

100794 [Petitions and Communications]

Petitions and Communications received from May 29, 2010, through June 7, 2010, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on June 15, 2010.

From Office of the Mayor, submitting the proposed June Budget Book for FY2010-2011. File No. 100699 (1)

From Office of the Controller, submitting audit report regarding crime and disorder on MUNI: A case study on data-driven policing in the Ingleside District. Copy: Each Supervisor (2)

From Office of the Controller, submitting the Public Education Enrichment Fund Annual Report for FY2010-2011. Copy: Each Supervisor (3)

From State Department of Fish and Game, submitting the draft Environmental Impact Report regarding migratory game bird hunting. (4)

From Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector, submitting their Annual Report of businesses that filed for the Clean Energy Technology Business Payroll Tax Exclusion for 2009 calendar year. Copy: Each Supervisor, Budget and Finance Committee Clerk (5)

From Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector, submitting their Annual Report of businesses that filed for the Biotechnology Payroll Tax Exclusion for the 2009 calendar year. Copy: Each Supervisor, Budget and Finance Committee Clerk (6)

From Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector, submitting their Annual Report of businesses that filed for tax credits for the 2009 calendar year. Copy: Each Supervisor, Budget and Finance Committee Clerk (7)

From Laguna Honda Hospital and Rehabilitation Center, submitting their Quarterly Report regarding compliance with the admission policy priorities that took place on February 22, 2005. (8)

From Office of the Mayor, submitting notice regarding transfer of function under Charter Section 4.132. Copy: Each Supervisor (9)

From Library Users Association, urging the Board of Supervisors to help direct library priorities on branch service during closures for renovations. (10)

From Public Utilities Commission, regarding status of Community Choice Aggregation Contract. (Reference No. 200100420-006) (11)

From Dr. Gary Tsai, submitting support for passage of Laura's Law. (12)

From Office of the Controller, submitting the results of the follow-up review for the audit of Municipal Transportation Agency Cable Car Fare Collection Practices. Copy: Each Supervisor (13)

From Office of the Controller, submitting notification of the Access Line Tax Annual Rate Adjustment. Copy: Each Supervisor, Budget and Finance Committee Clerk (14)

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to proposed resolution calling for a boycott of the State of Arizona and Arizona-based businesses until Arizona repeals Senate Bill 1070. File No.100256, 27 letters (15)

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to expanding parking meter hours/and or Sunday metering. Approximately 50 letters (16)

From concerned citizens, submitting support for the proposed legislation concerning the sit/lie law. File No. 100233, 5 letters (17)

From Troy Barber, submitting support for expanding parking meter hours/and or Sunday metering. (18)

From S.F. Public Golf Alliance, submitting support for continued funding for Sharp Park Golf Course. Copy: Budget and Finance Clerk (19)

From Clerk of the Board, the following departments have submitted their 2010 Local Agency Biennial Notice: (20)

Board of Appeals
Child Support Services
Civil Service Commission
Elections
Public Defender

From Judith Tornese, submitting support for a Charter Amendment that limits the growth of pensions for city employees and requires employees to pay more toward their pension benefits and pays at least 25% of their retiree health coverage. (21)

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition for continued funding of Sharp Park Golf Course. (22)

From Morris Bibliowicz, regarding trees being cut down at Treasure Island. (23)

From Mendocino County Citizens for Responsible Transportation, submitting opposition to funding the Willits Bypass Project. Copy: Each Supervisor (24)

From concerned citizens, urging the Board of Supervisors to protect Supportive Housing services in the FY2010-2011 Budget. 2 postcards (25)

From Office of the Controller, submitting the Government Barometer Report for April 2010. (26)

From Department of Public Works, regarding status of repairing potholes and sidewalk issues on Steiner Street and Golden Gate Avenue. (Reference No. 20100427-006) (27)

From Patrick Shaw, regarding Laguna Honda Hospital and Rehabilitation Center. 2 letters (28)

From Joe Cline, submitting opposition to public power in San Francisco. (29)

From Rita O'Flynn, regarding the Tenderloin Housing Clinic's non-compliance with grants received from the City and County of San Francisco. (30)

From John Adams, submitting support for annual drug testing of San Francisco cab drivers. (31)

From Francisco Da Costa, commenting on the draft Environmental Impact Report for Hunters Point Shipyard and Candlestick Point. (32)

From concerned citizens, submitting support for Mayor Newsom's right to know cell phone legislation. File No. 100104, 3 letters (33)

From Abdalla Megahed, regarding the exchange between President Obama and the Middle East. (34)

From Clerk of the Board, the following departments have submitted their Sole Source contracts for FY2009-2010: (35)
Department of Human Resources
Law Library
Status of Women.

From Melly Mel, regarding the proposed plan to build a disc-golf course in McLaren Park. (36)

From Public Utilities Commission, responding to various Workforce inquiries. (Reference No. 20100413-007) (37)

From State Fish and Game Commission, submitting notice that the California tiger salamander warrants listing to threatened species status. (38)

From Aaron Goodman, submitting opposition to granting a revocable major encroachment to S.F. State University to occupy a portion of the public-right-way to install and maintain private underground utilities crossing Font Boulevard in Parkmerced. File No. 100364 (39)

From Denise D'Anne, regarding the Peak Oil Task Force recommendations. (40)

From Nick August, submitting support for the same restrictions/fees for bicycle riders as motor vehicles. (41)

From Cynthia Hall, urging the Board of Supervisors to ensure that the California Pacific Medical Center Master Plan meet the needs of the surrounding communities. (42)

From S.F. Public Utilities Commission, regarding California Public Utilities Commission's formal acknowledgment of CleanPowerSF as a Community Choice Aggregator in the State of California. (43)

From Bay Area Rapid Transit, submitting notice of community meetings on various dates and locations. (44)

From State Department of Mental Health, submitting notice of placement of a person who was committed as a sexually violent predator at 101- 9th Street. Copy: Supervisor Daly, City Attorney (45)

From State Department of Mental Health, submitting notice retracting placement of a person who was committed as a sexually violent predator at 101- 9th Street. Copy: Supervisor Daly, City Attorney (46)

100699

Office of the Mayor
City & County of San Francisco



Gavin Newsom

June 1, 2010

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

Madam Clerk:

On behalf of the Mayor, it is my pleasure to present to you the Mayor's Proposed June Budget Book for Fiscal Year 2010-2011.

I look forward to working with you throughout the budget process. If I can be of any assistance, please do not hesitate to call upon me or my staff. I can be reached via phone at 554-6486.

Sincerely,

Greg Wagner
Mayor's Budget Director

cc: Members of the Board of Supervisors

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN - 1 PM 3:22
BY _____

(1)

City and County of San Francisco

Office of the Controller – City Services Auditor

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

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT

Addressing Crime and Disorder on
the Municipal Railway: A Case
Study on Data-Driven Policing in the
Ingleside District

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN -2 PM 4:51
BY RL



June 2, 2010

2

City and County of San Francisco

Office of the Controller – City Services Auditor

PUBLIC EDUCATION ENRICHMENT FUND:

Annual Report for FY 2010-11

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



June 4, 2010

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN -4 PM 2:03
BY RC

BOS-11
COB cpa 10

3



DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

http://www.dfg.ca.gov

Resource Management and Policy Division/Wildlife Branch/Waterfowl Program
1812 9th Street, Sacramento CA 95811



May 27, 2010

Attention: Government Documents Section

Enclosed is a copy of the following document prepared by the California Department of Fish and Game in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

Draft Environmental Document Regarding Migratory Game
Bird Hunting (Waterfowl, Coots, Moorhens)

To provide the public with an opportunity to review and comment on the proposals contained in this document, please make it available for public review until July 20, 2010.

If you have any questions regarding this request, please contact me at the letterhead address or by telephone at (916) 445-3555.

Sincerely,

Eric Loft, Chief
Wildlife Programs Branch

Enclosure

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN -3 PM 3:11
BY _____

4

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

Business Tax Section, Audit Unit
George Putris, Tax Administrator



BOS-11, c page
BF clerk
José Cisneros, Treasurer

May 28, 2010

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

Subject: 2009 Clean Energy Technology Business Exclusion Annual Report

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

The Tax Administrator, pursuant to the provisions of the San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations Code, herewith submits the annual report of businesses that filed for the clean energy technology business exclusion for the 2009 calendar year.

Schedule A of the report summarizes for the 2009 calendar year the number of firms filing for the exclusion, their total San Francisco employees, the number of eligible employees, and the amount of clean energy exclusion claimed. Twelve firms claimed the clean energy technology business exclusion in the amount of \$25,396,189. The San Francisco firms reported an increase of 127 employees in the clean energy technology business sector compared to the preceding calendar year. Schedule B of the report summarizes the clean energy exclusion for calendar years 2007 through 2009.

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

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "George Putris".

George Putris
Tax Administrator

cc: José Cisneros
San Francisco Public Library

Attachments

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 MAY 28 PM 2:23
BY _____
AK



**TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT
CLEAN ENERGY TECHNOLOGY EXCLUSION
CALENDAR YEAR 2009**

Year	No. of Firms Filing	Total SF Employees	No. of Eligible Employees	Total Clean Energy Exclusion	Payroll Tax Excluded
2009	12	288	287	\$ 25,396,189	\$ 380,943
2008	6	167	160	\$ 15,127,037	\$ 226,906
Increase	6	121	127	\$ 10,269,152	\$ 154,037

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

Year	No. of Firms Filing	Total S.F. Employees	No. of Eligible Employees	Total Clean Energy Exclusion	Payroll Tax Excluded
2007	2	31	31	\$ 2,386,129	\$ 35,792
2008	6	167	160	\$ 15,127,037	\$ 226,906
2009	12	288	287	\$ 25,396,189	\$ 380,943

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

Business Tax Section, Audit Unit
George Putris, Tax Administrator



WOS-U
B+F clerk
C page

José Cisneros, Treasurer

May 28, 2010

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

Subject: 2009 Biotechnology Exclusion Annual Report

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

The Tax Administrator, pursuant to the provisions of the San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations Code, herewith submits the annual report of businesses that filed for the biotechnology exclusion for the 2009 calendar year.

Schedule A of the report summarizes for the 2009 calendar year the number of firms filing for the exclusion, their total San Francisco employees, the number of eligible employees, and the amount of biotechnology payroll exclusion claimed. Eleven firms claimed the biotechnology exclusion in the amount of \$59,790,369. The San Francisco firms reported 565 employees that qualify for the exclusion. Compared to the preceding year, calendar year 2009 resulted in an increase of 328 jobs in the biotechnology business sector in the City. Schedule B of the report summarizes the biotechnology exclusion for calendar years 2007 through 2009.

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

Very truly yours,

George W. Putris
Tax Administrator

cc: José Cisneros
San Francisco Public Library

Attachment

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 MAY 28 PM 2:23
BY _____ AK

6

**TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT
BIOTECHNOLOGY EXCLUSION
CALENDAR YEAR 2009**

Year	No. of Firms Filing	Total SF Employees	No. of New Eligible Employees	Total Biotechnology Exclusion	Payroll Tax Excluded
2009	11	565	565	\$ 59,790,369	\$ 896,856
2008	9	243	237	\$ 24,684,098	\$ 370,261
Increase	2	322	328	\$ 35,106,271	\$ 526,595

**TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT
BIOTECHNOLOGY PAYROLL EXCLUSION
FOR CALENDAR YEARS 2007 THRU 2009**

Year	# of Firms Filing	Total S.F. Employees	# of Eligible Employees	Biotechnology Payroll Exclusion	Payroll Tax Excluded
2007	7	215	215	\$ 21,274,886	\$ 319,123
2008	9	243	237	\$ 24,684,098	\$ 370,261
2009	11	565	565	\$ 59,790,369	\$ 896,856

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

Business Tax Section, Audit Unit
George Putris, Tax Administrator



BOS-11
B+F clerk, c page
José Cisneros, Treasurer

May 28, 2010

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

Subject: 2009 Tax Credit Annual Report

Dear Ms. Calvillo,


The Tax Administrator, pursuant to the provisions of the San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations Code, herewith submits the annual report of businesses that filed for tax credits for the 2009 calendar year. This year the report covers the Enterprise Zone Tax Credit only.

Schedule A of the report summarizes for the 2009 calendar year the number of firms filing for the tax credit, the total number of San Francisco employees, the number of eligible employees, and the amount of tax credit claimed. 48 firms claimed the Enterprise Zone Tax Credit in the amount of \$106,793. The San Francisco firms reported 118 employees that qualify for this tax credit.

Schedule B of the report compares the Enterprise Zone Tax Credits by tax years from 2007 through 2009.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact me at (415) 554-4574.

Very truly yours,


George W. Putris
Tax Administrator

cc: José Cisneros
San Francisco Public Library

Attachments

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 MAY 28 PM 2:23
BY _____
AK

7

**TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT
TAX CREDITS
CALENDAR YEAR 2009**

Type of Tax Credit	No. of Firms Filing	Total SF Employees	No. of Eligible Employees	Total Tax Credit
Enterprise Zone (approved)	25	2,313	74	\$ 45,499
Enterprise Zone (pending approval)*	23	1,100	44	\$ 61,294
Total	48	3,413	118	\$ 106,793

* Pending taxpayers submission of vouchers, signed affidavit, or worksheet to support their claim for the 2009 Enterprise Zone Tax Credit.

**TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT
COMPARISON OF ENTERPRISE ZONE TAX CREDITS
TAX YEARS 2007 THROUGH 2009**

Type of Tax Credit	Number of Firms Filing			Total Number of SF Employees			Number of Eligible Employees			Total Tax Credits		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
Enterprise Zone reported in previous tax year	17	20		956	5,101		123	329		\$ 49,094	\$ 144,625	
Enterprise Zone filed in current year ¹	1	1	25	59	285	2,313	9	5	74	\$ 781	\$ 1,216	\$ 45,499
Enterprise Zone - pending submission of documentation	-	-	23	-	-	1,100	-	-	44	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 61,294
Enterprise Zone - reported prior year; did not qualify	-	(6)		-	(851)		-	(166)		\$ -	\$ (121,632)	
Total Enterprise Zone Tax Credit	18	15	48	1,015	4,535	3,413	132	168	118	\$ 49,875	\$ 24,209	\$ 106,793

¹ Statements filed in 2009 for prior years

City and County of San Francisco

Department of Public Health
Laguna Honda Hospital and Rehabilitation Center



Gavin Newsom
Mayor

Mivic Hirose
Executive Administrator

May 27, 2010

Honorable Carmen Chu
Member, Board of Supervisors

Honorable Eric Mar
Member, Board of Supervisors

Honorable Sophie Maxwell
Member, Board of Supervisors

Government Audits and Oversight Committee
#1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Resolution #050396

Dear Supervisors Chu, Mar, and Maxwell:

In response to Resolution #050396, I am enclosing a quarterly report to show Laguna Honda Hospital and Rehabilitation Center's (LHH) compliance with the reversal of the Admission Policy priorities that took place February 22, 2005.

As you will recall, the Mayor directed Dr. Katz to allow LHH Executive Staff to reverse the Admission Policy priorities back to the pre-March 2004 priorities on February 17, 2005. The policy was changed effective February 22, 2005. Since that time, you will see the percentage of patients coming to LHH from San Francisco General Hospital has continuously dropped. The annual percentage rates were as follows:

2003: 54%	2007: 58%
2004: 73%	2008: 57%
2005: 63%	2009: 54%
2006: 59%	January - March 2010: 45%

The age distribution shows an increased trend of residents over 50 years of age. In 2004, 83% of the residents were over 50 years of age, compared to 88% of the residents in this category as of March 2010.

I am available to answer any questions you may have. I can be reached at 759-2363.

Sincerely,

Mivic Hirose
Executive Administrator

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN - 1 PM 12:59
BY _____
AK

Attachments:

A. Sources of New SNF Admissions to Laguna Honda Hospital

- A-1 First Quarter of 2010
- A-2 2009
- A-3 2008
- A-4 2007
- A-5 2006
- A-6 2005 – (2004 revised Admissions Policy reverted priorities to 2003 Admissions Policy)
- A-7 2004
- A-8 2003
- A-9 2002
- A-10 2001

B. Laguna Honda Hospital Distribution of Residents by Race

- B-1 3/31/10 Snapshot
- B-1 3/31/09 Snapshot
- B-2 3/31/08 Snapshot
- B-2 3/31/07 Snapshot
- B-3 3/31/06 Snapshot
- B-3 3/31/05 Snapshot
- B-4 3/31/04 Snapshot
- B-4 3/31/03 Snapshot
- B-5 3/31/02 Snapshot
- B-5 3/31/01 Snapshot

C. Laguna Honda Hospital Age Distribution

Deciles of Age by percent from 2001 to March 31, 2010

D. Laguna Honda Hospital Gender Distribution

By percent from January 1, 2010 to March 31, 2010

cc: Honorable Sean Elsbernd, Member, Board of Supervisors
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Mitch Katz, MD, Director of Health

SOURCES OF NEW SNF ADMISSIONS TO LAGUNA HONDA HOSPITAL
JANUARY 2010 - MARCH 2010

Source of Admission	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	%
Board and Care	1	3	2										6	3%
Cal Pac Acute	2		1										3	2%
Cal Pac SNF													0	0%
Chinese Hospital Acute			1										1	1%
Chinese Hospital SNF													0	0%
Home	3	2	3										8	4%
Home Health													0	0%
Kaiser Acute													0	0%
Kaiser SNF													0	0%
Mt. Zion Acute	2		1										3	2%
Other Misc	6	2											8	4%
Other SNF	1	2	2										5	3%
Seton Acute													0	0%
SFGH Acute	23	43%	27	47%	24	35%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	74	41%
SFGH SNF	4	8%	2	4%	2	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8	4%
St. Francis Acute	1	3	2										6	3%
St. Francis SNF													0	0%
St. Luke's Acute		2											2	1%
St. Luke's SNF		1											1	1%
St. Mary's Acute	3	1	9										13	7%
St. Mary's SNF													0	0%
Seton Acute													0	0%
Seton SNF													0	0%
UC Med Acute	7	12	22										41	23%
UC Med SNF													0	0%
VA Hospital Acute													0	0%
VA Hospital SNF													0	0%
TOTAL	53	51%	57	51%	69	38%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	179	100%

SOURCES OF NEW SNF ADMISSIONS TO LAGUNA HONDA HOSPITAL
JANUARY 2009 - DECEMBER 2009

Source of Admission	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	%					
Board and Care																			
Cal Pac Acute	3	1		2	1	1	2	1		1		1	3	1%					
Cal Pac SNF		1		1	3				1				6	1%					
Chinese Hospital Acute													0	0%					
Chinese Hospital SNF													0	0%					
Home	2	2	1	3	2	1	3	3	2	4	4	4	31	7%					
Home Health													0	0%					
Kaiser Acute					1		1						2	0%					
Kaiser SNF													0	0%					
Mt. Zion Acute				1	1	1		1	2				6	1%					
Other Misc									1		7		13	3%					
Other SNF				1	2		3	1	1	2		2	11	2%					
Seton Acute				1			1						2	0%					
SFGH Acute	26	25	28	12	38%	14	44%	17	57%	21	54%	16	237	50%					
SFGH SNF		1	2%	2	6%	3	16%		0%	1	3%	1	18	4%					
St. Francis Acute		1		4	1	1	1	1		2			11	2%					
St. Francis SNF											1		1	0%					
St. Luke's Acute		1		1	1	1	1	1	2	1		2	10	2%					
St. Luke's SNF					1								1	0%					
St. Mary's Acute	3	5	5	1					2	3	1	3	23	5%					
St. Mary's SNF													0	0%					
Seton Acute													0	0%					
Seton SNF													0	0%					
UC Med Acute	15	7	11	3	1	4	4	3	7	7	13	10	85	18%					
UC Med SNF													0	0%					
VA Hospital Acute													0	0%					
VA Hospital SNF													0	0%					
TOTAL	49	53%	44	59%	32	60%	32	47%	30	57%	39	56%	38	45%	56	54%	55	472	100%

SOURCES OF NEW SNF ADMISSIONS TO LAGUNA HONDA HOSPITAL*
 JANUARY 2008 - DECEMBER 2008

Source of Admission	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	%						
Board and Care	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	2%						
Cal Pac Acute	1			3			1	1	1	1	1	1	10	4%						
Cal Pac SNF													1	0%						
Chinese Hospital Acute	1			1									3	1%						
Chinese Hospital SNF													0	0%						
Home	1	3	1	1	1	2	3	3	1	1	2	1	20	8%						
Home Health													0	0%						
Kaiser Acute				1									1	0%						
Kaiser SNF													0	0%						
Mt. Zion Acute					2								0	0%						
Other Misc						1					1		4	2%						
Other SNF						2				1			6	3%						
Seton Acute													0	0%						
SFGH Acute	7	58%	12	60%	18	64%	10	45%	8	53%	13	68%	7	47%	10	134	57%			
SFGH SNF	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0%	0	0	0%			
St. Francis Acute	2	1	3	1	1	1	2	1	1	1			14	6%						
St. Francis SNF													0	0%						
St. Luke's Acute	1			1									4	2%						
St. Luke's SNF													1	0%						
St. Mary's Acute				1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	3%						
St. Mary's SNF													0	0%						
Seton Acute													0	0%						
Seton SNF													0	0%						
UC Med Acute	1	1	4	4	4	6	1	1	2	2	1	3	25	11%						
UC Med SNF													0	0%						
VA Hospital Acute												1	1	0%						
VA Hospital SNF													0	0%						
TOTAL	12	58%	20	60%	15	53%	30	60%	28	64%	22	45%	15	53%	19	53%	18	47%	236	100%

*Due to budgetary and construction related issues, LHH decreased admissions effective 1/1/2008. General SNF Admissions were denied while Hospice, Rehab and AIDS/HIV were admitted based upon bed availability.

SOURCES OF NEW SNF ADMISSIONS TO LAGUNA HONDA HOSPITAL*
 JANUARY 2007 - DECEMBER 2007

Source of Admission	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	%												
Board and Care	1	2			1	2	3	1			2	1	13	3%												
Cal Pac Acute	1	3			5	2	4	1	3	5	5	1	30	6%												
Cal Pac SNF	1									1			2	0%												
Chinese Hospital Acute	4			1	1		1	1		2	2		12	3%												
Chinese Hospital SNF													0	0%												
Home	1	1	4	5	2	4	3	4	3		3		30	6%												
Home Health													0	0%												
Kaiser Acute	1		1		1			1					4	1%												
Kaiser SNF										1			1	0%												
Mt. Zion Acute													0	0%												
Other	2	1	3	1	2	1			3	1	2		16	3%												
R.K. Davies Acute					1				1				2	0%												
R.K. Davies SNF													0	0%												
SFGH Acute	22	63%	28	54%	25	63%	17	43%	26	57%	27	61%	19	53%	22	63%	30	71%	22	51%	16	80%	274	58%		
SFGH SNF	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%		
St. Francis Acute	3	4	3	3	1	5		3	2	1	4	1	30	6%												
St. Francis SNF													0	0%												
St. Luke's Acute	2		5		2	1	1	2			1		14	3%												
St. Luke's SNF													0	0%												
St. Mary's Acute			3	1	3	2					1		10	2%												
St. Mary's SNF	2												2	0%												
Seton Acute													0	0%												
Seton SNF													0	0%												
UC Med Acute	1	6	1	1	2	3	5	4	1	1	1	1	27	6%												
UC Med SNF													0	0%												
VA Hospital Acute													3	1%												
VA Hospital SNF													0	0%												
TOTAL	35	63%	52	54%	45	56%	32	63%	40	43%	46	57%	44	61%	36	53%	35	63%	42	71%	43	51%	20	80%	469	100%

*Excluding internal transfers

SOURCES OF NEW SNF ADMISSIONS TO LAGUNA HONDA HOSPITAL*
 JANUARY 2006 - DECEMBER 2006

Source of Admission	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Board and Care	2	4	3	3	1	2	2	2	2	1			13	3%											13	3%
Cal Pac Acute	8	4	3	3	2	1	2	3	1	2		2	31	6%											31	6%
Cal Pac SNF	2	1	1					2					8	2%											8	2%
Chinese Hospital Acute	1		1			1	1		1			1	5	1%											5	1%
Chinese Hospital SNF																										
Home	6	5	9	2	6	7	1		2	2	5	4	49	10%											49	10%
Home Health																									0	0%
Kaiser Acute	2		1	1	2					1			7	1%											7	1%
Mt. Zion Acute					1						1		2	0%											2	0%
Other		2	2	1	1	1	2		1	1	1	1	12	2%											12	2%
Out of County**																										
R.K. Davies Acute																										
R.K. Davies SNF																										
SFGH Acute	23	43%	31	58%	33	52%	27	64%	25	57%	24	53%	19	54%	29	69%	21	62%	15	52%	24	71%	23	59%	294	57%
SFGH SNF	1	2%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3	8%	8	2%
St. Francis Acute	3	2	2	2	2	4	2	2	3	2			23	4%											23	4%
St. Francis SNF																										
St. Luke's Acute	1			1	2	1	1	1	1	2			10	2%											10	2%
St. Luke's SNF																										
St. Mary's Acute		2	2	1		4	2	4	1	1	1		13	3%											13	3%
St. Mary's SNF																										
Seton Acute																										
Seton SNF																										
UC Med Acute	6	3	3	3	2	3	1			2	1		24	5%											24	5%
UC Med SNF																										
VA Hospital Acute																										
VA Hospital SNF	1		1										4	1%											4	1%
TOTAL	53	45%	53	58%	63	58%	42	64%	44	57%	45	53%	35	60%	42	69%	34	62%	29	55%	34	71%	39	67%	513	100%

*Excluding internal transfers

SOURCES OF NEW SNF ADMISSIONS TO LAGUNA HONDA HOSPITAL*
 JANUARY 2004 - DECEMBER 2004

Source of Admission	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	%
Board and Care					1	1	1						3	0%
Cal Pac Acute		4		2	3	3	1		2	2	1	2	20	3%
Cal Pac SNF												1	1	0%
Chinese Hospital Acute					1	1	1	1	2	1			6	1%
Chinese Hospital SNF													0	0%
Home	4	7	3	7	8	1	2	6	6	2	5	3	54	9%
Home Health													0	0%
Kaiser Acute	1				1			2		1			5	1%
Other	1	2		1	1	5	3	3	1				16	3%
Out of County**										1			1	0%
R.K. Davies Acute													0	0%
R.K. Davies SNF													0	0%
SFGH Acute	40	36	64	37	24	35	33	34	31	41	39	42	456	73%
SFGH SNF						1						1	2	0%
St. Francis Acute		1		5	1	1	2	2	1				13	2%
St. Francis SNF						1		1					2	0%
St. Luke's Acute		1			1	1	2		1	2			7	1%
St. Luke's SNF			1	1									2	0%
St. Mary's Acute	1		3		1	3	5	1	1			2	17	3%
St. Mary's SNF													0	0%
Seton Acute						1		1				1	3	0%
Seton SNF													0	0%
UC Med Acute		5	1		1	2	1		1	3	1		15	2%
UC Med SNF													0	0%
VA Hospital Acute													2	0%
VA Hospital SNF													0	0%
TOTAL	47	56	72	52	41	57	52	51	46	53	46	52	625	100%

* Excluding internal transfers

** Out-of-county count begins in October 2004

SOURCES OF NEW SNF ADMISSIONS TO LAGUNA HONDA HOSPITAL*
 JANUARY 2003 - DECEMBER 2003

Source of Admission	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	%
Board and Care		3	2	1	2	2				1			11	2%
Cal Pac Acute		2	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	1	3	3	21	4%
Cal Pac SNF	5	3	1	3			2	2		1			17	3%
Chinese Hospital Acute	1			3							2		6	1%
Chinese Hospital SNF			1										1	0%
Home	4	6	6	9	5	10	1	5	5	6	1	5	63	11%
Home Health										1			1	0%
Kaiser Acute		1	1			1	1						4	1%
Other		1	2	3	4		4	1	1	3	1	2	21	4%
R.K. Davies Acute													0	0%
R.K. Davies SNF													0	0%
SFGH Acute	27	19	29	20	32	20	20	23	24	23	24	29	290	52%
SFGH SNF	3	2	4	2		1				1			13	2%
St. Francis Acute	1	1	1			3	4	2			1	2	15	3%
St. Francis SNF	2	2	2			2	3			3	1	2	17	3%
St. Luke's Acute		1	1	2	2	1	1	1		1	3		13	2%
St. Luke's SNF	1		2		1		2			1	1	1	9	2%
St. Mary's Acute		4	4	2	1	1	1	2		2	2		19	3%
St. Mary's SNF		1	1										2	0%
Seton Acute					1		2	1		1			5	1%
Seton SNF	1												1	0%
UC Med Acute	1	1	1	1	3	5	2	2	3	3	4	2	28	5%
UC Med SNF													0	0%
VA Hospital Acute							1						1	0%
VA Hospital SNF					1			1					2	0%
TOTAL	46	47	60	47	54	46	42	47	34	48	43	46	560	100%

* Excluding admissions from Unit M7

SOURCES OF NEW SNF ADMISSIONS TO LAGUNA HONDA HOSPITAL*
 JANUARY 2002 - DECEMBER 2002



Source of Admission	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	%
Board and Care	4	2	2	2	5	2	1	2	1			1	22	4%
Cal Pac Acute	2				1	1	1			1		2	8	1%
Cal Pac SNF	1	2	1	4		2	1	7	4	1	4		27	5%
Chinese Hospital Acute	2	1	1		3		1	1	1	2		2	14	3%
Chinese Hospital SNF													0	0%
Home	2	3	4	2	9	3	8	12	6	8	3	5	65	12%
Home Health													0	0%
Kaiser Acute	1	1			1								3	1%
Other	1	1	3	2	2	1	2	3	2		2	1	20	4%
R.K. Davies Acute					1								1	0%
R.K. Davies SNF						1							1	0%
SFGH Acute	22	24	17	18	20	20	16	15	19	18	18	19	226	41%
SFGH SNF	5	7	4	4	4	3	2	3	7	3	1	5	48	9%
St. Francis Acute			2	1	2	3	1	4	3	4	2		22	4%
St. Francis SNF	2		1	1	3	1	3	1	2	2	2	1	17	3%
St. Luke's Acute	2	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1		12	2%
St. Luke's SNF	2	1		4		1		1				2	12	2%
St. Mary's Acute	3	1	3	3	1	1	7	1	3	1	2	1	25	4%
St. Mary's SNF	1		2	1		1	1		1	1	1		8	1%
Seton Acute													0	0%
Seton SNF												1	1	0%
UC Med Acute	1		3		2				4	2	2	4	18	3%
UC Med SNF											2		2	0%
VA Hospital Acute	1				1								2	0%
VA Hospital SNF					1						1		2	0%
TOTAL	52	44	42	43	56	41	47	49	52	45	41	44	556	100%

* Excluding admissions from Unit M7


SOURCES OF NEW SNF ADMISSIONS TO LAGUNA HONDA HOSPITAL*
 JANUARY 2001 - DECEMBER 2001

Source of Admission	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	%
Board and Care	3		1		2		2		1		1	2	12	2%
Cal Pac Acute	1	1		3	2					2		1	10	2%
Cal Pac SNF	4	4	4	1	6	5	5		3	2	2	2	38	7%
Chinese Hospital Acute	2	1					1						4	1%
Chinese Hospital SNF													0	0%
Home	3	7	6	5	7	1	7	6	2	5	2	8	59	11%
Home Health													0	0%
Kaiser Acute	1					1	2			1		1	6	1%
Other	2	1	2	2	3	1	1	3			3		18	3%
R.K. Davies Acute													0	0%
R.K. Davies SNF													0	0%
SFGH Acute	18	18	18	18	21	18	20	34	19	16	15	15	230	43%
SFGH SNF	4	4	6	3	2	5	3		2	4	3	3	35	7%
St. Francis Acute	1	3	1		7	3	1	2	5	1	1	2	27	5%
St. Francis SNF		2	1	2	3	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	19	4%
St. Luke's Acute	3		1										4	1%
St. Luke's SNF	1	4				3	3		2	1	2	1	17	3%
St. Mary's Acute	5	1	1	1		3	2	1	3		1	2	19	4%
St. Mary's SNF	1		1				2		2	2		1	9	2%
Seton Acute								1					1	0%
Seton SNF									1				1	0%
UC Med Acute	2	1		1	1	1	3		1	1	2	2	15	3%
UC Med SNF		1			1								2	0%
VA Hospital Acute													1	0%
VA Hospital SNF												1	2	0%
TOTAL	51	44	41	38	55	42	51	51	43	38	33	42	529	100%


* Excluding admissions from Unit M7




Laguna Honda Hospital Distribution of Residents by Race as of 3/31/08
(n=945)




Laguna Honda Hospital Distribution of Residents by Race as of 3/31/07
(n=1020)





Laguna Honda Hospital Distribution of Residents by Race as of 3/31/06
(n = 1025)




Laguna Honda Hospital Distribution of Residents by Race as of 3/31/05
(n= 1087)







Laguna Honda Hospital Distribution by Race as of 3/31/2002
(n=1068)




Laguna Honda Hospital Distribution by Race as of 3/31/2001
(n=1073)



Laguna Honda Hospital
 Age Distribution by Decibels
 2001 - First 3 Months of 2010



Laguna Honda Hospital Gender Distribution of Residents (January 1999 - March 2010)



cc: Members of the Budget and Finance Committee
Harvey Rose
Controller

Library Users Association

P.O. Box 170544, San Francisco, CA 94117-0544

Tel./Fax (415) 753-2180

May 28, 2010

Honorable Members
Board of Supervisors
City Hall
San Francisco
By email: Board.of.supervisors @ sfgov.org

Subject: *Please Help Direct Library Priorities on Branch Service
During Closures for Renovations*

Dear Supervisors:

Now and during this budget period, please make one of your priorities the provision of full-time, full interim library service at the six branches that are closed for renovation – and at the remaining few that are yet to be closed for renovation or rebuilding in the near future.

Fully one-quarter of the Library's branches are closed for renovation and have only bookmobile service instead. These bookmobiles provide only tiny collections, no chairs or tables to sit and read or study, no access to computers by patrons, and usually no librarian – just a clerk.

And the bookmobiles are available at each branch just 5-8 hours per week, instead of the approximately 45-55 hours that these branches were previously open.

San Franciscans, through you, have been funding 100% branch service, but getting only a fraction of it, instead of full-time interim service at a storefront or other location.

The library has said it cannot afford such service – and in at least one case said its budget for a storefront is zero dollars. Yet the Library has recently been saving millions of dollars on branch renovations for which bids came in far lower than expected. *But none of those savings have gone into funding public service. The savings, and more, have instead gone into construction scope expansions.* We have found very inexpensive alternate facilities – including trailers that could be rented for

\$250 per month and that could cost less than \$10,000 per year, including expenses such as ramps, installation, and removal.


In a library with bond expenditures totaling \$189 million, and an annual budget of \$83 million, why can't San Franciscans have storefronts or other full-time, full service locations during closures for renovation? The library says it continues to pay the workers, and continues to own the books (the books from closed branches are not available to the public). Why not use just some of those resources to provide service at closed branches?

The branches currently closed are Anza, Golden Gate Valley, Merced, Park, Parkside, and Presidio.

Please ensure that San Franciscans have the library service they deserve – and are paying for.

Sincerely yours,

Peter Warfield
Executive Director
Library Users Association



SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

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



Clage

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

FROM: Bart Broome, Government Relations Manager
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

CC: Supervisor Sean Elsbernd

DATE: May 21, 2010

REFERENCE: 20100420-006

RE: Status of Community Choice Aggregation Contract

GAVIN NEWSOM
MAYOR

F.X. CROWLEY
PRESIDENT

FRANCESCA VIOTOR
VICE PRESIDENT

ANN MOLLER CAEN
COMMISSIONER

JULIET ELLIS
COMMISSIONER

ANSON B. MORAN
COMMISSIONER

ED HARRINGTON
GENERAL MANAGER

In the April 20, 2010 Board of Supervisors meeting, Supervisor Sean Elsbernd submitted a letter of inquiry requesting that the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) and the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) state when the completed community choice aggregation (CCA) contract is expected to be submitted to the Board of Supervisors.

Both SFPUC and LAFCo staff are meeting daily with PowerChoice, Inc., the energy service provider, to expeditiously develop a supplier contract for San Francisco's CCA program, now called CleanPowerSF. We are working to ensure that the final supplier contract balances the need for reasonable rates, increased renewable energy sources, and managed risk.

A contract may be ready for review by the Board of Supervisors by the second week of June. However, negotiations are still continuing and we are unable to give a firm date at this time. We anticipate the contract will follow standard procedures for vetting by the City's policy makers including thorough reviews by the Budget Analyst and Controller's Offices.

The SFPUC has made significant progress on other regulatory requirements necessary for the launch of CleanPowerSF. On May 18, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) certified the City's CCA Implementation Plan, which details the organizational structure, financial considerations, and program administration of CleanPowerSF.

We are also very close to a signed service agreement between the City and Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) for the provision of energy distribution and billing services. Within the next two weeks we expect to have completed both the PG&E service agreement and an official registration packet for the CPUC.

Please feel free to contact us if you have further questions.

11



SAN MATEO COUNTY HEALTH SYSTEM

Gary Tsai, M.D.
Psychiatry Residency Training Program
San Mateo Medical Center
222 W. 39th Ave
San Mateo, CA 94403
garytsai1982@gmail.com

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Rm 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Members of the Board,

I am currently a first year resident at the Psychiatry Residency Training Program of San Mateo Medical Center and am writing to you in strong support for the passage of Laura's Law.

As members of and advocates for the mental health community, our residents see patients on a daily basis who are so severely mentally ill that they are unable to seek, and unable to competently refuse, the treatment that they desperately need. Although these individuals are often found on the outskirts of our communities in homeless shelters or on the streets, they are also quite diverse and can be found in every corner of society- from teachers, to police officers, to our own family members. Beyond the tragedy of the poor quality of life of individuals, inadequate treatment of the mentally ill also has economic costs as patients are repeatedly hospitalized for largely preventable episodes of decompensation. Societal costs of under-treatment are also evident, by both the increasing stigma and divide between the mentally ill and the society in which they live, as well as by the increasing possibility that the minority of violent mentally ill individuals may commit crimes as a direct result of their illness. In light of these important considerations, the potential impact of Laura's Law are immense, both quantitatively and qualitatively, and wide-reaching, with the potential to affect not only the lives of the severely mentally ill, but the lives of every member of our community.

Due to the societal and political influence that San Francisco holds in the Bay Area, it is our belief that the passage of this important piece of legislature by the City and County of San Francisco would lead to neighboring counties to follow suit. Considerate mandated outpatient treatment has been implemented and shown to be effective in Nevada and New York, at times decreasing rates of involuntary psychiatric hospitalization by approximately 50%, and I am confident that the resulting individual, societal, and economic benefits can be obtained in our community and beyond.

In the medical and judicial arena, we advocate for the most vulnerable members of our society because they are oftentimes unable to speak for themselves. Undoubtedly, the most severely mentally ill can be characterized as such and need our leaders to help them help themselves. As clinicians, we can treat patients once they present to us, but we need our community representatives to give us an opportunity to help these individuals, which is why I am asking for your vote in support of Laura's Law. Thank you for your time and consideration on this important matter, and please feel free to contact me should you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Gary Tsai, M.D.



RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN - 1 PM 4: 02
BY _____

Board of Supervisors: Mark Church • Rose Jacobs Gibson • Richard S. Gordon • Carole Groom • Adrienne Tissier
Health System Chief: Jean S. Fraser • San Mateo Medical Center CEO: Susan Ehrlich, MD, MPP

222 W. 39th Avenue • San Mateo, CA 94403 • PHONE 650.573.2222 • CA RELAY 711 • FAX 650.573.2030

www.sanmateomedicalcenter.org

12



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

Ben Rosenfield
Controller

Monique Zmuda
Deputy Controller

1005-11
603

AUDIT FOLLOW-UP MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 1, 2010
TO: John Haley, Director of Transit, SFMTA
FROM: Tonia Lediju, Director of Audits, City Services Auditor
SUBJECT: Results of Follow-up Review for Audit of MTA Cable Car Fare Collection Practices

BY _____
AJK

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN - 1 PM 12: 25

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Controller's City Services Auditor (CSA) Division issued an audit report in April 2007, entitled, *Municipal Transportation Agency: The Agency Needs to Improve Cable Car Fare Collection Practices*, on the Municipal Transportation Agency's (MTA) cable car fare collection practices. The audit revealed that cable car conductors did not always collect cash fares from passengers and recommended that MTA instruct cable car conductors to adhere to all cable car fare collection procedures. MTA identified seven initiatives to improve its cable car fare collection practices. Of the seven initiatives MTA identified for implementation to improve cable car fare collection practices in response to our audit finding, the audit team found that:

- Two of MTA's initiatives to improve its cable car fare collection practices in response to the audit findings already existed as part of MTA's training program or regular operations.
- MTA now posts weekly fare collection rule reminders for cable car operators.
- In November 2008, MTA increased the hours of operation of the ticket booths to increase sales of prepaid tickets. Due to staffing issues, one of the three booths closed in November 2009.
- According to MTA's cable car operations superintendent, MTA's management team rides cable car lines daily to enhance management's presence, but did not document the rides or report any findings or observations. As a result of this follow-up review, MTA will start documenting rides and observations.
- MTA's security personnel investigated complaints, including making periodic random observations to assess adherence to fare collection procedures.

13

- There are no management reports that identify issues requiring further research. MTA provided meeting minutes that document issues related to cable car safety, but none related to cable car fare collections.

Despite the fact that six of the seven MTA initiatives were implemented, the auditors found that cable car conductors continue to not consistently collect cable car fares.

BACKGROUND & METHODOLOGY

The MTA operates three cable car lines that travel from Market and Powell Street to Fisherman's Wharf, and along California Street. The cable car lines operate from approximately 6:00 a.m. to 12:30 a.m. daily. Each cable car is operated by a driver, known as a gripman, and a conductor. The conductor's job is to collect fares, manage boarding and exiting of passengers, and assist in braking when the car is on a steep hill.

The regular youth and adult cable car fare is \$5 per ride, which can be paid to the conductor during the ride. The fare can also be prepaid through the ticket booths at Powell & Market streets and at Hyde & Beach streets, or at the ticket outlet at the San Francisco Convention & Visitors Bureau at Hallidie Plaza at Powell & Market streets. According to MTA staff, the third ticket booth, at Beach Street, closed in November 2009 due to staffing issues.

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 single recommendation in its audit report of April 2007, entitled: *MTA: The Agency Needs to Improve Its Cable Car Fare Collection Practices*. 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 MTA has taken the corrective actions needed to implement the audit report's recommendation, with the goal of improving MTA's cable car fare collection process. On February 28, 2008, CSA requested MTA to review its implementation of the audit recommendation, but MTA did not respond to this request.

To conduct the follow-up, CSA staff met with or contacted key MTA personnel to discuss the status of the corrective actions taken to date, obtained documentary evidence, and verified the existence of processes that have been established, if any. CSA staff also took 15 rides on the three cable car lines at different times of the day on weekdays, rode long enough to give the conductor an opportunity to collect the fares, and documented the results.

RESULTS

In its April 2007 response to the audit recommendation for MTA to instruct cable car conductors to adhere to all cable car fare collection procedures, MTA proposed seven initiatives to improve its fare collection practices (see Attachment A). Despite implementing or partially implementing six of the seven MTA initiatives to improve cable car collection practices, this follow-up review determined that improvements are still needed in MTA cable car fare collection processes.

Of the 15 cable car rides that CSA staff took to conduct this follow-up review, fares were not collected for six of the 15 rides, which represent 40 percent of the total fares to be collected. Of the six uncollected fares, four were for the rides that CSA staff took later on a route and when the cable car was moderately crowded, or having 20-40 passengers on board the cable car (see table note a). The table below shows the results of the 15 rides taken, including the details of the rides for which fares were not collected.

**TABLE Cable Car Fare Collection Results
 Rides Taken December 11-30, 2009**

		Total Rides	Fares Collected			Fares Not Collected	
			Number	Percent	Receipts Issued	Number	Percent
Cable Car Line	Powell & Mason	7	4	57%	4	3	43%
	Powell & Hyde	5	3	60%	3	2	40%
	California	3	2	67%	2	1	33%
	Total	15	9		9	6	40%
Boarding Point	Terminals	8	6	75%	6	2	25%
	Later on Route	7	3	43%	3	4	57%
	Total	15	9		9	6	40%
Total Number of Passengers	Very Crowded (a)	1	0	0%	NA	1	100%
	Moderately Crowded	9	5	56%	5	4	44%
	Relatively Empty	5	4	80%	4	1	20%
	Total	15	9		9	6	40%
Time of Day	Commute Hours AM (b)	3	2	67%	2	1	33%
	Commute Hours PM	3	2	67%	2	1	33%
	Daytime Hours	9	5	56%	5	4	44%
	Total	15	9		9	6	40%

(a) For the purpose of this analysis, very crowded is defined as more than 40 passengers on board, moderately crowded is 20-40 passengers, and relatively empty is less than 20 passengers.

(b) For the purpose of this analysis, daytime hours are from 9 a.m. – 3 p.m., commute hours AM are from 6 a.m. – 9 a.m., and commute hours PM are from 3 p.m. – 6 p.m.

Source: CSA's analysis.

CSA extends our appreciation to you and your staff who assisted with this follow-up review. If you have any questions or concerns, please call or e-mail Helen Vo at (415) 554-7661 or Helen.vo@sfgov.org.

cc: Nathaniel P. Ford, Sr., Executive Director, SFMTA
 Sonali Bose, Chief Financial Officer, SFMTA
 Ben Rosenfield, Controller
 Robert Tarsia, Deputy Audit Director

Page intentionally left blank.

ATTACHMENT A: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS


	MTA Initiative in Response to Audit	Status per MTA	Auditor's Follow-up Work	Results
1	As part of the training program for conductors, include hands-on training and observation of fare collection procedures and require the trainee to be certified on fare collection (currently only driving training is certified).	Conductors are certified and sign off on the training.	Obtained and reviewed MTA's 2009 compliance record. Confirmed that MTA includes hands-on training and observation of fare collection procedures in its training program.	Implemented <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hands-on training & observation of fare collection procedures have always been part of MTA's training program. • Fare collection certification has always been part of MTA's training program.
2	Retrain all existing conductors and certify their training (e.g., require them to sign off on the training and/or verify their attendance at the training).	All conductors have already signed off.	Obtained documentation that all conductors have signed-off on their conductors' training, and reviewed MTA's compliance record.	Implemented Cable Car Division instructors refreshed the conductors on fare collection procedures and had them sign off the certification during annual compliance ride checks. This has always been a part of MTA's training program for transit operators.
3	The rail operations director and cable car supervisors will re-emphasize all conductor guidelines and operating behaviors weekly, including those related to fare collection.	Rules pertaining to fare collections are posted weekly on the "Rule of the Day" in the cable car operator's Gilley Room. Conductors are re-certified/trained on the proper procedure for collecting fares annually.	Interviewed MTA's Rail Operations staff.	Implemented Conductors have been re-certified/trained for collecting fares per the 2009 compliance record. Per MTA, fare collections rules reminders are posted weekly at the operators room.

	MTA Initiative in Response to Audit	Status per MTA	Auditor's Follow-up Work	Results
4	<p>Rotate security personnel in plainclothes to observe staff on the cable cars for quality control.</p>	<p>Undercover checks were stopped in May 2009 per Chief Operating Officer Kenneth McDonald's orders. Undercover checks will resume this week, and will be performed on a weekly basis. Two person teams will be performing checks. Pool of available security personnel for rotation will be increased.</p>	<p>Reviewed documentation and information regarding the undercover checks.</p>	<p>Implemented</p> <p>MTA's records show that MTA conducted investigations whenever it received complaints. Records also show that MTA staff conducted random observation of cable car fare collections and documented their observations.</p>
5	<p>Staff revenue booths at the 4 turning points for cable cars so that tickets are purchased at the booths rather than through conductors at these turning points. This will significantly reduce fare collection activities currently required of conductors, and restrict their collection efforts to passengers who get on the system at other stops.</p>	<p>The SFMTA Revenue Section currently staffs two sales locations at the cable car turnarounds at Powell and Market, and Hyde and Beach streets. They are both open seven days a week from 8:30 a.m. to 8:30 p.m. The booths are staffed with one person at Hyde & Beach, two at Powell & Market Streets.</p>	<p>Asked MTA staff about the number of ticket booths and hours of operations.</p>	<p>Implemented</p> <p>There are only three (not four) turning point booths for purchase of cable car tickets. One at Powell & Market, and two at the turning points at Fisherman's Wharf. One of these two (at Beach Street) closed in November 2009 due to staffing issues. These booths were open 6 hours from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., until November 2008 when MTA added six more operating hours, opening them from 8:30 a.m. to 8:30 p.m.</p>
6	<p>Institute a program where managers are assigned to ride cable cars during the week to enhance management's presence on vehicles, to demonstrate interest and stress the importance of this mode and the role of conductors and grip persons.</p>	<p>Management team (superintendent/assistant superintendent) rides the cable car lines daily/weekly.</p>	<p>Asked MTA for documentation of the rides and its report on the findings, if any.</p>	<p>Partially Implemented</p> <p>Per MTA Rail Operations' Deputy COO, the superintendent and assistant superintendent of cable cars have been riding cable cars, but have not documented the rides. MTA will now begin documenting the rides.</p>

	MTA Initiative in Response to Audit	Status per MTA	Auditor's Follow-up Work	Results
7	Develop management reports that identify any issues requiring further research.	Issues are documented on the Division Safety Committee (DSC) & Joint Labor Management Board (JLMB) meeting minutes/action items and follow-up actions are taken.	Requested documentation or meeting minutes where issues have been identified showing implementation of the recommendation.	<p>Not Implemented</p> <p>We reviewed minutes of several DSC meetings that MTA provided. However, most of the issues and action items relate to cable car safety and not fare collections.</p>

Page intentionally left blank.

ATTACHMENT B: SFMTA'S RESPONSE

SF	Gavin Newsom Mayor Tom Nolan Chairman Jerry Lee Vice-Chairman Cameron Beach Director Malcolm Harucko Director Bruce Oka Director Nathaniel P. Ford Sr. Executive Director/CEO
MEMORANDUM	
May 18, 2010	
TO: Tonia Lediju Director of Audits, City Service Auditor	
FROM: John Haley Director of Transit, SFMTA	
RE: Follow-up Review for Audit of MTA Cable/Car Fare Collection Practices	
Background	
The Controller's City Service Auditor Division performed an audit of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Cable Car fare collection practices in April 2007. In response to this audit, the SFMTA identified seven steps to improve Cable Car fare collection practices. In January 2010, the Controller's City Service Auditor Division performed a follow-up review of the April 2007 audit and found that five of the seven steps had been implemented. These steps include:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Requiring trainees to be certified on fare collection• Retraining existing conductors on fare collection procedures• Posting weekly fare collection reminders in the Operators' room• Conducting security audits• Increasing the number of staff performing sales of pre-boarding fare media at Cable Car turn-arounds	
In addition, the follow-up review found that step six, instituting a program to assign managers to ride cable cars to enhance management presence was only partially implemented because, although the Cable Car Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent were riding the cable car, they did not document the rides. The follow-up review also found that step seven, developing management reports to identify issues for further research had not been implemented because the Division Safety Committee and Joint Labor Management Board meeting minutes did not show that these two bodies had discussed fare collection practices.	
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency One South Van Ness Avenue, Seventh Fl. San Francisco, CA 94103 Tel: 415.701.4500 Fax: 415.701.4430 www.sfmta.com	

The City Services Auditor also found, based on a survey of 15 rides on 3 cable car lines, that despite implementing five of the seven steps identified in the 2007 audit, that further improvements are needed in the SFMTA cable care fare collection process.

SFMTA Response


The SFMTA agrees with the Controller's finding that five of the seven steps have been implemented. In addition, the SFMTA has documentation to demonstrate that step six, instituting a program to assign managers to ride cable cars to enhance management presence has been implanted. As per the attached Ride Log, in January 2010 the Cable Car Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent documented 7 rides on the cable car. Due to the death of the Assistant Superintendent and the accompanying staff shortages, the program to assign managers to ride the cable car was temporarily on hold. Beginning May 1, 2010, the new Director of Transit Operations has required ride clocks from division management. This new program will require documentation of rides by management for all modes of transit, including the cable car.

The SFMTA also has documentation to demonstrate that step seven, developing management reports to identify issues for further research has been implemented. As per the attached Disciplinary Tracking Fare Collection spreadsheet, which is used by management to identify personnel issues that require further research and action, since the 2007 audit, seven fare collection issues have been identified, tracked and addressed. Of these seven issues, two resulted in written warnings and five resulted in Skelly hearings.

The SFMTA agrees, as with all procedures, that further improvements in the Agency's cable car cash handling practices could be made. However, the SFMTA also acknowledges that sales of pre-boarding cable car fare media, which augments on-board cash fare collection, has increased since the time of the audit. At the time of the audit, the cable car turn-arounds were staffed 240 hours per week by Revenue personnel selling pre-boarding fare media. Currently, the cable car turn-arounds are staffed 252 hours per week, an increase of 5%. The additional staffing has resulted in an increase in pre-boarding fare media sales from 65% in 2007 to 66% in 2009. Given the safety concerns surrounding the collection of cash fares on board the cable car while the vehicle is in motion, increasing the pre-boarding fare media sales improves both fare collection and safety.

SF

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 13, 2010
TO: Transit Operations Management
Security/Enforcement Management
FROM: John Haley 
Director of Transit
SUBJECT: Observation Rides

We continue to explore all avenues to increase our revenue. One of the key elements in that strategy is to increase our fare box collections and to deter fare evasion. In order to support that effort I am directing that each manager completes at least 23 management observation rides each month to observe our operating practices including fare collection.

We are initiating this program on June 1 with an initial concentration on Cable Cars. Please fill out the attached sheet when taking your rides. All observations should be forwarded to Landon Modena-Kurpinsky and Judy Tam at DirectorofTransit@sfmta.com or faxed to 415.701.4721.



Municipal Transportation Agency

Manager Observation Ride

Date:	
Run:	
Line:	
Location/Direction:	
Time:	

Observations:

Area of Observation	Compliance (Y/N)	Comments
Collection Fares		
Quality of Ride		
Interaction with Passengers		
Operating Conditions of Vehicle (Standing Load, empty, etc.)		
Operator Appearance		
Compliance with Operating Rules		
Vehicle Condition (Graffiti, litter, stop request signals working, etc.)		

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
 San Francisco Municipal Highway | Department of Parking & Traffic
 One Joseph Van Ness Avenue, Seventh Fl., San Francisco, CA 94103 | Tel: 415.701.4500 | Fax: 415.701.4430 | www.sfmata.com



BOS-11 cpage
B/E clerk

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, Board of Supervisors
Clerk of the Board

FROM: Ben Rosenfield *[Signature]*

DATE: June 1, 2010

SUBJECT: Notification of Access Line Tax Annual Rate Adjustment

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN -1 PM 2:25
BY PC

In November 2008, San Francisco voters approved Proposition O to replace the Emergency Response Fee with the Access Line Tax. Prop O allows for annual inflationary adjustments to the per line tax rates, codified in San Business and Tax Regulations Code Section 784 as follows:

The amount of the tax shall be \$2.75 per month per access line, \$20.62 per month per trunk line and \$371.15 per month per high capacity line. These amounts shall be adjusted annually in accordance with the increase in the Consumer Price Index: All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco/Oakland/San Jose Area for All Items as reported by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, or any successor to that index, as of December 31st of each year, beginning with December 31, 2009.

In January, 2010, the Controller's Office calculated the inflationary increase on fees effective July 1, 2010 to be 2.61%. Source data are from the US Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics website using the "Consumer Price Index (CPI) - All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco - Oakland-San Jose CA Area," using December factors from the end of the prior year. The website is:

http://data.bls.gov/PDO/servlet/SurveyOutputServlet?data_tool=dropmap&series_id=CUURA422SA0,CUUSA422SA0. The difference between the inflation index for December 2008 (218.5) and December 2009 (224.2) is 5.71, or 2.61%.

When applied to current rates per line, the new rates are as follows:

Line Type	Current Rate Per Line	Adjustment Factor	New Rate Per Line
Access line	\$ 2.75	2.61%	\$ 2.82
Trunk line	\$ 20.62	2.61%	\$ 21.16
High capacity line	\$ 371.15	2.61%	\$ 380.84

Please contact me or Michelle Allersma, Citywide Revenue Manager, Controller's Office Budget and Analysis Division, at 554-4792 if you have any questions regarding this information.

14

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/04/2010 11:40 AM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject California Vacation - crankin

From: charles [mailto:crankin2@carolina.rr.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 03, 2010 5:22 PM
To: SFCVB PR Department
Subject: California Vacation

My wife and I and our son, daughter-in-law and two grandsons had planned and made arrangements for a July Vacation to Los Angeles and San Francisco, spending a week in each city during the period July 17th to July 31st. However, since both of your cities have boycotted the great state of Arizona, we have cancelled our airline tickets and our hotel reservations in both of these cities. We plan instead to change our vacation to go to several states in New England. I feel sure you won't even miss us since we are so far apart immigration-wise.

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

15

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/03/2010 04:17 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject West Portal residents do NOT want hours/fees for parking
meters to be increased!



GaryDLindsey@aol.com
06/02/2010 07:53 PM

To
cc garydlindsey@aol.com
Subject West Portal residents do NOT want hours/fees for parking
meters to be increased!

To the Elected and Appointed Officials for the Citizens of San Francisco City and County:

Over the past few years, the West Portal Business District has experienced a fleeing of mom-and-pop businesses, many of which has been here for decades.

This plight might be further aggravated if you, who we elected or have appointed, were to extend the hours for parking meters along West Portal Avenue to include Sundays.

Also, raising the fees on these meters to perhaps \$6.00 per hour might only spell the death knell for our beloved neighborhood and the heart of the neighborhood, our fellow business people.

Please listen to the people whom you represent: DO NOT APPROVE THESE DRACONIAN MEASURES!!!!

Sincerely,

Gary Lindsey

Gary D. Lindsey / Rodger Garcia
2700 15th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94127
415-759-6410

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

16

file 100233

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/03/2010 03:27 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Please support sit/lie ordinance...quality of life issue



"Joe Cline"
<jwdc56@msn.com>
05/31/2010 09:48 AM



To "Mayor of San Francisco" <gavin.newsom@sfgov.org>,
"Board of Supervisors" <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
Subject Please support sit/lie ordinance...quality of life issue

Dear Mayor and Board of Supervisors,
Please support the sit/lie ordinance. It is the responsible thing to do on behalf of the City's citizens who pay taxes in part to maintain a quality of life in our City. There are other solutions to care for the disadvantaged, but it is clear that semi-anarchists only wish to disrupt civility for us. Joe Cline. San Francisco.

17

File # ~~100109~~
100233

BDS-11



May 27, 2010

Honorable Members
San Francisco Board of Supervisors, Public Safety Committee
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Proposed Sit/Lie Ordinance

Dear Supervisors Chiu, Mirkarimi, and Dufty,

We're writing on behalf of the Board of Directors of the Yerba Buena Community Benefit District in support of the proposed Sit/Lie Ordinance. The nonprofit YBCBD works each day to improve the quality of life in our neighborhood. Your support of this legislation will help advance this goal.

We believe that this legislation will equip the San Francisco Police Department with a common sense tool to help address anti-social and negative behavior on the streets and sidewalks of our city. Providing a positive experience in the Yerba Buena neighborhood is vital to our convention business, museums, hotels, major retail, dining and entertainment venues. For many, especially the thousands of conventioners here each week, our neighborhood forms their first and lasting impressions of San Francisco.

All who live, work, and visit Yerba Buena and our other great neighborhoods deserve a safe and welcoming experience. Please support the proposed legislation to give the police department the tools they need to further improve the livability of our great city.

Sincerely,

Heather Almond, Board Chair
Senior Asset Manager
San Francisco Westfield Properties

Cathy Maupin
Executive Director

Cc: Captain Daniel McDonagh
Assistant Chief Kevin Cashman

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/03/2010 04:27 PM

To
cc
bcc
Subject: File 100233; pictures in support of Sit/Lie



Ambiance Antiques
<showroom@ambianceantiques.com>
Sent by:
ambianceantiques1@gmail.com

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject pictures in support of Sit/Lie

06/03/2010 10:40 AM

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please look at the attached picture that my son took yesterday of the sidewalk outside our showroom in the San Francisco Design District.

For more pictures and details, go here:

<http://www.support-sit-lie.com>

We hope that you pass the Sit/Lie ordinance next week, rather than continuing to enable people to live on the sidewalks of San Francisco. It is self-destructive behavior for the individuals who do it, and it hurts our city in many ways. Even if you don't care about our business, please care about San Francisco.

Thank you,
Teresa

—
Ambiance Antiques
550 15th St., #1
San Francisco, CA 94103
415-626-0145



www.ambianceantiques.com 15thSt-June1-2010.jpg

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/07/2010 11:57 AM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject File 100233- I'm a business owner FOR Sit/Lie



Georgina Rice
<georgina@georginarice.com
>
06/04/2010 05:52 PM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject I'm a business owner FOR Sit/Lie

I have a high end interior design studio and am tired of my clients having to walk over these people (or not coming over because they're afraid to). I am a liberal, and have thought long and hard about this, but have come to the conclusion that this is the only solution. Here's what it's like next door to my building:

www.support-sit-lie.com

Thank you for supporting this ordinance.

Georgina

Georgina Rice & Co.
Showplace Square West
550 Fifteenth Street, 3rd Floor
San Francisco CA 94103

T: 415-241-7104 (direct)

F: 415-241-7101

C: 415-695-4796

www.georginarice.com



Panhandler Boycott
<panhandlerboycott@yahoo.com>

06/07/2010 10:40 AM

To panhandlerboycott@yahoo.com

cc

bcc

Subject More Visual Evidence

I will be posting more images of people sitting and lying in downtown.

These pictures are taken only when the opportunity presents itself. I work a 40+ hour job and live in the tenderloin so I really don't have time to go looking for these people.

Most of these people appear at these locations regularly either downtown where I work, In the tenderloin and throughout the northern part of city where I walk from the bay to the ocean.

Here is the latest installment: There are more coming as soon as I find the time to get them off my camera.

<http://panhandlerboycott.vox.com/library/post/699-sutter-street-sf-ca---may-10th-2010-557pm.html>

17



troy barber
<finocchio68@yahoo.com>
05/28/2010 02:58 PM

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

cc

bcc

Subject I APPROVE extended parking meter hours

If this is a transit first city, i think we need to fund decent transit. I support the ideas to extend metered parking to Sunday, etc. And i drive a call, fwiw.

Troy Barber
Divis. St.

B/F chair page
RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2010 JUN -1 PM 4:07

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC GOLF ALLIANCE



Alc

235 Montgomery St., #400, San Francisco, CA. 94104 * 415-392-5431, ext. 203 * info@sfpublicgolf.com

April 20, 2010

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA. 94102

Re: San Francisco Public Golf Alliance
Supports Continued Funding for Sharp Park
In 2010-2011 Rec & Park Department Budget

Dear Supervisors,

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The San Francisco Public Golf Alliance, on behalf of our 4,000-plus San Francisco and Northern San Mateo County resident members, urges Your Board to retain funding in the 2010-2011 Rec & Park Budget for the Sharp Park Golf Course.

We expect that in Your upcoming budget hearings, anti-golf forces, led by the Tucson-based Center for Biological Diversity, will renew their call to close the course, based on arguments that golf is just for "elites," that Sharp Park is a "poor-quality" course, without historic value, which "loses money" and harms endangered species. Please don't be misled by such arguments.

Sharp Park is a working-class golf course. Its greens fees are the most affordable in the Bay Area. It serves boys and girls high school teams, large numbers of retired, women, and racial minorities. The most up-to-date financial figures show a positive cash-flow to the city treasury from Sharp Park. Sharp Park is also the work of the legendary golf architect Dr. Alister MacKenzie, and is

widely regarded as a world golf treasure. The historic golf course is supported by a remarkable coalition of labor, environmental, preservation, civic, and golf groups, and by the San Francisco Chronicle editorial board.

The arguments to close the golf course were extensively studied, debated, and publicly heard in the course of the Rec & Park Department's study of the matter, between July and December, 2009. Ultimately, the anti-golf arguments were rejected by Department Staff and their scientific and economic consultants, by the Park, Recreation, and Open Space Advisory Committee (by a 14-1 vote), and the Rec & Park Commission, which voted unanimously on December 17, 2009 in favor of the Department's plan to renovate the golf course as part of an extensive habitat restoration project at Sharp Park.

The Rec & Park Department is now working with its counterparts in Pacifica and the County of San Mateo, to locate financing and move forward with the habitat and golf restoration project.

We urge Your Board not to de-fund the golf course at this point, but to let the joint restoration project move forward, as recommended by the Department.

For your convenience, we offer the following summary of key facts and arguments developed in the course of Rec & Park's 2009 study and hearings on Sharp Park.

1. Ordinance 86-09, and the Rec & Park Department's Sharp Park Study.

By Ordinance 85-09, adopted May 5, 2009, Your Board directed the Recreation & Park Department to develop plans to restore habitat for the California Red-legged Frog and San Francisco Garter Snake at Sharp Park, alternately with or without the golf course, working together with San Mateo County, the City of Pacifica, and/or the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.¹

Culminating a six-month scientific study and extensive public discussion, public meetings, and hearings, the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission on

¹ San Francisco Board of Supervisors, Resolution 85-09, May 5, 2009: <http://www.sfbos.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/bdsupvrs/ordinances09/o0085-09.pdf>

December 17, 2009, by unanimous 6-0 vote, adopted the recommendation of Rec & Park Director Phil Ginsburg to renovate the 18-hole golf course as part of a comprehensive natural habitat restoration project at Sharp Park. This is simultaneously the least expensive alternative, with the greatest benefits to both the environment and to public recreation, according to the Department's Report.²

This was the third Rec & Park study since 2007 to recommend that the Sharp Park course be kept open. The Report's recommended level of habitat restoration—more than 25 percent of the golf course property west of Highway One—cannot fairly be called an "all-golf solution," as golf's opponents would have it. Nor can the Department's methodology or its six-month, 400-plus-page study be accurately characterized as a "rush to judgment," as golf's opponents say.

2. Sharp Park is a Public Treasure: A Classic, Much-Loved, Affordable Public Golf Course.

Public golf is popular recreation across all age, gender, ethnic, and social groups in San Francisco and the Peninsula—one of the oldest and most prominent public golf areas in America. Because of its low greens fees, easy freeway access, and relatively flat terrain, Sharp Park is the golf course of choice of juniors, seniors, and other golfers of modest means in San Francisco and San Mateo Counties. With a population over 700,000, San Mateo County has only one other public golf course with regular weekend greens fees under \$80.00.

This is consistent with the reports in 2007 and again in 2008 to the Rec & Park Department from its consultants, the National Golf Foundation³ and Leon Younger and PROS Consulting⁴, respectively, both of which found that

² Sharp Park Report, Table 3, at p. 50:
http://www.parks.sfgov.org/wcm_recpark/SharpParkGC/Tetratchfinalrpt110609.pdf

³ National Golf Foundation, "Operational Review and Recommendations for City of San Francisco Golf Operations, February, 2007, at page 23:
http://www.parks.sfgov.org/wcm_recpark/Golf/NGF/NGFFinal.pdf

⁴ Leon Younger & PROS Consulting, "San Francisco Recreational Opportunities Study Summary Report," August, 2008, at pages 7-8:
http://www.parks.sfgov.org/wcm_recpark/Golf/Taskforce/Final_report_August_26_2008.pdf

the San Francisco/San Mateo County area has too few courses to serve the market demand for public golf. Consistent with this fact, the editors of both the San Francisco Chronicle⁵ and the San Francisco Bay Guardian⁶ have identified Sharp Park as a regional golf asset.

In Fiscal Year 2008-2009, 54,073 18-hole rounds were played at Sharp Park, and Rec & Park Department figures show that revenues exceeded operating expenses there by \$99,142.006 even after Department accountants assessed a \$245,816.00 "overhead" figure,⁷ which includes both city-wide and Rec & Park Department fixed costs.⁸ In short, the most up-to-date financial data indicates that Sharp Park Golf Course generates an operating profit, and in fact subsidizes both Rec and Park and general governmental operations of the City and County of San Francisco.

⁵ San Francisco Chronicle editorial, "Let Golfers Play Through on Sharp Park Course," September 3, 2009 (supporting the 18-hole golf course): <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/c/a/2009/09/03/EDN019GUJ6.DTL>

⁶ San Francisco Bay Guardian, "Golfers and Garter Snakes," November 10, 2009, on-line comment by Editor Tim Richmond: <http://www.sfbg.com/politics/2009/11/10/golfers-and-garter-snakes>

⁷ Rec & Park Department, Sharp Park Financials presented to PROSAC public meeting, November 4, 2009 (first page): <http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=43298>

⁸ San Francisco Controller Ben Rosenfeld's Memorandum to Supervisor Sean Elsbernd, et al., regarding Golf Fund, etc., December 17, 2008, at pp. 2-3: <http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=40189>

3. Sharp Park Golf Course is Supported
By Congresswoman Jackie Speier,
The Mayors of San Francisco and Pacifica,
The San Mateo County Board of Supervisors,
Pacifica City Council, and
The San Francisco Parks, Recreation
And Open Space Advisory Committee ("PROSAC").

The Mayors of both San Francisco⁹ and Pacifica¹⁰, the San Mateo Board of Supervisors¹¹, Pacifica City Council¹², the San Francisco Parks, Recreation and Open Space Advisory Committee ("PROSAC")¹³, and Pacifica Chamber of Commerce¹⁴ have endorsed and/or adopted resolutions in favor of keeping the 18-hole Sharp Park course open.

Congresswoman Jackie Speier, whose district includes San Francisco west of Twin Peaks and most of San Mateo County, has endorsed the Sharp Park Report, and announced in a November 9, 2009 Press Release her formation of an intergovernmental, inter-agency Study Group "with all the relevant parties to help identify the resources necessary to complete this very worthwhile project."¹⁵

⁹ San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsom, interviewed on KNBR Radio "Murph & Mac in the Morning" Show, December 10, 2009:
<http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=44820>

¹⁰ Pacifica Mayor Julie Lancelle, in public testimony to San Francisco Recreation & Park Commission, November 19, 2009:
http://www.parks.sfgov.org/site/recpark_page.asp?id=115334

¹¹ County of San Mateo, Resolution of Board of Supervisors, December 18, 2007: http://sharppark.savegolf.net/data/smbos_res.pdf

¹² City of Pacifica, Resolution of City Council, December 10, 2007:
http://sharppark.savegolf.net/data/cop_res.pdf

¹³ PROSAC, Resolutions [Nos. 1 and 2] passed at PROSAC's Dec. 1, 2009 meeting, submitted to [Rec & Park] Commission on Dec. 3, 2009:
<http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=44912>

¹⁴ Pacifica Chamber of Commerce, letter (undated):
<http://sharppark.savegolf.net/data/ChamberSupportSP.pdf>

¹⁵ Congresswoman Jackie Speier, 12th U.S. Congressional District, Press Release, November 9, 2009:
<http://speier.house.gov/index.cfm?sectionid=48&parentid=46§iontree=46,48&itemid=330>

The Congresswoman's effort to save Sharp Park is in line with all three Rec & Park Department studies since February, 2007, all of which have recommended that the 18-hole course be maintained.

4. Labor, Environmental, and Preservation Organizations, and the San Francisco Chronicle Support the Golf Course.

The Rec & Park Department's plan to both preserve the historic MacKenzie golf course and restore habitat for the frog and snake, has been endorsed by the Sierra Club's Loma Prieta Chapter (representing San Mateo, Santa Clara, and San Benito counties)¹⁶, and Laborer's Union Local 261 (representing the golf course gardeners)¹⁷. The Washington D.C.-based Cultural Landscape Foundation has designated Sharp Park Golf Course an at-risk, nationally-significant cultural landscape.¹⁸ The San Francisco Chronicle supported keeping the golf course open in a September 3, 2009 editorial, "Let Golfers Play Through on Sharp Park."¹⁹

5. Legacy of the Renowned Dr. Alister MacKenzie.

Built in 1931-1932, Sharp Park is the legacy of history's best-known, most-acclaimed golf architect, Dr. Alister MacKenzie, who was hired and assisted by John McLaren, the father of the San Francisco parks system. Dr. MacKenzie designed many of the world's greatest courses, including Augusta National (home of the annual Masters Tournament) and Cypress Point, and was consulting architect at the birthplace of golf, the Old Course at St. Andrews, Scotland. San Francisco favorite son, Lincoln High graduate and 1964 United States Open Champion Ken Venturi

¹⁶ Testimony of Merrill Bobele, co-chair, Coastal Issues Committee, Loma Prieta Chapter, Sierra Club, to Board of Supervisors' Govt. Audit & Oversight Committee, Dec. 16, 2009, S.F. Govt. TV, at 3:11:37: http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=11

¹⁷ Testimony of Zac Salem, Chair, Golf Committee, Laborers' Local 261, to Board of Supervisors' Govt. Audit & Oversight Committee, Dec. 16, 2009, S.F. Govt. TV, at 2:17:30: http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=11

¹⁸ Cultural Landscape Foundation, Washington, D.C., July, 2009: <http://www.tclf.org/landslides/sharp-park-golf-course-threatened-closure>

¹⁹ San Francisco Chronicle, editorial, September 3, 2009: <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/c/a/2009/09/03/EDN019GUJ6.DTL>

calls Sharp Park "Dr. MacKenzie's great gift to the American public golfer"²⁰, while prominent MacKenzie restoration architect Mike DeVries labels Sharp Park "the world's greatest golf course architect's most significant public course."²¹

The August, 2008 "San Francisco Recreational Opportunities Study," authored by the Department's longtime consultant Leon Younger and PROS Consulting, pointed to Sharp Park's "... potential to be one of the best public golf courses in the nation... a great resource for the Recreation and Parks Department, much like having an existing park designed by Olmstead or a Frank Lloyd Wright home.... One of the few golf courses in America that a private fundraising (or endowment) for restoration could be accomplished...."²²

Virtually all of Sharp Park's existing 14 holes on the ocean side of Highway One are Dr. MacKenzie's original designs. The fact that a substantial portion of an internationally-significant cultural landscape still exists at Sharp Park, is well-known and virtually unanimously accepted among golf architecture experts²³, and is documented by Dr. MacKenzie's original routing drawings, aerial photographs, and Opening Day hole descriptions by MacKenzie's assistant Jack Fleming.²⁴

²⁰ Ken Venturi letter, October 12, 2009:
<http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=40561>

²¹ Mike DeVries letter, November 18, 2009:
<http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=43267>

²² Leon Younger & PROS Consulting, "San Francisco Recreational Opportunities Study Summary Report," August, 2008, pp. 14 and 44:
<http://www.parks.sfgov.org/wcm/recpark/GolfTaskforce/FinalreportAugust262008.pdf>

²³ Alister MacKenzie Society letter, April 28, 2009:
<http://www.pacificaripside.com/.a/6a00d8341c795b53ef01156f6f286c970c-pi>
Ken Venturi letter, October 12, 2009, *supra*, (fn. 20)
Mike DeVries letter, November 18, 2009, *supra*, (fn. 21)

²⁴ Golf Club Atlas, "MacKenzie's Sharp Park Under Siege," Bo Links and Richard Harris, September, 2009, n.17, and routing map, Jack Fleming hole descriptions, and 1941 aerial photo at end of the article.
<http://golfclubatlas.com/in-my-opinion/sharp-park>

6. Concern from the World Golf Community.

Because of Dr. MacKenzie's preeminent stature among golf architects, the beauty of his work at Sharp Park, and the popularity and historic significance of the course, the threat of closure has brought, and will continue to bring, attention from National and international preservationist organizations²⁵ and golf publications²⁶.

Major state, national, and international golf organizations, including the World Golf Foundation²⁷, California Alliance for Golf (whose members include the Northern and Southern California Golf Associations and all major California golf organizations)²⁸, and the Alister MacKenzie Society of Great Britain and Ireland²⁹, have written public letters in support of saving the Sharp Park Golf Course.

Against this weight of evidence, spokespersons for the Tucson-based Center for Biological Diversity, which has lead the charge to close the golf course, have repeatedly claimed that ". . . the golf course today has no appreciable legacy of MacKenzie's design"³⁰, and "Sharp Park

²⁵ Cultural Landscape Foundation, Washington, D.C., July, 2009 (watch-listing Sharp Park as an at-risk, nationally-significant cultural landscape):
<http://www.tclf.org/landslides/sharp-park-golf-course-threatened-closure>

²⁶ Golf World, "Sharply Divided," Geoff Shackelford, July 20, 2009:
http://www.golfdigest.com/golfworld/columnists/2009/07/golf_sharp_park_shackelford_0720?printable=true

Sports Illustrated, "Sharp Elbows," May 5, 2009:
http://www.golf.com/golf/courses_travel/article/0,28136,1895794-0,00.html

²⁷ World Golf Foundation, letter, July 23, 2009:
<http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=43233>

²⁸ California Alliance for Golf, letter, September 28, 2009:
<http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=43245>

²⁹ Alister MacKenzie Society letter, *supra*, fn. 23.

³⁰ KQED Radio, "Forum" program, "The Future of Sharp Park," November 9, 2009, 10:00 a.m., at 30:29-30:32:
<http://www.kqed.org/epArchive/R911091000>

today has nothing to do with Alister MacKenzie's original design."³¹ But this claim is belied by the only two golf history authorities that Center for Biological Diversity has ever cited in support of its claims, Daniel Wexler and Joe Faulkner³², both of whom have publicly and in writing denounced the Center for mischaracterizing and misrepresenting their work.³³

**7. Scientific Study Shows Golf is Compatible
With Enhanced Natural Habitat at Sharp Park.**

The San Francisco Garter Snake and the California Red-legged Frog are freshwater species, and historic maps and photos show that before the golf course, the land consisted of agricultural fields, located in a valley named "Salt Valley," surrounding the brackish Laguna Salada (Spanish for "Salty Lake"), which was periodically open to the sea. Accordingly Philip Williams & Associates concluded, in its seminal 1992 scientific study of the species at Sharp Park: "Given the saline nature of the pond [Laguna Salada], it is not likely to have supported the San Francisco garter snake, which feeds on freshwater frogs."³⁴ The first scientific reports of the San Francisco Garter Snake at the property are from the mid-1940's, long after

³¹ San Francisco Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Advisory Committee ("PROSAC") public meeting, July 7, 2009, audio tape at 1:22.03 to 1:22.07.

³² PROSAC public meeting, July 7, 2009, Id., audio tape at 1:20.54 to 1:22.07.

³³ Dan Wexler, letter, July 19, 2009:
[http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/recpark/meetings/Park Recreation and Open Space Advisory Committee %28PROSAC%29/supporting/2009/SFPGA.PDF](http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/recpark/meetings/Park%20Recreation%20and%20Open%20Space%20Advisory%20Committee%28PROSAC%29/supporting/2009/SFPGA.PDF)

Joe Faulkner, letter, July 31, 2009:
[http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/recpark/meetings/Park Recreation and Open Space Advisory Committee %28PROSAC%29/supporting/2009/Faulkner letter.pdf](http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/recpark/meetings/Park%20Recreation%20and%20Open%20Space%20Advisory%20Committee%28PROSAC%29/supporting/2009/Faulkner%20letter.pdf)

³⁴ Laguna Salada Resource Enhancement Plan, Philip Williams & Associates, June, 1992, at pp. 2-3, and Fig. 2:
http://www.biologicaldiversity.org/campaigns/restoring_sharp_park_california/pdfs/PWALagunaSaladaResourceEnhancementPlan.pdf

the course was completed in 1932 and the first unreinforced sea wall built in 1941.³⁵

So the golf course not only created the requisite freshwater conditions at Sharp Park for the California Red-legged Frog and San Francisco Garter Snake, the golfers have been coexisting with the frogs and snakes since these creatures first appeared at the property. The Rec & Park Department's April, 2009 Endangered Species Compliance Plan for Sharp Park³⁶, developed in consultation with state and federal agencies, includes provisions to modify the locations and times of mowing, integrated pest management, elimination of inorganic fertilizer, posting of signs, and other measures to provide additional protection for the frog, snake, and their habitat.³⁷

In testimony at the Rec & Park Commission's November 19, 2009 public hearing on the Sharp Park Report, the Rec & Park Department's biological consultant Karen Swaim strongly advocated keeping the 18-hole golf course. Ms. Swaim is also the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's consultant for the San Francisco Garter Snake recovery project at Mori Point, where she has also worked with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.³⁸

Retaining the existing 18-hole golf course, Ms. Swaim said, is the best way to protect the San Francisco Garter Snake and California Red-legged Frog in to-be-restored wetland and upland habitats at the Laguna Salada/Horse Stable Pond wetlands complex in the southwest quadrant of the property. She specifically rejected proposals from golf course opponents to close the golf holes between Laguna Salada and Highway One.

³⁵ Sharp Park Report, *supra*, Appendix "C," at p. 9:
<http://www.parks.sfgov.org/wcm/recpark/SharpParkGC/Tetrattechfinalrpt110609.pdf>

³⁶ San Francisco Recreation and Park Department Endangered Species Compliance Plan for Sharp Park, April 14, 2009:
<http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=40186>

³⁷ *Id.*, at pp. 8-15.

³⁸ Karen Swaim, public testimony (initial remarks) to San Francisco Rec & Park Commission at Commission hearing, November 19, 2009:
http://www.parks.sfgov.org/site/recpark_page.asp?id=115334

"There's so much misinformation about how the biology of the snake and the frog have been portrayed in this.... I don't think it's an appropriate thing to turn the holes of golf on the west side of Highway One into some kind of preserve for the snake. I find that contradictory to the biology of the species."³⁹

Golf is a "manageable, regulated type of activity" that has "distinct advantages" for the preservation of the threatened species, Ms. Swaim testified, as compared to other more self-directed recreational activities such as bike-riding, which is known to kill snakes, and which would be likely in the event the golf course property were opened to more general public use.⁴⁰

Ms. Swaim also explained that the golf course and golfers discourage cats, rats, and other small mammal predators, whose populations already exist in the area due to the surrounding residential areas, and would grow in the event the golf course were to be replaced with unmanaged wetlands and upland habitat.

"... [the golf course is] in a very fragmented habitat that has no carnivores that keep these animals [cats and other small predators] in check... in the lack of coyotes, bobcats and these types of things, feral cat and domestic cat populations can be an enormous problem for these [frog and snake] species. The garter snakes are diurnal and active during the day. Cats are hunters. Even cats that are well-fed, they have the hunting instinct... The one [dead snake] that we found [in the residential neighborhood adjacent to the golf course], if it had been a

³⁹ Karen Swaim, public testimony (concluding remarks) to San Francisco Rec & Park Commission at Commission hearing, November 19, 2009: http://www.parks.sfgov.org/site/recpark_page.asp?id=115334

⁴⁰ Karen Swaim, Id.

hungry feral cat we wouldn't have found it; that snake would probably have been eaten."⁴¹

Finally, Ms. Swaim addressed the issue of threatened sea level rise in her November 19, 2009 testimony to the Rec & Park Commission.

"... Horse Stable Pond is already below sea level. If the seawall goes there would be a significant amount of seawater intrusion not only now but that would increase as sea level rises. Now, if that is the assumption, this seawall going away right now is not an option at all, it's just off the table. The seawall protects not only the freshwater nature of the lagoon... we're hearing a lot of people want to protect the species but yet they want to take the seawall away. Those two things can't really be reconciled right now. The amphibians just can't survive in salt water. I have spoken with the regulatory agencies and they do not support removing the seawall. This is not an option that can be put forth right now..... I have to say that there's been comment that we're not taking sea level rise into account. That is the absolute reason that the Sharp Park on the west side where the golf course for the most part exists is not a good restoration option for the San Francisco garter snake in light of the fact that every one of us is saying and fully expects that there will be salt water surge, there will be storm events that will put that habitat at risk. The last thing we want to do is create a situation where the San Francisco Garter Snake becomes accustomed to, starts to colonize a habitat that is immediately east of Laguna Salada only to be wiped out by what everyone is saying is going to be an eventual event.... What the city has been mandated to do is to protect these species [frog and snake], and the only way that

⁴¹ Karen Swaim, Id. For documentation of a November 11, 2009 snake kill, apparently by a domestic cat, in the residential neighborhood south of the golf course, see the documents attached as exhibits GGNRA.1 through GGNRA.15 to the S.F. Public Golf Alliance letter to PROSAC, December 1, 2009:
<http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=44368>

we can do that right now is to get Laguna Salada and that wetland complex fixed.... We have to take action on getting this set, getting these snakes populated into Calera Creek and Mori Point, working with the GGNRA so there's a secure upland habitat. I've looked at the sea level rise all up and down this whole area."⁴²

8. Golf's Foes Have Not Offered A Realistic Plan To Finance Replacement of the Golf Course.

Center for Biological Diversity has not offered a realistic proposal to finance closure of the golf course. Although golf course opponents advocate creation of a "new national park" at Sharp Park, neither the National Park Service nor the Golden Gate National Recreation Area have come forward with an offer to either pay to take the property off San Francisco's hands or to fund the closure of the golf course. And this is unlikely, in light of the publicly-stated opposition of Congresswoman Jackie Speier to the close-the-golf-course proposal.⁴³

At PROSAC's July 7, 2009 public meeting, Biological Diversity spokesman Brent Plater painted a rosy picture of funding a golf course-to-wetlands conversion with a financial device called "mitigation banking." Mr. Plater explained:

"Now we have a plan trying to do something different with Sharp Park... There should be more walking and biking trails. .. This is the idea about trying to do something different at Sharp Park that will be consistent with protection of the snake and the frog... and makes a lot of money. We could do a mitigation bank down here. Mitigation bank credits sell for about Three Million bucks a credit. There's at least 200 acres of property at Sharp Park that could become wetlands for saving the frog. That's a gross revenue of about Six Hundred

⁴² Karen Swaim, Id.

⁴³ Congresswoman Jackie Speier, 12th U.S. Congressional District, Press Release, November 9, 2009: <http://speier.house.gov/index.cfm?sectionid=48&parentid=46§iontree=46,48&itemid=330>

Million Dollars. A fraction of that would be necessary to actually maintain the golf course itself. Let's presume that data is twice inflated, because of the decline in the economy over the past year: Three Hundred Million Dollars. Maybe it would take Ten Million to restore the landscape at Sharp Park. Put another Ten Million in trust in perpetuity to manage it forever, the rest of that is free money that can be spent on whatever the city desires."⁴⁴

However, Mr. Plater's proposal is not realistic, according to the November 6, 2009 "Financial Viability and Analysis" report of the Rec & Park Department's mitigation bank consultant, Westervelt Ecological Services.⁴⁵

Briefly summarized, the Westervelt Report says: (1) there is low likelihood that the federal and state regulatory agencies responsible for mitigation banks (e.g., the US Fish & Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish & Game) would allow hiking trails or any other public recreational use of mitigation bank property, because of potential conflicts with the threatened species; (2) mitigation banks have high up-front costs for construction and permitting, for which federal and state grant money is unavailable; (3) mitigation bank operation and maintenance costs would likely be high, requiring a large endowment to cover such costs in perpetuity; and (4) the prospects for sale of mitigation credits, and the price of such credits, are highly uncertain.

Testifying to the Rec & Park Commission on November 19, 2009, Westervelt Conservation Planner Lucy Triffleman emphasized the unlikelihood of the regulatory agencies allowing any public recreational use if Sharp Park were to be operated as a mitigation bank.

"... under the mitigation rules pretty much since the beginning of mitigation banking over a decade ago there has been an item in those regulations

⁴⁴ Park, Recreation and Open Space Advisory Committee (PROSAC) public meeting, July 7, 2009, audio (mp3) recording, at 1:29:35 to 1:30:44.

⁴⁵ Westervelt Ecological Services, "Financial Viability and Analysis, Sharp Park Mitigation Bank", etc., November 6, 2009: <http://www.parks.sfgov.org/wcm/recpark/SharpParkGC/Westerveltfinalrpt110609.pdf>

that say recreation would need to be excluded from mitigation banking and this is a component that the agencies have put in in order to maintain very high standards at mitigation or environmental offset areas. . . . So because of that at Sharp Park for example they feel like recreation on that property could injure animals including the SFGS and the Red-legged Frog due to take by bikes or OHB that sometimes has been observed on these properties and also on the GGNRA properties in the past. And the indirect effects of recreation that the agencies are very concerned about is the effect of dogs, particularly running through Laguna Salada, dislodging egg masses, or else chasing animals as they disperse across the upland habitat. So the likelihood of recreation occurring anywhere within a mitigation bank on Sharp Park is pretty low and it would probably mean the exclusion of recreation on the property if a mitigation bank was put there."⁴⁶

CONCLUSION:

**San Francisco Public Golf Alliance Supports
The "Win/Win" Option to Simultaneously
Renovate The Golf Course and Restore Habitat.**

Sharp Park is an historically-significant, heavily-used, much-loved 78-year-old golf course in need of renovation. There is an opportunity to create new and improved natural habitat at Sharp Park for threatened and endangered species. The Rec & Park Department's November 6, 2009 Report shows how both goals can be accomplished simultaneously, and the Department's scientific consultants recommend that preserving the golf course while enhancing habitat is both the best and the least expensive way to protect and preserve the frog and snake.

Anti-golf arguments that Sharp Park is historically insignificant, that it "loses money," and that golf and nature are incompatible at Sharp Park, have been investigated and rejected by every responsible entity that


⁴⁶ Lucy Triffleman, public testimony at Rec & Park Commission public hearing, November 19, 2009:
http://www.parks.sfgov.org/site/recpark_page.asp?id=115334

has investigated these matters--from the San Francisco Chronicle to PROSAC to the Rec & Park Commission.

Congresswoman Jackie Speier summarized in her November 9, 2009 Press Release supporting the Sharp Park Report: "... what is best for the threatened species is also the most cost-effective and best for the local community, who overwhelmingly support keeping the golf course at Sharp Park."⁴⁷

The San Francisco Public Golf Alliance, representing 4,000-plus mostly San Francisco and Peninsula golfers, encourages the Board of Supervisors to support the Rec & Park Commission's recommendation to move forward with a win/win solution to simultaneously restore the golf course and the frog and snake habitat at Sharp Park.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard Harris

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

APPENDIX

PARTIAL LIST OF SHARP PARK GOLF COURSE ENDORSEMENTS, AND CITED REFERENCES

Governmental Entities

City of Pacifica, Resolution of City Council, December 10, 2007: http://sharppark.savegolf.net/data/cop_res.pdf

County of San Mateo, Resolution of Board of Supervisors, December 18, 2007:
http://sharppark.savegolf.net/data/smbos_res.pdf

Congresswoman Jackie Speier, 12th U.S. Congressional District, Press Release, November 9, 2009:
<http://speier.house.gov/index.cfm?sectionid=48&parentid=46§iontree=46,48&itemid=330>

⁴⁷ Congresswoman Jackie Speier, 12th U.S. Congressional District, Press Release, November 9, 2009:
<http://speier.house.gov/index.cfm?sectionid=48&parentid=46§iontree=46,48&itemid=330>

Governmental Entities, cont.

San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsom, interviewed on KNBR Radio Show, "Murph & Mac in the Morning," December 10, 2009:
<http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=44820>

Environmental Organizations

Sierra Club, Loma Prieta Chapter (representing San Mateo, Santa Clara, and San Benito counties). Testimony of Merrill Bobele, co-chair, Coastal Issues Committee, Loma Prieta Chapter, Sierra Club, to Board of Supervisors' Govt. Audit & Oversight Committee, Dec. 16, 2009, S.F. Govt. TV, at 3:11:37:
http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=11

Labor Organizations

Laborers' Union Local 261:
Testimony of Zac Salem, Chair, Golf Committee, Laborers' Local 261, to Board of Supervisors' Govt. Audit & Oversight Committee, Dec. 16, 2009, S.F. Govt. TV, at 2:17:30:
http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=11

Historic Preservation Organizations

Cultural Landscape Foundation, Washington, D.C., July, 2009 (watch-listing Sharp Park as an at-risk, nationally-significant cultural landscape):
<http://www.tclf.org/landslides/sharp-park-golf-course-threatened-closure>

Civic Organizations

Pacifica Chamber of Commerce (undated):
<http://sharppark.savegolf.net/data/ChamberSupportSP.pdf>

Newspaper Editorial

San Francisco Chronicle, editorial, "Let Golfers Play Through on Sharp Park Golf Course," September 3, 2009:
<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/c/a/2009/09/03/EDN019GUJ6.DTL>

San Francisco Bay Guardian, "Golfers and Garter Snakes," Editor Tim Redmond, on-line comment, November 10, 2009:
<http://www.sfbg.com/politics/2009/11/10/golfers-and-garter-snakes>

Golf Organizations

Alistair MacKenzie Society, letter, April 28, 2009:
<http://www.pacificaripside.com/.a/6a00d8341c795b53ef01156f6f286c970c-pi>

World Golf Foundation, letter, July 23, 2009:
<http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=43233>

California Alliance for Golf, letter, September 28, 2009:
<http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=43245>

Golf Letters

Dan Wexler, letter, July 19, 2009:
[http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/recpark/meetings/Park Recreation and Open Space Advisory Committee %28PROSAC%29/supporting/2009/SFPGA.PDF](http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/recpark/meetings/Park%20Recreation%20and%20Open%20Space%20Advisory%20Committee%28PROSAC%29/supporting/2009/SFPGA.PDF)

Joe Faulkner, letter, July 31, 2009:
[http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/recpark/meetings/Park Recreation and Open Space Advisory Committee %28PROSAC%29/supporting/2009/Faulkner letter.pdf](http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/recpark/meetings/Park%20Recreation%20and%20Open%20Space%20Advisory%20Committee%28PROSAC%29/supporting/2009/Faulkner%20letter.pdf)

Ken Venturi, letter, October 12, 2009:
<http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=40561>

Mike DeVries, letter, November 18, 2009:
<http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=43267>

San Francisco Golf Studies

National Golf Foundation, "Operational Review and Recommendations for City of San Francisco Golf Operations, February, 2007:
<http://www.parks.sfgov.org/wcm/recpark/Golf/NGF/NGFFinal.pdf>

Leon Younger & PROS Consulting, "San Francisco Recreational Opportunities Study Summary Report," August, 2008:
[http://www.parks.sfgov.org/wcm/recpark/Golf Taskforce/Final report August 26 2008.pdf](http://www.parks.sfgov.org/wcm/recpark/Golf/Taskforce/Final%20report%20August%2026%202008.pdf)

Rec & Park Department, Sharp Park Financials, presented to PROSAC meeting, November 4, 2009:
<http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=43298>

Environmental Studies

Laguna Salada Resource Enhancement Plan, Philip Williams & Associates, June, 1992:

http://www.biologicaldiversity.org/campaigns/restoring_sharp_park_california/pdfs/PWALagunaSaladaResourceEnhancementPlan.pdf

National Sports and Golf Publications

Golf Club Atlas, "MacKenzie's Sharp Park Under Siege," by Bo Links and Richard Harris, September, 2009:

<http://golfclubatlas.com/in-my-opinion/sharp-park>

Golf World, "Sharply Divided," by Geoff Shackelford, July 20, 2009:

http://www.golfdigest.com/golfworld/columnists/2009/07/golf_sharp_park_shackelford_0720?printable=true

Sports Illustrated, "Sharp Elbows," by Curt Sampson, May 5, 2009:

http://www.golf.com/golf/courses_travel/article/0,28136,1895794-0,00.html

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN -3 PM 2:09

2010 Local Agency Biennial Notice

Name of Agency: BOARD OF APPEALS BY PN
Mailing Address: 1650 MISSION ST. #304
Contact Person: Cynthia Goldstein Office Phone No: 415-575-6880
E-mail: cynthia.goldstein@sfgov.org Fax No: 415-575-6885

This agency has reviewed its conflict-of-interest code and has determined that:

An amendment is required. The following amendments are necessary:
(Check all that apply.)

- Include new positions (including consultants) that must be designated.
- Delete positions that manage public investments from the list of designated positions.
- Revise disclosure categories.
- Revise the titles of existing positions.
- Delete titles of positions that have been abolished.
- Other (describe) _____

Code is currently under review by the code-reviewing body.

No amendment is required.

The agency's code accurately designates all positions that make or participate in the making of governmental decisions; the disclosure categories assigned to those positions accurately require the disclosure of all investments, business positions, interests in real property, and sources of income that may foreseeably be affected materially by the decisions made by those holding the designated positions; and the code includes all other provisions required by Government Code Section 87302.

Cynthia Goldstein
Signature of Chief Executive Officer

6-2-10
Date

Complete this notice regardless of how recently your code was approved or amended.

Please return this notice no later than **August 1, 2010**, via e-mail (PDF), inter-office mail, or fax to:

Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
ATTN: Peggy Nevin
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Fax: 554-5163

20
Forward to AS 6/3

2010 Local Agency Biennial Notice
Department of Child Support Services

Name of Agency: _____

Mailing Address: 617 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3503

Contact Person: Karen Roye Office Phone No: 415-356-2919

E-mail: karen.roye@sfgov.org Fax No: 415-356-2789

This agency has reviewed its conflict-of-interest code and has determined that:


An amendment is required. The following amendments are necessary:
(Check all that apply.)

- Include new positions (including consultants) that must be designated.
- Delete positions that manage public investments from the list of designated positions.
- Revise disclosure categories.
- Revise the titles of existing positions.
- Delete titles of positions that have been abolished.
- Other (describe) _____


Code is currently under review by the code-reviewing body.

No amendment is required.

The agency's code accurately designates all positions that make or participate in the making of governmental decisions; the disclosure categories assigned to those positions accurately require the disclosure of all investments, business positions, interests in real property, and sources of income that may foreseeably be affected materially by the decisions made by those holding the designated positions; and the code includes all other provisions required by Government Code Section 87302.



Signature of Chief Executive Officer




Date

Complete this notice regardless of how recently your code was approved or amended.

Please return this notice no later than **August 1, 2010**, via e-mail (PDF), inter-office mail, or fax to:

Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
ATTN: Peggy Nevin
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Fax: 554-5163

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN -3 PM 1:35
BY _____


ASV

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2010 JUN -3 AM 9:17

BY ME

2010 Local Agency Biennial Notice

Name of Agency: Civil Service Commission
Mailing Address: 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 720; SF, CA 94102
Contact Person: Sandra Eng Office Phone No: 415-252-3254
E-mail: sandra.eng@sfgov.org Fax No: 415-252-3260

This agency has reviewed its conflict-of-interest code and has determined that:

An amendment is required. The following amendments are necessary:


(Check all that apply.)

- Include new positions (including consultants) that must be designated.
- Delete positions that manage public investments from the list of designated positions.
- Revise disclosure categories.
- Revise the titles of existing positions.
- Delete titles of positions that have been abolished.
- Other *(describe)* _____

Code is currently under review by the code-reviewing body.

No amendment is required.

The agency's code accurately designates all positions that make or participate in the making of governmental decisions; the disclosure categories assigned to those positions accurately require the disclosure of all investments, business positions, interests in real property, and sources of income that may foreseeably be affected materially by the decisions made by those holding the designated positions; and the code includes all other provisions required by Government Code Section 87302.


Signature of Chief Executive Officer

June 2, 2010
Date

Complete this notice regardless of how recently your code was approved or amended.

Please return this notice no later than **August 1, 2010**, via e-mail (PDF), inter-office mail, or fax to:

Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
ATTN: Peggy Nevin
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Fax: 554-5163

ASV

2010 Local Agency Biennial Notice

Name of Agency: ELECTION
Mailing Address: 1 DR CARLTON B GOODLETT PL, #48
Contact Person: RACHEL GOSIENYIA Office Phone No: 554 4391
E-mail: rachel.gosienyia@sfgov.org Fax No: 554-7344

This agency has reviewed its conflict-of-interest code and has determined that:

An amendment is required. The following amendments are necessary:
(Check all that apply.)

- Include new positions (including consultants) that must be designated.
- Delete positions that manage public investments from the list of designated positions.
- Revise disclosure categories.
- Revise the titles of existing positions.
- Delete titles of positions that have been abolished.
- Other (describe) _____

Code is currently under review by the code-reviewing body.

No amendment is required.

The agency's code accurately designates all positions that make or participate in the making of governmental decisions; the disclosure categories assigned to those positions accurately require the disclosure of all investments, business positions, interests in real property, and sources of income that may foreseeably be affected materially by the decisions made by those holding the designated positions; and the code includes all other provisions required by Government Code Section 87302.

[Signature]
Signature of Chief Executive Officer

6/3/10
Date

Complete this notice regardless of how recently your code was approved or amended.

Please return this notice no later than August 1, 2010, via e-mail (PDF), inter-office mail, or fax to:

Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
ATTN: Peggy Nevin
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Fax: 554-5163

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN -3 AM 11:17
[Signature]

ASV

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2010 JUN -4 AM 9:41

2010 Local Agency Biennial Notice

BY JN

Name of Agency: Office of the Public Defender
Mailing Address: 555 Seventh Street, San Francisco, CA 94103
Contact Person: Teresa Caffese Office Phone No: 553-9315
E-mail: Teresa.Caffese@sfgov.org Fax No: 553-1607


This agency has reviewed its conflict-of-interest code and has determined that:

An amendment is required. The following amendments are necessary:
(Check all that apply.)

- Include new positions (including consultants) that must be designated.
- Delete positions that manage public investments from the list of designated positions.
- Revise disclosure categories.
- Revise the titles of existing positions.
- Delete titles of positions that have been abolished.
- Other (describe) _____

Code is currently under review by the code-reviewing body.

No amendment is required.
The agency's code accurately designates all positions that make or participate in the making of governmental decisions; the disclosure categories assigned to those positions accurately require the disclosure of all investments, business positions, interests in real property, and sources of income that may foreseeably be affected materially by the decisions made by those holding the designated positions; and the code includes all other provisions required by Government Code Section 87302.



Signature of Chief Executive Officer

6/3/10

Date

Complete this notice regardless of how recently your code was approved or amended.

Please return this notice no later than August 1, 2010, via e-mail (PDF), inter-office mail, or fax to:

Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
ATTN: Peggy Nevin
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Fax: 554-5163



Jmtornese@aol.com
06/02/2010 05:35 PM

To Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org, Sophie.Maxwell@sfgov.org,
Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org, Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org,
Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org, Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org,

cc

bcc

Subject Unfunded Public Employee Pension Obligations

The pension and health care benefits of city employees and retirees is crushing the budget and public services for the City of San Francisco. Something needs to be done IMMEDIATELY to reduce these costs or they will overwhelm the City and the taxpayers. It is absurd that San Francisco retirees get 75 to 90% of their salaries plus full health coverage. For this, they pay anywhere from nothing to 7.5% of their salaries into the retirement fund.

We support a charter amendment on the November ballot that would ease this burden by limiting the growth of pensions and require employees to pay more toward their highly generous pension benefits and also pay at least 25% of their retiree health coverage. San Francisco will go broke if these costs are not controlled.

WE NEED RETIREE PENSION REFORM NOW !!!

**Judith Tornese and Jerry Winters
224 Arguello Blvd.
San Francisco, Ca. 94118**

21



Mark Mushkat
<mmushkat@gmail.com>
06/01/2010 10:16 AM

To Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, gavin.newsom@sfgov.org
cc
bcc
Subject Please stop supporting golf at Sharp Park

We can't afford it and neither can the environment.
thanks
Mark Mushkat
San Francisco, CA

22

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/03/2010 04:14 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Sharp Park Golf Course



Suzanne Byron
<eatgreensnotcattle@gmail.com>
06/02/2010 03:38 PM

To Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, gavin.newsom@sfgov.org
cc
Subject Sharp Park Golf Course

Dear City Representatives,

As a resident of San Francisco I advise the discontinuation of subsidizing Sharp Park Golf Course. I am not comfortable with my tax dollars going toward destroying habitat for endangered species.

Pacifica could greatly use a National Park. Converting the golf course into a protected part of the GGNRA will bring tourism and recreation for locals. The golf course is an exclusive use of the land. Only golfers benefit. A National Park benefits all involved! People, nature, and the endangered species. We can all live in harmony but we first must subsidizing a bottomless pit. Please make the best decision for our future generations. We are counting on you.

Truly,

Suzanne Byron
573 40th Avenue
San Francisco 94121
415 699 8515

22

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/03/2010 05:24 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Tree Cut On Croaker Court At Treasure Island On Sunday
Morning, May 30, 2010



Morris Bibliowicz
<mbibliow@gmail.com>
06/01/2010 10:23 PM

To Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject Tree Cut On Croaker Court At Treasure Island On Sunday
Morning, May 30, 2010

Dear Sirs,

Please be alerted to the fact that there has been yet another tree cut down on Croaker Court on Treasure Island. This is the fifth tree that has been unjustifiably cut since I have been residing at this address. The tree was not in any danger of falling down, the tree was not sick. It had lost a limb due to improper recent trimming, and could have been trimmed to rebalance its looks and left in place.

The trees on Croaker court have not been properly trimmed in over five years. A few months back, the bottom half of the trees were trimmed, leaving the top half untouched. This creates a potentially dangerous situation, one in which other limbs are likely to break off and possibly hurt residents or pedestrians on the court. Will the people responsible for the proper care of these trees continue to cut them down when other limbs fall off?

It is unconscionable that instead of trimming properly these beautiful old trees, the people who have been trusted with their custodianship are acting as their worst enemies. The administration at The Villages at Treasure Island, under The John Steward Company, finds it easier and more expedient, to cut down at its will these beautiful old trees than to trim and maintain them. There has never been an effort to replace any of the trees cut.

The City and County of San Francisco has a Public-Works ordinance protecting trees from being trimmed excessively, or taken down entirely. There is a fine for cutting down trees without a permit. Has the Villages at Treasure Island applied for a permit to cut any of these trees?

Where is the accountability? Will we continue to have trees cut at the will of an administrator? Please help save the trees. These trees should be trimmed and maintained properly, not cut down. If a tree is cut down, it should be replaced by another one.

Sincerely,

Morris Bibliowicz


23

415-986-2337
mbibliow@gmail.com

Cc

Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org
Chris.Daly@sfgov.org,
Bord.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org,
SFUrbanForestCouncil@sfgov.org
T.I. Development Authority
jscosf@jsco.net

Highway 101 Traffic Volumes




Source: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/saferesr/trafdata/index.htm>

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2010 JUN -2 AM 9:10

BY AK

Dear Board of Supervisors
The Supportive Housing Employment Collaborative (SHEC) helps people in my community return to the workforce.



This budget cycle, please protect this important resource that saves the City money by moving people towards meaningful work.

SAVE OUR SHEC!

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mark Lora".

Street Address: 420 Berry St, #418
SF, CA 94158

Phone:

Email:

klavaca@gmail.com

To:

SF Board Of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mayor Gavin Newsom:

Services at Supportive Housing sites help people remain housed and save our city money by reducing visits to the hospital, shelter stays, and incarceration.

Please work to protect Supportive Housing services in the 2010-2011 budget.

Sincerely,

Chrysanthe Hyplus

Street Address: 684 E 11th St. #503

San Francisco CA 94109

Phone:

415-368-4683

Email:

chp@hypplus.org

community
housing
partnership



USA FIRST-CLASS FOREVER


District #62

To:

SF Board Of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/04/2010 11:32 AM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Government Barometer April 2010



Performance
Con/CON/SFGOV
Sent by: Keith DeMartini
06/04/2010 08:54 AM

To Performance Con/CON/SFGOV@SFGOV
cc
Subject Government Barometer April 2010

Colleagues,

This is an internal distribution to key City contacts of the Office of the Controller's April 2010 Government Barometer (file below). The report will be distributed to the public early next week.

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



CON Government Barometer 2010 April Draft v1.pdf

Keith DeMartini
City Services Auditor, Performance Measurement Program
General Support Phone: 415-554-5391
Email: Performance.CON@sfgov.org
Intranet: <http://budget.sfgov.org/>
Internet: www.sfgov.org/controller/performance

26

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



Activity or Performance Measure	Apr-2009	Feb-2010	Apr-2010	Period-to-Period		Year-to-Year	
				% Change	Trend	% Change	Trend
Public Safety							
Total number of serious violent crimes reported (homicide, forcible rape, robbery and aggravated assault, per 100,000 population)	57.6	56.5	52.0	-8.0%	Positive	-9.7%	Positive
Total number of serious property crimes reported (burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson, per 100,000 population)	339.1	292.3	317.9	8.8%	Negative	-6.3%	Positive
Percentage of fire/medical emergency calls responded to within 5 minutes	91.4%	88.1%	88.5%	0.5%	Neutral	-3.2%	Negative
Average daily county jail population	1,957	2,002	1,680	-16.1%	Positive	-14.2%	Positive
Percentage of 9-1-1 calls answered within 10 seconds	91%	92%	91%	-1.1%	Negative	0.0%	Neutral
Average 9-1-1 daily call volume	1,247	1,399	1,413	1.0%	Neutral	13.3%	Negative
Health, Human Services, and Employment							
Average daily population of San Francisco General Hospital	405	415	420	1.2%	Negative	3.7%	Negative
Average daily population of Laguna Honda Hospital	766	761	763	0.3%	Neutral	-0.4%	Neutral
Total number of Healthy San Francisco participants	39,761	50,768	52,477	3.4%	Positive	32.0%	Positive
New patient wait time in days for an appointment at a DPH primary care clinic	22	25	23	-8.0%	Positive	4.5%	Negative
Percentage of all available homeless shelter beds used	89.5%	89.0%	91.0%	2.2%	Positive	1.7%	Neutral
Average nightly homeless shelter bed use	1,050	1,091	1,085	-0.5%	Neutral	3.3%	Negative
Total number of children in foster care	1,486	1,363	1,401	2.8%	Negative	-5.7%	Positive
Streets and Public Works							
Average score of streets inspected using street maintenance litter standards (1 = acceptably clean to 3 = very dirty)	2.22	2.10	2.05	-2.4%	Positive	-7.7%	Positive
Percentage of street cleaning requests responded to within 48 hours	92.7%	92.0%	92.0%	0.0%	Neutral	-0.8%	Neutral
Percentage of graffiti requests on public property responded to within 48 hours	43.3%	13.0%	85.0%	553.8%	Positive	96.3%	Positive
Percentage of pothole requests repaired within 72 hours	69.7%	30.0%	35.0%	16.7%	Positive	-49.8%	Negative

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



Activity or Performance Measure	Apr-2009	Feb-2010	Apr-2010	Period-to-Period		Year-to-Year	
				% Change	Trend	% Change	Trend
Public Transit							
Percentage of MUNI buses and trains that adhere to posted schedules	74.5%	72.9%	73.8%	1.2%	Positive	-0.9%	Neutral
Average daily number of MUNI customer complaints regarding safety, negligence, discourtesy, and service delivery	72.8	71.1	65.8	-7.5%	Positive	-9.6%	Positive
Recreation, Arts, and Culture							
Average score of parks inspected using park maintenance standards	88.0%	91.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total number of individuals currently registered in recreation courses	11,307	7,093	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total number of park facility (picnic tables, sites, recreation facilities, fields, etc.) bookings	9,027	11,258	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total number of visitors at public fine art museums (Asian Art Museum, Legion of Honor, de Young)	167,992	225,437	159,881	-29.1%	Negative	-4.8%	Negative
Total circulation of materials at main and branch libraries	837,709	839,752	920,821	9.7%	Positive	9.9%	Positive
Environment, Energy, and Utilities							
Drinking water reservoirs storage as a percentage of normal for this month	106.3%	122.0%	123.0%	0.8%	Neutral	15.7%	Positive
Average monthly water use by City departments (in millions of gallons)	138.4	127.5	124.6	-2.3%	Positive	-10.0%	Positive
Average daily residential per capita water usage (in gallons)	53.0	51.2	51.0	-0.5%	Neutral	-3.7%	Positive
Average monthly energy usage by City departments (in million kilowatt hours)	73.5	72.4	72.2	-0.2%	Neutral	-1.7%	Neutral
Average daily tons of garbage going to landfill	1,144.6	1,020.4	1,035.0	1.4%	Negative	-9.6%	Positive
Percentage of total solid waste diverted from landfill through curbside recycling	49.9%	53.2%	57.0%	7.1%	Positive	14.2%	Positive

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



Activity or Performance Measure	Apr-2009	Feb-2010	Apr-2010	Period-to-Period		Year-to-Year	
				% Change	Trend	% Change	Trend
Permitting and Inspection							
Value (estimated cost, in millions) of construction projects for which new building permits were issued	\$121.0	\$64.4	\$112.0	73.9%	Positive	-7.5%	Negative
Percentage of all building permits involving new construction and major alterations review that are approved or disapproved within 60 days	57%	55%	53%	-3.6%	Negative	-7.0%	Negative
Percentage of all applications for variance from the Planning Code decided within 120 days	56%	30%	44%	46.7%	Positive	-21.4%	Negative
Percentage of life hazard or lack of heat complaints responded to within one business day	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	Neutral	0.0%	Neutral
Percentage of customer-requested construction permit inspections completed within two business days of requested date	93.0%	95.0%	97.0%	2.1%	Positive	4.3%	Positive
Customer Service							
Average daily number of 311 calls	10,804	8,913	7,843	-12.0%	Negative	-27.4%	Negative
Percentage of 311 calls answered by call takers within 60 seconds	77.6%	74.5%	83.4%	11.9%	Positive	7.5%	Positive
Quality score of 311 call takers	97%	97%	97%	0.0%	Neutral	0.0%	Neutral

Notes:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Values for prior periods (February 2010 or April 2009) may be revised in this report relative to their original publication in the barometer.

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



Activity or Performance Measure	Department	Performance Pattern	Measure Description	Measure Technical Description
Public Safety				
Total number of serious violent crimes reported (homicide, forcible rape, robbery and aggravated assault, per 100,000 population)	Police	Trending down is positive	Number of offenses divided by 100,000 population. Uniform Crime Report (UCR) violent crimes are: homicide, forcible rape, robbery and aggravated assault.	Collection Method: Number of UCR Violent Part I crimes divided by current San Francisco population and multiplied by 100,000. Population FY 2008: 829,848, FY 2009 & FY 2010: 842,625 (CA Dept of Finance E-2 Report). Timing: Monthly.
Total number of serious property crimes reported (burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson, per 100,000 population)	Police	Trending down is positive	Number of crimes divided by 100,000 population. UCR Part I property crimes are burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft and arson.	Collection Method: Number of Part I Property crimes divided by current San Francisco population and multiplied by 100,000. Population FY 2008: 829,848, FY2009 & FY2010: 842,625 (Source: CA Department of Finance, E-2 Report). Timing: Monthly.
Percentage of fire/medical emergency calls responded to within 5 minutes	Fire	Trending up is positive	Percentage of all incidents responded to in under five minutes (total response time (critical response interval (CRI)) from call intake to arrival on scene of first unit). Includes all calls the Department responds to with lights and sirens, not just those requiring possible medical care.	Raw data is stored at Department of Emergency Management and aggregated at Fire Department headquarters.
Average daily county jail population	Sheriff	Trending down is positive	Overcrowding creates security and safety issues for the Department and drives costs in many directions. Approximately 75% of those jailed are pretrial felony prisoners, who either cannot be released or cannot make bail. Housing such prisoners can require greater security precautions. An average daily population above the rated capacity can also drive demand for additional facilities.	Collection Method: Average Daily Population (ADP) is compiled by Sheriff's staff from reports issued daily from each jail. Records are located in City Hall, Room 456. Timing: Data available 5am daily. Population represents all in-custody people.
Percentage of 9-1-1 calls answered within 10 seconds	Emergency Management	Trending up is positive	The State of California 9-1-1 Office recommends that all 9-1-1 calls are answered within 10 seconds. There is no state or federal mandate. Our Center strives to answer 90% of all 9-1-1 calls within 10 seconds.	Collection Method: All calls introduced through the 9-1-1 State switch are captured in an automatic telephone call distribution system produced by Nortel Networks. This system analyzes the time it takes from the call to hit the message switch, then time it takes for our call takers to answer and process the call for service. All equipment housed at 1011 Turk.
Average 9-1-1 daily call volume	Emergency Management	Trending down is positive	This number represents the number of 9-1-1 telephone calls received and presented to the San Francisco Division of Emergency Communications on a daily basis.	Our statistics are continuously collected by our Nortel Network equipment. This information is collated daily and composed into weekly, monthly, and annual reports to reflect the call volume thus allowing us to allocate staff as needed.
Health, Human Services, and Employment				
Average daily population of San Francisco General Hospital	Public Health	Trending down is positive	The daily count of patients at SFGH (aka: Average Daily Census or ADC) is the number of admitted inpatients at SFGH at approximately 12 midnight, when the census is taken. This measure totals the daily census for a month, divided by the number of days in the month. The measure separates the average monthly census by services (acute medical/surgical, acute psychiatry, skilled nursing, and long-term behavioral health) and also provides the total for the hospital.	The daily count is tracked by the Hospital's computer system - SMS Invision Clinical Data System; maintained by DPH Community Health Network/SFGH. The reporting database is updated monthly, within 10 days of the following month. The data is 99% reliable within one month. Reports are run on an ad hoc basis.
Average daily population of Laguna Honda Hospital	Public Health	Trending down is positive	Laguna Honda Hospital (LHH) is a long-term care facility that provides a residential setting for physically or cognitively impaired individuals who require continuous nursing assistance, rehabilitation services, medical care, and monitoring. LHH also offers acute care for those patients whose condition changes to require this level of care. The daily count of patients (aka: Average Daily Census or ADC) is the total number of residents in-house at LHH at the time the census is taken each day.	Admissions, discharges, and transfers (relocations) are entered into the Invision Clinical Data System when any of these activities occur. Reports for ADC data (from Invision) can be generated for daily, monthly and/or quarterly basis. Numbers are drawn from the Monthly Average Census Report, using the SNF Occupied + M7A + L4A columns.
Total number of Healthy San Francisco participants	Public Health	Trending up is positive	This number represents enrollees in the Healthy San Francisco program (HSF). HSF is a comprehensive health coverage program for uninsured San Francisco residents, age 18 through 64 years old. Enrollment first began in July 2007 for lower income residents and has grown as more health clinic sites joined and as enrollment requirements expanded. This measure was added to the system in January 2009.	The enrollment number is derived from the One-E-App program. One-E-App is a web-based eligibility and enrollment application and system of record for Healthy San Francisco. Reports are run monthly and ad hoc.

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



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

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



Activity or Performance Measure	Department	Performance Pattern	Measure Description	Measure Technical Description
Recreation, Arts, and Culture				
Average score of parks inspected using park maintenance standards	Recreation and Parks	Trending up is positive	The average rating for neighborhood parks category only (i.e. an average of the neighborhood parks' percentages for meeting parks standards). The ratings for Neighborhood Parks have been chosen to be included as a performance measure as they represent the majority of RPD property types, include almost all park features rated, and are geographically dispersed throughout the City	Collection Method: RPD staff conducts quarterly park evaluations. Hard copies turned in to clerical staff for data entry into Park Evaluations database. Hard copies kept on file by clerical staff. Data Location: Park Evaluations Database. "Neighborhood Parks" is an established category of City parks and broken out in the current database reports (BY PARK TYPE BY DISTRICT REPORT). Timing: This data is available quarterly, no more than 30 days after the previous quarter end. For the barometer report, data is reported on a quarterly basis and 1 month in arrears.
Total number of individuals currently registered in recreation courses	Recreation and Parks	Trending up is positive	Measure indicates number of program participants for all age categories. It includes all recreation programs except aquatics programs. This number will establish a baseline standard that needs to be tracked in order to understand participation trends in programs overall. We will also be able to calculate the proportion of program participants by each age category.	Collection Method: CLASS recreation management software records all individuals (termed clients within the CLASS system) registered for any kind of program RPD offers. Timing: CLASS implementation launched in January 2007, with preliminary data available in May 2007. Data is now available quarterly, based on RPD's new annual program calendar with 4 sessions (Spring, Summer, Fall, Winter). Baseline data will be captured in FY 08 and 09 and the Department will begin to set targets in FY 10. For the barometer report, data is reported on a quarterly basis and 1 month in arrears.
Total number of park facility (picnic tables, sites, recreation facilities, fields, etc.) bookings	Recreation and Parks	Trending up is positive	Measure indicates number of park facilities being booked.	Collection Method: CLASS recreation management software currently only has the capacity to measure field permitting. Information about picnic table rentals, indoor recreation center bookings, and other types of facility rentals will be available in CLASS beginning in 2010. For the barometer report, data is reported on a quarterly basis and 1 month in arrears.
Total number of visitors at public fine art museums (Asian Art Museum, Legion of Honor, de Young)	Fine Arts Museums and Asian Art Museum	Trending up is positive	This measure aggregates data from 3 separate measures for the Asian Art Museum, Legion of Honor, and de Young Museum.	CON to manually calculate measure from data entered directly into PM system.
Total circulation of materials at main and branch libraries	Public Library	Trending up is positive	Number of items (books and other materials) circulated to the public (children, youth & adults) from all libraries.	Collection Method: Statistics generated from the Library's automated circulation system; Information Technology Division. Timing: Reports are generated monthly. For barometer, add both branch & main library measures together.
Environment, Energy, and Utilities				
Drinking water reservoirs storage as a percentage of normal for this month	Public Utilities Commission	Trending up is positive	Beginning of month total system storage (i.e. Hetch Hetchy, Cherry, Eleanor, Water Bank, Calaveras, San Antonio, Crystal Springs, San Andreas, Pilarcitos) as percentage of long-term median (water year 1968 to 2007).	The long-term median of total system storage at the beginning of the month was calculated using data stored in Form 11 for Hetch Hetchy Division and in WISKI database for Water Supply & Treatment Division for water years 1968 to 2007 (40-year period). 1968 was selected as the first year for the calculation to include San Antonio Reservoir. The current beginning of month total system storage is reported as a percentage of the long-term median.
Average monthly water use by City departments (in millions of gallons)	Public Utilities Commission	Trending down is positive	12-month rolling monthly average of total water use by City departments, in million gallons.	12-month rolling monthly average computed from total monthly amount of billed water usage for municipal departments per report 892-Monthly Sales and Revenue, converted to million gallons.
Average daily residential per capita water usage (in gallons)	Public Utilities Commission	Trending down is positive	Annual rolling average of daily residential water use per person.	Daily per capita usage computed using twelve months of city residential usage per report 892-Monthly Sales and Revenue, divided by 365 and estimated 2009 population of 818,887, the 2008 US Census number multiplied by the 2008 growth rate.
Average monthly energy usage by City departments (in million kilowatt hours)	Public Utilities Commission	Trending down is positive	Energy use by City departments in kilowatt hours (kWh) in millions for the month based on 12-month rolling average	Energy use by City departments in kilowatt hours (kWh) in millions for the month based on 12-month rolling average and maintained in our Electric Billing System.
Average daily tons of garbage going to landfill	Environment	Trending down is positive	Average daily tons of garbage going to landfill.	Total materials San Francisco sends to landfill, calculated by dividing the monthly tonnage by the number of days in the month. Universe is municipal, residential, commercial, industrial.
Percentage of total solid waste diverted from landfill through curbside recycling	Environment	Trending up is positive	Percentage of total solid waste diverted from landfill through curbside recycling.	Percentage of recycling (blue cart) and compostables (green cart) collected, factored against disposal tonnage (black cart). Universe is residential and small commercial customers.

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



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

Performance Pattern Notes:

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



"Moy, Barbara"
<Barbara.Moy@sfdpw.org>
06/04/2010 11:21 AM

To Board of Supervisors <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc "Mirkarimi, Ross" <Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org>, "Lee, Frank
W" <Frank.W.Lee@sfdpw.org>
bcc
Subject FW: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY # 20100427-006

I am responding to Supervisor Mirkarimi's inquiry on sidewalk defects, as follows:

On Steiner & Golden Gate, South of Golden Gate, east side of street.

On 5/4/10, inspection was conducted along the south side of Golden Gate from Steiner to Fillmore. The following conditions and / or defects were noted:

* 1355 Golden Gate: Noted 135 sq. ft. of damaged sidewalk, 12 lin. ft. of damaged curb, low soil level in tree basins, and damaged PG&E utility cover and surrounding sidewalk. Notifications issued to Bureau of Urban Forestry and PG&E to initiate corrective action.

* 1395 Golden Gate: Noted 63 sq. ft. of damaged sidewalk and damaged AT&T utility box cover. Notifications issued to Bureau of Urban Forestry and AT&T to initiate corrective action.

* 1395 Golden Gate, Steiner frontage: Sidewalk repairs have been completed around three City Trees.

* 1099 Fillmore: Noted 81 sq. ft. of damaged sidewalk and low soil in tree basins. Notifications issued to Bureau of Urban Forestry to initiate corrective action.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Barbara L. Moy
DPW Bureau of Street Use and Mapping.

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

From: Board of Supervisors
Sent: Friday, April 30, 2010 10:44 AM
To: Reiskin, Ed
Subject: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY

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

TO: Edward Reiskin
Public Works

FROM: Clerk of the Board
DATE: 4/30/2010
REFERENCE: 20100427-006
FILE NO.

Due Date: 5/30/2010

27

This is an inquiry from a member of the Board of Supervisors made at the Board meeting on 4/27/2010.

Supervisor Mirkarimi requests the following information:

Requesting the Department of Public Works to report on the status of repairing potholes and sidewalk issues at the following locations: On Steiner & Golden Gate, South of Golden Gate, east side of street.

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

Your response to this inquiry is requested by 5/30/2010

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/07/2010 11:59 AM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Laguna Honda Hospital suddenly excludes members of the
public from attending its town hall meetings



pmonette-shaw
<Pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net>

06/04/2010 08:16 PM

Please respond to
Pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net

To undisclosed-recipients;
cc
Subject Laguna Honda Hospital suddenly excludes members of the
public from attending its town hall meetings

Laguna Honda Hospital and Rehabilitation Center has suddenly decided to exclude members of the public from attending its town hall meetings.

A prominent San Franciscan says, "After two years of arm twisting by neighbors demanding LHH hold community meetings, now we can't even get return calls or email replies. Denying us access to community meetings to ask whether our donations to the Patient Gift Fund and Volunteers, Inc. have been misappropriated is an affront."

Read my new article at <http://www.examiner.com/x-50587-SF-Hospital-Examiner>.

And if you haven't already subscribed to receive e-mail alerts when I post new articles, please do so. Examiner.com doesn't permit me to see who has subscribed, so not to worry.

Patrick

28



pmonette-shaw
<Pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net>

06/03/2010 08:39 PM

Please respond to
Pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net

To undisclosed-recipients;

cc

bcc

Subject Laguna Honda Hospital deliberately removed patient rep's
from gift fund oversight committee in 2004

Within five minutes of posting my new article "Laguna Honda Hospital deliberately removed patient rep's from gift fund oversight committee in 2004," I received an "alert" that Google had picked up the story.

Check it out at <http://www.examiner.com/x-50587-SF-Hospital-Examiner>.

Patrick

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/03/2010 03:24 PM

To Ross Mirkarimi/BOS/SFGOV, Jeremy Pollock/BOS/SFGOV,
Jason Fried/BOS/SFG,
cc
bcc
Subject Fw: No on City-Run Power



"Joe Cline"
<jwdc56@msn.com>
05/31/2010 09:40 AM

To "Mayor of San Francisco" <gavin.newsom@sfgov.org>,
"Board of Supervisors" <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
Subject No on City-Run Power

Please do not support a City take-over of electric power ...risk-reward is not good. Joe Cline. San Francisco.

29



Rita August O'Flynn
<rita_august@msn.com>
05/28/2010 04:31 PM

To <kristineenea@gmail.com>, <az@zulpc.com>, <auweia1@gmail.com>, <home@prosf.org>, <winfieldnate@gmail.com>, <dshoemaker@sfgov.org>, <districtattorney@sfgov.org>, <trent.rhorer@sfgov.org>, <controller@sfgov.org>, <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>, <assessor@sfgov.org>, bcc
Subject More Information RE: City Must Investigate Tenderloin Housing Clinic Potential Non-Compliance with MOCI/ MOH Grant Terms and Conditions

Rather than send over several e-mail, I have provided the following summary of the Tenderloin Housing Clinic's non-compliance with their grants with the City.

I have copies of several of the THC's grant agreements with the City. The THC appears to be grossly non-compliant with several provisions such as the following:

1. Each of the City contracts with the THC specifically states: *"no funds appropriated by the City for this Agreement may be expended for organizing, creating, funding, participating in, supporting, or attempting to influence any political campaign for a candidate or for a ballot measure."* BeyondChron, the online news service of the Tenderloin Housing Clinic is rife with blatant violations of this contractual requirement (examples previously circulated and available upon request).
2. Each of the City contracts with the THC specifically states, *"Within sixty (60) days following the end of each Fiscal Year, Grantee shall deliver to City an unaudited balance sheet and the related statements of income and cash flows for such Fiscal Year, in all reasonable detail acceptable to City, certified by an appropriate financial officer of the Grantee as accurately presenting the financial position of the Grantee."* The THC has admitted that they did not prepare this for the most recent fiscal year and I don't believe they have ever been compliant with this contingency. The City agencies granting the funds to THC do not have any unaudited financial statements from the THC on file. Timing is important and interesting as the THC renews or is newly awarded grants within the first 3 months of a calendar year without benefit of the unaudited financial reports and in prior to the receipt of the audited financial report.
3. Until recently, the THC had documented significant lobbying expenses on their audited financial reports (I have some of these). When Supervisor Alliotto-Pier asked for an investigation as to whether City funds were used for THC's lobbying activities, she was shut down by Randy Shaw (head of THC and BeyondChron) (I have a copy of the letter sent Shaw sent to Alliotto-Pier) and the request for investigation was not taken any further by the City.
4. Many of the City contracts with the THC, usually those involving HUD funding, specifically states, *"Program income shall be substantially disbursed for eligible activities before additional cash disbursements may be requested under this Agreement."* For the fiscal year ending 2007 and 2008, THC reported Attorney Fees Receivable of approximately \$100,000 for the fiscal years of 2007 and 2008. The City has no documentation to show that these fees were used by the THC to further grant-related activities prior to drawing down additional grant funds from the City.
5. Each of the City contracts with the THC specifically states, *"Any services to be provided by a law firm or attorney must be reviewed and approved in writing in advance by the City Attorney"*. If you go on the SF Superior Court, Civil Court Website and search by name using Tenderloin Housing Clinic, you will see extensive

30

legal activity by the Tenderloin Housing Clinic, including evictions and lawsuits against the City; none of which have been approved in writing by the City Attorney. It should be noted that, nowhere in the budgets provided for grant consideration does the Tenderloin Housing Clinic mention the hundreds of thousands of dollars it spends on outside attorneys to evict tenants from the buildings they manage; the THC is, in fact, one of the most prolific evictors of the disadvantaged. The THC's most recent law suit against the City was to claim damages over the fact that the City awarded a grant to another agency to manage a small, women's only SRO. The case is closed but it raised questions as to whether the THC used any City funding to sue the City.

Each of the grant agreements allow for auditing by the City as well as a wide range of penalties for non-compliance. I have copies of the City's audit reports of the THC for the fiscal years 2007 and 2008. The report for 2007 raises considerable concerns regarding the THC and while the 2008 report seems to just gloss over things that the audited financial reports say are ongoing. No action has been taken by any of the City departments in regards to THC's non-compliance.

This is just the tip of the iceberg for the THC. We are talking about over \$100 million in grants (much of it Federal money given to the City) the City gives to the THC (this doesn't include the interest free loans the City makes to THC which will be "forgiven" as long as they are compliant with the terms and conditions of those loans). I have made the City Attorney aware of these repeated acts of non-compliance with contracts, but no action has been taken. Openly progressive, the THC, through BeyondChron, is very influential in City politics and policy and as this is an election year, the City may be a little gun shy of the THC. With the City facing billions of dollars in deficits and cuts to essential services, the public should be interested in the blind eye the City is turning to this matter.

I thought you might find it amusing that, City Attorney, Dennis Herrera, who is planning a run for Mayor, stated in BeyondChron that, the City expects grantees "to live up to their obligations" or his office will take action. Let's see some action.

Your support of an investigation into the Tenderloin Housing Clinic's non-compliance with their City contracts is needed. Please e-mail, the City Attorney, Douglas Shoemaker, and Trent Rhorer voicing your concern regarding the Tenderloin Housing Clinic and support for investigation.

Rita O'Flynn 415-386-8224 Cell: 415-260-7608

From: rita_august@msn.com
To: kristineenea@gmail.com; az@zulpc.com; auweia1@gmail.com; home@prosf.org; winnfieldnate@gmail.com; dwasserman@wassermanstern.com
CC: dshoemaker@sfgov.org; districtattorney@sfgov.org; trent.rhorer@sfgov.org; controller@sfgov.org; board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org; assessor@sfgov.org; jcote@sfchronicle.com; matierandross@sfchronicle.com; jvanderbeken@sfchronicle.com; cityinsider@sfchronicle.com; cityattorney@sfgov.org; jack.song@sfgov.org; matt.dorsey@sfgov.org; matthew.smith@sfweekly.com; hotline@hudoig.gov; gavin.newsom@sfgov.org; kathleen@koipolloi.com
Subject: City Must Investigate Tenderloin Housing Clinic Potential Non-Compliance with MOCI/ MOH Grant Terms and Conditions
Date: Fri, 28 May 2010 16:11:39 -0700

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/03/2010 03:22 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Drug Checks for Cab Drivers



John Adams
<johnadamsf2000@hotmail.com>
05/30/2010 07:25 PM

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

Sirs/Madams,

San Francisco Cab drivers do not have any kind of drug checks. Annual drug checks for cab drivers should be instituted immediately. I am a resident of San Francisco since 1974 and I have been driving cars all these years until now. I do not drive anymore. I take cabs everyday now and I am shocked drivers do street drugs right there in their taxicabs. I have volunteered in a number of drug rehabilitation programs and I am familiar with street drugs very well -including their smells- and drug addicts' behavioral patterns and problems.

It is shocking to me that even after living in this city for over 35 years I never found out about drivers' drug usage at work or that there is no drug checks until now. I seldom took cabs.

Many cities and states have mandatory annual drug checks for cab drivers. Annual drug checks plus surprise drug checks on cab drivers should be made law. With lots of taxicabs and proportionately higher number of taxicab accidents it is highly necessary that drivers with healthy bodies, minds and healthy spirits do this challenging job.

What also surprises me is that most commercial drivers in the country go through drug checks regularly and how come San Francisco has been so negligent?

Sincerely,
John Adams

John Adams
3234 Jackson Street
San Francisco CA 94115

Hotmail has tools for the New Busy. Search, chat and e-mail from your inbox. [Learn more.](#)

31



Francisco Da Costa
<fdc1947@gmail.com>
05/30/2010 08:25 AM

To Stanley Muraoka <Stanley.Muraoka@sfgov.org>, Bill Wycko
<bill.wycko@sfgov.org>, John Rahaim
<john.rahaim@sfgov.org>, Lisa Gibson

cc

bcc

Subject Responses and Comments to the Draft, EIR.

**Responses and Comments to the Draft EIR -
linked to Hunters Point Shipyard and Candlestick
Point. Many of my previous comments missing.
This report that is devoid of any standard. Lacks
a Transportation Document that is valid. Large areas
not mapped and therefore cannot be zoned In short
fails to address Quality of Life issues, huge impacts to the
surrounding area with the increase of population and
the adverse impacts - these impacts bring with them.**

**Cumulative pollution, more radiological in nature.
20,000 tons of methane gas spews per year in the area.
One ton of methane gas equals twenty two tons of
carbon dioxide. Over 80 dangerous radiological elements,
registered at high levels. This impacts the entire San Francisco
area and all San Franciscans. Go figure.**

**There is no mention of the Precautionary Principle - that is law
in the books of the City and County of San Francisco.**

**During the holidays we had to review over 4000 pages.
Now, 6000 pages in a couple of weeks. Who is behind
this plot to fast track, failing to address serious issues linked
to a Superfund Site. More prone to liquefaction and
flooding. One critical factor - the Cultural Resources
factors have been ignored again and this is a crying shame.
The Muwekma Ohlone the First People and other fair minded
people have protested - failing to first acknowledge the First
People and secondly leave them out of the equation.**

www.muwekma.org

**No one has money to waste in this economic climate. There
is a glut of housing, thousands of homes in fore-closure. Who
wants to buy a house and you cannot dig in your backyard.
Cannot go near the waterfront - notices will be placed debarring
any one to go near many area - ripe with radiological contaminants.
Waivers will have to signed and those that risk living on the Shipyard**

32

will slowly die of Cancer and other ailments that many are now already experiencing living near the Shipyard but outside the boundary.

Right now besides Parcel A all of the land at the Shipyard come under the jurisdiction of the United States Navy. The Navy must clean the Shipyard as mandated in Proposition P - passed by a margin of 87% of all San Franciscans. Prop P mandates the entire Shipyard be cleaned to the highest standards.

Those in charge at SF Planning and SF Redevelopment Agency have failed the constituents of San Francisco. Shame on you all.

<http://www.franciscodacosta.org/articles/environ126.html>

Francisco Da Costa

**4909 Third Street
San Francisco, CA 94125**

**Tel: 415.822.9602
Fax: 415.822.9600**

www.sescdc.org

www.hunterspointnavalshipyard.com

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/03/2010 03:01 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Cellphone labels



"Dennis and Sharon Noble"
<dsnoble@shaw.ca>
05/28/2010 01:42 PM

To <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
Subject Cellphone labels

Dear Sirs and Madams,

I do not live in San Francisco, but I want you to know that many are looking to you, your mayor, and your city for guidance on cellphone regulations. Many cities and countries around the world already have banned cellphone usage for children or have warnings on phones, yet North American cellphone companies have been allowed to sell products which many researchers believe cause harm with no precautionary advice to the public. In fact, these devices which have become so common were never tested for safety before they were presented to the marketplace. I personally think it appalling that my toaster was tested for safety but the cellphone teenagers live with was not.

Look at cellphone manuals, in the smallest print, and you will see statements like: "Keep this phone at least 1 inch from the head and body at all times." What does this tell you? It tells me there is recognized potential for harm. The recent Interphone Study, which was funded to a large degree by the cellphone industry, confirmed that using a phone for 30 minutes a day will increase risk of brain tumors by at least 40%. Don't people deserve to know this when they buy a phone?

Please, allow your citizens to make an informed decision by requiring a label with a precautionary message. Hopefully other cities and states will follow your lead.

Respectfully,
Sharon Noble
Victoria, British Columbia

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/03/2010 03:09 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Cell Phone Labeling



Judith Adler
<jadlermtnmama@sbcglobal.
net>
05/28/2010 09:00 PM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject Cell Phone Labeling

Dear members of the Board of Supervisors. I have done extensive research on the health implications of using cell phones and the EMF risks associated with being in close proximity to broadband towers. I think it is very critical that the public be informed of radiation levels of their cell phones. Thus, I urge you to support Gavin Newsom's Right to Know legislation on June 8th! Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely,
Judy Adler



Angela Flynn
<grnevolution@yahoo.com>
06/07/2010 12:53 PM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org,
michela.alioto-pier@sfgov.org, john.avalos@sfgov.org,
david.campos@sfgov.org, david.chiu@sfgov.org,
cc
bcc
Subject Comments on Cell Phone Right To Know labelling -
Ordinance 100104:

board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org; michela.alioto-pier@sfgov.org; john.avalos@sfgov.org;
david.campos@sfgov.org; david.chiu@sfgov.org; carmen.chu@sfgov.org; chris.daly@sfgov.org;
bevan.dufty@sfgov.org; sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org; eric.l.mar@sfgov.org; sophie.maxwell@sfgov.org;
ross.mirkarimi@sfgov.org

Dear San Francisco City and County Board of Supervisors,

I write to urge you to vote for the Cell Phone Right To Know labeling Ordinance 100104.

This action by San Francisco will be a wake up call to the cell phone industry that protecting people has priority over their profits.

While this ordinance is a much needed start on educating people on the dangers of cell phones, it is only a start.

Requiring retailers to post SAR levels of cell phones will help to increase the awareness of consumers that their phones emit potentially harmful non ionizing radiation (NIR), however the ordinance cannot be considered protective as it does not inform the public that SAR levels can be exceeded if a cell phone is placed directly in contact with the head and/or body. It also does not address the evidence that NIR is biologically active at levels below the thermal levels of which the SAR is based on.

I urge the Board of Supervisors to amend the ordinance to include a warning label that cell phones/pdas should not be held to the head or body; that the device may cause harm to the health of the user; and that children under 14 should only use cell phones in emergencies.

33

The amendments should also require that all cell phones be sold with either a head set or speaker phone in order to allow the user to avoid NIR exposures exceeding the FCC SAR safety standard.

Instruction manuals for cell phones warn that the SAR limits will be exceeded if the phone is held to the body or head. Here are some examples of the distances given:

- **Nokia 1100** warns, “This product meets RF exposure guidelines...when positioned at least 1.5 cm (~1/4 **inch**) away from the body...and should position the product at least 1.5 cm away from your body.” Nokia 1100 User’s Guide p. 63

- **Motorola V195 GSM** warns, “keep the mobile device and its antenna at least 2.5 centimeters (**1 inch**) from your body.” Motorola V195 GSM User’s Manual p. 70

If you wear the mobile device on your body, always place the mobile device in a Motorola-supplied or approved clip, holder, holster, case, or body harness. If you do not use a body-worn accessory supplied or approved by Motorola, keep the mobile device and its antenna at least 2.5 centimeters (1 inch) from your body when transmitting.

Using accessories not supplied or approved by Motorola may cause your mobile device to exceed RF energy exposure guidelines.

- **BlackBerry 8300** warns, “When using any data feature of the BlackBerry device, with or without a USB cable, keep the device at least **0.98 inches** (25 mm) from your body,” and “**SHOULD NOT** be worn or carried on the body.” [CAPITALIZATION in the original] Safety and Product Information, Blackberry Curve 8300

Smartphone, p.15 and p. 17

Holster: The BlackBerry device might not come with a holster (body-worn accessory).

If you wear the BlackBerry device on your body, always put the device in a BlackBerry device holster supplied or approved by Research In Motion (RIM). If you do not use a holster supplied or approved by RIM when you carry the BlackBerry device, keep the device at least 0.98 inches (25 mm) from your body when the BlackBerry device is turned on and connected to a wireless network. When using any data feature of the BlackBerry device, with or without a USB cable, keep the device at least 0.98 inches (25 mm) from your body. Using accessories that are not supplied or approved by RIM might cause your BlackBerry device to exceed radio frequency (RF) exposure guidelines.

- **iPhone** SAR measurement may exceed the FCC exposure guidelines for body-worn operation if positioned less than 15 mm (**5/8 inch**) from the body e.g when carrying iPhone in your pocket. For optimal mobile device performance and to be sure that human exposure to RF energy does not exceed the FCC, IC, and European Guidelines, always follow these instructions and precautions. When on a call using the built-in audio receiver in iPhone, hold iPhone with the dock connector pointed down toward your shoulder to increase separation from the antenna. When using iPhone near your body for voice calls or for wireless data transmission over a cellular network keep iPhone at least 15 mm (5/8 inch) away from the body and only use carrying cases, belt clips, or holders that do not have metal parts and then maintain at least 15mm (5/8 inch) separation between the iPhone and the body. If you are still concerned about exposure to RF energy, you can further limit your exposure by limiting the amount of time using iPhone, since time is a factor in how much exposure a person receives, and by placing more distance between your body and iPhone since exposure level drops off dramatically with distance.

• **Kyocera S1300** To maintain compliance with FCC RF exposure guidelines, if you wear a handset on your body, use the Kyocera Wireless Corp. (KWC) supplied and approved accessory designed for this product. Using accessories that are not supplied or approved by KWC may violate FCC RF exposure guidelines. Other accessories used with this device for body-worn operations must not contain any metallic components and must provide at least 15 mm (**5/8 inch**) separation distance including the antenna and the user's body.

• **T-Mobile** As with other mobile radio transmitting equipment, users are advised that for satisfactory operation of the equipment and for the safety of personnel, it is recommended that **no part of the human body be allowed to come too close to the antenna** during operation.

Thank you,

Angela Flynn
Wireless Radiation Alert Network
WRAN

5309 Iroquois Road

Bethesda, MD 20816

301-229-0282

FAX 301-229-4752

CELL TOWERS AND WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS – LIVING WITH RADIOFREQUENCY RADIATION
<http://www.scribd.com/doc/24352550/Cell-Tower-Rpt>

Copies

June 7, 2010

RECEIVED
MAYOR'S OFFICE

10 JUN -4 PM 1:05

Dear our American Ambassador to Egypt "MARGARET SCOBAY":

It gives me great pleasure to see with my own eyes the exchange between our American President, Barack Obama, and the Middle East. You are a remarkable woman, and I believe that the space that President Obama has created for you in my native country Egypt will build stronger relationships between both our governments. I am very happy and proud of your actions. My big dream is that I hope that God will give me time to see you when I return back to my family after 40 years. I am away from them.

I have asked a few of my grandchildren to go see you and give you this certificate. My family loves and supports you. I hope that my home country of Egypt will give you the warm welcome that you deserve.

I hope that you have a chance to watch the DVD that I have enclosed with this letter; the San Francisco Board of Supervisors meeting from April 6, 2010, in which I am a presenter.

I am the only one in California who has survived with 8 heart attacks and 6 heart operations, with 6 stents. Our Ambassador, pray for me, please!

Sincerely,

Abdalla Megahed

Abdalla Megahed
The Strongest S.F. Community Activist/ Homeless Advocate
and supporter of Barack Obama
Polk Geary Apartments
990 Polk Street #418
San Francisco, CA 94109

Cc: President of the United States
President of Egypt
Mayor of San Francisco
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

BY _____

RE

2010 JUN -4 PM 2:05

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

(34)



Brent Lewis
 <Brent.Lewis@sfgov.org>
 06/04/2010 05:06 PM

To "board.of.supervisors" <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
 cc Micki Callahan <Micki.Callahan@sfgov.org>
 bcc
 Subject Reminder: Sole Source Contracts and Annual Reports -
 Response Required

1 attachment



Sole Source Reminder 09-10.doc

To: Clerk of the Board

The Department of Human Resources did not enter into any sole source contracts in FY 2009-10.

Thanks,
 Brent Lewis
 Budget & Finance Director
 Dept. of Human Resources
 415-557-4944

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

From: Board of Supervisors
 Sent: 06/02/2010 06:13 PM PDT
 To: Angela Calvillo; Anita Sanchez; Ben Rosenfield; Catherine Dodd;
 Chris Vein; Cynthia Goldstein; David Assmann; Delene Wolf; District
 Attorney; ed.reiskin@sfdpw.org; eharrington@sfgwater.org; Edwin Lee;
 Elizabeth Murray; Emily Murase; Gary Amelio; George Gascon;
 jbuchanan@famsf.org; john.martin@flysfo.com; jxu@asianart.org; Jeff Adachi;
 Joanne Hayes-White; John Arntz; John Rahaim; John St.Croix; Jose Cisneros;
 Joyce Hicks; Julian Low; Luis Cancel; lherrera@sfpl.info; Marcia Bell;
 Maria Su; Michael Hennessey; Micki Callahan; Mitch Katz; Monique Moyer;
 nathaniel.ford@sfmta.com; Phil Ginsburg; Phil Ting; Tara
 Collins/CTYATT@CTYATT; Theresa Sparks; Trent Rhorer/DHS/CCSF@CCSF; Vicki
 Hennessy; Vivian Day; Wendy Still; William Siffermann
 Subject: Reminder: Sole Source Contracts and Annual Reports - Response
 Required

(See attached file: Sole Source Reminder 09-10.doc)

Board of Supervisors
 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
 San Francisco, CA 94102
 (415) 554-5184
 (415) 554-5163 fax
 Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form by
 clicking
<http://www.sfbos.org/index.aspx?page=104>

35



Marcia
Bell/LAWLIBRARY/SFGOV
06/04/2010 10:50 AM


To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
bcc
Subject Sole Source Contracts

June 4, 2010

The law library has no sole source contracts.

Thank you.

Marcia R. Bell, Director
San Francisco Law Library
401 Van Ness Avenue, Room 400
San Francisco, CA 94102
marcia.bell@sfgov.org
415-554-6824
www.sfgov.org/sfll



Laura
Marshall/DOSW/SFGOV
06/04/2010 08:59 AM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc Emily Murase/DOSW/SFGOV@SFGOV
bcc
Subject Sole Source Contracts

Clerk of the Board -

Per your memo of June 1, 2010 regarding Sunshine Ordinance Section 67.24(e), this is to inform you that the Department on the Status of Women did not enter into any sole source contracts during FY2009-10, and had no existing sole source contracts during that period. Please contact me with any questions about this information. Thank you.

Laura

Laura Marshall, MSW
Department on the Status of Women
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 130
San Francisco, CA 94102
p. (415) 252-2578
f. (415) 252-2575



Melly Mel
<melakarico@yahoo.com>
06/04/2010 09:52 AM

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

Subject No disc golf @ mclaren park!!

My name is Melvin Watson resident of the Visitacion Valley for 20 plus years and I love the peace quiet tranquility solidarity of the park. Please come take a ride through the park & see nature as u never seen before in the middle of an urban city. I was a guest once before at a disc golf gathering to part take in the new sport and as I feared for my safety from random disc flying at me from every which way I left the course in GG park ducking & hiding behind trees like I was in the military. Please go to GG park disc golf course see for one self. The birds & the rest of nature that Vis Valley residents love will scurry away from the crowds of disc golf players tearing through trees bushes or where ever to find their disc. Please help preserve the park for residents & other nature lovers.

Sent from my iPhone

36













"Kelly Jr, Harlan"
 <HKelly@sfgov.org>
 06/04/2010 10:22 AM

To "Avalos, John" <John.Avalos@sfgov.org>
 cc "Harrington, Ed" <EHarrington@sfgov.org>, "Carlin, Michael" <mcarlin@sfgov.org>, "Simmons, Rhonda" <Rhonda.Simmons@sfgov.org>, "Iglesias, Chris"
 bcc

Subject SFPUC's response to Workforce Inquiries, Ref. 20100413-007

10 attachments

-  00457 PLA.pdf
-  00457.pdf
-  00458 .pdf
-  00459 .pdf
-  00820.pdf
-  chapter 83.pdf
-  ResponsetoInquiries.pdf
-  Resp-BOS4-16-10.pdf
-  final table 1.xls
-  contractor and craft v1.xls

Supervisor, this email is in response to workforce development/local hiring inquiries forwarded by the Clerk of the Board. A hard copy will be delivered to your office.

Please see the attached document "**ResponsetoInquiries.pdf**" for the cover letter, and the attached document "**Resp-BOS4-16-10.pdf**" for the Responses. The other attachments are referred to within the Responses document.

Thank you,

Harlan

Harlan L. Kelly, Jr.
 Assistant General Manager, Infrastructure
 San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

COMMISSIONERS
Jim Kellogg, President
Discovery Bay
Richard Rogers, Vice President
Montecito
Michael Sutton, Member
Monterey
Daniel W. Richards, Member
Upland
Don Benninghoven, Member
Santa Barbara

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER



Governor

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

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Fish and Game Commission


June 2, 2010

TO ALL AFFECTED AND INTERESTED PARTIES:


This is to provide you with a copy of the Notice of Findings resulting from the Commission's March 3, 2010, meeting when it made a finding pursuant to Section 2075.5, Fish and Game Code, that the California tiger salamander warrants listing to threatened species status. The Notice of Findings will be published in the California Regulatory Notice Register on June 4, 2010.

The Commission, at its May 20, 2010 teleconference meeting, adopted the Notice of Findings and the proposed changes to Section 670.5, Title 14, CCR, to add the California tiger salamander to the list of species designated as threatened under the California Endangered Species Act.

Sincerely,


Sheri Tiemann
Staff Services Analyst

Attachment

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN -4 PM 3:04
BY 



NOTICE OF FINDINGS
California Tiger Salamander
(*Ambystoma californiense*)

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Fish and Game Commission (Commission), at its March 3, 2010 meeting in Ontario, California, made a finding pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2075.5, that the petitioned action to add the California tiger salamander (*Ambystoma californiense*) to the list of threatened species under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA)(Fish & G. Code, § 2050 et seq.) is warranted.¹ (See also Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (i)(1).)

NOTICE IS ALSO GIVEN that the Commission, consistent with Fish and Game Code section 2075.5, proposes to amend Title 14, section 670.5, of the California Code of Regulations, to add the California tiger salamander to the list of species designated as threatened under CESA. (See also *Id.*, tit. 14, 670.1, subd. (j).)

I.
BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On July 6, 2001, the Center for Biological Diversity (Center) petitioned the Commission to list the California tiger salamander as a threatened or endangered species under CESA, requesting that the Commission take emergency action to list the species as endangered pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2076.5.² (Cal. Reg. Notice Register 2001, No. 33-Z, p. 1393.) On August 3, 2001, with a supporting recommendation from the Department of Fish and Game (Department), the Commission declined to take emergency action to list the California tiger salamander, finding there was no emergency posing a significant threat to the continued existence of the species. (*Id.*, 2001, No. 34-Z, p. 1426.) Thereafter, on October 4, 2001, the Department submitted its initial Evaluation of Petition: Request of Center for Biological Diversity to List California Tiger Salamander (*Ambystoma californiense*) as Endangered (October 3, 2001) (hereafter, the 2001 Candidacy Evaluation Report) to the Commission at its meeting in San Diego, California, recommending that the petition be accepted for further consideration pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2073.5, subdivision (a)(2).

On December 7, 2001, at its meeting in Long Beach, California, the Commission rejected the Center's petition to list the California tiger salamander as a threatened or endangered species pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2074.2, subdivision (a)(1). In reaching its decision, the Commission considered the petition, the Department's 2001 Candidacy Evaluation Report, and other

¹ The definition of a "threatened species" for purposes of CESA is found in Fish and Game Code section 2067.

² The definition of an "endangered species" for purposes of CESA is found in Fish and Game Code section 2062.

relevant information, and determined based on substantial evidence in the administrative record of proceedings that the petition did not include sufficient information to indicate that the petitioned action may be warranted. The Commission adopted findings to the same effect at its February 8, 2002, meeting in Sacramento, California, publishing notice of its finding as required by Fish and Game Code section 2078 and controlling regulation on March 1, 2002. (Cal. Reg. Notice Register 2002, No. 9-Z, p. 469; see also Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (e)(1).)

On January 30, 2004, the Commission received a second petition from the Center to list California tiger salamander as a threatened or endangered species under CESA. (Cal. Reg. Notice Register 2004, No. 9-Z, p. 270.) Consistent with the Fish and Game Code and controlling regulation, the Commission referred the petition to the Department, the Department evaluated of the petition, along with additional information from the interested public, and submitted its initial Evaluation of Petition: Request of the Center for Biological Diversity et al. (2004) to List California Tiger Salamander (*Ambystoma californiense*) as Endangered (July 28, 2004) (hereafter, the 2004 Candidacy Evaluation Report) to the Commission. The Department recommended in its 2004 Candidacy Evaluation Report that the Commission accept the petition for further evaluation under CESA. (Fish & G. Code, § 2073.5, subd. (a)(2); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (d).)

The Commission, at its October 22, 2004 meeting in Concord, California, rejected the Center's 2004 petition for further evaluation under CESA pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2074.2, subdivision (a)(1). In reaching its determination, the Commission found, based on the petition, the Department's 2004 Candidacy Evaluation Report, and other substantial evidence in the administrative record of proceedings, that there was not sufficient information to indicate the petitioned action may be warranted. The Commission adopted findings to the same effect at its December 2, 2004 meeting in Monterey, California, publishing notice of its finding as required by Fish and Game Code section 2078 and controlling regulation on December 24, 2004. (Cal. Reg. Notice Register 2004, No. 52-Z, p. 1754; see also Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (e)(1).)

On February 28, 2005, the Center filed a petition for writ of mandate in Sacramento County Superior Court challenging the Commission's decision to reject the 2004 petition to list the California tiger salamander under CESA. (*Center for Biological Diversity v. California Fish and Game Commission*, Super. Ct. Sacramento County, 2005, No. 05CS00233.) The trial court in the litigation ruled against the Commission on December 14, 2006, finding that the administrative record of proceedings did not include substantial evidence to support the Commission's final action. The court, in turn, directed the Commission to accept the Center's petition for further evaluation and, in so doing, to designate California tiger salamander as a candidate species under

CESA. The Third District Court of Appeal affirmed the trial court decision on September 2, 2008, with the California Supreme Court denying the Commission's related petition for review on December 10, 2008. (*Center for Biological Diversity v. California Fish and Game Commission* (2008) 166 Cal.App.4th 597.)

On February 5, 2009, at its meeting in Sacramento, California, the Commission, pursuant to court order in the *Center for Biological Diversity* litigation, set aside its October 2004 determination rejecting the Center's second petition and designated the California tiger salamander as a candidate species under CESA.³ (Cal. Reg. Notice Register 2009, No. 8-Z, p. 284; see also Fish & G. Code, §§ 2080, 2085.) The Commission took emergency action at the same time pursuant to the Fish and Game Code and the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) (Gov. Code, § 11340 et seq.), authorizing take of the candidate species under CESA, subject to various terms and conditions. (See Fish & G. Code, §§ 240, 2084, adding Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 749.4; Cal. Reg. Notice Register 2009, No. 10-Z, p. 399.) The Commission extended the emergency take authorization for California tiger salamander on two occasions, effective through February 23, 2010. (*Id.*, 2009, No. 36-Z, p. 1499; Cal. Reg. Notice Register 2009, No. 49-Z, p. 208.)

Consistent with the Fish and Game Code and controlling regulation, the Department commenced a 12-month status review of California tiger salamander following published notice of its designation as a candidate species under CESA. As part of that effort, the Department solicited data, comments, and other information from interested members of the public, and the scientific and academic community; and the Department submitted a preliminary draft of its status review for independent peer review by a number of individuals acknowledged to be experts on the California tiger salamander, possessing the knowledge and experts to critique the scientific validity of the report. (Fish & G. Code, §§ 2074.4, 2074.8; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (f)(2).) The effort culminated with the Department's final Status Review of the California Tiger Salamander (*Ambystoma californiense*) (January 11, 2010) (Status Review), which the Department submitted to the Commission at its meeting in Sacramento, California, on February 4, 2010. The Department recommended to the Commission based on its Status Review and the best science available to the Department that designating California tiger salamander as a threatened species under CESA is warranted. (Fish & G. Code, § 2074.6; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (f).)

The Commission considered the petition, the Department's 2001 and 2004 Candidacy Evaluation Reports, the Department's 2010 Status Review, and other information included in the Commission's administrative record of proceedings at

³ The definition of a "candidate species" for purposes of CESA is found in Fish and Game Code section 2068.

its meeting in Ontario, California, on March 3, 2010. (Fish & G. Code, § 2075; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subds. (g), (i).) Following public comment and deliberation, the Commission determined, based on the best available science before it, that listing California tiger salamander as a threatened species under CESA is warranted. (Fish & G. Code, § 2075.5(2); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (i)(1)(A).) In so doing, the Commission directed its staff to prepare findings of fact consistent with its determination for consideration and ratification by the Commission at a future meeting. The Commission also directed its staff in coordination with the Department to begin formal rulemaking under the APA to add California tiger salamander to the list of threatened species set forth in Title 14, section 670.5, of the California Code of Regulations. (Fish & G. Code, §§ 2075.5(2); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (j).)

II. STATUTORY AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK

The Commission has prepared these findings as part of its final action under CESA to designate the California tiger salamander as a threatened species. As set forth above, the Commission's determination that listing California tiger salamander is warranted marks the end of formal administrative proceedings under CESA prescribed by the Fish and Game Code and controlling regulation. (See generally Fish & G. Code, § 2070 et seq.; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1.) The Commission, as established by the California Constitution, has exclusive statutory authority under California law to designate endangered, threatened, and candidate species under CESA. (Cal. Const., art. IV, § 20, subd. (b); Fish & G. Code, § 2070.)⁴

As set forth above, the CESA listing process for California tiger salamander began in the present case with the Center's submittal of its first petition to the Commission in July 2001. (Cal. Reg. Notice Register 2001, No. 33-Z, p. 1393; ; see also *Id.*, 2004, No. 9-Z, p. 270.) The regulatory process that ensued is described above in some detail, along with related references to the Fish and Game Code and controlling regulation. The CESA listing process generally is also described in some detail in published appellate case law in California, including

- *Mountain Lion Foundation v. California Fish and Game Commission* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 105, 114-116;
- *California Forestry Association v. California Fish and Game Commission* (2007) 156 Cal.App. 4th 1535, 1541-1542;

⁴ The Commission, pursuant to this authority, may add, remove, uplist or downlist any plant or animal species to the list of endangered or threatened species, or designate any such species as a candidate for related action under CESA. (See also Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (i)(1)(A)-(C).) In practical terms, any of these actions may be commonly referred to as subject to CESA's "listing" process.

- *Center for Biological Diversity v. California Fish and Game Commission* (2008) 166 Cal.App.4th 597, 600; and
- *Natural Resources Defense Council v. California Fish and Game Commission* (1994) 28 Cal.App.4th 1104, 1111-1116.

The “is warranted” determination at issue here for California tiger salamander stems from Commission obligations established by Fish and Game Code section 2075.5. Under this provision, the Commission is required to make one of two findings for a candidate species at the end of the CESA listing process; namely, whether the petitioned action is warranted or is not warranted. Here with respect to California tiger salamander, the Commission made the finding under section 2075.5(2) that the petitioned action is warranted.

The Commission was guided in making this determination by various statutory provisions and other controlling law. The Fish and Game Code, for example, defines an endangered species under CESA as a native species or subspecies of a bird, mammal, fish, amphibian, reptile or plant which is in serious danger of becoming extinct throughout all, or a significant portion, of its range due to one or more causes, including loss of habitat, change in habitat, over exploitation, predation, competition, or disease. (Fish & G. Code, § 2062.)

Similarly, the Fish and Game Code defines a threatened species under CESA as a native species or subspecies of a bird, mammal, fish, amphibian, reptile or plant that, although not presently threatened with extinction, is likely to become an endangered species in the foreseeable future in the absence of the special protection and management efforts required by this chapter. (*Id.*, § 2067.)

Likewise as established by published appellate case law in California, the term “range” for purposes of CESA means the range of the species within California. (*California Forestry Association v. California Fish and Game Commission, supra*, 156 Cal. App. 4th at p. 1540, 1549-1551.)

The Commission was also guided in making its determination regarding California tiger salamander by Title 14, section 670.1, subdivision (i)(1)(A), of the California Code of Regulations. This provision provides, in pertinent part, that a species shall be listed as endangered or threatened under CESA if the Commission determines that the species’ continued existence is in serious danger or is threatened by any one or any combination of the following factors:

1. Present or threatened modification or destruction of its habitat;
2. Overexploitation;
3. Predation;
4. Competition;
5. Disease; or
6. Other natural occurrences or human-related activities.

Likewise, the Commission was also guided in its determination regarding California tiger salamander by Fish and Game Code section 2070. This section provides that the Commission shall add or remove species from the list it establishes under CESA only upon receipt of sufficient scientific information that the action is warranted. Similarly, CESA provides policy direction not specific to the Commission per se, indicating that all state agencies, boards, and commissions shall seek to conserve endangered species and threatened species and shall utilize their authority in furtherance of the purposes of CESA. (Fish & G. Code, § 2055.) This policy direction does not compel a particular determination by the Commission in the CESA listing context. Yet, the Commission made its determination regarding California tiger salamander mindful of this policy direction, acknowledging that "[l]aws providing for the conservation of natural resources' such as the CESA 'are of great remedial and public importance and thus should be construed liberally.'" (*California Forestry Association v. California Fish and Game Commission*, *supra*, 156 Cal. App. 4th at pp. 1545-1546, citing *San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society v. City of Moreno Valley* (1996) 44 Cal.App.4th 593, 601; Fish & G. Code, §§ 2051, 2052.)

Finally in considering these factors, CESA and controlling regulation require the Commission to actively seek and consider related input from the public and any interested party. (See, e.g., *Id.*, §§ 2071, 2074.4, 2078; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (h).) The related notice obligations and public hearing opportunities before the Commission are also considerable. (Fish & G. Code, §§ 2073.3, 2074, 2074.2, 2075, 2075.5, 2078; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subds. (c), (e), (g), (i); see also Gov. Code, § 11120 et seq.) All of these obligations are in addition to the requirements prescribed for the Department in the CESA listing process, including an initial evaluation of the petition and a related recommendation regarding candidacy, and a 12-month status review of the candidate species culminating with a report and recommendation to the Commission as to whether listing is warranted based on the best available science. (Fish & G. Code, §§ 2073.4, 2073.5, 2074.4, 2074.6; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subds. (d), (f), (h).)

III.

FACTUAL AND SCIENTIFIC BASES FOR THE COMMISSION'S FINDING

The factual and scientific bases for the Commission's finding that listing California tiger salamander as a threatened species under CESA is warranted are set forth in detail in the Commission's administrative record of proceedings. Substantial evidence in the administrative record of proceedings in support of the Commission's determination includes, but is not limited to the Center's 2001 and 2004 petitions, the Department's 2001 and 2004 Candidacy Evaluation Reports, the Department's 2010 Status Review, and other information specifically presented to the Commission and otherwise included in the Commission's administrative record of proceedings as it existed up to and including the meeting in Ontario, California, on March 3, 2010. The Commission made its final

determination under CESA with respect to California tiger salamander at that meeting. (Fish & G. Code, § 2075; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subs. (g), (i).)

The Commission finds the substantial evidence highlighted in the preceding paragraph, along with other substantial evidence in the administrative record of proceedings, supports the Commission's determination under CESA that the continued existence of California tiger salamander in the State of California is threatened by one or a combination of the following factors:

1. Present or threatened modification or destruction of its habitat;
2. Overexploitation;
3. Predation;
4. Competition;
5. Disease; or
6. Other natural occurrences or human-related activities.

The Commission also finds that the same substantial evidence constitutes sufficient scientific information to establish that designating California tiger salamander as a threatened species under CESA is warranted.

The following Commission findings highlight in more detail some of the scientific and factual information and other substantial evidence in the administrative record of proceedings that support the Commission's determination that the California tiger salamander's continued existence is threatened in California:

1. Past and continuing loss and fragmentation of essential wetland and upland habitat due to urbanization and conversion to more intensive agricultural practices in its range in the Central Valley, Santa Barbara and Sonoma counties, Bay Area, and foothills of the Coast Range and Sierra Nevada.
2. Hybridization with non-native tiger salamander species illegally established in the wild (formerly legal as fishing bait) in significant portions of its range, resulting in viable hybrid offspring that have reduced genetic purity and which often out-compete or eat pure-strained California tiger salamanders.
3. Widespread predation and competition in breeding habitat by non-native fishes and bullfrogs.
4. Potential susceptibility to introduced diseases from non-native fishes and tiger salamanders, or other amphibian species.
5. Certain agricultural practices, primarily the use of rodenticides that kill ground squirrels whose burrows are essential California tiger salamander habitat.
6. Mortality from annual road crossings to breeding ponds.

7. Climate change, which would likely affect wetland-dependent species such as the California tiger salamander by changing wetland hydrology, reducing habitat, and increasing disease potential.
8. Populations on limited protected areas are impacted by varying degrees to the factors mentioned above.

IV.

FINAL DETERMINATION BY THE COMMISSION

The Commission has weighed and evaluated all information and inferences for and against listing California tiger salamander under CESA. This information includes scientific and other general evidence in the Center's 2001 and 2004 petitions, the Department's 2001 and 2004 Candidacy Evaluation Reports and the Department's related recommendations, the Department's 2010 Status Review and related recommendation based on the best available science, written and oral comments received from members of the public, and other evidence included in the Commission's administrative record of proceedings. Based upon substantial evidence in the administrative record the Commission has determined that there is sufficient scientific information to indicate that listing California tiger salamander as a threatened species under CESA is warranted. (Fish & G. Code, § 2075.5(2).) In making this determination, the Commission also finds the continued existence of California tiger salamander is threatened in the State of California as set forth in these findings and supported by substantial evidence in the Commission's administrative record of proceedings. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (i)(1)(A).)

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
06/07/2010 11:36 AM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject June 8th, 2010 - SFBOS Meeting / Item#28 - Parkmerced
OPEN SPACE!!!! "Do not ignore the MOU, loss-of-use, and
loss of open-space"



Aaron Goodman
<amgodman@yahoo.com>
06/04/2010 03:56 PM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
Subject June 8th, 2010 - SFBOS Meeting / Item#28 - Parkmerced
OPEN SPACE!!!! "Do not ignore the MOU, loss-of-use, and
loss of open-space"

Item#28 June 8th, 2010 SFBOS Hearing

SF Board of Supervisors;

Please do not support the major encroachment by SFSU-CSU into Parkmerced's prior masterplanned ignoring the lack of public notification in regards to the DPW order (see attached notice received from parkmerced, and students at SFSU-CSU were not notified of the proposed encroachment permit. This held on June 2nd, 2010 it was noted specifically by Commissioner Chase that the Page & Turnbull His OF PARKMERCED AS A HISTORIC DISTRICT in the DEIR!!! SFSU-CSU's EIR ignored this issue "divide + conquer" tactics by developers, and private institutions to acquire land, and ignore historical PROGRAMMATIC EIR, and not PROJECT SPECIFIC, showed how the university and parkmerced community prior in terms of the "loss-of-use" of the recreation parcel, and open-space, and community purchase by SFSU-Foundation. The current "encroachment" permits are allowing the SFSU planners Commission, SF Land-Use (in terms of the future use of the proposed site(s)) and SF BOS review of the SFSU-CSU which is WELL KNOWN. At the SF Land-Use hearing on this item, the SFSU-Capital Plan center" in terms of the existing one on SFSU's current campus. The actual use of this site is Parkmerced & Solomon on the SFSU-Masterplan and we protested prior with both of these Capital Planners present SFSU-CSU ignored the impacts of the expansion plans of SFSU. It ignored the open-space loss, housing cobbled together in time by SF Muni. This again shows why developer agreements, and negotiations by systems for there proposed new Creative Arts Center. By waiting to alleviate the impacts till after the the San Andreas Pipeline project work that ripped up half of the roadway on the eastern side of the sit

Why should this encroachment be permitted when SFSU-CSU is complaining of budget issues? They j land-lord of the properties they bought. Many residents who lived in the UPS blocks could not get repa

they have not done the seismic retrofitting of the UPS blocks, so why should students and existing tenants be allowed to do new work..? Please make sure that they do not go forward until they come forth with their plans for

By "rubber-stamping" this decision, you are rubber stamping any institutions encroachment through

Please think twice prior to approving this resolution.

Sincerely

Aaron Goodman

amgodman@yahoo.com

28. 100364 [Major Encroachment for San Francisco State University to Place Utilities Under Font Boulevard] Resolution granting a revocable major encroachment permit to San Francisco State University to occupy a portion of the public right-of-way to install and maintain private underground utilities crossing Font Boulevard to serve properties within Assessor Block No. 7304; making findings, including environmental findings and findings of consistency with the General Plan and the Eight Priority Policies of Planning Code Section 101.1.



DPW_maillist07304_001.pdf



Denise D Anne
<ddanne1@sbcglobal.net>
05/31/2010 07:51 PM

To Board of Supervisors <boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
bcc
Subject PEAK OIL

History:  This message has been forwarded.

From the Peak Oil Task Force "Because petroleum and natural gas are finite resources, this situation cannot last. If San Francisco is to thrive in the 21st century and remain a world-class city, it must begin planning today for how to maintain itself in a post- fossil fuel age."

Over the past twenty years or more I have made some concrete suggestions on how to use less fossil fuel in the operations of City services. Some of you have received an extensive list of ideas, none of which has ever been acknowledged. We need to seriously consider some of my ideas and that of others who work for the city.

I write this because I just came across the Peak Oil Task Force recommendations. I have not read it all but nothing has been done about their recommendations as well as far as I know.

Denise D'Anne
431-4172

40



Nick August
<phallusu@yahoo.com>
06/07/2010 05:02 AM

To wkane@sfgchronicle.com
cc gavin.newsom@sfgov.org, boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org
bcc

Subject Volunteers cut back on car use for a week

Volunteers cut back on car use for a week

<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2010/06/06/BA5K1DQ1S1.DTL>

as a sf pedestrian with a disability-i'll take my chances with a car/driver any day over some two wheeled drag show-at least the auto is identified, registered and insured (as well as by driving said vehicle operator alleges to have a license that compels the operator - unlike bicycles - to learn the rules of the road rather than the cyclists' incessant, childish 'me first' behavior that seems to have something to do with acting out for deliberately choosing to have a bicycle seat shoved up their butt). i think if the city needs additional revenue-they ought to consider the same restrictions/fees for services demanded for bicycle groups that are required by other vehicles. if the bike brigade demands recognition as a valid transport and operator-let them pay their way the same way other vehicles are required ... sort of redefining taxation without representation - here's a group that wants recognition but no taxation - like i said childishly self-absorbed being the example.

ps too, it's called a cross WALK and a side WALK-try to remember that rule the same way they remember the ok to pass a red light rule ... i promise to stay out of the bike paths-could you please stop creating safety hazards when we are trying to cross the streets at a traffic light at a crossWALK? could you please stop using other human beings as targets when you shove your way past us on the sideWALK? could you please stop blaming us for your parents rushing you through toilet training ... oops. Unfortunately, my experience is that drivers are much more considerate of pedestrians than ANY person with said seat tucked firmly in place ever has been-much much more considerate than some jerk waving you out of their way while screaming obscenities and making obscene gestures of course while madly pedaling away which only validates they can dish it out, but can't take it.

pps lastly, if riding a bike is so darn great, wonderful and let's all hug for being so green (of course NOT mentioning the base metals & rubber production facilities required for such contraptions, but i digress) why am i and other public transit riders always being delayed on the bus/train while someone carries their bike ...?

thank you for your attention.

41

Dear Supervisors:

5-31-10

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:

What is happening with the future plans for the southern sections of S.F.?

We're afraid that in an emergency we won't be able to get to a good hospital

in time, also the traffic rally jams up so when an ambulance can't get through sometimes,

if there's an earthquake what will happen? Bernal Heights and

Excelsior neighborhoods will be stuck, the city is growing more in the

south of Market areas, but there will only be limited hospital access there,

the city repeatedly get forky blocked, esp. if they fall down on them,

even within Hill & Silver Ave, S.F.'s Sutter Hill, Russian Ave, etc.

2 Pages
C: Ayles
CDumeret #11



San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

San Francisco, CA 94102

(27)



"Jue, Tyrone"
 <TJue@sfgov.org>
 06/02/2010 10:53 AM

To "Chiu, David" <David.Chiu@sfgov.org>, "Mar, Eric" <Eric.Mar@sfdph.org>, "Alioto-Pier, Michela" <Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org>, "Chu, Carmen" <Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org>
 cc "Harrington, Ed" <EHarrington@sfgov.org>, "Hale, Barbara" <BHale@sfgov.org>

bcc

Subject Press Release: CPUC Officially Registers CleanPowerSF as a Community Choice Aggregator in the State of California

1 attachment



22-10 CleanPowerSF Official CCA Release.pdf

Dear Supervisors,

Please find attached and in the body of this email a copy of a press release that was sent out moments ago regarding the California Public Utilities Commission's (CPUC) formal acknowledgment of CleanPowerSF as a Community Choice Aggregator in the State of California. Also included in the CPUC-certified registration packet was the negotiated Service Agreement with PG&E and a \$100,000 check from the City and County of San Francisco to satisfy interim bond requirements.

Please let us know if you have any questions related to the news. Thank you.

Tyrone

Tyrone Jue
 S.F. Public Utilities Commission
 Communications Division
 1155 Market Street, 11th Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94103
 Ph: (415) 554-3247 Fax: (415) 554-3282
 Email: tjue@sfgov.org

Please consider the environment before printing this email

NEWS RELEASE (Release No. 22-10)

**For Immediate Release:
 June 2, 2010**

**Contact: Tyrone Jue (415) 554-3247
 Charles Sheehan (415) 554-1548**

CPUC Officially Registers CleanPowerSF as a Community Choice Aggregator in the State of California

43

SAN FRANCISCO, CA – Today, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) announced that the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), late Friday, officially recognized CleanPowerSF as a registered “Community Choice Aggregator in the State of California.” Also included in the approved registration packet was a negotiated Service Agreement with PG&E, which will govern the business relationship between CleanPowerSF and PG&E.

“With the CPUC's certification, San Francisco enters an era of new possibilities for developing a clean-green energy future,” said Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi, Chair of the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo). “We anticipate that PG&E will continue to disrespect state law that enables cities to establish not-for-profit energy programs like ours, but as an officially recognized CCA, CleanPowerSF is moving forward undeterred and committed to cleaner energy.”

In order to become an official CCA program, the SFPUC had to submit a registration packet to the CPUC that included (1) the CCA's signed service agreement with PG&E, and (2) a check in the amount of \$100,000 from the City and County of San Francisco satisfying the interim CCA bond requirements. A typical Service Agreement includes provisions for audits, dispute resolution, defaults, billing, payment terms indemnity and many other items. Instead of signing the default, template PG&E service agreement, the SFPUC entered into a three-month negotiation session with PG&E that included three CPUC-mediated negotiation sessions. The end-product is a clarified service agreement that provides for a fairer, more detailed and stricter dispute resolution and penalty process should either side fail to comply with the terms of the Service Agreement.

The CPUC action on Friday closely follows another important milestone; the CPUC certification of the CleanPowerSF implementation plan. Concurrent with all of these developments, the SFPUC and LAFCo joint negotiating team continue to meet daily with the proposed energy service provider to finalize contract terms and customer rates. A proposed contract is scheduled to be released on June 8 with a vote planned at a future date pending a public review by the Board of Supervisors, LAFCo, SFPUC Commission, Rate Fairness Board, Budget Analyst and Controller's Office.

“CleanPowerSF is now one of two Community Choice Aggregators in California,” said SFPUC General Manager Ed Harrington. “I want to thank the SFPUC staff, our City Attorney's Office and the LAFCo team for all their hard work to implement CleanPowerSF.”

###



Molly M Burke
<MBurke@bart.gov>
06/03/2010 12:37 PM

To David.Chiu@sfgov.org, Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org,
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, Chris.Daly@sfgov.org,
Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org, Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org,
cc Roddrick Lee <RLee@bart.gov>, Kerry Hamill
<KHamill@bart.gov>, Jennifer Barton <JBarton@bart.gov>
bcc

Subject BART Community Meetings on Transit Issues - June 2010

1 attachment



BARTflyer_mt.pdf

BART invites you and your constituents to attend upcoming community meetings where BART is seeking the public's input on two critical transportation issues.

TOPICS FOR THIS SERIES OF MEETINGS:

Temporary Fare Reduction Options

BART has a surplus for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2010 due to funds unexpectedly received from the State of California. BART is considering an idea for how to use these funds to show our appreciation for our riders, which is to implement a temporary reduction. This is your chance to weigh-in on a fare reduction option. Attend this meeting to hear proposals and provide your input. Your ideas will be considered by BART's Board of Directors.

Defining "Major Service Changes"

In accordance with Federal guidelines, BART is seeking public input in defining what constitutes a "major service change". Attend this meeting for an opportunity to contribute your voice to developing this definition.

* Meeting dates and locations are indicated in the attached meeting notice. We look forward to receiving input from you and your constituents. Thank you.

Molly M. Burke
BART
Government & Community Relations
(510) 464-6172

44



BART Community Meetings

Influence Transportation Decisions



Please join the **San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART)** as it seeks input on two critical issues. On the back of this flyer are meeting dates open to the public. Translation services and child care are available if requested 72 hours prior to the meeting. Refreshments will be served.

TOPICS FOR THIS SERIES OF MEETINGS INCLUDE:

Temporary Fare Reduction Options

BART has a surplus for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2010 due to funds unexpectedly received from the State of California. BART is considering an idea for how to use these funds to show our appreciation for our riders, which is to implement a temporary reduction. This is your chance to weigh-in on a fare reduction option. Attend this meeting to hear proposals and provide your own input. Your ideas will be considered by BART's Board of Directors.

Defining "Major Service Changes"

In accordance with federal guidelines, BART is seeking public input in defining what constitutes a "major service change." Attend this meeting for an opportunity to contribute your voice to developing this definition.

Las reuniones comunitarias de BART – influncian las decisiones sobre el transporte

Lo invitamos a unirse al **San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART)** y proporcionarle sus comentarios y opiniones acerca de dos asuntos de vital importancia. Al reverso de este volante usted podrá ver las fechas de una serie de reuniones abiertas al público. Se contará con servicios de interpretación y cuidado infantil si los solicita con 72 horas de anticipación a la reunión. Se ofrecerán refrigerios.

LOS TEMAS A TRATAR EN ESTE SERIE DE REUNIONES INCLUYEN:

Opciones para la reducción temporal de las tarifas

BART cuenta con un superávit para el año fiscal que inicia el 1° de julio de 2010 debido a que, inesperadamente, recibió fondos por parte del Estado de California. BART está considerando una idea sobre cómo utilizar estos fondos y mostrarles a los usuarios nuestro agradecimiento por su preferencia, la cual es una reducción temporal de tarifas. Esta es su oportunidad de brindarnos sus opiniones acerca de la opción en la reducción de tarifas. Asista a esta reunión para escuchar las propuestas y proporcionarnos sus comentarios al respecto. Sus ideas serán tomadas en consideración por la Junta Directiva de BART.

Definición del término "modificaciones importantes en el servicio"

De conformidad con las normas federales, BART solicita comentarios del público para definir lo que constituye una "modificación importante en el servicio." Asista a esta reunión a fin de tener la oportunidad de contribuir con sus opiniones en el desarrollo de esta definición.

BART 社區會議 – 影響運輸決策

請與舊金山灣區捷運處 (**San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, BART**) 合作，表達您對兩項重要議題的意見。宣傳單背面列有開放供民眾參加的會議日期。如需翻譯和托兒服務，請於會議開始前 72 小時提出申請。現場有茶點招待。

此系列會議的主題包括：

暫時降低票價的選擇方案

由於 BART 突然從加州政府獲得一筆資金，因此 2010 年 7 月 1 日開始的新財政年度將有筆額外的預算。BART 目前在規劃這筆資金的最佳用途，希望以暫時降價的行動回饋乘客對捷運的支持。這是您對降低票價選擇方案表達想法的最佳機會。請參加這次會議，詳細了解所有提案並提供意見。BART 董事會將會慎重考慮您提出的想法。

「重要服務變動」的釋義

根據聯邦準則規定，BART 為「重要服務變動」釋義時必須徵求民眾的意見。請參加這次會議以便在釋義過程中表達您的看法。

Các Buổi Họp Cộng Đồng của BART – Tác Động Của Những Quyết Định Về Vận Chuyển

Mỗi quý vị tham gia cùng Cơ Quan Vận Chuyển Tốc Hành Vùng Vịnh San Francisco (BART) tìm kiếm ý kiến đóng góp về hai vấn đề quan trọng. Ngày giờ các buổi họp cộng khai cho công chúng có ở mặt sau tờ rơi này. Có các dịch vụ chuyển ngữ và giữ trẻ nếu quý vị yêu cầu 72 giờ trước buổi họp. Chúng tôi sẽ phục vụ đồ ăn nhẹ.

CÁC CHỦ ĐỀ CHO BUỔI HỌP NÀY BAO GỒM:

Các Lựa Chọn Giảm Giá Vé Tạm Thời

BART có một khoản dư cho năm tài chính bắt đầu từ ngày 1 tháng Bảy, 2010 do bất ngờ nhận được các ngân quỹ từ Tiểu Bang California. BART đang xem xét một ý tưởng về cách thức sử dụng những ngân quỹ này để tỏ lòng trân trọng đối với những người đi tàu của chúng tôi, đó là thực hiện giảm giá tạm thời. Đây là cơ hội của quý vị cần nhắc lựa chọn giảm giá vé. Hãy tham dự buổi họp này để lắng nghe các đề xuất và đưa ra ý kiến đóng góp của chính quý vị. Ban Quản Lý BART sẽ xem xét những ý kiến của quý vị.

Định nghĩa "Những Thay Đổi Dịch Vụ Chủ Yếu"

Theo đúng như các hướng dẫn của liên bang, BART đang tìm kiếm ý kiến đóng góp của công chúng trong việc xác định những yếu tố cấu thành "thay đổi dịch vụ chủ yếu." Hãy tham dự buổi họp này để có cơ hội đóng góp tiếng nói của quý vị nhằm phát triển định nghĩa này.

Pang-Komunidad na mga Pulong ng BART – Impluwensyahan ang Mga Pasya sa Transportasyon

Mangyaring sumali sa **San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART)** sa paghahanap nito ng input o palagay sa dalawang kritikal na mga isyu. Sa likod ng polyetong ito ay ang mga petsa ng pulong na bukas sa publiko. Ang mga serbisyo ng tagasalin at pangangalaga sa mga bata ay maaaring makuha kung hihilingin 72 oras bago ang pulong. Magsisilbi ng meryenda.

KABILANG SA MGA PAKSA PARA SA SUNOD-SUNOD NA MGA PULONG NITO:

Mga Opsyon sa Pansamantalang Paghaba ng Pamasaha

Ang BART ay mayroong sobrang salapi para sa piskal na taon simula Hulyo 1, 2010 dahil sa mga pondo na hindi inaasahang natanggap mula sa State of California. Ang BART ay isinasalang-alang ang ideya kung paano gamitin ang mga pondong ito upang maipakita ang aming pagpapahalaga sa ating mga pasahero, tulad ng pagpapatupad ng pansamantalang paghaba ng pasaha. Ito ang pagkakaon mo upang timbangin ang mga opsyon sa paghaba ng pamasaha. Dumalo sa pulong na ito upang maringin ang mga mungkahi at maibigay ang iyong sariling input o palagay. Ang iyong mga ideya ay isasaalang-alang ng Lupong ng direktor ng BART.

Pagtukoy sa "Mga Pangunahing Pagbabago sa Serbisyo"

Alinsunod sa mga gabay ng pederal, naghahanap ang BART ng input o palagay mula sa publiko sa pagtukoy sa kung ano ang bumubuo sa "pangunahing pagbabago sa serbisyo." Dumalo sa pulong na ito upang magkaroon ng oportunidad na makapagsalita para malinang ang pagtukoy na ito.

Собрания общенности BART – Повлияйте на процесс принятия решений, связанных с транспортной системой

Отдел быстрого транспорта района залива Сан-Франциско (San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, или BART) приглашает Вас принять участие в обсуждении двух критически важных вопросов. Информация о графике проведения открытых для общенности собраний приводится на обратной стороне. Услуги переводчиков и уход за детьми предоставляются при запросе их за 72 часа до собрания. Участникам будут предложены освежительные напитки.

В ПОВЕСТКУ ДНЯ ЭТОЙ СЕРИИ ВСТРЕЧ ВОШЛИ СЛЕДУЮЩИЕ ВОПРОСЫ:

Меры по временному снижению платы за проезд

В результате неожиданного получения финансовых средств от правительства штата Калифорния у организации BART имеется положительное сальдо на финансовый год, начинающийся 1 июля 2010 г. BART рассматривает вариант использования данных средств, позволяющий нам выразить благодарность нашим пассажирам. Таким вариантом является временное снижение платы за проезд. У Вас есть возможность оказать влияние на обсуждение этого вопроса. Примите участие в этом собрании для получения информации об имеющихся предложениях и для выдвижения собственных идей. Ваши предложения будут рассмотрены Советом директоров BART.

Определение «значительных изменений состава услуг»

В соответствии с федеральными нормативами организация BART проводит совещания с общенностью для уточнения определения «значительных изменений состава услуг». Примите участие в этом собрании для внесения собственного вклада в решение этого вопроса.

BART 지역 토론회 - 대중교통에 관한 정책결정에 참여하십시오

샌프란시스코 BART (Bay Area Rapid Transit District)는 두 가지 중요한 사안에 대해 여러분의 의견을 듣고자 합니다. 본 안내문 뒷면의 공개토론회 일정을 참고하여 주십시오. 토론회 72시간 전에 요청하시면 통역 및 보육 서비스가 제공됩니다. 간단한 다과가 제공됩니다.

이번 토론회의 주제는 다음과 같습니다.

임시 요금 인하 방안

BART는 캘리포니아 주로부터 계획에 없던 재정자원을 받게 되어 2010년 7월 1일자로 시작되는 회계연도에 흑자를 기록하게 되었습니다. BART는 승객 여러분들께 감사의 뜻을 전하기 위해 이 재정을 활용하여 임시로 요금을 인하하는 방안을 고려하고 있습니다. 이번 토론회는 요금인하 방안에 대한 여러분의 의견을 밝힐 수 있는 기회입니다. 토론회에 참석하셔서 다양한 제안에 대해 듣고 의견을 말씀해 주십시오. BART 이사회에서 여러분의 의견을 참고하겠습니다.

“근본적인 서비스 변경”의 내용

BART는 연방정부의 지침에 따라 여러분의 의견을 반영하여 “근본적인 서비스 변경”의 내용을 정하고자 합니다. 이번 토론회에 참석하셔서 이에 대한 의견을 말씀해 주십시오.

MEETING DATES AND LOCATIONS

FECHA Y UBICACIÓN DE LAS REUNIONES / 會議日期和地點 / NGÀY GIỜ VÀ ĐỊA ĐIỂM BUỔI HỌP
MGA PETA SA AT LOKASYON NG PULONG / ГРАФИКИ И МЕСТА ПРОВЕДЕНИЯ СОБРАНИЙ / 토론회 일시 및 장소

CHINATOWN, S.F. Tuesday, June 8 11:30 am – 1 pm SF Chinatown Community Development Ctr 663 Clay Street	OAKLAND Thursday, June 10 4 pm – 5:30 pm Lao Family Community Ctr 2325 E. 12th Street	DUBLIN Monday, June 14 6:30 pm – 8 pm Public Library 200 Civic Plaza	HAYWARD Monday, June 14 6:30 pm – 8 pm City Hall, Room 2A 777 B Street	OAKLAND Tuesday, June 15 6:30 pm – 8 pm Claridge Hotel - Ballroom 634 15th Street
PITTSBURG Tuesday, June 15 6:30 pm – 8 pm Senior Center 300 Presidio Lane	SAN FRANCISCO Tuesday, June 15 1 pm – 2:30 pm San Francisco Senior Center 481 O'Farrell Street	CONCORD Wednesday, June 16 6:30 pm – 8 pm El Rancho Restaurant 1450 Monument Blvd.	OAKLAND Wednesday, June 16 5 pm – 6:30 pm Youth UpRising 8711 MacArthur Blvd.	EXCELSIOR, S.F. Wednesday, June 16 10 am – 11:30 am Excelsior Family Connections 49 Ocean Ave.
RICHMOND Thursday, June 17 4 pm – 5:30 pm Nevin Center 598 Nevin Ave.	BAYVIEW, S.F. Thursday, June 17 6:30 pm – 8 pm YMCA 1601 Lane Street	UNION CITY Thursday, June 17 6:30 pm – 8 pm Community Center 1333 Decoto Road	LAFAYETTE Monday, June 21 6:30 pm – 8 pm Veterans Memorial Building 3780 Mt. Diablo Blvd.	MISSION, S.F. Monday, June 21 6:30 pm – 8 pm Chavita's #2 3161 24th Street
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO Monday, June 21 6:30 pm – 8 pm Municipal Service Building 333 Arroyo Drive	BERKELEY Tuesday, June 22 6:30 pm – 8 pm South Berkeley Senior Center 2939 Ellis Street	SAN PABLO Wednesday, June 23 6:30 pm – 8 pm City Hall – Maple Hall 13831 San Pablo Ave.		

For more details about Alameda County meetings:

Para obtener mayor información sobre las reuniones en el Condado de Alameda: / Alameda 縣會議的詳情: / Để biết thêm chi tiết về các buổi họp ở Quận Alameda County: / Para sa marami pang detalye tungkol sa mga pulong sa Alameda County: / Дополнительная информация о собраниях в округе Alameda (Alameda County): / 알라미다 카운티 토론회에 관한 자세한 내용: June Garrett, BART Government & Community Relations • (510) 464-6257 or jgarret@bart.gov

For more details about Contra Costa County meetings:

Para obtener mayor información sobre las reuniones en el Condado de Contra Costa: / Contra Costa 縣會議的詳情: / Để biết thêm chi tiết về các buổi họp ở Quận Contra Costa: / Para sa marami pang detalye tungkol sa mga pulong sa Contra Costa County: / Дополнительная информация о собраниях в округе Contra-Коста (Contra Costa County): / 콘트라 코스타카운티 토론회에 관한 자세한 내용: Walter Gonzales, BART Government & Community Relations • (510) 464-6428 or wgonzal@bart.gov

For more details about San Francisco County and San Mateo County meetings:

Para obtener mayor información sobre las reuniones en el Condado de San Francisco: / 舊金山縣會議的詳情: / Để biết thêm chi tiết về các buổi họp ở Quận San Francisco và Quận San Mateo: / Para sa marami pang detalye tungkol sa mga pulong sa San Francisco County: / Дополнительная информация о собраниях в округе Сан-Франциско (San Francisco County): / 샌프란시스코 카운티 토론회에 관한 자세한 내용: Molly Burke, BART Government & Community Relations • (510) 464-6172 or mburke@bart.gov





CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
Mental Health

Sup. Daly
epage
City Attorney

1600 9th Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 654-1720

June 03, 2010

TO: Chief of Police, San Francisco
District Attorney for San Francisco County
Sheriff for San Francisco County
Attorney, Brendan Conroy
City Attorney for San Francisco County
Clerk of the Board for San Francisco County
Sex Offender Unit of San Francisco

Dear Sir or Madam:

This will serve as official notice, under Welfare and Institutions Code 6609.1 regarding a Department of Mental Health (DMH) recommendation made to the San Francisco County Superior Court for the community placement of a person committed as a sexually violent predator under Welfare and Institutions Code 6600 et seq. The specifics of the recommendation are as follows:

Name of patient:	Paul George
Proposed placement address:	Roadway Inn 101 9 th Street San Francisco, CA 94103
Date of commitment	September 1999
County from which committed	San Francisco
Proposed placement date	Placement date subject to final approval of the committing court.
Next court hearing location and date	July 7, 2010 Judge Mary Morgan San Francisco Superior Court Department 15 850 Bryant Street San Francisco, CA 94103


45

Page 2
June 3, 2010

Agencies receiving this notification may provide written comments to the court and the DMH regarding the proposed placement, location and conditions of release. If appropriate, alternative locations are to be suggested, please identify the one agency within the community of placement authorized to make such suggestions, if any. Written comments to the DMH should be sent to my attention at the following address:

Department of Mental Health
Forensic Services Branch
1600 Ninth St. Room 250
Sacramento, CA 95814

Sincerely,



ROBERT LUCAS
Chief, Forensic Services
Long Term Care Services

Cc: Cynthia Radavsky, DMH
Richard DaBell, DMH
Alan Stillman, Liberty Healthcare
Nancy Kincaid, DMH
Catherine Hickinbotham, DMH

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

(Facsimile)

Case Name: People v. George**San Francisco County Case No. SCN124302**

I declare:

I am employed in the Office of Forensic Services, California Department of Mental Health, at whose direction this service is made. I am 18 years of age or older and not a party to this matter; my business address is: 1600 Ninth St. Sacramento CA 95814. I am familiar with the business practice at the Department of Mental Health for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. In accordance with that practice, correspondence placed in the internal mail collection system at the Department of Mental Health is deposited with the United States Postal Service that same day in the ordinary course of business. My facsimile machine telephone number is (916) 651-3088.

On June 3, 2010, at 3:30 P.M., I served the attached **Community Notification Letter** by transmitting a true copy by facsimile machine, pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 2008. The facsimile machine I used complied with rule 2003, and no error was reported by the machine. Pursuant to rule 2008(e)(4), I caused the machine to print a record of the transmission, a copy of which is attached to this declaration. In addition, I placed a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the internal mail system of the Department of Mental Health addressed as follows:

District Attorney, City and County of**San Francisco**

Kamala D. Harris
Hall of Justice
850 Bryant Street, Room 322
San Francisco, CA 94103
Office: (415) 553-1752
Fax: (415) 533-9054

Chief of Police, City of San Francisco

George Gascon
Hall of Justice
850 Bryant Street, Suite 525
San Francisco, CA 94103
Office: (415) 553-1551
Fax: (415) 553-1554

Sheriff for San Francisco County

Michael Hennessey
City Hall, Room 456
1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
Office: (415) 554-7225
Fax: (415) 554-7050

Clerk of the Board

Angela Calbitoc
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
Office: (415) 554-5184
Fax: (415) 554-5163

Brendan, Conroy, Attorney

255 Kansas Street, Suite 340
San Francisco, CA 94103
Office: (415) 565-9600 Ext 3324
Fax: (415) 565-9601

City Attorney

Dennis Herrera
Office of the City Attorney
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94103
Office: (415) 554-4748
Fax: (415) 554-4715

Sex Offender Unit

Lieutenant Dan Leydon
850 Bryant Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
Office: (415) 553-1361
Fax: (415) 553-9265

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on June 3, 2010 at Sacramento, California.

LINDA J. LEVINGSTON

Print Name

Linda J. Levingston

Signature

Paul George Community Notification Listing**District Attorney, City and County of San Francisco**

Kamala D. Harris
Hall of Justice
850 Bryant Street, Room 322
San Francisco, CA 94103
Office: (415) 553-1752
Fax: (415) 553-9054

Sheriff for San Francisco County

Michael Hennessey
City Hall, Room 456
1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
Office: (415) 554-7225
Fax: (415) 554-7050

Brendan, Conroy, Attorney

255 Kansas Street, Suite 340
San Francisco, CA 94103
Office: (415) 565-9600 Ext 3324
Fax: (415) 565-9601

Chief of Police, City of San Francisco

George Gascon
Hall of Justice
850 Bryant Street, Suite 525
San Francisco, CA 94103
Office: (415) 553-1551
Fax: (415) 553-1554

Clerk of the Board

Angela ~~Calillo~~ CALVILLO
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
Office: (415) 554-5184
Fax: (415) 554-5163

City Attorney

Dennis Herrera
Office of the City Attorney
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA 94102
Office: (415) 554-4748
Fax: (415) 554-4715

Sex Offender Unit

Lieutenant Dan Leydon
850 Bryant Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
Office: (415) 553-1361
Fax: (415) 553-9265



CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
Mental Health

*Sup. Daly
City Atty
c page*

1600 9th Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 654-2413

June 7, 2010

TO: Chief of Police, San Francisco
District Attorney for San Francisco County
Sheriff for San Francisco County
Attorney, Brendan Conroy
City Attorney for San Francisco County
Clerk of the Board for San Francisco County
Sex Offender Unit of San Francisco

Re: Mr. Paul George; Letter of Retraction; Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 6609.1

To Whom It May Concern:

This will serve as official notice that the California Department of Mental Health has retracted its written recommendation to the San Francisco County Superior Court, dated June 3, 2010, pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code 6609.1. Mr. Paul George will not reside at the Rodeway Inn, 101 9th Street, San Francisco, CA 94103, but will continue to reside at the address of record: Potter Hotel, 1288 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA.

Sincerely,

ROBERT LUCAS
Chief, Forensic Services
Long Term Care Services

Cc: Cynthia Radavsky, DMH
Mark Grabau, DMH
Richard DaBell, DMH
Nancy Kincaid, DMH
Catherine Hickinbotham, DMH
Alan Stillman, Liberty Healthcare

46



CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
Mental Health

1600 9th Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 654-1720

June 03, 2010

TO: Chief of Police, San Francisco
District Attorney for San Francisco County
Sheriff for San Francisco County
Attorney, Brendan Conroy
City Attorney for San Francisco County
✓ Clerk of the Board for San Francisco County
Sex Offender Unit of San Francisco

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JUN - 8 PM 3:19
BY _____

Dear Sir or Madam:


This will serve as official notice, under Welfare and Institutions Code 6609.1 regarding a Department of Mental Health (DMH) recommendation made to the San Francisco County Superior Court for the community placement of a person committed as a sexually violent predator under Welfare and Institutions Code 6600 et seq. The specifics of the recommendation are as follows:

Name of patient:	Paul George
Proposed placement address:	Roadway Inn 101 9 th Street San Francisco, CA 94103
Date of commitment	September 1999
County from which committed	San Francisco
Proposed placement date	Placement date subject to final approval of the committing court.
Next court hearing location and date	July 7, 2010 Judge Mary Morgan San Francisco Superior Court Department 15 850 Bryant Street San Francisco, CA 94103

Agencies receiving this notification may provide written comments to the court and the DMH regarding the proposed placement, location and conditions of release. If appropriate, alternative locations are to be suggested, please identify the one agency within the community of placement authorized to make such suggestions, if any. Written comments to the DMH should be sent to my attention at the following address:

Department of Mental Health
Forensic Services Branch
1600 Ninth St. Room 250
Sacramento, CA 95814

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Lucas', written over a horizontal line.

ROBERT LUCAS
Chief, Forensic Services
Long Term Care Services

Cc: Cynthia Radavsky, DMH
Richard DaBell, DMH
Alan Stillman, Liberty Healthcare
Nancy Kincaid, DMH
Catherine Hickinbotham, DMH

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

(Facsimile)

Case Name: **People v. George**

San Francisco County Case No. **SCN124302**

I declare:

I am employed in the Office of Forensic Services, California Department of Mental Health, at whose direction this service is made. I am 18 years of age or older and not a party to this matter; my business address is: 1600 Ninth St. Sacramento CA 95814. I am familiar with the business practice at the Department of Mental Health for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. In accordance with that practice, correspondence placed in the internal mail collection system at the Department of Mental Health is deposited with the United States Postal Service that same day in the ordinary course of business. My facsimile machine telephone number is (916) 651-3088.

On June 3, 2010, at 3:30 P.M., I served the attached **Community Notification Letter** by transmitting a true copy by facsimile machine, pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 2008. The facsimile machine I used complied with rule 2003, and no error was reported by the machine. Pursuant to rule 2008(e)(4), I caused the machine to print a record of the transmission, a copy of which is attached to this declaration. In addition, I placed a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the internal mail system of the Department of Mental Health addressed as follows:

**District Attorney, City and County of
San Francisco**

Kamala D. Harris
Hall of Justice
850 Bryant Street, Room 322
San Francisco, CA 94103
Office: (415) 553-1752
Fax: (415) 533-9054

Sheriff for San Francisco County

Michael Hennessey
City Hall, Room 456
1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
Office: (415) 554-7225
Fax: (415) 554-7050

Brendan, Conroy, Attorney

255 Kansas Street, Suite 340
San Francisco, CA 94103
Office: (415) 565-9600 Ext 3324
Fax: (415) 565-9601

Chief of Police, City of San Francisco

George Gascon
Hall of Justice
850 Bryant Street, Suite 525
San Francisco, CA 94103
Office: (415) 553-1551
Fax: (415) 553-1554

Clerk of the Board

Angela Calbiloo
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
Office: (415) 554-5184
Fax: (415) 554-5163

City Attorney

Dennis Herrera
Office of the City Attorney
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94103
Office: (415) 554-4748
Fax: (415) 554-4715

Sex Offender Unit

Lieutenant Dan Leydon
850 Bryant Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
Office: (415) 553-1361
Fax: (415) 553-9265

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on June 3, 2010 at Sacramento, California.

LINDA J. LEVINGSTON

Print Name

Linda J. Levingston

Signature

Paul George Community Notification Listing

District Attorney, City and County of San Francisco

Kamala D. Harris
Hall of Justice
850 Bryant Street, Room 322
San Francisco, CA 94103
Office: (415) 553-1752
Fax: (415) 553-9054

Sheriff for San Francisco County

Michael Hennessey
City Hall, Room 456
1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
Office: (415) 554-7225
Fax: (415) 554-7050

Brendan, Conroy, Attorney

255 Kansas Street, Suite 340
San Francisco, CA 94103
Office: (415) 565-9600 Ext 3324
Fax: (415) 565-9601

Chief of Police, City of San Francisco

George Gascon
Hall of Justice
850 Bryant Street, Suite 525
San Francisco, CA 94103
Office: (415) 553-1551
Fax: (415) 553-1554

Clerk of the Board

Angela Calbiloo
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
Office: (415) 554-5184
Fax: (415) 554-5163

City Attorney

Dennis Herrera
Office of the City Attorney
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA 94102
Office: (415) 554-4748
Fax: (415) 554-4715

Sex Offender Unit

Lieutenant Dan Leydon
850 Bryant Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
Office: (415) 553-1361
Fax: (415) 553-9265