

Petitions and Communications received from September 28, 2010, through October 8, 2010, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on October 19, 2010.

From Southeast Community Facility Commission, submitting their Annual Statement of Purpose and Annual Report for FY2009-2010. (1)

From U.S. Senator Dianne Feinstein, submitting support for comprehensive immigration reform. Copy: Each Supervisor (2)

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to the sheer number of chain stores spreading all over the small shopping neighborhoods of San Francisco. 2 letters (3)

From Abdalla Megahed, regarding his complaint against the building manager at 990 Polk Street. Copy: Each Supervisor (4)

From Human Rights Commission, submitting request for waiver of Administrative Code Chapter 12B for Holiday Inn Golden Gateway. (5)

From Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector, submitting their investment activity for fiscal year-to-date of the portfolios under the Treasurer's management. Copy: Each Supervisor (6)

From Aaron Goodman, regarding the Parkmerced Project. 2 letters (7)

From Department of Public Health, regarding the Ryan White HIV Emergency Relief Program. File No. 101253, Copy: Each Supervisor (8)

From Office of the Controller, submitting the concession audit report of Paradies Shops. Paradies Shops has three lease agreements with the Airport Commission. (9)

From Mordicai McGuire, regarding spending \$450,000 to build a wheelchair ramp in the Board of Supervisors Legislative Chamber. Copy: Each Supervisor (10)

From S.F. Environment, submitting the 2009 Annual Report for the Green Purchasing Program for City Staff. (11)

From Clerk of the Board, the Office of Economic and Workforce Development has submitted their 2010 Local Agency Biennial Notices: (12)

From Fire Department, submitting an update on the utility infrastructure safety review. (13)

From James Corrigan, regarding Fire Chief Hayes-White and Chief Gardner. (14)

From Bob Larive, regarding the homeless people in the Fisherman Wharf area. (15)

From Steve, submitting opposition to expanding parking meter hours/and or Sunday metering. (16)

From Susan Ruhne, submitting support for San Francisco's bid for the 34th America's Cup and endorsement of Host City. File No. 101254, 2 letters (17)

From Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, submitting their Annual Report for FY2009-2010. (18)

From Office of the Controller, submitting their August Monthly Overtime Report. (19)

From General Services Agency, Risk Management Division, submitting their Indemnification Quarterly Report for November 2008 through September 2010. Copy: Each Supervisor (20)

From Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board, submitting their Annual Statistical Report for FY2009-2010. (21)

From Department of Public Health, submitting their 2010 Annual Title XV Evaluation Report for San Francisco Detention Facilities. Copy: Each Supervisor (22)

From T-Mobile, submitting notification of eight cellular antennas to be installed at 482 Grand View Drive. (23)

From T-Mobile, submitting notification of six cellular antennas to be installed at 555 Market Street. (24)

From Office of the Controller, submitting the concession audit report of Smarte Carte. Smarte has a lease agreement with the Airport Commission. (25)

From State Fish and Game Commission, submitting notice of proposed regulatory action relating to the Mountain Yellow-Legged Frog. (26)

From State Fish and Game Commission, submitting notice of proposed regulatory action relating to the Pacific Fisher. (27)

From Fire Department, regarding a Matier and Ross article written on September 5, 2010. (28)

From Office of the Mayor, submitting the appointment of Michael Kim to the Port Commission. Copy: Each Supervisor, Rules Committee Clerk, City Attorney (29)

From U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, submitting an advance copy of the legal advertisement that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) will be publishing regarding the EPA's tentative decision to authorize California for revisions to its hazardous waste regulations. Copy: Each Supervisor (30)

From Police Department, thanking the Board of Supervisors for hearing the appeal objecting the Planning Commission's approval of a new Conditional Use for entertainment at 1268 Grant Avenue. File No. 101135, Copy: Each Supervisor (31)

From Cheryl Richard, submitting support for banning the use of pesticides and herbicides on all city-owned lands. (32)

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to an alcohol cost recovery fee. File No. 10865, 2 letters (33)

From Greg Patterson, submitting opposition to some specifics of the 222 2nd Street project plan. File No. 101031, Copy: Each Supervisor (34)

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to the 222 2nd Street plan. File No. 101031, 3 letters (35)

From Kimo Crossman, regarding the San Francisco Chronicle using the pejorative "illegals" on October 5, 2010, regarding undocumented immigrants. (36)

From Municipal Transportation Agency, regarding the required right- turn pilot project on eastbound Market Street. (37)

From Sanitary Truck Drivers and Helpers, Local 350, submitting opposition to resolution approving a ten-year landfill disposal facilitation agreement with Recology San Francisco. File No. 101225, Copy: Budget and Finance Committee Members and Committee Clerk (38)

From Department of Public Health, regarding resolution authorizing the Department of Public Health to apply for the HIV Emergency Relief Grant Program. File No. 101253, Copy: Each Supervisor (39)

From Department of Public Health, regarding October 2010 as Restaurant Appreciation Month. (40)

From James Corrigan, regarding parking control officers not issuing tickets to fire department personnel who doubled park their private vehicles in Chinatown. (41)

From Chris Barker, regarding World Statistics Day on October 20, 2010. (42)

From Tim Giangioffe, regarding the need for more single room occupancy (SRO) hotels in San Francisco. (43)

From Juliann Sum, regarding the economic recovery in San Francisco. (44)

From Lee Goodin, submitting Cowboy Bob's Bum Report. (45)

Willie B. Kennedy
President
Louise C. Jones
Vice President
Bobbrie Brown
Commissioner
Kenneth Sampson
Commissioner
Caesar Churchwell
Commissioner
Karen Chung
Commissioner
Al Norman
Commissioner



SOUTHEAST COMMUNITY FACILITY COMMISSION
CITY and COUNTY of SAN FRANCISCO

Gavin Newsom, Mayor

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ms. Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

DATE: September 24, 2010

FROM: Toye Moses, Executive Director
Southeast Community Facility Commission

RE: Submission of Annual Statement of Purpose & Annual Report July 1, 2009-June 30, 2010

Enclosed please find the Annual Statement of Purpose and Annual Report for Fiscal year 2009-2010.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "TOYE MOSES".

Toye Moses, Executive Director
Southeast Community Facility

TM/rp

enc.

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 SEP 29 PM 3:37
BY R



1900
1901
1902
1903
1904
1905
1906
1907
1908
1909
1910

2009-2010 Annual Report

**SOUTHEAST COMMUNITY
FACILITY COMMISSION**

CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

1800 Oakdale Avenue, Suite B
San Francisco, California 94124

Telephone: (415) 821-1534

Event Schedule: (415) 821-0921

Facsimile: (415) 821-1627

Website: <http://www.sefacility>

**SOUTHEAST COMMUNITY
FACILITY COMMISSION**
ANNUAL STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

&

ANNUAL REPORT

July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010

The Southeast Community Facility Commission is pleased to present this Annual Statement of Purpose and Annual Report to the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and the Citizens of San Francisco

SECF COMMISSIONERS:

*Willie B. Kennedy, President
Louise C. Jones, Vice President
Bobbrie Brown
Kenneth J. Sampson
Caesar Churchwell
Karen Chung
Helen Yang*

STAFF (current staff)

*Toye Moses, Executive Director
Francis Starr, Senior Mgmt. Assistant
Lee Ann Prifti, Acting Commission Secretary
Jutinut Pholsith, Senior Clerk Typist*

BACKGROUND HISTORY
&
ANNUAL STATEMENT OF PURPOSE
July 1, 2009 - June 30, 2010

Background History

ORDINANCE SEC. 54.1 of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors established The Southeast Community Facility (SECF) Commission located at 1800 Oakdale Avenue in 1987. The Southeast Community Facility was built as a **mitigation** measure in return for the Bayview-Hunter's Point (BVHP) community's acceptance of the Southeast Water Treatment Plant in the midst of their neighborhood.

Additionally, in order to obtain approval for the construction of the sewage treatment plant, the City of San Francisco agreed to operate and maintain, at City cost, this facility for the benefit of the Bayview Hunters Point community. The members of the **SECF Commission** are appointed and served at the pleasure of the Mayor.

The Southeast Community Facility (SECF) located at 1800 Oakdale Avenue is a community-based and oriented facility with numerous programs and services. For example, SEC Facility has an educational/training complex leased by the San Francisco Community College District, HeadStart Childcare Programs provided by San Francisco State University. Also, the SEC Facility is leased to non-profit community based organizations (CBO) that provide services to all San Francisco residents. Most of the programs provided are non-profit in status making them affordable to all members of the public. In conjunction with community based organizations, tenants as well as government agencies, we offer a wide range of assistance in the areas of employment opportunities provided by Department of Human Services/One Stop tax preparation, basic needs information, voter registration provided by Community of Opportunities/Single Stop, criminal expungement services provided by the SF Public Defender, and scholarship awards programs. The San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance mandates that public notices be disseminated in time to allow residents an opportunity to attend all functions provided by and at the SEC Facility.

The SEC Facility is centrally located and accessible to members of the public. Many government agencies and community-based organizations have used our facilities (*Alex Pitcher Community Room and E.P.Mills Community Center*) to hold events, training workshops and seminars, job and health fairs, graduation award ceremonies, and town hall meetings to inform and acquaint San Francisco residents about current events.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of the **SECF Commission** is to review and provide guidance regarding the operations of the SEC Facility and the other facilities under its jurisdiction.

The yearly goal of the **SECF Commission** is to promote and advocate improving the general economic, physical, health, public safety and welfare of all residents of San Francisco, but particularly those in the BVHP Community.

SOUTHEAST COMMUNITY FACILITY COMMISSION ANNUAL REPORT Fiscal Year 2008-2009

Highlights of the Year

The Southeast Community Facility (SECF) Commission continues to oversee the operation and maintenance of the SEC Facility, the Greenhouses and continues to have an advisory role with respect to significant decisions relating to the use of the Earl P. Mills Community Facility, and the three satellite childcare centers (Whitney Young Childcare Center, Martin Luther King Childcare Center, and Sojourner Truth Childcare Center), including the opportunity to review and provide comments on any and all future leasing activity.

The SECF Commission also continues to advocate for and support BVHP community organizations, health, welfare and economic development activities beneficial to all San Francisco residents, with emphasis on increasing opportunities for those who are disfranchised in the BVHP area.

The fiscal year 2009-2010 has been a year of significant accomplishment for the **SECF Commission**. As part of **Mayor Gavin Newsom's** commitment to revitalizing the BVHP neighborhood, the 5th edition of **San Francisco Southeast Sector Resource Directory** was created. This Resource Directory is currently being widely distributed throughout the City including the Mayor's office, Board of Supervisors, Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi, Senators Mark Leno, Leland Yee, Assemblyman Tom Ammiano, Assemblywoman Fiona Ma, and City agencies, community based organization, and also made available to the general public. The updated 5th edition of the Southeast Sector Resource Directory is a valuable source for informing San Francisco residents about the wealth of civic, religious, economic and social institutions available in the BVHP neighborhood. In addition to listing the businesses serving the Bayview-Hunter's Point area, we have also included organizations, churches, financial/legal assistance, medical/family support services, educational/training locations, and childcare facilities.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE YEAR

On July 9, 2009: Mr. Chris Jackson, Trustee, City College Board presented an update on The Bridge to Green Jobs Training Program which has been renamed by the State, The Green Job Corps. \$931,087 has been awarded to start the program which will prepare youth ages 16 – 24 for jobs in California's emerging green economy.

On July 22, 2009: Mr. Siri Datta, President, San Francisco Foliage presented on behalf of the Green House Tenants Association regarding an initiative for courses at City College. This joint educational and workforce development initiative involves the Bayview Hunter's Point Greenhouse Tenant's Association, City College of San Francisco-Southeast Campus, and the Environmental Horticulture Department of SF City College, with guidance from Dr. Toye Moses, Executive Director of the Southeast Community Facility Commission.

On August 13, 2009: Mr. Sam Murray, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), Director of Outreach for the Southeast Sector, thanked Commissioners Brown and Yang for serving on the Digester Task Force Committee. Mr. Murray introduced Tyrone Jue, Greg Mayer, and Bonnie Jones from the SFPUC. Bonnie Jones said the SFPUC had been meeting with the Digester Task Force monthly since February. She provided a handout of the San Francisco Sewer System Master Plan. Seventeen sites were evaluated for locating a new biosolids center that would replace the aging sludge handling facility now located at the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant (SEP).

On August 26, 2009: Jimi Harris from Pacific Gas and Electric Company provided an update on the dismantling of the power plants in the BayView.

On September 10, 2009: Mr. Dwayne Jones, Mayor's Office, Director of Communities of Opportunity provided an update on the Gateway To College program which allows students that have dropped out of high school to reengage to complete their academic career.

On September 23, 2009: Mr. Henry Alvarez, III, Executive Director of San Francisco Housing Authority said the Housing Authority was working on becoming more transparent. Mr. Alvarez reported \$18 million dollars in stimulus money was received by the Housing Authority for capital projects. The money has been spent primarily in the BayView district. The primary focus of the money was to restore vacant units. Much of the restoration has been done in Hunters View, Potrero Hill, Sunnydale, and Alice Griffin.

On October 8, 2009: Chancellor Griffin spoke on the additions of many sections of classes to the overall program at the Southeast Campus. In regard to the Computer Repair class, the instructor, Mr. Collins retired last year and due to budgetary constraints, he would not be replaced. Also, they are in the process of moving the class room from Room 306 an upstairs room in the 400's.

On November 12, 2009: New San Francisco Police Depart Chief George Gascón spoke about the current process of reorganization. He noted the promotion of BVHP Captain John Loftus to Commander of Police heading the Inspector's Bureau. Captain Greg Suhr will become the new Captain for Bayview-Hunters Point Station. He brings station experience and community relations experience to BVHP.

On November 23, 2009: **Captain John Loftus** of the BVHP Police Station has recently been promoted to Commander of Investigations for the San Francisco Police Department. He said that BVHP is in good hands with the new Captain Greg Suhr. Captain Loftus stated that the relationship between the police department and BVHP that is being developed will continue to grow with assignment of new top officers to the BVHP police station.

On January 14, 2010: **The SECFacility Commission** approved the Lease renewal to the Headstart Child Development Center for the Playground. Commissioner Kenneth Sampson advised that the Southeast Facility has been providing janitorial services and that the Headstart Child Development Center will now be paying for janitorial services starting immediately.

On February 24, 2010: **Commission President Kennedy welcomed Edwin Florentine** the new Manager for the One Stop Career Link Center Mission and Larry Spillane Supervisor II of the Electrical Division, PUC Southeast Water Treatment Plant. Mr. Florentine reported that in accordance with the Mayor's Press Release about the Stimulus Job Program he wanted to point out some of the highlights of what has been accomplished since the program was launched in September of 2009. They have been able to get 2,131 participants in the program.

On March 11, 2010: **Vice-Chair Louise C. Jones** announced that this year's Health Fair is tentatively scheduled to be held May 22, 2010, from 10:00 a.m. until 2:00 p.m. in the Alex Pitcher Community Room.

Mayor Newsom appointed Director Toye Moses along with 22 San Francisco residents to be members of the "Census Committee for 2010".

On May 13, 2010: **Captain Greg Suhr** of the Bayview Police Station proceeded to give a "state of the BVHP neighborhood". He said at the end of 2009 beginning of 2010 there was a spike in robberies in the Bayview. Many things were put in place such as an Awareness Campaign along San Bruno Avenue and the 3rd Street corridor where a Safe Haven Program was established for people who are feeling anxious or unsafe were able to go in and call the police. Flyers were distributed in English, Spanish and Chinese in public areas such as Muni Platforms, etc. The program was very well received.

On May 26, 2010: **Dwayne Jones**, Executive Director, Communities of Opportunity spoke about COO's goal of positive change, and intolerance for the status quo. He stated that whether the members get paid or not, the work gets done, and how he appreciates the Commission's support as he tries to figure out how to empower residents to take control of their own lives in their own communities. He observed that all of the Commissioners

and Dr. Moses have been great mentors and leaders and he hopes they will continue to do so as these young leaders continue this work to transform this community.

On June 10, 2010: Heidi Hardin, Executive director of Think Round, Inc. which has operated the Children's Mural Program for 6 years with the Bayview Opera House which is no longer able to support the program because they need to operate strictly within their building and the Children's Mural Program has always operated within the schools. Ms. Hardin is looking for a new home for the Children's Mural Program and she would like to combine with the SECF Commission They have participated in the Health Fair and it makes sense to her to continue that combined effort.

Policy Management

As legislatively mandated, implemented and enacted, the following are policies and directives adopted by the **SECF Commission**:

- **To handle** all logistical arrangements for the **SECF Commission** and its committee meetings two - three times monthly.
- **Implement** new security measures after the 911 and recent terrorist incidents by installing an electric gate/intercom system in the Southeast Facility parking lot area. Also installed were new security cameras for the administrative office and the perimeter of parking lot area.
- **In conjunction** with the Real Estate Department continue to manage the lease agreements for space usage at the four facilities under the "General Fund" budget.
- **In conjunction** with the PUC/Commercial Land Management Department continue to manage lease agreements for use of space at the Southeast Community Facility and Greenhouse under the "Clean Water Fund" budget. The lease for the Green House that was renewed to Decorative Plant Services is now responsible for all maintenance costs related to the Greenhouse.
- **Insure** compliance with all relevant City, State and Federal laws and regulations including but not limited to, capital improvement grants, lease/contract agreements and work/service orders.
- **To Maintain** compliance with regulatory requirements and particularly related to the American Disabilities Act (ADA).

ADA-Compliance Upgrades

Beginning January, 2008, the PUC began funding a large-scale project to ensure that all entry ways, restrooms, water faucets, ramps and general walkways on the SECF premises are ADA-compliant. PUC workers replaced the roof deck with a water proof deck; replaced all drinking fountains with high and low rise fountains and installed one new outdoor drinking fountain. Interior handrails were modified per life safety requirements and installed in all restrooms. Our landscapes were modified for ADA compliance including retrofit of pavement, ramps, stairways, irrigation systems, trees were added,

planting areas, preparation and execution of pedestrian traffic routing plans; new exterior fences were installed. Outreach to Government, Business, Community Organizations and Interested Individuals:

Business Development

The SECF Commission is very committed to the economic revitalization of Bayview-Hunter's Point and wants to see **Mayor Gavin Newsom's** vision of jobs, housing and economic vitality for area residents become **a reality**. The **SECF Commission's continued efforts** include written letters of support for businesses, individuals and community organizations seeking support in promoting or bringing business to the BVHP. The **SECF Commission** has also invited public officials, representatives/entrepreneurs from business enterprises to address and inform/educate the Commission and the community-at-large: **Mr. Alton Byrd**, Lennar/BVHP who updated the **SECF Commission** and BVHP Community on the status of Interim Marketplace located at the Bayview Opera House.

The SECF would like to extend **personal thanks** to the following individuals/organizations for volunteering time, contributing monetary and in-kind donations toward the Southeast Community Facility Founders Mural Project, as well as economic development of the Bayview Hunter's Point are.

Ed Harington, PUC General Manager, Tommy Moala, Assistant General Manager, Tony Flores, Manager/PUC/WWE, Heidi Hardin, Think Round Inc., Dwayne Jones, Director Mayor Office of Community of Opportunities, Supervisor Sophie Maxwell, City College Chancellor Dr. Don Griffin, Dr. Veronica Hunnicutt, Commissioner Linda Richardson, Alma Robinson, Executive Director California Lawyers For the Arts, Messrs. Greg George, Sam Murray/PUC, Jeffrey Betcher/Quesada gardens, John Chung/Associated Builders, Tony Caruso/Decorative Plant Services, Keith Jackson/Home Depot; Mr. Kofi Bonner/ BVHP Lennar; Southeast Community Facility Commissioners, and the host of individuals who have graciously volunteered their time.

Health & Environmental

The SECF Commission's Health and Housing Ad Hoc subcommittee, headed by Commissioner Louise Jones, works on issues related to the health and environment of the community, most especially health issues impacting children and young adults. The Ad-hoc subcommittee organized a health fair in the Alex Pitcher community room of the SECF. The health fair was titled: Healthy Bodies, Healthy Minds, and Families First. The fair targeted the diabetes and obesity issue facing youth in the Bayview-Hunter's Point community. Three Bayview Hunter's Point elementary schools; George Washington Carver, Bret Harte and Drew participated in the health fair by providing assistance in advertising and promoting the event to students and their families. The event was a success with students and families from each of the three schools in attendance. Various community organizations also provided food, nutritional information/giveaways

as well as raffle prizes for students, their families and community members as well. With the success of this initial health fair sponsored by the SECF Commission and held at the SECF, it was decided unanimously by the SECF Commissioners that this should become an annual event for the community. Special thanks to all the Health Fair participants, most especially, University of California Medical students coordinated by Willie ford Moses, UCSF Medical School professors, Commissioner Louis C. Jones, Dr. Churchwell, Dr. Parker and PUC/WWE staff

FY 2009-2010 Budget

The SECF Commission's FY 2009-2010 budget was \$916,223 of **Southeast Community Facility Fund** allocation. **The SECF Commission** would like to increase its budget to hire more staff and to improve the inherent infrastructure problems associated with running the facilities.

Membership and Administration

The SECF Commission has seven members appointed by the Mayor, a staff of three full-time and one clerical assistant. The current Commissioners are: **President Willie B. Kennedy, Vice-President Louise Jones, Caesar Churchwell, Kenneth Sampson, Karen Chung, Bobbrie Brown and Helen Yang.**

The SECF Commission also has four Sub-committees: **Facilities Committee** chaired by Commissioner Kennedy (Focuses on tenant leases, rules & regulations for rental of Alex Pitcher Community Room and Earl P. Mills Auditorium); Health, Housing Ad-Hoc Committee chaired by Commissioner Jones (Focuses on health); **Public Safety & Outreach Ad-Hoc Committee** (Focuses on issues pertaining to the tenants, programs, community outreach, education) and the Southeast Community Facility Commission Advisory Group, (SECF/CAG) co-chaired by Dr. Caesar Churchwell and Shirley Jones, former SECF Commission/President. The CAG focuses on the BVHP community issues and concerns.

The FY '09-10 Staff was headed by **Toye Moses**, Executive Director (to the Commission); Commission Secretary on leave (handles correspondence and agenda items, attends meetings/transcribes minutes, and performs routine office tasks); **Kenneth Olivencia**, Mgmt. Assistant responsible for coordinating all inter-departmental work/service orders; and **Jutinut Pholsith**, Senior Clerk Typist (coordinates community room rentals/activities, performs routine office tasks, and assists in mailers). Additionally we have two **work-ordered** personnel assigned from the Department of Real Estate (Stationary Engineer Richard O'Neal, and Claudette McLean Custodian).

Through the **Mayor's Youth Employment and Education Program (MYEEP)**, the **Young Community Developers (YCD)**, and the **PUC/Summer Youth Program Project PULL**, the **SECF Commission** has been very fortunate to have talented local

high school students assist in the Commission's clerical work and outreach to the community during the summer break.

The Future & In-coming Year

As legislatively mandated, the Commission will **continue to:**

- **Advocate** for improving the general economic, physical, health, safety and welfare of the residents of the southeast sector while ensuring the safe operation of the SEC Facility, the Greenhouse and the Earl P. Mills Center Auditorium.
- **Maintain** good relations with residents and community groups within the southeast sector, the Mayor's office, Board of Supervisors, government officials most especially Public Utilities Commission, City Attorney, Mayor's office Workforce, Mayor's office of Community of Opportunities, BVHP Project Area Committee, Mayor Shipyard Citizen Advisory Committee, Young Community Developers, and all residents of San Francisco.
- **Encourage** local tenants to take stake in the community by becoming home and property owners, and work with developers to increase the percentage of affordable units for sale in development projects in the BVHP.
- **Work** with potential business and housing developers to ensure maximum community benefit opportunities written into the "owner participation agreements".
- **Uphold** its partnership with the Mayor's Office of Community Neighborhood, BVHP Police Station, SF Public Utilities Commission and Department of Public Works in promoting clean and safe neighborhoods in San Francisco.
- **Maintain and renew agreement with American Red Cross** since the SEC Facility is designated to serve as an Emergency Red Cross shelter site in case of an earthquake or natural disaster. In the process of designing/building a **food storage bunker** to be use for feeding Southeast residents in case of an earthquake.
- **Maintain an ongoing communication with MUNI** regarding the Third Street Light Rail Project and planning process.
- **Continue to manage Alex Pitcher Community Room** as well as the E.P. Mills Auditorium at 100 Whitney Young Circle.
- **Work in conjunction with the PUC/Land management Division** in the management of lease agreement for the SEC Facility and the Greenhouse under the Clean Water Fund Budget.

- **Work closely with the PUC, General Manager Ed Harrington and the AGM/PUC/Wastewater Enterprise Tommy Moala** in strengthening communication links with the public most especially the Southeast residents on broader issues of community concern.

Community Partnerships in the Coming Year

The SECF Commission and its staff will continue to foster working relationships with the following **local/city agencies and state/federal officials**:

The Mayor/Office of the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, PUC/General Manager, Mayor's Office of Community Development, City Attorney's Office, Mayor's Office of Community of Opportunities/Single Stop, Mayor's Office of Workforce, San Francisco Police Department Bayview Station, City Attorney, District Attorney, Real Estate Department, Dept. of Human Services/Southeast One Stop, City College/Southeast Campus, Jeff Adachi Public Defender Office/Clean Slate Program, Assemblyman Tom Ammiano, Assemblywoman Fiona Ma, Senator Mark Leno's Office, Senator Leland Yee's office, Redevelopment Agency, SF Housing Authority, Parks & Recreation, Department of Public Works, Department of Public Health, MUNI, Mayor's Hunters Point Shipyard Citizen Advisory Committee, US Navy's Restoration Advisory Committee, Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi's Office, Department of Health Services, etc.

Additionally, we will partnership with the following **private developers, churches, and community-based organizations**:

Young Community Developers, Goodwill Industry, Providence Baptist Church, The California Lawyers For the Arts, Southeast Alliance for Environmental Justice, BVHP/Project Area Committee, Third Street Light Rail Advisory Committee, BVHP Foundation, Southeast Community College Campus, Bayview Merchants Association, Tenants/Community Room Users, BVHP Opera House, BVHP Rotary Club, BAYCAT, etc.

In conclusion the SECF Commission will continue to foster its commitment in improving the quality of life for the residents of the Southeast Sector and work vigorously to ensure effectiveness of the BVHP Employment/Housing and Contracting Policy.

The SECF Commission will also continue to promote diversity, health, safety as well as professional development of its employees.

Respectfully submitted,

*TOYE MOSES, Executive Director
Southeast Community Facility Commission*

DIANNE FEINSTEIN
CALIFORNIA



SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE - CHAIRMAN
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

United States Senate
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-0504
<http://feinstein.senate.gov>

305-11, cpage

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 SEP 28 PM 3:57
BY _____ AK

September 22, 2010

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

Dear Members of the Board:

Thank you for sending me a copy of your resolution in support of passing comprehensive immigration reform. I appreciate knowing your views, and I apologize for the delay in my response. For security reasons, postal mail is routed to an off-site facility for testing before it is released to my office, which delays the delivery process.

I share your support for comprehensive immigration reform. While effective enforcement and border security are important components of the U.S. immigration system, I do not support an enforcement-only approach to reform. I believe reforms should also meet the needs of California families and workers, make U.S. visa programs more workable and secure, and offer a pathway to earned citizenship that requires undocumented immigrants to pay taxes and fines, pass background checks, and learn English.

On April 29, 2010, I joined several colleagues, including Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) and Senator Charles Schumer (D-NY), who chairs the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees and Border Security, to unveil a framework for comprehensive immigration reform. I continue to advocate for action on this issue, and hope that the Senate will find a bipartisan solution to fix our broken immigration system.

On again, I appreciate your leadership on this matter. If I may be of additional assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me or my counsel, Barbara Leen, in my Washington, D.C. office at (202) 224-3841.

Sincerely yours,

Dianne Feinstein
United States Senator

DF:bl:dh

(2)



REFRIED CYCLES

September 22, 2010

JoyLamug
11Dr.CarltonB.GoodlettPlace
CityHall,
San Francisco, Ca. 94102-4689

Room244

Dear Board of Supervisors:

As a 38yr. Resident of this city and a pet owner, I would like to voice my strong disapproval of the sheer number of chain stores spreading like a malignancy over the small shopping neighborhoods of San Francisco. I was appalled at the new Levy's store you all obviously signed off on in the Valencia Street corridor and were that not enough for one week, today another.

I am referring to the pet supply chain outlet looking to open on California Street. Please know that another chain pet-supply outlet is, as I see it...nothing more than a nail in the coffin of the small neighborhood pet supply store I shop at for my *two dogs.*


Do your jobs and stand by this city's small business owners. Clearly if you won't help keep them open for those of us who prefer to patronize them, then we cannot look to the other powers that be (banks, current or former administration etc etc) to support them either.

Sincerely,

Becky Ann
Small business owner

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 SEP 28 PM 3:56
BY AK

3



THOMAS PLAGEMANN FINE ART & DESIGN

September 22, 2010

JoyLamug
11Dr.CarltonB.GoodlettPlace
CityHall,
San Francisco, Ca. 94102-4689

Room244


Dear Board of Supervisors:

As a 38yr. Resident of this city and a pet owner, I would like to voice my strong disapproval of the sheer number of chain stores spreading like a malignancy over the small shopping neighborhoods of San Francisco. I was appalled at the new Levy's store you all obviously signed off on in the Valencia Street corridor and were that not enough for one week, today another.

I am referring to the pet supply chain outlet looking to open on California Street. Please know that another chain pet-supply outlet is, as I see it...nothing more than a nail in the coffin of the small neighborhood pet supply store I shop at for my pit bull Bella.

Do your jobs and stand by this city's small business owners. Clearly if you won't help keep them open for those of us who prefer to patronize them, then we cannot look to the other powers that be (banks, current or former administration etc etc) to support them either.

Sincerely,



Thomas Plagemann
Artist/ Builder

BY AK

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 SEP 28 PM 3:55

BOS-11
Cpage

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

RECEIVED
MAYOR'S OFFICE

2010 SEP 30 PM 2:52

10 SEP 30 PM 2:46

September 30, 2010

Dear San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsom and ~~President of the Board~~ David Chiu:

BY AK

I request immediately your help regarding my heart condition and other seniors named below:

- 1) Mr. James Valent – Apt. # ~~6~~15.
- 2) Mr. Don Jee – Apt. # 403
- 3) Ms. Virginia Reyes – Apt. #414
- 4) Ms. Danielle Hyatt – Apt. # 308
- 5) Mr. Abdalla Megahed – Apt. # 418

This is an important letter from Abdalla Megahed, San Francisco community activist for over 26 years. I am writing in regard to the complaint I made at the public comment session on September 28, 2010 against the Building Manager (see name and contact information attached) at 990 Polk Street, who has given many tenants residing at this building Three Day Cure or Quit Notices in error.

Which we have a lot of hope to discuss our case at the Board of Supervisors meeting. We hope to be added to the agenda before Mr. Tulcanza can blame his supervisor Elizabeth Alridge or Property Manager. They have all blamed each other and declared themselves free of blame. To resolve problem at Supervisor meeting and they can discover what a mess this situation has become.

Our building has 3 case managers and they were not informed of the notes were handed out. I would like the full Board of Suprvisors and the Mayor to conduct and investigation into this manner. This has had an extremely negative impact on many senior and disabled tenants in the building. Please find my previous letter (dated 9/24/10) as well as contact information for the 990 Polk Street building management attached. He has violated our human and disabled rights.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Abdalla Megahed

CC: Kristi Lambert, Steve Ball and Du Tran, case manager, Adrienne Wynacht, nurse, SF Board of Supervisors, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, California Attorney General Jerry Brown, SF City Attorney Dennis Herrera, Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board and City and County of San Francisco

10/10/10
10/10/10

10 09 08 98 01

10 09 08 98 01

10 09 08 98 01

10

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



José Cisneros, Treasurer

Pauline Marx, Chief Assistant Treasurer

Investment Report for the month of August, 2010

September 24, 2010

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

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

Ladies and Gentlemen,

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

(in \$ millions unless specified)

INCOME	Fiscal Year to Date		Month Ending 8/31/2010	
	Pooled Fund	All Funds	Pooled Fund	All Funds
Cash Basis Earnings	6.11	6.11	4.48	4.48
Accrual Basis Earnings	9.05	9.10	4.78	4.82
Earned Income Yield (in %)	1.33%	1.33%	1.35%	1.35%
Current Yield to Maturity (in %)	n/a	n/a	1.33%	1.32%
PRINCIPAL				
Current Book Value	n/a	n/a	4,159	4,189
Amortized Book Value	n/a	n/a	4,151	4,181
Par Value	n/a	n/a	4,136	4,166
Market Value	n/a	n/a	4,178	4,208
Accrued Interest	n/a	n/a	15	15
Total Value (Market Value + Accrued Interest)	n/a	n/a	4,193	4,223
Average Daily Balance	4,008	4,039	4,171	4,201
Average Age of Portfolio - End of Period (in days)	n/a	n/a	702	699


In accordance with provisions of California State Government Code Section 53646, we forward this report detailing the City's investment portfolio as of 8/31/2010. These investments are in compliance with California Code and our statement of investment policy, and provide sufficient liquidity to meet expenditure requirements for the next six months.

Very truly yours,

José Cisneros
Treasurer


cc: Harvey Rose, Budget Analyst
Ben Rosenfield, Controller
Controller – Internal Audit Division: Tania Ledlju
Oversight Committee: J. Grazioli, Dr. Don Q. Griffin, Ben Rosenfield, T. Rydstrom, R. Sullivan
Transportation Authority – Cynthia Fong, San Francisco Public Library – 2 copies

Pooled Fund Maturities to Maturity Date





Asset Allocation Five Year History

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



All Funds

Investment Type	Par Value %	\$ in millions		
		Par Value	Original Book Value	Market Value
Banker's Acceptance	1.2%	50.00	49.87	49.94
Commercial Paper: Discount				
Commercial Paper: Interest Bearing				
Commercial Paper: Interest Bearing, Act/365				
Federal Farm Credit Bank: Discount Notes				
Federal Farm Credit Bank: Fixed	12.4%	517.04	519.68	521.81
Federal Farm Credit Bank: Float				
Federal Home Loan Bank: Discount Notes				
Federal Home Loan Bank: Fixed	7.7%	320.23	320.24	321.41
Federal Home Loan Bank: Float				
Federal Home Loan Bank: Float Monthly				
Federal Home Loan Bank: Multi Step				
Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp.: Discount Notes				
Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp.: Fixed	13.2%	551.50	553.25	555.28
Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp.: Float, Monthly, Act/360				
Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp.: Multi Step	0.5%	20.00	20.00	20.09
Federal National Mortgage Assn.	22.0%	915.99	917.55	921.87
Federal National Mortgage Assn.: Multi Step				
Federal National Mortgage Assn.L Discount Notes				
Money Market Funds	0.0%	0.25	0.25	0.25
Public Time Deposit: Monthly Pay				
Public Time Deposit: Quarterly Pay	1.7%	70.10	70.10	70.10
Tenn Valley Authority	0.5%	20.50	23.00	23.21
Treas. Liquidity Guarantee Program: Fixed	22.0%	917.31	930.17	937.90
Treas. Liquidity Guarantee Program: Float	1.2%	50.00	50.07	50.26
Treasury Bills	5.2%	218.00	217.20	217.75
Treasury Notes	10.1%	420.00	422.29	423.40
	100.0%	4,165.92	4,188.67	4,208.29



Inventory by Market Value - All Funds




Run Date: 9/22/2010 9:26:09 AM

Assets (000's)	Current Par	Current Book	Market	MKT/Book	Un Gain/Loss	Yield
TREASURY BILLS	218,000.00	217,202.06	217,754.37	100.25%	239.34	0.39%
TREASURY NOTES	420,000.00	422,285.38	423,396.88	100.26%	1,118.33	0.75%
TLGP (Treas Liquid Guar Prog)	917,310.00	930,165.20	937,903.30	100.83%	7,829.77	1.48%
TLGP FL (Treas Liquidity Guar)	50,000.00	50,074.05	50,257.81	100.37%	183.76	0.65%
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	320,230.00	320,241.78	321,406.29	100.36%	1,230.37	1.64%
FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSN	815,716.00	816,796.90	821,059.98	100.52%	4,263.08	1.63%
FNMA AMORT TO CALL	100,270.00	100,750.50	100,807.59	100.06%	173.66	1.53%
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	517,041.00	519,684.57	521,813.37	100.41%	2,143.70	1.33%
FHLMC Bonds	501,500.00	503,162.97	505,229.75	100.41%	2,070.67	1.51%
FHLMC FLOAT QTR 30/360	70,000.00	70,000.00	70,021.88	100.03%	21.88	1.04%
FHLMC MULTI-STEP	20,000.00	19,995.00	20,093.75	100.49%	98.75	2.02%
FHLMC AMORT TO CALL	50,000.00	50,089.42	50,046.88	99.92%	(19.63)	0.70%
TENN VALLEY AUTHORITY	20,500.00	22,999.80	23,206.64	100.90%	481.37	0.72%
BANKERS ACCEPTANCE-DOMESTIC	50,000.00	49,867.94	49,937.71	100.14%	32.01	0.53%
MONEY MARKET ACTUAL/365 R	251.69	251.69	251.69	100.00%	-	0.27%
PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT	70,100.00	70,100.00	70,100.00	100.00%	-	0.74%
COLLATERALIZED CD	25,000.00	25,000.00	25,000.00	100.00%	-	0.72%
Totals(000's)	4,165,918.69	4,188,667.25	4,208,287.90	100.47%	19,867.06	1.32%

INVESTMENT INVENTORY - 08/31/10

August 31, 2010

City & County of San Francisco



5

Run Date: 9/22/2010 9:31:55 AM

Inv No.	Security Description	CUSIP	Coupon Rate	Yield to Maturity	Purchase Date	Maturity Date	Current Book Value	Amortized Book Value	Par Value	Market Price	Current Market Value
Fund: 100 POOLED FUNDS											
42393	B 031011	912795V99	.0000	.3834	03/31/10	03/10/11	49,817,489	49,817,489	50,000,000	99.91	49,953,124
42402	Treasury Bil	912795VD0	.0000	.3995	04/23/10	04/07/11	149,421,242	149,421,242	150,000,000	99.88	149,812,500
42419	B 01 13 11	912795UX7	.0000	.3387	06/10/10	01/13/11	17,963,327	17,963,327	18,000,000	99.94	17,988,751
Inv Type: 11 TREASURY BILLS			.0000	.3908			217,202,058	217,202,058	218,000,000	99.89	217,754,375
42298	T 0.875 02 2	912828KE9	.8750	.6321	09/04/09	02/28/11	50,179,688	50,059,675	50,000,000	100.34	50,171,876
42325	T 1 08 31 11	912828LV0	1.0000	.8260	10/29/09	08/31/11	100,316	100,172	100,000	100.69	100,688
42326	T 1 08 31 11	912828LV0	1.0000	.8345	10/29/09	08/31/11	100,200,480	100,063,003	99,900,000	100.69	100,586,817
42341	T 1 7 31 11	912828LG3	1.0000	.6040	11/19/09	07/31/11	120,801,563	120,431,212	120,000,000	100.66	120,787,498
42352	T 1.125 12 1	912828KA7	1.1250	.7456	12/09/09	12/15/11	50,378,906	50,241,965	50,000,000	100.97	50,484,376
42382	T 1.5 07.15.	912828LB4	1.5000	1.1124	03/23/10	07/15/12	50,441,406	50,356,782	50,000,000	102.00	51,000,000
42415	T 1.25 11 30	912828JS0	1.2500	.3763	06/10/10	11/30/10	20,089,269	20,049,718	20,000,000	100.25	20,050,000
Inv Type: 12 TREASURY NOTES			1.0769	.7384			392,191,629	391,302,525	390,000,000	100.82	393,181,254
42165	J P MORGAN C	481247AK0	2.2000	2.0469	03/24/09	06/15/12	25,119,000	25,065,909	25,000,000	102.92	25,729,900
42166	GENL ELEC CA	36967HAN7	2.2500	2.0651	03/24/09	03/12/12	35,185,150	35,095,308	35,000,000	102.63	35,920,955
42170	MORGAN STANL	61757UAF7	2.0000	1.9382	03/16/09	09/22/11	25,037,750	25,015,839	25,000,000	101.73	25,433,594
42177	BAC 2.375 06	06050BAJ0	2.3750	1.9301	04/14/09	06/22/12	50,685,000	50,388,069	50,000,000	103.17	51,583,500
42181	C 2.125 04.3	17313UAE9	2.1250	1.9669	04/02/09	04/30/12	25,117,500	25,063,454	25,000,000	102.53	25,632,425
42182	BK OF THE WE	064244AA4	2.1500	1.9628	04/02/09	03/27/12	5,026,950	5,014,167	5,000,000	102.53	5,126,563
42183	BK OF THE WE	064244AA4	2.1500	1.9629	04/02/09	03/27/12	20,108,000	20,056,774	20,000,000	102.53	20,506,250
42191	BAC 2.1 04.3	06050BAG6	2.1000	1.9749	04/02/09	04/30/12	25,093,000	25,050,223	25,000,000	102.49	25,622,125
42195	GE 1.625 01.	36967HAG2	1.6250	1.2309	04/16/09	01/07/11	25,167,500	25,033,978	25,000,000	100.53	25,131,550
42196	GE 1.625 01.	36967HAG2	1.6250	1.2350	04/16/09	01/07/11	25,165,750	25,033,623	25,000,000	100.53	25,131,550
42197	C 1.625 03.3	17314JAA1	1.6250	1.3908	04/16/09	03/30/11	50,225,000	50,066,269	50,000,000	101.00	50,500,000
42198	GS 1.625 07.	38146FAF8	1.6250	1.4391	04/16/09	07/15/11	50,204,500	50,079,057	50,000,000	101.16	50,578,650
42211	USSA CAPITAL	90390QAA9	2.2400	1.9620	04/28/09	03/30/12	16,125,600	16,067,803	16,000,000	102.63	16,420,000
42258	CITIGROUP FD	17313YAC5	1.2500	1.2952	06/29/09	06/03/11	49,957,000	49,983,203	50,000,000	100.63	50,312,500
42259	CITIGROUP FD	17313YAC5	1.2500	1.2952	06/29/09	06/03/11	49,957,000	49,983,203	50,000,000	100.63	50,312,500
42274	GE TLGP 3 12	36967HAD9	3.0000	1.6091	07/30/09	12/09/11	51,602,500	50,862,599	50,000,000	103.03	51,515,450
42299	HSBC 3.125 1	4042EPAA5	3.1250	1.3413	09/16/09	12/16/11	51,969,550	51,129,912	50,000,000	103.44	51,721,650
42317	C 1.625 03.3	17314JAA1	1.6250	.7776	10/22/09	03/30/11	35,423,500	35,169,723	35,000,000	101.00	35,350,000
42328	MS 2.25 3 13	61757UAP5	2.2500	1.3169	11/04/09	03/13/12	20,431,800	20,280,670	20,000,000	102.58	20,515,625
42331	MS TLGP 2.25	61757UAP5	2.2500	1.3109	11/06/09	03/13/12	51,084,000	50,706,242	50,000,000	102.58	51,289,063
42332	GE TLGP 2.12	36967HAV9	2.1250	1.7893	11/06/09	12/21/12	25,253,750	25,187,255	25,000,000	103.11	25,777,350
42379	GS 3.25 06.1	38146FAA9	3.2500	1.2299	03/22/10	06/15/12	52,215,000	51,772,543	50,000,000	104.47	52,234,375
42380	GE TLGP 2% 0	36967HBB2	2.0000	1.4058	03/22/10	09/28/12	25,366,000	25,301,225	25,000,000	102.72	25,679,725
42400	GE TLGP 2.0	36967HBB2	2.0000	1.4358	04/20/10	09/28/12	76,101,917	75,950,153	75,000,000	102.72	77,039,175
42401	JPM 2.2 0615	481247AK0	2.2000	1.1630	04/21/10	06/15/12	51,097,500	50,911,791	50,000,000	102.92	51,459,800

INVESTMENT INVENTORY - 08/31/10

August 31, 2010

City & County of San Francisco



6

Run Date: 9/22/2010 9:31:55 AM

Inv No.	Security Description	CUSIP	Coupon Rate	Yield to Maturity	Purchase Date	Maturity Date	Current Book Value	Amortized Book Value	Par Value	Market Price	Current Market Value
42417	RF 2.75 12 1	7591EAAA1	2.7500	.3588	06/10/10	12/10/10	11,444,980	11,383,759	11,310,000	100.61	11,379,025
Inv Type: 15 TREASURY LGP			2.1190	1.4804			930,165,196	925,652,751	917,310,000	102.24	937,903,299
42242	MORGAN STANL	61757UAN0	.7284	.6358	03/19/09	03/13/12	25,040,325	25,020,680	25,000,000	100.45	25,113,281
42306	Union Bank T	905266AA0	.7371	.6597	03/23/09	03/16/12	25,033,725	25,017,404	25,000,000	100.58	25,144,531
Inv Type: 16 TLGP FLOATER			.7327	.6478			50,074,050	50,038,085	50,000,000	100.52	50,257,813
42349	FHLB 1.85 12	3133XW6C8	1.8500	1.8500	12/21/09	12/21/12	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100.31	100,312,500
42388	FHLB 1.875 0	3133XXN37	1.8750	1.9026	03/24/10	03/22/13	49,965,208	49,971,095	50,000,000	100.06	50,031,250
42397	FHLB 1.5 2.5	3133XY4B8	1.5000	1.5000	04/15/10	10/15/12	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100.69	100,687,500
42418	FHLB 1.42 fi	3133XXME4	1.4200	1.4507	06/10/10	09/24/12	20,276,567	20,277,963	20,230,000	100.56	20,343,794
42431	FHLB 1.32 4	3133706H6	1.3200	1.3200	07/22/10	04/22/13	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	100.06	50,031,250
Inv Type: 22 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK			1.6347	1.6409			320,241,775	320,249,058	320,230,000	100.37	321,406,294
42295	FNMA 2.15 09	31398AZA3	2.1500	2.0533	09/10/09	09/10/12	52,693,129	52,645,339	52,546,000	100.03	52,562,421
42335	FNMA 1.75 3	31398AVQ2	1.7500	.5980	11/19/09	03/23/11	50,770,000	50,319,652	50,000,000	100.81	50,406,250
42338	FNMA 1.75 3	31398AVQ2	1.7500	.5712	11/20/09	03/23/11	20,314,600	20,130,868	20,000,000	100.81	20,162,500
42350	FNMA FIXED 1	3136FJZT1	1.7500	1.7500	12/28/09	12/28/12	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100.38	100,375,000
42366	FNMA 3NC1.5	31398AF23	1.8000	1.8000	02/08/10	02/08/13	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	101.09	50,546,875
42367	FNMA 3NC1.5	31398AF23	1.8000	1.8172	02/08/10	02/08/13	24,987,500	24,989,838	25,000,000	101.09	25,273,438
42398	FNMA 2.5NC1	3136FMNR1	1.5600	1.5600	04/19/10	10/29/12	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100.66	100,656,250
42410	FNMA 2.5 6 2	3136FMA38	2.5000	2.5268	06/25/10	06/25/15	49,018,650	49,020,935	49,080,000	102.53	50,322,338
42411	FNMA 1.7 6 2	3136FMB78	1.7000	1.7052	06/28/10	06/28/13	99,985,000	99,985,890	100,000,000	100.06	100,062,500
42424	FNMA 1.3 7 1	31398AV90	1.3000	1.3171	07/16/10	07/16/13	24,987,500	24,988,036	25,000,000	100.56	25,140,625
42425	FNMA 1.3 7 1	31398AV90	1.3000	1.3171	07/16/10	07/16/13	49,975,000	49,976,072	50,000,000	100.56	50,281,250
42427	FNMA 1.55 7	31398AV25	1.5500	1.5603	07/12/10	07/12/13	69,069,273	69,070,237	69,090,000	100.25	69,262,725
42434	FNMA STRNT 1	3136FMX90	1.7500	1.7500	07/27/10	07/27/15	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	101.13	25,281,250
42435	FNMA STRNT 1	3136FMX90	1.7500	1.7500	07/27/10	07/27/15	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	101.13	25,281,250
42444	FNMA 1.50 07	31398AY22	1.5000	1.5051	07/26/10	07/26/13	24,996,250	24,996,377	25,000,000	100.13	25,031,250
42452	FNMA 2.125 8	3136FM6G4	2.1250	2.1250	08/10/10	08/10/15	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	101.38	25,343,750
42453	FNMA 1.35 08	31398A2H4	1.3500	1.3500	08/16/10	08/16/13	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	100.28	25,070,313
Inv Type: 23 FNMA			1.7293	1.6289			816,796,902	816,123,244	815,716,000	100.66	821,059,983
42443	FNMA 1.4 11	3136FMUG7	1.4000	1.2618	07/16/10	11/26/12	10,051,444	10,040,136	10,000,000	100.19	10,018,750
42447	FNMA STEP 1.	3136FMTW4	1.5000	1.4450	08/04/10	06/01/15	37,191,475	37,169,275	37,000,000	100.19	37,069,375
42457	FNMA 1.75 8	3136FM3R3	1.7500	1.6344	08/18/10	08/18/14	53,507,584	53,498,471	53,270,000	100.84	53,719,466
Inv Type: 123 FNMA AMORT TO CALL			1.6228	1.5273			100,750,504	100,707,883	100,270,000	100.54	100,807,591
42342	FFCB Bullet	31331YZ86	3.8750	.7849	11/19/09	08/25/11	52,705,000	51,503,711	50,000,000	103.47	51,734,375
42373	FFCB 2 Year	31331JGD9	.9500	1.0514	03/09/10	03/05/12	17,017,870	17,026,084	17,050,000	100.66	17,161,891
42374	FFCB 2 Year	31331JGD9	.9500	1.0432	03/09/10	03/05/12	57,899,982	57,925,678	58,000,000	100.66	58,380,625
42385	FFCB 1.875 1	31331G2R9	1.8750	1.5324	03/26/10	12/07/12	37,333,370	37,279,666	37,000,000	102.53	37,936,563
42399	FFCB 1.625 B	31331JAB9	1.6250	1.5877	04/16/10	12/24/12	50,048,500	50,041,691	50,000,000	102.00	51,000,000

INVESTMENT INVENTORY - 08/31/10

August 31, 2010

City & County of San Francisco



7

Run Date: 9/22/2010 9:31:55 AM

Inv No.	Security Description	CUSIP	Coupon Rate	Yield to Maturity	Purchase Date	Maturity Date	Current Book Value	Amortized Book Value	Par Value	Market Price	Current Market Value
42403	FFCB 1.125 2	31331JLW1	1.1250	1.2269	04/29/10	04/26/12	74,228,232	74,253,771	74,370,000	100.47	74,718,609
42407	FFCB 1.74 6	31331JRD7	1.7400	1.7916	06/10/10	06/10/13	24,962,500	24,965,340	25,000,000	100.03	25,007,813
42412	FFCB 1.34 12	31331JSB0	1.3400	1.3512	06/17/10	12/17/12	149,958,750	149,962,180	150,000,000	100.03	150,046,875
42414	FEDERAL FARM	31331GLL1	2.8000	2.8847	06/10/10	01/28/14	18,171,759	18,175,087	18,225,000	101.00	18,407,250
42455	FFCB 1.20 4	31331JUJ5	1.2000	1.2373	07/08/10	04/08/13	37,358,604	37,360,651	37,396,000	100.06	37,419,373
Inv Type: 28 FFCB			1.6241	1.3371			519,684,568	518,493,859	517,041,000	100.92	521,813,373
42351	FHLMC Fixed	3128X9RH5	1.7500	1.7500	12/28/09	12/28/12	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100.38	100,375,000
42356	FHLMC 1.125	3128X8P22	1.1250	.7120	11/20/09	06/01/11	28,779,471	28,687,806	28,600,000	100.59	28,769,813
42371	FHLMC 1.8 2	3128X9ZK9	1.8000	1.8000	02/25/10	02/25/13	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	100.56	75,421,875
42405	FHLMC 2NC1Y	3134G1DZ4	1.1700	1.1700	05/18/10	05/18/12	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	100.50	50,250,000
42408	FHLMC 2 12 2	3134G1GN8	2.0000	2.0000	06/23/10	12/23/13	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	100.09	50,046,875
42416	FHLMC 5.75 0	3134A4JT2	5.7500	1.0656	06/10/10	01/15/12	21,479,608	21,269,321	20,000,000	107.09	21,418,750
42420	FHLMC 2.05 6	3134G1GX6	2.0500	2.0500	06/30/10	06/30/14	37,900,000	37,900,000	37,900,000	101.31	38,397,438
42422	FHLMC 1.5 07	3134G1KL7	1.5000	1.5000	07/12/10	07/12/13	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	100.56	50,281,250
42423	FHLMC 1.5 7	3134G1KL7	1.5000	1.5000	07/12/10	07/12/13	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	100.56	50,281,250
42438	FHLMC STRNT	3134G1LU6	.5000	.5000	08/05/10	01/28/13	40,003,889	40,003,889	40,000,000	99.97	39,987,500
Inv Type: 30 FHLMC BONDS			1.7216	1.5112			503,162,967	502,861,015	501,500,000	100.74	505,229,750
42354	FHLMC 3nc1 f	3128X9DK3	1.0369	1.0369	09/10/09	09/10/12	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	100.03	50,015,625
42413	FHLMC 3nc1 f	3128X9DK3	1.0369	1.0369	06/10/10	09/10/12	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	100.03	20,006,250
Inv Type: 40 FHLMC FLOAT QTR			1.0369	1.0369			70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	100.03	70,021,875
42409	FHLMC MULTI	3134G1FQ2	2.0128	2.0181	06/24/10	06/24/15	19,995,000	19,995,189	20,000,000	100.47	20,093,750
Inv Type: 46 FHLMC MULTI STEP			2.0128	2.0181			19,995,000	19,995,189	20,000,000	100.47	20,093,750
42440	FHLMC .750 3	3134G1HD9	.7500	.7000	07/20/10	03/28/13	50,089,417	50,078,024	50,000,000	100.09	50,046,875
Inv Type: 130 FHLMC AMORT TO CALL			.7500	.7000			50,089,417	50,078,024	50,000,000	100.09	50,046,875
42446	TVA 6.79 5 2	880591DT6	6.7900	.7181	08/04/10	05/23/12	22,999,798	22,905,106	20,500,000	113.20	23,206,641
Inv Type: 95 TENN VALLEY AUTHORITY			6.7900	.7181			22,999,798	22,905,106	20,500,000	113.20	23,206,641
42432	BA 0.57 1 13	06422TN33	.5700	.5495	07/06/10	01/03/11	26,925,615	26,925,615	27,000,000	99.88	26,967,450
42456	BA 0.51 1 12	06422TNC3	.5100	.5113	07/19/10	01/12/11	22,942,328	22,942,328	23,000,000	99.87	22,970,260
Inv Type: 51 BANKERS ACCEPTANCE			.5424	.5319			49,867,943	49,867,943	50,000,000	99.88	49,937,710
42445	PFM PRIME FU		.2745	.2745	07/23/10	09/01/10	251,692	251,692	251,692	100.00	251,692
Inv Type: 72 MONEY MARKET FUNDS			.2745	.2745			251,692	251,692	251,692	100.00	251,692
42316	UBOC PTD 0.7		.7000	.7000	10/13/09	10/13/10	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	100.00	50,000,000
42365	FIRST NATL P		1.0000	1.0000	01/18/10	01/18/11	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	100.00	10,000,000
42406	BANK OF SAN		1.6500	1.6500	05/18/10	05/18/11	100,000	100,000	100,000	100.00	100,000
42448	FIRST NATION		.7000	.7000	07/31/10	07/31/11	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	100.00	5,000,000
42449	FIRST NATION		.7000	.7000	08/04/10	08/04/11	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	100.00	5,000,000
Inv Type: 1010 PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT			.7442	.7442			70,100,000	70,100,000	70,100,000	100.00	70,100,000
42294	B of A CD 0.		.7200	.7200	09/02/09	09/02/10	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	100.00	25,000,000

INVESTMENT INVENTORY - 08/31/10

August 31, 2010

City & County of San Francisco



8

Run Date: 9/22/2010 9:31:55 AM

Inv No.	Security Description	CUSIP	Coupon Rate	Yield to Maturity	Purchase Date	Maturity Date	Current Book Value	Amortized Book Value	Par Value	Market Price	Current Market Value
Inv Type: 1012 COLLATERALIZED CD			.7200	.7200			25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	100.00	25,000,000
Subtotal Fund 100			1.5927	1.3249			4,158,573,498	4,150,828,431	4,135,918,692	101.02	4,178,072,272
Fund: 9704 SFUSD BONDS 2006B											
42264	T 1.125 06.3	912828LF5	1.1250	.9622	07/21/09	06/30/11	30,093,750	30,044,032	30,000,000	100.72	30,215,626
Inv Type: 12 TREASURY NOTES			1.1250	.9622			30,093,750	30,044,032	30,000,000	100.72	30,215,626
Subtotal Fund 9704			1.1250	.9622			30,093,750	30,044,032	30,000,000	100.72	30,215,626
Funds			1.5893	1.3223			4,188,667,248	4,180,872,463	4,165,918,692	101.02	4,208,287,897

INVESTMENT EARNINGS - AUGUST 2010

August 31, 2010

City & County of San Francisco



Run Date: 9/22/2010 9:31:55 AM

Inv No.	Security Description	CUSIP	Coupon Rate	Yield to Maturity	Purchase Date	Maturity Date	Par Value	Beginning Prem/ (Disc)	Accretion Income	(Amortization) Expense	Interest Income Received	Gain / (Loss)	Cash Basis Earnings	Income Earned (Accrual Basis)	Accrued Interest
42393	B 031011	912795V99	.0000	.3834	03/31/10	03/10/11	50,000,000	-182,511						16,447	81,706
42402	Treasury Bil	912795VD0	.0000	.3995	04/23/10	04/07/11	150,000,000	-578,758						51,408	217,242
42419	B 01 13 11	912795UX7	.0000	.3387	06/10/10	01/13/11	18,000,000	-36,673						5,239	14,027
Inv Type: 11 TREASURY BILLS							218,000,000	-797,942	0	0	0	0	0	73,095	312,974
42298	T 0.875 02 2	912828KE9	.8750	.6321	09/04/09	02/28/11	50,000,000	179,688		-10,277	218,750		218,750	26,597	1,209
42325	T 1 08 31 11	912828LV0	1.0000	.8260	10/29/09	08/31/11	100,000	316		-15	500		500	70	3
42326	T 1 08 31 11	912828LV0	1.0000	.8345	10/29/09	08/31/11	99,900,000	300,480		-13,882	499,500		499,500	70,318	2,760
42341	T 1 7 31 11	912828LG3	1.0000	.6040	11/19/09	07/31/11	120,000,000	801,563		-40,143	600,000		600,000	60,944	104,348
42352	T 1.125 12 1	912828KA7	1.1250	.7456	12/09/09	12/15/11	50,000,000	378,906		-15,959				31,684	119,877
42382	T 1.5 07.15.	912828LB4	1.5000	1.1124	03/23/10	07/15/12	50,000,000	441,406		-16,194				46,986	97,826
42415	T 1.25 11 30	912828JS0	1.2500	.3763	06/10/10	11/30/10	20,000,000	89,269		-14,772				6,403	63,525
42437	T 1.00 7 15	912828NN6	1.0000	1.0600				-44,177	-685	0	12,908	202,380	215,288	203,054	
Inv Type: 12 TREASURY NOTES							390,000,000	2,147,452	-685	-111,242	1,331,658	202,380	1,534,038	446,055	389,547
42165	J P MORGAN C	481247AK0	2.2000	2.0469	03/24/09	06/15/12	25,000,000	119,000		-3,129				42,704	116,111
42166	GENL ELEC CA	36967HAN7	2.2500	2.0651	03/24/09	03/12/12	35,000,000	185,150		-5,295				60,330	369,688
42170	MORGAN STANL	61757UAF7	2.0000	1.9382	03/16/09	09/22/11	25,000,000	37,750		-1,272				40,395	220,833
42177	BAC 2.375 06	06050BAJ0	2.3750	1.9301	04/14/09	06/22/12	50,000,000	685,000		-18,227				80,731	227,604
42181	C 2.125 04.3	17313UAE9	2.1250	1.9669	04/02/09	04/30/12	25,000,000	117,500		-3,241				41,030	178,559
42182	BK OF THE WE	064244AA4	2.1500	1.9628	04/02/09	03/27/12	5,000,000	26,950		-766				8,192	45,986
42183	BK OF THE WE	064244AA4	2.1500	1.9629	04/02/09	03/27/12	20,000,000	108,000		-3,072				32,762	183,944
42191	BAC 2.1 04.3	06050BAG6	2.1000	1.9749	04/02/09	04/30/12	25,000,000	93,000		-2,565				41,185	176,458
42195	GE 1.625 01.	36967HAG2	1.6250	1.2309	04/16/09	01/07/11	25,000,000	167,500		-8,229				25,625	60,938
42196	GE 1.625 01.	36967HAG2	1.6250	1.2350	04/16/09	01/07/11	25,000,000	165,750		-8,143				25,711	60,938
42197	C 1.625 03.3	17314JAA1	1.6250	1.3908	04/16/09	03/30/11	50,000,000	225,000		-9,783				57,926	340,799
42198	GS 1.625 07.	38146FAF8	1.6250	1.4391	04/16/09	07/15/11	50,000,000	204,500		-7,731				59,977	103,820
42211	USSA CAPITAL	90390QAA9	2.2400	1.9620	04/28/09	03/30/12	16,000,000	125,600		-3,649				26,218	150,329
42258	CITIGROUP FD	17313YAC5	1.2500	1.2952	06/29/09	06/03/11	50,000,000	-43,000	1,893					53,977	152,777
42259	CITIGROUP FD	17313YAC5	1.2500	1.2952	06/29/09	06/03/11	50,000,000	-43,000	1,893					53,977	152,777
42274	GE TLGP 3 12	36967HAD9	3.0000	1.6091	07/30/09	12/09/11	50,000,000	1,602,500		-57,631				67,369	341,667
42299	HSBC 3.125 1	4042EPAAS	3.1250	1.3413	09/16/09	12/16/11	50,000,000	1,969,550		-74,368				55,840	325,521
42317	C 1.625 03.3	17314JAA1	1.6250	.7776	10/22/09	03/30/11	35,000,000	423,500		-25,054				22,341	238,559
42328	MS 2.25 3 13	61757UAP5	2.2500	1.3169	11/04/09	03/13/12	20,000,000	431,800		-15,565				21,935	210,000
42331	MS TLGP 2.25	61757UAP5	2.2500	1.3109	11/06/09	03/13/12	50,000,000	1,084,000		-39,166				54,584	525,000
42332	GE TLGP 2.12	36967HAV9	2.1250	1.7893	11/06/09	12/21/12	25,000,000	253,750		-6,894				37,377	103,299
42379	GS 3.25 06.1	38146FAA9	3.2500	1.2299	03/22/10	06/15/12	50,000,000	2,215,000		-84,148				51,268	343,056
42380	GE TLGP 2% 0	36967HBB2	2.0000	1.4058	03/22/10	09/28/12	25,000,000	366,000		-12,319				29,347	212,500
42400	GE TLGP 2.0	36967HBB2	2.0000	1.4358	04/20/10	09/28/12	75,000,000	1,101,917		-35,110				89,890	637,500

INVESTMENT EARNINGS - AUGUST 2010

August 31, 2010

City & County of San Francisco

10



Run Date: 9/22/2010 9:31:55 AM


Inv No.	Security Description	CUSIP	Coupon Rate	Yield to Maturity	Purchase Date	Maturity Date	Par Value	Beginning Prem/ (Disc)	Accretion Income	(Amortization) Expense	Interest Income Received	Gain / (Loss)	Cash Basis Earnings	Income Earned (Accrual Basis)	Accrued Interest
42401	JPM 2.2 0615	481247AK0	2.2000	1.1630	04/21/10	06/15/12	50,000,000	1,097,500		-43,286				48,381	232,222
42417	RF 2.75 12 1	7591EAAA1	2.7500	.3588	06/10/10	12/10/10	11,310,000	134,980		-22,865				3,053	69,981
Inv Type: 15 TREASURY LGP							917,310,000	12,855,196	3,787	-491,507	0	0	0	1,132,128	5,780,864
42242	MORGAN STANL	61757UAN0	.7284	.6358	03/19/09	03/13/12	25,000,000	40,325		-1,147				14,535	40,402
42306	Union Bank T	905266AA0	.7371	.6597	03/23/09	03/16/12	25,000,000	33,725		-960				14,907	39,412
Inv Type: 16 TLGP FLOATER							50,000,000	74,050	0	-2,107	0	0	0	29,442	79,814
42349	FHLB 1.85 12	3133XW6C8	1.8500	1.8500	12/21/09	12/21/12	100,000,000							154,167	359,722
42388	FHLB 1.875 0	3133XXN37	1.8750	1.9026	03/24/10	03/22/13	50,000,000	-34,792	1,133					79,258	414,063
42397	FHLB 1.5 2.5	3133XY4B8	1.5000	1.5000	04/15/10	10/15/12	100,000,000							125,000	566,667
42418	FHLB 1.42 fl	3133XXME4	1.4200	1.4507	06/10/10	09/24/12	20,230,000	46,567	521					24,460	125,280
42431	FHLB 1.32 4	3133706H6	1.3200	1.3200	07/22/10	04/22/13	50,000,000							55,000	71,500
Inv Type: 22 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK							320,230,000	11,775	1,655	0	0	0	0	437,885	1,537,231
42282	FHLB 1.5 3NC	3133XUM83	1.5000	1.5000							375,000		375,000	54,167	
42283	FHLB 1.5 3NC	3133XUM83	1.5000	1.5000							32,250		32,250	4,658	
42318	FHLB 0.75 9	3133XUVP5	.7500	.8072				-53,295	-21,423		138,284	83,819	222,103	77,536	
Inv Type: 38 FHLB MULTI STEP							0	-53,295	-21,423	0	545,534	83,819	629,353	136,361	0
42295	FNMA 2.15 09	31398AZA3	2.1500	2.0533	09/10/09	09/10/12	52,546,000	147,129		-4,161				89,983	536,626
42335	FNMA 1.75 3	31398AVQ2	1.7500	.5980	11/19/09	03/23/11	50,000,000	770,000		-48,814				24,103	384,028
42338	FNMA 1.75 3	31398AVQ2	1.7500	.5712	11/20/09	03/23/11	20,000,000	314,600		-19,985				9,182	153,611
42350	FNMA FIXED 1	3136FJZT1	1.7500	1.7500	12/28/09	12/28/12	100,000,000							145,833	306,250
42366	FNMA 3NC1.5	31398AF23	1.8000	1.8000	02/08/10	02/08/13	50,000,000				450,000		450,000	75,000	57,500
42367	FNMA 3NC1.5	31398AF23	1.8000	1.8172	02/08/10	02/08/13	25,000,000	-12,500	354		225,000		225,000	37,854	28,750
42398	FNMA 2.5NC1	3136FMNR1	1.5600	1.5600	04/19/10	10/29/12	100,000,000							130,000	572,000
42410	FNMA 2.5 6 2	3136FMA38	2.5000	2.5268	06/25/10	06/25/15	49,080,000	-61,350	1,042					103,292	224,950
42411	FNMA 1.7 6 2	3136FMB78	1.7000	1.7052	06/28/10	06/28/13	100,000,000	-15,000	424					142,091	297,500
42424	FNMA 1.3 7 1	31398AV90	1.3000	1.3171	07/16/10	07/16/13	25,000,000	-12,500	354					27,437	40,625
42425	FNMA 1.3 7 1	31398AV90	1.3000	1.3171	07/16/10	07/16/13	50,000,000	-25,000	707					54,874	81,250
42427	FNMA 1.55 7	31398AV25	1.5500	1.5603	07/12/10	07/12/13	69,090,000	-20,727	586					89,828	145,761
42434	FNMA STRNT 1	3136FMX90	1.7500	1.7500	07/27/10	07/27/15	25,000,000							36,458	41,319
42435	FNMA STRNT 1	3136FMX90	1.7500	1.7500	07/27/10	07/27/15	25,000,000							36,458	41,319
42444	FNMA 1.50 07	31398AY22	1.5000	1.5051	07/26/10	07/26/13	25,000,000	-3,750	106					31,356	36,458
42452	FNMA 2.125 8	3136FM6G4	2.1250	2.1250	08/10/10	08/10/15	25,000,000							30,990	30,990
42453	FNMA 1.35 08	31398A2H4	1.3500	1.3500	08/16/10	08/16/13	25,000,000							14,063	14,063
Inv Type: 23 FNMA							815,716,000	1,080,902	3,572	-72,960	675,000	0	675,000	1,078,800	2,993,000
42443	FNMA 1.4 11	3136FMUG7	1.4000	1.2618	07/16/10	11/26/12	10,000,000	51,444		-7,459				4,208	36,944
42447	FNMA STEP 1.	3136FMTW4	1.5000	1.4450	08/04/10	06/01/15	37,000,000			-22,200				19,425	138,750
42457	FNMA 1.75 8	3136FM3R3	1.7500	1.6344	08/18/10	08/18/14	53,270,000			-9,113				24,551	33,664

INVESTMENT EARNINGS - AUGUST 2010

August 31, 2010

City & County of San Francisco

11



Run Date: 9/22/2010 9:31:55 AM


Inv No.	Security Description	CUSIP	Coupon Rate	Yield to Maturity	Purchase Date	Maturity Date	Par Value	Beginning Prem/ (Disc)	Accretion Income	(Amortization) Expense	Interest Income Received	Gain / (Loss)	Cash Basis Earnings	Income Earned (Accrual Basis)	Accrued Interest	
Inv Type: 123 FNMA AMORT TO CALL							100,270,000	51,444	0	-38,771	0	0	0	48,184	209,358	
42342	FFCB Bullet	31331YZ86	3.8750	.7849	11/19/09	08/25/11	50,000,000	2,705,000		-130,210	968,750		968,750	31,249	32,292	
42373	FFCB 2 Year	31331JGD9	.9500	1.0514	03/09/10	03/05/12	17,050,000	-32,130	1,447					14,945	79,188	
42374	FFCB 2 Year	31331JGD9	.9500	1.0432	03/09/10	03/05/12	58,000,000	-100,018	4,526					50,443	269,378	
42385	FFCB 1.875 1	31331G2R9	1.8750	1.5324	03/26/10	12/07/12	37,000,000	333,370		-10,471				47,342	161,875	
42399	FFCB 1.625 B	31331JAB9	1.6250	1.5877	04/16/10	12/24/12	50,000,000	48,500		-1,530				66,179	151,215	
42403	FFCB 1.125 2	31331JLW1	1.1250	1.2269	04/29/10	04/26/12	74,370,000	-141,768	6,334					76,056	290,508	
42407	FFCB 1.74 6	31331JRD7	1.7400	1.7916	06/10/10	06/10/13	25,000,000	-37,500	1,061					37,311	97,875	
42412	FFCB 1.34 12	31331JSB0	1.3400	1.3512	06/17/10	12/17/12	150,000,000	-41,250	1,399					168,899	413,167	
42414	FEDERAL FARM	31331GLL1	2.8000	2.8847	06/10/10	01/28/14	18,225,000	-53,241	1,243					43,768	46,778	
42455	FFCB 1.20 4	31331JU05	1.2000	1.2373	07/08/10	04/08/13	37,396,000	-37,396	1,154					38,550	66,066	
Inv Type: 28 FFCB							517,041,000	2,643,568	17,162	-142,210	968,750	0	968,750	574,739	1,608,341	
42351	FHLMC Fixed	3128X9RH5	1.7500	1.7500	12/28/09	12/28/12	100,000,000							145,833	306,250	
42356	FHLMC 1.125	3128X8P22	1.1250	.7120	11/20/09	06/01/11	28,600,000	179,471		-9,971				16,842	80,438	
42371	FHLMC 1.8 2	3128X9ZK9	1.8000	1.8000	02/25/10	02/25/13	75,000,000				675,000		675,000	112,500	22,500	
42405	FHLMC 2NC1Y	3134G1DZ4	1.1700	1.1700	05/18/10	05/18/12	50,000,000							48,750	167,375	
42408	FHLMC 2 12 2	3134G1GN8	2.0000	2.0000	06/23/10	12/23/13	50,000,000							83,333	188,889	
42416	FHLMC 5.75 0	3134A4JT2	5.7500	1.0656	06/10/10	01/15/12	20,000,000	1,479,608		-78,541				17,293	146,944	
42420	FHLMC 2.05 6	3134G1GX6	2.0500	2.0500	06/30/10	06/30/14	37,900,000							64,746	131,650	
42422	FHLMC 1.5 07	3134G1KL7	1.5000	1.5000	07/12/10	07/12/13	50,000,000							62,500	102,083	
42423	FHLMC 1.5 7	3134G1KL7	1.5000	1.5000	07/12/10	07/12/13	50,000,000							62,500	102,083	
42438	FHLMC STRNT	3134G1LU6	.5000	.5000	08/05/10	01/28/13	40,000,000							14,443	18,332	
Inv Type: 30 FHLMC Bonds							501,500,000	1,659,078	0	-88,511	675,000	0	675,000	628,740	1,266,544	
42354	FHLMC 3nc1 f	3128X9DK3	1.0369	1.0369	09/10/09	09/10/12	50,000,000							43,203	116,649	
42413	FHLMC 3nc1 f	3128X9DK3	1.0369	1.0369	06/10/10	09/10/12	20,000,000							17,281	46,660	
Inv Type: 40 FHLMC FLOAT QTR							70,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60,485	163,309
42440	FHLMC .750 3	3134G1HD9	.7500	.7000	07/20/10	03/28/13	50,000,000	89,417		-8,213				23,037	65,625	
Inv Type: 130 FHLMC AMORT TO CALL							50,000,000	89,417		-8,213					23,037	65,625
42409	FHLMC MULTI	3134G1FQ2	2.0128	2.0181	06/24/10	06/24/15	20,000,000	-5,000	85					33,632	74,921	
Inv Type: 46 FHLMC MULTI STEP							20,000,000	-5,000	85	0	0	0	0	33,632	74,921	
42446	TVA 6.79 5 2	880591DT6	6.7900	.7181	08/04/10	05/23/12	20,500,000			-94,693				9,704	378,920	
Inv Type: 95 TENN VALLEY AUTHORITY							20,500,000	0	0	-94,693	0	0	0	9,704	378,920	
42432	BA 0.57 1 13	06422TN33	.5700	.5495	07/06/10	01/03/11	27,000,000	-74,385						12,740	23,425	
42456	BA 0.51 1 12	06422TNC3	.5100	.5113	07/19/10	01/12/11	23,000,000	-57,673						10,101	14,337	
Inv Type: 51 BANKERS ACCEPTANCE							50,000,000	-132,058	0	0	0	0	0	22,841	37,762	
42445	PFM PRIME FU		.2745	.2745	07/23/10	09/01/10	251,692				1,692		1,692	431	431	
Inv Type: 72 MONEY MARKET FUNDS							251,692	0	0	0	1,692	0	1,692	431	431	

INVESTMENT EARNINGS - AUGUST 2010

August 31, 2010

City & County of San Francisco

12



Run Date: 9/22/2010 9:31:55 AM

Inv No.	Security Description	CUSIP	Coupon Rate	Yield to Maturity	Purchase Date	Maturity Date	Par Value	Beginning Prem/ (Disc)	Accretion Income	(Amortization) Expense	Interest Income Received	Gain / (Loss)	Cash Basis Earnings	Income Earned (Accrual Basis)	Accrued Interest
42316	UBOC PTD 0.7		.7000	.7000	10/13/09	10/13/10	50,000,000							30,139	46,667
42365	FIRST NATL P		1.0000	1.0000	01/18/10	01/18/11	10,000,000							8,611	17,222
42406	BANK OF SAN		1.6500	1.6500	05/18/10	05/18/11	100,000							142	284
42448	FIRST NATION		.7000	.7000	07/31/10	07/31/11	5,000,000							3,014	3,111
42449	FIRST NATION		.7000	.7000	08/04/10	08/04/11	5,000,000							2,722	2,722
Inv Type: 1010 PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT							70,100,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	44,628	70,007
42294	B of A CD 0.		.7200	.7200	09/02/09	09/02/10	25,000,000							15,500	45,500
Inv Type: 1012 COLLATERALIZED CD							25,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	15,500	45,500
Subtotal Fund 100							4,135,918,692	19,624,588	4,153	-1,050,215	4,197,634	286,199	4,483,832	4,795,685	15,014,147
Fund: 9704 SFUSD BONDS 2006B															
42264	T 1.125 06.3	912828LF5	1.1250	.9622	07/21/09	06/30/11	30,000,000	93,750		-4,099				24,332	29,348
Inv Type: 12 TREASURY NOTES							30,000,000	93,750	0	-4,099	0	0	0	24,332	29,348
Subtotal Fund 9704							30,000,000	93,750	0	-4,099	0	0	0	24,332	29,348
Total - All							4,165,918,692	19,718,338	4,153	-1,054,314	4,197,634	286,199	4,483,832	4,820,017	15,043,495

DETAIL TRANSACTION REPORT - AUGUST 2010

August 31, 2010

City & County of San Francisco



Run Date: 8/31/2010 7:55:39 AM

Transaction Type	Settlement Date	Investment No.	Description	Investment Type	CUSIP	Par Value	Book Value	(Interest)	(Gain) / Loss	Transaction Amount
Call	08/27/2010	42282	FHLB 1.5 3NC1 step-	Agency	3133XUM83	-50,000,000	-50,000,000			50,000,000
Call	08/27/2010	42283	FHLB 1.5 3NC1 step-	Agency	3133XUM83	-4,300,000	-4,300,000			4,300,000
Total Call						-54,300,000	-54,300,000	0	0	54,300,000
Purchase	08/10/2010	42452	FNMA 2.125 8 1 15	Agency	3136FM6G4	25,000,000	25,000,000			-25,000,000
Purchase	08/16/2010	42453	FNMA 1.35 08 16 13	Agency	31398A2H4	25,000,000	25,000,000			-25,000,000
Purchase	08/05/2010	42438	FHLMC STRNT .499951	Agency	3134G1LU6	40,000,000	40,003,889			-40,003,889
Deposit	08/02/2010	42445	PFM PRIME FUND 06 3	Money Market Funds		1,692	1,692			-1,692
Purchase	08/04/2010	42446	TVA 6.79 5 23 12	Agency	880591DT6	20,500,000	22,999,798			-22,999,798
Purchase	08/04/2010	42447	FNMA STEP 1.50 6 1	Agency	3136FTW4	37,000,000	37,191,475			-37,191,475
Purchase	08/18/2010	42457	FNMA 1.75 8 18 14	Agency	3136FM3R3	53,270,000	53,507,584			-53,507,584
Purchase	08/04/2010	42449	FIRST NATIONAL BANK	Public Time Deposits		5,000,000	5,000,000			-5,000,000
Total Purchase/Deposit						205,771,692	208,704,438	0	0	-208,704,438
Withdrawal	08/03/2010	42445	PFM PRIME FUND 06 3	Money Market Funds		-24,750,000	-24,750,000	0	0	24,750,000
Sale	08/03/2010	42437	T 1.00 7 15 13	Treasury	912828NN6	-25,000,000	-24,955,823	-12,908	-202,380	25,171,111
Sale	08/16/2010	42318	FHLB 0.75 9 29 11 2	Agency	3133XUVP5	-48,450,000	-48,396,705	-138,284	-83,819	48,618,808
Total Sale/Withdrawal						-98,200,000	-98,102,528	-151,192	-286,199	98,539,919
Interest	08/02/2010	42341	T 1 7 31 11	Treasury	912828LG3			-600,000		600,000
Interest	08/31/2010	42298	T 0.875 02 28 11	Treasury	912828KE9			-218,750		218,750
Interest	08/31/2010	42325	T 1 08 31 11	Treasury	912828LV0			-500		500
Interest	08/31/2010	42326	T 1 08 31 11	Treasury	912828LV0			-499,500		499,500
Interest	08/08/2010	42366	FNMA 3NC1.5 1X 1.80	Agency	31398AF23			-450,000		450,000
Interest	08/08/2010	42367	FNMA 3NC1.5 1X	Agency	31398AF23			-225,000		225,000
Interest	08/25/2010	42342	FFCB Bullet 3.875 8	Agency	31331Y286			-968,750		968,750
Interest	08/25/2010	42371	FHLMC 1.8 2 25 13 3	Agency	3128X9ZK9			-675,000		675,000
Interest	08/27/2010	42282	FHLB 1.5 3NC1 step-	Agency	3133XUM83			-375,000		375,000
Interest	08/27/2010	42283	FHLB 1.5 3NC1 step-	Agency	3133XUM83			-32,250		32,250
Interest	08/02/2010	42445	PFM PRIME FUND 06 3	Money Market Funds				-1,692		1,692
Total Interest						0	0	-4,046,442	0	4,046,442
Sub Total - Fund 100						53,271,692	56,301,910	-4,197,634	-286,199	-51,818,078

DETAIL TRANSACTION REPORT - AUGUST 2010

August 31, 2010

City & County of San Francisco



Run Date: 8/31/2010 7:55:39 AM

Transaction Type	Settlement Date	Investment No.	Description	Investment Type	CUSIP	Par Value	Book Value	(Interest)	(Gain) / Loss	Transaction Amount
Fund: 9704 SFUSD BONDS 2006B										
Sub Total - Fund 9704						0	0	0	0	0
Total - All Funds						53,271,692	56,301,910	-4,197,634	-286,199	-51,818,078



To:
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Fw: Parkmerced (EIR Comments & Responses) - Nov. 18th

From: Aaron Goodman <amgodman@yahoo.com>
To: linda.avery@sfgov.org, Kelley.Amdur@sfgov.org
Cc: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/30/2010 03:25 PM
Subject: Parkmerced (EIR Comments & Responses) - Nov. 18th

Sept. 30th, 2010

SF Planning Commissioners

As I was unable to attend today's discussion on the Parkmerced date-setting. I would like to provide additional comment on what was stated today at the hearing.

a) the majority of the meetings sponsored by the developer were "skewed" to their favor, with limited response time, and few opportunities to actually change anything besides suggesting items to be written down on a pen-board documented by a Stellar Management Representative. There has been ZERO meetings held where community members or interested parties have been able to present, or even draw or physically alter the projects layout, or concept on the boards for alternative ideas, suggestions or even basic principles that should be included. The suggestion that the SF Planning Department should hold or should have held there own independent community meetings on this large scale rezoning project is correct, and should have been done prior to or during the stated 250+ held meetings. There has not been any opportunity to change the plans to date, and there still has been zero effort by the planning department besides the scoping hearings to sequester alternatives, or look at the significant ideas stated as options/alternatives on the transit, and design for parkmerced's future, especially the preservation alternatives that seem to have been eliminated based on back-room dealings with the developer on scheduling and project alternatives to be considered.

b) the rezoning of the Parkmerced site, brings into direct question the SFSU-CSU Masterplan, and the issues of what is the original boundaries of Parkmerced. To date there has been only 2 EIR's submitted that BOTH inaccurately delineate the original boundaries of Parkmerced which has been noted as an eligible site to the national register of historic places per the developers own CEQA historical resources documentation which is not even an adequate or thorough analysis of the landscape design of this site as it ignores it entirely.. The lack of infill, or preservation based alternatives has been noted by commissioners, and preservationists repeatedly in the documents submitted on both projects, as they utilize the EIR's to ignore the original boundaries and limit the conversation to the "owned property" in question. This is not taking into account the site as a WHOLE. The urban planning of Parkmerced as a site, and its significance in the development of the city require a proper and adequate survey of the site, the landscape features that give Parkmerced its uniqueness and the effort to adequately analyze what will be lost in destroying Parkmerced's garden landscape design.

c) I have received the BVHP EIR documents and as Commissioner Moore stated these documents are far from easy to digest for any single person not versed in CEQA, EIR's and the intricate layers of city policy. I noted on the BVHP there was not any individuals submitted "alternatives" drawn or detailed, showing how the developer could meet goals while preserving or providing better public benefit. It just so happens that I submitted 30 pages of text and 30 pages of 11x17's sketches that showcase significant alternatives and ideas that delineate opportunity through one of the eliminated options to meet the project sponsors goals, preserve the landscape significantly, and provide adequate ample new development and buildings, along with direct mass-transit improvements. I do not believe for a moment that the EIR responses from the SF Planning Department have adequately addressed

the issues I have highlighted in the response comments. I do not believe that 2 weeks is significant time to digest the EIR Responses prior to holding hearings, and I seriously doubt that there has been any significant information provided by the developer on the condition of the existing buildings to date. Such as the need for a soundness report on the proposed destruction of sound housing. The garden units can be actively restored, while creating new infill designs in modern concepts of infill community development. The existing towers have not been independently analyzed for their structural integrity due to their early 1940's construction. They remain the ONLY towers west of twin peaks over 10 stories NOT retrofitted for seismic stability. The cracking and leaking roofs on the now termed "pent-house" floors seem to need a more serious review since they have tapered walls, and utilized sikaflex enhancement additive when constructed initially. I am sure that the pressure to complete the EIR CEQA comments comes directly from the developer's interests, and the SFSU-CSU responses to stated issues indicated a similar tact of ignoring public input.

d) I have lived in Parkmerced for 5 years, walked its grounds, documented the issues upfront, and seen what is inside. I do not believe any of you to date have been there and looked at Parkmerced from the many angles I have. Parkmerced ownership removed last years "tour" during Architecture in the city week, and this year promoted/sanctioned an off-site location at SOM's corporate office for discussion of their ideas. The efforts have been spear-headed by PJ Johnston and TWO Lobbying firms in addition to multiple legal teams they have at work consistently on the project. It is impossible for an individual to show in depth the true impacts, I want you to see what is there, not just discuss it from a distance. This is the difference between "planning" and architecture. The ability to set foot on site, view the property from many angles and see its strengths and weaknesses. Stellar Management's presentation promotes the weakness while rarely looking into the sites positives or features besides the vague ads for "large-open-space" and "living large".... I suggest you look at Parkmerced's strengths. It has provided the city with the largest rental community and housing stock in the city. It provided prior for many years affordable rental housing where none existed. It is a green-belt in itself which is shared social housing not found ANYWHERE else at this scale or level of intricacy. The social housing aspect of Parkmerced may never be able to be replaced or rebuilt elsewhere dollar investment wise without significant philanthropic or governmental assistance. It can be seen from hundreds of homes and vantage points throughout the city. The site-plane suggested by the designer is NOT the most critical issue, the need for addressing the impacts neglected in the SF General Plan by the proposed development is your area of expertise. I strongly suggest looking close at what issues the current development proposal ignores and think of how the option/alternative I have submitted in detail provides not only a key, but a solution of how to move forward on this proposal in a substantive way that creates not only a future, but protects the past, the environment, and allows the maximal creation of new rental housing for our city.

e) Gibson Dunn and Crutcher's comments did not indicate that the Parkmerced "VISION" website is also skewed to the developer's favor. There is little indicative on this site of issues or concerns raised, and my requests to post articles or important issues was typically met by refusal or non-response by Mr. Bert Polacci (Government Relations) at Parkmerced. The listed meetings and comments, typically edit, or soften the comments raised at the meetings and are thus NOT indicative of fair or equitable meetings being held to garner opposition's input on this project. My submitted documents show much more clearly the concerns and issues at stake. You may request a copy from Rick Cooper or Sophie Hayward at the SF Planning Department prior to Nov. 21st hearing, perhaps I can answer questions, or request answers to my raised design issues on the project with Director Rahaim, and the Planning Commission with an extended speaking period over 3 minutes. Perhaps 30 minutes similar to the developer's time span at prior city hearings and Introductory meetings to date?

f) there has been little info. on the legal implications, and the serious lack of accounting for the missing rental housing stock due to the SFSU-CSU Masterplan's -1,000 units purchased in Stonestown Apartments and University Park South (Parkmerced's northern edge prior). There has also been no inventive and open transportation design, or solution proposed utilizing open competition for the linkages and issues related to 19th Ave. This should be Director Rahaim's efforts, or perhaps Mrs. Amdur's so that we do not just have a vision by CSU, and Stellar, but a proposal that takes PUBLIC BENEFIT to light, in its conception and development. That's how Met-Life came to invest in Parkmerced. Perhaps it is best to look how Parkmerced was "entitled" and the reasons behind it to understand how we should be approaching the future parkmerced "vision". The future garden and open-spaces, boulevard's and housing concepts SOM's head designer has proposed are far from public benefit. They represent pro-forma development or as they term it "green"

strategy that they have used in numerous cities with little regard for the existing communities they impact or displace in the process..I highly suggest an independent alternative design or concept generation on this one, to promote design(s) or ideas that may better solve the current public need for housing, open-space and direct transit linkages.

Sincerely

Aaron Goodman
amgodman@yahoo.com

cc: SF Historic Preservation Commission, SF Board of Supervisors



To:
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Fw: SF Planning Commission Item C-11 on Sept. 30th 2010

From: Aaron Goodman <amgodman@yahoo.com>
To: linda.avery@sfgov.org
Cc: Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/29/2010 12:30 PM
Subject: SF Planning Commission Item C-11 on Sept. 30th 2010

Sept. 30th, 2010

SF Planning Commission;

I write to you as I just received notice on the item being considered for discussion on the initial setting of hearings possibly for the Parkmerced Project.

I am concerned that the information is **NOT** going out adequately to the community in terms of notification by the current owner of Parkmerced to all affected parties. The little one line note on the agenda is easily missed by many and to have discussion and "dog+pony show" presentations by the Parkmerced developer without adequate equal response time by opposition to this project is sincerely unjust and un-equitable.

Please do note that MANY people living in Parkmerced are seniors, disabled, students, working class, immigrants and non-native english speakers. There are many people who cannot attend mid-day hearings, or evening hearings repeatedly. The presentation by Parkmerced has consistently drowned out or extended beyond many residents ability to even sit through some of the presentations and hearings to date.

The SFSU-CSU "Masterplan" also utilized the "holidays" to hold hearings when students were NOT present or able to participate. I am concerned about the dates being set for the hearings, and the similar proximity to the holidays for many working class residents of this community and their ability to attend, speak up and be heard on this important issue.

The recent article on affordability of housing in the SFBG by Rebecca Bowe, along with other similar concerns of the lack of essential rental working class housing being built citywide are important issues to be properly and adequately discussed with the public.

I hope you will consider a more extended discussion on Parkmerced, and the impacts the destruction of the housing and site will cause to ensure that sustainability, and "green" design INCLUDE preservation in the discussion of solutions.

The elimination of the "infill" option appears to be more of a back-room negotiation than a real look at the essential housing needs, and the SF General Plan which denote distinctly the importance of protecting and preserving essential rental housing, open-space, and

our unique urban planning districts in the city.

Please consider proper and adequate notice to the residents and neighborhoods surrounding Parkmerced, the Preservationist Organizations that have worked hard to bring to the public's attention Parkmerced, and the concerns of tenancy organizations of the current legal issues which make the promises of the current ownership mute and undiscernible legally and technically due to three pieces of case law in southern California.

The negotiations for Trinity Plaza do NOT provide adequate assurances on the rent-control status of these units at Parkmerced, and many residents are not informed sufficiently on the current legal and technical issues of rent-control nor the enforceability of the promises being made at Parkmerced.

If there are to be hearings scheduled I strongly urge the notice to be wider-spread, and ensure that state and national organizations are allowed the opportunity to provide comment and input on this important discussion of our cities affordable future for working class families, seniors, students, immigrants and disabled residents.

Sincerely

Aaron Goodman
amgodman@yahoo.com

cc: SF Historic Preservation Commission, SF Board of Supervisors.

File 101253 BOS-11, cpage, File

City and County of San Francisco

Department of Public Health



Mitchell H. Katz, MD
Director of Health

October 1, 2010

Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Rm. 250
San Francisco, CA

Re: Resolution authorizing the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) to apply for the HIV Emergency Relief Grant Program (Ryan White Programs, Part A)

Dear Honorable Supervisors,

One of our resolutions, "Grant Application-Department of Public Health-Ryan White HIV Emergency Relief Program-\$36,118,233", File #101253, is calendared for the full Board agenda for adoption without committee reference on October 5, 2010.

Approval of the proposed resolution by the Board would authorize the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) to submit an application for the Ryan White ACT HIV/AIDS Emergency Relief Grant Program (Ryan White Programs, Part A) to the Health Resources Services Administration (HRSA). This application is required to receive continued funding for approximately \$36,118,233 for the San Francisco Eligible Metropolitan Area (EMA). DPH has received from HRSA the application guidance and the application deadline is October 18, 2010. The signed document must be returned with the application. However, we intend to submit an Accept and Expend Approval application upon receipt of the Notice of Grant Award for these funds.

If you should have any questions regarding the resolution, please contact Ann Santos, DPH Grants Manager at 255-3546. She would be happy to meet with you before the Board meeting or speak to you over the phone.

Sincerely,

Mitchell H. Katz, M.D.
Director of Health

City and County of San Francisco

Office of the Controller – City Services Auditor

AIRPORT COMMISSION:

**Concession Audit of
The Paradies Shops, Inc.**



October 4, 2010

**CONTROLLER'S OFFICE
CITY SERVICES AUDITOR**

The City Services Auditor was created within the Controller's Office through an amendment to the City Charter that was approved by voters in November 2003. Under Appendix F to the City Charter, the City Services Auditor has broad authority for:

- Reporting on the level and effectiveness of San Francisco's public services and benchmarking the city to other public agencies and jurisdictions.
- Conducting financial and performance audits of city departments, contractors, and functions to assess efficiency and effectiveness of processes and services.
- Operating a whistleblower hotline and website and investigating reports of waste, fraud, and abuse of city resources.
- Ensuring the financial integrity and improving the overall performance and efficiency of city government.

The audits unit conducts financial audits, attestation engagements, and performance audits. Financial audits address the financial integrity of both city departments and contractors and provide reasonable assurance about whether financial statements are presented fairly in all material aspects in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles. Attestation engagements examine, review, or perform procedures on a broad range of subjects such as internal controls; compliance with requirements of specified laws, regulations, rules, contracts, or grants; and the reliability of performance measures. Performance audits focus primarily on assessment of city services and processes, providing recommendations to improve department operations.

We conduct our audits in accordance with the Government Auditing Standards published by the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO). These standards require:

- Independence of audit staff and the audit organization.
- Objectivity of the auditors performing the work.
- Competent staff, including continuing professional education.
- Quality control procedures to provide reasonable assurance of compliance with the auditing standards.

Audit Team: Elisa Sullivan, Audit Manager
John Haskell, Associate Auditor



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

Ben Rosenfield
Controller

Monique Zmuda
Deputy Controller

October 4, 2010

San Francisco Airport Commission
P.O. Box 8097
San Francisco International Airport
San Francisco, CA 94128

John L. Martin, Director
San Francisco International Airport
P.O. Box 8097
San Francisco, CA 94128

President, Members, and Director Martin:

The Controller's Office, City Services Auditor, presents its report concerning the audit of The Paradies Shops, Inc.(Paradies). Paradies has three lease agreements with the Airport Commission of the City and County of San Francisco to operate five retail stores at the San Francisco International Airport. Two leases had original terms of five years, which were extended for two years, and will expire on June 24, 2011. The third lease had an original term of five years, which was also extended for two years, and will expire on February 25, 2012.

Reporting Period: July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2009

Rent Paid: \$ 1,439,856

Results:

Paradies correctly reported gross revenues of \$9,102,430 under its three leases, but overpaid rent by \$1,253. In addition, Paradies did not submit to the Airport some of its required annual financial statement audits in a timely manner.

The responses of the Airport and Paradies are attached to this report. The Controller's Office, City Services Auditor, will work with the Airport to follow up on the status of the recommendations made in this report.

Respectfully,

Tonia Lediju
Director of Audits

cc: Mayor
Board of Supervisors
Budget Analyst
Civil Grand Jury
Public Library

Page intentionally left blank.

INTRODUCTION

Audit Authority

The Office of the Controller (Controller) has authority under the San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 10, Article 1, Section 10.6-2, to audit, at regular intervals, all leases of city-owned real property where rent of \$100,000 or more a year is to be paid to the City and County of San Francisco (City). In addition, the City Charter provides the Controller, City Services Auditor (CSA), with broad authority to conduct audits. This audit was conducted under that authority and pursuant to an audit plan agreed to by the Controller and the Airport Department (Airport).

Background

The Paradies Shops, Inc. (Paradies) has three lease agreements with the Airport Commission of the City. Leases 04-0006 and 04-0007 have rent commencement dates of June 25, 2004, and terms of five years each, which expired on June 24, 2009, and were extended for two-year periods to June 24, 2011. Lease 04-0166 has a rent commencement date of February 26, 2005, a term of five years, which expired on February 25, 2010, and was extended by the Airport Commission for two years to February 25, 2012. Leases 04-0006 and 04-0007 allow Paradies to operate four CNBC News stores, three at the International Terminal and one at Terminal 3. Lease 04-0007 allows Paradies to operate the PGA Tour Shop, also located at Terminal 3.

All three leases require Paradies to pay the Airport monthly the greater of one-twelfth of a minimum annual guarantee (MAG) or a tiered percentage rent of 12 to 16 percent of its gross revenues under each lease. The percentage rent rate to be applied each month depends on the cumulative amount of Paradies' total gross revenues per lease year it has reached that month. Lease 04-0006 requires a MAG of \$401,000, lease 04-0007 requires a MAG of \$222,000, and lease 04-0166 requires a MAG of \$81,900.

Scope and Methodology

The purpose of this audit was to determine whether:

- The monthly statements of gross revenues that Paradies submitted to the Airport accurately reflected actual gross revenues based on monthly and daily records.

- Paradies paid the proper amount of rent to the Airport, according to the terms of its lease.
- Paradies currently has no overdue rent payable to the Airport for the audit period.
- Paradies complied with other provisions of its lease.

The audit covered the period July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2009.

To conduct the audit, the audit team:

- Examined the applicable terms of the lease and the adequacy of Paradies' procedures for collecting, recording, summarizing, and reporting its gross revenues to the Airport.
- Compared on a sample basis Paradies' reported gross revenues to those recorded in its internal monthly summary records in order to determine whether Paradies accurately reported its gross revenues to the Airport.
- Compared on a sample basis Paradies' internal monthly summary records to daily sales reports and other specific source documents.
- Examined the Airport's aged accounts receivable report to determine whether Paradies had any outstanding payments due to the Airport.
- Selected key lease requirements and performed inquiry, observation, and testing to determine whether Paradies complied with other provisions of its leases.

This performance audit was conducted in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. These standards require planning and performing the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for the findings and conclusions based on the audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for the findings and conclusions based on the audit objectives.

AUDIT RESULTS

Paradies Correctly Reported Its Gross Revenues

For the audit period July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2009, Paradies reported gross revenues under its three leases of \$9,102,430 and calculated and paid rent of \$1,439,856. The exhibit below shows Paradies' reported gross revenues and rent paid.

EXHIBIT		
Gross Revenues Reported and Rent Paid July 1, 2007, Through June 30, 2009		
Lease and Reporting Period	Gross Revenues Reported	Rent Paid
CNBC News – Lease 04-0006		
<i>July 1, 2007-June 30, 2008</i>	\$2,284,856	\$ 401,000*
<i>July 1, 2008-June 30, 2009</i>	2,347,676	401,000*
Total	\$4,632,532	\$ 802,000
CNBC News – Lease 04-0007		
<i>July 1, 2007-June 30, 2008</i>	\$1,386,367	\$ 222,000*
<i>July 1, 2008-June 30, 2009</i>	1,478,512	222,000*
Total	\$2,864,879	\$ 444,000
PGA Tour Shop – Lease 04-0166		
<i>July 1, 2007-June 30, 2008</i>	\$ 834,689	\$ 100,163
<i>July 1, 2008-June 30, 2009</i>	770,330	93,693
Total	\$1,605,019	\$ 193,856
Total	\$9,102,430	\$1,439,856

* For leases 04-0006 and 04-0007, Paradies was required to pay only the MAG each year.

Source: Airport monthly sales reports and FAMIS cash receipts reports.

Paradies Overpaid Rent for the PGA Tour Shop in Fiscal Year 2008-09

For the period July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009, Paradies paid rent to the Airport of \$93,693 for the PGA Tour Shop, but owed only \$92,440, an overpayment of \$1,253. This occurred due to the fluctuation of revenues received by Paradies during this year, which required Paradies to pay the MAG rent for some months and the percentage rent for others, resulting in a credit owed to Paradies upon true-up of rent due at fiscal year end. The Airport has now notified Paradies of the credit and

requested that Paradies instruct the Airport on how to apply the credit.

**Annual Financial
Statement Audits Were
Submitted Late or There
Is No Record of Receipt**

The three leases that Paradies has with the Airport stipulate that annual financial audits be performed and their results be submitted to the Airport within 90 days of the end of the lease year. To determine the date when the audit results were received, the audit team relied on date stamps on the reports. For the lease of the PGA Tour Shop, the date stamps indicated that the annual reports for the lease years ending February 2008, 2009 and 2010, were all submitted more than 90 days after the end of the lease year. For the two leases for the CNBC News stores, none of the reports had a date stamp and the Airport had no record of when they were received. Consequently, it was impossible to determine when the reports were received.

Recommendations

The Airport should take the following actions:

1. Ensure that the \$1,253 credit due Paradies is either applied to open invoices or refunded according to Paradies' preference.
2. Communicate to Paradies that the company is required to submit annual financial statement audit reports within 90 days of the end of the lease year, pursuant to the terms of its leases.
3. Ensure that Airport staff who receive the audit reports date stamp them on the day they are received, and maintain a system to track receipt.

ATTACHMENT A: AIRPORT'S RESPONSE

Recommendation	Responsible Agency	Response
1. Ensure that the \$1,253 credit due Paradies is either applied to open invoices or refunded according to Paradies' preference.	AIR	The Airport concurs.
2. Communicate to Paradies that the company is required to submit annual financial statement audit reports within 90 days of the end of the lease year, pursuant to the terms of its leases.	AIR	The Airport concurs. A letter will be sent to Tenant.
3. Ensure that Airport staff who receive the audit reports date stamp them on the day they are received, and maintain a system to track receipt.	AIR	The Airport concurs.

ATTACHMENT B: PARADIES' RESPONSE



THE PARADIES SHOPS

*A Family Business
Since 1960*

September 29, 2010

Tonia Lediju, Director of Audits
City Hall, Room 477
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Ms Lediju,

In response to the Concession Audit of The Paradies Shops Inc at San Francisco County Airport Commission, please note Paradies' findings below:

1. Outstanding credits totaling \$2,037 were used on Paradies check numbers 010078093 and 010078094 dated September 27, 2010. The balances were provided by Grace Marley of San Francisco Airport Commission.
2. Electronic copies of Certified Annual Statements are emailed to San Francisco Airport Commission members within the 90 day time frame for submittal.

If you have any questions please call 404.494.3392.

Sincerely

Beth Perkins
Controller

BOS-11
CPAGE

Sups Squandering Public Funds....Again
nesad58
to:
Board of Supervisors
10/01/2010 01:34 PM
Show Details

Dear Madam Clerk,

Please inform your Board members that it would be the height of idiocy to spend \$450,000 to build a wheelchair ramp to the Board's throne.

If, at some point in the future, someone in a wheel chair became the Chairp, a temporary "dias" could be established at one of the Supervisor's tables for a lot less than \$450,000.

If 10 out of the 11 Supervisors are in favor of wasting our tax dollars in this extraordinarily foolish way, then maybe it's time to put them in wheel chairs and send them to rest homes to face blank walls.

Mordicai (Duke) McGuire
San Francisco

10



SF Environment

Our home. Our city. Our planet.



GAVIN NEWSOM
Mayor

MELANIE NUTTER
Director

Annual Report: 2009 San Francisco Green Purchasing Program for City Staff

Presented to the Commission on the Environment, City County of San Francisco

October 5, 2010

Prepared by SF Department of the Environment (SFE) Toxics Reduction Team: Jessian Choy & Chris Geiger
With assistance from:

Alicia Culver, Green Purchasing Institute
Lynn Khaw, Office of Contract Administration (OCA)

Pamela Olivier, OCA
Hannah Safford, Intern, SFE

Table of Contents

I.	Executive Summary	2
II.	Introduction	2
A.	History and Mandate	2
B.	Precautionary Purchasing Ordinance.....	2
C.	Summary of Past Annual Reports.....	2
D.	Scope of Report	2
E.	2009 Staff That Worked on Green Purchasing.....	3
III.	2009 Accomplishments	3
A.	City Champions That Bought Required Green Products	3
B.	Vendors That Sold Required Green Products.....	4
C.	2009 Total Contracts & Products in SF Approved List (Details in Table E)	4
D.	2009 % Required Green Products Bought by the City (Details in Table A)	4
E.	Policies and Specifications	4
F.	Trainings to City Staff	5
G.	New Outreach Methods	5
IV.	Actions or Laws Needed To Implement Green Purchasing Ordinance	5
A.	Need More Cost-Efficient Way to Track Sales.....	5
B.	Need Better Way for City Staff to Read / Write Green Product Reviews Online.....	6
V.	2010 Workplan	6
A.	New Ideas	6
B.	Outreach.....	6
C.	Carpet.....	6
D.	Computers	6
E.	Foodware	6
F.	Food.....	6
G.	Janitorial Cleaners	6
H.	Lighting.....	6
I.	Paints	6
VI.	Tables.....	7
A.	City Purchases of Required Green Products 2007-09	7
B.	All City Champions of Green Foodware 2009.....	8
C.	All City Champions of Green Cleaners, Paper Towels, Toilet Tissue / Seat Covers 2009	9
D.	All City Champions of Paper 2009 (100% Post-Consumer Recycled, Processed Chlorine-free)	13
E.	Details of Contracts & Products in SF Approved List 2009.....	19
F.	City Purchases of Green Office Supplies 2009	20

11

I. Executive Summary

The San Francisco Department of the Environment (SFE) and the Office of Contract Administration (OCA) have taken lead roles in implementing the City's Precautionary Purchasing Ordinance.

Major accomplishments for 2009

Since the ordinance passed in 2005, SFE created a list of over 1,000 green products for City staff with environmentally preferable specifications for 34 green product subcategories, and 13 citywide commodities contracts.

In 2009, San Francisco became the first city in the nation to require purchases of EPEAT-Gold computer and Climate Savers computer servers. New janitorial services contract language was developed that requires contracted custodians to use SF Approved products and implement other measures compatible with green building certifications. Overall purchases of Required Green Products were \$6,924,291.

Total Required Green Products bought: 79% for computers, 78% for janitorial cleaners, 72% for janitorial papers, 50% for lighting products, 93% for office papers, 70% for selected categories of office supplies, and 31% for toner cartridges.

SFE started to create SFApproved.org, a new site for easier compliance and where to buy green products.

Future activities

In 2010, SFE will work on at least three new contracts—office supplies, janitorial cleaners, and compostable trash can liners—and continue to improve existing specifications and user buy-in.

II. Introduction

A. History and Mandate

San Francisco has been buying green products since the 1980s, but purchasing requirements were scattered among several ordinances. In 1998, the City undertook an ambitious Green Purchasing Pilot Program which:

- Inventoried and assessed hazardous chemical products purchased by City departments
- Established environmental and health criteria
- Set priorities
- Field tested products.

In 2005, San Francisco became the first city in the nation to enact the Precautionary Purchasing Ordinance.

B. Precautionary Purchasing Ordinance

The Precautionary Purchasing Ordinance (Environment Code, Chapter 2) requires establishes goals and procedures for environmentally preferable purchasing (green purchasing) by City funds to be used to departments. This ordinance was groundbreaking in its application of the Precautionary Principle (Environment Code, Chapter 1), and in its mandate that purchasers for the city may only buy commodities from "approved alternative product lists" for certain products. The "approved alternative products" are now categorized as REQUIRED products in the SF Approved List at SFAApproved.org.

C. Summary of Past Annual Reports

Table A compares the % difference in green purchases from 2007-09.

D. Scope of Report

In its description of program activities, this report covers the calendar year 2009. Previous reports are at: www.sfenvironment.org/sfapproved. Table 1 compares the % difference in green purchases from 2007-09.

E. 2009 Staff That Worked on Green Purchasing

OCA

Bill Jones
 Naomi Kelly
 Galen Leung
 Pamela Olivier
 Howard Tevelson
 Ken Easton

SFE

Julie Bryant
 Jessian Choy
 Chris Geiger
 Paul Ledesma

Full-Time Equivalent (FTE): 2.5, including the OCA Green Purchaser funded by SFE since 2008.

III. 2009 Accomplishments

A. City Champions That Bought Required Green Products

The City would like to thank Green Teams below and all Champions of green foodware, janitorial, papers (See Tables B-D).

City Staff That Bought 90+% Required Green Cleaners, Paper Towels, Toilet Tissue / Seat Covers	% Green by Staff	% by Dept. Team	
Animal Care & Control:	82%	91%	
Animal Care & Control: Victor Serrato	100%		
Asian Art Museum:	100%	100%	
Library:	100%	100%	
Library: Darren Brown	100%		
Police: Dante Giovannel	100%	95%	
Police: Don West	100%		
Police: Don West	100%		
Police: Ed Barsetti	100%		
Police: Eric Petterson	100%		
Police: Fred Kwan	100%		
Police: Leon Kiang	100%		
Police: Lucy Clemons	100%		
Police: Lynn Reilly	100%		
Police: Mark Hutchins	100%		
Police: R&Y Ching	100%		
Police: Ricardo Rodriguez	17%		
Police: Sandra Ribeiro	100%		
Police: Scott Gaines	100%		
Police: Tim Yee	100%		
Police: Tom Tang	100%		
Police: Victor Rothenberg	100%		
Police: Yesinia Brandt	100%		
Sheriff: Daniel Gertsikov	86%		94%
Sheriff: Joyce Wong	100%		
Sheriff: Richard Castillo	95%		

B. Vendors That Sold Required Green Products

The City would like to thank all vendors that sold green products:

Janitorial Vendors	% Green	Total REQUIRED & PROHIBITED Products	REQUIRED CLEANERS	REQUIRED PAPERS	PROHIBITED BATTERIES	PROHIBITED CLEANER DEGREASERS	PROHIBITED CLEANER: General Purpose	PROHIBITED CLEANERS: Glass	PROHIBITED PAPERS
Clean Source	100%	\$ 300,430.89		\$300,430.89					
H&L Int'l	100%	\$ 70,550.47		\$ 70,550.47					
Aldran	100%	\$ 1,213.20	\$ 1,213.20						
United	81%	\$ 32,009.10	\$ 26,039.60			\$ 3,504.40		\$ 2,465.10	
Waxie	78%	\$ 376,028.80	\$ 918.40	\$293,220.39			\$ 324.00		\$ 81,566.01
Santora Sales	56%	\$ 734,709.79	\$ 6,310.32	\$405,199.95	\$ 7.40		\$ 59.99	\$ 1,908.06	\$321,224.07
Champion	0%	\$ 3,291.00					\$ 3,051.00	\$ 240.00	
Grand Total	74%	\$1,518,233.25	\$ 34,481.52	\$1,069,401.70	\$ 7.40	\$ 3,504.40	\$ 3,434.99	\$ 4,613.16	\$402,790.08

Lighting Vendors (lamps)	% Required Green	Total Products
Maltby	5%	\$ 55,944.51
Omega	21%	\$ 290,891.11

C. 2009 Total Contracts & Products in SF Approved List (Details in Table E)

Sub-Categories	New subcategory	New Green Contract	Green Citywide Contract	Required Products	Suggested Products	Limited Use Products	Prohibited Products
80	34	3	13	30	48	6	5

D. 2009 % Required Green Products Bought by the City (Details in Table A)

PRODUCT CATEGORY	\$ Total Green & Prohibited	% Green
COMPUTERS (2009=first year for purchasing requirements)	\$5,087,625	79%
JANITORIAL CLEANERS	\$44,364	78%
JANITORIAL PAPERS	\$1,530,784	72%
LIGHTING (bulbs/ lamps, ballasts)	\$166,333	50%
OFFICE PAPER (Copier & Bond)	\$1,261,449	93%
OFFICE SUPPLIES	\$40,358	70%
TONER CARTRIDGES	\$5,469	31%
Total	\$8,612,906	80%

E. Policies and Specifications

San Francisco was the first major city to create these purchasing requirements

- Computer equipment: Worked with Dept. of Technology, SF Public Utilities Commission, and the Committee on Information Technology (COIT) to adopt EPEAT Gold as a purchasing requirement for all laptops, desktops, and monitors.
- Computer servers: Worked with DT, PUC and COIT to require that all non-blade computer servers be listed by the Climate Savers Computing Initiative.

Food policy: Submitted draft language for a sustainable food procurement ordinance, as required by the Mayor's Executive Directive 09-03. Worked with city stakeholders and SF Department of Public Health.

Office supplies: Worked with OCA on language for new office supplies contract.

Lighting: Updated specifications for lamps, bulbs and ballasts, for the next lighting contract

Janitorial services: Created language for inclusion in janitorial services contracts that promotes compatibility with the US Green Building Council's LEED-EB O&M (2009) checklist, as well as compatibility with the City's green purchasing requirements.

F. Trainings to City Staff

Trainings	People Trained	Depts.	Hours
Easier compliance with new SF Approved List. How can SFE make it easier for City staff to buy green & recycle toxic products?	385	12	12
Green cleaning trainings (10 trainings)	302 custodians. Mostly from City, two trainings included SF Green Businesses	4	30
TOTAL	505 Staff	16 Depts.	42 Hours

G. New Outreach Methods

1. Published and called each staff that bought:
 - a. Required green products to thank them.
 - b. Prohibited products to find out how to make it easier for them to buy from the SF Approved List.
2. Worked with Climate Action Coordinator to require City Depts. to host at least one SFE Green Purchasing & Hazwaste Consultation per year with their staff that can:
 - a. Initiate or approve purchases, or develop contracts.
 - b. Add the SF Approved List website to Requisition, Payment, Encumbrance, & Materials Request forms or software. This will remind all staff to check the List before every purchase.
3. Sent 4 email newsletters to over 1,300 City staff.
4. Drafted letter for Mayor to send to all 28,000 City staff on easier compliance with the new SF Approved.
5. Combined 6 SF Approved Lists of different product categories into a one-stop shop, the SF Approved List.

IV. Actions or Laws Needed To Implement Green Purchasing Ordinance

A. Need More Cost-Efficient Way to Track Sales

Issues:

1. More incentives/disincentives are needed to prevent vendors from selling (or City staff from buying) Prohibited products.
2. In order to track the amount of green products the City bought, SFE:
 - a. Would like to thank Pamela Olivier and Lynn Khaw at OCA for collecting and merging 20+ spreadsheets of sales reports from vendors.
 - b. Needs to reduce the 100+ hours spent to clean these spreadsheets from vendors (each having about 2,000 rows of data).
3. Better information resources are needed to allow staff and vendors to easily identify products meeting the City's environmental specifications.

Proposed Solutions:

The City may save money in the long-run if:

1. An online "data warehouse" could ensure vendors submit accurate data.

2. Sample consequences could be enacted for vendors that sell Prohibited products or inaccurately fill out SFE's sales report template:
 - Vendors would get less points in future bids.
 - Their current contract could be canceled.
3. The City purchasing system, ADPICS could:
 - a) Create quick reports to ensure City was not overcharged, who bought Required/Prohibited products.
 - b) Take Green Seal's suggestion for cities to have green commodity codes.
 - c) Prompt City staff to buy from the SF Approved List.

B. Need Better Way for City Staff to Read / Write Green Product Reviews Online

SFE implemented a low-budget way for City staff to read / write green product reviews but a more user-friendly method is needed for cleaners and pesticides.

V. 2010 Workplan

A. New Ideas SFE Will Explore for Green Contracts

- Designate products that can be replaced with green products as Limited Use and/or Prohibited.
- Implement the SF Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) Resolution. Vendors selling should find new ways to make it easier and more affordable for City staff to buy green products and recycle.
- Try to get better prices for green products (e.g., make forecast quantities greater for green products).

B. Outreach

- Meet with all OCA purchasers for 1 hour on how both depts. can help promote each other's mission.
- SFE will continue to train delegated purchasers annually.

C. Carpet

- Review existing carpet standards/certifications and identify the best to add to the SF Approved List.

D. Computers

- Collaborate with OCA, Dept. of Technology vendors in developing a workable sales reporting system.
- Work directly with IT Store vendors to improve education on green computers.
- Monitor development of new Energy Star standards for computer servers and update City requirements.

E. Foodware

- Continue to work with hospital staff to compost food and foodware (not non-compostable foodware).

F. Food

- Work with OCA and SFDPH to include local, and/or organic food in the new citywide dairy contract.

G. Janitorial Cleaners

- Implement new janitorial cleaners contract & continue meetings with Custodial Products Green Team.
- Direct outreach to departments who are not purchasing Required green cleaners.

H. Lighting

- Meet with end-users and SFPUC to increase sales of Required green lighting. Implement new lamps and ballasts contract. Explore outsourcing of SF Approved Lighting List of thousands of products.

I. Paints

- Work with City painters to pilot test green paints.

A. City Purchases of Required Green Products 2007-09

CATEGORY	SUB-CATEGORY	2007		2008		2009		% Green**	09 Notes
		Total Spent on Green Products (\$)	% Green	Total Spent on Green Products (\$)	% Green	Total Spent on Green Products (\$)	Total Spent on ALL products in covered categories* (\$)		
COMPUTERS (2009=first year for purchasing requirements)	Desktops	\$2,358,748	\$2,824,948	83%	Many specialized monitors (with cameras, touch screens) not EPEAT certified. All levels of Climate Savers included in calculation for server purchases. Blade servers are inherently more efficient but do not yet fall under a certification system.
	Laptops	\$1,035,203	\$1,221,784	85% EPEAT Gold (95% if EPEAT Silver included)	
	Monitors	\$151,218	\$482,036	31% (75% if EPEAT Silver included)	
	Servers (non-blade)	\$476,523	\$558,857	85%	
	TOTAL	\$4,021,692	\$5,087,625	79%	
FOODWARE	Compostable	\$193,529	...	\$219,265	...	\$382,953	
	Recyclable	\$18,456	...	\$42,048	...	\$93,570	
	TOTAL	\$211,885	...	\$261,313	...	\$476,523	\$476,523	...	
JANITORIAL CLEANERS	Bathroom-Tub-Tile	\$41,505	...	\$708	\$708	100%	Percentages are volatile due to low sales volume. Some departments bought these products off-contract using departmental purchasing authority. New contract in development
	Degreasers	\$10,406	74%	\$26,967	...	\$26,040	\$29,544	88%	
	General Purpose Cleaners	\$1,719	29%	\$10,506	...	\$5,193	\$8,628	60%	
	Glass cleaners	\$548	...	\$2,541	\$5,484	46%	
	TOTAL	\$12,125	...	\$79,525	...	\$34,482	\$44,364	78%	
JANITORIAL PAPERS	Paper Towels	\$464,224	100%	\$623,762	...	\$392,604	
	Toilet Seal Covers	\$85,767	100%	\$51,744	...	\$640,590	
	Toilet Tissue	\$115,982	58%	\$251,234	...	\$73,117	
	TOTAL	\$665,973	...	\$926,740	...	\$1,106,311	\$1,530,784	72%	
LIGHTING (bulbs/lamps/ballasts)	CFLS	\$3,658	63.2% (1 vendor)	\$7,574	\$11,633	66%	Understates green lighting purchases due to separate contracts for SF PUC efficient lighting retrofits. 2009 is the first year we had full vendor cooperation on sales data. Lamps % compares Required lamps to total lamps purchased. CFL % compares Required Green CFLs to total CFLs + Prohibited incandescents purchased. 18% of all lamps purchased were Required.
	Lamps	\$152,754	30.5% (1 vendor)	\$11,503	78% (1 vendor)	\$34,723	\$101,294	34%	
	Ballasts	\$40,678	85% (1 vendor)	\$3,249	84% (1 vendor)	\$41,016	\$53,407	77%	
	TOTAL	\$83,313	\$166,333	50%	
MULTIFUNCTION PRINTERS	Ricoh	307 units	...	382 units	N/A	This contract applies to leases of units, not purchases.
	Xerox	357 units	...	374 units	N/A	
	Konica Minolta	278 units	...	313 units	N/A	
	TOTAL	942 units	...	1069 units	N/A	475 units	N/A	N/A	
OFFICE PAPER	30% PCW	\$145,533	88%	Specification increased from 30% to 100% PCW in 2008. Colored papers, specialty papers, odd sizes not included in calculation. 2008 data incomplete.
	50% PCW	\$775	0%	
	100% PCW	\$18,703	11%	\$ 1,172,104.31	
	TOTAL	\$524,766	93%	\$165,012	100%	\$ 1,172,104.31	\$1,261,449	93%	
OFFICE SUPPLIES	Batteries (rechargeables AAA-D 1.5-9-volt)	\$8,597	42%	\$16,410	49%	\$248	\$506	50%	Data does not include Dec., 2009 sales. See Tables 2 & 3 for details on covered product categories.
	Recycled file folders, notebooks, other items	\$27,903	\$39,852	70%	
	TOTAL	\$28,156	\$40,358	70%	
TONERS	Remanufactured	\$1,710	\$5,469	31%	Data only since beginning of contract (June-Dec. '09)

B. All City Champions of Green Foodware 2009 (Required Products)

The City Thanks These City Champions	Compostable	Recyclable	Total by City Champion	Total by Dept. Team
Animal Care & Control: Eric Zuercher	\$ 1,218.00		\$ 1,218.00	\$ 1,218.00
Board of Supervisors : Ohn Myint		\$ 67.90	\$ 67.90	\$ 67.90
City College of San Francisco: Stephanie Chui	\$ 7,578.88	\$ 692.74	\$ 9,675.52	\$ 9,675.52
Juvenile Probation Department: Christian Losno	\$ 2,094.90	\$ 2,624.98	\$ 4,719.88	\$ 4,719.88
Recreation & Park Department: Karla Rosaies	\$ 88.80	\$ 189.50	\$ 278.30	\$ 278.30
School District, San Francisco Unified: Ellaine Ramos	\$ 4,164.13		\$ 4,164.13	\$ 4,164.13
Public Health: Diego Davalos	\$ 93,322.40	\$ 2,410.45	\$ 151,472.24	\$ 340,306.23
Public Health: Christine Hanson	\$ 3,187.24	\$ 985.91	\$ 4,173.15	
Public Health: Henry Kelly	\$ 70,487.11	\$ 23,613.75	\$ 158,070.21	
Public Health: Stanley Lee	\$ 5,364.00	\$ 13,327.16	\$ 18,870.02	
Public Health:	\$ 4,579.80	\$ 2,182.66	\$ 7,720.61	
Municipal Railway (PTD14):		\$ 690.00	\$ 690.00	\$ 690.00
Total by City Champion	\$ 192,085.26	\$ 46,785.05	\$ 361,119.96	\$ 361,119.96

C. All City Champions of Green Cleaners, Paper Towels, Toilet Tissue / Seat Covers 2009 (Required & Prohibited Products)

The City thanks all Champion that bought green cleaners & janitorial papers	% Green by Customer	% Green by Dept. Team	Total by City Staff	REQUIRED Bathroom Cleaner	REQUIRED Degreaser (Liquid Sunshine 777)	PROHIBITED Degreasers	REQUIRED General Purpose Cleaner	PROHIBITED General Purpose Cleaner	REQUIRED Glass Cleaner	PROHIBITED GLASS Cleaner	REQUIRED Toilet Seat Cover	REQUIRED Toilet Tissue	REQUIRED Paper Towels	PROHIBITED PAPERS
Airport:	99%	74%	\$ 246,261.97						\$ -		\$ -	\$ 242,611.97	\$ -	\$ 3,650.00
Airport: Joseph Walsh	0%		\$ 2,085.88						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,085.88
Airport: Sekio Fuapopo	100%		\$ 50,906.50						\$ -		\$ 50,906.50	\$ -	\$ -	
Airport: Severin Rizzo	99%		\$ 196,245.60					\$ 1,707.60	\$ -	\$ 240.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 194,298.00	
Animal Care & Control:	82%	91%	\$ 1,990.80						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,629.30	\$ 361.50
Animal Care & Control: Victor Serrato	100%		\$ 38.42						\$ -		\$ 38.42	\$ -	\$ -	
Asian Art Museum:	100%	100%	\$ 480.60						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 480.60	
Fine Arts Museums: Kevin O'Brien	34%	34%	\$ 3,732.63						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,263.90	\$ 2,468.73
Fire: Jeff Wong	71%	71%	\$ 30,050.00						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 21,196.00	\$ 8,854.00
Housing Authority- Alice Griffith Site:	0%	34%	\$ 67.56						\$ -	\$ 67.56	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Housing Authority- Clementina St.:	14%		\$ 117.65						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16.56	\$ 101.09
Housing Authority- Clementina St. Philip	7%		\$ 230.46						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15.78	\$ 214.68
Housing Authority- Egbert Site:	63%		\$ 1,108.61						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 693.90	\$ 414.71
Housing Authority- Egbert Site: John Finnegan	41%		\$ 270.04						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 111.00	\$ 159.04
Housing Authority- Egbert Site: Oscar Parish	0%		\$ 225.00						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 225.00
Housing Authority- Egbert Site: Youngsil Lee	0%		\$ 167.00						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 167.00
Housing Authority- Holly Courts Site: Ken Banford	0%		\$ 23.32						\$ -	\$ 23.32	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Housing Authority- Pacific Ave:	100%		\$ 58.29						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 58.29
Housing Authority- Potrero Site Annex:	0%		\$ 169.30					\$ 59.99	\$ -	\$ 67.56	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 41.75
Housing Authority- Sunnydale Site:	33%		\$ 118.08						\$ -	\$ 79.22	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 38.86	
Housing Authority- Webster Site: Omar Larea	0%		\$ 41.75						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 41.75
Housing Authority:	0%		\$ 53.87						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 53.87
Housing Authority: Henry Kwan	100%		\$ 38.86						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 38.86	
Housing Authority: Oscar Parish	100%		\$ 111.00						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 111.00	
Housing Authority: Youngsil Lee	92%		\$ 412.28						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 379.30	\$ 32.98

The City thanks all Champion that bought green cleaners & janitorial papers	% Green by Customer	% Green by Dept. Team	Total by City Staff	REQUIRED Bathroom Cleaner	REQUIRED Degreaser (Liquid Sunshine 777)	PROHIBITED Degreasers	REQUIRED General Purpose Cleaner	PROHIBITED General Purpose Cleaner	REQUIRED Glass Cleaner	PROHIBITED GLASS Cleaner	REQUIRED Toilet Seat Cover	REQUIRED Toilet Tissue	REQUIRED Paper Towels	PROHIBITED PAPERS
Human Services Commission: Albert	0%	33%	\$ 11.62						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11.62
Human Services Commission: Lito Dela Cruz	0%		\$ 802.58						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 802.58
Human Services Commission: Lou Palileo	100%		\$ 55.50						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 55.50	
Juvenile Probation:	32%	16%	\$ 13,260.80						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,209.65	\$ 9,051.15
Juvenile Probation: Christian Lonso	0%		\$ 1,166.40					\$ 1,166.40	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Library:	100%	100%	\$ 5,016.00						\$ -		\$ -	\$ 5,016.00	\$ -	
Library: Darren Brown	100%		\$ 25,767.10						\$ 1,213.20		\$ 2,881.00	\$ -	\$ 21,672.90	
Municipal Transportation Agency-Burke St.:	86%	50%	\$ 109,899.96						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 72,804.21	\$ 37,095.75
Municipal Transportation Agency-Overhead Lines:	84%		\$ 662.72						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 554.84	\$ 107.88
Municipal Transportation Agency-Woods Storeroom:	0%		\$ 36.60						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 36.60
Police: Dante Giovannel	100%	95%	\$ 1,003.53						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,003.53	
Police: Don West	100%		\$ 466.32						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 466.32	
Police: Don West	100%		\$ 466.32						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 466.32	
Police: Ed Barsetti	100%		\$ 2,776.34						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,776.34	
Police: Eric Petterson	100%		\$ 1,820.64						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,820.64	
Police: Fred Kwan	100%		\$ 2,546.23						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,546.23	
Police: Leon Kiang	100%		\$ 2,531.28						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,531.28	
Police: Lucy Clemons	100%		\$ 1,409.37						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,409.37	
Police: Lynn Reilly	100%		\$ 2,362.12						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,362.12	
Police: Mark Hutchins	100%		\$ 2,306.06						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,306.06	
Police: R&Y Ching	100%		\$ 246.85						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 246.85	
Police: Ricardo Rodriguez	17%		\$ 1,363.20					\$ 229.60	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,133.60
Police: Sandra Ribeiro	100%		\$ 58.29						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 58.29	
Police: Scott Gaines	100%		\$ 638.21						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 638.21	
Police: Tim Yee	100%		\$ 1,695.79						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,695.79	
Police: Tom Tang	100%		\$ 2,312.66						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,312.66	
Police: Victor Rothenberg	100%		\$ 2,640.73						\$ -		\$ 768.40	\$ -	\$ 1,872.33	
Police: Yesinia Brandt	100%	\$ 2,484.98						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,484.98		
Port: Gene Sheets	0%	\$ 333.60						\$ -	\$ 333.60	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
Port: George	0%	\$ 91.84						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 91.84	
Port: Lorenza Racklin	0%	\$ 1,587.10						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,587.10	

The City thanks all Champion that bought green cleaners & janitorial papers	% Green by Customer	% Green by Dept. Team	Total by City Staff	REQUIRED Bathroom Cleaner	REQUIRED Degreaser (Liquid Sunshine 777)	PROHIBITED Degreasers	REQUIRED General Purpose Cleaner	PROHIBITED General Purpose Cleaner	REQUIRED Glass Cleaner	PROHIBITED GLASS Cleaner	REQUIRED Toilet Seat Cover	REQUIRED Toilet Tissue	REQUIRED Paper Towels	PROHIBITED PAPERS
Public Health- General Hospital: Shawn Campbell	0%	34%	\$ 71.40						\$ -	\$ 71.40	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Public Health- Laguna Honda Hospital: Charles	0%		\$ 289.20						\$ -	\$ 289.20	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Public Health:	44%		\$ 503.27						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 222.00	\$ 281.27
Public Health: Ann Ma Bautista	65%		\$ 900.66						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 584.20	\$ 316.46
Public Health: Noreen Tai	62%		\$ 2,401.11						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,496.95	\$ 904.16
Public Health: Richard Bitanga	95%		\$ 21,250.05						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,260.65	\$ 989.40
Public Health: Steve Hoffman	44%		\$ 806.65						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 351.50	\$ 455.15
Public Health: Theresa	0%		\$ 366.96						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 366.96
Public Health: Vilma Posadas	100%		\$ 272.80						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 272.80	
Public Utilities Commission- Millbrae:	33%	23%	\$ 5,016.43						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,666.00	\$ 3,350.43
Public Utilities Commission- Newcomb Ave.:	1%		\$ 6,735.78						\$ 74.36		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,661.42
Public Utilities Commission- Sunol:	55%		\$ 2,108.40						\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,154.16	\$ 954.24
Public Utilities Commission- Wpcd:	100%		\$ 11,002.81						\$ -		\$ -	\$ 11,002.81	\$ -	
Public Utilities Commission:	11%		\$ 9,289.50						\$ -		\$ -	\$ 1,002.00	\$ -	\$ 8,287.50
Public Utilities Commission: Andy Pettit	4%		\$ 3,266.32						\$ -		\$ 146.32	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,120.00
Public Utilities Commission: George Dugan	0%		\$ 2,068.00	\$ -		\$ 2,068.00	\$ -		\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Public Utilities Commission: Mike Stez	0%		\$ 166.80	\$ -			\$ -		\$ -	\$ 166.80	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Public Utilities Commission: Tomio Takeshita	0%		\$ 957.60			\$ 957.60					\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Public Works: Benjamin Santana	0%	55%	\$ 415.80							\$ 415.80	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Public Works: Brooks Fenton	0%		\$ 148.80							\$ 148.80	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Public Works: Joel Prather	69%		\$ 2,019.30		\$ 1,395.60						\$ 623.70	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Public Works: John Lee	100%		\$ 16,059.00		\$ 16,059.00						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Public Works: Joseph Stelmak	84%		\$ 52,782.05				\$ 231.20	\$ 177.00			\$ 3,342.54	\$ -	\$ 40,506.20	\$ 8,525.11
Public Works: Miguel Govea	72%		\$ 1,622.70								\$ 669.60	\$ -	\$ 504.90	\$ 448.20
Public Works: Mohammad Khattana	57%		\$ 3,252.28				\$ 22.96				\$ 446.50	\$ -	\$ 1,398.40	\$ 1,384.42
Public Works: Otis Williams	54%		\$ 13,593.10		\$ 1,010.00						\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,308.30	\$ 6,274.80
Real Estate- 501 Stanyan St.:	66%		76%	\$ 17,928.90								\$ -	\$ 11,799.40	\$ -
Real Estate- Opera House:	95%	\$ 7,481.50									\$ -	\$ 7,122.70	\$ -	\$ 358.80
Real Estate- War Memorial:	25%	\$ 6,409.00									\$ -	\$ 1,625.00	\$ -	\$ 4,784.00
Real Estate:	61%	\$ 45,302.43									\$ -	\$ -	\$ 27,810.80	\$ 17,491.63
Real Estate: Joseph Stelmak	65%	\$ 59,281.46			\$ 1,515.00						\$ 1,728.90	\$ -	\$ 36,066.92	\$ 19,970.64
Real Estate: Michael Hanson	98%	\$ 23,601.50		\$ 672.70			\$ 245.70	\$ 324.00	\$ -		\$ 3,649.90	\$ 12,815.62	\$ 5,860.60	\$ 32.98
Real Estate: Otis Williams	97%	\$ 17,092.80		\$ -	\$ 1,010.00		\$ -		\$ 229.60		\$ 2,157.00	\$ -	\$ 13,248.00	\$ 448.20
Real Estate: Victor Serrato	97%	\$ 36,781.17		\$ -			\$ -		\$ -		\$ 172.89	\$ -	\$ 35,324.78	\$ 1,283.50

The City thanks all Champion that bought green cleaners & janitorial papers	% Green by Customer	% Green by Dept. Team	Total by City Staff	REQUIRED Bathroom Cleaner	REQUIRED Degreaser (Liquid Sunshine 777)	PROHIBITED Degreasers	REQUIRED General Purpose Cleaner	PROHIBITED General Purpose Cleaner	REQUIRED Glass Cleaner	PROHIBITED GLASS Cleaner	REQUIRED Toilet Seat Cover	REQUIRED Toilet Tissue	REQUIRED Paper Towels	PROHIBITED PAPERS	
Rec & Park- 100 Larkin St.:	100%	37%	\$ 15,662.40								\$ -	\$ 15,662.40	\$ -		
Rec & Park- Golden Gate Park Storage room:	39%		\$ 48,707.20								\$ -	\$ 18,973.00	\$ -	\$ 29,734.20	
Rec & Park- Moscone Center:	100%		\$ 2,499.00									\$ -	\$ 2,499.00	\$ -	
Rec & Park: Al Hardy	100%		\$ 315.40									\$ -	\$ -	\$ 315.40	
Rec & Park: Albert Khoo	14%		\$ 3,431.75									\$ -	\$ -	\$ 485.75	\$ 2,946.00
Rec & Park: Benny Jarvis	38%		\$ 3,917.50									\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,490.70	\$ 2,426.80
Rec & Park: Bill Chapman	45%		\$ 3,197.10									\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,442.70	\$ 1,754.40
Rec & Park: Brent Dennis	100%		\$ 55.50									\$ -	\$ -	\$ 55.50	
Rec & Park: Claudia Rhinehart	0%		\$ 5,782.00									\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,782.00
Rec & Park: Cliff Hsiung	17%		\$ 17,546.62									\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,908.52	\$ 14,638.10
Rec & Park: Dan Mui	10%		\$ 97,788.92					\$ 4,463.52			\$ 1,670.40	\$ 5,763.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 85,892.00
Rec & Park: Danny	100%		\$ 406.40									\$ -	\$ -	\$ 406.40	
Rec & Park: David Clifton	0%		\$ 172.82									\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 172.82
Rec & Park: Davida Kapler	0%		\$ 570.90									\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 570.90
Rec & Park: Eladio Mateo	30%		\$ 1,295.00									\$ -	\$ -	\$ 388.60	\$ 906.40
Rec & Park: John Miller	0%		\$ 79.52									\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 79.52
Rec & Park: Keneth Emeka	0%		\$ 695.00									\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 695.00
Rec & Park: Larry	0%		\$ 1,842.00									\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,842.00
Rec & Park: Martha Scaler	66%		\$ 3,763.99									\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,499.60	\$ 1,264.39
Rec & Park: Michael Castillo	46%		\$ 5,373.05									\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,301.50	\$ 3,071.55
Rec & Park: Michael Gray	19%		\$ 27,692.80									\$ -	\$ -	\$ 213.40	\$ 27,479.40
Rec & Park: Ramiro Rodriguez	25%		\$ 12,857.60									\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,150.00	\$ 9,707.60
Rec & Park: Ricardo Moody	0%		\$ 2,087.50									\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,087.50
Rec & Park: Ricardo Rojas	38%		\$ 5,942.60									\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,943.00	\$ 3,999.60
Rec & Park: Robert Sheets	0%		\$ 795.20									\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 795.20
Rec & Park: Steve Shames	40%	\$ 1,874.30									\$ -	\$ -	\$ 746.90	\$ 1,127.40	
Rec & Park: Susan Nervo	100%	\$ 1,486.80									\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,486.80		
Redevelopment: Monterey Morrissey	22%	22%	\$ 5,391.77								\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,207.35	\$ 4,184.42	
Sheriff: Daniel Gertsikov	86%	94%	\$ 13,980.00								\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,091.50	\$ 1,888.50	
Sheriff: Joyce Wong	100%		\$ 78,637.89								\$ -	\$ 62,473.89	\$ 16,164.00		
Sheriff: Richard Castillo	95%		\$ 26,830.90						\$ 1,024.00		\$ 446.50	\$ -	\$ 24,134.40	\$ 1,226.00	
Unknown:	97%	97%	\$ 28,389.60			\$ 478.80				\$ 415.80	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 27,495.00		
Grand Total	54%	54%	\$ 1,516,555.45	\$ 707.78	\$ 26,039.60	\$ 3,504.40	\$ 5,192.98	\$ 3,434.99	\$ 2,541.16	\$ 2,942.76	\$ 73,117.47	\$ 392,603.79	\$ 640,589.95	\$ 365,880.57	

D. All City Champions of Paper 2009 (Required Products: 100% Post-Consumer Recycled, Processed Chlorine-free)

The City Thanks These City Champions That Bought Green Paper	Total
Adult Probation : Noreen Mangabay	\$ 8,875.20
Airport: Jeff Wun	\$ 50,430.70
Animal Care & Control: Nuvia Bolanos	\$ 1,702.36
Appeals, Board Of (Permit Appeals) : Cecilia Huang	\$ 430.71
Arts Commission: Sharon Page Ritchie	\$ 994.87
Assessment Appeals Board St: Helen Lee	\$ 77.38
Assessor-Recorder: Feliciano Payumo	\$ 8,650.08
Bay Area Uasi Program : Jada Jackson	\$ 105.00
Board Of Supervisors: Eng Eng Chan	\$ 7,396.00
Board Of Supervisors: Jill Jay	\$ 773.80
Building Inspection Commission: Lawrence Aviado	\$ 2,304.20
Building Inspection: Josephine Liu	\$ 412.50
Building Inspection: Patricia Beasley	\$ 41.25
Building Inspection: Stephen Lee	\$ 1,431.53
Bureau Of Architecture: Maria Maniasevici	\$ 1,599.60
Child Support Services: Peter o'brien	\$ 7,396.00
Children, Youth & Families: Jerry Sierra	\$ 386.90
Children, Youth & Families: Kahala Drain	\$ 502.97
Children, Youth & Families: Leticia Dixon	\$ 1,547.60
City Attorney: Sharon	\$ 541.66
City Attorney: Stephani Thompson	\$ 31,116.60
City Planning: Lulu Hwang	\$ 13,433.20
Civil Service Commission: Lizette Henriquez	\$ 116.07
Civil Service Commission: Sandra Eng	\$ 116.07
Controller's: Angela W	\$ 116.07
Controller's: Debbie Toy	\$ 1,392.84
Controller's: Joe Nurisso	\$ 928.56
Controller's: Louise Nigro	\$ 2,321.40
Controller's: Melson Mangroban	\$ 619.04
Controller's: Monica Laura	\$ 386.90
Controller's: Monica Wu	\$ 187.50
Controller's: Monica Wu	\$ 773.80
Controller's: Myrna Evan	\$ 773.80
Controller's: Patti Erickson	\$ 1,005.94
Controller's: Rosanne Torre	\$ 3,843.83
Controller's: Seretha Gallaread	\$ 1,238.08
District Attorney: Mary Mcdevitt	\$ 232.14
District Attorney: Reggie Clay	\$ 3,869.00
District Attorney: Rey Salonga	\$ 1,547.60
District Attorney: Samir sakkal	\$ 39,687.43
District Attorney: Stephani Thompson	\$ 315.00
Elections: Julius Gawaran	\$ 3,042.38
Emergency Management: Camilla Arcia	\$ 773.80
Emergency Management: Fermi Chau	\$ 309.52
Emergency Management: Grace Chan	\$ 1,160.70
Emergency Management: Jada Jackson	\$ 812.49
Emergency Management: Vanessa Gianelli	\$ 701.90
Employee Retirement Svcs: Ted Davis	\$ 9,285.60
Entertainment Commission: Crystal Stewart	\$ 77.38
Environment: Bo-Ming Ng	\$ 2,958.40
Ethics Commission: Marvin Ford	\$ 3,095.20
Events Department: Amyestelle Soldevilla	\$ 154.76
Events Department: Gretchen Rude	\$ 77.38
Fire: Cathy Davey	\$ 2,999.65
Fire: David Eng	\$ 468.75
Fire: Jeff Wong	\$ 14,792.00
General Services Agency- Arts Grants: Brett Conner	\$ 154.76
General Services Agency- Central Shops: Rich Ferarri	\$ 2,958.40
General Services Agency- County Clerk: Kenton Owyang	\$ 928.56
General Services Agency: Diedre Darley	\$ 1,866.10
General Services Agency: Elizabeth Fitzgerald	\$ 116.07
General Services Agency: Elizabeth Fordyce	\$ 116.07
General Services Agency: Janin Cordoba	\$ 1,213.20
General Services Agency: Mabel Martinez	\$ 4,147.35
General Services Agency: Marc Rosaaen	\$ 8,875.20
General Services Agency: Maria Espina	\$ 1,238.08
Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority: Ben Shockey	\$ 52.50

The City Thanks These City Champions That Bought Green Paper	Total
Health Service System: Elizabeth Salazar	\$ 4,371.97
Health Service System: Samira Causevic	\$ 52.50
Health Service System: Stanley Lee	\$ 648.75
Human Resources: Arlene Mesa	\$ 17,431.90
Human Resources: Martin Isidro	\$ 1,479.20
Human Resources: Yock Chow	\$ 105.00
Human Services- Supply Room: Lito Dela Cruz	\$ 1,050.00
Human Services: Arlene Gorospe	\$ 125,249.76
Human Services: Dorothy Chan	\$ 165.00
Human Services: Gigi Guevara	\$ 2,958.40
Human Services: Laurie Kassel	\$ 1,479.20
Human Services: Lou Palileo	\$ 5,916.80
Human Services: Marc Rosaaen	\$ 20,080.78
Human Services: Phelan Fong	\$ 7,109.30
Human Services: Seretha Gallaread	\$ 52.50
Human Services: Shirley Burns	\$ 2,958.40
Juvenile Probation Department: Manny Pagsisihan	\$ 262.50
Juvenile Probation: Christian Losno	\$ 10,354.40
Juvenile Probation: Manuel P	\$ 1,479.20
Labor Standards: Mary Marzotto	\$ 77.38
Labor Standards: Winnie Loi	\$ 1,470.22
Library: Kam Ko	\$ 14,362.80
Library: Martha Neves	\$ 165.00
Library: Norm Carlota	\$ 170.80
Library: Norm Carlotta	\$ 41.25
Library: Pat Fahrenfold	\$ 41.24
Mayor's Of Housing: Lise Chansin	\$ 2,426.40
Mayor's: Andrea Bruss	\$ 154.76
Mayor's: Andrea Bruss	\$ 1,086.62
Mayor's: Armina Brown	\$ 3,211.27
Mayor's: Charlotte Grimes	\$ 696.42
Mayor's: Dee Schnyder	\$ 193.45
Mayor's: Karen Henderson	\$ 1,757.60
Mayor's: Lakeisha	\$ 38.69
Mayor's: Laurel Barsotti	\$ 232.14
Mayor's: Mabel Chow	\$ 38.69
Mayor's: Miyesha Harvey	\$ 270.83
Mayor's: Monique Forester	\$ 773.80
Mayor's: Monique Forster	\$ 1,160.70
Mayor's: Monique Foster	\$ 386.90
Medical Examiner: Sue Keller	\$ 2,592.23
Medical Examiner: Susan Keller	\$ 154.76
Municipal Railway: Daisy Avalos	\$ 1,200.00
Municipal Transportation Authority- Parking & Traffic: Millie Chan	\$ 157.50
Municipal Transportation Authority- Parking & Traffic: Terry Delapaz	\$ 52.50
Municipal Transportation Authority- Parking & Traffic: Wei Chen	\$ 824.90
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Aida Corpuz	\$ 3,675.55
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Annie Knight	\$ 386.90
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Carol Chen	\$ 466.80
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Daisy Avalos	\$ 4,067.80
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: David Danbury	\$ 193.45
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Debra Benton	\$ 541.66
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Deirdre Darley	\$ 1,392.84
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Deirdre Darley	\$ 3,500.06
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Dennis	\$ 1,479.20
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Dorothy Chan	\$ 3,869.00
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Ed Daniel	\$ 193.45
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Eden Mojica	\$ 7,393.62
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Ellen Pon	\$ 1,160.70
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Ellen Pon	\$ 386.90
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Fumiko Satoda	\$ 4,437.60
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Gigi Pabros	\$ 5,687.43
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Henry Gong	\$ 928.56
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Herman Baumann	\$ 464.28
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Howard Baumann	\$ 464.28
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Janet Wilson	\$ 773.80
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Jeanette Wilson	\$ 1,276.77
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Jessie Katz	\$ 1,354.15
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Joery Nacion	\$ 812.49

The City Thanks These City Champions That Bought Green Paper	Total
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Kathryn Nichololas	\$ 77.38
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Laura Zhang	\$ 928.56
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Lucille Hammons	\$ 270.83
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Marina Villena	\$ 116.07
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Paul Hootman	\$ 773.80
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Rosanna Yu	\$ 773.80
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Sandra Chau	\$ 773.80
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Sandra Chua	\$ 6,759.00
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Susie Nakhieangchanh	\$ 773.80
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Wei Chen	\$ 2,958.40
Municipal Transportation Agency- Electric: Yvette Torres	\$ 386.90
Municipal Transportation Agency- Parking & Traffic: Celeste Austria Marks	\$ 1,479.20
Municipal Transportation Agency- Parking & Traffic: Debbie Borthne	\$ 928.56
Municipal Transportation Agency- Parking & Traffic: James Hsiong	\$ 4,437.60
Municipal Transportation Agency- Parking & Traffic: Terri Delapaz	\$ 1,160.70
Municipal Transportation Agency- Parking & Traffic: Terry Delapaz	\$ 2,553.54
Municipal Transportation Agency- Taxi & Access : Vicky Siu	\$ 348.21
Municipal Transportation Agency- Taxi & Access: Vicky Siu	\$ 270.83
Municipal Transportation Agency: Aida Corpuz	\$ 2,485.10
Municipal Transportation Agency: Annie Knight	\$ 52.50
Municipal Transportation Agency: Gary Dawson	\$ 1,140.00
Municipal Transportation Agency: Gigi Pabros	\$ 1,847.85
Municipal Transportation Agency: Joanne Williams	\$ 41.25
Municipal Transportation Agency: Joery Nacion	\$ 825.00
Municipal Transportation Agency: Josie Deocampo	\$ 369.00
Municipal Transportation Agency: Lizz Holman	\$ 696.42
Municipal Transportation Agency: Nicholas Johnson	\$ 262.50
Municipal Transportation Agency: Sandra Chua	\$ 412.50
Municipal Transportation Agency: Sandra Ciu	\$ 315.00
Municipal Transportation Agency: Susie Nakhieangchanh	\$ 416.25
Municipal Transportation Agency: Wei Chen	\$ 1,762.30
Office Of Contracts Administration: Annie Leary	\$ 193.45
Office Of Contracts Administration: Carmen Omran	\$ 386.90
Office Of Contracts Administration: Richelle Hilario	\$ 773.80
Office Of Contracts Administration: Richelle Hilario	\$ 386.90
Police- Citizen's Complaints: Laura Tham	\$ 1,663.67
Police: Eric Peterson	\$ 386.90
Police: Kevin Mcpherson	\$ 193.45
Police: Leon Kang	\$ 967.25
Police: Lucy Clemmons	\$ 1,479.20
Police: Lynn Reilly	\$ 967.25
Police: Rene Rodriguez	\$ 443.76
Police: Tim Yee	\$ 464.28
Police: Victor Rothenberg	\$ 135,229.77
Port: George Onyemem	\$ 12,113.60
Port: George Onyemem	\$ 1,479.20
Public Defender: Angela Auyong	\$ 18,502.80
Public Defender: John Dunbar	\$ 2,639.90
Public Defender: Lynn Mechanic	\$ 193.45
Public Health- General Hospital: Aida Maluto	\$ 154.76
Public Health- General Hospital: Allan Renken	\$ 464.28
Public Health- General Hospital: Althea Kacher	\$ 193.45
Public Health- General Hospital: Amy Demonteverde	\$ 1,083.32
Public Health- General Hospital: Amy Walker	\$ 359.91
Public Health- General Hospital: Anna Rubio	\$ 116.07
Public Health- General Hospital: Antonina Abad	\$ 193.45
Public Health- General Hospital: Barbara Khuu	\$ 4,255.90
Public Health- General Hospital: Bob Eggleston	\$ 309.52
Public Health- General Hospital: Carisa Veridiano	\$ 77.38
Public Health- General Hospital: Carlos Salazar	\$ 928.56
Public Health- General Hospital: Charles Yeh	\$ 327.93
Public Health- General Hospital: Cheryl Denson	\$ 386.90
Public Health- General Hospital: Christine Hieu	\$ 1,547.60
Public Health- General Hospital: Daisy Planas	\$ 232.14
Public Health- General Hospital: Deborah Robinson	\$ 1,508.91
Public Health- General Hospital: Donna Gurr	\$ 309.52
Public Health- General Hospital: Ester Armstrong	\$ 773.80
Public Health- General Hospital: Fatima Ascano	\$ 193.45
Public Health- General Hospital: Fatima Lau	\$ 154.76

The City Thanks These City Champions That Bought Green Paper	Total
Public Health- General Hospital: Francisco Saenz	\$ 362.02
Public Health- General Hospital: Ivy Solomon	\$ 1,741.05
Public Health- General Hospital: Janet Hines	\$ 77.38
Public Health- General Hospital: Jennie Trinh	\$ 541.66
Public Health- General Hospital: Jimmy Ho	\$ 812.49
Public Health- General Hospital: Jon Dean Green	\$ 541.66
Public Health- General Hospital: Julio Guillen	\$ 232.14
Public Health- General Hospital: Lang Nguyen	\$ 116.07
Public Health- General Hospital: Larry Fabian	\$ 1,508.91
Public Health- General Hospital: Laura	\$ 193.45
Public Health- General Hospital: Laura Chow	\$ 619.04
Public Health- General Hospital: Lilly Lee	\$ 386.90
Public Health- General Hospital: Lita Torres	\$ 8,875.20
Public Health- General Hospital: Lula Hobbs	\$ 773.80
Public Health- General Hospital: Margo Dextrase	\$ 354.71
Public Health- General Hospital: Marilou Lomibao	\$ 270.83
Public Health- General Hospital: Mary A Anigilaje	\$ 773.80
Public Health- General Hospital: Matt Cuenot	\$ 3,229.23
Public Health- General Hospital: Michael Rhoades	\$ 424.92
Public Health- General Hospital: Milagros Ramos	\$ 464.28
Public Health- General Hospital: Mireya Lopez	\$ 77.38
Public Health- General Hospital: Nancy Law	\$ 773.80
Public Health- General Hospital: Nokeo Nhingsavath	\$ 38.69
Public Health- General Hospital: Norma Olmedo-Cortez	\$ 77.38
Public Health- General Hospital: Nuria Zaldivar	\$ 541.66
Public Health- General Hospital: Pat Borg	\$ 116.07
Public Health- General Hospital: Peggy Mo	\$ 967.25
Public Health- General Hospital: Peter Smith	\$ 696.42
Public Health- General Hospital: Peterita Braganza	\$ 309.52
Public Health- General Hospital: Rachel Ainza	\$ 425.59
Public Health- General Hospital: Rebecca Padilla	\$ 2,708.30
Public Health- General Hospital: Remy Hammel	\$ 580.35
Public Health- General Hospital: Rena Hong	\$ 154.76
Public Health- General Hospital: Ron Beard	\$ 619.04
Public Health- General Hospital: Roxana Salinas	\$ 386.90
Public Health- General Hospital: Sara Gracia	\$ 77.38
Public Health- General Hospital: Shirley Lee	\$ 773.80
Public Health- General Hospital: Suzanne Pun	\$ 116.07
Public Health- General Hospital: Taurin Jones	\$ 309.52
Public Health- General Hospital: Tonya Thompson	\$ 425.59
Public Health- General Hospital: Wiley Ching	\$ 773.80
Public Health- Mental Health Board: Howard Fong	\$ 17,328.90
Public Health/16: Eileen Marshall	\$ 1,479.20
Public Health/16: Wally	\$ 1,479.20
Public Health: Alicia David	\$ 5,581.20
Public Health: Amy Kwan	\$ 2,321.40
Public Health: Barbara Rezuca	\$ 1,479.20
Public Health: Bella Hoe	\$ 83.98
Public Health: Bernadette	\$ 1,479.20
Public Health: Bernette White	\$ 2,958.40
Public Health: Carmen	\$ 193.45
Public Health: Carmen Nolasco	\$ 348.21
Public Health: Chris	\$ 1,392.84
Public Health: Christa	\$ 270.83
Public Health: Christa Mea	\$ 270.83
Public Health: Christina	\$ 270.83
Public Health: Christina Mea	\$ 386.90
Public Health: Condon Robertson	\$ 386.90
Public Health: Connie	\$ 309.52
Public Health: Dana Henderson	\$ 38.69
Public Health: Debra Matthews	\$ 1,934.50
Public Health: Debra Matthews	\$ 1,160.70
Public Health: Dora Chang	\$ 1,895.81
Public Health: Elaina Chin	\$ 386.90
Public Health: Elia Gurumendi	\$ 2,863.06
Public Health: Elizabeth Won	\$ 773.80
Public Health: Frank	\$ 502.97
Public Health: Frank Pinell	\$ 232.14
Public Health: Jane	\$ 348.21

The City Thanks These City Champions That Bought Green Paper	Total
Public Health: Jane Chu	\$ 386.90
Public Health: Jerry Sierra	\$ 773.80
Public Health: Jn Kendall	\$ 2,639.90
Public Health: Joanne	\$ 39.99
Public Health: John Martinez	\$ 4,824.50
Public Health: Josephine Muir	\$ 1,276.77
Public Health: Joy Kendrix	\$ 773.80
Public Health: Karen Mckenzie	\$ 464.28
Public Health: Kate Monico Klein	\$ 386.90
Public Health: Kris	\$ 270.83
Public Health: Kristina Kelly	\$ 3,316.16
Public Health: Lannie Adelman	\$ 1,083.32
Public Health: Maria Rogers	\$ 193.45
Public Health: Marilou Dudley	\$ 386.90
Public Health: Mele Lau-Smith	\$ 386.90
Public Health: Mila Miranda	\$ 116.07
Public Health: Nickie	\$ 154.76
Public Health: Nicky Ho	\$ 154.76
Public Health: Nikkie	\$ 154.76
Public Health: Noreen Tai	\$ 386.90
Public Health: Orlando Tolbert	\$ 1,479.20
Public Health: Richard Saraille	\$ 1,479.20
Public Health: Rose Faupopo	\$ 2,958.40
Public Health: Stephanie Dupuy	\$ 1,741.05
Public Health: Tina Hicks	\$ 1,160.70
Public Health: Tomas Marrero	\$ 580.35
Public Health: Truc Vo	\$ 464.28
Public Health: Wally	\$ 2,050.57
Public Health: Wally Wong	\$ 206.20
Public Health: Xiaoxia Zhu	\$ 386.90
Public Library: Norm Carlota	\$ 232.14
Public Utilities Commission Health And Safety: Stephen Brooks	\$ 232.14
Public Utilities Commission- Hetch Hetchy: Ray Emerald	\$ 2,755.97
Public Utilities Commission- Hetch Hetchy: Rudy White	\$ 1,599.60
Public Utilities Commission- Laguna Honda: Russell Nakai	\$ 11,126.90
Public Utilities Commission- Laguna Honda: Stanley Lee	\$ 23,667.20
Public Utilities Commission- Wastewater: Andrew Ong	\$ 2,089.26
Public Utilities Commission- Water Quality: Dolson Kwan	\$ 309.52
Public Utilities Commission- Water Quality: Gloria Eng	\$ 154.76
Public Utilities Commission- Water Quality: Laura Ureta	\$ 1,160.70
Public Utilities Commission- Water Quality: Lisa Chan	\$ 2,321.40
Public Utilities Commission- Water Quality: Mike Kellog	\$ 38.69
Public Utilities Commission- Water Quality: Ruby Ponce	\$ 2,553.54
Public Utilities Commission: Annabelle Caulian	\$ 386.90
Public Utilities Commission: Bernice Basco	\$ 309.52
Public Utilities Commission: Beth Ison	\$ 41.25
Public Utilities Commission: Bill Caponera	\$ 386.90
Public Utilities Commission: Carmelita Navarro	\$ 232.14
Public Utilities Commission: Christina	\$ 232.14
Public Utilities Commission: Christina Castro	\$ 639.52
Public Utilities Commission: Connie Chang	\$ 386.90
Public Utilities Commission: Delia Quintero	\$ 14,260.01
Public Utilities Commission: Elma Young	\$ 544.40
Public Utilities Commission: Eugene Shu	\$ 135.00
Public Utilities Commission: Frank Faria	\$ 9,013.10
Public Utilities Commission: Gigi Borromeo	\$ 453.69
Public Utilities Commission: Howard Perkins	\$ 6,714.80
Public Utilities Commission: James Hsiong	\$ 1,479.20
Public Utilities Commission: Janet Elliot	\$ 1,944.74
Public Utilities Commission: Joseph Singh	\$ 541.66
Public Utilities Commission: Jossy Bayot	\$ 703.45
Public Utilities Commission: Julie Mark	\$ 593.15
Public Utilities Commission: Kamille Harvey	\$ 5,018.88
Public Utilities Commission: Kathy Basconcello	\$ 3,312.67
Public Utilities Commission: Kathy Bosconcello	\$ 773.80
Public Utilities Commission: Lorelei	\$ 764.81
Public Utilities Commission: Maria Garcia	\$ 773.80
Public Utilities Commission: Maria Sylvester	\$ 1,443.75
Public Utilities Commission: Maria Sylvester	\$ 386.90

The City Thanks These City Champions That Bought Green Paper	Total
Public Utilities Commission: Michael Fenton	\$ 386.90
Public Utilities Commission: Mike Fenton	\$ 386.90
Public Utilities Commission: Molly Bode	\$ 1,201.94
Public Utilities Commission: Nancy Boie	\$ 3,040.90
Public Utilities Commission: Nora Molina	\$ 510.65
Public Utilities Commission: Rachelle More	\$ 386.90
Public Utilities Commission: Rebecca	\$ 1,238.08
Public Utilities Commission: Rebecca Ona	\$ 2,373.90
Public Utilities Commission: Receiving	\$ 164.98
Public Utilities Commission: Sandra Poole	\$ 1,217.28
Public Utilities Commission: Sandy Ng	\$ 2,979.13
Public Utilities Commission: Sera Collins	\$ 386.90
Public Utilities Commission: Shirley Simpliano	\$ 116.07
Public Utilities Commission: Shirley Sympliano	\$ 123.72
Public Utilities Commission: Stephen Brooks	\$ 93.75
Public Utilities Commission: Teresa Roiz	\$ 386.90
Public Utilities Commission: Tony Lujan	\$ 1,479.20
Public Utilities Commission: Tony Lujane	\$ 165.00
Public Utilities Commission: Valerie Aguilar	\$ 386.90
Public Utilities Commission: Verma Walton	\$ 1,005.65
Public Utilities Commission: Victor Mena	\$ 5,803.50
Public Works: Ada Aberilla	\$ 3,305.95
Public Works: Bernardita Espadilla	\$ 4,437.60
Public Works: Brannon Wong	\$ 735.11
Public Works: Catherine	\$ 580.35
Public Works: Clayton Choy	\$ 4,437.60
Public Works: Joseph Alberto	\$ 386.90
Public Works: Katherine Nicholas	\$ 580.35
Public Works: Katherine Won	\$ 3,327.34
Public Works: Lisa Mak	\$ 4,119.10
Public Works: Mary Ngwe	\$ 1,177.07
Public Works: Michael Walsh	\$ 773.80
Public Works: Nancy George	\$ 38.69
Public Works: Nancy Terranova	\$ 455.76
Public Works: Nathan Rodis	\$ 386.90
Public Works: Raymond Lee	\$ 1,315.46
Public Works: Sally Yuan	\$ 309.52
Public Works: Zaida Camacho	\$ 657.73
Real Estate- War Memorial: Joyce Furlough	\$ 2,166.64
Real Estate: Lori Mazzola	\$ 232.14
Real Estate: Wennie	\$ 232.14
Real Estate: Wennie Columna	\$ 1,470.22
Real Estate: Winnie Loi	\$ 116.07
Recreation & Park: Sharie Canja	\$ 551.86
Recreation & Park: Sherrl	\$ 464.28
Recreation & Park: Ted Davis	\$ 157.50
Recreation & Park: Whitney Bagby	\$ 13,262.28
Rent Board: Kathy B Chau	\$ 3,095.20
Sheriff (Sh-01): Canisha Smith	\$ 2,553.54
Sheriff (Sh-01): Debra Reed	\$ 4,991.01
Sheriff (Sh-01): Joan Scannell	\$ 386.90
Sheriff (Sh-01): Luigi Cauteruccio	\$ 773.80
Sheriff (Sh-01): Marybeth Long	\$ 116.07
Sheriff (Sh-01): Sarah Gieseke	\$ 386.90
Sheriff (Sh-01): Veronica Keller	\$ 116.07
Sheriff (Sh-01): William Fein	\$ 42,249.48
Sheriff: Armina Brown	\$ 431.25
Sheriff: Jan Crosbie-Taylor	\$ 315.00
Sheriff: Marybeth Long	\$ 644.92
Technology- Repr: Ely Bulanadi	\$ 13,553.60
Technology- Repr: Julie Creer	\$ 3,078.80
Technology- Repr: Salla Vaerma	\$ 25,906.88
Technology: Daniel Morris	\$ 386.90
Technology: Philip Russo	\$ 2,958.40
Technology: Robin Earle	\$ 1,238.08
Treasure Island Dev Auth: Nikki Ivey	\$ 386.90
Treasurer/ Tax Collector: Janet Winder	\$ 14,792.00
War Memorial And Performing Arts Center: Joyce Furlough	\$ 146.25
Grand Total	\$ 1,172,104.31

E. Details of Contracts & Products in 2009 SF Approved List

Category	Sub-Categories	New subcategory	New Green Contract	Green Citywide Contract	Required Subcategory	Suggested Subcategory	Limited Use Subcategory	Prohibited Subcategory
Automotive Fluids	Antifreeze	New subcategory				Suggested		
	Brake Cleaners	New subcategory				Suggested		
	Carburetor Cleaners	New subcategory				Suggested		
	Degreasers	New subcategory				Suggested		
	Parts Washers	New subcategory				Suggested		
Automotive Supplies & Equipment	Mud Flaps	New subcategory				Suggested		
	Refillable Can / Sprayer	New subcategory				Suggested		
	Shop Towels	New subcategory				Suggested		
	Tires	New subcategory				Suggested		
	Wheel Weights	New subcategory				Suggested		
Automotives	Alternative Fuel			contract	Required			
Batteries	Rechargeables- Hybrid	New subcategory				Suggested		
	Rechargeables- NimH		(Office Supplies Contract)	(Office Supplies Contract)	Required			
	Alkalines						Limited Use	
	Ni-Cad							Prohibited
Building		New subcategory				Suggested		
Electronics	Computers	New subcategory		Contract	Required			
	Netbooks	New subcategory			Required			
	Computer servers (non-	New subcategory			Required			
	Copiers, Printers,			Contract	Required			
Electronics Cleaners	Electronics Cleaners	New subcategory				Suggested		
	Air Blowers	New subcategory				Suggested		
	Coil Cleaners	New subcategory				Suggested		
	Degreasers	New subcategory				Suggested		
	Vacuums (hand-held)	New subcategory				Suggested		
Food	Meetings, Events	New subcategory				Suggested		
Foodware	Aluminum			Contract	Required			
	Bags				Required			
	Clamshells				Required			
	Cold Cups				Required			
	Eating Utensils				Required			
	Food Wrapping				Required			
	Hot Cups				Required			
	Paper Napkins And				Required			
	Paper Plates,					Required		
Fuel	Biodiesel			Contract	Required			
Janitorial Cleaners	Bathroom			Contract	Required			
	Cleaner Degreasers				Required			
	General Purpose				Required			
	Glass Cleaners				Required			

Category	Sub-Categories	New subcategory	New Green Contract	Green Citywide Contract	Required Subcategory	Suggested Subcategory	Limited Use Subcategory	Prohibited Subcategory
	Bowl Cleaners: Acid					Suggested		
	Bowl Cleaners: Non-					Suggested		
	Carpet Cleaners					Suggested		
	Disinfectants					Suggested		
	Drain Openers					Suggested		
	Floor Finishes					Suggested		
	Floor Strippers					Suggested		
	Hand Soaps					Suggested		
	Metal Cleaners					Suggested		
	Odor Control for Drains					Suggested		
	Tile & Grout Cleaners					Suggested		
Janitorial Papers	Paper Towels			Contract	Required			
	Toilet Seat Covers				Required			
	Toilet Tissue				Required			
Janitorial	Contract Language	New subcategory				Suggested		
Janitorial Supplies	Hand Dryers: Electric					Suggested		
	Microfiber cloths,					Suggested		
Landscaping	Compost	New subcategory				Suggested		
	Edging (Lawn &	New subcategory				Suggested		
	Fertilizers	New subcategory				Suggested		
	Hoses (Garden &	New subcategory				Suggested		
	Mulch	New subcategory				Suggested		
Lighting	Fixtures	New subcategory	New	Contract	Required		Limited Use	Prohibited
	Ballasts			Contract	Required		Limited Use	Prohibited
	Bulbs, Tubes,				Required		Limited Use	Prohibited
Lubricants, Oil	Motor Oil (Re-refined)	New subcategory				Suggested		
Movers	Reusable Boxes	New subcategory				Suggested		
Office Papers	Copier Bond							
Office Supplies	Various (includes		New	Contract				
	Markers: Permanent					Suggested		
	Markers: Whiteboard					Suggested		
	Paper: white, 8.5" X 11"			Contract	Required			
	Paper: white, 8.5" X 14"				Required			
	Paper: white, 11" X 17				Required			
	Sanitizers					Suggested		
Paints	Green Seal Certified	New subcategory				Suggested		
Paint	Graffiti Removers	New subcategory				Suggested		
Paint	Acetone	New subcategory				Suggested		
Toner	Remanufactured			Contract		Suggested		
Wood	Forest Stewardship	New subcategory				Suggested		
	Arsenic-Treated						Limited Use	
TOTAL	80	34	3	13	30	48	6	5

F. City Purchases of Green Office Supplies 2009

Ranked by sales volume for 50 most popular categories. % green for each category are calculated by dollars spent.* From Office Depot sales reports.

	Category of Office Product	Total	Green Products Available	% Green*	Notes
1	SITE SPECIFIC SPECIALS	\$13,764			calendars - no recycled content option listed
2	CALENDAR, DESK WALL, REFILLS, DATED	\$12,476	YES	83.00%	
3	CALENDAR, TIME MGMT, ORGANIZERS, REFILLS, DATED	\$4,194	YES	83.00%	
4	LUNCHROOM EQUIP SUPPLIES (FOOD SERVICE,PPR,PLAST	\$2,806			
5	FILE FOLDERS - TOP TAB	\$2,788	YES	98.00%	
6	TAPE,TAPE DISPENSERS	\$2,470			
7	BINDERS, PRESENTATION, VIEW	\$2,393	YES	88.00%	
8	POST IT, FLAGS, PADS, EASELS	\$2,386	YES	19.00%	
9	PEN,BALLPOINT,EXECUTIVE,SETS, CUSTOM INK, INK CL	\$2,322	YES	40.00%	includes refillable or recycled content
10	CLEANER,DISINFECT,DEODORIZER	\$2,199			specification needed
11	INDEXES, DIVIDERS, INDEX TABS	\$2,166	YES	81.00%	
12	SAFETY,FIRST AID,CROWD CNTRL,INTERCM,SEC	\$2,129			
13	LABELS, SHEET, MAILING, SPECIALTY	\$1,918			recycled content should be available
14	BOOK,ACCOUNTING,COLUMNAR,RECORD,RECORD KEEPING SYS	\$1,819	YES	10.00%	
15	STORAGE BOXES,FILES,DRWR,SYSTEMS	\$1,669	YES	97.00%	
16	ENVELOPES CUSTOM	\$1,644	YES	22.00%	
17	MAILROOM,SHIPPING,CORRAGATED BOXES,KNIVES	\$1,205	SOME		mixed category-can't compare
18	COMPUTER TAPE,DISKETTES,CD,MAG CARD STORAGE	\$1,193	SOME		mixed category-can't compare
19	BOARD,CHALK,BULLETIN,DRY ERASE	\$1,176	SOME		mixed category-can't measure
20	PAD,WRITING,LEGAL,LETTER	\$1,018	YES	25.00%	
21	STAPLERS,STAPLES,STAPLE REMOVER, STAPLE GUNS	\$985			
22	CALULATORS ACCESSORIES	\$981			
23	CORRECTION FLUIDS,PENS,PAPER,TAPE	\$962	SOME		mixed category-can't compare
24	MEMORY DRIVES	\$940			
25	HANGING FILE FOLDERS	\$883	YES	97.00%	
26	LETTERING MACHINE,TAPE CTRG,SUPPLIES,LABELERS	\$868	SOME		mixed category-can't compare
27	DESK ACCESSORIES/ORGANIZERS, BOOKENDS, STANDS, ACC	\$801	YES	17.00%	
28	PAPER FASTENERS, CLIPS, CLAMPS, SPINDLES, DISPENS	\$791	SOME		mixed category-can't compare
29	SKIN, SOAP, LOTION, DISP.	\$747			
30	DISCONTINUED BY MANUFACTURER	\$686			
31	MARKERS	\$684	YES	73.00%	satisfactory spec does not exist
32	AIR CLEANER	\$679			
33	EXPANDING FILES	\$596	YES	98.00%	
34	OEM Toner Cartridges	\$544			separate cartridge contract exists
35	BINDING,LAMINATING MACHINE SUPPLIES	\$539	SOME		mixed category-can't compare
36	FACSIMILE MACHINE	\$522			
37	BATTERIES CHARGERS	\$506	YES	50.00%	Nonrechargeable required for some uses
38	PAPER PUNCH, DRILL	\$455			
39	AEROSOLS	\$452			spec needed - mostly air fresheners
40	BINDERS, REFERENCE STORAGE, NON VIEW	\$444	YES	93.00%	

	Category of Office Product	Total	Green Products Available	% Green*	Notes
41	HEATER,FAN,AIR CLNR,HUMDFRS	\$440			
42	CALENDAR, DESK WALL, REFILLS, UNDATED	\$408	YES	97.00%	
43	NOTEBOOK, MEMO, WB, BOUND	\$407	YES	64.00%	
44	HIGHLIGHTERS	\$403	YES	68.00%	
45	DISC JANITORIAL ITEMS	\$391			
46	SIGNS, ELECTRONIC SIGNS	\$370			
47	GLOVES, APRONS	\$354			
48	REPORT COVERS, PORTFOLIOS	\$352	YES	73.00%	
49	SHREDDER, SHREDDER BAGS ACCESSORIES	\$351			

*% Green" for this calculation includes primarily any items with postconsumer waste recycled content. It also includes "AP Certified NonToxic, Conforms to ASTM D-4236" (some with "water-based" designation), "Green Seal Certified, contains 30% postconsumer recycled content" (some paper products), and "refillable" (for ballpoint pens). A breakdown of actual recycled contents purchased can be found below.

20

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 SEP 30 PM 2:03
BY

2010 Local Agency Biennial Notice

Name of Agency: Office of Economic and Workforce Development
Mailing Address: 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 448
Contact Person: Todd Rufo Office Phone No: 415-554-5694
E-mail: todd.rufo@sfgov.org Fax No: (415)554-4565


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

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

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

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

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



Signature of Chief Executive Officer

9/30/10

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

CP ✓
AS ✓
12

Director, Office of Economic and Workforce Development
Development Advisor
Director, Neighborhood Business Development
Director, Business Development
Director, International Trade and Commerce
Project Managers
Director of Workforce Development
Deputy Director of Workforce Development
City Build Program Director

JOANNE HAYES-WHITE
CHIEF OF DEPARTMENT




GAVIN NEWSOM
MAYOR

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor Gavin Newsom

FROM: Joanne Hayes-White, Chief of Department 

DATE: September 23, 2010

RE: Update on Utility Infrastructure Safety Review

As you know, it has been two weeks since the San Bruno natural gas transmission explosion and fire. Following the incident, a Utility Infrastructure Safety Review was formed at your direction. The mission was to work closely with PG&E to receive a comprehensive report on all natural gas transmission and distribution lines in the City and County of San Francisco including location, age, condition and maintenance of lines.

A Utility Infrastructure Safety Review Workgroup has been formed comprised of City Administrator Ed Lee, Chief of Staff Steve Kawa, Director of Department of Public Works Ed Reiskin, myself and members of the San Francisco Fire Department.

I am pleased to report that significant progress has been made to date:

On September 15, 2010, the Workgroup met with PG&E representatives to discuss objectives and timelines. This initial meeting provided a solid foundation to gain a thorough understanding of the natural gas infrastructure within our City. At this meeting, we made a request for maps of all pipeline infrastructure. On September 16, 2010, a site visit was conducted in San Bruno.

We have scheduled a follow up meeting with PG&E on September 29, 2010 and will be convening at PG&E's Emergency Operations Center to continue our discussions and review their emergency response protocols.

Just this morning, I personally met with PG&E representatives and was provided with a detailed map of both gas transmission and distribution lines, in addition to a Risk Management Procedures document detailing PG&E's gas transmission pipeline integrity management plan. PG&E also provided a copy of the

Code of Federal Regulations that addresses safety requirements for gas transmission pipelines. I was assured that PG&E is in full compliance with these Federal regulations. After preliminary review of the maps and discussions with PG&E, we have learned that gas transmission lines entering into the City and County of San Francisco are less than half of the pressure of the lines in operation in San Bruno.

Having this information from PG&E prior to our meeting on September 29, 2010 will afford the Fire Department the ability to review and analyze all documents, allowing for a more productive meeting.

PG&E has been responsive to all requests made to date and has cooperated fully from completing leak surveying within hours of the San Bruno incident to demonstrating a willingness to provide natural gas training to our members. I will continue to update you as our Utility Infrastructure Safety review makes further progress.

cc: Steve Kawa, Chief of Staff, Mayor's Office
David Chiu, President, Board of Supervisors
Ed Lee, City Administrator
Dennis Herrera, City Attorney



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Rookie Fire Fighting mistakes by Chief Hayes-White and Chief Gardner.

From: JAMES CORRIGAN <marylouc@mac.com>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 10/04/2010 08:24 AM
Subject: Rookie Fire Fighting mistakes by Chief Hayes-White and Chief Gardner.

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

Last year, Chief Hayes-White and Chief Gardner made a total of \$533,000. Yet, despite being professionals, they play russian roulette, by professional firefighting standards, by keeping "in service" a truck company whose aerial is extended and jacks are out. A NO! NO! by the standards of a professional fire department.

Sure, nothing happened that time. That's why they call it Russian Roulette. What's even more dangerous, is to have 40 fire stations in San Francisco performing community service without notifying either Headquarters or the Dispatch Center.

Jim Corrigan

From: william.mcdonald@sanjoseca.gov
Subject: RE: Aerial Truck Companies - "in service" or "out of service?"
Date: September 21, 2010 5:23:16 PM PDT
To: marylouc@mac.com
Hello Mr. Corrigan,

My name is Willie McDonald, thank you for your interests in the City of San Jose Fire Department. The answer to your question is that if a truck or engine company has equipment off of their vehicle for any reason such that they would have a delayed response, **that company is placed out of service** and unavailable to respond to emergencies. The reason for our practice is that we believe that our best chance to make a difference in an emergency and have the greatest potential for an incident to have a positive outcome is for our companies to arrive as quickly as possible. Our service level objective for the Department is to arrive at the scene of a reported emergency within 8 minutes, 80% of the time. If a company has put itself in a position that would require 20 minutes or more before it could begin responding, we think that allowing an emergency to continue uncontrolled for that amount of time (given your scenario) would be completely unacceptable. Please let me know if you have any other questions or need additional clarification. I can be reached by phone at (408) 277-5488.

Thanks,

William I. McDonald, Fire Chief
City of San Jose

From: ronnie.villanueva@lacity.org Los Angeles Fire Department

14

Subject: Re: Aerial Ladder companies - "in service"" or "out of service?"

Date: September 23, 2010 11:40:22 AM PDT

To: marylouc@mac.com

"We would put ourselves out of service. From the time of alarm, our goal is to have a response time of 5 minutes 90% of the time. **With the aerial out of the bed and the ground jacks down we'd never make it.** I believe it takes approximately 3 minutes to put everything back to normal.

- In the Fire Station we are to get out of the station in 60 seconds.
- If we make ourselves conditionally available (CAV, means you're out of service but can still respond) we are to respond within 3 minutes.
- If you cannot meet the criteria above, we put ourselves Not Available (NAV).

If you need any further information please let me know."

Ronnie

On Tue, Sep 21, 2010 at 1:50 PM, JAMES CORRIGAN <marylouc@mac.com> wrote:

Los Angeles Fire Department

Dear Chief Villanueva and Chief McDonald:

Could you answer this question for me?

If one of your aerial ladders is requested to perform a special service (i.e. not an emergency service) to assist say a Church with stringing a banner or hanging Christmas lights; and

if it necessitates the use of the aerial and Jacks; and if it is estimated the job will take 20 minutes to a half hour; does the San Jose Fire Department place that aerial truck company

in an "out of service" status or would you keep that Truck "in service" should an "emergency dispatch" occur?

Could you very briefly explain your decision?

Thank you so much,

Jim Corrigan

Deputy Chief Gardner has responded to my questions regarding Truck 14 hanging a banner on Geary St. (see below)

From a Department that cries, "Seconds Count", Chief Gardner doesn't wince when he says, optimistically, that Truck 14 **could have been ready to go in 5 minutes or 300 seconds.**

Chief Gardner is almost home spun when he writes, " **Many times these requests are done through the local Fire Stations.**"

Wow! We can have 40 Independent, S.F. fire stations carrying out good will tasks with our fire equipment, with no one at Headquarters or the Dispatch Center, the wiser, or in a position to approve or disapprove. Now that is a helluva way to run an emergency service. Perhaps our firefighters should wear cowboy hats instead of helmets as they are acting like undisciplined cowboys.

Chief Gardner admits no written requests were made by the Church or Station 14.
In other words, proper professional procedure, ends with a pre-school wishing to visit a firehouse:

- **"All Group Visits to SFFD Fire Stations, must be scheduled through the Chief's Administrative Officer with at least 10 business days advance notice. "**
<http://www.sf-fire.org/index.aspx?page=162>
- **If you want to borrow an aerial ladder truck and its crew, to hoist a banner high into the air, hindering it to respond to a life and death situation by at least 5 minutes, don't ask and don't tell anyone at Headquarters or Central Dispatch. We, the SFFD, will just wing it.**

Chief Gardner is proud to announce that the SFFD is "always willing to help our neighbors in any way."

Is it "irony" that when the SFFD helps a tax-exempt entity such as the Church on Geary St. they do it for free; and when they take a San Francisco taxpayer to the hospital it costs the taxpayer \$1643.00?

If Chief Gardner had answered a promotional exam question as to whether to keep Truck 14 "in service" while hanging that banner, and he answered it "YES",

he would have been marked WRONG. Just ask Oakland, L.A. and San Jose Fire officials their take on such a situation.

Because there was no calamity resulting from Truck 14 remaining "in service" during this incident, one should not find solace. It only means that one more round is in the chamber the next time cowboys run free with emergency equipment in San Francisco.

Sincerely yours,

Jim Corrigan

Begin forwarded message:

From: Patrick.Gardner@sfgov.org

Date: September 20, 2010 5:21:20 PM PDT

To: marylouc@mac.com

Subject: Ability to respond

Mr. Corrigan,

The Truck Company that assisted with the banner was Truck 14. The aerial ladder and the hydraulic jacks were used. Modern Trucks have only two jacks that can be operated by one Firefighter. **Retracting the aerial and jacks requires about 4 to 5 minutes.**

No written request was received by Headquarters. The Fire Department makes every effort to assist in community service when ever possible. We are known for our emergency responses but are always willing to help our neighbors in any way. **Many times these requests are done through the local Fire Stations.**

Truck 14 was in service when they were assisting with the Church Banner. If the Truck was dispatched during the time the aerial was extended, the response time still would be faster than dispatching another Truck from a longer distance.

Respectfully,



To:
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Cowboy Bob's Bum Report

From: "Bob Larive" <bob@fior.com>
To: "Bob at Home" <bob@fior.com>, <lgoodin1@mindspring.com>, "Craig Schwan" <Craig.Schwan@ihrco.com>, "Aline Estournes" <aestournes@wbcsf.com>, <danialduke@hyatt.com>, "Jan Misch" <Jan.Misch@tuscaninn.com>, "Kevin Carroll" <kcarroll@visitfishermanswharf.com>, "quin. orlick@tuscaninn.com" <quin.orlick@tuscaninn.com>, "Steve" <stevew@pier39.com>, <kevin.cashman@sfgov.org>, "cwnevius" <cwnevius@sfchronicle.com>, "kgarcia" <kgarcia@sfexaminer.com>
Cc: "Lee Housekeeper" <NewsService@aol.com>, <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, <dsaunders@sfchronicle.com>, <matierandross@sfchronicle.com>, <lgarchik@sfchronicle.com>, <dhussey@sfexaminer.com>, <gavin.newsom@sfgov.org>, <northbeachchamber@gmail.com>, <info@northbeachneighbors.org>, <David.Chiu@sfgov.org>, <Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org>, <Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org>, <Chris.Daly@sfgov.org>, <David.Campos@sfgov.org>, <Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org>, <John.Avalos@sfgov.org>, <Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org>, <Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org>, <Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org>, <Sophie.Maxwell@sfgov.org>
Date: 10/01/2010 09:34 AM
Subject: Cowboy Bob's Bum Report

I was out this AM and was very disappointed that Supervisors Chiu and Daly had not solved the problem already.

Darn! There were only 33 **bums, homeless, underserved** in the Wharf area. Note some of the pictures below.

The problem keeps getting worse but who really cares? By the way note the one picture of the lunch Sup. Daly left for them on Jefferson. I wish he would hurry up and open his bar so they will be able to get drinks and better food.

Fior d' Italia

America's Oldest Italian Restaurant

Bob and Jinx Larive

Proprietors

2237 Mason Street

San Francisco CA 94133

(415) 986-1886 www.fior.com

fior@fior.com



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: PLease do not raise parking meter rates and fines

From: s m <mts7@hotmail.com>
To: <mtaboard@sfmta.com>, <gavin.newsom@sfgov.org>, <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Date: 09/29/2010 09:53 AM
Subject: PLease do not raise parking meter rates and fines

Hon. Mayor, MTA Board, and Supervisors,

I have read that the city maybe running a deficit and has a large pension fund gap but trying to plug them with parking meter rate hikes and fines is the wrong way to do it. Such hikes will actually lower the revenues as businesses will suffer and also cause congestion in residential areas. The city needs to cut spending and not harass local businesses and residents and visitors by raising parking fees fines.

Thank you.

Steve

A long time resident and a tax payer

16



To:
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Fw: Support for the America's Cup

From: Susan Ruhne <sruhne@yahoo.com>
To: Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org, John.Avalos@sfgov.org, David.Campos@sfgov.org, David.Chiu@sfgov.org, Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org, Chris.Daly@sfgov.org, Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org, Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org, Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org, Sophie.Maxwell@sfgov.org, Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org
Cc: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org, Susan Ruhne <sruhne@yahoo.com>, gavin.newsom@sfgov.org
Date: 09/29/2010 09:51 AM
Subject: Support for the America's Cup

Dear Supervisors;

I am writing to ask you to support the bid to host the 34th America's Cup in San Francisco.

I am a nine year resident of San Francisco, and a passionate sailor. I am also a member of a San Francisco yacht club, for over 15 years. I am not a "wealthy yacht owner" but instead a sailor who loves being on the water. I do not own my own boat. I live in district 1, spend a lot of my free time in district 2, and work in district 6. I had the honor of working for the AmericaOne Campaign in 1999/2000, that was from San Francisco & raced in Auckland, New Zealand. I saw firsthand how a community came together, invested in cleaning up & developing prime waterfront facilities that made the event appealing to, and fun for, thousands of both locals & visitors. Since the two America's Cup events in Auckland, this area & development has just improved, for the benefit of many.

I ask you all, as the elected supervisors for the City & County of San Francisco to not pass up this opportunity to showcase our wonderful city, fix/ redevelop waterfront facilities to allow more people to access the waterfront & activity from our port, and host the America's Cup. The unique set up of San Francisco's port & waterfront would allow for the Cup & associated events to touch so many districts in San Francisco - and allow so many residents to be able to visit/watch/be involved in this great event.

Over the last two months, our club has hosted three world championships and one major international regatta. The sailors - and family and friends who accompany them - came from over 29 nations, and all spent money in our city - on housing, food, supplies for their boats, rental cars, touring the area and so much more. San Francisco is known worldwide as one of the greatest places to sail, a place that tests a sailors skills, and a wonderful place to visit too.

17

Americas Cup - Thank you

Susan Ruhne

to:

Michela.Alioto-Pier, John.Avalos, David.Campos, David.Chiu, Carmen.Chu, Chris.Daly, Bevan.Dufty, Sean.Elsbernd, Eric.L.Mar, Sophie.Maxwell, Ross.Mirkarimi, board.of.supervisors, Susan Ruhne, gavin.newsom

10/07/2010 11:08 AM

Show Details

Supervisors Mirikarimi, Dufty, Elsbernd, Mar, Maxwell, Alioto-Pier, Campos, Chiu and Chu,

Thank you for your support of the Americas Cup 34 in San Francisco. The opportunity to hold this event in San Francisco would have great results - for a variety of San Franciscans, not just the rich people, not just sailors. Having spent 6 months in Auckland, New Zealand the first time they hosted the cup, I saw firsthand how the local businesses benefited - not just hospitality, but household shops, grocery stores, hardware stores, everything! I attended Sunday's Giant's game & it was so nice to look at the beautiful area around the ballpark - the america's cup would add more to this progress.

For the Supervisors who voted against it - I hope you get a chance to witness the excitement that an event can bring to the residents of our city, and also the benefits of revitalizing our port for maritime activities.

Thank you again!

Susan Ruhne

205 7th Ave #2

San Francisco, CA 94118

sruhne@yahoo.com

From
CR - e pages

SUNSHINE ORDINANCE
TASK FORCE



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-7724
Fax No. (415) 554-7854
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

October 6, 2010

Honorable David Chiu
President, Board of Supervisors

Dear President Chiu:

Please find attached the Annual Report to the Board of Supervisors from the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. Again, I express regrets about our tardiness in submitting the report, but the delay was unavoidable because Task Force members' outside commitments made it impossible at times to maintain or even muster a quorum.

We trust the report will help you, your honorable Board colleagues and your administrative staff to understand the mission and goals of the Task Force, and how we are working to meet them. We are happy to provide additional information that any of you requires. You can reach us through Task Force Administrator Chris Rustom in City Hall Room 244; phone (415) 554-7724; e-mail sotf@sfgov.org. Thank you for your kind attention.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Richard A. Knee".

Richard A. Knee
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Chair

SUNSHINE ORDINANCE TASK FORCE 2009-10 ANNUAL REPORT

The Ordinance and the Task Force

The Sunshine Ordinance Task Force was established by the Sunshine Ordinance (Administrative Code Sections 67.1 et seq.) to foster City government transparency and accountability.

The Ordinance was originally enacted in 1993 by the Board of Supervisors and then-Mayor Frank Jordan. The current Ordinance was approved as Proposition G by City voters in November, 1999.

The Task Force has 11 seats for voting members. Ten of them are filled as this report is being written. The members are Chair Richard Knee; Vice-Chair Bruce Wolfe; Sue Cauthen; Hanley Chan; Hope Johnson; James Knoebber; Suzanne Manneh; David Snyder; Allyson Washburn; and Marjorie Ann Williams. Seat #7 recently became vacant when Nicholas Goldman left the Task Force to study law.

Members are appointed by the Board of Supervisors, and the appointments receive Mayoral approval. Members serve for two-year terms, without pay or expense reimbursement. There is no tenure limit for serving on the Task Force.

The Task Force has seats designated for ex-officio, non-voting members from the offices of the Mayor and the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors. Both seats are vacant as this report is being written.

The Task Force is responsible for monitoring the effectiveness of the Ordinance and recommending ways to improve it. The goals are to maximize citizens' access to City records that are by law disclosable and to City meetings that are by law open to the public; and to help City officials, employees and entities find operationally and economically efficient and effective ways to meet those goals.

The Task Force normally meets on the fourth Tuesday of each month at 4 p.m. Committees of the Task Force normally meet on various days during the second week of each month.

The length of Task Force and committee meetings varies with the amount of business before them. Often, a major determinant for meetings of the Task Force, and of the Complaint, the Compliance & Amendments and the Education, Outreach & Training Committees is the number of sunshine-related complaints before them.

It is important to note that the number of complaints that the Task Force Administrator receives is substantially higher than the number of complaints that goes to the Task Force for adjudication. This is because the Administrator is often able to bring the parties in interest together for satisfactory clarification and resolution.

Long-Term Issues

The Task Force also deals with long-term issues. The current list includes:

☼ Amending the Ordinance. The Task Force believes some reforms are necessary to enable it to do its job more effectively. For a variety of reasons, the Task Force could not complete deliberations on the proposed amendments in time to get the reform package on the November, 2010, ballot. The target date is now November, 2011. Because the current Ordinance was enacted by the voters, amendments to it also must go on the ballot. Only in certain, narrowly defined cases may the Board and the Mayor amend the Ordinance.

☼ Ethics Commission handling of sunshine-related complaints. The Commission has invited the Task Force's input in developing a new set of policies in this area. The Task Force has long been troubled with the way the Commission has been handling matters that the Task Force has referred to the Commission. The Task Force believes that the Commission has erroneously placed decisions on these matters with staff when the Commission itself should be making the determinations. The Commission staff has dismissed all of the roughly 15 complaints on which the Task Force has requested enforcement for willful violation of the Ordinance. To the best of the Task Force's knowledge, the staff has taken these actions often without reading through the entire body of material relevant to a given case and never in consulting with the Task Force or an original complainant.

☼ Updating the Index of Records. The City Administrator's Office is revising its guidelines and policies for the Index of Records required by Section 67.29 of the Ordinance, and has told the Task Force that it plans to train City departments to comply with new procedures. These revisions are intended to create an Index that is more useful to the general public. The Task Force continues to provide guideline and policy recommendations and monitor department compliance.

Issues for the Board of Supervisors to Consider

The Task Force believes some clarifications regarding statements and perceptions about the procedures and resources needed to manage the Task Force can help to inform future decisions regarding the Task Force's annual budget. It seems there is a perception that "action minutes" can be used for a quasi-judicial body. The Task Force does not conduct business in the same way that the Board of Supervisors and its committees do. Evidence and testimony presented to the Board and its committees are meant to shape policies that will revise or be added to existing code; thus "action minutes" are pretty much the standard for policy bodies and the results are what ultimately matter.

The operational process for the Task Force is quite different. It is, again, a quasi-judicial body that, when receiving a sunshine-related complaint, takes specific testimony and evidence from the complainant, from the respondent, and from persons supporting either party in interest. Such hearings also include public comment. All of the foregoing and the resulting finding for the complainant or the respondent go into a file that is at times quite voluminous. In addition, the docket must be available for review, as it serves as "case law" under the Sunshine Ordinance.

There are other City policy bodies that operate much like the Task Force – including but not limited to the Rent Board, Ethics Commission and Appeals Board –all of which have budgets and staffs far larger than those of the Task Force.

The Task Force and its staff continually look for ways to improve operational and economic efficiencies, both at meetings and in record-keeping. At the same time, the Task Force strongly believes that maintaining staffing, equipment, supplies and facilities – and thus, the budget – at least at current levels is of paramount importance. The Task Force notes with appreciation that the Board and the Mayor intend to do that for fiscal 2010-11. But going forward, it is important to remember that reducing the Task Force’s budget based on the perceptions or presentations would produce no net benefit and may violate the Sunshine Ordinance provision regarding staffing and resource requirements. Ordinance Section 67.31 states in part, “The Clerk of the Board of Supervisors shall provide a full-time staff person to perform administrative duties for the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force and to assist any person in gaining access to public meetings or public information. The Clerk of the Board of Supervisors shall provide that staff person with whatever facilities and equipment are necessary to perform said duties.”

The Task Force encourages the Board to consult with the Clerk of the Board, Angela Calvillo, and with Task Force Administrator Chris Rustom when questions arise about what the Task Force needs in staffing, facilities, equipment and supplies to meet its responsibilities.

On a similar and equally relevant matter, the Task Force is deeply concerned about a paring of assistance from the City Attorney’s Office. Section 67.30(a) of the Sunshine Ordinance mandates that a deputy city attorney (DCA) be assigned to work with the Task Force. Unfortunately, budgetary constraints have caused the City Attorney to limit the number of hours per year that a DCA is available to work with the Task Force. This is causing problems for the Task Force and its committees as they weigh substantive and procedural matters. The Task Force has reminded City Attorney Dennis Herrera of the Section 67.30(a) mandate. In an August 31, 2010, letter to Chair Knee, Mr. Herrera expressed his desire to provide the Task Force with “top-notch” assistance as needed but said a reduction in the General Fund budget allocation to his Office made it necessary to pare the number of hours that a DCA could work with the Task Force. The Task Force strongly urges the Board of Supervisors to provide sufficient funding to enable the City Attorney’s Office to comply with the 67.30(a) mandate in future fiscal years.

A final note: The Task Force has for more than five years been requesting live videocasting of its meetings on the City’s cable channel, SFGOV-TV, and on the City’s web site. The Task Force has proved a viable, vital resource for the public, and its activities are sufficiently instructive as to be a compelling subject for regular videocast. And this should not be difficult, as the Task Force and its committees meet regularly in hearing rooms each equipped with at least one video camera.

Again, the Task Force strongly urges that Board and the Mayor keep the Task Force’s budget at least at its current level, and recognize the Task Force’s needs and requirements under the Sunshine Ordinance for full-time staff and resources that will enable it to continue providing services to the City and the public.

Respectfully submitted,
Richard A. Knee, Chair
Bruce Wolfe, Vice-Chair

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Complaint Committee 2009-10 Annual Report

The Complaint Committee determines whether the Task Force has jurisdiction on a given complaint, helps complainants focus their complaints, monitors the complaint process and makes recommendations to the Task Force regarding how complaints should be handled.

The Complaint Committee comprises three members: Chair James Knoebber, Richard Knee and Allyson Washburn. Member Knee on July 1 replaced Doyle Johnson, who is no longer on the Task Force. Member Johnson consistently showed genuine interest in ensuring informed and fair decisions on the issues that came before the Committee and the full Task Force.

The Complaint Committee normally meets on the second Tuesday of each month at 3:30 p.m.

In 2009 the Complaint Committee heard 22 complaints. It should be noted that the full Task Force held hearings on many more complaints than these. This is because the complaint underlying a particular hearing may not necessarily come before the Complaint Committee. This happens if jurisdiction is not contested. Following are the matters that came before the Complaint Committee in 2009, by month:

January

Witt v. Taxi Commission
Anonymous Tenants v. DBI

February

Anonymous v. City Attorney's Office

March

Rita O'flynn v. DTI
David Larkin v. DPW
Charles Pitts v. Health Dept.

April

Banks v. SF HIV Health Svcs. Planning Council

May

Anonymous v. MTA

June

Weston v. DHS
Leung & Fong v. DHS
Xex v. DHS
Xex v. DHS

July

Grogan v. Police Commission

Maionchi v. Dept. Rec Park
Tomina v. DBI

August

Kinnard v. HRC
Mabbutt v. Dept. Rec Park

September

No meeting

October

Mollinedo v. Zoological Society
Garcia v. Entertainment Commission

November

Lawrence v. MTA

December

Banks v. DPH

In 2010, the Complaint Committee has heard 13 complaints:

March

Lawrence v. MTA
Datesh v. Arts Commission
Daly v. Mayor's Office (Yarne and Arellano)

April

Bretherton v. Emergency Management Dept.

May

Crawford v. City Attorney's Office
Datesh v. Arts Commission
Robinson v. Rent Board
Hartz v. Rent Board (2 complaints)
Kinnard v. Human Rights Commission

June

Ptashnaya v. Adult & Aging Services Dept.
Xex v. Children & Families Commission
Dumont v. Recreation & Parks Dept.

The Complaint Committee would be aided immeasurably by the presence of a Deputy City Attorney at our meetings. Economy moves within the City Attorney's office have eliminated our ability to rely on a legal voice to assist us as we deliberate.

Respectfully submitted,
James Knoebber, Chair

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Compliance & Amendments Committee 2009-10 Annual Report

The Compliance & Amendments Committee (CAC) takes the lead in monitoring the effectiveness of the Sunshine Ordinance and in proposing revisions thereto. In addition, the CAC follows up on Orders of Determination that the Task Force issues when finding violations of the Ordinance, investigating whether the Orders have been met and recommending when necessary that the Task Force refer cases of willful violation to entities empowered to impose penalties.

The CAC comprises five members: Chair Allyson Washburn, Hope Johnson, Richard Knee, David Snyder and Bruce Wolfe. Mr. Snyder replaces Erica Craven-Green on the CAC and on the Task Force, holding the Task Force seat designated for an attorney nominated by the Society of Professional Journalists, Northern California Chapter. Ms. Craven-Green contributed extensive knowledge of statutory and case law, and of their applicability to matters that came before the CAC, which she chaired from July, 2009, to April, 2010, and the Task Force.

The CAC normally meets the second Tuesday of each month at 4 p.m.

The CAC in March, 2010, completed a long series of exhaustive public deliberations on proposed amendments to the Sunshine Ordinance, and sent the package for in-public review, still in progress, by the Task Force.

The CAC is taking the lead in developing guidelines for the Task Force on public access to electronic records, including backup, storage and retrieval. This is a long, complex process, given the immense volume of information to be gathered on available and evolving technology, work in progress by the Committee on Information Technology, and best practices in other jurisdictions around the country.

The CAC in 2009 followed up on 20 Orders of Determination that the Task Force issued after finding violations of the Sunshine Ordinance:

February

Crossman v. Dept. of Telecommunications & Information Services (DTIS): Partial compliance found; matter continued.

Xex v. Arts Commission: Compliance found. No further action taken.

May

O'Flynn v. Dept. of Technology (formerly DTIS): Continued.

Arce & Brooks v. SFPUC: Referred back to Task Force with recommendation to refer to Ethics Commission due to willful violation.

Larkin v. Dept. of Public Works: Referred back to Task Force with recommendation to refer to Ethics Commission due to willful violation.

Anonymous Tenants v. Dept. of Building Inspection: Continued to July meeting.

June

O'Flynn v. Dept. of Technology (continued from previous month): Ms. O'Flynn could not attend; matter continued.

SORE v. SFPUC: Neither party was present or represented. Matter was deemed concluded.

July

O'Flynn v. Dept. of Technology (continued from previous month): CAC determined it could take no further action.

Anonymous Tenants v. Dept. of Building Inspection (continued from May meeting): Continued.

August

Anonymous Tenants v. Dept. of Building Inspection (continued from previous meeting): Compliance found. Matter concluded.

September

Maionchi v. Dept. of Recreation & Parks: Compliance found. No further action taken.

Kinnard v. Human Rights Commission: Continued.

Mabbutt v. Dept. of Recreation & Parks: Good-faith effort by both sides found. Matter taken off calendar.

Warfield v. Public Library: Continued.

Warfield v. Board of Appeals: Respondent not present or represented. Matter continued.

October

Cauthen v. Library Commission: Referred to Task Force with recommendation of referral to Ethics Commission due to willful violation by Commission President Jewelle Gomez.

Kinnard v. Human Rights Commission (continued from previous month): There was tentative indication of compliance. CAC asked complainant to meet with respondent and inform the CAC if Order of Determination had not been met. CAC took no formal action.

Mabbutt v. Dept. of Recreation & Parks: CAC encouraged parties to work together; took no formal action.

Warfield v. Public Library (continued from previous month): Agreed CAC Chair Craven-Green would write a letter to the Library expressing displeasure at its failure to appear at hearings, and asking why documents were not provided and why an unusable copy of a draft was provided after five days. Library was also to respond as to when the original of a requested blueprint was deleted and whether it could provide full-sized copies. If the Library does not respond within five days following receipt of the letter, the CAC was to refer matter to Task Force.

Warfield v. Board of Appeals (continued from previous month): Matter referred to Task Force with recommendation to refer it to Ethics Commission due to willful violation.

O'Flynn v. Mayor's Office of Housing: Further information needed; matter continued.

Evans v. Ella Hill Hutch Community Center: Further information needed; matter continued.

Evans v. African-American Art & Culture Complex: CAC Chair Craven-Green said she would urge respondent produce a list of employees and other documents sought by complainant. She would also inform the Arts Commission that it needs to produce documents it may have on the Art and Culture Complex. No further action.

November

O'Flynn v. Mayor's Office of Housing (continued from previous month): Information from respondent needed; matter continued.

Mollinedo v. Zoological Society: Continued with instruction to respondent to produce minutes that had been redacted.

Warfield v. Clerk of the Board: Compliance found. No further action.

Warfield v. Clerk of the Board: Continued with instruction that respondent provide written policy regarding personal-information redactions.

December

Kinnard v. Human Rights Commission: Consensus to correspond with respondent for clarification on pending issues.

O'Flynn v. Mayor's Office of Housing (continued from previous month): Non-compliance and willful violation found; matter referred back to Task Force.

Mollinedo v. Zoological Society (continued from previous month): Compliance found. No further action.

The CAC has in 2010 followed up on 10 Orders of Determination that the Task Force issued after finding violations of the Sunshine Ordinance:

January

Mabbutt v. Dept. of Parks & Recreation: Continued.

February

Mabbutt v. Dept. of Parks & Recreation (continued from previous meeting): Matter referred to Task Force with recommendation to refer it to Ethics Commission due to willful violation.

Banks v. Dept. of Public Health: Complainant advised to make broad request for information. Matter concluded.

Anonymous Tenants v. Planning Dept.: Evidence from both sides found lacking. No further action.

Tsang v. Dept. of Building Inspection: Compliance found. Matter concluded.

Addario v. Arts Commission: Compliance found but certain aspects of the matter needed attention of Education, Outreach & Training Committee.

March

Starr v. City Attorney's Office: Referred to Task Force for referral to an enforcement entity to be determined, due to willful violation.

Kinnard v. Human Rights Commission: Compliance found except for non-timely response violation. No further action.

July

Ptashnaya v. Dept. of Aging & Adult Services: Referred to Task Force for referral to an enforcement entity to be determined, due to willful violation.

Dumont v. Recreation & Parks Dept.: Compliance found. Matter concluded.

Hartz v. Police Commission: Continued.

The CAC would be aided immeasurably by the presence of a Deputy City Attorney at our meetings. Economy moves within the City Attorney's office have eliminated our ability to rely on a legal voice to assist us as we deliberate.

Respectfully submitted,
Allyson Washburn, Chair

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Education, Outreach & Training Committee 2009-10 Annual Report

The Education Outreach & Training Committee (EOTC) is active on several fronts as it pursues its mission to communicate the precepts of open government to City departments and the residents of San Francisco.

The EOTC comprises five members: Chair Hanley Chan, Sue Cauthen, Hope Johnson, Suzanne Manneh and Marjorie Ann Williams. Ms. Johnson on July 1 replaced Doyle Johnson, who is no longer on the Task Force. Mr. Johnson consistently showed genuine dedication to the work of the Committee and the full Task Force.

The EOTC normally meets on the second Thursday of each month at 4 p.m.

The EOTC works with City departments on compliance issues. It explains the Sunshine Ordinance to community groups and government entities. It contacts local news media to acquaint them with open government issues.

OUTREACH: In 2009, the EOTC took on a new function: working with City departments found in violation of the Sunshine Ordinance. The goal is to bring them into voluntary compliance and avoid punitive measures.

We are pleased to report a high degree of success. A notable example is the Historic Preservation Commission, which upgraded its minutes to conform to the Sunshine Ordinance by providing a brief summary of each public comment.

Other groups pursuing voluntary compliance with Sunshine law at the behest of the EOTC include the Planning Department, the Public Utilities Commission, Shanti, the Shelter Monitoring Committee, the Mayor's Office of Economic & Workforce Development, the SF HIV Health Services Planning Council, and the Arts Commission, among others.

Recently, the EOTC proposed giving Sunshine awards to encourage government entities to undertake full compliance with open-government precepts, following both the spirit and the letter of the law. We believe our awards will draw more attention to the Sunshine Ordinance and the many positive features of participatory democracy.

EDUCATION: In pursuing our charge to transmit the principles of open government to the public, the Committee was effective on two fronts: (1) presentations to community and government groups, and (2) development and distribution of educational materials.

The EOTC has met with such diverse groups as Police Department Community Relations teams, Shanti, the Mayor's Office of Economic & Workforce Development, the SF HIV Health Services Council and North Beach Neighbors. We are set to appear before the Shelter Monitoring Committee, as well as the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, a 35-member umbrella group. Once amendments to the Ordinance are in place, we anticipate a lively business explaining the new rules to the public.

We have also developed a brochure to explain the Sunshine Ordinance and its administration to the public, including tips on how to file a Sunshine complaint and other helpful facts. With the assistance of YBR Promotions, we created a compact, full-color handout on glossy paper, titled "We Love Sunshine in SF." We also helped the Public Utilities Commission's revise its government procedures to ensure compliance.

We are hampered when an informed representative from a City department does not attend our meetings, a requirement under Section 67.21(e) of the Sunshine Ordinance. Failure to appear makes it impossible for us to pursue voluntary compliance with Task Force findings.

The EOTC would be aided immeasurably by the presence of a Deputy City Attorney at our meetings. Economy moves within the City Attorney's office have eliminated our ability to rely on a legal voice to assist us as we deliberate.

Nonetheless, the EOTC is encouraged by the positive response to our efforts from both City government and the general public. We welcome the opportunity to continue fostering open government.

Respectfully submitted,
Hanley Chan, Chair
Sue Cauthen, Immediate Past Chair

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Rules Committee 2009-10 Annual Report

The Rules Committee's job is to set guidelines to help the Task Force meet its missions of monitoring the effectiveness of the Sunshine Ordinance; recommending revisions to the Ordinance; and helping City entities such as policy bodies and departments to comply with the Ordinance.

The Rules Committee is dormant; Task Force Chair Richard Knee has stated it will be reactivated when necessary.

Toward the end of his service on the Task Force in mid-2010, Committee Chair Doyle Johnson proposed what he envisioned as a low-cost marketing campaign aimed at generating Sunshine awareness among young adults and to encourage their participation in the political process.

The campaign would include production of printed materials for distribution at major city festivals, street fairs, park events, etc.; use of online resources such as social networking sites and the City's own website; and an online newsletter.

These goals could be met by finding sponsors such as green printers and online media; obtaining free printing in exchange for tax breaks and publicity; getting volunteers or interns to pass out handbills and other materials; getting interns to create campaign graphics designs; and distributing a monthly Task Force newsletter, in electronic and print versions, to City entities to make officials aware of their Sunshine responsibilities.

Respectfully submitted,
Richard A. Knee, Task Force Chair

Complaints: January 2009 to June 2010

Date Received	Complainant	Department/Respondent	Status
1/5/2009	Ray Hartz (09001)	City Attorney's Office (Matt Dorsey)	Complaint 2/10/09, Task Force 02/24/09, Contd, 03/24/09, Withdrawn 3/24/09
1/6/2009	Michael Petrelis (09002)	Public Health STD Unit	Task Force 1/27/09, No violation
1/19/2009	Rita O'Flynn (09003)	Dept of Technology	Task Force 02/24/09, continued, Complaint Committee 3/10/09, Task Force 3/24/09, Violated 67.21-1 and CPRA 6253.9, CAC 5/12/09, Contd 6/9/09, 7/14/09, No further action
1/23/2009	Ray Hartz (09004)	City Attorney, Matt Dorsey	Task Force 2/24/09, No action taken, petition for reconsideration denied 3/24/09.
1/23/2009	Steve Lawrence (09005)	Public Utilities Commission	Task Force 2/24/09; Withdrawn 2/9/09
1/26/2009	Joshua Arce & Eric Brooks (09006)	Public Utilities Commission	Task Force 2/24/09, quorum loss, Task Force 3/24/09, violated 67.29-7, CAC 5/12/09, Task Force 5/26/09, EC referral failed
1/30/2009	David Larkin (09007)	Public Works	Complaint 03/10/09, Task Force 3/24/09, 4/28/09, Violated 67.29 and 67.21 (e), CAC 5/12/09, Task Force 5/26/09, Referred to EC
2/4/2009	Ray Hartz (09008)	Police Commission	Task Force 2/24/09, violated 67.29 & 67.21(e). EOT 4/9/09, SOTF 6/23/09, 8/25/2009, 9/22/2009, No further action, EOT to review every few months
2/9/2009	Charles Pitts (09009)	Health Dept	Complaint 03/10/09, Task Force 3/24/09, Violated 67.21 (e)
2/20/2009	Ray Hartz (09010)	Arts Commission	Task Force 3/24/09, EOT 4/9/09, No further action
2/23/2009	Ray Hartz (09011)	City Attorney's Office (Matt Dorsey)	Task Force 3/24/09, Withdrawn 3/24/09
2/23/2009	Ray Hartz (09012)	Office of Citizen Complaints	Complaint 4/14/09, Withdrawn 3/24/09
2/27/2009	Steve Lawrence (09013)	Public Utilities Commission	Task Force 3/24/09, 4/28/09, violated 67.21 (b), EOT 5/14/09, 6/11/09
3/18/2009	Ahimsa Porter Sumchai (09014)	Board of Supervisors	Task Force 4/28/09, Contd 5/26/09, No violation
3/18/2009	Raymond Bank (09015)	SF HIV Health Services Planning Council	Complaint Committee 4/14/09, Task Force 4/28/09, violated 67.21 (b), EOT 5/14/09, 6/11/09, No further action
3/23/2009	Peter Green (09016)	Public Health	Task Force 4/28/09, Contd 5/26/09, No violation
23-Mar	SORE (09017)	Public Utilities Commission	Task Force 4/28/09, violated 67.21 (b), EOT 5/14/09, No further action
3/27/2009	Anonymous Tenants (09018)	Dept of Bldg Inspection	Complaint Committee 4/14/09, Task Force 4/28/09, Violated 67.28 (d), CAC 5/12/09, Contd 7/14/09, Contd 8/11/09, no further action
4/3/2009	Christian Holmer (09019)	Board of Supervisors (COB & SOTF)	Task Force 5/26/09, Withdrawn
4/7/2009	Anonymous (09020)	MTA	Task Force 5/26/09, No violation

Complaints: January 2009 to June 2010

4/23/2009	SORE (09021)	Public Utilities Commission	Task Force 5/26/08, Violated 67.21 (b), CAC 6/9/09
5/13/2009	Raymond Banks (09022)	SF HIV Health Services Planning Council	Task Force 5/26/08, No violation
5/13/2009	SORE (09023)	Public Utilities Commission	Task Force 5/26/08, No violation
5/15/2009	Paul Weston (09024)	Human Services	Complaint 6/9/09, Task Force 6/23/09, violated 67.25 (a)
5/15/2009	Charles Pitts (09025)	Human Services	Task Force 6/23/09; 7/28/09, violated 67.25, No further action
5/18/2009	Hanna Leung & Lydia Fong (09026)	Human Services	Complaint 6/9/09, Task Force 6/23/09, 7/28/09, No further action
5/18/2009	Alvin Xex (09027)	Office of Economic and Workforce Development	Complaint 6/9/09, Task Force 6/23/09, violated 67.21 (b), EOT 7/9/09, No further action
5/18/2009	Alvin Xex (09028)	Dept. of Human Resources	Complaint 6/9/09, Task Force 6/23/09, No violation
5/20/2009	Paul Weston (09029)	Human Services (St Vincent de Paul Society)	Task Force 6/23/09, No violation
6/8/2009	Ann Grogan (09030)	Police Commission	Complaint 7/14/09; Task Force 7/28/2009, violated 67.6 (e) and 67.4, EOT, 9/10/09, 10/8/09, Tabled
6/3/2009	Kenneth Kinnard (09031)	Human Rights Commission	Complaint 7/14/09; Cont requested 8/11/09, TF 8/25/2009, violated 67.21, 67.25, CAC 9/8/2009, 10/13/09, No further action
6/18/2009	Dominic Maionchi (09032)	Park and Recreation	Task Force 7/28/09, violated 67.27, 67.24. CAC 9/8/2009, No further action
6/23/2009	Sue Cauthen (09033)	Library Commission	Task Force 7/28/09, violated 67.15 (a) and 67.34. EOT 9/10, CAC 10/13/09, Task Force 10/27/2009, Contd 12/01/2009, referred to EC
6/23/2009	Brian Tomina (09034)	Bldg Inspection	Complaint 7/14/09; Task Force 7/28/09. No violation.
7/14/2009	Dave Schneider (09035)	COB, BOS	Task Force 8/25/2009, violated 67.15 (a) & (e) No further action
7/14/2009	Bridgid (09036)	Police Dept	Task Force 8/25/2009, violated 67.21 (a), 67.24 (d), 67.27, EOT 9/10/09, No further action
7/14/2009	Ging Louie (09037)	SFPUC	Task Force 8/25/2009, Withdrawn 8/14/09
7/17/2009	Anmarie Mabbutt (09038)	Rec & Park	Complaint 8/11/2009, Task Force 8/25/2009, violated 67.21, CAC 9/8/2009, 10/13/2009, No further action
7/20/2009	Rita O'Flynn (09039)	Mayor's Office of Housing	Task Force 8/25/2009, 9/22/2009, violated 67.21, 67.29-7 (a), CAC 10/13/2009, contd 11/10/2009, 12/8/2009, Task Force 01/5/10, referred to EC and DA
7/22/2009	Hanna Leung & Lydia Fong (09040)	Human Services	Task Force 8/25/2009, 9/22/2009, Withdrawn

Complaints: January 2009 to June 2010

7/28/2009	Anna Mabbutt (09041)	Mayor's Office	Task Force 8/25/2009, Withdrawn 8/22/2009
8/11/2009	Peter Warfield (09042)	Public Library	Task Force 8/25/2009, violated 67.21, CAC 9/8/09, Task Force 09/22/2009, CAC 10/13/2009, Task Force 10/27/09, referred to EC
8/11/2009	Peter Warfield (09043)	Library Commission	Task Force 8/25/2009, 9/22/2009, No further action
8/11/2009	Peter Warfield (09044)	Board of Appeals	Task Force 8/25/2009, violated 67.1 (g), 67.21, CAC 9/8/2009, 10/13/09, Task Force 10/27/2009, contd 12/01/2009, referred to EC
8/11/2009	Peter Warfield (09045)	Board of Appeals	Task Force 8/25/2009, No further action
8/14/2009	Randal Evans (09046)	Ella Hill Hutch Community Center	Task Force 9/22/2009, CAC 10/13/2009, 11/10/2009, Withdrawn
8/14/2009	Dominic Maionchi (09047)	Park and Recreation	Task Force 9/22/2009, withdrawn
8/14/2009	Brian Tomina (09048)	Bldg Inspection	Task Force 9/22/2009, withdrawn
8/17/2009	Randall Evans (09049)	Public Defender (MoMagic)	Task Force 9/22/2009, withdrawn
8/17/2009	Randall Evans (09050)	African American Art and Culture Complex	Task Force 9/22/2009, violated 67.21, CAC 10/13/2009, Tabled
8/20/2009	Marilyn Mollinedo (09051)	Zoological Society	Complaint Committee 10/13/2009, Task Force 10/27/2009, violated 67.21, CAC 11/10/2009 CAC 11/10/2009, 12/8/2009, no further action
9/2/2009	Charles Pitts (09052)	Shelter Monitoring Committee	Task Force 9/22/09, violated 67.15 (d), EOT 10/08/2009, No further action
9/3/2009	Lou Dillon (09053)	Recreation and Park	Task Force 9/22/09, Contd 10/27/2009, No violation
9/8/2009	Robert Garcia (09054)	Entertainment Commission	Complaint Committee 10/13/09, Withdrawn 10/13/2009
9/9/2009	Peter Warfield (09055)	Public Library	Task Force 9/22/09, No further action
9/9/2009	Peter Warfield (09056)	Clerk of the Board	Task Force 9/22/09, violated 67.21 (a), 67.21 (g), Contd 10/27/2009, CAC 11/10/2009, No further action
9/9/2009	Peter Warfield (09057)	Clerk of the Board	Task Force 9/22/09, Contd 10/27/2009, 67.21 (a), 67.21 (b), CAC 11/10/2009, 12/8/2009, Task Force 01/5/10, referred to EC and EOTC 03/11/10, Task Force 04/27/10, referred to EC and BOS
9/11/2009	Anmarie Mabbutt (09058)	Clerk of the Board	Task Force 10/27/09, Withdrawn 10/23/09
9/11/2009	Anmarie Mabbutt (09059)	Clerk of the Board	Task Force 10/27/09, Withdrawn 10/23/09
9/11/2009	Anmarie Mabbutt (09060)	Clerk of the Board	Task Force 10/27/09, Withdrawn 10/23/09

Complaints: January 2009 to June 2010

9/22/2009	Alvin Xex (09061)	Human Services Agency	Task Force 10/27/09, No violation
10/2/2009	Debra Benedict (09062)	Public Health	Task Force 10/27/09, No further action
10/5/2009	Alvin Xex (09063)	Human Services Agency	Task Force 10/27/09, Tabled
10/6/2009	Alvin Xex (09064)	Economic Opportunity Council of San Francisco	Task Force 10/27/09, No further action
10/7/2009	Charles Pitts (09065)	Local Homeless Coordinating Board	Task Force 11/24/2009, violated 67.7 (a) and 67.21 (e), No further action
10/7/2009	Emil Lawrence (09066)	Municipal Transportation Agency	Complaint 11/10/2009, no jurisdiction
10/13/2009	Library Users Association (09067)	Historic Preservation Commission	Task Force 11/24/2009, violated 67.16, 67.21 (e), referred to EOTC 12/10/09, 01/14/10, 02/11/10, Tabled
10/14/2009	Brent Plater (09068)	Recreation and Park	Task Force 11/24/2009, , Withdrawn 11/13/2009
10/14/2009	Asian Law Caucus (09069)	Mayor's Office	Task Force 11/24/2009, violated 67.21 (e), 67.22, 67.21 (e), 67.27, Task Force 01/05/10, CAC 02/09/10, TF 03/23/2010, 04/27/10
10/21/2009	Anmarie Mabbutt (09070)	Recreation and Park	Task Force 11/24/2009, violated 67.14 (c), CAC 01/12/10, 02/09/20, 03/09/2010, Withdrawn
10/21/2009	Anmarie Mabbutt (09071)	Recreation and Park	Task Force 11/24/2009, No violation
10/23/2009	Anmarie Mabbutt (09072)	Clerk of the Board	Task Force 11/24/2009, 01/05/10, No violation
10/23/2009	Anmarie Mabbutt (09073)	Clerk of the Board	Task Force 11/24/2009, 01/05/10, No violation
10/27/2009	Kimo Crossman (09074)	Ethics Commission	Task Force 11/24/2009, 01/05/10, Withdrawn, 12/31/09
10/29/2009	Bred Starr (09075)	City Attorney's Office, Jack Song	Task Force 12/8/2009, 01/05/10, 1/26/10, CAC 03/09/10, TF 03/23/2010, No further action
11/2/2009	Anmarie Mabbutt (09076)	Mayor's Office	Task Force 11/24/2009, violated 67.25 (a), EOTC 01/12/10, 02/11/10, Tabled
11/6/2009	Raymond Banks (09077)	Public Health	Complaint Committee 12/8/2009, Task Force 01/05/2010, violated 67.4, EOTC 02/11/10, CAC 03/09/10, Tabled
12/16/2009	Anonymous Tenants (09078)	Planning Department	Task Force 01/05/2010, violated 67.21 (b) (e) (I), 67.26, CAC 02/09/10, No further action
12/16/2009	Kenneth Kinnard (09079)	Human Rights Commission	Task Force 01/05/2010, Tabled, TF 01/05/26, CAC 03/09/10, No further action
12/17/2009	Alvin Xex 09080	Human Services Agency	Task Force 01/05/2010, Tabled


Complaints: January 2009 to June 2010

12/17/2009	Alvin Xex 09081	Economic Opportunity Council of San Francisco	Task Force 01/05/2010, Tabled
12/17/2009	Raymond Banks 09082	Public Health	Task Force 01/05/2010, violated 67.21 b e 67.25 and CPRA 6253.1 (a) 1 2 3, CAC 02/09/10, 03/09/2010, No further action
12/17/2009	Ellen Tsang 09083	Building Inspection	Task Force 01/05/2010, violated 67.25, 67.21 (1), CAC 02/09/10, No further action
12/17/2009	Chris Daly 09084	Mayor's Office	Task Force 01/05/2010, Tabled
12/17/2009	Mike Addario 09085	Arts Commission	Task Force 01/05/2010, violated 67.25, CAC 02/09/10, EOTC 03/11/2010, No further action
12/29/2009	Karl Beale 09086	Planning Department	Complaint Committee 02/09/2010, Withdrawn
1/12/2010	Nick Pasquarello 10001	General Services Agency	Task Force 02/23/2010, No jurisdiction
1/22/2010	Nancy Cross 10002	Law Library	Task Force 02/23/2010, No jurisdiction
1/22/2010	Nancy Cross 10003	ECS Sanctuary	Task Force 02/23/2010, No violation
1/22/2010	Rita O'Flynn 10004	City Attorney's Office	Task Force 02/23/2010, Withdrawn
2/2/2010	Emil Lawrence 10005	MTA	Complaint 03/09/10, Task Force 3/23/2010, No violation
2/4/2010	Paula Datesh 10006	Arts Commission	Complaint 03/09/10, No jurisdiction
2/22/2010	Chris Daly 10007	Mayor's Office	Complaint 03/09/10, Task Force 3/23/2010, violated 67.21(b), 67.21(e), 67.25(b), Task Force 04/27/10, referred to EC and BOS
3/3/2010	Sandra Brotherton 10008	Dept. of Emergency Management	Complaint 04/27/10, Task Force 4/27/2010, No further action
3/10/2010	Majeid Crawford 10009	City Attorney's Office	Complaint 5/11/10, TF 5/25/2010, violated 67.26, 67.27, TF 6/22/10, referred to EC
3/26/2010	Paula Datesh 10010	Arts Commission	Complaint 5/11/10, TF 5/25/2010, TF 6/22/10, 07/27/2010, 08/24/2010, Contd
3/26/2010	Juan De Anda 10011	Public Health	Task Force 04/27/10, contd 05/25/10, Tabled
3/29/2010	Ellen Tsang 10012	Planning Department	Task Force 04/27/10, violated 67.21(e), 67.25, TF 6/22/10, no further action
4/5/2010	Nick Pasquarello 10013	Dept. of Technology	Task Force 05/25/10, violated 67.21(b), TF 6/22/10, CAC 8/10/10, TF 08/24/2010, referred to EC
4/9/2010	Michael Robinson 10014	Rent Board	Complaint 5/11/10, no jurisdiction

Complaints: January 2009 to June 2010

4/14/2010	Ellen Tsang 10015	Planning Department	Task Force 05/25/10, violated 67.21, 67.25, 67.26 and 67.27, TF 6/22/10, referred to EC
4/10/2010	Ray Hartz 10016	Rent Board	Complaint 5/11/10, TF 5/25/2010, violated 67.24(1)(i) and (ii), TF 6/22/10, matter concluded
4/10/2010	Ray Hartz 10017	Rent Board	Complaint 5/11/10, TF 5/25/2010, No further action
5/18/2010	Svetlana Ptashnaya 10018	Aging and Adult Services	Complaint 6/8/2010, TF 6/22/10, violated 67.21(c), 67.21(e) 67.24(c)(7) & 67.27, CAC 07/13/2010, TF 7/27/2010, referred to EC
5/21/2010	Alvin Xex 10019	First 5 (San Francisco)	Complaint 6/22/10, Tabled
4/26/2010	Kenneth Kinnard 10020	Human Rights Commission	Complaint 5/11/10, no jurisdiction
4/28/2010	Anonymous 10021	Recreation and Parks Department	Task Force 5/25/10, withdrawn 5/24/10
5/3/2010	Suzanne Dumont 10022	Recreation and Parks Department	Complaint 6/8/2010, TF 6/22/10, violated 67.27, CAC 07/13/2010, Matter concluded
5/21/2010	Alvin Xex 10023	First 5 (San Francisco)	Complaint 07/13/10, Tabled
5/25/2010	Ray Hartz 10024	San Francisco Police Dept	Complaint TF 6/22/10 Contd 07/27/2010, no further action
5/25/2010	Ray Hartz 10025	San Francisco Police Commissi	TF 6/22/10, violated 67.29 & 67.21(e), CAC 07/13/2010, 08/10/2010, TF 08/24/2010, Matter concluded
5/25/2010	Ray Hartz 10026	City Attorney's Office	TF 6/22/10, Contd. 07/27/2010, 07/27/2010, Withdrawn 07/27/2010
6/1/2010	Barry Taranto 10027	MTA Board of Directors	Task Force 7/27/10, vio 67.7, EOTC 08/12/2010, 09/08/2010, 10/14/2010
6/1/2010	Charles Pitts 10028	Local Homeless Coordinating B	Task Force 7/27/10, Matter concluded
6/1/2010	Charles Pitts 10029	Local Homeless Coordinating B	Task Force 7/27/10, Matter concluded
6/4/2010	Michael Wright 10030	SF Human Services Agency	Complaint 7/13/10, 07/27/2010, 08/24/2010, referred to EC, CAC 09/14/2010, Task Force 9/28/2010, CAC 10/12/2010
6/23/12010	Charles Pitts 10031	Local Homeless Coordinating B	Task Force 7/27/10, 08/24/2010, EOTC 10/14/08/10
6/23/2010	Mike Addario 10032	Human Rights Commission	Complaint 7/13/10, Closed 06/28/2010, False Claim
6/23/2010	Milindha Morahela 10033	Arts Commission	Complaint 7/13/10, Withdrawn 7/13/2010
6/28/2010	Nick Pasquariello 10034	Department of Technology	Complaint 7/13/10, 07/27/2010, 08/24/2010, EOTC 10/14/2010

Number of contacts the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force administrator had with the public






CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

Ben Rosenfield
Controller

Monique Zmuda
Deputy Controller

TO: Members, Board of Supervisors
Mayor Gavin Newsom

FROM: Ben Rosenfield, Controller 

DATE: October 5, 2010

SUBJECT: August Monthly Overtime Report (Administrative Code Section 18.13-1)

Administrative Code Section 18.13-1, enacted through Ordinance No. 197-08, requires the Controller to submit a monthly overtime report to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor's Budget Director listing the five City departments using the most overtime in the preceding month.

The five City departments using the most overtime for August 2010 were: (1) Municipal Transportation Agency; (2) Fire; (3) Police; (4) Public Health; and (5) Public Utilities Commission. Collectively, these five departments averaged 6.6% overtime versus regular hours and accounted for 88.7% of the total Citywide overtime for the month. This data includes two pay periods ending August 6, 2010 and August 20, 2010.

Fiscal Year 2010-11 To-Date

The five City departments using the most overtime cumulatively for the fiscal year are: (1) Municipal Transportation Agency; (2) Fire; (3) Police; (4) Public Health; and (5) Sheriff. Collectively, these five departments averaged 6.6% overtime versus regular hours and accounted for 88.8% of the total Citywide overtime for the two month period of July 2010 and August 2010.

Please contact me at (415) 554-7500 if you have any questions regarding this overtime information.

cc: Greg Wagner, Mayor's Budget Director
Harvey Rose, Budget Analyst
Victor Young, Clerk, Board of Supervisors' Budget and Finance Committee
Sonali Bose, Finance Director, Municipal Transportation Agency
Ken Bukowski, Finance Director, Police Department
Deborah Landis, Senior Analyst, Police Department
Monica Fields, Deputy Chief of Administration, Fire Department
Mark Corso, Budget Manager, Fire Department
Gregg Sass, Finance Director, Department of Public Health
Jenny Louie, Budget Manager, Department of Public Health
Maureen Gannon, Budget Manager, Sheriff
Carlos Jacobo, Budget Director, Public Utilities Commission
Todd Rydstrom, Chief Financial Officer, Public Utilities Commission

City and County of San Francisco
Controller's Office
Appendix 1: Monthly Overtime Report

July 2010 (includes 1.7 pay periods)					
Department	Regular Hours	Overtime Hours	Percentage Overtime vs. Regular Hours	Percent of Total Citywide Overtime	Overtime Pay
MTA	577,137	66,476	11.5%	48.2%	3,215,854
Fire	234,705	27,545	11.7%	20.0%	1,929,187
Police	348,724	9,261	2.7%	10.2%	841,184
Public Health	733,481	14,116	1.9%	6.7%	646,361
Sheriff	139,151	5,577	4.0%	4.0%	357,849
Total	2,033,197	122,974	6.4%	89.2%	\$6,990,435

July 2010, Average per Pay Period			
Department	Regular Hours	Overtime Hours	Overtime Pay
MTA	339,492	39,103	1,891,679
Fire	138,062	16,203	1,134,816
Police	205,132	5,447	494,814
Public Health	431,459	8,304	380,212
Sheriff	81,853	3,281	210,499
Total	1,195,998	72,338	\$4,112,021

August 2010 (includes 2 pay periods)					
Department	Regular Hours	Overtime Hours	Percentage Overtime vs. Regular Hours	Percent of Total Citywide Overtime	Overtime Pay
MTA	679,338	89,228	13.1%	49.3%	4,348,678
Fire	270,775	36,163	13.4%	20.0%	2,506,238
Police	420,619	9,395	2.2%	5.2%	1,500,882
Public Health	884,634	19,990	2.3%	11.0%	909,720
Public Utilities Commission	322,908	5,947	1.8%	3.3%	368,206
Total	2,578,275	160,722	6.6%	88.7%	\$9,633,724

August 2010, Average per Pay Period			
Department	Regular Hours	Overtime Hours	Overtime Pay
MTA	339,669	44,614	2,174,339
Fire	135,388	18,081	1,253,119
Police	210,310	4,698	750,441
Public Health	442,317	9,995	454,860
Public Utilities Commission	161,454	2,974	184,103
Total	1,289,137	80,361	\$4,816,862

Fiscal Year 2010-11 Total To-Date					
Department	Cumulative Regular Hours	Cumulative Overtime Hours	Cumulative Percentage Overtime vs. Regular Hours	Cumulative Percent of Total Citywide Overtime	Cumulative Overtime Pay
MTA	1,255,479	155,661	12.4%	48.8%	7,569,770
Fire	505,424	63,708	12.6%	20.0%	4,424,811
Police	769,591	18,656	2.4%	5.8%	2,350,413
Public Health	1,617,806	34,095	2.1%	10.7%	1,556,081
Sheriff	305,175	11,052	3.6%	3.5%	674,509
Total	4,453,475	283,171	6.6%	88.8%	\$16,575,584

Fiscal Year To-Date, Average per Pay Period			
Department	Regular Hours	Overtime Hours	Overtime Pay
MTA	339,319	42,070	2,045,884
Fire	136,601	31,854	1,195,895
Police	207,998	9,328	635,247
Public Health	437,245	17,048	420,562
Sheriff	82,480	5,526	182,300
Total	1,203,642	105,826	\$4,479,888



To:
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Fw: Controller's Office Report Issued: August Monthly Overtime Report

From: Controller Reports/CON/SFGOV
To: Angela Calvillo, BOS-Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV, BOS-Legislative Aides/BOS/SFGOV, Steve Kawa, Greg Wagner/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Tony Winnicker/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Starr Terrell/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Severin Campbell/BudgetAnalyst/SFGOV@SFGOV, Debra Newman/BudgetAnalyst/SFGOV@SFGOV, sfdocs@sfpl.info, Ben Rosenfield, monique.zmuda@sfgov.org, Maura Lane, CON-EVERYONE/CON/SFGOV
Date: 10/06/2010 11:29 AM
Subject: Controller's Office Report Issued: August Monthly Overtime Report
Sent by: Debbie Toy

Administrative Code Section 18.13-1, enacted through Ordinance No. 197-08, requires the Controller to submit a monthly overtime report to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor's Budget Director listing the five City departments using the most overtime in the preceding month.

The five City departments using the most overtime for August 2010 were: (1) Municipal Transportation Agency; (2) Fire; (3) Police; (4) Public Health; and (5) Public Utilities Commission. Collectively, these five departments averaged 6.6% overtime versus regular hours and accounted for 88.7% of the total Citywide overtime for the month.



CONOT100510_20101006113122_000.PDF



Gavin Newsom
Mayor

Edwin M. Lee
City Administrator

GENERAL SERVICES AGENCY RISK MANAGEMENT DIVISION

Bos-11
c page



RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 OCT -5 AM 10:06
BY _____

TO: HONORABLE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
FROM: MATT HANSEN *MH*
DIRECTOR
DATE: September 14, 2010
RE: INDEMNIFICATION QUARTERLY REPORT
NOVEMBER 2008 - MARCH 2009

This report is submitted to the Board of Supervisors as per Administrative Code Section 1.24, wherein the Risk Manager is required to maintain a record of all indemnification agreements approved under the authority granted to the Risk Manager by said Code and to submit quarterly reports of such approvals.

There were no indemnification agreements approved by this office for the period of January through October 2008.

Copy of this report will be furnished to the City Attorney and City Controller as per ordinance, and forwarded to the San Francisco Main Library for filing.

cc: Dennis Herrera, City Attorney
Ben Rosenfield, Controller
SF Main Library, Government Section

20





Gavin Newsom
Mayor

Edwin M. Lee
City Administrator

GENERAL SERVICES AGENCY RISK MANAGEMENT DIVISION



BOS-11 cpage

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 OCT -5 AM 10:06
BY *[Signature]*

TO: HONORABLE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
FROM: MATT HANSEN
DIRECTOR
DATE: September 14, 2010
RE: INDEMNIFICATION QUARTERLY REPORT
APRIL - JUNE 2009

This report is submitted to the Board of Supervisors as per Administrative Code Section 1.24, wherein the Risk Manager is required to maintain a record of all indemnification agreements approved under the authority granted to the Risk Manager by said Code and to submit quarterly reports of such approvals.

There were no indemnification agreements approved by this office for the period of April through June 2009.

Copy of this report will be furnished to the City Attorney and City Controller as per ordinance, and forwarded to the San Francisco Main Library for filing.

cc: Dennis Herrera, City Attorney
Ben Rosenfield, Controller
SF Main Library, Government Section

25

RISK MANAGEMENT APPROVAL OF INDEMNITY PROVISIONS

JULY – SEPTEMBER 2009

Date	Department	Other Party	Nature of Agreement	Approved Indemnity
8/14/2009	Planning Dept	Mr. John Peterson	Agreement with John Peterson who will donate his design and professional services in connection with the 17 th Street/Castro Pavement to Park Project. Design plans will be reviewed by City staff and re-worked as necessary to meet City codes and standards.	City to hold harmless John Peterson.
8/14/2009	Planning Dept	Ms. Jane Martin	Agreement with Jane Martin who will donate her design and professional services in connection with the Guerrero Park Pavement to Park Project. Design plans will be reviewed by City staff and re-worked as necessary to meet City codes and standards.	City to hold harmless Jane Martin.
8/14/2009	Planning Dept	Mr. John Bela	Agreement with John Bela who will donate his design and professional services in connection with the Showplace Triangle Pavement to Park Project. Design plans will be reviewed by City staff and re-worked as necessary to meet City codes and standards.	City to hold harmless John Bela.

9/17/2009	Port	California State Water Resources Control Board	Agreement with the CA State Water Resources Control Board for their funded Economic Stimulus Project ("Pier 45 Drainage Improvements Project")	City to hold harmless California State Water Resources Control Board against any loss or liability arising out of the grant.
-----------	------	--	--	--



Gavin Newsom
Mayor

Edwin M. Lee
City Administrator

GENERAL SERVICES AGENCY RISK MANAGEMENT DIVISION



BOS-11 page

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 OCT - 5 AM 10:05
BN
Mc

TO: HONORABLE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

FROM: MATT HANSEN
DIRECTOR

DATE: September 23, 2010


RE: INDEMNIFICATION QUARTERLY REPORT
OCTOBER - DECEMBER 2009

This report is submitted to the Board of Supervisors as per Administrative Code 1.24, wherein the Risk Manager is required to maintain a record of all indemnification agreements approved under the authority granted to the Risk Manager by said Code and to submit quarterly reports of such approvals.

There were no indemnification agreements approved by this office for the period of October through December 2009.

Copy of this report will be furnished to the City Attorney and City Controller as per ordinance, and forwarded to the San Francisco Main Library for filing.

cc: Dennis Herrera, City Attorney
Ben Rosenfield, Controller
SF Main Library, Government Section





Gavin Newsom
Mayor

Edwin M. Lee
City Administrator

GENERAL SERVICES AGENCY RISK MANAGEMENT DIVISION



Bos-ll cpage

TO: HONORABLE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

FROM: MATT HANSEN
DIRECTOR

DATE: September 23, 2010

RE: INDEMNIFICATION QUARTERLY REPORT
JANUARY – MARCH 2010

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 OCT -5 AM 10:05
BY *[Signature]*

This report is submitted to the Board of Supervisors as per Administrative Code 1.24, wherein the Risk Manager is required to maintain a record of all indemnification agreements approved under the authority granted to the Risk Manager by said Code and to submit quarterly reports of such approvals.

While the attached summary is a brief recap of the nature of the indemnity agreements, supporting documentation is filed in the Risk Management office of the General Services Agency.

Copy of this report will be furnished to the City Attorney and City Controller as per ordinance, and forwarded to the San Francisco Main Library for filing.

cc: Dennis Herrera, City Attorney
Ben Rosenfield, Controller
SF Main Library, Government Section

RISK MANAGEMENT APPROVAL OF INDEMNITY PROVISIONS

JANUARY – MARCH 2010

Date	Department	Other Party	Nature of Agreement	Approved Indemnity
2/10/2010	Planning Dept	Mr. Seth Boor	Agreement with Seth Boor who will donate his design and professional services in connection with the Guerrero Park Pavement to Park Project and the 17 th /Castro Pavement to Park Project. Design plans will be reviewed by City staff and re-worked as necessary to meet City codes and standards.	City to hold harmless Seth Boor.

RISK MANAGEMENT APPROVAL OF INDEMNITY PROVISIONS

APRIL – JUNE 2010

Date	Department	Other Party	Nature of Agreement	Approved Indemnity
6/21/2010	Tax Collectors Office	California Employment Development Department	State agency to provide necessary confidential information such as unemployment insurance claim and wage, employer, and client address to CCSF-BDR, and cannot be provided by any other party.	City to hold harmless the California Employment Development Department against any loss or liability arising out of the agreement.





Gavin Newsom
Mayor

Edwin M. Lee
City Administrator

GENERAL SERVICES AGENCY RISK MANAGEMENT DIVISION



Bos-11 page

TO: HONORABLE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

FROM: MATT HANSEN
DIRECTOR

DATE: September 23, 2010

RE: INDEMNIFICATION QUARTERLY REPORT
JULY - SEPTEMBER 2010

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 OCT -5 AM 10:05
BY *RZ*

This report is submitted to the Board of Supervisors as per Administrative Code 1.24, wherein the Risk Manager is required to maintain a record of all indemnification agreements approved under the authority granted to the Risk Manager by said Code and to submit quarterly reports of such approvals.

While the attached summary is a brief recap of the nature of the indemnity agreements, supporting documentation is filed in the Risk Management office of the General Services Agency.

Copy of this report will be furnished to the City Attorney and City Controller as per ordinance, and forwarded to the San Francisco Main Library for filing.

cc: Dennis Herrera, City Attorney
Ben Rosenfield, Controller
SF Main Library, Government Section

RISK MANAGEMENT APPROVAL OF INDEMNITY PROVISIONS

JULY – SEPTEMBER 2010

Date	Department	Other Party	Nature of Agreement	Approved Indemnity
8/17/2010	Planning Dept	Ms. Jane Martin	Agreement with Jane Martin who will donate her design and professional services in connection with the Naples Green Pavement to Park Project. Design plans will be reviewed by City staff and re-worked as necessary to meet City codes and standards.	City to hold harmless Jane Martin.



RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2010 OCT -5 AM 10: 06

BY _____
Pa

September 23, 2010

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

Re: Rent Board Annual Statistical Report 2009-10

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

Please find attached the department's annual statistical report with copies for each of the Board members.

Please call me at 252-4650 if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

Delene Wolf, Executive Director
Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board

encl.

- cc: Supervisor Michela Alioto-Pier
- Supervisor John Avalos
- Supervisor David Campos
- Supervisor David Chiu, Board President
- Supervisor Carmen Chu
- Supervisor Chris Daly
- Supervisor Bevan Dufty
- Supervisor Sean Elsbernd
- Supervisor Eric Mar
- Supervisor Sophie Maxwell
- Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi

21





Rent Board Memorandum

Date: September 23, 2010
 To: To Interested Parties
 From: Delene Wolf, Executive Director *D.W.*
 Re: Annual Statistical Report, FY 2009-10

RECEIVED
 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
 SAN FRANCISCO
 2010 OCT -5 AM 10:07
 BY *PC*

The following pages reflect the filings and activities at the Rent Board for the past fiscal year ending June 30, 2010. Overall, the number of petitions filed with the Board decreased by 20% from 1,509 in FY08-09 to 1,200 in FY09-10. The decrease in total petitions was in large part due to a significant reduction in the number of utility passthrough petitions filed with the Board (387 petitions in FY 08-09 compared to 244 petitions in FY09-10). Tenant in occupancy (Principal Place of Residence) petitions decreased 40% from 30 in FY 08-09 to 18 in FY 09-10. Landlord Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) requests increased by 50%, while tenant ADR requests increased by 25%.

Total eviction notices filed with the Board increased by about 4% from 1,315 to 1,372, while the number of tenant reports of alleged wrongful eviction decreased by 7% from 488 to 452. The number of units withdrawn from the rental market under the Ellis Act decreased from 165 to 108 units.

Highlights of some of the tables are as follows (percentages as compared to last year):

- 40% 1.21 (Principal Place of Residence) Petitions
- 37% Utility Passthroughs
- 36% Landlord Appeals
- 35% Operating and Maintenance Petitions
- 33% Capital Improvement Petitions
- 33% Landlord Petitions
- 18% Tenant Appeals
- 10% Tenant Petitions
- 7% Allegations of Wrongful Evictions
- +4% Eviction Notices
- +25% Tenant ADR
- +50% Landlord ADR



City and County of San Francisco



Gavin Newsom
Mayor

*The Report is on
file in the Office
of the Clerk of
the Board.*

BOS-11, c page
Department of Public Health

Mitchell H. Katz, MD
Director of Health

October 1, 2010

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 OCT -5 PM 1:19
BY: *mc*

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

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

Enclosed for your information is a complete set of the Annual 2010 Title XV Evaluation Reports for San Francisco detention facilities, as required by the California Board of Corrections under Section 459 of the California Health and Safety Code.

A team of professionals from the San Francisco Department of Public Health, including registered dietitians, an environmental health inspector, and a health care analyst performed the inspections. Facility administrators were given the opportunity to review and comment on the draft reports and written responses have been attached.

The following facilities were evaluated:

- All County Jail facilities
- SFPD holding cells
- SFGH Wards 7D, 7L, and Emergency Room area holding cell
- Juvenile Hall
- Log Cabin Ranch

Sincerely,

MITCHELL H. KATZ, MD
Director of Health

cc: Honorable Gavin Newsom, Mayor
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
William Siffermann, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer
California Board of Corrections



T-Mobile West Corporation
a subsidiary of T-Mobile USA Inc.
Engineering Development
1855 Gateway Boulevard, 9th Floor
Concord, California 94520

BY AK

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 SEP 29 PM 3:07

September 22, 2010

Anna Hom
Consumer Protection and Safety Division
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: T-Mobile West Corporation as successor in interest to Omnipoint Communications, Inc. d/b/a T-Mobile (U-3056-C) Notification Letter for T-Mobile Site No. SF53638A

This letter provides the Commission with notice pursuant to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California (CPUC) that with regard to the project described in Attachment A:

- (a) T-Mobile has obtained all requisite land use approval for the project described in Attachment A.
- (b) No land use approval is required because

A copy of this notification letter is being sent to the local government agency identified below for its information. Should there be any questions regarding this project, or if you disagree with the information contained herein, please contact Joni Norman, Senior Development Manager, for T-Mobile, at (925) 521-5987, or contact Ms. Anna Hom of the CPUC Consumer Protection and Safety Division at (415) 703-2699.

Sincerely,

Joni Norman
Sr. Development Manager
T-Mobile West Corporation
a subsidiary of T-Mobile USA Inc.

Enclosed: Attachment A

cc: City of San Francisco, Attn: Planning Director, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94102
City of San Francisco, Attn: City Manager, 1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102
City of San Francisco, Attn: City Clerk, 1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102

23


The first part of the document
 discusses the general principles
 of the system and its
 objectives. It also outlines
 the scope of the project and
 the roles of the various
 stakeholders involved.

The second part of the document
 provides a detailed description
 of the system's architecture and
 its components. It also
 discusses the implementation
 strategy and the expected
 benefits of the system.

The third part of the document
 discusses the system's security
 and privacy requirements. It
 also outlines the measures that
 will be taken to ensure the
 system's integrity and
 confidentiality.

The fourth part of the document
 discusses the system's
 performance and scalability
 requirements. It also outlines
 the measures that will be
 taken to ensure the system's
 reliability and availability.

The fifth part of the document
 discusses the system's
 user interface and usability
 requirements. It also outlines
 the measures that will be
 taken to ensure the system's
 ease of use and accessibility.



The sixth part of the document
 discusses the system's
 maintenance and support
 requirements. It also outlines
 the measures that will be
 taken to ensure the system's
 long-term viability and
 adaptability.

ATTACHMENT A

1. Project Location

Site Identification Number: SF53638A
Site Name: East Grandview Water Tank
Site Address: 482 Grand View Dr., San Francisco, CA 94080
County: San Francisco
Assessor's Parcel Number: 015-250-210
Latitude: 37° 39' 12.86" N
Longitude: 122° 23' 08.03" W

2. Project Description

Number of Antennas to be installed: 8
Tower Design: 13' Pipe mounts
Tower Appearance: Install eight (8) panel antennas onto 13' pipe mounts.
Tower Height: 13 feet
Size of Buildings: 150 sq feet

3. Business Addresses of all Governmental Agencies

City of San Francisco	City of San Francisco	City of San Francisco
Attn: Planning Director	Attn: City Manager	Attn: City Clerk
1650 Mission Street	1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl	1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl
Suite 400	San Francisco, CA 94102	San Francisco, CA 94102
San Francisco, CA 94102		

4. Land Use Approvals

Date Zoning Approval Issued: 09/02/10
Land Use Permit #: P09-0095, UP09-0025 & DR09-0054
If Land use Approval was not required:

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records.

2. It also covers the various methods used to collect and analyze data.

3. The following section describes the results of the experiments conducted.

4. These results show a clear correlation between the variables studied.

5. The data suggests that there is a significant impact on the overall system.

6. This finding is supported by the statistical analysis performed.

7. The conclusions drawn from this study are as follows:

8. First, it is essential to ensure that all data is properly documented.

9. Second, the use of standardized procedures is crucial for consistency.

10. Finally, regular communication and collaboration are key to success.

11. In summary, the findings of this study provide valuable insights.

12. These insights can be used to improve the efficiency of the process.

13. The next steps will involve further research and implementation.

14. We hope that this document has been helpful and informative.

15. Thank you for your attention and interest in this project.

16. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions.

17. We look forward to continuing our work together.

18. Sincerely,
[Signature]

19. [Name]
[Title]

20. [Address]
[City, State, Zip]

21. [Phone Number]
[Email Address]

22. [Date]



T-Mobile West Corporation
a subsidiary of T-Mobile USA Inc.
Engineering Development
1855 Gateway Boulevard, 9th Floor
Concord, California 94520

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 SEP 29 PM 3:07

September 22, 2010

Anna Hom
Consumer Protection and Safety Division
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: T-Mobile West Corporation as successor in interest to Omnipoint Communications, Inc. d/b/a T-Mobile (U-3056-C) Notification Letter for T-Mobile Site No. SF53572B

This letter provides the Commission with notice pursuant to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California (CPUC) that with regard to the project described in Attachment A:

(a) T-Mobile has obtained all requisite land use approval for the project described in Attachment A.

(b) No land use approval is required because

A copy of this notification letter is being sent to the local government agency identified below for its information. Should there be any questions regarding this project, or if you disagree with the information contained herein, please contact Joni Norman, Senior Development Manager, for T-Mobile, at (925) 521-5987, or contact Ms. Anna Hom of the CPUC Consumer Protection and Safety Division at (415) 703-2699.

Sincerely,

Joni Norman
Sr. Development Manager
T-Mobile West Corporation
a subsidiary of T-Mobile USA Inc.

Enclosed: Attachment A

cc: City of San Francisco, Attn: Planning Director, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94102
City of San Francisco, Attn: City Manager, 1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102
City of San Francisco, Attn: City Clerk, 1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102

24

REPORT

The following information was obtained from the records of the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, regarding the land parcels described herein.

The land parcels described herein are situated in the County of [County Name], State of [State Name]. The parcels are described as follows:

Parcel 1: [Detailed description of Parcel 1, including acreage and location details].

Parcel 2: [Detailed description of Parcel 2, including acreage and location details].

Parcel 3: [Detailed description of Parcel 3, including acreage and location details].

Parcel 4: [Detailed description of Parcel 4, including acreage and location details].

The above parcels are situated in the vicinity of [Location], and are subject to the following conditions:

[Detailed list of conditions and restrictions applicable to the parcels, including any easements or encumbrances.]

Prepared by: [Name of the official or agency responsible for the report].

This report is prepared for the use of the [Agency/Department] and is not intended to constitute an offer of insurance or any other financial product.

ATTACHMENT A

1. Project Location

Site Identification Number: SF53572B
Site Name: Market St Colo
Site Address: 555 Market St, San Francisco, CA 94105
County: San Francisco
Assessor's Parcel Number: 3708-057
Latitude: 37° 47' 24.43" N
Longitude: 122° 23' 56.10" W

2. Project Description

Number of Antennas to be installed: 6
Tower Design: Rooftop
Tower Appearance: Install six (6) panel antennas mounted on upper rooftop.
Tower Height: 358 feet
Size of Buildings: 168 sq feet

3. Business Addresses of all Governmental Agencies

City of San Francisco	City of San Francisco	City of San Francisco
Attn: Planning Director	Attn: City Manager	Attn: City Clerk
1650 Mission Street	1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl	1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl
Suite 400	San Francisco, CA 94102	San Francisco, CA 94102
San Francisco, CA 94102		

4. Land Use Approvals

Date Zoning Approval Issued: 09/07/10
Land Use Permit #: 2010.0806.8275
If Land use Approval was not required:

... and the ... of the ...

Section 1

Section 2

... and the ... of the ...

Section 3

... and the ... of the ...

Section 4

... and the ... of the ...

Section 5

... and the ... of the ...

... and the ... of the ...



To:
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Fw: Report Issued: Airport Commission: Concession Audit of Smarte Carte, Inc.

From: Controller Reports/CON/SFGOV
To: Angela Calvillo/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, BOS-Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV, BOS-Legislative Aides/BOS/SFGOV, Steve Kawa/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Greg Wagner/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Tony Winnicker/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Starr Terrell/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, ggiubbini@sftc.org, sfdocs@sfpl.info, gmetcalf@spur.org, CON-Media Contact/CON/SFGOV, CON-EVERYONE/CON/SFGOV, Cheryl.Nashir@flysfo.com, Jean.Caramatti@flysfo.com, Wallace.Tang@flysfo.com, Gigi.Ricasa@flysfo.com, holstenl@smartecarte.com, ehlersm@smartecarte.com, Tara Collins/CTYATT@CTYATT, Michael Cohen/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Jennifer Entine Matz/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, john.martin@flysfo.com
Date: 09/28/2010 11:30 AM
Subject: Report Issued: Airport Commission: Concession Audit of Smarte Carte, Inc.
Sent by: Richard Kurylo

The Office of the Controller, City Services Auditor, has issued a report, Airport Commission: Concession Audit of Smarte Carte, Inc.

The report indicates that Smarte Carte over reported its gross revenues by \$74,314 in February 2009 and overpaid its rent for the month by \$10,677. Smarte Carte also improperly excluded from its gross revenues credit card transactions totalling \$32,489 during the audit period that were denied payment by its credit card processing company, and underpaid its rent to Airport by \$8,122 during the audit period. To determine the final rent for the audit period, the Airport needs to revise its year-end true-up of Smarte Carte's rent due and rent paid for each lease year, taking into account the errors in reported gross revenues identified above.

The audit also found that Smarte Carte correctly billed the Airport Commission for cart usage under the Customs Luggage program, and identified some other contract compliance issues, and Airport contract management issues.

To view the full report, please visit our website at: <http://co.sfgov.org/webreports/details.aspx?id=1188>

This is a send-only email address.

For questions regarding this report, please contact Ben Carlick at ben.carlick@sfgov.org or 415-554-7656, or the Controller's Office, Audits Unit, at 415-554-7469.

25



COMMISSIONERS
Jim Kellogg, President
Discovery Bay
Richard Rogers, Vice President
Montecito
Michael Sutton, Member
Monterey
Daniel W. Richards, Member
Upland
Mike Sutsos, Member
Sonoma

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER



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

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Fish and Game Commission

September 28, 2010

TO ALL AFFECTED AND INTERESTED PARTIES:

This is to provide you with a copy of the Notice of Findings for the Mountain Yellow-Legged Frog, which will be published in the California Regulatory Notice Register on October 1, 2010.

Sincerely,


Sheri Tiemann
Staff Services Analyst

Attachment

BY _____ AK _____

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 OCT - 1 PM 2:58



Copyright © 2000
by Pearson Education, Inc.

0-201-30600-0

ISBN 0-201-30600-0

**CALIFORNIA FISH AND GAME COMMISSION
NOTICE OF FINDINGS**

Mountain Yellow-Legged Frog
(Rana muscosa and Rana sierrae)

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, pursuant to the provisions of Section 2074.2 of the Fish and Game Code, the California Fish and Game Commission, at its September 15, 2010 meeting in McClellan, California, accepted for consideration the petition submitted to list the Mountain Yellow-Legged Frog (*Rana muscosa* and *Rana sierrae*) as endangered. Pursuant to subdivision (a)(2) of Section 2074.2 of the Fish and Game Code, the aforementioned species is hereby declared a candidate species as defined by Section 2068 of the Fish and Game Code.

Within one year of the date of publication of this notice of findings, the Department of Fish and Game shall submit a written report, pursuant to Section 2074.6 of the Fish and Game Code, indicating whether the petitioned action is warranted. Copies of the petition, as well as minutes of the September 15, 2010, Commission meeting, are on file and available for public review from Jon K. Fischer, Acting Executive Director, Fish and Game Commission, 1416 Ninth Street, Box 944209, Sacramento, California 94244-2090, phone (916) 653-4899. Written comments or data related to the petitioned action should be directed to the Commission at the aforementioned address.

Fish and Game Commission

September 21, 2010

Jon K. Fischer
Acting Executive Director

COMMISSIONERS
Jim Kellogg, President
Discovery Bay
Richard Rogers, Vice President
Montecito
Michael Sutton, Member
Monterey
Daniel W. Richards, Member
Upland
Mike Sutsos, Member
Sonoma

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER



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

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Fish and Game Commission

September 28, 2010

TO ALL AFFECTED AND INTERESTED PARTIES:

This is to provide you with a copy of the Notice of Findings for the Pacific fisher, which will be published in the California Regulatory Notice Register on October 1, 2010.

Sincerely,


Sheri Tiemann
Staff Services Analyst

Attachment

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 SEP 30 PM 3:49
BY AK

27

03/11/2011

01/11/2011

01/11/2011

NOTICE OF FINDINGS
Pacific fisher
(*Martes pennanti*)

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Fish and Game Commission (Commission), at its June 23, 2010 meeting in Folsom, California, made a finding pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2075.5, that the petitioned action to add the Pacific fisher (*Martes pennanti*) to the list of threatened or endangered species under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA)(Fish & G. Code, § 2050 et seq.) is not warranted. (See also Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (i)(1).)

I.
BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On January 23, 2008, the Center for Biological Diversity (Center) petitioned the Commission to list the Pacific fisher as a threatened or endangered species under CESA.¹ (Cal. Reg. Notice Register 2008, No. 8-Z, p. 275; see also Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (a); Fish & G. Code, § 2072.3.) The Commission received the petition and, pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2073, referred the petition to the Department of Fish and Game (Department) for its evaluation and recommendation. (*Id.*, § 2073.) Thereafter, on June 27, 2008, the Department submitted its initial Evaluation of Petition: Request of Center for Biological Diversity to List the Pacific fisher (*Martes pennanti*) as Threatened or Endangered (June 2008) (hereafter, the 2008 Candidacy Evaluation Report) to the Commission at its meeting in Upland, California, recommending that the petition be rejected pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2073.5, subdivision (a)(1). (See also Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (d).)

On August 7, 2008, at its meeting in Carpinteria, California, the Commission considered the Department's 2008 Candidacy Evaluation Report and related recommendation, public testimony, and other relevant information, and voted to reject the Center's petition to list the Pacific fisher as a threatened or endangered species pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2074.2, subdivision (a)(1). In so doing, the Commission determined there was not sufficient information to indicate that the petitioned action may be warranted. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (e)(1); see also Cal. Reg. Notice Register 2009, No. 8-Z, p. 285.)

On February 5, 2009, at its meeting in Sacramento, California, the Commission voted to postpone and delay the adoption of findings ratifying its August 2008 decision, indicating it would reconsider its earlier action at the next Commission meeting. (Cal. Reg. Notice Register 2009, No. 8-Z, p. 285.) On March 4, 2009, at its meeting in Woodland, California, the Commission set aside its August 2008 determination rejecting the Center's petition, designating the Pacific fisher as a

¹ The definitions of endangered and threatened species for purposes of CESA are found in Fish and Game Code sections 2062 and 2067, respectively.

candidate species under CESA.² (Fish & G. Code, § 2074.2, subd. (a)(2), Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (e)(2).) In reaching its decision, the Commission considered the petition, the Department's 2008 Candidacy Evaluation Report, public comment, and other relevant information, and determined based on substantial evidence in the administrative record of proceedings that the petition included sufficient information to indicate that the petitioned action may be warranted. The Commission adopted findings to the same effect at its meeting in Lodi, California, on April 8, 2009, publishing notice of its determination as required by law on April 24, 2009. (Cal. Reg. Notice Register 2009, No. 17-Z, p. 609; see also Fish & G. Code, §§ 2074.2, subd. (b), 2080, 2085.)

On April 8, 2009, the Commission also took emergency action pursuant to the Fish and Game Code and the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) (Gov. Code, § 11340 et seq.), authorizing take of Pacific fisher as a candidate species under CESA, subject to various terms and conditions. (See Fish & G. Code, §§ 240, 2084, adding Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 749.5; Cal. Reg. Notice Register 2009, No. 19-Z, p. 724.) The Commission extended the emergency take authorization for Pacific fisher on two occasions, effective through April 26, 2010. (*Id.*, 2009, No. 45-Z, p. 1942; Cal. Reg. Notice Register 2010, No. 5-Z, p. 170.) The emergency take authorization repealed by operation of law on April 27, 2010.

Consistent with the Fish and Game Code and controlling regulation, the Department commenced a 12-month status review of Pacific fisher 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 Pacific fisher, possessing the knowledge and expertise 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 Fisher (*Martes pennanti*) in California (February 2010) (Status Review), which the Department submitted to the Commission at its meeting in Ontario, California, on March 3, 2010. The Department recommended to the Commission based on its Status Review and the best science available to the Department that designating Pacific fisher as a threatened or endangered species under CESA is not warranted. (Fish & G. Code, § 2074.6; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (f).) Following receipt, the Commission made the Department's Status Review available to the public, inviting further review and input. (*Id.*, § 670.1, subd. (g).)

² The definition of a "candidate species" for purposes of CESA is found in Fish and Game Code section 2068.

On March 26, 2010, the Commission published notice of its intent to begin final consideration of the Center's petition to designate Pacific fisher as an endangered or threatened species at a meeting in Monterey, California, on April 7, 2010. (Cal. Reg. Notice Register 2010, No. 13-Z, p. 454.) At that meeting, the Commission heard testimony regarding the Center's petition, the Department's Status Review, and an earlier draft of the Status Review that the Department released for peer review beginning on January 23, 2010 (Peer Review Draft). Based on these comments, the Commission continued final action on the petition until its May 5, 2010 meeting in Stockton, California, a meeting where no related action occurred for lack of quorum. That same day, however, the Department provided public notice soliciting additional scientific review and related public input until May 28, 2010, regarding the Department's Status Review and the related peer review effort. The Department briefed the Commission on May 20, 2010, regarding additional scientific and public review, and on May 25, 2010, the Department released the Peer Review Draft to the public, posting the document on the Department's webpage. On June 9, 2010, the Department forwarded to the Commission a memorandum and related table summarizing, evaluating, and responding to the additional scientific input regarding the Status Review and related peer review effort.

On June 23, 2010, at its meeting in Folsom, California, the Commission considered final action regarding the Center's petition to designate Pacific fisher as an endangered or threatened species under CESA. (See generally Fish & G. Code, § 2075.5; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (i).) In so doing, the Commission considered the petition, public comment, the Department's 2008 Candidacy Evaluation Report, the Department's 2010 Status Review, and other information included in the Commission's administrative record of proceedings. Following public comment and deliberation, the Commission determined, based on the best available science, that designating Pacific fisher as an endangered or threatened species under CESA is not warranted. (Fish & G. Code, § 2075.5(1); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (i)(2).) At the same time, the Commission directed its staff in coordination with the Department to prepare findings of fact consistent with the Commission's determination for consideration and ratification by the Commission at a future meeting.

II. STATUTORY AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK

The Commission has prepared these findings as part of its final action under CESA regarding the Center's January 2008 petition to designate Pacific fisher as an endangered or threatened species under CESA. As set forth above, the Commission's determination that listing Pacific fisher is not 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.)³

The CESA listing process for Pacific fisher began in the present case with the Center's submittal of its petition to the Commission in January 2008. (Cal. Reg. Notice Register 2008, No. 8-Z, p. 275.) The regulatory process that ensued is described above in some detail, along with related references to the Fish and Game Code and controlling regulation. The CESA listing process generally is also described in some detail in published appellate case law in California, including

- *Mountain Lion Foundation v. California Fish and Game Commission* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 105, 114-116;
- *California Forestry Association v. California Fish and Game Commission* (2007) 156 Cal.App.4th 1535, 1541-1542;
- *Center for Biological Diversity v. California Fish and Game Commission* (2008) 166 Cal.App.4th 597, 600; and
- *Natural Resources Defense Council v. California Fish and Game Commission* (1994) 28 Cal.App.4th 1104, 1111-1116.

The "is not warranted" determination at issue here for Pacific fisher 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 Pacific fisher, the Commission made the finding under section 2075.5(1) that the petitioned action is not 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.)

³ The Commission, pursuant to this authority, may add, remove, uplist, downlist, or choose not to list 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) and (2).) In practical terms, any of these actions is commonly referred to as subject to CESA's "listing" process.

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 Pacific fisher 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.

Fish and Game Code section 2070 provides similar guidance. This section provides that the Commission shall add or remove species from the list of endangered and threatened species 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 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 Pacific fisher 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, subs. (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 designating Pacific fisher as an endangered or threatened species under CESA is not warranted are set forth in detail in the Commission's administrative record of proceedings. Substantial evidence in the administrative record in support of the Commission's determination includes, but is not limited to, the Department's 2008 Candidacy Evaluation Report and 2010 Status Review, and other information specifically presented to the Commission and otherwise included in the Commission's administrative record as it exists up to and including the Commission meeting in Folsom, California, on June 23, 2010, and up to and including the adoption of these findings.

The Commission finds the substantial evidence highlighted in the preceding paragraph, along with other substantial evidence in the administrative record, supports the Commission's determination that the continued existence of Pacific fisher in the State of California is not in serious danger or 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 Pacific fisher as an endangered or threatened species under CESA is not warranted. The Commission finds in this respect that the Pacific fisher is not in serious danger of becoming extinct throughout all, or a significant portion, of its range. Similarly, the Commission finds that, although the Pacific fisher is not presently threatened with extinction, it is also unlikely to become an endangered species in the foreseeable future in the absence of the special protection and management efforts required by CESA.

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

designating Pacific fisher as an endangered or threatened species under CESA is not warranted:

1. Survey and monitoring information from private timberlands, some in collaboration with the Department, indicates fisher inhabit forests that are not late successional.
2. Over the past twenty or more years, forests on public lands have undergone changes in management and direction, including significant protections for forest habitats beneficial to fisher. On private lands, the State has instituted Forest Practice Rules and ensured compliance with CEQA, both of which benefit fisher habitat values.
3. Trapping and poisoning of fisher and its prey has been made unlawful, thereby eliminating a significant historical mortality factor.
4. Comparative evidence between the historical and modern fisher populations indicates fisher are likely as numerous now, if not more numerous, than during the period 1910-1940. There is no indication of a fisher population decline in the southern Sierra, northern California, or statewide since the 1920s era.
5. There have been studies that included examination of predation, disease, and competition, however none have demonstrated that fisher populations are unduly at risk from these mortality factors. While these factors do affect fisher, there is not evidence that they limit populations.
6. Current fisher populations are not at risk of catastrophic population decline from wildfires. Modeling may demonstrate impacts to fisher populations from large and frequent fires; however current fuels management activities and other forest management prescriptions may reduce fuel loading and effects to fisher. Southern California forest managers in particular are actively selecting for conditions supporting fisher.
7. Management activities underway, such as the translocation effort in the northern Sierra Nevada, demonstrate that active management rather than listing provides adequate protections to fisher.

IV. ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS INFORMING THE COMMISSION'S FINAL DETERMINATION

The Commission's determination that designating Pacific fisher as an endangered or threatened species under CESA is not warranted is informed by various additional considerations. In general, the Fish and Game Code contemplates a roughly 12-month long CESA listing process before the Commission, including multiple opportunities for public and Department review and input, and peer review specifically whenever possible. (See generally Fish & G. Code, § 2070 et seq.; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1.) The CESA listing process for Pacific fisher, in contrast, is approaching the 3-year mark. This length of time is not unusual compared to other recent CESA listing actions by

the Commission.⁴ What the length of time does underscore in the present case, however, is the depth, breadth, and complexity of the scientific and legal issues that the Commission has considered in making its final determination regarding Pacific fisher. This section highlights some of those issues to more fully document the Commission's final determination in the present case.

From the initial receipt of the Center's petition in January 2008 through adoption of these findings in September 2010, the Commission received numerous comments and other significant public input regarding the status of Pacific fisher from a biological and scientific standpoint, and with respect to the petitioned action under CESA, including the listing process generally. For example, considerable controversy surrounded the Department's 2010 Status Review and its related peer review effort. Similarly, the Commission received many comments focusing on the current and historical status of Pacific fisher throughout all or a significant portion of its range. The Commission also received comments regarding the related status of Pacific fisher under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA)(16 U.S.C. § 1531 et seq.). (See 69 Fed.Reg. 18770 (April 8, 2004).) Finally, the Commission received various comments and other important information regarding a number of scientific issues related to the status of Pacific fisher in California. The Commission, as highlighted below, was informed by and considered all of these issues, among others, in making its final determination that designating Pacific fisher as an endangered or threatened species under CESA is not warranted. (Fish & G. Code, § 2075.5(1); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (i)(2).)

A. The Peer Review Effort Informing the Commission's Final Determination

The Commission received a number of comments during the CESA listing process expressing concern regarding the Department's peer review effort pursuant to Title 14, section 670.1, subdivision (f)(2), of the California Code of Regulations. Various individuals and other interested members of the public expressed concern to the Commission that the Department, for example, failed to seek peer review as required by the controlling regulation or that the Department's related effort fell short of the overall mark under Title 14. Individuals and interested members of the public also highlighted changes between the Department's Peer Review Draft and final 2010 Status Review as

⁴ For example, with respect to the California tiger salamander, the species most recently designated as endangered or threatened under CESA, the Commission received the petition on January 30, 2004, and adopted findings that listing is warranted on May 20, 2010. (See Cal. Reg. Notice Register 2004, No. 9-Z, p. 270; Cal. Reg. Notice Register 2010, No. 23-Z, p. 855). Likewise, the CESA listing process for the longfin smelt, and not the related subsequent action under the APA, occurred over the time period from August 14, 2007 to June 25, 2009. (Cal. Reg. Notice Register 2007, No. 36-Z, p. 1512; 2009, No. 24-Z, p. 924. Similarly, the delisting of the Brown pelican, and again not the related subsequent APA process, occurred over the time period from May 26, 2006 to February 5, 2009. (Cal. Reg. Notice Register 2006, No. 24-Z, p. 784; 2008, No. 3-Z, p. 111.)

submitted to the Commission, criticizing the Department for: (1) failure to recirculate the latter document for additional peer review, (2) changes reflected in the final Status Review following peer review of the earlier draft, and (3) the Department's allegedly according peer-reviewed scientific studies and other relevant information equal weight in the final Status Review. The Commission is aware of and has considered all of these comments in making its final determination regarding Pacific fisher.

In considering the comments discussed above, the Commission acknowledges that some level of criticism directed at the Department's peer review effort may be appropriate. The Commission disagrees, however, that the Department failed to comply with the peer review requirement prescribed by regulation. For purposes of that regulation, peer review is defined as the analysis of a scientific report by persons of the scientific/academic community commonly acknowledged to be experts on the subject under consideration, possessing the knowledge and expertise to critique the scientific validity of the report. The same regulation directs the Department to seek such independent and competent peer review whenever possible during the 12-month status review period prescribed by Fish and Game Code section 2074.6. Likewise, the regulation casts the requirement to seek peer review whenever possible against the backdrop of the Department's broader obligation to solicit data and comments, pursuant to section 2074.4, to inform development of the status review ultimately submitted to the Commission. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (f)(2).)

In the present case, the administrative record of proceedings before the Commission establishes that the Department released the Peer Review Draft to a select group of independent, competent and respected members of the scientific community in February 2010. The administrative record also establishes that those individuals provided related input to the Department, input that is reflected in or otherwise informed the Department's final Status Review as submitted to the Commission in March 2010. The Department, in this respect, sought and obtained analysis of a scientific report during the status review period prescribed by Fish and Game Code section 2074.6, and it appears to the Commission that the related information submitted to the Department informed or was otherwise reflected in the Department's final Status Review submitted to the Commission. The Commission, in this respect, finds that the Department complied with the peer review requirements prescribed by Title 14, section 670.2, subdivision (f)(2). Having made this finding, the Commission also disagrees with the contention that the Department was required, as a matter of law, to seek peer review of the final 2010 Status Review as a result of changes to the earlier Peer Review Draft, or that the Department was required to seek peer review of the final 2010 Status Review either before or after submittal of that analysis to the Commission.

In making these findings, the Commission acknowledges the criticism aired by various members of the public and certain individual peer reviewers regarding

the process followed by the Department during development of the Status Review. Members of the public and certain peer reviewers also criticized the Department's Status Review from a substantive standpoint. Even the Commission, following submittal of the Status Review in March 2010, initially expressed concern about the process followed by the Department to conduct required peer review. Yet, while there is certainly room to improve the CESA listing process in its current form, including required peer review, the Commission disagrees that the process followed by the Department to seek peer review in the present case failed to comply with Title 14, section 670.2, subdivision (f)(2). The same is true of criticism leveled against the Department's substantive conclusions in the final Status Review; that is, the existence of substantive disagreement regarding points established by, or the reasonable inferences appropriately drawn from, relevant scientific information, does not itself establish that the Department failed to conduct required peer review.

Importantly, when the Department submitted the final Status Review to the Commission in March 2010, the Commission made the analysis available to the public as required by law. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (g)(2).) Thereafter, in response to related controversy and at the Commission's urging, the Department subjected the final Status Review to additional public and scientific review for a near month-long period during May 2010, also releasing the earlier Peer Review Draft to the public on May 25, 2010. The Department, in turn, prepared and submitted to the Commission a memorandum dated June 9, 2010, describing and analyzing the scientific information received by the Department in response to the request for additional scientific review. Taken together, in the Commission's opinion, these combined efforts provided the Commission with the robust public discourse and the type of information intended by the peer review provision in Title 14, along with, more importantly, the broader statutory charge that Commission listing determinations under CESA are based on the best scientific information available. (See, e.g., Fish & G. Code, § 2074.6.)

Finally, as part of the controversy surrounding the Department's peer review effort, the Commission received a number of comments critical of how much relative weight or not that the Department gave to certain information discussed in or relevant to the Status Review. The Commission also received various comments contending that certain Department scientists may have disagreed with or expressed criticism of the Department's final recommendation to the Commission regarding the petitioned action. The Commission finds that, in many instances, these comments and the related criticism reflect differences in opinion not necessarily related to the body of scientific evidence and other information regarding the status of Pacific fisher in California, or what can be reasonably inferred from that evidence and information from a biological standpoint. Instead, the comments and criticism reflect differences in opinion regarding whether that body of evidence and information provides sufficient information to indicate that the petitioned action is or is not warranted.

B. The Status of Pacific Fisher Throughout All or a Portion of Its Range and the Existing Northern and Southern Populations

The Commission received a number of comments during the CESA listing process calling for more robust, individualized analysis of the two distinct population of Pacific fisher in northern and southern California. A number of comments asserted that, despite the related information already before the Commission, without this additional population-specific analysis by the Department the Commission could not assess whether Pacific fisher is in serious danger of becoming extinct or, absent listing under CESA, threatened with extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range. (See generally Fish & G. Code, §§ 2062, 2067.) Finally, some comments indicated that, because there is no evidence of a persistent population of Pacific fisher in the northern and central Sierra Nevada, a recognized portion of the species' historical range, designating Pacific fisher as an endangered or threatened species under CESA is warranted per se.

The Commission disagrees that the lack of evidence of a persistent population of Pacific fisher in the northern and central Sierra Nevada for nearly the last century compels a listing "is warranted" determination by the Commission for Pacific fisher. Information before the Commission indicates Pacific fisher in this portion of the species' historical range declined significantly as the result of trapping and related practices in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Other information before the Commission indicates that, while there are a number of documented observations of Pacific fisher in this portion of the species' historical range over the last number of decades, there is no evidence of a persistent population within the northern and central Sierra Nevada for the last 80 years at a minimum. This information is an indication that the current status of Pacific fisher in the northern and central Sierra Nevada has likely improved relative to the species' status following the decline in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Evidence before the Commission also indicates that recent species translocation efforts by the Department in collaboration with the academic and regulated communities, among other things, is also improving the status of Pacific fisher overall, with respect to the southern population, and Pacific fisher in the southern Sierra Nevada. In short, the Commission recognizes there is no current evidence of a persistent population of Pacific fisher in the northern and central Sierra Nevada a portion of the species' historical range in California. Yet, the evidence before the Commission indicates that the status of the two California populations of Pacific fisher within the species' historical range has been and is stable, and likely improving as of late.

Against this backdrop, the Commission recognizes that Pacific fisher declined significantly in the northern and central Sierra Nevada as a result of trapping and related activity in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Likewise, the Commission recognizes that, while there have been a number of documented

observations of the species over the last number of decades, there is no evidence of a current persistent population in this portion of the species' historical range. The Commission disagrees, however, that the lack of evidence of a persistent population of Pacific fisher in the northern and central Sierra Nevada constitutes sufficient scientific information in and of itself to indicate that the petitioned action is warranted for Pacific fisher as a whole, or for the northern and southern populations respectively. The Commission has reached this determination informed by the Department's Status Review and related public comments, and other scientific information, recognizing and understanding the scientific information regarding the lack of a persistent population in the northern and central Sierra Nevada contributes to the species' vulnerability overall, as well as the northern and southern populations, respectively. In the Commission's opinion, however, there is not sufficient scientific information to indicate that the continued existence of Pacific fisher is, or the northern and southern populations are, respectively, in serious danger or threatened by the lack of a persistent population in the northern and central Sierra Nevada, alone or in combination with other threats.

The Commission's final determination is also based on relevant statutory language. Section 2062 of the Fish and Game Code defines an endangered species, in pertinent part, as a species "in serious danger of becoming extinct through all, or a significant portion, of its range[.]" Section 2067, in turn, defines threatened species as a species "that, although not presently threatened with extinction, is likely to become an endangered species in the foreseeable future[.]" In the Commission's opinion, the quoted language, when given its ordinary meaning and construed in context, denotes a present-tense condition of being at risk of a future, undesired event. To say a species "is in danger" in an area where it no longer exists (i.e., in a portion of its historical range) is not consistent with the common ordinary meaning of phrase at issue. In addition to "range" meaning California for purposes of CESA (*California Forestry Association, supra*, 156 Cal.App.4th at pp. 1549-1551), for purposes of the issue at hand, it strikes the Commission that range must mean current occupied range and not historical range. This interpretation is further supported in the Commission's opinion by the fact that, assessing whether a species is endangered involves consideration of "present or threatened" (i.e., future), rather than past "modification or destruction of its habitat." (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (i)(1)(A).) Taken together, the Commission does not agree that the lack of evidence of a persistent population of Pacific fisher in the northern and central Sierra is a basis per se to conclude that the petition action is warranted.

C. The Status of Pacific Fisher under the Federal Endangered Species Act

On April 8, 2004, the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (Service) added the West Coast distinct population segment (DPS) of Pacific fisher, which includes fisher in Washington, Oregon, and California, to the list of candidate species under the federal ESA. (69 Fed.Reg. 18770.) The Service designated Pacific fisher within

the West Coast DPS as candidate species after considering all available scientific and commercial information available at the time, and determining that designating fisher in the West Coast DPS as an endangered or threatened species under the federal ESA was warranted, but precluded by higher priority listing actions. (See generally 16 U.S.C. § 1533, subd. (b)(3)(B)(iii).) In so doing, the Service concluded that the overall magnitude of threats to the West Coast DPS is high, but that the immediacy of those threats was non-imminent. (69 Fed.Reg. at p. 18792.) At the same time the Service also assigned the West Coast DPS a Listing Priority Number of 6, an assignment the Service affirmed most recently in the Federal Register on November 9, 2009. (74 Fed.Reg. 57804.)

The Commission received a number of comments during the CESA listing process for Pacific fisher tied to the species' status under the federal ESA. Principal among those comments is the contention that Pacific fisher's status under the federal ESA necessarily requires a similar finding by the Commission under CESA. Others questioned whether the Commission has the legal authority to reach a conclusion under CESA with respect to Pacific fisher in California different from the Service's finding under federal law relative to the West Coast DPS. Finally, one commenter correctly pointed out a Department misstatement early in the CESA listing process that failed to acknowledge the federal candidate status of the West Coast DPS is premised on a Service finding that listing is warranted, but precluded under the federal ESA.

In making its final determination under CESA the Commission carefully considered the Service's findings and analysis under the federal ESA related to the West Coast DPS. The Commission also carefully considered related public comment and other information and evidence in its own administrative record of proceedings. With respect to the petitioned action under CESA, the Commission is charged by law to review and exercise its independent judgment in determining whether to designate Pacific fisher in California as an endangered or threatened species. The Commission, in this respect, must reach its own conclusion regarding the status of Pacific fisher in California independent of, but informed by, among other things, the Service's related findings under the federal ESA. The Commission is not obligated to adopt or otherwise compelled to find that the petitioned action is warranted under CESA as a result of the species' status under the federal ESA. Instead, the Commission must carefully review and consider the scientific and other information as included in the administrative record of proceedings, which it has, and reach its own conclusion as to whether there is sufficient scientific information to indicate that the petitioned action is warranted.

D. Various Scientific Issues Related to the Petitioned Action and Status of Pacific fisher in California

Throughout the petition evaluation and status review process, the Commission received a broad spectrum of scientific information, as well as additional information beyond that, for which there exists vigorous, appropriate, robust discourse that is critical to informing the determination required by the regulatory framework that lies with the Commission. The discussion surrounding this information, which occurred via public comments aired orally at Commission meetings and via comment letters, is an encouraged part of the evaluation process which helped to inform and influence the Commission's ultimate determination.

One topic about which the Commission received a great deal of discussion was whether managed timberland provides habitat elements supporting all essential Pacific fisher life requirements, such as denning, resting, and rearing young. Some comments asserted that individuals of the species are thriving on managed timberland, proving the sufficiency of this habitat. Comments on the opposite end of the spectrum assert that managed timberland does not resemble that described by scientists as being favorable for fisher, and may be of poor quality for fisher. The totality of the information received by the Commission does not support a finding that the available habitat for Pacific fisher is insufficient to support the species' life requirements.

Another topic about which the Commission received competing information was whether the southern Sierra fisher population's isolation makes it more vulnerable to threats such as fire, disease, predation, and stochastic events. Some comments assert that threats such as logging, roads, disease, predation, small population size, and development can impact the fisher population cumulatively, and therefore represent a significant threat to the population's continued existence. Opposing comments assert that the southern population has endured for many decades despite these extant threats, so its isolation alone is not an indicator of serious danger or immediate threat to the continued existence of the population. As discussed above, the Pacific fisher populations in California have been isolated for decades, if not a century, during which time neither stochastic events nor the enumerated threats have resulted in the extinction of either population. The Commission cannot conclude based on the information before it that the relative isolation of the two distinct California fisher populations poses an imminent threat to the species' or either populations' continued existence, including in combination with other threats, such that listing is warranted.

A third magnet for robust debate was the question of whether the geographic gap between the two California fisher populations reflects a contraction in population size and constitutes an indicator of population instability. Some comments assert that the two populations are thriving and that the gap does not impact the survival of the species. Opposing comments assert that the geographic separation has caused both genetic differences between the populations, as well as a corresponding increase in genetic similarity among individuals within each

population, representing yet another threat to the continued existence of fisher in the California. As discussed above, substantial evidence in the administrative record of proceedings before the Commission indicates that the gap in geographic range has existed for decades, if not a century, so the passage of time itself has answered the question as to whether the geographic gap poses a serious danger or threat of extinction in the foreseeable future to fisher populations in California. In light of the evidence before it, the Commission cannot conclude that the geographic gap between the two California fisher populations constitutes evidence that the Pacific fisher is at serious danger of extinction or threatened with extinction in the foreseeable future such that listing is warranted.

A final topic that received much attention was whether the Department's ongoing reintroduction effort will benefit fisher long term, since the release sites are located on managed timberlands. Some comments point to the reintroduction effort as evidence that the Department considers fisher to be in need of the protection afforded by listing. Some of these same commenters also note the uncertainty of whether the translocation effort will be a success to assert that the effort does not remove the imminent threat to the survival of the species that the petition suggests. Opposing comments assert that the availability of suitable habitat as yet unpopulated by the species makes reintroduction a valuable tool for expanding its available range and allowing the species to grow. The totality of the information received by the Commission does not support a finding that the available habitat for Pacific fisher is insufficient to support the species' life requirements, and the Department's relocation efforts further reinforce the Commission's determination that listing is not warranted.

Finally, the issues highlighted in this section represent only a portion of the complex issues aired and considered by the Commission during the CESA listing process for Pacific fisher. The issues addressed here in these findings represent some, but not all of the information, issues, and considerations affecting the Commission's final determination. Other issues aired before and considered by the Commission are addressed in detail in the Commission's administrative record of proceedings.

V. FINAL DETERMINATION BY THE COMMISSION

The Commission has weighed and evaluated all information and inferences for and against designating Pacific fisher as an endangered or threatened species under CESA. This information includes scientific and other general evidence in the Center's 2008 petition, the Department's 2008 Candidacy Evaluation Report and 2010 Status Review, and the Department's related recommendations based on the best available science, written and oral comments received from members of the public, the regulated community, various public agencies, and the scientific community; 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 the best scientific information available indicates that the continued existence of Pacific fisher is not in serious danger or threatened by present or threatened modifications or destruction of the species' habitat, overexploitation, predation, competition, disease, or other natural occurrences or human-related activities. (See generally Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (i)(1)(A); Fish & G. Code, §§ 2062, 2067.) The Commission finds for the same reason that there is not sufficient scientific information at this time to indicate that the petitioned action is warranted. (See *Id.*, § 2070.) The Commission finds, as a result, that designating Pacific fisher, or the northern or southern populations, respectively, as an endangered or threatened species under CESA is not warranted and that, with adoption of these findings, Pacific fisher for purposes of its legal status under CESA shall revert to its status prior to the filing of the Center's petition. (*Id.*, § 2075.5(2); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 670.1, subd. (i)(2).)

Patrick T. Gardner
Deputy Chief - Operations
San Francisco Fire Department
698 Second Street
San Francisco, CA 94107
Work 415-558-3402
Fax 415-558-3407

Matier & Ross September 5, 2010.

Fire alarm: A "concerned taxpayer" tells us he and a friend were chagrined to see a San Francisco Fire Department ladder truck and crew helping hang a "Taste of Greece Festival" banner from the front of a Geary Boulevard church the other day - and tying up traffic in the process.

"Are we using city equipment and the right-of-way to benefit a church?" our inquiring mind, who asked not to be named for fear of retaliation, wanted to know.

Well, Fire Department spokeswoman Lt. **Mindy Talmadge** tells us firefighters did lend a hand to hang the banner because "one of our members goes to that church."

Talmadge said the truck was on duty at the time, and that the firefighters would have jumped into their gear and taken off had they been needed elsewhere.

"We do community service all day long - every day," she said.

Which, no doubt, is why everyone loves firefighters.

Read more:

<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2010/09/05/BAFM1F8GQS.DTL#ixzz11P20Y02y>

28

Office of the Mayor
City & County of San Francisco



Orig: Joy, BOS-11, COB
Leg Dip., City Attorney
Gavin Newsom Rules clerk
page 6x file

Notice of Appointment

October 7, 2010

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 OCT -7 PM 1:06
BY AK

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

Pursuant to Charter §4.114, I nominate Michael Kim for appointment to the San Francisco Port Commission.

Michael Kim is appointed to succeed Stephanie Shakofsky for a four-year term ending May 1, 2014. Please see the attached biography which will illustrate that Michael Kim's qualifications allow him to represent the communities of interest, neighborhoods and diverse populations of the City and County.

Should you have any questions, please contact my liaison to commissions, Matthew Goudeau, at 415-554-6674.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom
Mayor

29



Notice of Appointment

October 7, 2010


Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to Charter §4.114, I nominate Michael Kim for appointment to the San Francisco Port Commission.

Michael Kim is appointed to succeed Stephanie Shakofsky for a four-year term ending May 1, 2014.

I am confident that Michael Kim will serve our community well. Attached are his qualifications to serve, which demonstrate how the appointment represents the communities of interest, neighborhoods and diverse populations of the City and County of San Francisco.

I encourage your support and am pleased to advise you of this appointment.



Gavin Newsom
Mayor

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 OCT -7 PM 1:06
BY *W*

FILE NO.

MOTION NO.

1 [Motion confirming the appointment of Michael Kim to the Port Commission, term ending May
2 1, 2014]

3 **Motion confirming the appointment of Michael Kim to the Port Commission, term**
4 **ending May 1, 2014.**

5
6 RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco
7 does hereby confirm the reappointment by the Mayor of the following designate to serve as a
8 member of the San Francisco Port Commission, pursuant to the provisions of the California
9 Health and Safety Code, Section 33110, for the term specified:

10
11 Michael Kim, succeeding Stephanie Shakofsky, for a four-year term ending May 1,
12 2014.

MICHAEL KIM

(650) 346-2914

michael@cendanacapital.com

EXPERIENCE

CENDANA CAPITAL MANAGEMENT

Managing Partner

San Francisco, CA

January 2010 to Present

- Founder of investment management firm for next generation private equity fund of funds
- Initial investment focus on micro cap VC / institutional seed funds

RUSTIC CANYON PARTNERS

Partner

Redwood Shores, CA

July 2000 to December 2009

- One of three senior partners managing \$900 million in venture capital funds; 7 partners total
- Co-led fundraising effort for RCV III (\$207 million closed in October 2008)
- Area of specialization: communications infrastructure, clean technology/efficient energy and digital media
- Investments included: Archcom (lasers), Auxora/Confluent (fiber optics components), Dipity (social media aggregation), EM4 (components packaging and integration), Insync (RFID and asset tracking software), Twofish/LiveGamer (virtual goods transaction platform), MerchantCircle (local merchant network), Playfirst (casual games), Ohai (social games), Amber Networks (communications hardware), ODS-Petrodata (oil & gas media), GSI Commerce (ecommerce fulfillment & logistics).
- Advised senior management on strategic partnership strategies, building internal infrastructure, HR, financial control, introduction to potential customers, financing & exit strategy

SAN FRANCISCO EMPLOYMENT RETIREMENT SYSTEM

Commissioner

San Francisco, CA

March 2004 to September 2009

- One of seven Trustees who oversee the \$13 billion pension fund for employees of the City and County of San Francisco
- Major initiatives included: expansion of investment staff, risk measurement and search process for the new Executive Director
- Helped to devise, implement and enforce policies on portfolio review, governance, process improvements and communications
- Review appropriate asset allocation strategy and asset/liability planning
- Review new and existing fund managers in equities, fixed income, real estate and private equity
- Served as the President of the Board, Chairman of the Investment Committee, Personnel Committee and Finance Committee
- Appointed by the Mayor in March 2004 to serve a five year term

MORGAN STANLEY & CO. INCORPORATED

Mergers & Acquisitions

Menlo Park, CA

August 1997 to February 2000

- Member of the 15 person West Coast Technology M&A team ranked #1 worldwide for merger and acquisitions advisory services to technology companies
- Provided strategic advisory services and developed quantitative and qualitative analyses for client development, transaction structure and valuation

- Gained substantial experience negotiating and structuring transactions; high degree of client management
- Rated #1 worldwide in 1999; consistently rated Outstanding in review process
- Announced 27 transactions worth \$77Bn at announcement

THE CHASE MANHATTAN BANK, NA

New York, NY

Associate, Credit Risk Management

August 1992 to July 1995

- Determined appropriate exposure to US and international clients based on credit analysis
- Promoted to Associate in less than two years.
- Consistently rated at the highest performance levels
- Underwent 9 month credit analysis program including cash flow analysis

EDUCATION

THE WHARTON SCHOOL, University of Pennsylvania

Philadelphia, PA

Master of Business Administration

May 1997

- Major in Finance; Teaching Assistant for Advanced Corporate Finance
- Developed Internet-based business plan that was ranked #1 in Fall 1996 entrepreneur class

SCHOOL OF FOREIGN SERVICE, Georgetown University

Washington, DC

Master of Science in Foreign Service

May 1992

- Major in International Politics & Economics
- Dean's List, received honors certificate for International Business program

COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES, Cornell University

Ithaca, NY

Bachelor of Arts, *Cum Laude*

May 1990

- Major in Government, concentration in International Relations
- Honors thesis: "The Deregulation of Japanese Financial Markets"
- Dean's List, Chairman of Student Life Committee, Student Finance Commissioner

COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES & INTERESTS

- Trustee of the Asian Art Museum Foundation, which oversees the Asian Art Museum in San Francisco; served on the following Board Committees: Executive committee, Search committee, Strategic Long Range Planning committee, Marketing/Branding committee, Trustees committee and Compensation Committee (chairman in 2009); created the Young Trustees program
- Member of the Cornell University Council (2007 to present)
- Former co-chair of the Advisory Board of Symphonix, the young professionals' league of the San Francisco Symphony
- Co-Chair of 10th year Wharton reunion class and Committee member for 20th year Cornell reunion class
- Co-Chair of the Symphony Supper for the San Francisco Symphony Opening Gala (2009 and 2010)
- Co-Chair of the Aficionados for the San Francisco Fall Antiques Show (2010)
- Co-Chair of the Lords of the Samurai Opening Gala, Asian Art Museum (2009)



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION IX
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

BOS-11
Cpage

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 OCT -6 PM 4:18
BY _____

September 15, 2010

Dear Sir or Madam:

You have been identified as an interested party in the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) tentative decision to authorize changes to California's hazardous waste program, or your name appears on the mailing list for California's Department of Toxic Substances Control.

Enclosed is an advance copy of the legal advertisement that the EPA will be publishing regarding EPA's tentative decision to authorize California for revisions to its hazardous waste regulations. EPA intends to publish this Legal Advertisement as close in time as possible to the publication of the Federal Register notice of this decision. The **Federal Register** notice will be published on September 30, 2010. The Legal Advertisement will be published in the following newspapers: San Francisco Examiner, Sacramento Bee, and Los Angeles Daily News.

EPA is inviting public comment on the California revised program application and the Agency's tentative decision to authorize these revisions. The application was necessary under 40 Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) 271.21 due to changes in EPA's regulations.

Please note, the closing date for all written comments will be November 1, 2010.

Comments should be sent to Rebecca Smith, U.S. EPA Region IX (WST-2), 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105. For further information, contact Ms. Smith at (415) 972-3313.

Sincerely,

Jeff Scott, Director
Waste Management Division

Enclosure

30



United States Environmental Protection Agency

In accordance with Title 40 of the United States Code of Federal Regulations, Section 271.21(b)(4), the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is hereby giving notice of its proposal to approve the State of California's revised hazardous waste management program.

California has applied for final authorization for revisions to its hazardous waste program under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) (hereafter "Revised Program"). EPA reviewed California's application and has made a determination, subject to public review and comment, that the State's Revised Program satisfies all of the requirements necessary to qualify for final authorization. Thus, EPA intends to grant final authorization to California to implement its Revised Program, subject to the authority retained by EPA in accordance with the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984 (HSWA). California's authorization application will be available for public review and comment as specified below.

DATES: Written comments on California's program revision authorization application must be received by the close of business November 1, 2010. The proposed Federal Register notice was published on September 30, 2010.

ADDRESSES: EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA-R09-RCRA-2010-0598. Upon publication of this notice in the Federal Register, publicly available docket materials will be available electronically through www.regulations.gov or in hard copy at the following two locations:

California Department of Toxic Substances Control
1001 I Street, 22 Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814-2828
Business Hours: 9 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. and 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.
Monday through Thursday
Tel. (916) 324-0912
Maria Aliferis-Gjerde

U.S. EPA Region 9 Library
75 Hawthorne Street, 13th Floor
San Francisco, California 94105
Business Hours: 9 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. and 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.
Monday through Thursday
Tel. (415) 947-4406

Written comments should be sent to Rebecca Smith at the address below.

SUMMARY: California initially received final authorization to implement the RCRA hazardous waste management program on July 23, 1992, with an effective date of August 1, 1992 (57 FR 32726). On August 4, 2004, August 17, 2004 and October 28, 2009, California submitted final complete program revision applications for changes and additions to selected Federal RCRA regulations in accordance with 40 CFR 271.21. A complete listing of the revisions will be in the upcoming Federal Register.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rebecca Smith, Waste Management Division, WST-2, Environmental Protection Agency Region 9, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901; telephone number: (415) 972-3313; fax number: (415) 947-3533; e-mail address: smith.rebecca@epa.gov.



GAVIN NEWSOM
MAYOR

POLICE DEPARTMENT
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

THOMAS J. CAHILL HALL OF JUSTICE
850 BRYANT STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94103-4603

File 101135
BOS-11
cpage



BY
GEORGE GASCON
CHIEF OF POLICE
2010 OCT - 7 AM 9:37
RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

October 1, 2010

Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
#1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102


Dear Board of Supervisors:

Thank you for hearing the objection to the Planning Commission's approval of a new conditional use for entertainment at 1268 Grant Avenue in the Central District. The premises known as the "King of Thai" at 1268 Grant Avenue are emblematic of a restaurant exceeding their ABC License privilege by essentially turning their operation from a restaurant in another bar. This North Beach area already requires an unprecedented police presence and it is increasingly problematic dealing with alcohol related problems and behavior in this oversaturated area of the city.

There are over 3200 ABC licenses in San Francisco with an estimated 750 in the Central District alone. The area of 1268 Grant Avenue is over intensified with over 70 licenses in an area where the ABC recommends 14.

The venue was reprimanded for violating the Planning Code for converting into a non-conforming bar and has just, this past week, been given a Notice of Violation by Planning Department staff for other violations. Last week, the Planning Department admitted their own error in their finding since they did not do an inspection of the premise before the August hearing, but only did so after the exemption was granted. I agree with their new findings since the August hearing and believe that the conditional use permit should be rejected by the Board of Supervisors and not be returned to the Planning Commission for a new hearing.

Sincerely,


GEORGE GASCON
Chief of Police

legislation proposed

C R

to:

Board.of.Supervisors

10/07/2010 07:22 AM

Show Details

Why don't we San Franciscans ban the use of pesticides and herbicides on all city-owned lands? These products cause bees' colony collapse disorder. We could hopefully start a nationwide trend. Ban Monsanto's RoundUp and all other biotech products from city-owned lands.

Cheryl Richard

940 San Jose Ave. No. 4

San Francisco, CA 94110

(Noe Valley)

32

No on alcohol tax
michael hammond
to:
board.of.supervisors
10/01/2010 08:42 PM
Show Details

File 100865

I don't even drink, but think that's a bad idea. Something like that should be decided by the people, not a board the citizens don't know.

Mike hammond


33

U-page
BDS-11

California Alliance for Hospitality Jobs
268 Bush Street, Suite 200
San Francisco, CA 94104-0503




SEP 2010 PM 37



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

File #100865



Ready for more taxes and job losses?

The hospitality industry is hemorrhaging jobs in San Francisco due to the economic downturn. San Francisco's hospitality workers are critical to our economic recovery and we should be doing everything we can to protect those jobs. San Francisco supervisors are considering imposing new taxes on every single drink purchased in the city. The hospitality industry is the heart of our economy. New taxes will drive away customers and force businesses to eliminate jobs. Isn't it tough enough to sustain a business in San Francisco without the addition of another new tax?

Help us STOP alcohol taxes.

Fill out the section below and mail back.

Name: RACHEL LIM
Business/Organization: _____
Address: 239 BRANNAN ST., SF, CA
Email: _____
Signature: Rachel Lim



Learn more: www.savemycajob.com

Received 1 postcards from concerned citizens in opposition to proposed legislation concerning alcohol tax. File No. 100865

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 OCT -4 AM 8:55
BY DS

File 101031

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2010 SEP 30 PM 3:48

Bos-11
CoB, Leg Dep
By file
cpage

9/29/10

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

BY AK

SF Supervisors Appeal Hearing on proposed 222 2nd St. project, October 5, 2010

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Please kindly direct this letter is to the SF Board of Supervisors regarding the hearing planned above.

I am a resident at 246 2nd St., San Francisco. When I write the following I speak on behalf of hundreds of people, and many families in our building and the many other residential buildings immediately surrounding the 2nd/Howard corner.

I am not opposed to new construction at the location of the proposed 222 2nd St. project (2nd at Howard). Other local residents and I are, however, opposed to some of the specifics of the plan. Conceptually the problems are as follows:

- The neighborhood is being presented by developers as primarily commercial, when in fact there are a large and growing number of residences and families with children.
- The best design (not yet presented) would integrate well into a historic and mixed-use area, and would dominate light and wind to a lesser degree.
- At the recent Planning Commission meeting, which only narrowly approved the project (with several commissioners indicating that they were only voting in favor "for now"), it became clear that the developers are using a strategy to ask for too much and then to appear to make concessions, when in reality the concessions still only lead to a request that still requires exceptions, rather than trying to find the right design for the special nature of the neighborhood.
- At the Planning Commission meeting, the lead designer representing the project was asked something like "could the building be built in a different way that would address the concerns of the public and still be an attractive project to the developer", and he declined to answer... the clear unspoken answer was "yes".
- Open-space design is not easily accessible to the public.

There are other concerns as well, some of which are technical and that other citizens will certainly address, but the above may be the most important issues to local residents and businesses both large and small, that can clearly be addressed with excellent design.

Why provide exceptions and why not insist upon a design that works well in a historic and mixed-use area? This is an important area being revived in San Francisco, and will also connect directly to what will eventually be the "Folsom Boulevard" street-life concept, so it the way it will affect the perception of San Francisco is not insignificant.

Again, I/we are not against development. Rather, we are in favor of development, as long as it is smart, appropriate development. Please don't let powerful developers use their influence to push it through at the expense of the city's character and quality of life.

Please insist upon a design that we can all be proud of for decades and generations, and that will not damage quality of life and city attractiveness, for visitors, commuters and residents alike.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,


Greg Patterson

34



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 101031: Tishman Speyer - 222 2nd street

From: Alexi Arvanitidis <alexiarvan@yahoo.com>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 10/06/2010 08:57 AM
Subject: Tishman Speyer - 222 2nd street

In regards to the proposed non-code compliant office building at 222 2nd street, I am definitely opposed to its construction. I am a home owner at 246 2nd street and I would be very much opposed to the changes brought about by this building to our wonderful neighborhood.

If you have any questions or any further information regarding this project, and anything I can do to help contribute to this cause, please let me know. Thank you for your attention.

Best regards,
Alexi Arvanitidis

246 2nd Street
#602

35



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 101031: Regarding Case #2006.1106E, EIR for 222 2nd Street

From: Min Lee <minlee888@yahoo.com>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 10/05/2010 03:29 PM
Subject: Regarding Case #2006.1106E, EIR for 222 2nd Street

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am the owner of Unit #1202 at 246 2nd Street and would like to write to you regarding my concerns for the new proposed office building at 222 2nd Street.

I am aware of the hearing today, October 5th, and would have preferred to attend; however, I am in Los Angeles for business and cannot attend.

In lieu of my attendance, I would like to share my strong concerns regarding this office building. While I am aware that it is important for San Francisco both economically and culturally to maintain a vibrant business climate; I do feel that it should be balanced by concerns of the people who actually live in the city.

I have for most of my life traveled for work and lived in a variety of cities. I have never considered a city to be "home," until I moved here. In San Francisco, I found a truly wonderful place that seemed to balance commerce, business, and livability in one city. However, I feel that this project distorts that balance for the following reasons:

- 1) 222 2nd St. and the surrounding area is already crowded with businesses, condominiums, and office towers. I do not understand how a large office tower such as the one proposed will positively impact the neighborhood. There is such a thing as too much. I fear that it will be too much: too many cars, too much traffic, too much noise. The city has allowed a large number of residences to be built within this area. Consequently, the people who live in this area 24/7 should have their voices heard in regards to how much traffic, commerce, and people can be accommodated in this small area.
- 2) There is already a large amount of vacant office space in this area. Hence, there doesn't seem to be any need for additional office space. It seems to me that this request is not critical to the business community in this area and only detracts from the well-being of the people who live here.
- 3) In any city with large number of residences, I think open space is critical to have and maintain. It's one of the reasons why I much prefer San Francisco over New York. I would hope that San Francisco continues to maintain that philosophy instead of building every tall office tower that a developer desires. Moreover, I believe this specific request is out of standard for Shadow Impact. San Francisco strives to be a city of beauty, culture, and commerce. This building request seems counter to that goal.
- 4) Lastly, it is the people who make any city, including San Francisco, a desirable place to live. I would hope that our concerns are heard and acted upon. Given the glut of vacancies and the negative impact to congestion and neighborhood "livability", I feel strongly that the negatives outweigh the positives in this case.

Thank you for hearing my concerns and I am more than happy to provide additional feedback if it is needed or helpful.

Sincerely,

Min Lee
246 2nd St. #1202
San Francisco



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 101031 Proposed building at 222 Second Street

From: Ann Tubbs <anntubbs@yahoo.com>
To: "board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org" <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Date: 10/04/2010 02:06 PM
Subject: Proposed building at 222 Second Street

Thank you for agreeing to review the Planning Commission's shocking decision to approve the building proposed for this site, in complete disregard for the neighborhood's increasingly residential nature and for the commission's own criteria regarding bulk,, shadow, etc.

Please take the time, before your hearing, to visit the neighborhood, have a bite to eat or a drink at one of our cafes, watch the families....yes, with children...walking the sidewalks. Think of the damage that will be done with this hulking structure blocking sunlight and worsening traffic and air pollution in our neighborhood.

We are already surrounded by empty and half-empty office buildings. Companies are not moving out of San Francisco because they can't find office space. San Francisco is where young people want to live. They commute to their jobs in Novato and Silicon Valley and even Sacramento. Please, let's keep our city a pleasant, exciting place to live (and for tourists to visit).

At the very least, please apply the rules to this project!

Thank you,
Ann Tubbs

SF Chron uses Pejorative "Illegals" headline on 10/5 re undocumented immigrants

Kimo Crossman

to:

begelko, angelac, angelac, Luke Thomas, editor, editor, editor, paul, Sandy Close, Johnson, Hope, Allen Grossman, Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org, David Waggoner, David Chiu, David Campos, Ross Mirkarimi, Board of Supervisors, superdaly, Matt Dorsey, Richard Knee

10/05/2010 11:27 PM

Sent by:

kimocrossman@gmail.com

Please respond to kimo

Show Details

Security:

To ensure privacy, images from remote sites were prevented from downloading. Show Images

(BOS Clerk please make this part if the BOS Communications file)

The term "illegals" is a pejorative and demeaning phrase please work with SF Chronicle to educate.

BTW, I understand that typically the headline is written by someone other than the person who wrote the story.

<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2010/10/05/BAKA1FONOE.DTL&tsp=1>

Fight over illegals' tuition reaches high court

Bob Egelko, Chronicle Staff Writer

Tuesday, October 5, 2010

 Print  E-mail  Share  Comments (183)  Font | Size:  

MORE EDUCATION

S.F. 1st U.S. city to start college savings plan 10.05.10

Students left waiting at public schools 10.04.10

Cal sports cuts: tough call, but right one 10.02.10

(10-05) 18:21 PDT FRESNO -- The issue of benefits for illegal immigrants landed at the state Supreme Court on Tuesday, as out-of-state students challenged a law allowing anyone who has graduated from a California high school to pay in-state tuition at a public university, regardless of immigration status.

90



The 2002 law, intended to encourage youngsters to attend college, enables undocumented students to pay the same lower fees as other state residents - at the University of California, \$11,300 instead of \$34,000 a year.

A lawyer for 42 non-Californians who pay the higher fees at UC, state university and

36

community college campuses argued that the statute is discriminatory and violates federal immigration law.

"One of the privileges of U.S. citizenship is not being treated worse than an illegal alien," attorney Kris Kobach told the court at a hearing in Fresno.

He said California is flouting a 1998 federal law that prohibits states from providing benefits to illegal immigrants on the basis of their residence, unless a state makes the same benefits available to U.S. citizens who live in other states.

But Justice Kathryn Mickle Werdegar said the California law is not based on residence and instead reduces tuition for all students who went to high school in the state, no matter where they live when they apply to college.

And Justice Ming Chin cited UC reports that more than 70 percent of the students paying lower fees because of the law are U.S. citizens or legal residents, not illegal immigrants.

That's not enough, Kobach argued, because Congress intended to make all U.S. citizens eligible for at least the same benefits that illegal immigrants receive.

Justice Carol Corrigan questioned, however, whether federal lawmakers meant to "usurp how each state should decide to spend its education budget in terms of out-of-state tuition."

The case represents the court's first look at the controversy over immigration laws and California's authority to make its own rules.

Kobach, a law professor at the University of Missouri-Kansas City, was the chief drafter of the Arizona law requiring police to check the legal status of anyone they stop and reasonably suspect of being undocumented. A federal appeals court in San Francisco will hear arguments Nov. 1 in Arizona's appeal of a judge's ruling that found the law conflicted with federal regulation of immigration.

The topic also arose during Saturday's debate between the candidates for governor, in which Democrat Jerry Brown endorsed, and Republican Meg Whitman opposed, a bill that would allow state financial aid for illegal immigrants attending public colleges. Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger vetoed the measure last week, citing its cost.

Lawyers said nine other states have laws like the 2002 California statute allowing resident illegal immigrants to pay in-state tuition.

The state law "has enabled thousands of talented high school students ... to get an affordable education," said Ethan Schulman, lawyer for the UC regents.

But Kobach said the tuition reduction "creates an incentive for continued unlawful presence."

The suit seeks to overturn the state law and require illegal immigrants to pay out-of-state tuition. A ruling is due within 90 days.

The case is Martinez vs. Regents, S167791.

E-mail Bob Egelko at begeko@sfchronicle.com.

This article appeared on page **C - 1** of the San Francisco Chronicle

Read more: <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2010/10/05/BAKA1FONOE.DTL&tsp=1#ixzz11Yaz9RaB>

Gavin Newsom | Mayor

Tom Nolan | Chairman

Jerry Lee | Vice-Chairman

Cameron Beach | Director

Cheryl Brinkman | Director

Malcolm Heinicke | Director

Bruce Oka | Director

Nathaniel P. Ford Sr. | Executive Director/CEO

James J. Ludwig
66 Montclair Terrace
San Francisco, CA 94109


Dear Mr. Ludwig:

Mayor Newsom has forwarded your letter dated September 15, 2010 regarding the pilot Required Right Turn project on eastbound Market Street to us.

As you know, the Required Right Turn project on eastbound Market Street at Tenth and Sixth streets is a pilot program. We anticipate holding public hearings within the next two months to decide whether the required right turns on eastbound Market Street should be adopted as permanent regulations, modified or removed. We will notify you of these hearings when they have been scheduled.

If you would like to discuss this matter further, please feel free to contact me or Mr. Jerry Robbins of our staff at 701-4490. Thank you for your input on this important project.

Sincerely,



Bond M. Yee
Director of Sustainable Streets

Cc: Mayor Newsom
 Board of Supervisors

BY _____

AK

2010 OCT -5 PM 4: 21

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

1917

1917

1917



ROBERT MORALES
Secretary-Treasurer

SANITARY TRUCK DRIVERS AND HELPERS

Local No. 350

AFFILIATED WITH THE
INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS



Office: CEDAR HILL OFFICE BUILDING
295 89th STREET, SUITE 304
DALY CITY, CALIFORNIA 94015
Telephone: (650) 757-7290
FAX: (650) 757-7294

File 101225

orig: BTF clerk
Sup's Avalos, Murkaremi & Elsborn
AFFILIATED WITH
Joint Council of Teamsters No. 7
Bay Area Union Labor Party
cpage

October 4, 2010

The Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
C/O Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca. 94102-4689

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 OCT - 5 PM 4: 25
BY _____
AK

Re: **Board of Supervisors Meeting of Tuesday, October 5, 2010**
Matter # 101225 --Approving Landfill Disposal and Facilitation Agreements -
Department of the Environment - Recology San Francisco

Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to express Local 350's opposition to the approval of the above-referenced Agreement.


As you know, Local 350 represents Recology of San Francisco (*fka* Norcal) employees, including employees who transport and sort the waste at the designated landfills. Pursuant to the Department of the Environment's Request for Proposal for Landfill Disposal Capacity, Recology's proposal and the Landfill Disposal Agreement with the City reflects that San Francisco waste would be transported via rail rather than by truck. The Agreement also provides for use of landfill sites in Yuba and Solano Counties.

Approval of this Agreement will force the layoff of two groups of Local 350-represented Recology employees: (1) the drivers who transport San Francisco's waste to the landfill(s) and (2) the sorters, helpers, machine operators and related classifications now employed to sort waste received at the Alameda County landfill site.

Regarding the drivers, however laudable the environmental goals, the City must consider the displacement of longstanding employees who have hauled City waste to the landfill for years, in most cases, for decades. Many if not most of these longer haul drivers are no longer

38

SANCTIONED BY NEGLECT



~~AND PERMITTED BY
MAYOR GAVIN NEWSOM
SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT~~

AGENTS OF BLIGHT AND DISORDER

physically able to work on a refuse truck and if there will be no long haul jobs to be performed they will be subject to layoff. Given their age and the general condition of the economy, these drivers' alternative employment opportunities will be limited at best. The City's long experience has been that trucking of waste to the landfill is safe and cost effective. The employees who have long performed this work should not be rewarded with a layoff notice in the service of questionable environmental goals.

The employees working at the landfills specified in the Agreement are, we understand, un-represented and their wages and benefits are substantially less than that of the Recology-employed sorters, helpers and machine operators employed at the current Alameda landfill. Because the persons performing these tasks at the Yuba and Solano Counties sites apparently will not be Recology employees, the Landfill Disposal Agreement's standard minimum compensation, guaranteed health benefits, and "First Source Hiring" provisions will be inapplicable. If the City intends to contract for new landfill sites it has the responsibility to insure that the basic City contract employee protections apply to any landfill employees and that the existing Alameda County landfill employees have transfer rights.

In short, the Board cannot approve this Agreement until or unless the City and Recology have addressed the rights of the employees the Agreement seeks to displace. On this basis Local 350 urges you not to approve the Agreement.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Morales
Secretary-Treasurer

SAFE HARBOR INCOME TAX

CPAs & Tax Consultants

388 12 Avenue @ Geary

(415) 742-4249



**LOOK FOR ILLEGAL BANNER TIED FROM
THE TELEPHONE POLE TO THE BUILDING**



**AND THE ILLEGAL SIDEWALK SIGNS
CHAINED TO THE TRAFFIC SIGNAL POLES**



October 1, 2010

File 101253

Mitchell H. Katz, MD
Director of Health

BOS-11
cpage

Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Rm. 250
San Francisco, CA

Re: Resolution authorizing the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) to apply for the HIV Emergency Relief Grant Program (Ryan White Programs, Part A)

Dear Honorable Supervisors,

One of our resolutions, "Grant Application-Department of Public Health-Ryan White HIV Emergency Relief Program-\$36,118,233", File #101253, is calendared for the full Board agenda for adoption without committee reference on October 5, 2010.

Approval of the proposed resolution by the Board would authorize the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) to submit an application for the Ryan White ACT HIV/AIDS Emergency Relief Grant Program (Ryan White Programs, Part A) to the Health Resources Services Administration (HRSA). This application is required to receive continued funding for approximately \$36,118,233 for the San Francisco Eligible Metropolitan Area (EMA). DPH has received from HRSA the application guidance and the application deadline is October 18, 2010. The signed document must be returned with the application. However, we intend to submit an Accept and Expend Approval application upon receipt of the Notice of Grant Award for these funds.

If you should have any questions regarding the resolution, please contact Ann Santos, DPH Grants Manager at 255-3546. She would be happy to meet with you before the Board meeting or speak to you over the phone.

Sincerely,

Mitchell H. Katz, M.D.
Director of Health

BY _____
AK

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 OCT -5 PM 4:21

39

CAGE



City and County of San Francisco
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Gavin Newsom, Mayor
Mitchell H. Katz, MD, Director

OCCUPATIONAL & ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

Rajiv Bhatia, MD, MPH
Director of Environmental Health

October 8, 2010

The Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: October 2010 Restaurant Appreciation Month

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors:

In order to recognize and celebrate the contribution of restaurants to the vitality of San Francisco, the Board of Supervisors recently declared October as *Restaurant Appreciation Month* in San Francisco. The Department of Public Health has worked with the Golden Gate Restaurant Association, Supervisor Alioto-Pier's office, and the Office of Small Business on this project. We would like to utilize the October 26th Board of Supervisors meeting to launch this program, and would like for each member of the Board as well as a representative from the Mayor's office to present a Certificate of Honor to one restaurant.

We are soliciting nominations each member of the Board of Supervisors as well as the Mayor for restaurants that exemplify unique contributions to San Francisco and/or your district. Please prioritize your three top choices using the Restaurant Appreciation Nomination Form attached. Please consider the following categories when you submit your nominations:

- Innovative cuisine
- Environmental conservation and sustainability
- Use of local and regional food
- Improved food access and nutrition in underserved communities
- Community work
- Labor practices and workforce development
- Nutrition
- High food safety standards

Please submit your Restaurant Appreciation Nomination Form by October 14th to paula.jones@sfdph.org. To ensure that the restaurants being recognized on October 26th in compliance with health and safety, labor, and business license requirements, the nominated restaurants will each be screened with Department of Public Health, Office of Labor Standards and Enforcement, and the Tax Collector. We anticipate having a final list by October 19th, and we will send it to you at that time.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call Paula Jones at 252-3853.

Thank you.

Rajiv Bhatia, MD, MPH

40



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: DPT and SFFD coordinate the making of traffic jams in Chinatown every morning.

From: JAMES CORRIGAN <marylouc@mac.com>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Cc: Fire Commission <Fire.Commission@sfgov.org>, cnevius@sfchronicle.com
Date: 10/07/2010 10:07 PM
Subject: DPT and SFFD coordinate the making of traffic jams in Chinatown every morning.

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors:

I have tried and failed to get DPT to ticket the double parked cars of City employees in Chinatown over several years.

I have tried to get the Chief of the Fire Department to end the practice of her employees double parking in Chinatown,

resulting in the stalling and congesting of automobile and bus traffic in that busy area.

This 2 minute video details what drivers must face EVERY morning if they choose to drive on Powell St. thanks to inconsiderate members of the SFFD

and the management and Enforcement Officers of DPT who abet them.

I am asking for your assistance in this matter. Please get DPT to ticket City employees' private vehicles

just as aggressively as they ticket non-City employees.

Please get Chief Hayes-White to practice being a "good neighbor" in busy Chinatown.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9_ouofPdG7k

Sincerely yours,

James J. Corrigan

41



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: World Statistics Day - October 20, 2010 - Press Release (good news)

From: Chris <chrismbarker@yahoo.com>
To: gavin.newsom@sfgov.org, gavin@gavinnewsom.com, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 10/08/2010 07:20 AM
Subject: World Statistics Day - October 20, 2010 - Press Release (good news)

Dear Honorable Mayor Newsom and Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors of San Francisco,

I sincerely hope you will consider announcing the U.N. declaration of World Statistics Day to the people of the city of San Francisco.

Please let me give you the background, this is very good news, and also provides very important opportunities for jobs.

Below, I'm attaching a link below to a press release - and some excellent news.

As you may know, the United Nations has announced that October 20, is the First World Statistics Day.
<http://unstats.un.org/unsd/wsd/>

The American Statistical Association (ASA www.amstat.org), representing over 18,000 statisticians, has prepared a press release about the event. As noted in the release the Statisticians job is the "sexy job" of the future. Particularly in this economy where jobs appear to be scarce, students in college may want to consider a career in statistics. As the release notes, statisticians are needed to analyze a "...Tsunami of Digital Data...".

I love my job and have yet to meet a statistician who does not love the work they do.
Here's the link for the press release.

42

<http://www.sfasa.org/WSD2010.pdf>

We are also announcing this to as many Bay Area news organizations as possible.

Also, I'm the President-Elect of the San Francisco Bay Area Chapter of the ASA. Our chapter was chartered in 1928 and is the fourth oldest chapter in the ASA and one of the top ten largest in the ASA by number of members. We also know that before 1928, the chapter was preceded by a smaller group of statisticians in industry.

We will be glad to introduce you to one or more Bay Area Statisticians. Very likely there are one or more statisticians working in the government offices of San Francisco.

Thank you in advance.

Chris Barker, Ph.D.
President and Owner
Statistical Planning and Analysis Services, Inc.
www.barkerstats.com
<http://www.linkedin.com/in/christophermbarker/>
415 609 7473

and:

President-Elect
San Francisco Bay Area Chapter of the American Statistical Association
<http://www.sfasa.org/chapinfo.htm#Officers>
<http://www.sfasa.org/index.htm>



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: [John Joebee Homeless in SF] A Billionaire Can't Fix The NIMBYS and Care Not C...

From: TimGiangiobbe <TimGiangiobbe@cheerful.com>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/30/2010 05:41 PM
Subject: [John Joebee Homeless in SF] A Billionaire Can't Fix The NIMBYS and Care Not C...

Some Nice Billionaire Like Larry Ellison can Go To Gavin Newsom Tomorrow and say "Gavin I want TO get The Homeless Off The Streets NOW,Here is 100 Million Dollars."But the Stipulation is You Must House 75 percent of these Citizens.

Guess What? San Francisco Could not do it unless Homeless citizens Agreed to leave for a Lump sum of money.

I personally was BORN HERE and The Wealthy can't give me enough Money to Leave!!!

Without an adequate Supply of SROs this will NEVER BE DONE.

Don't Laugh It's True because the SROs are Not available and the NIMBYS would never Let the Housing be built quick enough.

Randy Shaw and The Tenderloin Housing Clinic wants to Build SROs on The New land that WAS donated to THC.He will have to beat down the Onslaught of NIMBYS if the Development has too any SROs which seems to be any SROs lately.

The Shame is the City Demolished The SROs that were in the SOMA area to build the Moscone Center and the SMOMA along with Hotels and Open Space.This had a Pay off for the benefit of Arts and The Wealthy in the City on the Backs of the POOR.

The SROs that made San Francisco a Great place to Live and work if you ere a Blue Collar worker and single have been demolished and the working class are now screwed by the Upper Middle Class City that was Born.

Yes Indeed San Francisco did respect the Needs of the Working class Until the crack epidemic and the Hell Zone that the Tenderloin became after the Big Dig for BART.San Francisco has never been the same since for the Poor and Disabled.

The 6th street area and The Theater district Around Woolworth's all the way to Van Ness was a safe area when I was Young.No Shit!!The Working Class People had Rooms for a Price that was reasonable.San Francisco Boasted that the Working Class Had not been Screwed Like New York City in the 50s and 60s.

43

Then The Redevelopment Agency Took away The SROs and They have never returned. The worries about Flop houses is Bullshit.

Most of the NICE SROs they Demolished on Howard and Mission were Nice. Some were Real bad.

They sure concentrated on the Blight and Included the rest. I remember the area and I don't want to hear it was seedy because it wasn't.

The Pool hall and Fascination. I had Fun and my parents did not worry. I ran the streets and not in a bad way. The 60s and 70s was the Turning Point. Sex Drugs and Rock and Roll has not Died. They call it Raves Now!

The SROs were in Great Shape Then. Some of the Best damn SROs were LOST to the Demolition and The MOSCONE CENTER. That was A Prime SRO area.

Great Job redevelopment agency!! You Really Stuck it to the Poor and the working Class all because of a Drug war and The behavior of a few. The sad part is the Drug dealers who Pulled off the coup have The Place now and the People are Trapped in the Tenderloin because they can't afford to live elsewhere. Not all the TLs Residents are Drug Dealers and Dope fiends. The perception is different. Society thinks that they must be addicts to live there. Therefore the NIMBYS won't allow the housing without Whining like a Puppy.

It is sad That a Billionaire can't help until the The NIMBYS are Silenced and The SROs are BUILT.

The Homeless will be blamed for a Planning Nightmare and Extremely high rents for SROs.

The Ex Pats from India who have Taken Over the SROs now Master Lease to the City.

The Slumlords Enjoy the Equity because the City of San Francisco lacks a Politician with the Balls to Tackle This Dilemma.

San Francisco needs to build SRO Housing and Quit leasing over time.

WTF San Francisco does the City want to continue down this Path?

Some of the Old SRO Hotels Were Gems. The New ones that will be Built will Suffice.

The NIMBYS and The Police need to have more Empathy and Tough Love at the same Time.

Empathy for the Homeless Baby Boomers No matter where they sleep and Tough love for the

Addicts who make their life hell.

They make their Life Hell By Taking over SRO Hotels that are still Somewhat reasonable in rent.

This minority holds the Places hostage. This happened at The Mission for Years With Carlos and THC and They did Nothing.

Bad managers are Usually Damn Good Liars and Hustlers just like Carlos. The Legacy that Carlos and the Nortenos have left still lingers, Believe me!!

The Hotels Can be Restored using Covenant Law and Non Profits. Not Ex Pats who are Slumlords and Laughing at San Francisco for being so Ignorant and letting them gain the equity using San Francisco's Master Lease Get The Ex Pat Rich Program.

That is what THC could manage Given The NIMBYS. The Waterfront land that was Donated To THC can Have world Class SRO Housing Built on It. I Know Randy Shaw wants to Build SROs and That will be The Ticket if he Gets BIG BRASS BALLS and Really uses The Clout he has Amassed in San Francisco. Fuck The NIMBYS Randy they will Lose.

Give Us Poor the damn authority and Changes will be made. The changes would bring Equity and Dignity to the City. We Could use Both!

Best Practices are not what I Observe in The Loin and The 6th Street Corridor SRO Hotels.

San Francisco Goes after The Bridge Hotel because of the Neighborhood.

Why Can't Dennis Herrera start the Paperwork on The Civic Center Hotel, The Coronado, The Drake and The Henry. They all suck and Win the Sub Scum Hotel Award for The Month of September.

The Seneca and the Mission are Competing for That Honor.

WTF Gavin?

Does the City ever really even Take a Look in the TL every Once in awhile?

That is not caring It's Containing!!

San Francisco NIMBYS see this and say: "Why do we want More SROs and that Kind of Behavior."

Their Right!!!

Cleaning Up bad SROs may Bring These Saviors if they see a chance for an Actual Change and Not Just Rhetoric. I see Plenty of wealth, They just don't want to Enable Dope Fiends. These Titans

are Use to Business Models that make sense.

They see San Francisco Cuddling Addicts and Giving them Rooms while Baby Boomers sleep on the streets. Yet Care Not Cash has been successful for the Clients who Applied themselves.

The City Need not throw the baby out with the Bathwater, That is Why More SROs are Needed.

Care Not cash Does not help the Disabled Baby Boomer On a stipend who can't afford the High rent.

Care Not cash Helps the Indigent because of the federal Funding. That is why when they take the SROs away and there is less SROs for the Boomers, Disabled and The Working Class Now.

The City Can't stuff Twenty Five Pounds of issues in a Ten Pound Bag.

There Needs to be a Change and Then Benefit on The Good PR.

There Also needs to be an Interruption in the Supply and Demand of cannabis in The Loin, Market Street and The 6th street Corridor.

The Time for Cannabis Harm Reduction is here on November 2nd.

The City can Help the Simple Growers get this Honor if they are 501C3.

Or Sell Out to the Rich Growers Like Oakland did.

How do You Think some of them Became rich? Prop 215 of course. Time to Give Back!

The World is Observing how San Francisco will Handle the Homeless and The Cannabis Issue.

Harm Reduction Centers Can Help to Fund another 501C3 Charity and Insidiously eliminate the stigma of Cannabis and Help to get The Homeless off the streets.

Then San Francisco's Future Will have some Nice SRO Hotels and Remember a Time when dignity was dead.

Because Dignity will have Arrived!

GOD BLESS ALL

--

Posted By TimGiangiobbe to [John Joebee Homeless in SF](#) at 9/29/2010 07:06:00 PM

17

Government say the economy is recovering, but our communities still need jobs, good wages and healthcare.

Across San Francisco, low-wage workers and communities of color are still in crisis. Though our languages, industries, neighborhoods and skin color may appear different, we share the same needs for decent jobs and supporting our families.

We want to be included in the economic recovery and we are uniting as one voice to call the city of San Francisco to take action:



1. **Jobs and Training, especially for those who face greatest barriers to employment,**
2. **Labor Law Enforcement to stop wage theft,**
3. **Equal treatment for all workers.**
4. **Protect the social safety net for poor and marginalized communities,**
5. **Support and promote responsible businesses,**

This Bill of Rights is important to me because: It will move us towards a more humane city / society / world

Name: Juliana Sam

Address: 1869 Capistrano Ave., Berkeley, CA

Phone: 510-643-7593 email: juliana.sam@berkeley.edu



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

BY AK
2010 SEP 29 PM 3:06
RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO



45

RE: Cowboy Bob's Bum Report

lgoodin1

to:

Bob Larive, Bob Larive, Craig Schwan, Aline Estournes, dania.duke, Jan Misch, Kevin Carroll, quin.orlick@tuscaninn.com, Steve, kevin.cashman, cwnevius, kgarcia

10/06/2010 09:48 AM

Cc:

"Lee Housekeeper", Board.of.Supervisors, dsaunders, matierandross, lgarchik, dhussey, gavin.newsom, northbeachchamber, info, David.Chiu, Bevan.Dufty, Carmen.Chu, Chris.Daly, David.Campos, Eric.L.Mar, John.Avalos, Michela.Alioto-Pier, Ross.Mirkarimi, Sean.Elsbernd, Sophie.Maxwell

Please respond to lgoodin1

Show Details

When, oh when, are you going to get these people off of our sidewalks and into appropriate indoor settings?!?! All we hear is We're Working On It (WWOI). Surely some genius in City Hall must have a plan?!

Lee Goodin



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Fw: Cowboy Bob's Bum Report

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

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

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 10/06/2010 10:20 AM -----

From: "Bob Larive" <bob@fior.com>
To: "Bob Larive" <bob@fior.com>, <lgoodin1@mindspring.com>, "Craig Schwan"
<Craig.Schwan@ihrco.com>, "Aline Estournes" <aestournes@wbcfsf.com>,
<danialduke@hyatt.com>, "Jan Misch" <Jan.Misch@tuscaninn.com>, "Kevin Carroll"
<kcarroll@visitfishermanswharf.com>, "quin. orlick@tuscaninn.com"
<quin.orlick@tuscaninn.com>, "Steve" <stevew@pier39.com>, <kevin.cashman@sfgov.org>,
<cwnevius@sfchronicle.com>, "kgarcia" <kgarcia@sfexaminer.com>
Cc: "Lee Housekeeper" <NewsService@aol.com>, <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>,
<dsaunders@sfchronicle.com>, <matierandross@sfchronicle.com>, <lgarchik@sfchronicle.com>,
<dhussey@sfexaminer.com>, <gavin.newsom@sfgov.org>, <northbeachchamber@gmail.com>,
<info@northbeachneighbors.org>, <David.Chiu@sfgov.org>, <Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org>,
<Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org>, <Chris.Daly@sfgov.org>, <David.Campos@sfgov.org>,
<Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org>, <John.Avalos@sfgov.org>, <Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org>,
<Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org>, <Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org>, <Sophie.Maxwell@sfgov.org>
Date: 10/06/2010 09:22 AM
Subject: Cowboy Bob's Bum Report

Just a note. With Fleet Week and Columbus Day coming we will expose another million or so visitors to our bums, homeless, underserved. I'm sure they will be very impressed!

Fior d' Italia

America's Oldest Italian Restaurant
2237 Mason Street
San Francisco CA 94133
(415) 986-1886 www.fior.com
fior@fior.com



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Cowboy Bob's Bum Report

From: "Bob Larive" <bob@fior.com>
To: "Bob Larive" <bob@fior.com>, <lgoodin1@mindspring.com>, "Craig Schwan"
<Craig.Schwan@ihrco.com>, "Aline Estournes" <aestournes@wbcfsf.com>,
<dania.duke@hyatt.com>, "Jan Misch" <Jan.Misch@tuscaninn.com>, "Kevin Carroll"
<kcarroll@visitfishermanswharf.com>, "quin. orlick@tuscaninn.com"
<quin.orlick@tuscaninn.com>, "Steve" <stevew@pier39.com>, <kevin.cashman@sfgov.org>,
"cwnevius" <cwnevius@sfnchronicle.com>, "kgarcia" <kgarcia@sfxaminer.com>
Cc: "Lee Housekeeper" <NewsService@aol.com>, <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>,
<dsaunders@sfnchronicle.com>, <matierandross@sfnchronicle.com>, <lgarchik@sfnchronicle.com>,
<dhussey@sfxaminer.com>, <gavin.newsom@sfgov.org>, <northbeachchamber@gmail.com>,
<info@northbeachneighbors.org>, <David.Chiu@sfgov.org>, <Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org>,
<Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org>, <Chris.Daly@sfgov.org>, <David.Campos@sfgov.org>,
<Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org>, <John.Avalos@sfgov.org>, <Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org>,
<Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org>, <Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org>, <Sophie.Maxwell@sfgov.org>
Date: 10/06/2010 09:19 AM
Subject: Cowboy Bob's Bum Report

Quick walk this AM. I was out again this AM and was very disappointed that Supervisors Chiu and Daly still have not solved the problem. There were only 37 **bums, homeless, underserved** in the Wharf area this AM. Note some of the pictures below.

Last night they were all over the Wharf. At about 8 PM. 9 of the bums, homeless, underserved were blocking about ½ the sidewalk outside In and Out Burger with a sign asking "money for weed". Very impressive for the visitors and tourists passing by.

I'm so proud of San Francisco.

Note a few of today's pictures below:

