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, 2009.  (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 Bibilowicz, 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 inquires. (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)
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
SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT

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

Conserving California's Wildlife Since 1870
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,

George Putris
Tax Administrator

cc: José Cisneros
San Francisco Public Library

Attachments
### TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT

**CLEAN ENERGY TECHNOLOGY EXCLUSION**

**CALENDAR YEAR 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Firms</th>
<th>Total SF Employees</th>
<th>No. of Eligible Employees</th>
<th>Total Clean Energy Exclusion</th>
<th>Payroll Tax Excluded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>$25,396,189</td>
<td>$380,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$15,127,037</td>
<td>$226,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$10,269,152</td>
<td>$154,037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

May 28, 2010
## TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT

### CLEAN ENERGY TECHNOLOGY EXCLUSION

FOR CALENDAR YEARS 2006 THRU 2008

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

May 28, 2010
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
## TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT
### BIOTECHNOLOGY EXCLUSION
#### CALENDAR YEAR 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Firms</th>
<th>Total SF Employees</th>
<th>No. of New Eligible Employees</th>
<th>Total Biotechnology Exclusion</th>
<th>Payroll Tax Excluded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>$59,790,369</td>
<td>$896,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>$24,684,098</td>
<td>$370,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>$35,106,271</td>
<td>$526,595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

May 28, 2010
### TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT

#### BIOTECHNOLOGY PAYROLL EXCLUSION

FOR CALENDAR YEARS 2007 THRU 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Firms Filing</th>
<th>Total S.F. Employees</th>
<th># of Eligible Employees</th>
<th>Biotechnology Payroll Exclusion</th>
<th>Payroll Tax Excluded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>$21,274,886</td>
<td>$319,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>$24,684,098</td>
<td>$370,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>$59,790,369</td>
<td>$896,856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Tax Credit</th>
<th>No. of Firms Filing</th>
<th>Total SF Employees</th>
<th>No. of Eligible Employees</th>
<th>Total Tax Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Zone (approved)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,313</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>$45,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Zone (pending approval)*</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$61,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3,413</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>$106,793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Tax Credit</th>
<th>Number of Firms Filing</th>
<th>Total Number of SF Employees</th>
<th>Number of Eligible Employees</th>
<th>Total Tax Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Zone reported in previous tax year</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Zone filed in current year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Zone - pending submission of documentation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Zone - reported prior year, did not qualify</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(851)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Enterprise Zone Tax Credit</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1,015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Statements filed in 2009 for prior years
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Mar 2010</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(415) 759-2363 – Phone
(415) 759-2374 - Fax

375 Laguna Honda Blvd.  San Francisco, CA 94116-1499
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-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

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

Attachment A-1
### SOURCES OF NEW SNF ADMISSIONS TO LAGUNA HONDA HOSPITAL
#### JANUARY 2009 – DECEMBER 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Admission</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board and Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Pac Acute</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Pac SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Zion Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Misc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other SNF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11 2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFGH Acute</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFGH SNF</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis Acute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Luke's Acute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Luke's SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's Acute</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Med Acute</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55 18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Med SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Hospital Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Hospital SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

| 49 | 53% | 44 | 59% | 45 | 62% | 32 | 44% | 20 | 60% | 32 | 59% | 32 | 47% | 30 | 57% | 39 | 56% | 38 | 45% | 36 | 54% | 55 | 472 | 100% |
### SOURCES OF NEW SNF ADMISSIONS TO LAGUNA HONDA HOSPITAL*
**JANUARY 2008 – DECEMBER 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Admission</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board and Care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Pac Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Pac SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Hospital Acute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Hospital SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Zion Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Misc</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFGH Acute</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFGH SNF</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis Acute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Luke's Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Luke's SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Med Acute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Med SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Hospital Acute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Hospital SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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.

Attachment A-3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Admission</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board and Care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Pac Acute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Pac SNF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Hospital Acute</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Hospital SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Zion Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.K. Davies Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.K. Davies SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFGH Acute</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFGH SNF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis Acute</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Luke's Acute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Luke's SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's Acute</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setaon Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setaon SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Med Acute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Med SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Hospital Acute</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Hospital SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excluding internal transfers

Attachment A-4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Admission</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board and Care</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Pac Acute</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Pac SNF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Hospital Ac</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Hospital SNF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser Acute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Zion Acute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of County**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.K. Davies Acute</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.K. Davies SNF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFGH Acute</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFGH SNF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis Acute</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis SNF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Luke's Acute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Luke's SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's Acute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's SNF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Acute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Med Acute</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Med SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Hospital Acute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Hospital SNF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excluding internal transfers
## SOURCES OF NEW SNF ADMISSIONS TO LAGUNA HONDA HOSPITAL*
### JANUARY 2005 - DECEMBER 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Admission</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>SFGH</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board and Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Pac Acute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Pac SNF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Zion Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of County</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.K. Davies Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.K. Davies SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFGH Acute</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFGH SNF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis Acute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Luke's Acute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Luke's SNF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Acute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton SNF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UIC Med Acute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UIC Med SNF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Hospital Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Hospital SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

* Excluding internal transfers
** Out-of-county count begins in October 2004
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Admission</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board and Care</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Pac Acute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Pac SNF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Hospital Acute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Hospital SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser Acute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.K. Davies Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.K. Davies SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFGH Acute</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFGH SNF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis Acute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis SNF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Luke's Acute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Luke's SNF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's Acute</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's SNF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton SNF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Med Acute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Med SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Hospital Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Hospital SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excluding admissions from Unit M7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Admission</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board and Care</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Pac Acute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Pac SNF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Hospital Acute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Hospital SNF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser Acute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.K. Davies Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.K. Davies SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFGH Acute</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFGH SNF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis SNF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Luke’s Acute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Luke’s SNF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s Acute</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s SNF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Acute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Med Acute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Med SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Hospital Acute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Hospital SNF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excluding admissions from Unit M7
## SOURCES OF NEW SNF ADMISSIONS TO LAGUNA HONDA HOSPITAL*
### JANUARY 2001 – DECEMBER 2001

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

* Excluding admissions from Unit M7

Attachment A-10
Laguna Honda Hospital Distribution of Residents by Race as of 3/31/06

(n = 1023)

- Asian 22%
- African-American 25%
- Non-Hispanic White 33%
- Other 3%
- Hispanic 12%
Laguna Honda Hospital Distribution by Race as of 3/31/2004
(n=1066)

- Non-Hispanic White: 41%
- Asian: 27%
- Other: 2%
- Hispanic: 6%
- African-American/Black: 24%

Laguna Honda Hospital Distribution by Race as of 3/31/2003
(n=1063)

- Non-Hispanic White: 41%
- Asian: 20%
- African-American/Black: 26%
- Other: 2%
- Hispanic: 11%

Attachment B-4
### Laguna Honda Hospital
#### Age Distribution by Decibels
#### 2001 - First 3 Months of 2010

#### Table of Age Distribution by Decibels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=30</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 69</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 - 79</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 - 89</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 - 99</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;99</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Chart Description
- The chart depicts the age distribution by decibels for Laguna Honda Hospital over the years 2001 to the first 3 months of 2010.
- Each bar graph represents a different year, with the height of the bar indicating the percentage of residents in each age category.

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

Attachment D
June 1, 2010

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

Re: Notice of Transfer of Function under Charter Section 4.132

Dear Madam Clerk:

This letter constitutes a notice to the Board of Supervisors under Charter Section 4.132 of
a transfer of function between departments within the Executive including:

- Seven positions (1.0 FTE 1053, 4.0 FTE 1062, 1.0 FTE 1063 and 1.0 FTE 1070) will
  transfer from the Department of Technology (DT) to the Police Department to provide
direct support on a variety of public safety IT applications.

- Two positions (1.0 FTE 1052, 1.0 FTE 1063) will transfer from DT to the City
  Administrator to provide direct support to the 311 Call Center.

- One position (1.0 FTE 1246) will transfer from the Department of Human Resources to
  the Assessor-Recorder to provide direct human resources support.

- Four positions (1.0 FTE 9772, 1.0 FTE 2917, 1.0 FTE 1842) will transfer on October 1,
  2010 from the Department of Children, Youth and Their Families to the Human Services
  Agency (HSA) to create the Office of Child Care and Early Learning (OCCEL). This
  new office will consolidate Early Care and Education (ECE) services to improve
  management over the child care subsidy system as well as child care provider supports
  and workforce investments.

- One position (1.0 FTE 1012) will transfer from the Department of Building Inspection
  (DBI) to HSA to consolidate desktop support between the departments and allow DBI to
  access other information technology services available at HSA through a workorder.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom
Mayor

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 200, San Francisco, California 94102-4641
gavin.newsom@sfgov.org • (415) 554-6141
Transfer of Function, Charter Section 4.132
June 1, 2010

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

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.
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.

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
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

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.
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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>Cable Car Fare Collection Results</th>
<th>Rides Taken December 11-30, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fares Collected</td>
<td>Fares Not Collected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Rides</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable Car Line</td>
<td>Powell &amp; Mason</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Powell &amp; Hyde</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarding Point</td>
<td>Terminals</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Later on Route</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Passengers</td>
<td>Very Crowded (a)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderately Crowded</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relatively Empty</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of Day</td>
<td>Commute Hours AM (b)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commute Hours PM</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daytime Hours</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MTA Initiative in Response to Audit</th>
<th>Status per MTA</th>
<th>Auditor’s Follow-up Work</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
<td>Conductors are certified and sign off on the training.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
<td>All conductors have already signed off.</td>
<td>Obtained documentation that all conductors have signed-off on their conductors’ training, and reviewed MTA’s compliance record.</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Interviewed MTA’s Rail Operations staff.</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 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.

Cable Car Division instructors refreshed the conductors on fare collection procedures and had them sign off the certification during annual compliance nde checks. This has always been a part of MTA’s training program for transit operators.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MTA Initiative in Response to Audit</th>
<th>Status per MTA</th>
<th>Auditor's Follow-up Work</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Rotate security personnel in plainclothes to observe staff on the cable cars for quality control.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Reviewed documentation and information regarding the undercover checks.</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 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.</td>
<td>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 &amp; Beach, two at Powell &amp; Market Streets.</td>
<td>Asked MTA staff about the number of ticket booths and hours of operations.</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are only three (not four) turning point booths for purchase of cable car tickets. One at Powell &amp; 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 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.</td>
<td>Management team (superintendent/assistant superintendent) rides the cable car lines daily/weekly.</td>
<td>Asked MTA for documentation of the rides and its report on the findings, if any.</td>
<td>Partially Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTA Initiative in Response to Audit</td>
<td>Status per MTA</td>
<td>Auditor’s Follow-up Work</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Develop management reports that identify any issues requiring further research.</td>
<td>Issues are documented on the Division Safety Committee (DSC) &amp; Joint Labor Management Board (JLMB) meeting minutes/action items and follow-up actions are taken.</td>
<td>Requested documentation or meeting minutes where issues have been identified showing implementation of the recommendation.</td>
<td>Not Implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
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:

- 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.
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 car 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 86% 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.
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@sfmtpa.com or faxed to 415.701.4721.
Manager Observation Ride

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Run:</th>
<th>Line:</th>
<th>Location/Direction:</th>
<th>Time:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Observations:**

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

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
San Francisco Municipal Railway | Department of Parking & Traffic
One South Van Ness Avenue, Seventh Fl. San Francisco, CA 94103 | Tel: 415.701.4800 | Fax: 415.701.4400 | www.sfmtda.com
MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, Board of Supervisors
   Clerk of the Board

FROM: Ben Rosenfield

DATE: June 1, 2010

SUBJECT: Notification of Access Line Tax Annual Rate Adjustment

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/PDL/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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Type</th>
<th>Current Rate Per Line</th>
<th>Adjustment Factor</th>
<th>New Rate Per Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access line</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
<td>2.61%</td>
<td>$2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trunk line</td>
<td>$20.62</td>
<td>2.61%</td>
<td>$21.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High capacity line</td>
<td>$371.15</td>
<td>2.61%</td>
<td>$380.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
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.
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
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.
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 Duffy,

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 commonsense 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
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
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
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
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.
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/bdsvprs/ordinances09/c0085-
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.\footnote{Sharp Park Report, Table 3, at p. 50:
http://www.parks.sfgov.org/wcm_recpark/SharpParkGC/Tetratclfinalrpt10609.pdf}

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 Foundation\footnote{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_Taskforce/Final_report_August_26_2008.pdf}, respectively, both of which found that...
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.

---


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 Francisco\(^9\) and Pacifica\(^{10}\),
the San Mateo Board of Supervisors\(^{11}\), Pacifica City
Council\(^{12}\), the San Francisco Parks, Recreation and Open
Space Advisory Committee ("PROSAC")\(^{13}\), and Pacifica Chamber
of Commerce\(^{14}\) 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,

\(^{12}\) 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, 12\(^{th}\) U.S. Congressional District, Press
Release, November 9, 2009:
45,48&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.


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)\(^\text{16}\), and Laborer's Union Local 261 (representing the golf course gardeners)\(^\text{17}\). The Washington D.C.-based Cultural Landscape Foundation has designated Sharp Park Golf Course an at-risk, nationally-significant cultural landscape.\(^\text{18}\) The San Francisco Chronicle supported keeping the golf course open in a September 3, 2009 editorial, "Let Golfers Play Through on Sharp Park."\(^\text{19}\)

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

---


\(^\text{17}\) 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](http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=11)


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 experts^{23}, and is documented by Dr. MacKenzie’s original routing drawings, aerial photographs, and Opening Day hole descriptions by MacKenzie’s assistant Jack Fleming.^{24}
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 organizations and golf publications.

Major state, national, and international golf organizations, including the World Golf Foundation, California Alliance for Golf (whose members include the Northern and Southern California Golf Associations and all major California golf organizations), and the Alister MacKenzie Society of Great Britain and Ireland, 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,” and “Sharp Park


29 Alister MacKenzie Society letter, supra, fn. 23.
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today has nothing to do with Alister MacKenzie's original design. 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 Faulkner, both of whom have publicly and in writing denounced the Center for mischaracterizing and misrepresenting their work.

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." 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/SPPGA_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.\textsuperscript{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 Park\textsuperscript{36}, 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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.


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

\textsuperscript{37} Id., at pp. 8-15.

\textsuperscript{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/recopark_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.”

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.

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

---


40 Karen Swaim, Id.
hungry feral cat we wouldn’t have found it; that snake would probably have been eaten."\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{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.

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."

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.

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 Trifileman 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.

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 bites 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.”

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 Trifileman, 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,

[Signature]
Richard Harris
San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

APPENDIX

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

Governmental Entities


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


Governmental Entities, cont.


Environmental Organizations


Labor Organizations


Historic Preservation Organizations


Civic Organizations

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

Newspaper Editorial


Golf Organizations

Alister MacKenzie Society, letter, April 28, 2009:
http://www.pacificariptide.com/a/5a00d8341c795b53ef01156f6f286c970c-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

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/Faulkn er letter.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


Leon Younger & PROS Consulting, “San Francisco Recreational Opportunities Study Summary Report,” August, 2008:

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:

National Sports and Golf Publications


2010 Local Agency Biennial Notice

Name of Agency:          Board of Appeals
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.)
   o Include new positions (including consultants) that must be designated.
   o Delete positions that manage public investments from the list of designated positions.
   o Revise disclosure categories.
   o Revise the titles of existing positions.
   o Delete titles of positions that have been abolished.
   o 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:  6 - 2 - 10

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

[Stamp: 20]
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.)
   o Include new positions (including consultants) that must be designated.
   o Delete positions that manage public investments from the list of designated positions.
   o Revise disclosure categories.
   o Revise the titles of existing positions.
   o Delete titles of positions that have been abolished.
   o Other (describe) _________________________________________________________

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

X 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] June 1, 2010

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

Anita. [Signature]
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
2010 Local Agency Biennial Notice

Name of Agency: 

Mailing Address: 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl, #48

Contact Person: Rachael Gosewyng Office Phone No: 554-4391

E-mail: Rachael.Gosewyng@drey.my 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.)
   o Include new positions (including consultants) that must be designated.
   o Delete positions that manage public investments from the list of designated positions.
   o Revise disclosure categories.
   o Revise the titles of existing positions.
   o Delete titles of positions that have been abolished.
   o Other (describe)

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

x 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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
11/17
RECEIVED
2010 Local Agency Biennial Notice

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 87902.

Signature of Chief Executive Officer 6/3/10

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: 554-3163
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
We can't afford it and neither can the environment.
thanks
Mark Mushkat
San Francisco, CA
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
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
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
Mendocino County Citizens For Responsible Transportation
1150 Hearst Road
Willits, CA 95490
May 21, 2010

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

Dear Supervisors:

We know that there are important transportation projects in your district that may not be funded due to high competition for limited dollars. In June 2010, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) will be deciding whether or not to fund the Willits Bypass Project.

Phase I of this project is a $200 million freeway bypass on Highway 101 in Mendocino County, around the town of Willits (population 5000). This costly bypass would be only 5.9 miles long and transport less than 10,000 vehicles per day. Several alternative proposals have not yet been adequately explored.

In 2007, the CTC denied funding for this project because of demands from areas of the state such as yours that are in more serious need of congestion relief. In response local city and county officials cried foul, and succeeded in convincing the CalTrans Director to find funds for Phase I of this project.

This controversial bypass has long divided our small community, and is a tragic waste of scarce transportation funds. As of this writing, CalTrans has not been granted its required resource agency permits, nor have they been able to reach an agreement with the City of Willits on relinquishment of the existing highway.

Abandoning this project would open up a potential source of transportation funding. If fully built (Phases I & II), this multimillion dollar bypass “to nowhere” would only serve to strip funds from more deserving projects. Please feel free to contact us for more detail on the Willits Bypass Project, or our work to promote responsible transportation planning.

Yours sincerely,

Donna Kerr
Mendocino County Citizens For Responsible Transportation
afkdsk@willitsonline.com
(707) 459-0957
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.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

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

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,

[Signature]

Chrysanthus Wyplis
Street Address: 684 E 11th St. #503
San Francisco CA 94109
Phone: (415) 368-4683
Email: chp@hyphlus.net

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity or Performance Measure</th>
<th>Apr-2009</th>
<th>Feb-2010</th>
<th>Apr-2010</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of MUNI buses and trains that adhere to posted schedules</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average daily number of MUNI customer complaints regarding safety, negligence, discourtesy, and service delivery</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-9.6%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recreation, Arts, and Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity or Performance Measure</th>
<th>Apr-2009</th>
<th>Feb-2010</th>
<th>Apr-2010</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average score of parks inspected using park maintenance standards</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of individuals currently registered in recreation courses</td>
<td>11,307</td>
<td>7,093</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of park facility (picnic tables, sites, recreation facilities, fields, etc.) bookings</td>
<td>9,027</td>
<td>11,258</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of visitors at public fine art museums (Asian Art Museum, Legion of Honor, de Young)</td>
<td>167,992</td>
<td>225,437</td>
<td>159,881</td>
<td>-29.1%</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>-4.8%</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total circulation of materials at main and branch libraries</td>
<td>837,709</td>
<td>839,752</td>
<td>920,821</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environment, Energy, and Utilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity or Performance Measure</th>
<th>Apr-2009</th>
<th>Feb-2010</th>
<th>Apr-2010</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water reservoirs storage as a percentage of normal for this month</td>
<td>105.3%</td>
<td>122.0%</td>
<td>123.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average monthly water use by City departments (in millions of gallons)</td>
<td>138.4</td>
<td>127.5</td>
<td>124.6</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average daily residential per capita water usage (in gallons)</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average monthly energy usage by City departments (in million kilowatt hours)</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average daily tons of garbage going to landfill</td>
<td>1,144.6</td>
<td>1,020.4</td>
<td>1,035.0</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>-9.6%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total solid waste diverted from landfill through curbside recycling</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity or Performance Measure</td>
<td>Apr-2009</td>
<td>Feb-2010</td>
<td>Apr-2010</td>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>Trend</td>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitting and Inspection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value (estimated cost, in millions) of construction projects for which new building permits were issued</td>
<td>$121.0</td>
<td>$64.4</td>
<td>$112.0</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-7.3%</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of all building permits involving new construction and major alterations review that are approved or disapproved within 60 days</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>-3.6%</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>-7.0%</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of all applications for variance from the Planning Code decided within 120 days</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-21.4%</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of life hazard or lack of heat complaints responded to within one business day</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of customer-requested construction permit inspections completed within two business days of requested date</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average daily number of 311 calls</td>
<td>10,804</td>
<td>8,913</td>
<td>7,843</td>
<td>-12.0%</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>-27.4%</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of 311 calls answered by call takers within 60 seconds</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality score of 311 call takers</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.
### Government Barometer Measure Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity or Performance Measure</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Performance Pattern</th>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Measure Technical Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of serious violent crimes reported (homicide, forcible rape, robbery and aggravated assault, per 100,000 population)</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Trending down is positive</td>
<td>Number of offenses divided by 100,000 population. Uniform Crime Report (UCR) violent crimes are: homicide, forcible rape, robbery and aggravated assault.</td>
<td>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 &amp; FY 2010: 442,625 (CA Dept of Finance E-2 Report). Timing: Monthly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of serious property crimes reported (burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson, per 100,000 population)</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Trending down is positive</td>
<td>Number of crimes divided by 100,000 population. UCR Part I property crimes are burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft and arson.</td>
<td>Collection Method: Number of Part I Property crimes divided by current San Francisco population and multiplied by 100,000. Population FY 2008: 829,848, FY 2009 &amp; FY 2010: 442,625 (Source: CA Department of Finance, E-2 Report). Timing: Monthly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of fire/medical emergency calls responded to within 5 minutes</td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Trending up is positive</td>
<td>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 siren, not just those requiring possible medical care.</td>
<td>Raw data is stored at Department of Emergency Management and aggregated at Fire Department headquarters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average daily county jail population</td>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>Trending down is positive</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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 406. Timing: Data available 3am daily. Population represents all in-custody people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of 9-1-1 calls answered within 10 seconds</td>
<td>Emergency Management</td>
<td>Trending up is positive</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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 10111 Turk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 9-1-1 daily call volume</td>
<td>Emergency Management</td>
<td>Trending down is positive</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health, Human Services, and Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average daily population of San Francisco General Hospital</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>Trending down is positive</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average daily population of Laguna Honda Hospital</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>Trending down is positive</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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 + MNA + LAA columns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of Healthy San Francisco participants</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>Trending up is positive</td>
<td>This number represents enrollees in the Healthy San Francisco program (HSP). HSP 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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Government Barometer Measure Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity or Performance Measure</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Performance Pattern</th>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Measure Technical Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New patient wait time in days for an appointment at a DPH primary care clinic</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>Trending down is positive</td>
<td>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 employee to wait for a primary care appointment.</td>
<td>This data is collected manually by a DPH staff person who searches the DPH computerized appointment system (Invision) for the first available routine appointment at each primary care clinic or, if required, calls the clinic to inquire about next appointment availability for a new &amp; 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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of all available homeless shelter beds used</td>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>Trending up is positive</td>
<td>This is the average percentage of shelter beds (single adult) available that have been reserved and used on a nightly basis.</td>
<td>Data for this measure is derived from the CHANGES shelter bed reservation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average nightly homeless shelter bed use</td>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>Trending down is positive</td>
<td>The numbers reported here represent the average number of beds (single adult) used during the month.</td>
<td>Data for this measure is reported via the CHANGES system, but the actual number of beds available is based upon negotiated contractual obligations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of children in foster care</td>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>Trending down is positive</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Streets and Public Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Measure Technical Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average score of streets inspected using street maintenance litter standards (1 = acceptably clean to 3 = very dirty)</td>
<td>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 DPFW 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 &quot;district&quot; inspections, are available every other month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of street cleaning requests responded to within 48 hours</td>
<td>DPFW 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of graffiti requests on public property responded to within 48 hours</td>
<td>DPFW receives calls from the public to report graffiti, primarily through 311. DPFW crews respond to those 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of pothole requests repaired within 72 hours</td>
<td>DPFW 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Public Transit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Measure Technical Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of MUNI buses and trains that adhere to posted schedules</td>
<td>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-2pm), 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 SFPMTA Board of Directors in April or May. For the barometer report, data is reported on a quarterly basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average daily number of MUNI customer complaints regarding safety, negligence, discourtesy, and service delivery</td>
<td>Definition: Customers may provide feedback regarding Muni services through 311, sfmata.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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity or Performance Measure</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average score of parks inspected using park maintenance standards</td>
<td>Recreation and Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of individuals currently registered in recreation courses</td>
<td>Recreation and Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of park facility (picnic tables, stairs, recreation facilities, fields, etc.) bookings</td>
<td>Recreation and Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of visitors at public fine art museums (Asian Art Museum, Legion of Honor, de Young)</td>
<td>Fine Arts Museums and Asian Art Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total circulation of materials at main and branch libraries</td>
<td>Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water reservoirs storage as a percentage of normal for this month</td>
<td>Public Utilities Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average monthly water use by City departments (in millions of gallons)</td>
<td>Public Utilities Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average daily residential per capita water usage (in gallons)</td>
<td>Public Utilities Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average monthly energy usage by City departments (in million kilowatt hours)</td>
<td>Public Utilities Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average daily tons of garbage going to landfill</td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total solid waste diverted from landfill through curbside recycling</td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity or Performance Measure</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitting and inspection: the value (estimated cost, in millions) of new construction projects for which new building permits were issued</td>
<td>Building Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of all building permits involving new construction and major alterations - review that are approved or disapproved within 60 days</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of all applications for variance from the Planning Code decided within 120 days</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of life hazard or lack of heat complaints responded to within one business day</td>
<td>Building Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of customer-requested construction permit inspections completed within two business days of requested date</td>
<td>Building Inspection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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: Aysis'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.
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
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
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."


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
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.


Patrick
Please do not support a City take-over of electric power ...risk-reward is not good. Joe Cline. San Francisco.
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 Allioto-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 Allioto-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
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 THCs 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; mattr.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
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.
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
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
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
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.
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 15 mm (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
June 7, 2010

Dear our American Ambassador to Egypt "MARGARET SCOBRY"

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
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
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@sfwater.org; Edwin Lee; Elizabeth Murray; Emily Murase; Gary Amelio; George Gascon; jbouchanan@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 Hennessey; 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 
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/sfl
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
*****************************************************************
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
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
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,

[Signature]
Sheri Tiemann
Staff Services Analyst

Attachment
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. (j)(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 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.)


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 2088.
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.)

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


---

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

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).)
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 historica PROGRAMMATICAL 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 communit 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 bn systems for the proposed new Creative Arts Center. By waiting to alleviate the impacts till after 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 just, land-lord of the properties they bought. Many residents who lived in the UPS blocks could not get release...
they have not done the seismic retrofitting of the UPS blocks, so why should students and existing tena
to 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 Bou
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

DPW_maillist07304_001.pdf
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
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.
Dear Supervisors,

As we develop a health care plan for San Francisco, I want to make sure that we are addressing the needs of all communities, including the Latino community. The Latino community is one of the fastest-growing populations in our city, and it is crucial that we develop a plan that reflects their needs.

I would like to hear from you about the current health care plan for San Francisco. Specifically, I would like to know why the plan does not support the needs of the Latino community.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
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@sfwater.org

Please consider the environment before printing this email

NEWS RELEASE (Release No. 22-10)

For Immediate Release: Contact: Tyrone Jue (415) 554-3247
June 2, 2010 Charles Sheehan (415) 554-1548

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

###
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
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 – Influencian 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. El reverso de este volante tendrá la fecha de una serie de reuniones abiertas al público. Se centrarán en servicios de interpretación y cuidado infantil si los solicita con 72 horas de anticipación a la reunión. Se ofrecerán refrescos.

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 finaliza el 1 de julio de 2010 debido a fondos recibidos por parte del Estado de California. BART está considerando una idea sobre cómo utilizar estos fondos y mostrarle a los usuarios nuestro agradecimiento por su preferencia. Esta es una reducción de tarifas. Esta es su oportunidad de brindar sus opiniones acerca de la opción de reducción de tarifas. Asista a esta reunión para escuchar las propuestas y proporcionar 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 los lineamientos federales, BART solicita comentarios del público para definir lo que constituye una “modificación importante en el servicio.” Asista a esta reunión si desea 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

請參與舊金山灣區運輸局 (San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, BART) 合作，表達您對兩項重要議題的意見。

公車和鐵路列車時間表及服務參加會議日期，將於後日二時提出申請，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本，因此 2010 年 7 月 1 日開始的新財政年度將有額外的預算。BART 目前在計劃資本支出的用途，希望建議議員的行動邀請乘客對建議的投資，這是您對降低票價選擇方案表達想法的最佳機會。請參加此次會議，詳說了解所有提案並提供意見。BART 章潤，將會慎重考慮您提出的意

重要服務變動的釋義

根據聯合國總部規定，BART 為「重要服務變動」釋義時必須徵求民眾的意見。請參加此次會議以便在釋義過程中表達您的意

Các buổi họp cộng đồng của BART – Tác động của những quyết định về vận chuyển

Mỗi ngày việt tham gia công Cự Quản Vệ Chuyển Túc Hành Vọng Viên San Francisco (BART) sẽ tìm hiểu về việc đồng góp về hai vấn đề quan trọng. Ngày giữa các buổi họp cộng để chỉ các khó khăn với việc thực hiện nhà ở và phát triển công nghiệp phục vụ công vụ 72 giờ trước buổi họp. Chúng tôi sẽ phục vụ tận tình.

Các chủ đề được thảo luận hàng ngày bao gồm:

Các buổi họp cộng đồng của BART - Tác động của những quyết định về vận chuyển

Mỗi ngày việt tham gia công Cự Quản Vệ Chuyển Túc Hành Vọng Viên San Francisco (BART) sẽ tìm hiểu về việc đồng góp về hai vấn đề quan trọng. Ngày giữa các buổi họp cộng để chỉ các khó khăn với việc thực hiện nhà ở và phát triển công nghiệp phục vụ công vụ 72 giờ trước buổi họp. Chúng tôi sẽ phục vụ tận tình.

Các chủ đề được thảo luận hàng ngày bao gồm:

www.bart.gov / continuación 

continúa al reverso / 回覆 / tayo / tain / tappo / tappou / trinh / trinh nga / ove / over >
BART 지역 토크 - 대중교통에 관한 정책결정에 참여하십시오

샌프란시스코의 BART('Bay Area Rapid Transit District')는 주기로 중요한 시민에 대한 여러분의 의견을 듣고 있습니다. 본 안내문은 토크에 대한 의견을 표명하는 방법에 대해 설명합니다.

MEETING DATES AND LOCATIONS

FECHA Y UBICACIÓN DE LAS REUNIONES / 預計日期與地點 / 地點與日期 / MEETING AND PROVISION OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS / 토크 일정 및 사회 관계

FOR MORE DETAILS ABOUT ALAMEDA COUNTY MEETINGS:
Para obtener mayor información sobre las reuniones en el Condado de Alameda: / Alameda 县集會更多資訊： / 想要了解更多關於阿拉米達郡的集會資訊： / 因此，您可以訪問下面的網站： / Jane Garrett, BART Goverment & Community Relations / (510) 464-6257 or jarrett@bart.gov

FOR MORE DETAILS ABOUT CONTRA COSTA COUNTY MEETINGS:
Para obtener mayor información sobre las reuniones en el Condado de Contra Costa: / 門蒂諾郡集會更多資訊： / 想要了解更多關於門蒂諾郡的集會資訊： / 因此，您可以訪問下面的網站： / Walter Gonzales, BART Government & Community Relations / (510) 464-6426 or wgonzales@myphantommail.com

FOR MORE DETAILS ABOUT SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY AND SAN MATEO COUNTY MEETINGS:
Para obtener mayor información sobre las reuniones en el Contra Costa County: / 門蒂諾郡集會更多資訊： / 想要了解更多關於門蒂諾郡的集會資訊： / 因此，您可以訪問下面的網站： / Walter Gonzales, BART Government & Community Relations / (510) 464-6426 or wgonzales@myphantommail.com

For more details about San Francisco County and San Mateo County meetings:
Para obtener mayor información sobre las reuniones en el Contra Costa County: / 門蒂諾郡集會更多資訊： / 想要了解更多關於門蒂諾郡的集會資訊： / 因此，您可以訪問下面的網站： / Walter Gonzales, BART Government & Community Relations / (510) 464-6426 or wgonzales@myphantommail.com

For more details about Alameda County meetings:
Para obtener mayor información sobre las reuniones en el Condado de Alameda: / Alameda 县集會更多資訊： / 想要了解更多關於阿拉米達郡的集會資訊： / 因此，您可以訪問下面的網站： / Jane Garrett, BART Goverment & Community Relations / (510) 464-6257 or jarrett@bart.gov
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 9th 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
950 Bryant Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
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
Karina D. Harris
Hall of Justice
850 Bryant Street, Room 122
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 125
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) 554-7223
Fax (415) 554-7050

Clerk of the Board
Angela Celentano
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 94104
Office (415) 565-9600 Ext 3324
Fax (415) 563-9601

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) 554-4746
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. Levington

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 Calviolo
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
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
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 9th 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,

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 the 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) 553-9054

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 Calibuo
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. LEVINGTON

Print Name

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