, that logic has come under fierce challenge from a team of University of Illinois researchers led by professors Richard Mulvaney, Saeed Khan, and Tim Ellsworth. In two recent papers (see [here](#) and [here](#)) the trio argues that the net effect of synthetic nitrogen use is to reduce soil's organic matter content. Why? Because, they posit, nitrogen fertilizer stimulates soil microbes, which feast on organic matter. Over time, the impact of this enhanced microbial appetite outweighs the benefits of more crop residues.

And their analysis gets more alarming. Synthetic nitrogen use, they argue, creates a kind of treadmill effect. As organic matter dissipates, soil's ability to store organic nitrogen declines. A large amount of nitrogen then leaches away,

30

fouling ground water in the form of nitrates, and entering the atmosphere as nitrous oxide (N₂O), a greenhouse gas with some 300 times the heat-trapping power of carbon dioxide. In turn, with its ability to store organic nitrogen compromised, only one thing can help heavily fertilized farmland keep cranking out monster yields: more additions of synthetic N.

The loss of organic matter has other ill effects, the researchers say. Injured soil becomes prone to compaction, which makes it vulnerable to runoff and erosion and limits the growth of stabilizing plant roots. Worse yet, soil has a harder time holding water, making it ever more reliant on irrigation. As water becomes scarcer, this consequence of widespread synthetic N use will become more and more challenging.

In short, "the soil is bleeding," Mulvaney told me in an interview.

<http://www.grist.org/article/2010-02-23-new-research-synthetic-nitrogen-destroys-soil-carbon-undermines-/>

Yours

David Mendenhall

We hang the petty thieves and appoint the great ones to public office. Aesop, 620-560 BC
They must find it difficult... Those who have taken authority as the truth, rather truth as authority.



Mayor Gavin Newsom
Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager

April 12, 2010

Dear Garfield Swimming Pool Patrons:

The extensive renovation of Garfield Pool continues thru the month of April and beyond. The San Francisco Recreation and Park Department appreciates the patience and understanding you have shown while the work is completed. We apologize for any inconvenience this extended and **temporary** closure may have caused you. Please consider joining us at other public aquatic facilities near you, which includes San Francisco's only outdoor pool – Mission Pool. Below is a listing of the closest facilities to Garfield Square and an update on the renovation's progress.

BALBOA POOL

50 Havelock Street, (415) 337-4701
Monday to Friday: 6:00 a.m. – 7:30p.m.
Sat.: 9:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

MISSION POOL

19th and Linda Street, (415) 641-2841
Wednesday to Friday: 10:30am – 7:30 p.m.
Sat.: 10:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Sun.: 10:30 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

PROJECT UPDATE

The funding was approved by the Recreation and Parks Commission in mid-February; since then, two tests were conducted and completed for asbestos and lead. At this time, the Project Manager is working with several contractors to coordinate the scope of work and confirm a completion time line, which is anticipated to be announced no later than Monday April 19, 2010.

Some of the improvements to the facility include: (1) removing the metal brackets and old lighting fixtures on the ceiling; (2) patching the holes, priming, and painting the ceiling; (3) painting the natatorium walls, beams and door jams; (4) installing new light fixtures in the natatorium; (5) enlarging the pool main drain sump box, and installing an unblockable grate; (6) re-plastering the entire pool shell; and (7) replacing the pool circulation pumps.

Please visit our website www.parks@sfgov.org for updates on the progress of our repairs. If you have any questions and or concerns on the project please contact Mr. Danny Ogawa, Aquatic Supervisor, at danny.ogawa@sfgov.org.

The San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department thanks you for your patience and we look forward to seeing at Garfield Pool for our grand re-opening.



Garfield Aquatic Center APRIL 2010 Maintenance Update

EXTENDED & EXTENSIVE REPAIRS

The San Francisco Recreation and Park Department appreciates your patience and invites you to join us at other aquatic facilities near you. We apologize for any inconvenience this temporary closure may have caused you.

BALBOA POOL

50 Havelock Street, (415) 337-4701
Monday to Friday: 6:00 a.m. – 7:30p.m.
Sat.: 9:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

MISSION POOL

19th and Linda Street, (415) 641-2841
Wednesday to Friday: 10:30am – 7:30 p.m.
Sat.: 10:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Sun.: 10:30 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

For a complete list of programs visit our website at

www.parks.sfgov.org

Please contact us if you have any questions and/or concerns.

Mr. Danny Ogawa, Aquatics Supervisor, at 415.661.8438

email at danny.ogawa@sfgov.org

32

Dear Supervisors:

Please stand up for healthcare justice by opposing CPMC's "Master Plan" for St. Luke's Hospital and the new Cathedral Hill facility.

California Pacific Medical Center (CPMC) plans on shrinking St. Luke's Hospital by 62 percent and segregating most services in the Cathedral Hill area. St. Luke's patients would be offered a lower standard of care. This would be a crippling loss of healthcare resources for our city. CPMC's plans amount to medical redlining, and would be a tragedy for the many families around St. Luke's Hospital in need of access to quality healthcare services in our community. A healthy San Francisco cannot discriminate!

I urge you to NOT support CPMC's Master Plan plan unless 1) CPMC agrees to rebuild St. Luke's Hospital at an appropriate size to meet community needs and to provide equal standard of care for all patients, and 2) CPMC signs a binding agreement with the community to treat local residents and businesses, patients, nurses, and hospital staff with the respect we all deserve.

Why I care about St. Luke's Hospital / Why I am against CPMC's current plan:

It would be unfair to many low-income & working-class families in the Mission, Portrero & Noe Valley area. S.F. General is already over-burdened.


Kathie Post

SIGNATURE

DATE

400 Alemany Blvd. #1 SF CA 94110

YOUR ADDRESS



San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

San Francisco, CA 94102

BY *AK*

2010 APR 12 PM 3:57

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO