

# 101392

Petitions and Communications received from November 2, 2010, through November 8, 2010, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on November 16, 2010.

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to proposed legislation regarding setting nutritional standards for restaurant food sold accompanied by toys or other youth focused incentive items. File No. 101096, 23 letters (1)

From concerned citizens, submitting support for proposed legislation regarding setting nutritional standards for restaurant food sold accompanied by toys or other youth focused incentive items. File No. 101096, 2 letters (2)

From the Port, regarding funding for the construction project at Exploratorium Pier15/17. File No. 091178 (3)

From Dominic Maionchi, regarding the West Harbor renovation. File No. 101302 (4)

From Library Users Association, submitting support for proposed legislation designating the North Beach Branch Library as a landmark in San Francisco. File No. 101230, 2 letters (5)

From Lee Goodin, submitting opposition to proposed legislation designating the North Beach Branch Library as a landmark in San Francisco. File No. 101230, 2 letters (6)

From Aaron Goodman, regarding the Parkmerced project. 3 letters (7)

From Bay Area Clean Water Agencies, submitting support for proposed legislation regarding Safe Drug Disposal. File No. 100455 (8)

From Office of the Controller, submitting the Parks Maintenance Standards Annual Report for FY2010-2011. (9)

From Office of the Controller, submitting the August 2010 Government Barometer Report. (10)

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. (11)

From Cristi Sturgill, regarding sitting or lying down on a public sidewalk in San Francisco. (12)

From Office of the Mayor, submitting notice that Mayor Newsom will be out of state from November 5, 2010, until November 7, 2010. Supervisor Carmen Chu will serve as Acting-Mayor. Copy: Each Supervisor, City Attorney (13)

From Department of Public Health, submitting their Annual Report of gifts received in FY2009-2010. (14)

From Department of Human Resources, submitting their Annual Report on sexual harassment complaints filed in FY2009-2010. Copy: Each Supervisor (15)

From Chloe Jager, urging the Board of Supervisors to pass legislation banning smoking on the fire escapes in apartment buildings. (16)

From James Corrigan, regarding the number of firefighters at Starbuck's and Pete's coffee shops. (17)

From T Mobile, submitting notification of two cellular antennas to be installed at 2016 Chestnut Street. (18)

From Ivan Edgar Pratt, urging people to support and donate funds to the San Francisco City Academy School. (19)

From Dr. Schneider, submitting support for the public park at Sharp Park. (20)

From State Fish and Game Commission, submitting notice of the new hearing date regarding the Alameda Creek. (21)

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to proposed Westside recycled water treatment plant in Golden Gate Park. 7 letters (22)

From James Chaffee, regarding the Library Commission. (23)

From Francisco Da Costa, regarding the Lennar Corporation. (24)

From Michele Garside, regarding open space in San Francisco. (25)



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: File 101096: Happy Meals

*Copy  
File*

---

From: "Bitsy Harris" <mharris160@cox.net>  
To: <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>  
Date: 11/03/2010 06:20 AM  
Subject: Happy Meals

---

Wow! Now you are the food police. The parents are certainly stupid and not to be trusted to make food decisions for their children. The government will do it for us. Next will you forbid people to cook at home. Will you put the food police to break into homes and demand that we only eat tofu... or whatever you think is best. This is disgusting. Since when are you the ones to decide. This is not Nazi Germany, or is it?

Disgusting misuse and abuse of power. Now you are the food terrorists! Happy meals are evil??? I am thinking there are some serious problems in this state and Happy Meals are your focus for improving things? Good grief, we are being lead by a bunch of idiots!

①

file #101096  
page



### Request for City Services - Clerk of the Board

Enter Personal Details > Enter Service Request Details > Review & Submit > Attach Photo(s) / File(s) > Print & Track

#### Successfully Submitted

Thank you for your submission. You will receive an email confirmation with a link to follow the progress of your submission.

If you have any additional requests or questions, you can call us 7 days a week, 24 hours a day at 311 (for calls outside of San Francisco please dial (415)701-2311).

Your Tracking Number is: 765504

Nov 3 2010 4:57PM.

Please print a copy for your records. You may close your browser when done.

#### Location Information:

Location Description:

#### Request Details:

Category:	Complaint
Department:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Sub-Division:	Clerk of the Board

#### Additional Information:

Additional Request Details:	I'm boycotting your city. No toys in Happy Meals??? The marijuana law didn't pass so you better stop smoking the weed, you morons!
-----------------------------	--

#### Customer Contact Information:

First Name:	
Last Name:	
Primary Phone:	
Alternate Phone:	
Address Number:	
Street Name:	
City, State:	
ZIP Code:	
Email:	anonymous@sfgov311.org

Customer requested to be contacted by the department servicing their request:





To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: File 101096: Happy Meals

*epage*  
*file*

---

From: "susan" <sper2324@verizon.net>  
To: <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>  
Date: 11/03/2010 01:20 AM  
Subject: Happy Meals

---

To the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am a native Californian and retired school teacher who stopped coming to the fabulous city by the bay years ago and with no regrets. What you do and how you think is your business and of no concern to me. That said, I just cannot resist commenting on an article on my Yahoo homepage regarding your ban on happy meals. Your thinking is laughable and absurd at the same time, not to mention the arrogance of your action.

Kids' eating habits are parent/adult driven. Because the Almighty Board sets an edict that kids' meals must have fruits/veggies and may not include a toy is not going to alter the way parents feed their children. What is in the water you are drinking that brings forth such ridiculous thinking?

You can not tell parents what to feed their children. They will continue to prepare economical food at home for their families. Guess what! This means hamburgers, meat loaf, Hamburger Helper, and the dreaded hot dogs. Fruits and vegetables are not economical and no one wants to waste money by throwing out food their children will not eat.

Childhood obesity in families of all income levels comes from lazy parents who would rather be their child's best friend rather than being the authority, setting sensible eating and exercising standards. These attitudes have been generated from the likes of you who tell parents they should not discipline their children or hurt their little psyches by actually telling them what to do. I site the quote in the Yahoo article to illustrate my point:

***"Fast food is really fattening, and it's really addicting, and sometimes it's hard to tell a child no," she said .***

Here is a parent who can't possibly say no to a visit to McDonald's and claims it is the enticement of the toy that is to blame. Give me a break! This is craziness.

Your actions have denied children, especially of lower income families, something they seldom experience.....a luxury; given something special for absolutely no reason; a toy they did not earn but were given simply because. I guarantee you that most children of low-income families are never given a toy for no reason. Do you know what this act does for children's feeling of self worth, not to mention how the parents feel when they

see the delight on the faces of their little ones?

How pathetic that you are unable to think outside of the box. Instead of denying children Happy Meals, why not teach parents how to parent and teach children the benefits of exercise.

Sincerely,

Susan Perry



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: File 101096 Communism Lives in San Francisco

---

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 11/05/2010 03:18 PM -----

From: Stephen Johnson <stephenseniior@comcast.net>  
To: <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
Date: 11/05/2010 03:05 PM  
Subject: Communism Lives in San Francisco  
Sent by: <stephenseniior@live.com>

---

Choosing what meals a parent can buy now???? HOW FRICKEN STUPID. My time in Vietnam was obviously wasted.



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: Appalled SF Resident - "Happy Meal Ban"

*File 101096*

---

From: Jamie <bast9459@gmail.com>  
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org  
Date: 11/05/2010 01:46 PM  
Subject: Appalled SF Resident - "Happy Meal Ban"

---

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a resident of San Francisco, I am disgusted by your latest "legislation"-- banning gifts to children in meals unless those meals meet certain nutritional standards. I fail to recognize how our city/county government has any place in deciding what a privately owned and operated restaurant can sell to its clientele.

It is my understanding that this law was sponsored by our own Supervisor Eric Mar. In news articles he has been reported as saying that he's horrified by his own daughter's collection of toys from fast food restaurants. Who purchased these meals with toys for her? Who is responsible for educating her to make healthy choices? Certainly not the government. (Though California is quickly becoming known as the nanny state). If she has too many toys from McDonald's Happy Meals or other fast food kids' meals, I encourage Mr. Mar to be a responsible parent and fix her something nutritious to eat!

According to the New York Times, "Mr. Mar said he hoped [the law] would act as an incentive to fast-food companies to 'provide better choices.' " If this is an "incentive", where is McDonald's reward in all this? That is the definition of "incentive" after all; incentive implies positive encouragement. Disallowing a product is hardly that.

Furthermore, in the case of McDonalds, their kids' meals do offer healthier options, so it really is up to the individual diner to choose. Their Happy Meal menu offers: apple slices or french fries; low fat milk, a soft drink, or apple juice; a hamburger or white meat chicken nuggets. If we don't like their selection, we are all free to dine elsewhere.

One final question for you... What ever happened to personal responsibility? We can't all be victims!

Concerned for our city and my rights as a consumer,

Jamie Bastine  
[bast9459@gmail.com](mailto:bast9459@gmail.com)

*(1)*



Appalled SF Resident - "Happy Meal Ban"

Jamie

to:

Board.of.Supervisors

11/05/2010 01:46 PM

Show Details

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a resident of San Francisco, I am disgusted by your latest "legislation"-- banning gifts to children in meals unless those meals meet certain nutritional standards. I fail to recognize how our city/county government has any place in deciding what a privately owned and operated restaurant can sell to its clientele.

It is my understanding that this law was sponsored by our own Supervisor Eric Mar. In news articles he has been reported as saying that he's horrified by his own daughter's collection of toys from fast food restaurants. Who purchased these meals with toys for her? Who is responsible for educating her to make healthy choices? Certainly not the government. (Though California is quickly becoming known as the nanny state). If she has too many toys from McDonald's Happy Meals or other fast food kids' meals, I encourage Mr. Mar to be a responsible parent and fix her something nutritious to eat!

According to the New York Times, "Mr. Mar said he hoped [the law] would act as an incentive to fast-food companies to 'provide better choices.' " If this is an "incentive", where is McDonald's reward in all this? That is the definition of "incentive" after all; incentive implies positive encouragement. Disallowing a product is hardly that.

Furthermore, in the case of McDonalds, their kids' meals do offer healthier options, so it really is up to the individual diner to choose. Their Happy Meal menu offers: apple slices or french fries; low fat milk, a soft drink, or apple juice; a hamburger or white meat chicken nuggets. If we don't like their selection, we are all free to dine elsewhere.

One final question for you... What ever happened to personal responsibility? We can't all be victims!

Concerned for our city and my rights as a consumer,

Jamie Bastine

[bast9459@gmail.com](mailto:bast9459@gmail.com)



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: File 101096: happy meals

---

From: Steve parker <stevemari@msn.com>  
To: <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
Date: 11/04/2010 06:57 PM  
Subject: happy meals

---

I read yesterday that the board of supervisors has passed a measure that bans toys in fast food meals unless that meal includes the variety of food that the board has deemed appropriate.

While I am troubled by the rate of childhood obesity, I believe that it is the parents responsibility to choose and control the type and amount of food their children eat. Government agencies may have the responsibility to try to educate people on the benefits of making healthier choices but should not dictate to them what they may or may not eat, unless that agency is paying for the food.

I know that one e-mail will do nothing to change the boards mind about this, but I thought I would let you know that my family's future vacations to the bay area will be confined to Oakland or some other city/county where I still have the right to choose what food comes with the "Happy Meal" toy.

Clerk of the Board Customer Satisfaction Form  
Board.of.Supervisors  
to:  
Board.of.Supervisors  
11/05/2010 10:19 AM  
Show Details

File 101096

To:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org  
Email:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org  
DIVISION\_AGENCY:COB  
TREATED\_YOU:Disagree  
VOICEMAIL:Does\_Not\_Apply  
EMAIL\_RESPONSE:Does\_Not\_Apply  
QUESTIONS:Strongly\_Disagree  
ACCURATE\_INFORMATION:Strongly\_Disagree  
BEHAVED\_ETHICALLY:Strongly\_Disagree  
ANSWER\_RESPONSE:Strongly\_Disagree  
COMFORT\_LEVEL:Unacceptable  
ADDITIONAL\_COMMENTS:San Francisco used to be a beacon of equality, now you're trying to tell a city of nearly a million people what they can and cannot eat. Only I decide if my children can or cannot have a Happy Meal, not you. Fuck off, San Francisco.  
NUMBER:  
MAILING\_ADDRESS:  
CONTACT\_EMAIL:

Clerk of the Board Customer Satisfaction Form  
Board.of.Supervisors  
to:  
Board.of.Supervisors  
11/04/2010 05:58 PM  
Show Details

File 101096

To:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org  
Email:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org  
DIVISION\_AGENCY:COB  
TREATED\_YOU:Strongly\_Disagree  
VOICEMAIL:Strongly\_Disagree  
EMAIL\_RESPONSE:Strongly\_Disagree  
QUESTIONS:Strongly\_Disagree  
ACCURATE\_INFORMATION:Strongly\_Disagree  
BEHAVED\_ETHICALLY:Strongly\_Disagree  
ANSWER\_RESPONSE:Strongly\_Disagree  
COMFORT\_LEVEL:Unacceptable  
ADDITIONAL\_COMMENTS:The board's upcoming decision to bab toys in Happy Meals is one of the most un-American things you could possibly do. This is a disgrace! This is the type of government control that our forfathers were trying to avoid. Your board should be ashamed. You allow other unhealthy things in this nasty city, but you want to target Happy Meals? You must really think that the people of San Fran are the most pathetic losers in the country and do not have the capability to make their own decisions. Why stop there? Get rid of every bar in the city. Alcohol is way worse then a little hamburger meal. While your at it clean all the faggots out of town.  
NUMBER:  
MAILING\_ADDRESS:  
CONTACT\_EMAIL:



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: File 101096: Toy Ban on Kids Meals

---

From: Brenda Brinks <bbrinks63@yahoo.com>  
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org  
Date: 11/04/2010 06:30 AM  
Subject: Toy Ban on Kids Meals

---

I was absolutely incensed when I heard that the board is considering a ban on toys in kid's meals that do not meet their health requirements! This is a perfect example of government - even if it is not at a national lever - imposing its will on the American people, and you should be ashamed of yourselves for even suggesting it.

While I agree that this may not be the case for everyone, let me tell you about our dining out experience - it is RARE, and it is a TREAT! I try to feed my family healthy meals every day - EVERY DAY, not just here and there. The bigger problem for us is that we do not get enough exercise, something we have recently begun working on - too early at this point to report much success, but we will get there. Fast food in a definite no no most of the time, but if I want it, or choose to reward my children for it once in a while, I damn well will. And I don't need YOU to tell me I can't give them a certain choice because it has a consequence. It is no different than government taxing foods that some group of idiots has decided for me that I should not have.

While I agree that obesity is an ongoing problem, here is the bottom line - if Americans choose to be obese, THAT IS THEIR RIGHT UNDER THE CONSTITUTION - STAY OUT OF IT! It is none of your business. We as parents must begin to teach our children about the benefits of better eating and exercise, as we and many of our friends are making a conscious effort to do. Where do you stop? Gonna take away Trick or Treating next?

Brenda Brinks

1



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: File 101096: Are Happy Meals REALLY the most important thing on your agenda??

---

From: Earth Dance <libby@earthdancesoaps.com>  
To: "Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org" <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>  
Cc: "BillCarroll@kfi640.com" <BillCarroll@kfi640.com>, "johnandken@kfi640.com" <johnandken@kfi640.com>  
Date: 11/04/2010 01:27 PM  
Subject: Are Happy Meals REALLY the most important thing on your agenda??

---

To Whom It May Concern~

As a parent, I find your agenda to legislate private business by taking away parental responsibility abhorrent. You have no right to parent anyone else's children but your own. McDonalds has already done more than enough to comply with restrictive diet regulations imposed by over-reaching committees such as yours. The more power you remove from parents to actually parent their children, the more their children grow up incapable to cope with everyday life and parent their own children (as witnessed by this generation of "entitled" young Americans).

The day that you have solved all of your city's other problems (homelessness, illegal alien population READ: sanctuary city, crime, budget deficits, pensions, etc. Ad Nauseum) is the day you may step down from your lofty heights to earn your halo. How perfect your children must be and I'm sure in tip top physical shape.

It is every parent's right to make decisions for their children AND some of those decisions may be mistakes, but you DO NOT have the right to make them for them.

As a side note, though I cannot see what you look like from the neck down from your pictures on the website...  
I am positive none of you are overweight, RIGHT???

My son who is 19 now, ate at McDonalds quite a bit when he was younger. We loved those Happy Meals and made it a mission to collect ALL the toys, some of which we gave out as birthday party favors. He is in college now with a double major of registered dietician and personal trainer. It was my parenting that did that. Not yours. Lazy fat children will always be lazy fat children unless the parents step up to the plate and lead.

Libby Claridge  
Earth Dance Botanical BodyCare  
Ph. 760.765.0101  
Cell 760.550.2171



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: File 101096: Banning of McD's toy in happy meals

---

From: "Corey" <galaktican@comcast.net>  
To: <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>  
Date: 11/03/2010 05:18 PM  
Subject: Banning of McD's toy in happy meals

---

McDonalds can't give away toys?

Damn it this pisses me off and I have not found one single American Citizen that agrees this law should have been passed. I have checked comments on 3 different sites and talked personally to over 20 people about this. When the percentage of children in SF remain "overweight or obese" what will be the next stupid law? The American people across the country just spoke out in droves on Nov. 2 wanting less government and you guys push this down our throats. We didn't ask for it and we don't want it.

I would rather you smart people just do nothing and collect your inflated paychecks. That would be better then doing the things you do that destroys our country. I don't think its stupidity, I think you people know exactly what you are doing and I hate it.

An American, tax-paying voter's opinion.

Sent by **Corey Warren**

408-239-6953



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: File 101096: Board decisions

---

From: "James R. Botts" <jbotts858@gmail.com>  
To: "board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org" <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
Date: 11/04/2010 08:21 AM  
Subject: Board decisions

---

Please STOP taking my American rights from all of us and please quit raping the people. Fast foo was never meant to be someones daily meal. You should cite parents that allow their lazy good for nothing kids to sit around and watch tv rather than making them do something active. Parents are to blame for fat kids not food you have a choice to what goes in your mouth. I've never seen Ronald McDonald force a child to eat a burger and fries. I personally eat fast food a couple of times a week but I do things like go on walks and yard work which is why I am not overweight. The majority of fat people are lazy why don't you just make it illegal to sit in chairs that would also help kids loose weight. As an American I find it sad that our government has completely thrown out common sense. Use you brain it might make the world a better place

Sent from my iPhone





To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: File 101096: QUESTION

---

From: "Aaron Steadmon" <aaron.steadmon@austindistributing.com>  
To: <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>  
Date: 11/04/2010 07:53 AM  
Subject: QUESTION

---

Why in the hell did you have happy meals banned. You are not doing what the people want, this is a free country and need no government official telling me it more legal to smoke ort than it is to eat a happy meal, you have destroyed the hearts of children everywhere in this country and you are showing that Americans have no personal rights and freedoms for themselves, I have started a petition to pull the strength from you peoples hands to where the people make the decisions and not a group of old outdated uneducated morons, or excuse me to educated with no common sense what so ever. Revoke this happy meal crap or actions will be taken

Aaron Steadmon  
Counter Sales  
Austin Distributing

*page  
file*



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: File 101096 Happy Meals

---

From: David <mgsyst@yahoo.com>  
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org  
Date: 11/02/2010 07:13 PM  
Subject: Happy Meals

---

Leave the toys alone. Leave McDonalds alone. Chinese food has more negative ingredients than a Happy Meal. Even so, this is not something the politicians have any mandate to get in to.

My God you people are ridiculous.  
David Howard



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: File 101096: No Happy Meals in the "Republic of San Francisco"..what a suprise!

---

From: Djohnswholecup@aol.com  
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org  
Date: 11/03/2010 12:36 PM  
Subject: No Happy Meals in the "Republic of San Francisco"..what a suprise!

---

Dear Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco,

Now I know why Nancy Pelosi was fired by the Citizens of the USA! No Happy Meals at McDonald's due to "dietary concerns"!! Well, as an International traveler to Socialist & Communist countries for the past 10 years this seems like more of what they would do to their citizens!

Have any of you recently viewed the Constitution of the United States?? Does the phrase "Free Enterprise with oversight", I repeat oversight, of the laws and not running private businesses of the USA mean anything to you?? You are there for the people of City & County of San Francisco and not there to push your liberal agenda onto you citizens or interfere with Free Enterprise (McDonalds').

Look at the recent election results and see what happens to Big Government and a Socialist Agenda endorsed by Pelosi and Obama! California, Nevada, Oregon and Washington are in their own world and all or hampered by Illegal Immigration and it's drain on the economy, paying off Unions at the expense of the state's taxpayers, increasing the size / cost of local and state government and are now looking at BILLIONS of DOLLARS in DEBT!!

You live in a fantasy world where the states/city leaders dictate what their population will buy, sell and live their lives, all under your doctoral thumb! Sounds like practices of governments in South America, Mainland China, the Middle East and Southeast Asia..not the USA under the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States.

Wake up and smell what Freedom really means!

Danny Johns  
Portland, Oregon



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: File 101096: New McDonalds ruling

---

From: MAX FRODGE <mmfrodge@msn.com>  
To: <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
Date: 11/03/2010 10:27 AM  
Subject: New McDonalds ruling

---

I am shocked at your new ruling not allowing McDonalds to put toys in meals that don't meet your Standards for healthy eating. I realize that childhood obesity is at an all time high but the Government stepping into the role of a parent is NEVER acceptable.

Maybe you should ENCOURAGE local businesses to help promote fitness instead of punishing children and over-reaching YOUR responsibility to the public. You are going to run all the businesses out of your area, now that they see that the government is going to step into tell them what products that they can and can't sell. McDonalds offers healthy choices and guess what.....some times parents/children and sometimes they don't. I suppose you never go out to dinner as an adult and too many calories/fats???

My children eat fruits and vegetables at home, they play outside and are well rounded healthy children, but YOU feel the need to tell me that I can not treat my children every few weeks to a burger and fries!! REALLY!! Get a grip on who you are.....and who you ARE NOT!!!

Please rethink your decision....  
Signed: Unhappy Parent!!



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: File 101096: McDonalds

---

From: joe cavaleri <joeycav17@gmail.com>  
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org  
Date: 11/03/2010 09:22 AM  
Subject: McDonalds

---

Being from MA, I thought I had seen it all but this might just be the craziest thing you liberals have come up with. What makes your board think it has the right to tell any company what they can give away with certain purchases. This has no effect on me but just reading the story is infuriating. We all know that fast food is bad for you but parents have to be responsible for their own kids. If you liberals were so concerned with the health of children you would start by limiting the types of food people who are on food stamps( you probably call it transitional assistance) can buy. Of all the adults and children on food stamps, over 60% are overweight. This would be very simple to do but the left would scream discrimination as would the people who receive the food stamps. It could just be the rules of the program, their cards would not pay for anything that has a certain amount of fat or calories per serving. I work sales for an ice cream company and i see people all day long here in Mass. buying junkfood with their food stamp cards. I know it makes the board feel really good about themselves to ban toys in Mcdonalds, but why dont you do something that will ACTUALLY make a difference.

Joe Cavaleri  
31 Connolly st



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: File 101096: Happy Meals

---

From: Alan Jones <ajtribefan@yahoo.com>  
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org  
Date: 11/05/2010 03:19 PM  
Subject: Happy Meals

---


To the Board:

Who do you think you are? The last time I looked, the USA was a FREE country.

You left wing liberals are all the same. YOU know what is best for everyone.

YOU should tell parents what to feed their children since YOU know best. On the "B" side of a big hit, in a song titled "A Month of Sundays" Don Henley writes "...we get the government we deserve..." and in the case of SF he is correct. You are Socialists and Marxists. Hopefully, when the "big one" hits California, you people will all be downtown at that instant and fall into the sea with the rest of the garbage. Why not move to Cuba - I'm sure they too know what is best for their people - you'll fit right in

File 101096 + page



### Request for City Services - Clerk of the Board

Enter Personal Details > Enter Service Request Details > Review & Submit > Attach Photo(s) / File(s) > **Print & Track**

### Successfully Submitted

Thank you for your submission. You will receive an email confirmation with a link to follow the progress of your submission.

If you have any additional requests or questions, you can call us 7 days a week, 24 hours a day at 311 (for calls outside of San Francisco please dial (415)701-2311).

Your Tracking Number is: 767052

Nov 6 2010 6:06AM.

Please print a copy for your records. You may close your browser when done.

#### Location Information:

Location Description:

#### Request Details:

Category:	Complaint
Department:	Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Sub-Division:	Clerk of the Board

#### Additional Information:

Additional Request Details:	Did anyone on your board ever really read the Constitution of the United States of America, of which you are a part. The part about the pursuit of happiness and all that freedom stuff? My humble family lives in Wisconsin and we considered a trip to SF but can't come to grips with your unlawful attempt of interdiction with Mc Donald's. Please consider leaving us (american citizens) alone and using all that brainpower to either succeed the union, at which time you can pay back all those funds and grants and back handed deals... or find constitutional solutions. Good Luck SF.
-----------------------------	---

#### Customer Contact Information:

First Name:	Matt
Last Name:	Mattoon
Primary Phone:	262-914-6741
Alternate Phone:	
Address Number:	5618
Street Name:	31st Ave
City, State:	Kenosha, Wisconsin
ZIP Code:	53144
Email:	mattnpam_mattoon@sbcglobal.net

Customer requested to be contacted by the department servicing their request:



RECEIVED  
 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
 SAN FRANCISCO  
 2010 NOV - 8 AM 9:21  
 BY [Signature]



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: File 101096: Mc Donalds toy ban

---

From: Jim Beehn <beehnj@yahoo.com>  
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org  
Date: 11/06/2010 03:20 PM  
Subject: Mc Donalds toy ban

---

This is the strangest ban I have ever heard off. you need to let parents decide whats good for there children, I realize that your board thinks of the general public as idiots and not able to make there own decisions but its not your job to control every aspect of every ones life.

Jim Beehn  
Madison, Nebraska





To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: File 101096: McD's Happy Meals

---

From: David Smith <majordave59@gmail.com>  
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org  
Date: 11/07/2010 04:54 AM  
Subject: McD's Happy Meals

---

Your recent passage of the law regulating McD's happy meals shows your ignorance and lack of education regarding obesity (the reason for passage). With the majority of meals eaten at home, the Department of Agriculture's expenses of over 6 million annually to promote milk and more recently cheese and the parents responsibilities of healthy eating you feel your regulation will assist in the reduction of obesity. Additionally, if you understood program or policy evaluations (I implore you to review) you would understand that valid assessment is needed to draw your conclusion which is based on a prejudice and a false premise. Ultimately, your new regulation which will only result in a loss of tax revenue for your local economy and a request for subsidies or additional taxes to your constituents.

How is this any different than a dictator regulating what they beleve to be true and correct?

David Smith



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: File 101096: Happy Meals

---

From: Alan Jones <ajtribefan@yahoo.com>  
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org  
Date: 11/05/2010 03:19 PM  
Subject: Happy Meals

---

To the Board:

Who do you think you are? The last time I looked, the USA was a FREE country.

You left wing liberals are all the same. YOU know what is best for everyone.

YOU should tell parents what to feed their children since YOU know best. On the "B" side of a big hit, in a song titled "A Month of Sundays" Don Henley writes "...we get the government we deserve..." and in the case of SF he is correct. You are Socialists and Marxists. Hopefully, when the "big one" hits California, you people will all be downtown at that instant and fall into the sea with the rest of the garbage. Why not move to Cuba - I'm sure they too know what is best for their people - you'll fit right in



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: File 101096: McD's Happy Meals

---

From: David Smith <majordave59@gmail.com>  
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org  
Date: 11/07/2010 04:54 AM  
Subject: McD's Happy Meals

---

Your recent passage of the law regulating McD's happy meals shows your ignorance and lack of education regarding obesity (the reason for passage). With the majority of meals eaten at home, the Department of Agriculture's expenses of over 6 million annually to promote milk and more recently cheese and the parents responsibilities of healthy eating you feel your regulation will assist in the reduction of obesity. Additionally, if you understood program or policy evaluations (I implore you to review) you would understand that valid assessment is needed to draw your conclusion. which is based on a prejudice and a false premise. Ultimately, your new regulation which will only result in a loss of tax revenue for your local economy and a request for subsidies or additional taxes to your constituents.

How is this any different than a dictator regulating what they beleve to be true and correct?

David Smith



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: File 101096: Mc Donalds toy ban

---

From: Jim Beehn <beehnj@yahoo.com>  
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org  
Date: 11/06/2010 03:20 PM  
Subject: Mc Donalds toy ban

---

This is the strangest ban I have ever heard off. you need to let parents decide whats good for there children, I realize that your board thinks of the general public as idiots and not able to make there own decisions but its not your job to control every aspect of every ones life.

Jim Beehn  
Madison, Nebraska



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: Cowboy Bob's Bum Report

---

From: " " <lgoodin1@mindspring.com>  
To: "Bob at Home" <bob@fior.com>, "Bob Larive" <bob@fior.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@sfchronicle.com>, "kgarcia" <kgarcia@sfexaminer.com>  
Cc: "Lee Housekeeper" <NewsService@aol.com>, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, dsanders@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: 11/05/2010 10:21 PM  
Subject: RE: Cowboy Bob's Bum Report

---

Cowboy Bob,

Stop obsessing on Bums and concentrate on the real criminals: kids who eat "Happy Meals" (misdemeanor) and parents who buy their kids "Happy Meals" (felony). Consumption of three Happy Meals (strikes) in one day is a capital crime punishable by a strict diet of broccoli for life. Obviously, our focus must be on moms and kids not on Bums. Moms and kids are the criminals - Bums are the poor, underserved, hopeless, hapless, huddled, stinking, obnoxious, frightening, vulnerable, masses that need our support - not those uncaring moms who might choose to reward their ungrateful brat with a toy in a fatty, salty, sugar-laden box of drek once a month treat. The eleventh commandment: Thou shalt not take the name of your Lord Stupidvisor in vain.

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

From: Bob at Home

To: Bob Larive;lgoodin1@mindspring.com;Craig Schwan;Aline Estournes;dania.duke@hyatt.com;Jan Misch;Kevin Carroll;quin.orlick@tuscaninn.com;Steve;kevin.cashman@sfgov.org;cwnevius;kgarcia

Cc: Lee Housekeeper; Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org; dsanders@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

Sent: 11/5/2010 8:49:28 PM

Subject: Cowboy Bob's Bum Report

Missed a week as I was out of town but these are from last week. Isn't it nice to see the visitors here for the World Series were greeted by our finest?

But the good news is we are now banning "Happy Meals". What a screwed up city!



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: Cowboy Bob's Bum Report

---

From: "Bob at Home" <bob@fior.com>  
To: "Bob Larive" <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: 11/05/2010 08:48 PM  
Subject: Cowboy Bob's Bum Report

---

Missed a week as I was out of town but these are from last week. Isn't it nice to see the visitors here for the World Series were greeted by our finest?

But the good news is we are now banning "Happy Meals". What a screwed up city!

***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](http://www.fior.com)**

**[fior@fior.com](mailto:fior@fior.com)**

Clerk of the Board Customer Satisfaction Form  
Board.of.Supervisors  
to:  
Board.of.Supervisors  
11/05/2010 10:24 AM  
Show Details

File 101096

To:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org  
Email:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org  
DIVISION\_AGENCY:COB  
TREATED\_YOU:Strongly\_Agree  
VOICEMAIL:Does\_Not\_Apply  
EMAIL\_RESPONSE:Does\_Not\_Apply  
QUESTIONS:Strongly\_Agree  
ACCURATE\_INFORMATION:Strongly\_Agree  
BEHAVED\_ETHICALLY:Strongly\_Agree  
ANSWER\_RESPONSE:Strongly\_Agree  
COMFORT\_LEVEL:Outstanding  
ADDITIONAL\_COMMENTS:Thank you for Banning Happy Meals!!! Other cities look up to you and I appreciate your courage to prevent childhood obesity.  
NUMBER:  
MAILING\_ADDRESS:  
CONTACT\_EMAIL:theonlysparkle@gmail.com

2

Clerk of the Board Customer Satisfaction Form  
Board.of.Supervisors  
to:  
Board.of.Supervisors  
11/05/2010 10:47 AM  
Show Details

*File 101096*

To:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org  
Email:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org  
DIVISION\_AGENCY:COB  
TREATED\_YOU:Strongly\_Agree  
VOICEMAIL:Neutral  
EMAIL\_RESPONSE:Neutral  
QUESTIONS:Neutral  
ACCURATE\_INFORMATION:Strongly\_Agree  
BEHAVED\_ETHICALLY:Strongly\_Agree  
ANSWER\_RESPONSE:Strongly\_Agree  
COMFORT\_LEVEL:Outstanding  
ADDITIONAL\_COMMENTS:Just wanted to send a word of thanks from East Bay for the Happy Meal ordinance!!! Way to go!!! Ignore any negative feedback you get. You did the right thing. Proud of you all! Keep up the great work!!!  
NUMBER:415 577 5807  
MAILING\_ADDRESS:22302 Center St. #8 Castro Valley, CA 94546  
CONTACT\_EMAIL:cbaultman@hotmail.com



Nov. 4, 2010

Re: Happy Meals

cc: Board of Supervisors

File 101096  
BOS-11  
cpage

Dear Mayor Newsom,

I am writing this to urge you to approve the measure that would eliminate toys from Happy Meals that don't meet nutritional guidelines.

I am providing a short example of why I believe this is an important issue for families.

Some years ago, I suggested to my granddaughter, who was becoming plump, that she not order fries with her hamburgers when she eats at MacDonalds or other fast-food chains.

Her immediate reply (she was about 4 at the time): "But then I won't get a toy."

As you know, toys are VERY exciting to kids that age.

I hope you'll take a leadership role in this and help put a "happy face" on kids who grow up to be healthy because they're eating nutritious foods instead of fat-laden foods that lead to serious health problems such as obesity and diabetes.

Thank you for considering my comments,


Cookson Beecher

*Cookson Beecher  
and family*

Review of funding for the Pier 15/17 construction project pursuant to Board Resolution  
No. 430-09

Jonathan Stern to: Angela Calvillo, Board.of.Supervisors  
Cc: Larry Brown, Jennifer Sobol

11/03/2010 12:55 PM



From Port of San Francisco, submitting review of funding for the Exploratorium Pier 15/17 construction project pursuant to Board Resolution No. 430-09



pler 15 Funding Memo.pdf

---

Jonathan Stern  
Asst. Deputy Director, Waterfront Development  
Port of San Francisco  
Pier 1  
San Francisco, California 94111  
415.274.0545 direct  
415.544.1746 fax  
jonathan.stern@sfport.com



BOS-11  
File 09/1178

MEMORANDUM

TO: San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
San Francisco Port Commission

FROM: Lawrence Brown, Financial Analyst – Port of San Francisco  
Jonathan Stern, Manager of Waterfront Development – Port of San Francisco

DATE: 3 November 2010

SUBJECT: Funding for the Construction of the Exploratorium project at Piers 15/17

Pursuant to Board of Supervisor's Resolution No. 430-09, The Board requested that the Port of San Francisco review the financing that the Exploratorium has for the construction of its new facilities at Piers 15/17. The Board has also requested that the Port report back to them on the adequacy of such financing to complete the project, as contemplated. The authors of this memorandum have personally reviewed pledge information and other documents at the Exploratorium's business office related to its capital campaign and financing for the relocation of the museum to the Port's Piers 15/17 site.

In the course of our investigation we have:

- Reviewed in-house reports related to pledges made to the capital campaign and the amounts received. Documents evidencing such pledges, the amounts pledged and the timing of pledge payments were also reviewed.
- Verified cash funding available for the project.
- Reviewed the organization's audited financial statements for fiscal year ended June 30, 2010.
- Reviewed in-house reports on project costs, including costs incurred to-date.
- Reviewed in-house projections of project cash flows.
- Reviewed a credit agreement for a loan obtained by the Exploratorium for the museum relocation.
- Reviewed an agreement for Federal Historic Tax Credits to be received upon completion of construction at Piers 15/17.
- Reviewed other related documents.

Conclusion

In our professional opinion, the Exploratorium has provided adequate evidence that it has sufficient funding to complete the construction of its new facility at the Port's Pier 15/17 location.

### Summary of Findings

Certified total development costs for the Exploratorium museum relocation project (the project) is \$204.8 million. This is based on Port staff review of a \$137.9 million Guaranteed Maximum Price Contract with Nibbi Brothers Associates, Incorporated (general contractors for the project) and verification of predevelopment and project soft costs (architecture and engineering, project management costs, etc.). The certified project costs are listed on Exhibit J to the Lease Development and Disposition Agreement, on file at the Port's Offices.

Identified sources of funding for the project are as follows: i) \$163.6 million in unrestricted or construction-related pledges which are available to be used for project costs; and ii) a Historic Tax Credit syndication agreement (managed by Bank of America) which will provide an estimated \$45.0 million (based on current project costs). A breakdown of project funding and project costs is shown in the table below:

#### **Pier 15/17 Development Budget**

<b>Sources:</b>	
Pledges available for construction	\$163.6 M
Pledges to be collected	\$81.9 M
Pledges spent on pre-development	\$33.0 M
Pledges currently held in cash	\$48.7 M
Historic tax credit proceeds	\$45.0 M
	<u>\$208.6 M</u>
<b>Uses</b>	
Hard Costs	\$137.9 M
Soft Costs	\$49.9 M
Contingency	\$17.0 M
	<u>\$204.8 M</u>

The \$163.6 million in pledges represent commitments from donors received by the Exploratorium as of October 18, 2010, are part of the Exploratorium's \$300 million capital campaign, received during the silent (non-public) portion of the campaign. The majority of the pledges come from well-known Bay Area foundations and philanthropists that have a long track record of delivering or increasing their pledges for capital campaigns of their favored cultural and civic institutions. Donors include the Bernard Osher Foundation, the Gordon Moore family (Mr. Moore is co-founder and Chairman Emeritus of Intel Corporation), the William K. Bowes family (Mr. Bowes is a founding partner of US Venture Partners, a venture capital firm), and many other prominent donors.

To date, the Exploratorium has raised \$209 million of its \$300 million goal. Of the amount raised, \$45.4 million is for a combination of transitions costs, Exploratorium programs and new exhibits, the entity's endowment, and other non-project purposes. The remaining \$163.6 million is available to fund project costs.

With the ground breaking ceremony on October 19, 2010 the campaign has now entered its public phase. Fund raising is on-going with the Exploratorium continuing to receive new pledge commitments. We confirmed that \$163.6 million in unrestricted and construction pledges are available to be used for project costs. However, it should be noted that the Exploratorium continues to receive pledges for the project.

Many of the pledges received to-date are payable over several years. Nevertheless, based on our review, we believe that the pledges are of very high quality, and that they will be collected as scheduled. We note that collections to date have been well above 99% of the amounts pledged.

Of the \$163.6 million in unrestricted and construction related pledges available to fund project costs, \$81.7 million (or 50%) has been collected to date. Of that amount, approximately \$33.0 million has been spent in design and predevelopment activities, \$43.7 million is invested in a corporate money market account at a major financial institution and available to fund construction, and the remaining \$5.0 million is in a deposit account at a major financial institution. We have verified these amounts by examining records of project expenses, and the money market and deposit account balances. \$81.9 million in pledges remain to be collected, over various periods extending out to 2024. We have examined the pledge documents of all donors whose pledges have not been fully paid as of October 18, 2010. Of the \$81.9 million yet to be collected, approximately \$35.0 million is scheduled to be collected between now and the completion of construction in December of 2013.

In order to bridge the timing between when pledges are collected and when funds are needed for construction of the project, the Exploratorium has secured \$100.0 million in financing from a syndicate of banks, \$95.0 million of which is available for project construction. The loan will add an anticipated \$10.2 million in financial costs to the project total. The Exploratorium has closed this loan, but is not yet able to borrow under the credit line. The banking syndicate has asked that the Exploratorium secure approximately \$9 million more in pledges before it will permit the organization to utilize the credit facility. The Exploratorium anticipates securing the additional pledges needed to access its credit facility by the end of 2010. We note that based on the expected construction spending and pledge collection schedules, and the \$48.7 million currently in hand, the Exploratorium will have sufficient cash to fund construction through August 2011. In addition, a construction bond guarantees the performance of the project contractor.

It is our professional opinion that the Exploratorium has shown evidence that it has sufficient funding in place to complete the museum relocation project and related construction. Funds in hand combined with financing that the organization has secured (both construction financing and historic tax credit financing) is sufficient to fully fund the project and the associated financing costs. We are confident that the Exploratorium will obtain the additional pledges needed to draw against its construction loan. As additional security for the Port, \$5.0 million of the \$48.7 million in cash on hand has been pledged as security to the Port. The Port will retain a security interest in these funds for 12 months or until the Exploratorium draws on its construction loan, whichever comes first. Further, a construction bond guarantees the performance of the project contractor. In summary, we believe that the Exploratorium will complete the museum project as currently envisioned.

FILE NO. 091178

RESOLUTION NO.

1 [Approval of Lease for Pier 15 and a portion of Pier 17, a related Parking Agreement and  
Licenses.]

2 **Resolution approving and authorizing a 66-year Lease of Pier 15 and a portion of**  
3 **Pier 17 and a related Parking Agreement at Seawall Lot 321, two Curb Indent Licenses**  
4 **in front of Piers 15 and 17 and a Curb Space License at Green Street between the**  
5 **Exploratorium and the City and County of San Francisco acting by and through the San**  
6 **Francisco Port Commission.**

7  
8 WHEREAS, The Port of San Francisco's Waterfront Land Use Plan ("Waterfront Plan")  
9 includes Piers 15 and 17, which piers are within the Northeast Waterfront Subarea and the  
10 San Francisco Embarcadero National Register Historic District ("Historic District"); and

11 WHEREAS, Objectives established in the Waterfront Plan and the Historic District are  
12 to: (1) preserve and restore historic structures in accordance with the Secretary of Interior  
13 Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings  
14 ("Secretary's Standards"); (2) maximize opportunities for the retention of maritime operations;  
15 (3) provide an array of uses which establish a daytime and nighttime presence, but are not  
16 primarily tourist-oriented; (4) highlight the location of the area as a gateway to the North  
17 Beach and Chinatown neighborhoods to the west, and Fisherman's Wharf to the north; and  
18 (5) provide new public access amenities which highlight newly created points of interest; and

19 WHEREAS, The existing Piers 15 and 17 facilities are critically in need of rehabilitation  
20 and the Exploratorium estimates the cost of the piers substructure repair and related work  
21 total approximating \$65 million for Pier 15 and \$35 million for Pier 17; and

22 WHEREAS, The Exploratorium is a world-renowned museum and educational center,  
23 providing access to, and information about, science, nature, art, and technology, and serves  
24 more than 480,000 visitors annually, including teachers and children on field trips; and  
25

1           WHEREAS, The Exploratorium has been housed since its inception in 1969 at the  
2 Palace of Fine Arts and over the past few years, with the support of the City, has been  
3 engaged in an extensive search for a new site that will better meet its need to be located in a  
4 more visible, accessible, transit-friendly location with sufficient capacity to meet its expanding  
5 program and constituency and house its accessory functions such as exhibit development and  
6 fabrication, administrative space, and ancillary restaurant and retail space; and

7           WHEREAS, The Exploratorium desires to lease Pier 15 and a portion of Pier 17 on the  
8 San Francisco waterfront under a long-term lease of sixty-six years ("Lease") from the San  
9 Francisco Port Commission ("Port") for the Exploratorium's museum and ancillary operations  
10 at Pier 15 and portions of Pier 17, with the possibility of expanding the museum into Pier 17 in  
11 the future and to initially repair and restore Pier 15 in accordance with the Secretary's  
12 Standards and if it expands the museum into Pier 17 in the future, repair and restore Pier 17  
13 at that time, in accordance with the Secretary's Standards ("Exploratorium Project"); and

14           WHEREAS, On June 21, 2005, by Resolution No. 477-05, the Exploratorium obtained  
15 a waiver from the Board of Supervisors exempting the potential Lease of Pier 15, the  
16 Connector Building and the Valley between Piers 15 and 17 and portions of the Pier 17  
17 marginal wharf area ("Original Project") from the competitive bidding policy set forth in San  
18 Francisco Administrative Code Section 2.6-1; and

19           WHEREAS, On February 28, 2006, by Resolution No. 06-13, the Port Commission  
20 approved an Exclusive Negotiation Agreement between the Exploratorium and the Port for the  
21 Original Project and a term sheet for the Lease ("Original Term Sheet"), which included an  
22 option to expand the leased premises into Pier 17 in the 17th year of the proposed Lease; and

23           WHEREAS, On July 25, 2006, by Resolution No. 446-06, the Board of Supervisors  
24 found that the Original Project was fiscally feasible and responsible pursuant to San Francisco  
25 Administrative Code Chapter 29 and endorsed the Original Term Sheet; and

1 WHEREAS, On August 12, 2008, by Resolution No. 08-51, the Port Commission  
2 approved an Amended and Restated Exclusive Negotiation Agreement and a revised term  
3 sheet ("Amended Term Sheet"), which included the addition of portions of Pier 17 to the initial  
4 premises for the term of the proposed Lease (the "Revised Project"); and

5 WHEREAS, By Resolution No. 477-05, the Board of Supervisors exempted the  
6 potential Lease for the Original Project from the competitive bidding policy set forth in San  
7 Francisco Administrative Code Section 2.6-1 for the reasons set forth therein and by  
8 Resolution No. 521-08 also applied the exemption to the Revised Project for the reasons set  
9 forth in said Resolution No. 521-08; and

11/2  
10 WHEREAS, By Resolution No. ~~466-06~~ 446-06, the Board of Supervisors endorsed the  
11 Term Sheet for the Original Project and found the Original Project to be fiscally feasible and  
12 responsible after considering the Project's general description, general purpose and other  
13 information; and by Resolution No. 521-08 found that Resolution No. 446-06 continued to  
14 apply to the Revised Project for the reasons set forth therein and endorsed the Amended  
15 Term Sheet; and

16 WHEREAS, The Port and the Exploratorium have negotiated a Lease Disposition and  
17 Development Agreement ("LDDA"), Lease, Parking Agreement at Seawall Lot 321 (whose  
18 term commences on the date the museum opens to the general public and expires on the day  
19 before the 16<sup>th</sup> anniversary date of the Lease commencement date), and related documents  
20 (including a Curb Indent License for each of Pier 15 and Pier 17 for passenger drop-off and  
21 pick-up and Curb Space License along Green Street at the Embarcadero for temporary bus-  
22 overflow parking (collectively, the "Licenses")) and exhibits thereto, governing the  
23 rehabilitation and operation of the Exploratorium Project; and

24 WHEREAS, On September 8, 2009, the Port Commission, by Resolution No. 09-46,  
25 adopted findings and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP"), as required



1 by the California Environmental Quality Act, regarding the Final Environmental Impact Report  
2 ("FEIR"), alternatives and variants, mitigation measures and significant environmental impacts  
3 analyzed in the FEIR, associated actions; and

4 WHEREAS, On September 8, 2009, the Port Commission by Resolution No. 09-47  
5 approved the LDDA, the Lease, the Parking Agreement and related documents (including the  
6 Licenses) and exhibits thereto; and

7 WHEREAS, The Exploratorium Project is consistent with the San Francisco General  
8 Plan's Northeastern Waterfront Plan objectives and policies designed to contribute to the  
9 waterfront's environmental quality, enhance the economic vitality of the Port and the City,  
10 preserve the unique maritime character, provide open space and other public attractions that  
11 invite the public onto the pier areas, provide access to the Bay, provide for the retention and  
12 improvement of existing maritime uses, result in the historic rehabilitation and adaptive reuse  
13 of Piers 15 and 17 in accordance with the Secretary's Standards as presented and for the  
14 reasons more particularly set forth in the FEIR; and

15 WHEREAS, In connection with the development of the Exploratorium Project, staff of  
16 the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission ("BCDC") has proposed  
17 an amendment to the BCDC *San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan* ("SAP") to require  
18 that fill that is not removed from Piers 15 and 17 as currently required under the SAP be offset  
19 by the removal of fill from locations other than at Piers 15 and 17 (the "Off-Site Fill"); and

20 WHEREAS, Section 9.11 of the Lease sets forth the obligations of both the Port and  
21 the Exploratorium as they relate to the funding and removal of the Off-Site Fill; and

22 WHEREAS, A copy of the proposed Lease, Licenses, and the Parking Agreement are  
23 on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 091178, which is hereby declared  
24 to be a part of this resolution as if set forth fully herein; and

1           WHEREAS, Charter Section 9.118(c) requires the Board of Supervisors approval of  
2 leases having a term of ten or more years or anticipated revenues of one million dollars or  
3 more; and

4           WHEREAS, Charter Section 9.118(b) requires the Board of Supervisors approval of  
5 non-construction related contracts or agreements having a term of ten or more years; and

6           WHEREAS, On October 28, 2009, the Board of Supervisors Budget & Finance  
7 Committee required that prior to the close of escrow on the Lease, the Port submit to the  
8 Board of Supervisors a written report showing adequate evidence that the Exploratorium has  
9 secured sufficient funding to complete construction of the improvements as required by the  
10 LDDA; and

11           WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors, in companion Resolution No. 091179 ;  
12 adopted environmental findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, State  
13 guidelines and Administrative Code Chapter 31 for Board Actions in connection with the  
14 Exploratorium Relocation Project and adopted a MMRP, which Resolution No. 091179  
15 is hereby incorporated herein as if fully set forth; now, therefore, be it

16           RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors hereby approves the Lease, the Parking  
17 Agreement, and the Licenses (collectively, "Board Actions") and finds that there are sufficient  
18 conditions requiring the Exploratorium to provide evidence of financing prior to  
19 commencement of the Lease to satisfy the requirements of the endorsement of the Amended  
20 Term Sheet by the Board of Supervisors in Resolution No. 521-08 to ensure that the  
21 Exploratorium will secure sufficient funding to complete the Exploratorium Project; and be it

22           FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors authorizes and directs the  
23 Executive Director of the Port (the "Executive Director") to execute the Lease, the Parking  
24 Agreement and the Licenses in such final form as is approved by the Executive Director in  
25 consultation with the City Attorney; and be it

1           FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors authorizes the Executive  
2 Director to enter into any additions, amendments or other modifications to the Lease, the  
3 Parking Agreement, and/or the Licenses (including, without limitation, preparation and  
4 attachment of, or changes to, any or all of the exhibits or related documents) that the  
5 Executive Director, in consultation with the City Attorney, determine are in the best interests of  
6 the City, and otherwise do not materially increase the obligations or liabilities of the Port or the  
7 City or materially decrease the public benefits accruing to the Port or the City, and are  
8 necessary or advisable to complete the transactions which the Lease, the Parking Agreement  
9 and the Licenses contemplate and to effectuate the purpose and intent of this resolution, such  
10 determination to be conclusively evidenced by the execution and delivery by the Executive  
11 Director of the Lease, the Parking Agreement and the Licenses and any amendments to such  
12 documents; and be it

13           FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors urges the Port to include in the  
14 Port's ten (10) year capital plan, the Port's funding strategy for accomplishing the Off-Site Fill  
15 removal obligations described in Section 9.11 of the Lease and the proposed amendment to  
16 the SAP; and be it

17           FURTHER RESOLVED, That if the Port and the Exploratorium are unable to secure  
18 non-Port public funds to pay for the cost of removing the Off-Site Fill within five (5) years  
19 following issuance of a certificate of occupancy for a major development at Pier 15, the Board  
20 of Supervisors urges the Port and the Mayor to establish an account in the Port's annual  
21 operating budget where funds (including funds from the Port's Harbor Fund and funds from  
22 other sources) will be deposited on an annual basis to pay for the cost of removing the Off-  
23 Site Fill by the time required under the proposed amendment to the SAP (10 years after the  
24 issuance of a certificate of occupancy for a major development at Pier 15); and be it  
25

1           FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors requires that prior to the close  
2 of escrow on the Lease, the Port submit to the Board of Supervisors a written report showing  
3 adequate evidence that the Exploratorium has secured sufficient funding to complete  
4 construction of the improvements as required by the LDDA; and be it

5           FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors authorizes and urges the  
6 Executive Director, and any other appropriate officers, agents or employees of the City to take  
7 any and all steps (including, but not limited to, the execution and delivery of any and all  
8 certificates, agreements, notices, consents and other instruments or documents), as they or  
9 any of them deems necessary or appropriate, in consultation with the City Attorney, in order to  
10 consummate the transaction under the Lease, the Parking Agreement and the Licenses in  
11 accordance with this resolution, or to otherwise effectuate the purpose and intent of this  
12 resolution, such determination to be conclusively evidenced by the execution and delivery by  
13 any such person or persons of any such documents; and be it

14           FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors approves, confirms and ratifies  
15 all prior actions taken by the officials, employees and agents of the Port Commission or the  
16 City with respect to the Lease, the Parking Agreement and the Licenses.



# City and County of San Francisco

City Hall  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

## Tails Resolution

---

**File Number:** 091178

**Date Passed:**

Resolution approving and authorizing a 66-year Lease of Pier 15 and a portion of Pier 17 and a related Parking Agreement at Seawall Lot 321, two Curb Indent Licenses in front of Piers 15 and 17 and a Curb Space License at Green Street between the Exploratorium and the City and County of San Francisco acting by and through the San Francisco Port Commission.

---


October 20, 2009 Mayor — SUBSTITUTED

November 3, 2009 Board of Supervisors — ADOPTED

Ayes: 11 - Alioto-Pier, Avalos, Campos, Chiu, Chu, Daly, Dufty, Elsbernd, Mar, Maxwell, Mirkarimi


File No. 091178

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED on November 3, 2009 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Angela Calvillo  
Clerk of the Board

11-10-09

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date Approved

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor Gavin Newsom



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: West Harbor renovation

File 101302  
Cpage

---

From: dominic maionchi <dm567@pacbell.net>  
To: Phil Ginsburg <Phil.Ginsburg@sfgov.org>  
Cc: Mary.hobson@sfgov.org, larrywhite100@aol.com, Penny Schulz <PSchulz@dbw.ca.gov>, Max Delaney <Maxd@bcdc.ca.gov>, Brendan Huffman <brendan@huffmanpa.com>, "H.P. Sandy Purdon" <HPPurdon@cox.net>, Lenora Clark <lenorasclark@yahoo.com>, Matt Webb <matt.Webb@webbassociates.com>, metzabc@yahoo.com, Steve Moore <sjsheriff@sjgov.org>, Cavec1@aol.com, recpark.commission@sfgov.org, senator.yee@senate.ca.gov, Leah Rowell <Leah.rowell@sen.ca.gov>, catherine.stefani@sfgov.org, Michela Alioto-Pier <michela.alioto-pier@sfgov.org>, Ana Alvarez <Ana.Alvarez@sfgov.org>, Margarita Sanchez <msanchez@dbw.ca.gov>, Becky Dickinson <seaglassdream@yahoo.com>, "John G. Millar" <jgmillar@jgmillar.com>, Olive Gong <Olive.Gong@sfgov.org>, Alan Silverman <alansilverman185@comcast.net>, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org  
Date: 11/02/2010 10:08 AM  
Subject: West Harbor renovation

---

ATTENTION

TO: BCDC Max Delaney; please include this letter as part of the public record for the next BCDC meeting concerning the Marina Project. Please confirm.

TO: DBW Penny Schultz; please include this letter in the marina renovation loan file. Please confirm.

TO: RPD Commission Margaret McArthur: please include this letter as a letter to the commission in the next general commission meeting. Please confirm.

TO: SF Board of Supervisors Clerk of the SF Board of Supervisors; Angela Calvillo; please include this letter in the public record of the next scheduled SF board of supervisor meeting as a letter to the board of supervisors.

Dear Mr. Ginsburg,

I received the latest renovation flyer.

On the positive side, it looks like RPD management has come to its senses and is keeping the Scott Street mole which protects the inner harbor and is keeping the majority of the West mole. In effect they are renovating the harbor "as is" as was my suggestion in the first place (Project Manager Mary Hobson wouldn't even consider my request that such an option be considered and priced out; she thought it was crazy.) Regardless of whether these changes were made for the right reasons or not, these are positive changes. Thus I did not object to the new design at BCDC. I have no problem with the floating breakwater as long as the Scott Street mole remains. If the marina residents have a problem with it I'll leave it up to them to complain. They probably will but only after its too late and it shows up one day in tow behind a tug boat marring their views for decades. (and the public's views)

I did submit letters that document the collusion between the RPD Project Manager, Ms. Hobson, (and others) and the engineer providing an "independent" engineering report that purported to justify the replacement of the fixed breakwater that was approved in the EIR with a floating breakwater that was never approved in the EIR. No good can come from such doctored engineering reports. Such collusion is unacceptable in city government. Such collusion is now

4

part of the public record for all to see. I have also documented and submitted for the public record the collusion between the Planning Department, RPD, and the City Attorney's office with regard to approving the changes to the EIR as an "addendum" in clear violation of CEQA. Addendums were clearly meant under CEQA for "minor" changes. A 300 foot floating breakwater outside the scope of the project area is not a minor change.

On the negative side, RPD's planned renovation still does not include double finger slips and concrete docks, although the concrete docks are apparently still a possibility. What the marina tenants are getting is double finger wood docks being replaced by single finger wood docks; all this at twice the per foot rental rate the marina was at just a few years ago.

As you know I have been a strong critic of Mary Hobson from the start. It is her incompetence that has caused many of the years delays by not working with tenants of the harbor or the neighborhood. Her incompetence will continue if management does not intervene. The bidders know what the budget is and will bid accordingly. They will provide the least amount of infrastructure (single finger slips) and the lowest quality of infrastructure (wood docks) and provide bids just under the budget numbers leaving little or no room for improvements. Furthermore if this is not going to be a fixed price contract they will further pad their profits with inevitable cost overruns.

May I suggest that you bid the marina out with concrete docks and double finger slips with a fixed price contract and see where the bids come in. You will still have the opportunity to cut costs later if the Marina cannot afford such improvements. If you do it the other way around we will surely never see double fingered slips nor concrete docks. Also, it is important to get as many bidders as possible. Reopen the window for request for qualifications and leave a longer window open for bidding.

If you continue on your present course and do this Mary Hobson's way the San Francisco Marina will never be a first class marina with single finger wood docks. Please recall that she has stated publicly on at least two occasions that she knows nothing about Marinas. That is the one thing she did get right.

Regards,

Dominic Maionchi

dominic maionchi  
[dm567@pacbell.net](mailto:dm567@pacbell.net)

This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. E-mail transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error-free as information could be intercepted, corrupted, lost, destroyed, arrive late or incomplete, or contain viruses. The sender therefore does not accept liability for any errors or omissions in the contents of this message, which arise as a result of e-mail transmission. If verification is required please request a hard-copy version. This message is sent from a computer that is not secure and the authenticity of the sender may be in question.



File 101230

# Library Users Association

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

Tel./Fax (415) 753-2180

November 7, 2010

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

Subject: ***Please Landmark North Beach Branch Library***

Ladies and Gentlemen:

We ask you to give landmark status to North Beach Branch Library at Tuesday's meeting. As a second choice, we ask you to hear the issue in detail, preferably at a future date.

The Land Use Committee hearing on Monday, November 1, which ended in a 3-0 vote against landmarking, was a most unfortunate performance. It appeared to ignore completely the findings of experts regarding this library, including the Historic Preservation Commission which had voted 4-3 in favor.

1. The author of the Planning Department's extensive report about the branch presented herself twice during the hearing, offering to provide additional information and answer questions – but ***not one of the members asked her a single question.***
2. The Land Use Committee members asserted as fact such things as the building's unworthiness to be landmarked. They did not make it clear that ***these evaluations were their personal opinions – and in direct contradiction to the Planning Department's staff evaluation.***
3. ***The members spoke repeatedly about matters that have nothing to do with the merits of the building and its worthiness to be landmarked.*** These included such things as the supposed benefits of building a new library, and how the neighborhood "deserved"

5

an improved building – as though the renovation and expansion, which had been planned for more than seven years since the branch bond measure (Prop. A) passed in 2000, would provide no benefits or was somehow not an option. *Meantime, no mention was made of the fact that the new building will cost triple the renovation/expansion, and that the increased costs will make less money available for patron service for decades to come.*

Prop. D (2007) provides that money used for bond repayments may come out of the library's mandated funding – which was forbidden prior to 2007.

Others supporting landmarking include San Francisco Architectural Heritage, San Francisco Preservation Consortium, Friends of Appleton and Wolfard, and of course Library Users Association.

By my recollection, this would be the first time a library building would be landmarked *before* renovations. Please approve landmarking. Landmarking does not necessarily prevent renovations or reuse or even abandonment, but does give some measure of protection to a valuable, mid-century modern building that embodies quality architecture for libraries in San Francisco.

Library Users Association thanks you for the time and effort you have expended on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Peter Warfield  
Executive Director



To: Alisa Somera/BOS/SFGOV,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: File 101203: Please Landmark North Beach Branch Library

---

From: Library Users Association <libraryusers2004@yahoo.com>  
To: sophie.maxwell@sfgov.org, Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org, David.Chiu@sfgov.org,  
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org  
Cc: Judson.True@sfgov.org, Catherine.Rauschuber@sfgov.org, Les.Hilger@sfgov.org,  
Jon.Lau@sfgov.org, Alias.Somera@sfgov.org  
Date: 11/01/2010 12:27 PM  
Subject: Please Landmark North Beach Branch Library

---

Dear Supervisors:

We ask you to support the landmarking of North Beach Branch Library at today's Land Use Committee meeting, as we have worked to make this happen for more than a year.

The city's Planning Department staff has said that this branch is the best-preserved of the eight Appleton & Wolfard libraries, and deserves to be landmarking based on its architectural qualities.

For more than seven years, San Francisco Public Library's plans for the branch included only renovation and expansion. Only after the passage of Prop. D in 2007 did the Library change course and plan a new building -- at TRIPLE THE COST of the planned renovation and expansion. Similarly, the Library recently demolished Ortega Branch rather than renovating and expanding as originally planned, also at about triple the estimated renovation cost.

More than a year ago we approached the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) to consider landmarking a number of library branches, something they said had not come to their attention since the Branch Library Improvement Program (BLIP) bond of 2000 (Prop. A). The HPC's recommendation to landmark comes after long and extensive hearings and consideration on the subject beginning more than a year ago.

Please likewise approve the landmarking of North Beach Branch library.

Thank you for your attention to this.

Sincerely yours,

Peter Warfield  
Executive Director  
Library Users Association  
415/7 5 3 - 2 1 8 0

5



To: Alisa Somera/BOS/SFGOV,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: File 101203: "North Beach library is not a landmark"

---

From: " " <lgoodin1@mindspring.com>  
To: "David.Chiu" <David.Chiu@sfgov.org>, "bevan.dufty" <bevan.dufty@sfgov.org>, "carmen.chu" <carmen.chu@sfgov.org>, "chris.daly" <chris.daly@sfgov.org>, "david.campos" <david.campos@sfgov.org>, "Eric.L.Mar" <Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org>, "john.avalos" <john.avalos@sfgov.org>, "Michela.Alioto-Pier" <Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org>, "Ross.Mirkarimi" <Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org>, "Sean.Elsbernd" <Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org>, "Sophie Maxwell" <Sophie.Maxwell@sfgov.org>, "board.of.supervisors" <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
Cc: "cwnevius" <cwnevius@sfchronicle.com>  
Date: 11/02/2010 11:10 AM  
Subject: "North Beach library is not a landmark"

---

Honorable Supervisors,

For your reading pleasure some quotable quotes from the item in the SF Chronicle, Jessica Kwong, November 01, 2010:

**"Clapping and cheering sounded at the Board of Supervisors Land Use and Economic Development Committee Monday following the unanimous vote against designating the North Beach library a land mark.**

The existing building is the "least representative and most lacking of architectural characteristics" of the seven libraries designed by the firm Appleton & Wolfard between 1951 and 1969, said Supervisor David Chiu, who represents North Beach. To designate North Beach library as a landmark "cheapens" the architectural merits of other mid-century-style branches, Chiu said.

The San Francisco Public Library has proposed a new, 8,500-square-foot, two-story structure to be constructed on a triangle lot bound by Columbus Avenue and Lombard and Mason streets, to replace the existing building that many have called dark and dingy.

The new structure would better serve the needs of families and the handicapped, new library supporters said. Like about two-thirds of the speakers during public comment, City Librarian Luis Herrera said he was "absolutely thrilled" that the committee did not designate North Beach as a landmark. "It really puts people who need a new library at the priority," Herrera said."

**Supervisors, when this issue comes before the full Board, I trust you will heed these words and the public support behind them, and vote unanimously to disapprove landmark status for this outdated, outmoded, nonfunctional, non-accessible, butt-ugly structure.**

Thank you,  
Lee Goodin  
600 Chestnut Street  
North Beach  
415 346-4335  
[lgoodin1@mindspring.com](mailto:lgoodin1@mindspring.com)

(6)

File 101230

North beach Library  
lgoodin1

to:

David.Chiu, david.campos, bevan.dufty, board.of.supervisors, carmen.chu, chris.daly, Eric.L.Mar, john.avalos,  
Michela.Alioto-Pier, Ross.Mirkarimi, Sean.Elsbernd, Sophie Maxwell

11/07/2010 02:29 PM

Cc:

"Julie Christensen", "lizzy@arcadia-garden.com", "cwnevius"

Please respond to lgoodin1

Show Details

Supervisors,

Tuesday, you have the opportunity to further a project that has been ten years in the making - a project that has the support of hundreds of North Beach residents and is opposed by a only a handful of obstructionists - a project that will provide a new state of the art library and a bigger, improved playground for the families in this high density neighborhood - a project that will be killed if you approve landmark status for the existing non-functional, non-accessible structure. Please vote NO on landmarking - it's the right thing to do!

Lee Goodin  
600 Chestnut Street  
North beach  
415 346-4335  
[lgoodin1@mindspring.com](mailto:lgoodin1@mindspring.com)

(b)

Aaron Goodman  
25 Lisbon St.  
San Francisco, CA 94112  
[amgodman@yahoo.com](mailto:amgodman@yahoo.com)

San Francisco Planning Commission  
c/o [linda.avery@sfgov.org](mailto:linda.avery@sfgov.org)  
RE: November 4<sup>th</sup>, 2010 Meeting Item #9 & 10

SF Planning Commissioners;

I am unable to attend the Thursday Nov. 4<sup>th</sup> hearing on the development agreement proposed on the Parkmerced project. I therefore wanted to submit comments on Item #10, and additional issue related to Parkmerced and the SFSU-CSU "Masterplan" EIR and MOU negotiated prior between the city and CSU agency that lacked any formal inclusion of "fair-share" impact assessment on open-space, housing, transit, traffic, and effects on Parkmerced as a historic district on the item #9 2010.0838T prior below.

**9. 2010.0839T AMENDMENTS TO THE PLANNING CODE RESIDENTIAL INCLUSIONARY AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAM. [BOS FILE NO. 10-1095] - Hearing of a proposed Ordinance that would amend amending the Residential Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program, Planning Code Sections 415 et seq. to exempt certain Qualified Student Housing Projects, as defined, if the project meets certain requirements; and making findings including environmental findings. The Commission will consider an Ordinance introduced by Supervisor Dufty that would amend the Planning Code as described with additional modifications as recommended by the Planning Department and making various findings including environmental findings, Planning Code Section 101 and 302 findings, and General Plan consistency findings. [Preliminary Recommendation: Approval with Modifications]**

This amendment directly impacts Parkmerced and the housing issues of district 7 in relation to San Francisco State University's CSU's masterplan project. The loss of over 1,000 rent-controlled units in the stonestown and parkmerced areas has NOT been accounted for in the MOU negotiated with the city or the overall impact on low-mid income renters, families, seniors, and disabled residents of this district. The allowance to EXEMPT projects per CEQA from environmental review is absurd and ignores multiple sections of the SF General Plan and concerns of institutional growth on adjacent communities. To date the SF Planning Commission has done an extremely poor job of recognizing the impacts on historical districts such as parkmerced and of SFSU and other institutional masterplans on adjacent communities and has eliminated open-space, and displaced residents consistently without any financial or remedial efforts to lessen the impacts such as "fair-share" cost assessments or directly fining the institutions for the lack of financial contribution to the impacts they create. The SFSU-CSU masterplan's proposed development on the University Park South blocks would per this amendment be allowed through per my understanding without any formal EIR to adequately assess the impacts on the Parkmerced original historical boundaries. The SFSU-CSU campus already has a severe impact on the housing availability, and the efforts by Stellar Management to flip the property units during the 2007 summer period has impacted not only students, but families of low-mid income level that would find these units "family" sized and appropriate as social housing stock in the city. I strongly urge you to reconsider this amendment in light of projects that perhaps supervisor dufty has not been appraised on and ensure that institutional growth for whatever proposed development type NOT be given exemption of ceqa.

**10. PARK MERCED MIXED-USE PROJECT OVERVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT – INFORMATIONAL ONLY –**  
*Informational Hearing to provide an overview of the proposed project components and draft Development Agreement. The project, which would be implemented over 20-30 years in multiple phases, includes the addition of approximately 5,700 net new residential units, the demolition and replacement of approximately 1,800 existing units which would remain subject to the San Francisco Rent Stabilization Ordinance, rent-protections and relocation rights for existing tenants, re-alignment and re-design of streets and blocks, re-alignment and improvement of the M Ocean View light rail line, the addition of new neighborhood serving retail and office space, new and re-configured public open spaces including neighborhood parks, pedestrian and bike paths, athletic fields, a new organic farm, and community gardens, overall transportation improvements, ecological hydrology improvements, and provision of renewable energy and water infrastructure. The draft Development Agreement would become the binding legal contract between the City and the Developer and would memorialize all of the public benefits and obligations of the Developer and associated agreements between both parties toward implementation of the Project. [Preliminary Recommendation: No Action Requested. Informational Discussion Only.]*

I received a copy of the comments and responses, and the developer agreement recently this last week. The responses are indicative of the typical SF Planning Department response to very pointed and sincere comments on alternatives, in essence they have again IGNORED the very VISUAL and COMPELLING solutions I have proposed on the transportation, and "infill" options that would mitigate and lessen the impacts on Parkmerced as an eligible national landmark site. The Thursday hearing proposes to discuss the developer agreement. This is a complex legal document even more complex than the MOU negotiated with the SFSU-CSU agency on their prior "masterplan" that also jointly impacts Parkmerced residents/tenants. In the MOU between the city and CSU-SFSU tenants and the tenant organization were IGNORED, and the impacts on the community left unmitigated. This appears to again be the case in the proposed development agreement. It has been repeatedly noted by community members, and the SF Planning Commissioner's statements that the development proposal and information presented seems "ONE-SIDED" from the developer's standpoint. This has been the case for the entire process to date, with little change since the inception documents and meetings in terms of the presented documents and design. Repeated commenters to work on an infill option that lessened the overall impact on Parkmerced and looked adequately at the joint impacts of TWO EIR's and developments jointly on Parkmerced have been consistently ignored, citing land-ownership vs. adequate CEQA analysis and ensuring proper and full review of the soundness of the units, socio-economic factors, CSU student impact, and obvious technical errors in the defining of OPEN-SPACE and the loss to the community since Parkmerced's development of amenities consistently degrading the quality of the communities design intentionally by prior owners. I read through the initial "development agreement" summary and noted the following sections that I have noted below some initial issues;

- **Community Improvement** - There is little info. or input on the stated questions raised by individuals on the overall community benefits being proposed. There is a significant loss of open-space undetermined by the documents, and intentionally represented improperly by the developer's legal team in terms of open-space or private/public outdoor amenities, and amenities sold off prior such as the open-space owned currently by SFSU-CSU, the SFUSD site, and the open-space area at 800 Brotherhood Way, along with the Cambon Commerical zoned core that has also not been included in the community improvements and issues on impacts to the area. There is also little discussion on the actual loss/benefit of urbanizing an entire low-scale neighborhood environmentally, nor discussion on the actual USEABILITY of the open-space to be provided in the future.
- **Rent-Controlled Housing Replacement & Tenant Relocation Program** - It mentions in the development agreement "with no pass through added to rent of the Replacement Unit for the capital costs of the Project." There is NO mention of the already spent money by Stellar Management for the \$130million+ improvements pumped through parkmerced since their initial purchase in 2007. This financial sum, would therefore be pass-through eligible by Fortress

Investment's on the work done to date by Stellar. There is no mention of this "total" amount spent to date, nor the cost implications of a pass-through to existing tenants for the work between 2007 and 2010 or up until the capital costs are determined. The discussion of "Home-owner's Dues" is also a foreign subject for renter's, and the eventual future "owners" of units in parkmerced. The impact of consistently rising HOA dues in many developments in the valley of California has often forced families to sell, or leave the developments since it adds on significant fees and costs to the mortgage or rental agreements. There is no protection from such increased fees as it is set typically by a board or panel that does not take into account any financial hardship issues. The fact that the community has always served as essential rental housing and now is proposed as "for-profit-for-sale" housing is also troubling considering the amount of high-end homes built citywide with little for-rent units at any semblance of affordability for working class families.

- **Transit System Improvements** - The transit system "improvements" have been noted previously as negative in numerous ways. Directly routing the transit through the core is a drastic step that should be looked at in terms of the Tier-5 Level routing that may be required in the future. The traffic/transit gridlock will only worsen without direct routing of transit, and tunneling along 19<sup>th</sup> and Junipero Serra Blvd. to divert auto traffic directly out of the area. There has been little discussion of renegotiating the MOU with SFSU-CSU to mandate "fair-share" impact fees for the transit/traffic/transportation impacts of the university on Parkmerced. This will not improve with the proposed current improvements. The alternative tunneling locations, and cross-intersection of 19<sup>th</sup> and Junipero Serra Blvd. is not adequately analyzed for optimal release of traffic volume that is gridlocked here daily. Alternatives submitted included a tunneling proposal with stacked or vertical alignment along the Caltrans route of 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. This is a SIGNIFICANT un-reviewed alternative route that provides the optimal transformation of the districts transit. The 30'-0" varied drop and rises in elevation along both Junipero Serra (from St. Francis Circle to Brotherhood Way) and 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. (from Vincente to the Brotherhood Way area) represent ideal conditions to explore Tier-5 level funding for changes that would adequately resolve transit system congestion, right-of-way cross overs along 19<sup>th</sup> and Ocean Ave. and minimize transit side-tracking versus
- **Negotiations with Stellar Management, Parkmerced Investors LLC, and/or Fortress Investments Inc.** - It is shocking that the city is willing to negotiate with organizations/investment entities that have been linked directly to both Predatory Equity Lending/Investment Strategies, and a Mortgage Fraud Case of over \$500 Million. The documents indicate negotiation with Stellar Management in the agreement for "entitlements" the property however has been noted as sold to Fortress Investments Inc.. The numerous articles dealing with Predatory Equity Lending on the east coast, and concerns for the PUBLIC BENEFIT AND PROTECTION MUST BE ENSURED. The negotiations on such a huge development require independent analysis on the legal implications. The rush to approve such entitlements again jeopardizes community protection and benefit by public representatives in the lack of adequate independent legal support. The documents are highly complex, and lack layman's or simple outlay of prior legal decisions that affect the communities members. The entitlements are meant only as a profiteering measure to ensure that the seller (Stellar, or Parkmerced Investments LLC) retains management control and fees, and the sale of the property as a developer give-away in the entitlements section. The original development and agreement between Met-Life and the City of San Francisco should be produced for review to determine the original benefit the housing was entitled to as a development for ESSENTIAL HOUSING STOCK and RENTAL HOUSING STOCK that is currently under-developed by the city in its lack of adherence to the SF General Plan. The "negotiations" being discussed place the city and the legal groups negotiating the "deal" in jeopardy since the development teams legal team is far excelled and prepared to negotiate the terms of such agreements without any opposition from tenants or community organizations. This directly affects PEOPLE, and should not be negotiated without community direct involvement and strong legal support by federal, or national legal representation on such development



agreements. The city of San Francisco attorney generals office may not represent the best interests of the community in such a large scale agreement, and a stronger legal rights group that benefits the communities interests should be involved in any decision, or agreements drafted.

- **Greater Public Benefit's Has NOT been proven by the City** - There has been no formal accurate summation or analysis of the PUBLIC BENEFIT of such a project, when the existing community to date has been displaced, amenities sold-off, and effects of SFSU-CSU impacts on rental family housing district wide, is unaccounted for, and the cities lax analysis in review of the development of essential housing rental stock citywide. The mention of the "better-streets-program" indicates a lack of understanding on what makes communities diverse and exceptional in design and pattern. There would be distinct benefit to turning Parkmerced into a National Register Site and Cultural Landscape, to ensure that public protection of the Thomas Dolliver Church Landscape elements are preserved and repaired. There is no cost assessed or analyzed in terms of this loss to the city and country as it is the ONLY public accessible site of his work that displays a large variety of detail, and design concept. The Parkmerced development differs succinctly from the ordinary street grid of San Francisco. There is no proof that the beaux arts street layout if changed would benefit any areas surrounding. The street reconfiguration also has been indicated to be insufficient in public benefit to ALL modes of transit. The SFPUC had indicated that the preferred method would be tunneling along 19<sup>th</sup> Ave. to separate grade modes. There has been zero effort to analyze the future routing of underground transit routes, to optimize the future transit needs. The city does own land within the project site, namely the SFUSD site that is not mentioned, and the streets that are PUBLIC land.
- **Sustainability** - The development agreement states in summary on page 3 of 5 it absurdly discusses "washer and dryer" replacement in the discussion of "equal units". This section notes that a new washer and dryer will be provided to the tenants what is this an advertisement for "large-green-open-space" that will no longer exist! There is no mention of the new laundry facilities built and renovated under stellar management, the increased costs to tenants of these machines, the lack of maintenance by Stellar post there installation, the costs environmentally of providing 1:1 washer's and dryer's in every unit water and energy wise. The demolition of units, landscape, infrastructure and regarding of the site has NOT been analyzed or any accurate information on energy waste, and costs environmentally on the proposed long-term large scale regarding of the site. Many opportunities existed during the renovations to date by Stellar to implement solar, and water saving measures. Instead plantings, cosmetic fixes, tree-trimming, and expenditures on supplies, vehicles, and advertisement has been the fore-front of the sustainability efforts to date. Implemented trash and recycling programs have not met adequately the issues of hygiene in the towers due to compost issues in the basement areas, nor the concern for the increased reliance on staff untrained in recycling and compost duties typically carried out by Recology and Sunset Scavenger Union workers. The effects of 1:1 parking, and total lack of any solar or water collection implementation when re-roofing projects occurred by Stellar during there ownership is indicative of the ignorance of the developer and architect in the implementation of such programs prior to or within the actual development versus demolition. There has been no analysis of the sustainability and energy use of adaptive re-use of the buildings on site and how much embued energy would be saved by preservation based alternatives vs. demolition. The soundness of the units have been consistently questioned by the owners, and architect with little factual basis or independent analysis on the actual buildings conditions. The efforts by SFSU-CSU on the upgrades to the University Park South blocks included water/flashing/gutter changes and roofing work that exceeded ALL of the renovations to the Parkmerced (Stellar) owned property in terms of sustainable implementation of solar, and repair work, including a recycling of roofing materials that never has occurred on Parkmerced's other units to date during the extensive renovation projects that occurred. There has been little proof of the energy efficiency of work implemented in the towers, and to date little factual

information on the costs and energy consumed in the cosmetic changes by Stellar Management to date.

As to the actual agreement statements I only had time to skim the text and respond accordingly as the document is too long, and complex for individuals without legal representation and understanding on the implications. It is impossible in the time-span between the issuance of the C&R's and the quick posting of the Developer Agreement I noted to digest and retort on the items proposed, which do NOT represent the communities best interests in such legal matters without independent legal assistance in reviewing the agreement proposed. I will briefly tag a couple of issues (sections in red *italic* from the DA below, comments initially below in black as I read through the document;

*A.1 One-for-one replacement of 1,538 rent-controlled dwelling units currently existing on the Project Site (the "Existing Units") with new rent-controlled units (i.e., units that are subject to the provisions of the San Francisco Rent Ordinance), each with the same or greater number of bedrooms and bathrooms as the Existing Unit being replaced (each, a "Replacement Unit" and collectively, the "Replacement Units"). Although none of the Existing Units have washer or dryers, each Replacement Unit will have a washer and a dryer and a dish washer installed by Developer prior to occupancy and all Existing Tenants shall be entitled to relocate to a Replacement Unit of approximately similar or greater size and with the same or greater number of bedrooms or bathrooms as their Existing Unit.*

This statement ignores the loss of open-space, hardscape, softscape and shared community features of the landscape design which is not mentioned or indicated as receiving EQUAL replacement. The paths, walkways, patios, hedges, planters, internal and external courtyards, and shared internal and external patio, walkways and openspace are not equally replaced in the future development. The SOM and Page & Turnbull documents and emails by the developers team to the SF Planning Department indicate already discrepancies in the exchange being proposed. ONE FOR ONE REPLACEMENT MUST TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION THE LOSS OF OPEN SPACE!!!, Whether it is shared, communal, hardscape (concrete) or softscape (planted), private, public, or any other misnomer of classification by the developer, it is LOST in the deal being proposed. Adequate steps must be taken to classify, or acknowledge this loss in the sale of open space to SFSU-CSU and additional lands sold off that prior were a part of the original classification of density for Parkmerced's development. There is little acknowledgement on the size of the existing units in terms of FAMILY sized rental housing, and the desperate need to increase such units citywide. The units in Parkmerced represent the LARGEST units in the city rental wise in one development and were created to provide flexibility and adaptability of the units for differing family sizes. The development's large number of newly created units does not indicate the MAXIMUM density that would create a detrimental level in a garden rental apartment community in terms of the transformation proposed.

*A.3 Relocation by Developer of Existing Tenants from their Existing Units to the Replacement Units, with an initial rent and pass through charges equal to the rent and pass through charges charged to the Existing Tenant for their Existing Unit at the time of relocation to the Replacement Unit, with the right to remain in the Replacement Unit for an unlimited term subject to the eviction rules, procedures and protections set forth in the San Francisco Rent Ordinance, and no pass throughs added to rent of the Replacement Unit for the capital costs of the Project.*

At the time of relocation would than mean that Fortress Investment's can and probably will pass-through improvement costs to date prior to the actual move in to the new constructed units. There is no legal binding issue here, as the tenants organizations have stated clearly that the costa-hawkins act and legal cases negate the agreements by the MOEWD on trinity plaza and that they are NOT ENFORCEABLE. New units per current state

law are not protected, or at least non-enforceable as noted by tenant organizations, agreeing to negotiate such terms without adequate legal clarity places citizens and the city at risk legally.

3.3.2 Compliance with CEQA. The Parties acknowledge that the FEIR prepared for the Project complies with CEQA. The Parties further acknowledge that (i) the FEIR contains a thorough analysis of the Project and possible alternatives to the Project, (ii) the Mitigation Measures have been adopted to eliminate or reduce to an acceptable level certain adverse environmental impacts of the Project, and (iii) the Board of Supervisors adopted a statement of overriding considerations in connection with the Project Approvals, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, for those significant impacts that could not be mitigated to a less than significant level. For these reasons, the City does not intend to conduct any further environmental review or mitigation under CEQA for any aspect of the Project vested by this Agreement, as more particularly described by the Basic Approvals, except as may be required by applicable law in taking future discretionary actions relating to the Project.

This means that the city is ignoring CEQA and is not acknowledging the issues that have been stated in memos directly to the SF Planning Department that note NON-COMPLIANCE with CEQA in the documents and decisions submitted to date, and not enforcing the need to adequately review the original historic district boundaries of Parkmerced, It also seems to state that no "soundness" report is required when demolishing an entire neighborhood of houses. This whole agreement and project directly contradicts the SF General Plan under multiple sections, and needs to look adequately at CEQA law to ensure proper and adequate analysis of the raised options/alternatives, and concerns on soundness of existing units. The lack of proper analysis of the historical boundaries of Parkmerced as a district is again a violation of CEQA. That the city is not benefitting directly in terms of revenue for this project and the proposed tax-base is again non-compliance. There has been too many direct payments to political interests, and city agencies not to see a distinct pattern of non-compliance with state regulatory laws in regards to CEQA on multiple large scale projects.

In brief conclusion;

I do not consider the Developer Agreement to be clear, concise or accurate in numerous points and issues that I have raised prior in documents submitted to the SF Planning Department and SF Board of Supervisors. I have spent over 5 years documenting and issuing emails/letters/memo's and connecting with organizations and community members, and there is still little support for such a large scale undertaking without a more scaled back version of the development.

To consistently support or back such a project and development that is obviously NOT in the public's best interest, but a developer give-away is again a problem the SF Planning Department, SF Historic Preservation Commission, SF Planning Commission, SF Board of Supervisors, and newly appointed Mayor will have to undertake. There are better alternatives, and solutions and rushing to the finish line on greased wheels is not the correct method of sustainable green development in any alternative on such a large scale and long term project.

Sincerely

Aaron Goodman

Cc: SF Planning Commission, SF Historic Preservation Commission, SF Board of Supervisors



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: [Parkmerced] Item#9 + 10 Nov. 4th, 2010 - a little too much in one day?

---

From: Aaron Goodman <amgodman@yahoo.com>  
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org, linda.avery@sfgov.org  
Date: 11/02/2010 02:37 AM  
Subject: [Parkmerced] Item#9 + 10 Nov. 4th, 2010 - a little too much in one day?

---

#### SF Planning Commission & SF Board of Supervisors

I noted the posting of the items for the day on the Nov. 4th SF Planning Commission hearing and it appears that there is a large amount of issues being heard that date. Many attendee's as noted are working people (9-5 jobs) and there are many students, seniors, and disabled residents that may want to attend and speak on the issues. To hold a "mid-night-extravaganza" of the SF Planning Commission seems again as some commissioners have noted to be "cramming" a bit too much for a final exam and pushing things through rapidly without adequately looking over these issues. Tenants organizations raised significant concern about the legal "binding" issues of case-law, in addition the CEQA exemption item on Student Housing (Item#9) also directly affects Parkmerced in the UPS blocks and the SFSU-CSU Masterplan and MOU Negotiated by the city prior. It ignores and allows a state institution to ignore state law in regards to preservation and adequate review of such housing projects that might be developed in the SFSU-CSU Masterplan on Parkmerced's original outline. The National Trust for Historic Preservation submitted comments on the SFSU-CSU EIR directly pointing to this issue and CSU's proposed student housing projects and recommending project specific EIR's in relation to **ANY** such proposed projects that may affect Parkmerced. Currently to my knowledge no city organization including the SF Attorney's office has clarified or issued a formal statement as to how item #9 and the MOU negotiated prior with SFSU-CSU on their "masterplan" EIR is impacted or affected by the two items placed on the SF Planning Commission's agenda for thursday. I am not a legal body, or representative of any legal ability, therefore I would hope a sincere effort is made to explain the issues involved in relation to the MOU negotiated prior, and the EIR and Item #9 on the proposed EXEMPTION of student housing projects from CEQA.

The Parkmerced "development agreement" is also a distinctly intricate and complex legally binding document of over 100 pages, currently the residents community organizations, and neighborhood groups, along with the public agencies involved in the discussion have only recently received last week the comments and responses section on Parkmerced's EIR. To expect any ordinary non-planning or EIR certified individual to not only stay awake late enough, but be able to digest and respond adequately to the developer agreement items recently posted is not doing due justice to the need to provide the best community benefit and adequate review of the documents.

I would suggest a couple of weeks more to review the documents just issued, and a seperate individual hearing time and date, or postpone some of the other items noted for discussion so that the issue can be heard and reviewed adequately.

Sincerely

Aaron Goodman  
[amgodman@yahoo.com](mailto:amgodman@yahoo.com)

Fortress and Stellar at "play" in SF's essential rental housing market.....

Aaron Goodman

to:

board.of.supervisors

11/03/2010 09:52 PM

Cc:

linda.avery

Show Details

Please find the attached memo from the Wall Street Journal Oct. 20th, 2010 under Plots & Ploys on the issue of Parkmerced's purchase by Fortress Investments Inc.

I find the article disturbing in its consideration of essential housing as something we should "play" with in regards to peoples lives, and ability to live and work in SF.....

sincerely

Aaron Goodman



## Bay Area Clean Water Agencies

A Joint Powers Public Agency

Leading the Way to Protect our Bay

November 2, 2010

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

*Sent via electronic mail to [board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org), [gavin.newsom@sfgov.org](mailto:gavin.newsom@sfgov.org),  
[gail.johnson@sfgov.org](mailto:gail.johnson@sfgov.org)*

**Re: Support for the SF Safe Drug Disposal Ordinance (file #100455)**

Dear Supervisors,

On behalf of the Bay Area Clean Water Agencies (BACWA), I am writing to ask you to support the San Francisco Safe Drug Disposal ordinance which will be before you on November 23. BACWA is a joint powers authority representing more than fifty public utilities that collect and treat municipal wastewater. Our membership includes large metropolitan facilities such as the City and County of San Francisco, East Bay Municipal Utility District, the City of San Jose, East Bay Dischargers Authority and Central Contra Costa Sanitary District. In addition to treating sanitary waste, many of BACWA's member agencies also manage municipal solid waste and household hazardous waste programs.

BACWA supports the concept of extended producer responsibility, which is a growing movement to require manufacturers to cover the disposal costs of dangerous and hazardous products that otherwise may go down the sewer, in the trash or to household hazardous waste programs. In the past two years, California passed manufacturer-funded EPR programs for paint, carpet and mercury thermostats, which will help cash-strapped local governments.

The Bay Area Pollution Prevention Group (BAPPG), a BACWA-housed organization that implements Bay Area wide pollution prevention programs, has been a leader in encouraging the thoughtful disposal of pharmaceuticals. In 2009 BAPPG partnered with the Teleosis Institute to conduct a pilot pharmaceutical mail-back program with a local hospice organization. This pilot project diverted more than 100 pounds of pharmaceuticals and demonstrated that such programs can be implemented, but are not as cost-effective as collection programs at pharmacies. In 2009 BAPPG coordinated a regional No Drugs Down the Drain campaign to coincide with National Pollution Prevention Week. Twenty agencies participated in this campaign, collecting over 3,000 pounds of unwanted medications. These efforts successfully demonstrated that there is a need for drug disposal programs; however, our experience and participant surveys indicate collection programs located at point-of-sale would be more convenient for consumers and likely the most economical. Implementation of these programs, however, is best suited for the companies that profit from pharmaceuticals sales rather than local government agencies with limited resources.

---

Central Contra Costa Sanitary District • East Bay Dischargers Authority • City of San Jose  
East Bay Municipal Utility District • City & County of San Francisco  
Bay Area Clean Water Agencies • PO Box 24055, MS702 • Oakland, CA 94623

8


Over the last several years, BACWA representatives have participated in the National Dialogue on Pharmaceutical Disposal, convened by the Product Stewardship Institute. This program involved pharmaceutical manufacturers, some of whom seemed receptive to the concept of product stewardship, but pointed to barriers presented by federal law to the collection of certain kinds of pharmaceuticals. Recently, the President signed S 3397 into law, which will effectively remove these barriers.

San Francisco now has the opportunity to lead the country in providing a model program for pharmaceutical product stewardship. As representatives of the local government agencies tasked with providing environmentally sound, cost effective wastewater treatment we ask that you support the San Francisco Safe Drug Disposal ordinance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Amy Chastain".

Amy Chastain  
Executive Director, Bay Area Clean Water Agencies



Support for SF Safe Drug Disposal (file 100455)

Amy Chastain to: board.of.supervisors, gavin.newsom,  
gail.johnson

11/02/2010 01:23 PM

Cc: Jeremy.Pollock, "Jackson, Jennifer", "Newton, Sharon"

View: (Mail Threads)

Attached is the Bay Area Clean Water Agencies' letter of support for San Francisco Safe Drug Disposal ordinance. Please let me know if you have any difficulty opening or viewing the attached.

Sincerely,

Amy

---

**Amy J. Chastain, Executive Director**

**Bay Area Clean Water Agencies**

*A joint powers public agency*

PO Box 24055, MS702  
Oakland, CA 94623

(415) 308-5172 (Tel)

(510) 287-1351 (Fax)



BACWA Pharm Ordinance Support (file 100455).pdf



# City and County of San Francisco

Office of the Controller – City Services Auditor

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

## PARKS MAINTENANCE STANDARDS

ANNUAL REPORT FY 2009-10

Citywide average score continues to  
increase for the fifth year in a row.



November 3, 2010

# City and County of San Francisco

Office of the Controller – City Services Auditor

## GOVERNMENT BAROMETER

August 2010



November 4, 2010

10

**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.

**About the Government Barometer:**

The purpose of the Government Barometer is to share key performance and activity information with the public in order to increase transparency, create dialog, and build the public's confidence regarding the City's management of public business. The report lists measures in major service areas, such as public safety, health and human services, streets and public works, public transit, recreation, environment, and customer service. This is a recurring report. The October 2010 report is scheduled to be issued in late November 2010.

For more information, please contact the Office of the Controller, City Services Auditor Division.

Phone: 415-554-7463

Email: [CSA.ProjectManager@sfgov.org](mailto:CSA.ProjectManager@sfgov.org)

Internet: [www.sfgov.org/controller/performance](http://www.sfgov.org/controller/performance)

**Program Team:**

Peg Stevenson, Director  
Andrew Murray, Deputy Director  
Keith DeMartini, Performance Analyst  
Sherman Luk, Performance Analyst  
Dennis McCormick, Performance Analyst  
Richard Kurylo, Operations Analyst  
Department Performance Measurement Staff

# Government Barometer – August 2010



The Office of the Controller has issued the August 2010 Government Barometer. Significant changes reported in August 2010 include the following:

## Summary:

- Although the average daily population at the county jail increased slightly to 1,721 in August 2010 from two months prior, it declined by 13.3% from a year ago.
- The wait time for a new patient appointment at a primary care clinic increased 55.0% from the prior year (August 2009), from 20 days to 31 days. This increase can be attributed to continued pressure to manage new Healthy San Francisco patients, among other demands.
- Since January 2008, the average daily population at Laguna Honda hospital has decreased by 24.0% to 758 patients, which is slightly below the new hospital's capacity of 780 beds.
- Food Stamp caseload increased by 52.7% over the past two years, to 23,961 in August 2010. San Francisco nutrition issues have been addressed through the Food Security Task Force<sup>1</sup>, and other program initiatives, such as increasing access to food stamps and BenefitsSF,<sup>2</sup> which allows people to apply online 24 hours a day/7 days a week.
- Responsiveness to graffiti requests on public property showed marked improvement over the past year, with 66.1% of requests filled within 48 hours.
- Average daily number of Muni complaints are the lowest they have been in the past two years, at 43.6 complaints.
- Park reservations for picnic tables, sites, recreation facilities, fields, etc, have increased period-to-period and year-to-year.
- The number of visitors at the de Young Museum increased significantly in August 2010 because of the very popular Musée d'Orsay exhibit. Also, membership at the museum now stands at over 112,000 households.
- Environment, energy and utilities measures reported little change, except for the percentage of solid waste being diverted from landfill through curbside recycling improving to 57.0% in August 2010 compared to 51.2% a year ago.
- The value of new construction projects for which new building permits were issued increased to \$103.4 million in August 2010, a 63.6% increase from a year ago.

## Measure Highlight:

Incidents of both serious violent and property crimes have declined during the last two and a half years, as the charts below illustrate; however, each showed an increase in August 2010 versus both the previous report (June 2010) and the previous year (August 2009).



<sup>1</sup> More information about the Food Security Task Force is available at the following website: <http://www.sfgov3.org/index.aspx?page=754>

<sup>2</sup> More information about Benefits SF is available at the following website: <https://www.benefitsf.org/>

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



Activity or Performance Measure	Prior Year	Prior Period	Current Period	Period-to-Period		Year-to-Year	
	Aug-2009	Jun-2010	Aug-2010	% Change	Trend	% Change	Trend
<b>Public Safety</b>							
Total number of serious violent crimes reported (homicide, forcible rape, robbery and aggravated assault, per 100,000 population)	59.0	52.5	68.2	29.9%	Negative	15.6%	Negative
Total number of serious property crimes reported (burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson, per 100,000 population)	344.9	299.1	423.7	41.7%	Negative	22.8%	Negative
Percentage of fire/medical emergency calls responded to within 5 minutes	92.7%	88.8%	87.7%	-1.2%	Negative	-5.4%	Negative
Average daily county jail population	1,986	1,667	1,721	3.2%	Negative	-13.3%	Positive
Percentage of 9-1-1 calls answered within 10 seconds	92%	91%	89%	-2.2%	Negative	-3.3%	Negative
Average 9-1-1 daily call volume	1,259	1,480	1,444	-2.4%	Positive	14.7%	Negative
<b>Health, Human Services, and Employment</b>							
Average daily population of San Francisco General Hospital	419	394	399	1.3%	Negative	-4.8%	Positive
Average daily population of Laguna Honda Hospital	765	761	758	-0.4%	Neutral	-0.9%	Neutral
Total number of Healthy San Francisco participants	45,578	53,428	54,036	1.1%	Positive	18.6%	Positive
New patient wait time in days for an appointment at a DPH primary care clinic	20	30	31	3.3%	Negative	55.0%	Negative
Current active CalWORKs caseload	4,828	4,723	4,666	-1.2%	Positive	-3.4%	Positive
Current active County Adult Assistance Program (CAAP) caseload	7,620	7,511	7,680	2.3%	Negative	0.8%	Neutral
Current active Non-Assistance Food Stamps (NAFS) caseload	19,548	22,777	23,961	5.2%	Negative	22.6%	Negative
Percentage of all available homeless shelter beds used	93.0%	91.0%	94.0%	3.3%	Positive	1.1%	Neutral
Average nightly homeless shelter bed use	1,095	1,084	1,066	-1.7%	Positive	-2.6%	Neutral
Total number of children in foster care	1,427	1,389	1,317	-5.2%	Positive	-7.7%	Positive
<b>Streets and Public Works</b>							
Average score of streets inspected using street maintenance litter standards (1 = acceptably clean to 3 = very dirty)	1.94	1.97	1.94	-1.5%	Positive	0.0%	Neutral
Percentage of street cleaning requests responded to within 48 hours	89.4%	88.8%	90.8%	2.2%	Positive	1.6%	Neutral
Percentage of graffiti requests on public property responded to within 48 hours	38.1%	69.9%	66.1%	-5.5%	Negative	73.4%	Positive
Percentage of pothole requests repaired within 72 hours	73.6%	54.9%	65.3%	19.0%	Positive	-11.3%	Negative

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



Activity or Performance Measure	Prior Year	Prior Period	Current Period	Period-to-Period		Year-to-Year	
	Aug-2009	Jun-2010	Aug-2010	% Change	Trend	% Change	Trend
<b>Public Transit</b>							
Percentage of MUNI buses and trains that adhere to posted schedules	70.4%	74.3%	73.7%	-0.8%	Neutral	4.7%	Positive
Average daily number of MUNI customer complaints regarding safety, negligence, discourtesy, and service delivery	65.5	53.8	43.6	-19.0%	Positive	-33.4%	Positive
<b>Recreation, Arts, and Culture</b>							
Average score of parks inspected using park maintenance standards	90.0%	91.0%	91.0%	0.0%	Neutral	1.1%	Neutral
Total number of individuals currently registered in recreation courses	6,824	12,016	11,196	-6.8%	Negative	64.1%	Positive
Total number of park facility (picnic tables, sites, recreation facilities, fields, etc.) bookings	2,714	4,215	4,539	7.7%	Positive	67.2%	Positive
Total number of visitors at public fine art museums (Asian Art Museum, Legion of Honor, de Young)	350,816	197,518	310,048	57.0%	Positive	-11.6%	Negative
Total circulation of materials at main and branch libraries	912,556	978,567	926,153	-5.4%	Negative	1.5%	Neutral
<b>Environment, Energy, and Utilities</b>							
Drinking water reservoirs storage as a percentage of normal for this month	104.0%	96.0%	105.1%	9.5%	Positive	1.1%	Neutral
Average monthly water use by City departments (in millions of gallons)	128.9	120.9	125.0	3.4%	Negative	-3.0%	Positive
Average daily residential per capita water usage (in gallons)	52.0	50.6	50.6	0.0%	Neutral	-2.7%	Neutral
Average monthly energy usage by City departments (in million kilowatt hours)	72.8	72.0	71.9	-0.1%	Neutral	-1.3%	Neutral
Average daily tons of garbage going to landfill	1,066.5	1,059.7	1,072.5	1.2%	Negative	0.6%	Neutral
Percentage of total solid waste diverted from landfill through curbside recycling	51.2%	57.4%	57.0%	-0.7%	Neutral	11.3%	Positive

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



Activity or Performance Measure	Prior Year	Prior Period	Current Period	Period-to-Period		Year-to-Year	
	Aug-2009	Jun-2010	Aug-2010	% Change	Trend	% Change	Trend
<b>Permitting and Inspection</b>							
Value (estimated cost, in millions) of construction projects for which new building permits were issued	\$63.2	\$147.2	\$103.4	-29.8%	Negative	63.6%	Positive
Percentage of all building permits involving new construction and major alterations review that are approved or disapproved within 60 days	65%	59%	58%	-1.7%	Negative	-10.8%	Negative
Percentage of all applications for variance from the Planning Code decided within 120 days	38%	20%	33%	65.0%	Positive	-13.2%	Negative
Percentage of life hazard or lack of heat complaints responded to within one business day	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	Neutral	0.0%	Neutral
Percentage of customer-requested construction permit inspections completed within two business days of requested date	99.2%	96.0%	95.0%	-1.0%	Negative	-4.2%	Negative
<b>Customer Service</b>							
Average daily number of 311 contacts, across all contact channels	N/A	8,195	7,860	-4.1%	Negative	N/A	N/A
Percentage of 311 calls answered by call takers within 60 seconds	69.5%	77.6%	66.2%	-14.7%	Negative	-4.7%	Negative

**Notes:**

- The barometer is currently issued every other month, covering even months.
- The period-to-period change reflects the change since the last even month (e.g., for the August 2010 barometer, change since June 2010).
- The year-to-year change reflects the change since the same month last year (e.g., for the August 2010 barometer, change since August 2009).
- A period-to-period change of less than or equal to +/-1% and a year-to-year change of less than or equal to +/-3% is considered "Neutral."
- Data reported for the most recent month is either data for that month or the most recent data available. See the measure details for more information.
- For additional detail on measure definitions and department contact information, please see [www.sfgov.org/controller/performance](http://www.sfgov.org/controller/performance).
- Values for prior periods (August 2009 or June 2010) may be revised in this report relative to their original publication in the barometer.

*To prepare this report, the Citywide Performance Measurement Program has used performance data supplied by City Departments. The Departments are responsible for ensuring that such performance data is accurate and complete. Although the Citywide Performance Measurement Program has reviewed the data for overall reasonableness and consistency, the Program has not verified or audited the data or information provided by the Departments.*

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



Activity or Performance Measure	Department	Performance Pattern	Measure Description	Measure Technical Description
<b>Public Safety</b>				
Total number of serious violent crimes reported (homicide, forcible rape, robbery and aggravated assault, per 100,000 population)	Police	Trending down is positive	Number of offenses divided by 100,000 population. Uniform Crime Report (UCR) violent crimes are: homicide, forcible rape, robbery and aggravated assault.	Collection Method: Number of UCR Violent Part I crimes divided by current San Francisco population and multiplied by 100,000. Population FY 2008: 829,848, FY 2009 & FY 2010: 842,625 (CA Dept of Finance E-2 Report). Timing: Monthly.
Total number of serious property crimes reported (burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson, per 100,000 population)	Police	Trending down is positive	Number of crimes divided by 100,000 population. UCR Part I property crimes are burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft and arson.	Collection Method: Number of Part I Property crimes divided by current San Francisco population and multiplied by 100,000. Population FY 2008: 829,848, FY2009 & FY2010: 842,625 (Source: CA Department of Finance, E-2 Report). Timing: Monthly.
Percentage of fire/medical emergency calls responded to within 5 minutes	Fire	Trending up is positive	Percentage of all incidents responded to in under five minutes (total response time (critical response interval (CRI)) from call intake to arrival on scene of first unit). Includes all calls the Department responds to with lights and sirens, not just those requiring possible medical care.	Raw data is stored at Department of Emergency Management and aggregated at Fire Department headquarters.
Average daily county jail population	Sheriff	Trending down is positive	Overcrowding creates security and safety issues for the Department and drives costs in many directions. Approximately 75% of those jailed are pretrial felony prisoners, who either cannot be released or cannot make bail. Housing such prisoners can require greater security precautions. An average daily population above the rated capacity can also drive demand for additional facilities.	Collection Method: Average Daily Population (ADP) is compiled by Sheriff's staff from reports issued daily from each jail. Records are located in City Hall, Room 456. Timing: Data available 5am daily. Population represents all in-custody people.
Percentage of 9-1-1 calls answered within 10 seconds	Emergency Management	Trending up is positive	The State of California 9-1-1 Office recommends that all 9-1-1 calls are answered within 10 seconds. There is no state or federal mandate. Our Center strives to answer 90% of all 9-1-1 calls within 10 seconds.	Collection Method: All calls introduced through the 9-1-1 State switch are captured in an automatic telephone call distribution system produced by Nortel Networks. This system analyzes the time it takes from the call to hit the message switch, then time it takes for our call takers to answer and process the call for service. All equipment housed at 1011 Turk.
Average 9-1-1 daily call volume	Emergency Management	Trending down is positive	This number represents the number of 9-1-1 telephone calls received and presented to the San Francisco Division of Emergency Communications on a daily basis.	Our statistics are continuously collected by our Nortel Network equipment. This information is collated daily and composed into weekly, monthly, and annual reports to reflect the call volume thus allowing us to allocate staff as needed.
<b>Health, Human Services, and Employment</b>				
Average daily population of San Francisco General Hospital	Public Health	Trending down is positive	The daily count of patients at SFGH (aka: Average Daily Census or ADC) is the number of admitted inpatients at SFGH at approximately 12 midnight, when the census is taken. This measure totals the daily census for a month, divided by the number of days in the month. The measure separates the average monthly census by services (acute medical/surgical, acute psychiatry, skilled nursing, and long-term behavioral health) and also provides the total for the hospital.	The daily count is tracked by the Hospital's computer system - SMS Invision Clinical Data System; maintained by DPH Community Health Network/SFGH. The reporting database is updated monthly, within 10 days of the following month. The data is 99% reliable within one month. Reports are run on an ad hoc basis.
Average daily population of Laguna Honda Hospital	Public Health	Trending down is positive	Laguna Honda Hospital (LHH) is a long-term care facility that provides a residential setting for physically or cognitively impaired individuals who require continuous nursing assistance, rehabilitation services, medical care, and monitoring. LHH also offers acute care for those patients whose condition changes to require this level of care. The daily count of patients (aka: Average Daily Census or ADC) is the total number of residents in-house at LHH at the time the census is taken each day.	Admissions, discharges, and transfers (relocations) are entered into the Invision Clinical Data System when any of these activities occur. Reports for ADC data (from Invision) can be generated for daily, monthly and/or quarterly basis. Numbers are drawn from the Monthly Average Census Report, using the SNF Occupied + M7A + L4A columns.
Total number of Healthy San Francisco participants	Public Health	Trending up is positive	This number represents enrollees in the Healthy San Francisco program (HSF). HSF is a comprehensive health coverage program for uninsured San Francisco residents, age 18 through 64 years old. Enrollment first began in July 2007 for lower income residents and has grown as more health clinic sites joined and as enrollment requirements expanded. This measure was added to the system in January 2009.	The enrollment number is derived from the One-E-App program. One-E-App is a web-based eligibility and enrollment application and system of record for Healthy San Francisco. Reports are run monthly and ad hoc.
New patient wait time in days for an appointment at a DPH primary care clinic	Public Health	Trending down is positive	This measure shows the number of calendar days that a new patient would have to wait for a routine primary care appointment and/or examination. This assumes that the patient is not reporting any health issue and is not yet established with a primary care provider. The Healthy San Francisco program has set a goal of 60 calendar days for a new enrollee to wait for a primary care appointment.	This data is collected manually by a DPH staff person who searches the DPH computerized appointment system (Invision) for the first possible routine appointment at each primary care clinic or, if required, calls the clinic to inquire about next appointment availability for a new & routine patient appointment. The report represents a point in time, the day the report is done. To obtain one monthly number for the measure, the wait for each clinic is added together and divided by the number of clinics (13).
Current active CalWORKs caseload	Human Services	Trending down is positive	This measure is the number of CalWORKs cases that have received cash assistance (TANF) during the month for which the data is reported.	Data for this measure is obtained from a monthly extract generated by the CalWIN client tracking system.



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



Activity or Performance Measure	Department	Performance Pattern	Measure Description	Measure Technical Description
Current active County Adult Assistance Program (CAAP) caseload	Human Services	Trending down is positive	This measure reflects the number of cases that are paid cash assistance during the month for which data has been reported.	Data for this measure is obtained from a monthly extract generated from the CalWIN client tracking system.
Current active Non-Assistance Food Stamps (NAFS) caseload	Human Services	Trending down is positive	This is the total number of cases receiving non-assistance food stamps. Non-assistance food stamps cases do not include those cases which also receive other forms of public assistance (e.g. CalWORKs).	Collection Method: Data for this measure is tracked within the CalWIN system. A case file is opened at the point of intake and maintained while the case is active. Timing: The CalWIN data system is dynamic, and can be queried for current data. Historical data is stored in extracts that can also be queried for previous periods.
Percentage of all available homeless shelter beds used	Human Services	Trending up is positive	This is the average percentage of shelter beds (single adult) available that have been reserved and used on a nightly basis.	Data for this measure is derived from the CHANGES shelter bed reservation system.
Average nightly homeless shelter bed use	Human Services	Trending down is positive	The numbers reported here represent the average number of beds (single adult) used during the month.	Data for this measure is reported via the CHANGES system, but the actual number of beds available is based upon negotiated contracted obligations.
Total number of children in foster care	Human Services	Trending down is positive	This measure provides a count of the number of children with an open case in foster care at the end of each month that data is being reported.	The data source for this measure is the Child Welfare Services Case Management System (CWS/CMS). CWS/CMS is a longitudinal statewide database that can be queried for current and historical data.
<b>Streets and Public Works</b>				
Average score of streets inspected using street maintenance litter standards (1 = acceptably clean to 3 = very dirty)	Public Works	Trending down is positive	Average score of the inspection results of selected routes for the street cleanliness standard 1.1, which is based on a scale from 1 to 3. (For each 100 curb feet, 1 = under 5 pieces of litter; 2 = 5 - 15 pieces of litter; and 3 = over 15 pieces of litter). See maintenance standards manual for details.	For selected blocks, an inspector assigns a score from 1 to 3 to each 100 curb feet, for blocks of selected routes. Block and route averages are calculated. This measure provides the average of routes inspected for the selected time period. It includes only DPW inspections. Inspections were conducted on a combination of 11 residential and 11 commercial routes. Clean Corridors routes are excluded. Data collection: Data source are MNC Excel files, and summaries are generated by the Controller's Office. Data for these "district" inspections, are available every other month.
Percentage of street cleaning requests responded to within 48 hours	Public Works	Trending up is positive	DPW receives requests to address street cleaning issues primarily through 311. Our goal is to resolve these issues within 48 hours of receiving the request.	Collection Method: Dated services requests and action taken data is entered into the Bureau of Street Environmental Services' 28 Clean Access database. Timing: Data is available on a daily basis.
Percentage of graffiti requests on public property responded to within 48 hours	Public Works	Trending up is positive	DPW receives calls from the public to report graffiti, primarily through 311. DPW crews respond to these calls and abate the graffiti on public property. Our goal is to abate within 48 hours. If the graffiti is on private property, the property owner is notified to abate. This metric only measures abatements on public property.	Collection Method: Dated service requests and action taken data is logged into the Bureau of Street Environmental Services' 28 Clean Access database. Timing: Data is available on a daily basis.
Percentage of pothole requests repaired within 72 hours	Public Works	Trending up is positive	DPW receives calls from the public reporting potholes. Our goal is to repair these potholes within 72 hours.	Collection Method: Dated service requests and action taken data is entered into the Bureau of Street and Sewer Repair's Pothole database daily. Timing: Data is available on a monthly basis.
<b>Public Transit</b>				
Percentage of MUNI buses and trains that adhere to posted schedules	Municipal Transportation Agency	Trending up is positive	Definition: Each line is checked at least once in each six month period. Such checks are conducted no less often than 10 weekdays and weekends per period. An annual checking schedule is established for the routes. The order in which the routes are checked is determined monthly through a random selection process. To the extent automated systems can be substituted at less cost for such checks, or the measurement of any performance standard, such systems will be used.	Method: Check the designated lines using criteria of 1/4 minutes. Periods of time includes morning rush (6am-9am), midday (9am-4pm), evening rush (4pm-7pm), and night (7pm-1am). Supervisors conduct a one-hour check at a point at mid-route during all four time periods stated above. Timeframe: Data is available approximately 60 days after each quarter closes. The annual goal for the forthcoming fiscal year is traditionally approved by the SFMTA Board of Directors in April or May. For the barometer report, data is reported on a quarterly basis.
Average daily number of MUNI customer complaints regarding safety, negligence, discourtesy, and service delivery	Municipal Transportation Agency	Trending down is positive	Definition: Customers may provide feedback regarding Muni services through 311, sfmta.com, by mail, and by fax.	Method: Feedback data is pulled from the Trapeze system on a monthly basis and divided by the number of days in the month to come up with the average daily number of complaints.

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



Activity or Performance Measure	Department	Performance Pattern	Measure Description	Measure Technical Description
<b>Recreation, Arts, and Culture</b>				
Average score of parks inspected using park maintenance standards	Recreation and Parks	Trending up is positive	The average rating for neighborhood parks category only (i.e. an average of the neighborhood parks' percentages for meeting parks standards). The ratings for Neighborhood Parks have been chosen to be included as a performance measure as they represent the majority of RPD property types, include almost all park features rated, and are geographically dispersed throughout the City	Collection Method: RPD staff conducts quarterly park evaluations. Hard copies turned in to clerical staff for data entry into Park Evaluations database. Hard copies kept on file by clerical staff. Data Location: Park Evaluations Database. "Neighborhood Parks" is an established category of City parks and broken out in the current database reports (BY PARK TYPE BY DISTRICT REPORT). Timing: This data is available quarterly, no more than 30 days after the previous quarter end. For the barometer report, data is reported on a quarterly basis and 1 month in arrears.
Total number of individuals currently registered in recreation courses	Recreation and Parks	Trending up is positive	Measure indicates number of registered program participants for all age categories. It includes all recreation programs except aquatics programs. Please note that given a certain month, this number does not reflect all participants but rather those that registered in that given month.	Collection Method: CLASS recreation management software records all individuals (termed clients within the CLASS system) registered for any kind of program RPD offers. Timing: CLASS implementation launched in January 2007, with preliminary data available in May 2007. Data is now available monthly. Baseline data was captured in FY08 and FY09 and the Department began to set targets in FY10.
Total number of park facility (picnic tables, sites, recreation facilities, fields, etc.) bookings	Recreation and Parks	Trending up is positive	Measure indicates number of park facilities permits created.	Collection Method: CLASS recreation management software measures field permitting, picnic table rentals, indoor recreation center bookings, and other types of facility rentals.
Total number of visitors at public fine art museums (Asian Art Museum, Legion of Honor, de Young)	Fine Arts Museums and Asian Art Museum	Trending up is positive	This measure aggregates data from 3 separate measures for the Asian Art Museum, Legion of Honor, and de Young Museum. Museum visitors includes all visitors to the 3 separate museums, including school children, business visitors, rental events, and other events, but excluding cafe and store visitors.	CON to manually calculate measure from data entered directly into PM system.
Total circulation of materials at main and branch libraries	Public Library	Trending up is positive	Number of items (books and other materials) circulated to the public (children, youth & adults) from all libraries.	Collection Method: Statistics generated from the Library's automated circulation system; Information Technology Division. Timing: Reports are generated monthly. For barometer, add both branch & main library measures together.
<b>Environment, Energy, and Utilities</b>				
Drinking water reservoirs storage as a percentage of normal for this month	Public Utilities Commission	Trending up is positive	Beginning of month total system storage (i.e. Hetch Hetchy, Cherry, Eleanor, Water Bank, Calaveras, San Antonio, Crystal Springs, San Andreas, Pilarcitos) as percentage of long-term median (water year 1968 to 2007).	The long-term median of total system storage at the beginning of the month was calculated using data stored in Form 11 for Hetch Hetchy Division and in WISKI database for Water Supply & Treatment Division for water years 1968 to 2007 (40-year period). 1968 was selected as the first year for the calculation to include San Antonio Reservoir. The current beginning of month total system storage is reported as a percentage of the long-term median.
Average monthly water use by City departments (in millions of gallons)	Public Utilities Commission	Trending down is positive	12-month rolling monthly average of total water use by City departments, in million gallons.	12-month rolling monthly average computed from total monthly amount of billed water usage for municipal departments per report 892-Monthly Sales and Revenue, converted to million gallons.
Average daily residential per capita water usage (in gallons)	Public Utilities Commission	Trending down is positive	Annual rolling average of daily residential water use per person.	Daily per capita usage computed using twelve months of city residential usage per report 892-Monthly Sales and Revenue, divided by 365 and estimated 2009 population of 818,887, the 2008 US Census number multiplied by the 2008 growth rate.
Average monthly energy usage by City departments (in million kilowatt hours)	Public Utilities Commission	Trending down is positive	Energy use by City departments in kilowatt hours (kWh) in millions for the month based on 12-month rolling average	Energy use by City departments in kilowatt hours (kWh) in millions for the month based on 12-month rolling average and maintained in our Electric Billing System.
Average daily tons of garbage going to landfill	Environment	Trending down is positive	Average daily tons of garbage going to landfill.	Total materials San Francisco sends to landfill, calculated by dividing the monthly tonnage by the number of days in the month. Universe is municipal, residential, commercial, industrial.

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



Activity or Performance Measure	Department	Performance Pattern	Measure Description	Measure Technical Description
Percentage of total solid waste diverted from landfill through curbside recycling	Environment	Trending up is positive	Percentage of total solid waste diverted from landfill through curbside recycling.	Percentage of recycling (blue cart) and compostables (green cart) collected, factored against disposal tonnage (black cart). Universe is residential and small commercial customers.
<b>Permitting and Inspection</b>				
Value (estimated cost, in millions) of construction projects for which new building permits were issued	Building Inspection	Trending up is positive	The construction valuation is driven by customer demand, the number of projects approved for construction, major developments, and the overall economic climate. This construction valuation or number of permits issued for construction cannot be estimated.	Collection Method: This is a new measure for DBI. The data entered for April 2008 and April 2009 is actual data, not estimated cost as indicated on Column C. The data is collected through our automated Permit Tracking System and is based on the fees collected for permits issued. Timing: Available on a weekly/monthly basis.
Percentage of all building permits involving new construction and major alterations review that are approved or disapproved within 60 days	Planning	Trending up is positive	When a member of the public wants to conduct major physical improvements to existing construction or to develop property, the proposal comes to the Planning Department for review to ensure the project conforms with existing land use requirements as specified in the Planning Code.	Collection Method: Data is stored in the Department of Building Inspection's permit tracking database, housed at 1650 Mission Street. Timing: Data updates are available on a monthly basis.
Percentage of all applications for variance from the Planning Code decided within 120 days	Planning	Trending up is positive	A variance allowing a project to vary from the strict quantitative standards of the Planning Code may be granted after a public hearing before the Zoning Administrator. Variances are typically requested for projects that do not meet the Planning Code standards for rear yards, front setbacks, parking requirements, and open space requirements. The 4 month target is based on a reasonable time to complete the lowest priority applications.	Collection Method: Data stored in Department's case intake database, housed at 1650 Mission Street. Timing: Data updates are available on a monthly basis.
Percentage of life hazard or lack of heat complaints responded to within one business day	Building Inspection	Trending up is positive	This measure addresses response time for complaints received from the public regarding life hazards or lack of heat. Complaints are received in person, by phone, email, through the internet, and mail. Response consists of contacting person making complaint and visiting the building. Measure changed in FY 02-03 to reflect 24-hour turnaround instead of 48 hours, but the data reflecting the 24-hour target was reported for the first time in FY 07. Definition of life hazard includes abandoned buildings, which may not need an inspection.	Collection Method: Staff in Housing Inspection Services utilize the Complaint Tracking System to maintain a record of complaints received and responded to. Response data is compiled into monthly, quarterly and annual reports. Timing: Statistics are available two weeks after the end of the month (i.e., statistics for September will be available on October 15th.)
Percentage of customer-requested construction permit inspections completed within two business days of requested date	Building Inspection	Trending up is positive	Customers request inspection of construction to meet permit requirements. Customers contact inspection divisions via phone to set up appointments. Inspections are completed when inspectors visit sites to conduct inspection.	Collection Method: Daily logs are entered into Oracle database; this information is compiled into monthly, quarterly and annual reports. Timing: Statistics are available two weeks after the end of the month (i.e., statistics for September will be available on October 15th.)
<b>Customer Service</b>				
Average daily number of 311 contacts, across all contact channels	Administrative Services	Trending up is positive	The average daily number of calls and service requests and information accessed on-line, via self-service forms, Twitter, and Open311 applications. Calls received at 311 which includes those calls that were "answered" and those that were "abandoned" by the caller.	Calculation: The total number of calls (answered and abandoned), self-service requests, Open311 requests and website visits received divided by the number of days in that particular month. Sources: The CMS application is used to track the volume of calls, use of self-service forms, and Open 311 apps. Urchin Software is used to track the total number of visits to the website. Frequency: Call volumes are reported on a daily basis with data for the previous day.
Percentage of 311 calls answered by call takers within 60 seconds	Administrative Services	Trending up is positive	The percentage of calls answered within 60 seconds versus the total number of calls received on a monthly basis. This metric of answering 50% of calls in 60 seconds was developed in July 2008 as a performance measure for 311.	Calculation: The number of calls answered within 60 seconds divided by the total number of calls received during the measurement interval. Data Source: Avaya's Call Management System (CMS) will be utilized to determine the number of calls answered within 60 seconds and the total number of calls received. Frequency: Monthly.

**Performance Pattern Notes:**

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

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 September, 2010

October 29, 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 9/30/2010	
	Pooled Fund	All Funds	Pooled Fund	All Funds
Cash Basis Earnings	13.32	13.32	7.22	7.22
Accrual Basis Earnings	13.41	13.48	4.37	4.39
Earned Income Yield (in %)	1.33%	1.33%	1.33%	1.33%
Current Yield to Maturity (in %)	n/a	n/a	1.30%	1.30%
<b>PRINCIPAL</b>				
Current Book Value	n/a	n/a	3,756	3,786
Amortized Book Value	n/a	n/a	3,747	3,777
Par Value	n/a	n/a	3,733	3,763
Market Value	n/a	n/a	3,775	3,805
Accrued Interest	n/a	n/a	13	13
Total Value (Market Value + Accrued Interest)	n/a	n/a	3,788	3,818
Average Daily Balance	4,004	4,034	3,996	4,026
Average Age of Portfolio - End of Period (in days)	n/a	n/a	676	673

In accordance with provisions of California State Government Code Section 53646, we forward this report detailing the City's investment portfolio as of 9/30/2010. These investments are in compliance with California Code and our statement of investment policy, and provide sufficient liquidity to meet expenditure requirements for the next six months.

Very truly yours,

José Cisneros  
Treasurer

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


11




## All Funds

Investment Type	Par Value %	\$ in millions		
		Par Value	Original Book Value	Market Value
Banker's Acceptance	1.3%	50.00	49.87	49.96
Federal Agricultural Mortgage Association	1.2%	45.00	44.91	45.71
Federal Farm Credit Bank: Discount Notes				
Federal Farm Credit Bank: Fixed	10.4%	392.04	394.73	396.66
Federal Farm Credit Bank: Float				
Federal Home Loan Bank: Discount Notes				
Federal Home Loan Bank: Fixed	7.2%	270.23	270.22	271.22
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	13.3%	501.50	503.23	504.93
Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp.: Float, Monthly, Act/360				
Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp.: Multi Step	0.5%	20.00	20.00	20.07
Federal National Mortgage Assn.	20.3%	763.44	764.87	769.13
Federal National Mortgage Assn.: Multi Step				
Federal National Mortgage Assn.: Discount Notes				
Negotiable Certificates of Deposit	0.7%	25.00	25.00	25.00
Money Market Funds	0.0%	0.25	0.25	0.25
Public Time Deposit: Monthly Pay				
Public Time Deposit: Quarterly Pay	1.9%	70.10	70.10	70.10
Tenn Valley Authority	0.5%	20.50	23.00	23.21
Treas. Liquidity Guarantee Program: Fixed	24.4%	917.31	930.07	937.44
Treas. Liquidity Guarantee Program: Float	1.3%	50.00	50.07	50.18
Treasury Bills	5.8%	218.00	217.20	217.81
Treasury Notes	11.2%	420.00	422.29	423.27
	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>3,763.37</b>	<b>3,785.81</b>	<b>3,804.95</b>

**Par Value of All Funds**



**Trailing 12 Month Key Interest Rates**



## Inventory by Market Value - All Funds



Assets (000's)	Current Par	Current Book	Market	MKT/Book	Un Gain/Loss	Yield
TREASURY BILLS	218,000.00	217,202.06	217,806.87	100.28%	221.10	0.39%
TREASURY NOTES	420,000.00	422,285.38	423,275.00	100.23%	996.45	0.75%
TLGP (Treas Liquid Guar Prog)	917,310.00	930,073.53	937,443.70	100.79%	7,370.17	1.48%
TLGP FL (Treas Liquidity Guar)	50,000.00	50,074.05	50,179.69	100.21%	105.64	0.39%
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	270,230.00	270,215.92	271,221.78	100.37%	1,005.85	1.59%
FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSN	663,170.00	664,118.77	668,286.33	100.63%	4,167.56	1.58%
FNMA AMORT TO CALL	100,270.00	100,750.50	100,844.80	100.09%	210.87	1.53%
FARMER MAC	45,000.00	44,914.95	45,714.60	101.78%	799.65	2.17%
FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	392,041.00	394,730.40	396,660.23	100.49%	1,936.81	1.35%
FHLMC Bonds	451,500.00	453,162.97	454,881.69	100.38%	1,722.61	1.46%
FHLMC MULTI-STEP	20,000.00	19,995.00	20,068.75	100.37%	73.75	2.02%
FHLMC AMORT TO CALL	50,000.00	50,066.50	50,046.88	99.96%	(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	49,959.11	100.18%	31.30	0.53%
MONEY MARKET ACTUAL/365 R	252.11	252.11	252.11	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%	-	0.75%
<b>Totals(000's)</b>	<b>3,763,373.11</b>	<b>3,785,809.88</b>	<b>3,804,948.17</b>	<b>100.51%</b>	<b>19,103.50</b>	<b>1.30%</b>



# INVESTMENT INVENTORY - 09/30/10

September 30, 2010

City & County of San Francisco



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
<b>Fund: 100 POOLED FUNDS</b>											
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	99.91	149,859,372
42419	B 01 13 11	912795UX7	.0000	.3387	06/10/10	01/13/11	17,963,327	17,963,327	18,000,000	99.97	17,994,375
<b>Inv Type: 11: TREASURY BILLS</b>			.0000	.3908			217,202,058	217,202,058	218,000,000	99.91	217,806,871
42298	T 0.875 02 2	912828KE9	.8750	.6321	09/04/09	02/28/11	50,179,688	50,049,729	50,000,000	100.28	50,140,624
42325	T 1 08 31 11	912828LV0	1.0000	.8260	10/29/09	08/31/11	100,316	100,158	100,000	100.66	100,656
42326	T 1 08 31 11	912828LV0	1.0000	.8345	10/29/09	08/31/11	100,200,480	100,049,569	99,900,000	100.66	100,555,592
42341	T 1 7 31 11	912828LG3	1.0000	.6040	11/19/09	07/31/11	120,801,563	120,392,364	120,000,000	100.63	120,750,000
42352	T 1.125 12 1	912828KA7	1.1250	.7456	12/09/09	12/15/11	50,378,906	50,226,520	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	50,341,110	50,000,000	102.03	51,015,624
42415	T 1.25 11 30	912828JS0	1.2500	.3763	06/10/10	11/30/10	20,089,269	20,035,422	20,000,000	100.16	20,031,250
<b>Inv Type: 12: TREASURY NOTES</b>			1.0769	.7384			392,191,629	391,194,872	390,000,000	100.79	393,078,122
42165	J P MORGAN C	481247AK0	2.2000	2.0469	03/24/09	06/15/12	25,119,000	25,062,881	25,000,000	102.83	25,707,900
42166	GENL ELEC CA	36967HAN7	2.2500	2.0651	03/24/09	03/12/12	35,185,150	35,090,184	35,000,000	102.55	35,892,885
42170	MORGAN STANL	61757UAF7	2.0000	1.9382	03/16/09	09/22/11	25,037,750	25,014,608	25,000,000	101.61	25,402,344
42177	BAC 2.375 06	06050BAJ0	2.3750	1.9301	04/14/09	06/22/12	50,685,000	50,370,429	50,000,000	103.17	51,587,400
42181	C 2.125 04.3	17313UAE9	2.1250	1.9669	04/02/09	04/30/12	25,117,500	25,060,318	25,000,000	102.50	25,625,000
42182	BK OF THE WE	064244AA4	2.1500	1.9628	04/02/09	03/27/12	5,026,950	5,013,426	5,000,000	102.47	5,123,438
42183	BK OF THE WE	064244AA4	2.1500	1.9629	04/02/09	03/27/12	20,108,000	20,053,802	20,000,000	102.47	20,493,750
42191	BAC 2.1 04.3	06050BAG6	2.1000	1.9749	04/02/09	04/30/12	25,093,000	25,047,741	25,000,000	102.46	25,615,950
42195	GE 1.625 01.	36967HAG2	1.6250	1.2309	04/16/09	01/07/11	25,167,500	25,026,014	25,000,000	100.40	25,099,775
42196	GE 1.625 01.	36967HAG2	1.6250	1.2350	04/16/09	01/07/11	25,165,750	25,025,742	25,000,000	100.40	25,099,775
42197	C 1.625 03.3	17314JAA1	1.6250	1.3908	04/16/09	03/30/11	50,225,000	50,056,802	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	50,071,575	50,000,000	101.13	50,563,950
42211	USSA CAPITAL	90390QAA9	2.2400	1.9620	04/28/09	03/30/12	16,125,600	16,064,271	16,000,000	102.56	16,410,000
42258	CITIGROUP FD	17313YAC5	1.2500	1.2952	06/29/09	06/03/11	49,957,000	49,985,036	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	49,985,036	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	50,806,827	50,000,000	102.88	51,437,500
42299	HSBC 3.125 1	4042EPAA5	3.1250	1.3413	09/16/09	12/16/11	51,969,550	51,057,943	50,000,000	103.23	51,616,300
42317	C 1.625 03.3	17314JAA1	1.6250	.7776	10/22/09	03/30/11	35,423,500	35,145,477	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	20,265,607	20,000,000	102.56	20,512,500
42331	MS TLGP 2.25	61757UAP5	2.2500	1.3109	11/06/09	03/13/12	51,084,000	50,668,340	50,000,000	102.56	51,281,250
42332	GE-TLGP 2.12	36967HAV9	2.1250	1.7893	11/06/09	12/21/12	25,253,750	25,180,583	25,000,000	102.95	25,738,281
42379	GS 3.25 06.1	38146FAA9	3.2500	1.2299	03/22/10	06/15/12	52,215,000	51,691,109	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	25,289,303	25,000,000	102.75	25,688,350
42400	GE TLGP 2.0	36967HBB2	2.0000	1.4358	04/20/10	09/28/12	76,010,250	75,824,509	75,000,000	102.75	77,065,050
42401	JPM 2.2 0615	481247AK0	2.2000	1.1630	04/21/10	06/15/12	51,097,500	50,869,901	50,000,000	102.83	51,415,800

# INVESTMENT INVENTORY - 09/30/10

September 30, 2010

City & County of San Francisco




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	11,361,632	11,310,000	100.42	11,357,129
<b>Inv Type: 15 TREASURY LGP</b>			2.1190	1.4804			930,073,530	925,089,097	917,310,000	102.19	937,443,701
42242	MORGAN STANL	61757UAN0	.5934	.3848	03/19/09	03/13/12	25,040,325	25,019,571	25,000,000	100.28	25,070,313
42306	Union Bank T	905266AA0	.6187	.4018	03/23/09	03/16/12	25,033,725	25,016,475	25,000,000	100.44	25,109,375
<b>Inv Type: 16 TLGP FLOATER</b>			.6061	.3933			50,074,050	50,036,046	50,000,000	100.36	50,179,688
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	100.25	100,250,000
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	100.63	100,625,000
42418	FHLB 1.42 fl	3133XXME4	1.4200	1.4507	06/10/10	09/24/12	20,215,922	20,217,823	20,230,000	100.50	20,331,150
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	100.03	50,015,625
<b>Inv Type: 22 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK</b>			1.5902	1.5925			270,215,922	270,217,823	270,230,000	100.37	271,221,775
42335	FNMA 1.75 3	31398AVQ2	1.7500	.5980	11/19/09	03/23/11	50,770,000	50,272,413	50,000,000	100.72	50,359,375
42338	FNMA 1.75 3	31398AVQ2	1.7500	.5712	11/20/09	03/23/11	20,314,600	20,111,528	20,000,000	100.72	20,143,750
42350	FNMA FIXED 1	3136FJZT1	1.7500	1.7500	12/28/09	12/28/12	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100.28	100,281,250
42366	FNMA 3NC1.5	31398AF23	1.8000	1.8000	02/08/10	02/08/13	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	101.03	50,515,625
42367	FNMA 1.8 2 8	31398AF23	1.8000	1.8172	02/08/10	02/08/13	24,987,500	24,990,180	25,000,000	101.03	25,257,813
42398	FNMA 2.5NC1	3136FMNR1	1.5600	1.5600	04/19/10	10/29/12	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100.59	100,593,750
42410	FNMA 2.5 6 2	3136FMA38	2.5000	2.5268	06/25/10	06/25/15	49,018,650	49,021,943	49,080,000	102.63	50,368,350
42424	FNMA 1.3 7 1	31398AV90	1.3000	1.3171	07/16/10	07/16/13	24,987,500	24,988,378	25,000,000	100.75	25,187,500
42425	FNMA 1.3 7 1	31398AV90	1.3000	1.3171	07/16/10	07/16/13	49,975,000	49,976,756	50,000,000	100.75	50,375,000
42427	FNMA 1.55 7	31398AV25	1.5500	1.5603	07/12/10	07/12/13	69,069,273	69,070,805	69,090,000	100.19	69,219,544
42434	FNMA STRNT 1	3136FMX90	1.7500	1.7500	07/27/10	07/27/15	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	101.06	25,265,625
42435	FNMA STRNT 1	3136FMX90	1.7500	1.7500	07/27/10	07/27/15	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	101.06	25,265,625
42444	FNMA 1.50 07	31398AY22	1.5000	1.5051	07/26/10	07/26/13	24,996,250	24,996,479	25,000,000	100.06	25,015,625
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	101.50	25,375,000
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	100.25	25,062,500
<b>Inv Type: 23 FNMA</b>			1.7004	1.5838			664,118,773	663,428,483	663,170,000	100.77	668,286,331
42443	FNMA 1.4 11	3136FMUG7	1.4000	1.2618	07/16/10	11/26/12	10,051,444	10,032,918	10,000,000	100.13	10,012,500
42447	FNMA STEP 1.	3136FMTW4	1.5000	1.4450	08/04/10	06/01/15	37,191,475	37,145,489	37,000,000	100.13	37,046,250
42457	FNMA 1.75 8	3136FM3R3	1.7500	1.6344	08/18/10	08/18/14	53,507,584	53,478,944	53,270,000	100.97	53,786,053
<b>Inv Type: 123 FNMA AMORT TO CALL</b>			1.6228	1.5273			100,750,504	100,657,351	100,270,000	100.57	100,844,803
42460	FARMER MAC 2	3131SPGT0	2.1250	2.1651	09/15/10	09/15/15	44,914,950	44,915,695	45,000,000	101.59	45,714,600
<b>Inv Type: 27 FARMER MAC</b>			2.1250	2.1651			44,914,950	44,915,695	45,000,000	101.59	45,714,600
42342	FFCB Bullet	31331YZ86	3.8750	.7849	11/19/09	08/25/11	52,705,000	51,377,702	50,000,000	103.19	51,593,750
42373	FFCB 2 Year	31331JGD9	.9500	1.0514	03/09/10	03/05/12	17,016,071	17,025,685	17,050,000	100.69	17,167,219
42374	FFCB 2 Year	31331JGD9	.9500	1.0432	03/09/10	03/05/12	57,893,860	57,923,935	58,000,000	100.69	58,398,750
42385	FFCB 1.875 1	31331G2R9	1.8750	1.5324	03/26/10	12/07/12	37,333,370	37,269,533	37,000,000	102.63	37,971,250
42399	FFCB 1.625 B	31331JAB9	1.6250	1.5877	04/16/10	12/24/12	50,048,500	50,040,211	50,000,000	102.09	51,046,875
42403	FFCB 1.125 2	31331JLW1	1.1250	1.2269	04/29/10	04/26/12	74,228,232	74,259,901	74,370,000	100.41	74,672,128

# INVESTMENT INVENTORY - 09/30/10

September 30, 2010

City & County of San Francisco



7

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
42414	FEDERAL FARM	31331GLL1	2.8000	2.8847	06/10/10	01/28/14	18,171,759	18,176,290	18,225,000	100.78	18,367,383
42455	FFCB 1.20 4	31331JUU5	1.2000	1.2373	07/08/10	04/08/13	37,358,604	37,361,767	37,396,000	100.00	37,396,000
42459	FFCB 1.75 03	31331JE33	1.7500	1.7616	09/16/10	03/16/15	49,975,000	49,975,228	50,000,000	100.09	50,046,875
<b>Inv Type: 28 FFCB</b>			1.6113	1.2227			394,730,396	393,410,252	392,041,000	101.18	396,650,230
42351	FHLMC Fixed	3128X9RH5	1.7500	1.7500	12/28/09	12/28/12	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100.28	100,281,250
42356	FHLMC 1.125	3128X8P22	1.1250	.7120	11/20/09	06/01/11	28,779,471	28,678,157	28,600,000	100.53	28,751,938
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	100.47	75,351,563
42405	FHLMC 2NC1Y	3134G1DZ4	1.1700	1.1700	05/18/10	05/18/12	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	100.47	50,234,375
42416	FHLMC 5.75 0	3134A4JT2	5.7500	1.0656	06/10/10	01/15/12	21,479,608	21,193,314	20,000,000	106.75	21,350,000
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	101.19	38,350,063
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 0.4999	3134G1LU6	.5000	.5000	08/05/10	01/28/13	40,003,889	40,003,889	40,000,000	100.00	40,000,000
<b>Inv Type: 30 FHLMC BONDS</b>			1.6907	1.4571			453,162,967	452,775,359	451,500,000	100.75	454,881,688
42409	FHLMC MULTI	3134G1FQ2	2.0128	2.0181	06/24/10	06/24/15	19,995,000	19,995,271	20,000,000	100.34	20,068,750
<b>Inv Type: 46 FHLMC MULTI STEP</b>			2.0128	2.0181			19,995,000	19,995,271	20,000,000	100.34	20,068,750
42440	FHLMC .750 3	3134G1HD9	.7500	.7000	07/20/10	03/28/13	50,066,500	50,047,159	50,000,000	100.09	50,046,875
<b>Inv Type: 130 FHLMC AMORT TO CALL</b>			.7500	.7000			50,066,500	50,047,159	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	22,803,650	20,500,000	113.20	23,206,641
<b>Inv Type: 95 TENN VALLEY AUTHORITY</b>			6.7900	.7181			22,999,798	22,803,650	20,500,000	113.20	23,206,641
42432	BA 0.57 1 13	06422TN33	.0000	.5495	07/06/10	01/03/11	26,925,615	26,925,615	27,000,000	99.92	26,978,850
42456	BA 0.51 1 12	06422TNC3	.0000	.5113	07/19/10	01/12/11	22,942,328	22,942,328	23,000,000	99.91	22,980,258
<b>Inv Type: 51 BANKERS ACCEPTANCE</b>			.0000	.5319			49,867,943	49,867,943	50,000,000	99.92	49,959,108
42445	PFM PRIME FU		.2307	.2307	07/23/10	10/01/10	252,112	252,112	252,112	100.00	252,112
<b>Inv Type: 72 MONEY MARKET FUNDS</b>			.2307	.2307			252,112	252,112	252,112	100.00	252,112
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
<b>Inv Type: 1010 PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT</b>			.7442	.7442			70,100,000	70,100,000	70,100,000	100.00	70,100,000
42458	B OF A NEGO	0605C02G6	.7500	.7500	09/02/10	09/06/12	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	100.00	25,000,000
<b>Inv Type: 91 NEGOTIABLE CD</b>			.7500	.7500			25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	100.00	25,000,000
<b>Subtotal Fund 100</b>			1.5784	1.2876			3,755,716,131	3,746,993,170	3,733,373,112	101.11	3,774,751,295

**INVESTMENT INVENTORY - 09/30/10**

September 30, 2010

City & County of San Francisco




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
<b>Fund: 9704 SFUSD BONDS 2006B</b>											
42264	T 1.125 06.3	912828LF5	1.1250	.9622	07/21/09	06/30/11	30,093,750	30,035,966	30,000,000	100.66	30,196,874
<b>Inv Type: 12 TREASURY NOTES</b>			1.1250	.9622			30,093,750	30,035,966	30,000,000	100.66	30,196,874
<b>Subtotal Fund 9704</b>			1.1250	.9622			30,093,750	30,035,966	30,000,000	100.66	30,196,874
<b>Total - All Funds</b>			1.5748	1.2850			3,785,809,881	3,777,029,136	3,763,373,112	101.10	3,804,948,169

# INVESTMENT EARNINGS - SEPTEMBER 2010

September 30, 2010

City & County of San Francisco



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						15,917	97,622
42402	Treasury Bil	912795VD0	.0000	.3995	04/23/10	04/07/11	150,000,000	-578,758						49,750	266,992
42419	B 01 13 11	912795UX7	.0000	.3387	06/10/10	01/13/11	18,000,000	-36,673						5,070	19,097
<b>Inv Type: 11 TREASURY BILLS</b>							<b>218,000,000</b>	<b>-797,942</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>70,737</b>	<b>383,711</b>
42298	T 0.875 02 2	912828KE9	.8750	.6321	09/04/09	02/28/11	50,000,000	179,688		-9,946				26,311	37,465
42325	T 1 08 31 11	912828LV0	1.0000	.8260	10/29/09	08/31/11	100,000	316		-14				69	86
42326	T 1 08 31 11	912828LV0	1.0000	.8345	10/29/09	08/31/11	99,900,000	300,480		-13,434				69,356	85,550
42341	T 1 7 31 11	912828LG3	1.0000	.6040	11/19/09	07/31/11	120,000,000	801,563		-38,848				58,978	202,174
42352	T 1.125 12 1	912828KA7	1.1250	.7456	12/09/09	12/15/11	50,000,000	378,906		-15,445				30,662	165,984
42382	T 1.5 07.15.	912828LB4	1.5000	1.1124	03/23/10	07/15/12	50,000,000	441,406		-15,671				45,470	158,967
42415	T 1.25 11 30	912828JS0	1.2500	.3763	06/10/10	11/30/10	20,000,000	89,269		-14,296				6,196	84,016
<b>Inv Type: 12 TREASURY NOTES</b>							<b>390,000,000</b>	<b>2,191,629</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-107,654</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>237,042</b>	<b>734,242</b>
42165	J P MORGAN C	481247AK0	2.2000	2.0469	03/24/09	06/15/12	25,000,000	119,000		-3,028				42,805	161,944
42166	GENL ELEC CA	36967HAN7	2.2500	2.0651	03/24/09	03/12/12	35,000,000	185,150		-5,124	393,750		393,750	60,501	41,563
42170	MORGAN STANL	61757UAF7	2.0000	1.9382	03/16/09	09/22/11	25,000,000	37,750		-1,231	250,000		250,000	40,436	12,500
42177	BAC 2.375 06	06050BAJ0	2.3750	1.9301	04/14/09	06/22/12	50,000,000	685,000		-17,639				81,319	326,562
42181	C 2.125 04.3	17313UAE9	2.1250	1.9669	04/02/09	04/30/12	25,000,000	117,500		-3,136				41,135	222,830
42182	BK OF THE WE	064244AA4	2.1500	1.9628	04/02/09	03/27/12	5,000,000	26,950		-742	53,750		53,750	8,217	1,194
42183	BK OF THE WE	064244AA4	2.1500	1.9629	04/02/09	03/27/12	20,000,000	108,000		-2,972	215,000		215,000	32,861	4,778
42191	BAC 2.1 04.3	06050BAG6	2.1000	1.9749	04/02/09	04/30/12	25,000,000	93,000		-2,482				41,268	220,208
42195	GE 1.625 01.	36967HAG2	1.6250	1.2309	04/16/09	01/07/11	25,000,000	167,500		-7,964				25,891	94,792
42196	GE 1.625 01.	36967HAG2	1.6250	1.2350	04/16/09	01/07/11	25,000,000	165,750		-7,880				25,974	94,792
42197	C 1.625 03.3	17314JAA1	1.6250	1.3908	04/16/09	03/30/11	50,000,000	225,000		-9,467	406,250		406,250	58,241	2,257
42198	GS 1.625 07.	38146FAF8	1.6250	1.4391	04/16/09	07/15/11	50,000,000	204,500		-7,482				60,227	171,528
42211	USSA CAPITAL	90390QAA9	2.2400	1.9620	04/28/09	03/30/12	16,000,000	125,600		-3,531	179,200		179,200	26,335	996
42258	CITIGROUP FD	17313YAC5	1.2500	1.2952	06/29/09	06/03/11	50,000,000	-43,000	1,832					53,916	204,861
42259	CITIGROUP FD	17313YAC5	1.2500	1.2952	06/29/09	06/03/11	50,000,000	-43,000	1,832					53,916	204,861
42274	GE TLGP 3 12	36967HAD9	3.0000	1.6091	07/30/09	12/09/11	50,000,000	1,602,500		-55,771				69,229	466,667
42299	HSBC 3.125 1	4042EPAAS	3.1250	1.3413	09/16/09	12/16/11	50,000,000	1,969,550		-71,969				58,239	455,729
42317	C 1.625 03.3	17314JAA1	1.6250	.7776	10/22/09	03/30/11	35,000,000	423,500		-24,246	284,375		284,375	23,150	1,580
42328	MS 2.25 3 13	61757UAP5	2.2500	1.3169	11/04/09	03/13/12	20,000,000	431,800		-15,063	225,000		225,000	22,437	22,500
42331	MS TLGP 2.25	61757UAP5	2.2500	1.3109	11/06/09	03/13/12	50,000,000	1,084,000		-37,902	562,500		562,500	55,848	56,250
42332	GE TLGP 2.12	36967HAV9	2.1250	1.7893	11/06/09	12/21/12	25,000,000	253,750		-6,672				37,599	147,569
42379	GS 3.25 06.1	38146FAA9	3.2500	1.2299	03/22/10	06/15/12	50,000,000	2,215,000		-81,434				53,983	478,472
42380	GE TLGP 2% 0	36967HBB2	2.0000	1.4058	03/22/10	09/28/12	25,000,000	366,000		-11,922	250,000		250,000	29,745	4,167
42400	GE TLGP 2.0	36967HBB2	2.0000	1.4358	04/20/10	09/28/12	75,000,000	1,101,917		-33,977	658,333		658,333	91,023	12,500
42401	JPM 2.2 0615	481247AK0	2.2000	1.1630	04/21/10	06/15/12	50,000,000	1,097,500		-41,889				49,777	323,889

# INVESTMENT EARNINGS - SEPTEMBER 2010

September 30, 2010

City & County of San Francisco

10



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
42417	RF 2.75 12 1	7591EAAA1	2.7500	.3588	06/10/10	12/10/10	11,310,000	134,980		-22,128				3,791	95,899
<b>Inv Type: 15 TREASURY LGP</b>							917,310,000	12,855,196	3,665	-475,652	3,478,158	0	3,478,158	1,147,861	3,830,887
42242	MORGAN STANL	61757UAN0	.5934	.3848	03/19/09	03/13/12	25,000,000	40,325		-1,110	46,539		46,539	11,183	6,156
42306	Union Bank T	905266AA0	.6187	.4018	03/23/09	03/16/12	25,000,000	33,725		-929	47,090		47,090	11,872	5,124
<b>Inv Type: 16 TLGP FLOATER</b>							50,000,000	74,050	0	-2,039	93,629	0	93,629	23,056	11,280
42349	FHLB 1.85 12	3133XW6C8	1.8500	1.8500	12/21/09	12/21/12	100,000,000							154,167	513,889
42388	FHLB 1.875 0	3133XXN37	1.8750	1.9026				-34,792	-5,887		463,542	40,000	503,542	88,801	
42397	FHLB 1.5 2.5	3133XY4B8	1.5000	1.5000	04/15/10	10/15/12	100,000,000							125,000	691,667
42418	FHLB 1.42 fi	3133XXME4	1.4200	1.4507	06/10/10	09/24/12	20,230,000	46,567	505		82,988		82,988	24,443	5,586
42431	FHLB 1.32 4	3133706H6	1.3200	1.3200	07/22/10	04/22/13	50,000,000							55,000	126,500
<b>Inv Type: 22 FEDERAL HOME BANK</b>							270,230,000	11,775	-5,382	0	546,530	40,000	586,530	447,414	1,337,641
42295	FNMA 2.15 09	31398AZA3	2.1500	2.0533				147,129		47,790	564,870	-147,129	417,741	-71,095	
42335	FNMA 1.75 3	31398AVQ2	1.7500	.5980	11/19/09	03/23/11	50,000,000	770,000		-47,239	437,500		437,500	25,677	19,444
42338	FNMA 1.75 3	31398AVQ2	1.7500	.5712	11/20/09	03/23/11	20,000,000	314,600		-19,340	175,000		175,000	9,827	7,778
42350	FNMA FIXED 1	3136FJZT1	1.7500	1.7500	12/28/09	12/28/12	100,000,000							145,833	452,083
42366	FNMA 3NC1.5	31398AF23	1.8000	1.8000	02/08/10	02/08/13	50,000,000							75,000	132,500
42367	FNMA 1.8 2 8	31398AF23	1.8000	1.8172	02/08/10	02/08/13	25,000,000	-12,500	342					37,842	66,250
42398	FNMA 2.5NC1	3136FMNR1	1.5600	1.5600	04/19/10	10/29/12	100,000,000							130,000	702,000
42410	FNMA 2.5 6 2	3136FMA38	2.5000	2.5268	06/25/10	06/25/15	49,080,000	-61,350	1,008					103,258	327,200
42411	FNMA 1.7 6 2	3136FMB78	1.7000	1.7052				-15,000	-890		425,000	15,000	440,000	141,610	
42424	FNMA 1.3 7 1	31398AV90	1.3000	1.3171	07/16/10	07/16/13	25,000,000	-12,500	342					27,425	67,708
42425	FNMA 1.3 7 1	31398AV90	1.3000	1.3171	07/16/10	07/16/13	50,000,000	-25,000	684					54,851	135,417
42427	FNMA 1.55 7	31398AV25	1.5500	1.5603	07/12/10	07/12/13	69,090,000	-20,727	567					89,809	235,002
42434	FNMA STRNT 1	3136FMX90	1.7500	1.7500	07/27/10	07/27/15	25,000,000							36,458	77,778
42435	FNMA STRNT 1	3136FMX90	1.7500	1.7500	07/27/10	07/27/15	25,000,000							36,458	77,778
42444	FNMA 1.50 07	31398AY22	1.5000	1.5051	07/26/10	07/26/13	25,000,000	-3,750	103					31,353	67,708
42452	FNMA 2.125 8	3136FM6G4	2.1250	2.1250	08/10/10	08/10/15	25,000,000							44,271	75,260
42453	FNMA 1.35 08	31398A2H4	1.3500	1.3500	08/16/10	08/16/13	25,000,000							28,125	42,188
<b>Inv Type: 23 FNMA</b>							663,170,000	1,080,902	2,157	-18,789	1,602,370	-132,129	1,470,241	946,703	2,486,094
42443	FNMA 1.4 11	3136FMUG7	1.4000	1.2618	07/16/10	11/26/12	10,000,000	51,444		-7,218				4,449	48,611
42447	FNMA STEP 1.	3136FMTW4	1.5000	1.4450	08/04/10	06/01/15	37,000,000	191,475		-23,786				22,464	185,000
42457	FNMA 1.75 8	3136FM3R3	1.7500	1.6344	08/18/10	08/18/14	53,270,000	237,584		-19,527				58,158	111,349
<b>Inv Type: 123 FNMA AMORT TO CALL</b>							100,270,000	480,504	0	-50,531	0	0	0	85,071	344,960
42460	FARMER MAC 2	31315PGT0	2.1250	2.1651	09/15/10	09/15/15	45,000,000		745					43,245	42,500
<b>Inv Type: 27 FARMER MAC</b>							45,000,000	0	0	0				43,245	42,500
42342	FFCB Bullet	31331YZ86	3.8750	.7849	11/19/09	08/25/11	50,000,000	2,705,000		-126,009				35,449	193,750
42373	FFCB 2 Year	31331JGD9	.9500	1.0514	03/09/10	03/05/12	17,050,000	-32,130	1,400		79,188		79,188	14,898	11,698

# INVESTMENT EARNINGS - SEPTEMBER 2010

September 30, 2010

City & County of San Francisco

11



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
42374	FFCB 2 Year	31331JGD9	.9500	1.0432	03/09/10	03/05/12	58,000,000	-100,018	4,380		269,378		269,378	50,297	39,794
42385	FFCB 1.875 1	31331G2R9	1.8750	1.5324	03/26/10	12/07/12	37,000,000	333,370		-10,133				47,680	219,688
42399	FFCB 1.625 B	31331JAB9	1.6250	1.5877	04/16/10	12/24/12	50,000,000	48,500		-1,480				66,228	218,924
42403	FFCB 1.125 2	31331JLW1	1.1250	1.2269	04/29/10	04/26/12	74,370,000	-141,768	6,129					75,851	360,230
42407	FFCB 1.74 6	31331JRD7	1.7400	1.7916				-37,500	-2,840		108,750	37,500	146,250	45,535	
42412	FFCB 1.34 12	31331JSB0	1.3400	1.3512				-41,250	-3,430		502,500	41,250	543,750	127,153	
42414	FEDERAL FARM	31331GLL1	2.8000	2.8847	06/10/10	01/28/14	18,225,000	-53,241	1,203					43,728	89,303
42455	FFCB 1.20 4	31331JUUS	1.2000	1.2373	07/08/10	04/08/13	37,396,000	-37,396	1,116					38,512	103,462
42459	FFCB 1.75 03	31331JE33	1.7500	1.7616	09/16/10	03/16/15	50,000,000		228					36,687	36,458
<b>Inv Type: 28 FFCB</b>							<b>392,041,000</b>	<b>2,643,568</b>	<b>8,187</b>	<b>-137,622</b>	<b>959,816</b>	<b>78,750</b>	<b>1,038,566</b>	<b>582,018</b>	<b>1,273,307</b>
42351	FHLMC Fixed	3128X9RH5	1.7500	1.7500	12/28/09	12/28/12	100,000,000							145,833	452,083
42356	FHLMC 1.125	3128X8P22	1.1250	.7120	11/20/09	06/01/11	28,600,000	179,471		-9,649				17,164	107,250
42371	FHLMC 1.8 2	3128X9ZK9	1.8000	1.8000	02/25/10	02/25/13	75,000,000							112,500	135,000
42405	FHLMC 2NC1Y	3134G1DZ4	1.1700	1.1700	05/18/10	05/18/12	50,000,000							48,750	216,125
42408	FHLMC 2 12 2	3134G1GN8	2.0000	2.0000							250,000		250,000	61,111	
42416	FHLMC 5.75 0	3134A4JT2	5.7500	1.0656	06/10/10	01/15/12	20,000,000	1,479,608		-76,007				19,826	242,778
42420	FHLMC 2.05 6	3134G1GX6	2.0500	2.0500	06/30/10	06/30/14	37,900,000							64,746	196,396
42422	FHLMC 1.5 07	3134G1KL7	1.5000	1.5000	07/12/10	07/12/13	50,000,000							62,500	164,583
42423	FHLMC 1.5 7	3134G1KL7	1.5000	1.5000	07/12/10	07/12/13	50,000,000							62,500	164,583
42438	FHLMC 0.4999	3134G1LU6	.5000	.5000	08/05/10	01/28/13	40,000,000	3,889						16,665	34,997
<b>Inv Type: 30 FHLMC Bonds</b>							<b>451,500,000</b>	<b>1,662,967</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-85,656</b>	<b>250,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>250,000</b>	<b>611,595</b>	<b>1,713,795</b>
42354	FHLMC 3nc1 f	3128X9DK3	1.0369	1.0369							129,610		129,610	12,961	
42413	FHLMC 3nc1 f	3128X9DK3	1.0369	1.0369							51,844		51,844	5,184	
<b>Inv Type: 40 FHLMC FLOAT QTR</b>							<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>181,454</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>181,454</b>	<b>18,145</b>	<b>0</b>
42440	FHLMC .750 3	3134G1HD9	.7500	.7000	07/20/10	03/28/13	50,000,000	89,417		-7,948	70,833		70,833	23,302	3,125
<b>Inv Type: 130 FHLMC AMORT TO CALL</b>							<b>50,000,000</b>	<b>89,417</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-7,948</b>	<b>70,833</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>70,833</b>	<b>23,302</b>	<b>3,125</b>
42409	FHLMC MULTI	3134G1FQ2	2.0128	2.0181	06/24/10	06/24/15	20,000,000	-5,000	82					33,629	108,468
<b>Inv Type: 46 FHLMC MULTI STEP</b>							<b>20,000,000</b>	<b>-5,000</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>33,629</b>	<b>108,468</b>
42446	TVA 6.79 5 2	880591DT6	6.7900	.7181	08/04/10	05/23/12	20,500,000	2,499,798		-101,456				14,540	494,916
<b>Inv Type: 95 TENN VALLEY AUTHORITY</b>							<b>20,500,000</b>	<b>2,499,798</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-101,456</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14,540</b>	<b>494,916</b>
42432	BA 0.57 1 13	06422TN33	.0000	.5495	07/06/10	01/03/11	27,000,000	-74,385						12,329	35,754
42456	BA 0.51 1 12	06422TNC3	.0000	.5113	07/19/10	01/12/11	23,000,000	-57,673						9,775	24,112
<b>Inv Type: 51 BANKERS ACCEPTANCE</b>							<b>50,000,000</b>	<b>-132,058</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>22,104</b>	<b>59,866</b>
42445	PFM PRIME FU		.2307	.2307	07/23/10	10/01/10	252,112				421		421	48	56
<b>Inv Type: 72 MONEY MARKET FUNDS</b>							<b>252,112</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>56</b>
42458	B OF A NEGO	0605C02G6	.7500	.7500	09/02/10	09/06/12	25,000,000							15,104	15,104
<b>Inv Type: 91 NEGOTIABLE CD</b>							<b>25,000,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15,104</b>	<b>15,104</b>

**INVESTMENT EARNINGS - SEPTEMBER 2010**

September 30, 2010

City & County of San Francisco

12



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							29,167	75,833
42365	FIRST NATL P		1.0000	1.0000	01/18/10	01/18/11	10,000,000							8,333	25,556
42406	BANK OF SAN		1.6500	1.6500	05/18/10	05/18/11	100,000							138	422
42448	FIRST NATION		.7000	.7000	07/31/10	07/31/11	5,000,000							2,917	6,028
42449	FIRST NATION		.7000	.7000	08/04/10	08/04/11	5,000,000							2,917	5,639
<b>Inv Type: 1010 PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT</b>							70,100,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	43,471	113,477
42294	B of A CD 0.		.7200	.7200							46,000		46,000	500	
<b>Inv Type: 1012 COLLATERALIZED CD</b>							0	0	0	0	46,000	0	46,000	500	0
<b>Subtotal Fund 100</b>							<b>3,733,373,112</b>	<b>22,654,806</b>	<b>-8,709</b>	<b>-987,348</b>	<b>7,229,210</b>	<b>-13,379</b>	<b>7,215,831</b>	<b>4,365,580</b>	<b>12,953,429</b>
<b>Fund: 9704 SFUSD BONDS 2006B</b>															
42264	T 1.125 06.3	912828LF5	1.1250	.9622	07/21/09	06/30/11	30,000,000	93,750		-3,967				23,547	85,292
<b>Inv Type: 12 TREASURY NOTES</b>							30,000,000	93,750	0	-3,967	0	0	0	23,547	85,292
<b>Subtotal Fund 9704</b>							<b>30,000,000</b>	<b>93,750</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-3,967</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>23,547</b>	<b>85,292</b>
<b>Total - All Funds</b>							<b>3,763,373,112</b>	<b>22,748,556</b>	<b>-8,709</b>	<b>-991,315</b>	<b>7,229,210</b>	<b>-13,379</b>	<b>7,215,831</b>	<b>4,389,127</b>	<b>13,038,722</b>



# DETAIL TRANSACTION REPORT - SEPTEMBER 2010

September 30, 2010

City & County of San Francisco



Transaction Type	Settlement Date	Investment No.	Description	Investment Type	CUSIP	Par Value	Book Value	(Interest)	(Gain)/Loss	Transaction Amount
<b>Fund: 100 POOLED FUNDS</b>										
Call	09/22/2010	42388	FHLB 1.875 03.22.13	Agency	3133XXN37	-50,000,000	-49,960,000		-40,000	50,000,000
Call	09/10/2010	42295	FNMA 2.15 09 10 12	Agency	31398AZA3	-52,546,000	-52,693,129		147,129	52,546,000
Call	09/28/2010	42411	FNMA 1.7 6 28 13	Agency	3136FMB78	-100,000,000	-99,985,000	-425,000	-15,000	100,425,000
Call	09/10/2010	42407	FFCB 1.74 6 10 13	Agency	31331JRD7	-25,000,000	-24,962,500	-108,750	-37,500	25,108,750
Call	09/17/2010	42412	FFCB 1.34 12 17 201	Agency	31331JSB0	-150,000,000	-149,958,750	-502,500	-41,250	150,502,500
Call	09/23/2010	42408	FHLMC 2 12 23 13	Agency	3134G1GN8	-50,000,000	-50,000,000	-250,000		50,250,000
Call	09/10/2010	42354	FHLMC 3nc1 float st	Agency	3128X9DK3	-50,000,000	-50,000,000			50,000,000
Call	09/10/2010	42413	FHLMC 3nc1 float st	Agency	3128X9DK3	-20,000,000	-20,000,000			20,000,000
<b>Total Call</b>						<b>-497,546,000</b>	<b>-497,559,379</b>	<b>-1,286,250</b>	<b>13,379</b>	<b>498,832,250</b>
Purchase	09/15/2010	42460	FARMER MAC 2.125 09	Agency	31315PGT0	45,000,000	44,914,950			-44,914,950
Purchase	09/16/2010	42459	FFCB 1.75 03 16 15	Agency	31331JE33	50,000,000	49,975,000			-49,975,000
Deposit	09/01/2010	42445	PFM PRIME FUND 06 3	Money Market Funds		421	421			-421
Purchase	09/02/2010	42458	B OF A NEGO CD 09 0	Negotiable CDs	0605C02G6	25,000,000	25,000,000			-25,000,000
<b>Total Purchase/Deposit</b>						<b>120,000,421</b>	<b>119,890,371</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-119,890,371</b>
Maturity	09/02/2010	42294	B of A CD 0.72 09 0	Collateralized CDs		-25,000,000	-25,000,000	-46,000		25,046,000
<b>Total Maturity</b>						<b>-25,000,000</b>	<b>-25,000,000</b>	<b>-46,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>25,046,000</b>
Interest	09/12/2010	42166	GENL ELEC CAP CORP	TLGP	36967HAN7			-393,750		393,750
Interest	09/13/2010	42328	MS 2.25 3 13 12	TLGP	61757UAP5			-225,000		225,000
Interest	09/13/2010	42331	MS TLGP 2.25 03 13	TLGP	61757UAP5			-562,500		562,500
Interest	09/22/2010	42170	MORGAN STANLEY FDIC	TLGP	61757UAF7			-250,000		250,000
Interest	09/27/2010	42182	BK OF THE WEST.BNP	TLGP	064244AA4			-53,750		53,750
Interest	09/27/2010	42183	BK OF THE WEST.BNP	TLGP	064244AA4			-215,000		215,000
Interest	09/28/2010	42380	GE TLGP 2% 09.28.20	TLGP	36967HBB2			-250,000		250,000
Interest	09/28/2010	42400	GE TLGP 2.0 Bullet	TLGP	36967HBB2		-91,667	-658,333		750,000
Interest	09/30/2010	42197	C 1.625 03.30.11 TL	TLGP	17314JAA1			-406,250		406,250
Interest	09/30/2010	42211	USSA CAPITAL CO	TLGP	90390QAA9			-179,200		179,200
Interest	09/30/2010	42317	C 1.625 03.30.11 TL	TLGP	17314JAA1			-284,375		284,375
Interest	09/13/2010	42242	MORGAN STANLEY FDIC	Agency	61757UAN0			-46,539		46,539
Interest	09/16/2010	42306	Union Bank TLGP Flo	Agency	905266AA0			-47,090		47,090
Interest	09/22/2010	42388	FHLB 1.875 03.22.13	Agency	3133XXN37		-5,208	-463,542		468,750
Interest	09/24/2010	42418	FHLB 1.42 fixed 2.5	Agency	3133XXME4		-60,645	-82,988		143,633
Interest	09/10/2010	42295	FNMA 2.15 09 10 12	Agency	31398AZA3			-564,870		564,870
Interest	09/23/2010	42335	FNMA 1.75 3 23 11	Agency	31398AVQ2			-437,500		437,500


# DETAIL TRANSACTION REPORT - SEPTEMBER 2010

September 30, 2010

City & County of San Francisco





Transaction Type	Settlement Date	Investment No.	Description	Investment Type	CUSIP	Par Value	Book Value	(Interest)	(Gain)/Loss	Transaction Amount
<b>Fund: 100 POOLED FUNDS</b>										
Interest	09/23/2010	42338	FNMA 1.75 3 23 2011	Agency	31398AVQ2			-175,000		175,000
Interest	09/05/2010	42373	FFCB 2 Year Bullet	Agency	31331JGD9		-1,800	-79,188		80,988
Interest	09/05/2010	42374	FFCB 2 Year Bullet	Agency	31331JGD9		-6,122	-269,378		275,500
Interest	09/10/2010	42354	FHLMC 3nc1 float st	Agency	3128X9DK3			-129,610		129,610
Interest	09/10/2010	42413	FHLMC 3nc1 float st	Agency	3128X9DK3			-51,844		51,844
Interest	09/01/2010	42445	PFM PRIME FUND 06 3	Money Market Funds				-421		421
Interest	09/28/2010	42440	FHLMC .750 3 28 11	Agency	3134G1HD9		-22,917	-70,833		93,750
<b>Total Interest</b>						0	-188,359	-5,896,960	0	6,085,318
<b>Sub Total - Fund 100</b>						<b>-402,545,579</b>	<b>-402,857,367</b>	<b>-7,229,210</b>	<b>13,379</b>	<b>410,073,198</b>
<b>Fund: 9704 SFUSD BONDS 2006B</b>										
<b>Sub Total - Fund 9704</b>						0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total - All Funds</b>						<b>-402,545,579</b>	<b>-402,857,367</b>	<b>-7,229,210</b>	<b>13,379</b>	<b>410,073,198</b>

Re: CCSF Investment Report for the month of September 2010 

Pauline Marx to: Pauline Marx

11/04/2010 08:58 AM

Ben Rosenfield, Board of Supervisors, cynthia.fong, dgriffin, grazilij, Greg  
Cc: Wagner, Harvey Rose, Jose Cisneros, Kurian Joseph, Michelle Durgy, ras94124,  
sfdocs, Tonia Lediju, trydstrom

	Pauline Marx	CCSF Investment Report for the month of August 2010
	Pauline Marx	<hr/> <i>Pauline A. Marx</i>



CCSF Monthly Portfolio Report 093010.pdf

---

Pauline A. Marx  
Chief Assistant Treasurer  
City and County of San Francisco  
City Hall - Room 140  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4638  
415/554-5260 (phone)  
415/554-4672 (fax)



**Overturn San Francisco's Discriminatory Sidewalk Sitting Ban**

Cristi Sturgill to: Board.of.Supervisors

11/04/2010 09:21 AM

Please respond to CSturgill2

Cristi Sturgill	Overturn San Francisco's Discriminatory Sidewalk Sitting Ban
-----------------	--

Angela Calvillo  
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Greetings,,

As you know, after the San Francisco Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 against a measure to ban sitting on city sidewalks in June 2010, Mayor Gavin Newsom took Proposition L, better known as the sit-lie ordinance, to the ballot.

Supporters, especially businesspeople in the Haight-Ashbury neighborhood, said it would curb loitering and aggressive panhandling. But since the police acknowledge that enforcement will be "complaint-driven," opponents are sure it will be unfairly used against homeless people.

Penalties for repeat offenders include 30-day jail sentences and \$500 fines. Officials can go ahead and add to that jail sentence, since \$500 might as well be \$1,000,000 for many of the city's homeless. It makes no sense to put people in jail, costing taxpayers money, because they can't pay a fine.

Please take action once again to end this discriminatory sidewalk sitting ban.

Cristi Sturgill  
455 Sayre School Rd  
Mount Vernon, KY 40456

12

Office of the Mayor  
City & County of San Francisco



orig: cpage  
c: BOS-H, COB, Lea + Op Dep  
Gavin Newsom  
City Attny EX file

November 5, 2010

Ms. Angela Calvillo  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94109

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO  
2010 NOV -5 PM 2:39  
BY [Signature]

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Pursuant to Charter Section 3.100, I hereby designate Supervisor Carmen Chu as Acting-Mayor from the time I leave the state of California at 5:50PM on Friday, November 5, 2010, until 3:35PM Sunday, November 7, 2010.

In the event I am delayed, I designate Supervisor Chu to continue to be the Acting-Mayor until my return to California.

Sincerely

  
Gavin Newsom  
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

cc: Mr. Dennis Herrera, City Attorney

13

City and County of San Francisco

BOS-11 page  
Department of Public Health



Gavin Newsom  
Mayor

Gregg Sass  
Chief Financial Officer

November 3, 2010

Through: Mitchell Katz, M.D.  
Director of Health

Angela Calvillo  
Clerk of the Board  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RE: FY 2009-10 Annual Report of Gifts

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

Enclosed is the FY 2009-10 Annual Report of Gifts received by the Department of Public Health. As required by Section 10.110 of the San Francisco Administrative Code the Department of Public Health annually reports to the Board of Supervisors all gifts received. This report was reviewed and accepted by the Health Commission.

Please accept and file this report. If you have any questions, please call me at 554-2610.

Sincerely,

Gregg Sass  
Chief Financial Officer

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO  
2010 NOV -5 AM 9:19  
BY \_\_\_\_\_  
AK

14



Gavin Newsom  
Mayor

Mitchell H. Katz, MD  
Director of Health

MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 2, 2010

TO: James Illig, President  
and Honorable Members of the Health Commission

THROUGH: Mitchell Katz, M.D.  
Director of Health

FROM: Gregg Sass, *Gregg Sass*  
Chief Financial Officer

RE: Annual Report of Gifts Received in FY 2009-10

As required by section 10.100-201 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and consistent with the policy and procedure for the acceptance of gifts adopted by the Health Commission in October 1995, the following provides a summary of gifts received in FY 2009-10.

Summary of Gifts Received in FY 2009-10

<u>Fund/Organization</u>	<u>Amount under</u> <u>\$25,000</u>	<u>Amount over</u> <u>\$25,000</u>	<u>Total</u>
<b>San Francisco General Hospital</b>			
SFGH Foundation	\$1,408,430	\$3,396,120	\$4,804,550
<b>Laguna Honda Hospital</b>			
Patient Gifts			
Gift Fund	10,206	-	10,206
LHH Volunteers Inc.	-	76,581	76,581
Staff Gifts			
Gift Fund	3,550	-	3,550
Total	13,756	76,581	90,337
<b>Population Health &amp; Prevention</b>			
San Francisco Public Health Foundation	257,485	233,446	490,931
<b>Total Gifts</b>	<b>\$1,679,671</b>	<b>\$3,706,147</b>	<b>\$5,385,818</b>

The Department is grateful to the volunteers and their leaders, and for the generous contributions received from the community.

## San Francisco General Hospital

### San Francisco General Hospital Foundation

The San Francisco General Hospital Foundation was established in 1994 to support programs and projects at the San Francisco General Hospital. For the above period, grants and donations totaling \$4,804,550 were received by the San Francisco General Hospital Foundation. Grants and gifts of \$25,000 and over amounted to \$3,396,120.

<u>Fund/Organization</u>	<u>Amount under \$25,000</u>	<u>Amount over \$25,000</u>	<u>Total</u>
SFGH Foundation	\$1,408,430	\$3,396,120	\$4,804,550

Grants and Donations \$25,000 and over are from the following donors:

Avon Foundation	\$	900,000
Kaiser	\$	789,300
San Francisco Health Plan	\$	422,840
Susan G. Komen Foundation	\$	186,050
OREF	\$	128,125
The Herbst Foundation	\$	100,000
Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation	\$	90,000
State of California - Department of Public Health	\$	87,650
The San Francisco Foundation	\$	80,310
OMEGA	\$	79,875
California Healthcare Foundation	\$	76,970
Center for Orthopedic Trauma Advancement	\$	75,000
UCSF	\$	65,000
Richard and Rhoda Goldman Fund	\$	50,000
Joseph Down Foundation	\$	50,000
The Horace Goldsmith Foundation	\$	50,000
Mimi & Peter Haas Fund	\$	40,000
Macy's	\$	25,000
The Mary Wholford Foundation	\$	25,000
Firedoll Foundation	\$	25,000
Genentech, Inc.	\$	25,000
George Frederick Jewett Foundation	\$	25,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>3,396,120</b>



Programs and services funded in the period 7/1/09 to 6/30/10 as follows:

Amputee Support	\$	29,211
Bay Area Perinatal AIDS Center		83,012
Draper Nursing Education Program		13,150
Cancer Awareness Resource Education		43,161
Chinatown Public Health Education		76,419
eReferral Specialty Care		73,685
eReferral Spread Project		44,671
ER Capital Campaign		96,427
Health Coaches for Youth		11,299
Healthy San Francisco		17,045
Mammography Screening Equipment		155,860
Magnet Application Support		11,504
Neuro-Trauma		84,250
Orthopedics Department		136,619
Other Projects		90,906
Palliative Care		22,880
Prevent Heart Attacks & Strokes		167,911
SFGHF Hearts Grant - 4C Infusion		59,785
SFGHF Hearts Grant - Palliative Care Room		3,392
SFGHF Hearts Grant - Early Insuline		7,075
SFGHF Hearts Grant - Electroencephalography Machine		39,618
SFGHF Hearts Grant - Electroconvulsive Machine		16,090
SFGHF Hearts Grant: HIV Patient education		23,141
SFGHF Hearts Grant: HIV prevention for the Mentally Ill		27,003
SFGHF Hearts Grant: Lymphedema Education		1,331
SFGHF Hearts Grant: Other Projects		8,711
SFGHF Hearts Grant: Violence Survivor Guide		7,691
SFGHF Spirit		6,436
Southeast Health Center		43,009
Transitional Care Program		643,677
Video Medical Interpretation		83,636
Volunteer Program		45,852
Vulnerable Population		157,422
Women Health - Avon (portion of grants booked in prior periods)		788,386
Women's Option Center		70,955
<b>Total</b>		<b><u>\$ 3,191,220</u></b>

Fundraising costs for the San Francisco General Hospital Foundation will not be available until their audited financials are completed later this month.

**Laguna Honda Hospital**

Laguna Honda received gifts totaling \$90,337 in FY 2009-10. The gifts consisted of:

Donor	Amount under \$1,000	Amount over \$1,000	Total
<b>Patient Funds' Donations:</b>			
Various	\$ 4,545	\$ 5,661	\$ 10,206
Laguna Honda Volunteers Inc.		76,581	76,581
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 4,545</b>	<b>\$ 82,242</b>	<b>\$ 86,787</b>
<b>Staff Education and Development Funds' Donations</b>			
Various	\$ 550	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,550
<b>Total Donations</b>	<b>\$ 5,095</b>	<b>\$ 85,242</b>	<b>\$ 90,337</b>

Gift Fund

Laguna Honda Hospital Gift Fund received a total of \$90,337 from cash donations in FY 2009-10. These included:

Received \$1 - \$1,000 from each of 49 different donors	\$ 5,095
Production LLC	3,000
Alzheimer's Association	2,181
United Way of the Bay Area	1,280
Gary Speer	1,200
The Center for Student Mission	1,000
LH Volunteers Inc.	76,581
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 90,337</b>

FY 2009-10 donations combined with donations from prior years funded programs and services in the period 7/1/09 to 6/30/10 as follows:

Patient-related expenses:	
Various events-food	\$ 22,523
Ball game tickets	10,949
Outings -bus & food	76,565
Supplies, game prizes, ward money	25,584
Entertainment	16,632
Art with Elders Program	30,000
Total	<u>\$ 182,253</u>
Staff education-related expenses:	
Retreats & events	\$ 22,926
Educational supplies	2,353
Total	<u>\$ 25,729</u>

There are no direct fundraising costs as acceptance and expenditures of the LHH gift funds are managed as part of LHH's account staff duties.

**Population Health and Prevention**

Population Health and Prevention programs received gifts totaling \$ 490,931 in FY 2009-2010 through the San Francisco Public Health Foundation (SFPHF).

SFPHF, founded in 1988, is dedicated to augmenting and expanding the services and programs of the San Francisco Department of Public Health. The Foundation provides the mechanism for individuals, corporation, foundations and organizations to support programs and fund special projects that make a meaningful contribution to the health and welfare of our city. The Foundation assists the Department in providing innovative services to San Francisco's most vulnerable residents. Thanks to funds directed through the foundation, children and adults, in addition to being physically healthy, thrive and enjoy an improved quality of life.

The gifts help support a growing number of new and innovative community programs and services.

<u>Fund/Organization</u>	<u>Gift Amounts</u> <u>under \$25,000</u>	<u>Gift Amounts</u> <u>over \$25,000</u>	<u>Total</u>
San Francisco Public Health Foundation	\$257,485	\$233,446	\$490,931

The sources of the gifts to the San Francisco Public Health Foundation in FY 2009-2010 included:

Government	\$ 3,015
Individuals	15,978
Organizations	129,645
Corporate/Businesses	53,476
Foundations	248,617
Universities	40,200
Total	\$ 490,931

Expenditures totaling \$384,476 were used for the following programs and services:

Public Health Education & Prevention	\$ 20,977
Direct Patient Services	91,254
Communicable Disease Control/treatment/prevention	13,909
Outreach & Healthcare for the Homeless	221,765
Youth & Children's Services	14,300
Environmental Services	17,774
Public Outreach and Administration	4,497
	\$ 384,476

The total overhead, administration and fundraising costs of the San Francisco Public Health Foundation for FY 2009-10 were \$44,770, approximately 12% of the program expenses. Total assets at the end of the year were \$943,522 in restricted funds, \$76,212 in unrestricted funds.

## Foundation and Volunteer Boards

---

The Board of Directors for the San Francisco General Hospital Foundation, The San Francisco Public Health Foundation, and the volunteer organizations for SFGH and LHH are listed on the following pages.

### San Francisco General Hospital Foundation Board of Directors

Judith Swift Guggenhime, President	Lynn Jimenez-Catchings
Helen Archer-Dusté, Secretary	James Messemer
Jonathan Tsao, Vice President	Theodore Miclau
John Luce, Vice President	Magdalen Mui
Matthew Paul Carbone, Vice President	Walter Newman
Michael Dowling, Treasurer	Roland Pickens
Pam Baer	Laura A. Robertson
Mary Bersot	Alex Rosenblatt
Kirsten Bibbins-Domingo	David Sanchez, Ex-Officio
Amy Busch	Connie Shanahan
Sue Carlisle, Ex-Officio	Ruth Ann Stumpf
Sue Currin, Ex-Officio	Leon Tuan
Tina Frank	Beth S. Veniar
Prisca Geeslin	Michael West
Lisa Hauswirth	Jamie Whittington

### Laguna Honda Volunteers, Inc. Board of Directors

Joseph S. Lerer, President	Patrick Devlin
Kathleen Cardinal, Vice President	R. Porter Felton
G. Barney Schley, Vice President	William J. Hoehler
Terry Lowry, Vice President	Peter A. Johnson
Bruce Nelson, Treasurer	June Lilienthal
W. Sloan Upton, Secretary	William B. MacColl, Jr.
Morris H. Noble, Jr., Past President	Mrs. James K. McWilliams (Anne)
Richard J. Behrendt	William C. Miller
Peter W. Callander, M.D.	H. Boyd Seymour
Craig B. Collins	Sara C. Stephens
Lisa Wilcox Corning	

### San Francisco Public Health Foundation Board of Directors

Sutanto Widjaja, President	Anne Kronnenberg
Randy Wittorp, Vice-President	Dani Nolin
Daniel Cody, Secretary:	Steven Tierney
Cynthia Gomez, Treasurer:	Arthur Wiess
Lisa Hammann	

City and County of San Francisco

Gavin Newsom  
Mayor



Department of Human Resources

Micki Callahan  
Human Resources Director

305-11  
CPA/CC

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Honorable Mayor Gavin Newsom  
Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors  
Theresa Sparks, Executive Director, Human Rights Commission  
Emily Murase, Executive Director, Department on the Status of Women

FROM: Micki Callahan, Human Resources Director

DATE: November 4, 2010

SUBJECT: Annual Report on Sexual Harassment Complaints filed in Fiscal Year 2009/2010

I: Annual Report on Sexual Harassment Complaints

Pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 16.9-25(e)(2):

The Human Resources Director shall provide annually to the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Human Rights Commission, and the Commission on the Status of Women a written report on the number of claims of sexual harassment filed, including information on the number of claims pending and the departments in which claims have been filed. The reports shall not include names or other identifying information regarding the parties or the alleged harassers.

In accordance with the San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 16.9-25(e)(2), enclosed is the "Annual Report on Sexual Harassment Complaints." Attachment A identifies "internal" complaints filed with individual City and County of San Francisco Departments and the Department of Human Resources, Equal Employment Opportunity Division (DHR EEO). Attachment B identifies "external" complaints filed with the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH). For Fiscal Year 2009/2010, a total of 18 complaints (18 internal and 0 external) alleging sexual harassment were filed.

Please feel free to contact Linda Simon, DHR EEO Director at 415-557-4837, for further information.

Enclosure

cc: Dennis Herrera, City Attorney

**ANNUAL REPORT ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT COMPLAINTS  
INTERNAL COMPLAINTS<sup>1</sup>**

Fiscal Year 2009/2010 (July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010)

DEPARTMENT	TOTAL FILED	STATUS				
		Pending	Settled	Insufficient Evidence	Sustained	Not Investigated
Asian Art Museum	1	1				
Assessor	2				1	1
Child Support Services	1	1				
City Planning	2					2
Environment	2	1				1
Human Services Agency	1	1				
Police	3					3
Public Health	1	1				
Public Works	3	1				2
Recreation and Park	1	1				
Technology	1					1
<b>TOTAL COMPLAINTS</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>7</b>			<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>

Definitions:

- "Settled": complaint was resolved;
- "Insufficient Evidence": complaint was investigated and there was insufficient evidence to establish sexual harassment;
- "Sustained": complaint investigated and there was sufficient evidence that sexual harassment occurred; and
- "Not Investigated": complaint was not investigated because: (1) there was no EEO jurisdiction, (2) it was withdrawn, or (3) it was untimely.

<sup>1</sup> Complaints filed with individual Departments and the Department of Human Resources, Equal Employment Opportunity Division (DHR EEO).

ANNUAL REPORT ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT COMPLAINTS:  
EXTERNAL COMPLAINTS<sup>2</sup>

Fiscal Year 2009/2010 (July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010)

ZERO COMPLAINTS

Definitions:

- "Settled": complaint was resolved;
- "Insufficient Evidence": complaint was investigated and there was insufficient evidence to establish sexual harassment;
- "Sustained": complaint investigated and there was sufficient evidence that sexual harassment occurred; and
- "Not Investigated": complaint was not investigated because the EEOC or the DFEH: (1) determined investigation was not warranted or (2) issued notice of request to sue

---

<sup>2</sup> Complaints filed externally with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) or the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC).

## Smoking Ban Proposal

Chloe

to:

Board of Supervisors, Eric.L.Mar, Michela.Alioto-Pier, David.Chiu, Carmen.Chu, Ross.Mirkarimi,  
Sean.Elsbernd, Bevan.Dufty, David.Campos, Sophie.Maxwell, John.Avalos

11/03/2010 04:57 PM

Show Details

Good afternoon, Supervisors,

I read with delight that the recently passed law banning smoking in any outdoor areas of restaurants has now gone into effect. (I'm hoping this includes coffee shops and cafes, but I'm not sure. I was unable to find the law itself to read the wording.) Thank you, Supervisor Mar, for sponsoring the law, and thank you, Board, for passing it.

I would like to ask if another anti-smoking law might be in order. I live in an apartment building with fire escapes, and there are several smokers in the building who smoke on the fire escape because they don't want their apartments to smell like smoke. (Their words, not mine.) I have asked that they please smoke either in their apartments, out on the street in front of the building, or in the garage area. I've asked in person, and I've posted the request a couple of times on the communal cork board. Not only do I not like the smell, but I am in fact allergic to smoke.

Unfortunately, they still smoke out on the fire escape, and the smoke enters my apartment via the open windows. It affects not only my health, but the health of my cats and any guests I may have visiting. In addition to cigarettes, some smoke marijuana, of which I am also not appreciative. It doesn't matter if I am home or not, I can smell the cigarettes when I arrive home. Of course, it's much stronger when I am home. (My cats, of course, have to deal with it all day.)

I registered a complaint with 311 and received calls and/or emails from both the SFDPH and the SFFD. Both advised that there is nothing they can do. While it's technically illegal for tenants to use the fire escapes for anything other than an emergency, unless they catch them in the act, there's no way to stop the tenants from smoking on the fire escapes. (If I were to call for this non-emergency, the smokers would surely be done by the time anyone arrived. A waste of time and energy.)

In my opinion, this law is at least as necessary as the one you just passed. While a person can avoid those smoking on patios/sidewalks by crossing the street, or covering their mouths as they pass (both of which I have been doing for years when walking past the smokers outside of Church Street cafe on Church between Market and 15th streets), I can't avoid the smoke coming into my apartment unless I close my windows. Fresh air, though, is something I think we all should have access to, especially in our own homes.

I know some of you are on your way out of office, but I ask that you please take my proposal request under consideration or pass the information along to your successors. In trying to make San Francisco a healthy city, this would be a great help.

Thank you for your attention,

Chloe Jager  
340 Church Street, Apt. #9  
San Francisco, CA 94114  
415-867-9776

*There are always those who need our support as they keep our country free.  
If you would like to learn more, please visit...*

<http://soldiersangels.org/>

*You cannot do a kindness too soon,  
For you never know how soon it will be too late.  
~Ralph Waldo Emerson*





To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: Attractive nuisances

---

From: JAMES CORRIGAN <marylouc@mac.com>  
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org  
Date: 11/04/2010 10:42 AM  
Subject: Fwd: Attractive nuisances

---

Nov. 4, 2010

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors::

Is there a means by which San Francisco could make Starbucks and Pete's etc. less inviting to our firefighters?

Any day one can see our SFFD finest, in uniform, lined up with ordinary, non-emergency personnel called civilians, awaiting to order a latte.

The fact that their rigs are often parked hundreds of yards distant, causes me concern over that whole "seconds count" thing.

I believed John Hanley, former President of Local # 798, when he was quoted, "A minute is a lifetime" in firefighting.

In addition, Chief Hayes-White is creditable when she states to the Budget Committee that "seconds count."

San Franciscans should not be asking where their nearest firehouse is located, but rather, where is the nearest crew and how far are they away from their rigs?

Sincerely yours,

James Joseph Corrigan

This video was shot on November 1, 2010.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2nHAu2o7twc>



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

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO  
2010 NOV -2 PM 3:12

BY \_\_\_\_\_

October 4, 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. SF43603D**

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

(18)

**ATTACHMENT A**

**1. Project Location**

Site Identification Number: SF43603D  
Site Name: Anchor Bldg  
Site Address: 2016 Chestnut St, San Francisco, CA 94123  
County: San Francisco  
Assessor's Parcel Number: 0467A-023  
Latitude: 37° 48'03.40" N  
Longitude: 122° 26'12.30" W

**2. Project Description**

Number of Antennas to be installed: 2  
Tower Design: Rooftop  
Tower Appearance: Install two (2) panel antennas mounted on existing building on columns.  
Tower Height: 70 feet  
Size of Buildings: 408 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: The Planning Commission denied the Design Review request and approved the application as proposed on July 15, 2010. The project planner, Sara Vellve, signed on off the building permit application on September 2, 2010.

Land Use Permit #: Building Permit Application No. 2009.0730.3759 (Design Review Case No. 2010.0134D).

If Land use Approval was not required:



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: Supporting The Children of San Francisco's Tenderloin Area District 6

From: Ivan E Pratt <prattbuddhahood@gmail.com>  
To: Brody Tucker <Brody.Tucker@sfdph.org>, reiko <reiko@cyberhedz.com>, IVAN E PRATT <IEP55@juno.com>, masmith@php.ucsf.edu, asha <asha@sfdigifilm.com>, "Selby, Van" <van.selby@ucsf.edu>, membership@parksconservancy.org, volunteer@sfbotanicalgarden.org, Michael Pacheco III <hoikeikeala@yahoo.com>, vince <vince@elainezamora.com>, "board.of.supervisors" <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>, rfreeman <rfreeman@peralta.edu>, membership.services@sierraclub.org, Chughes <Chughes@ymcasf.org>, sgiangel <sgiangel@earthlink.net>, Edward Evans <edwevans@gmail.com>, Gavin Newsom <gavin@gavinnewsom.com>, cwatros@ggsf.com, Michael Nulty <sf\_district6@yahoo.com>, AlexanderTenantsAssociation-owner <AlexanderTenantsAssociation-owner@yahoogroups.com>, Chi Wolf <chiwolf@hotmail.com>, mhann <mhann@tndc.org>, david\_villalobos@sbcglobal.net, ehuerta <ehuerta@parksconservancy.org>, "Ho, Alice" <Alice.Ho@ropesgray.com>, media@gavinnewsom.com, FoodFairy <FoodFairy@aol.com>, "chris.daly" <chris.daly@sfgov.org>, "chico.garza" <chico.garza@sbcglobal.net>, heidi <heidi@studycenter.org>, "christopher.nguyen" <christopher.nguyen@dph.sf.ca.us>, regimeadows <regimeadows@ymail.com>, goldoor5 <goldoor5@yahoo.com>, "richard.montantes" <richard.montantes@sfdph.org>, ecomerritt@peralta.edu, elaine <elaine@elainezamora.com>, Steven Andrew Kacsmar <stevenandrew@earthlink.net>, enews@calacademy.org, volunteer@parksconservancy.org, Daniel Miller <daniel@spiralgardens.org>, "Morelli, Julie" <morellij@medsfgh.ucsf.edu>, PBCA@cahi-oakland.org, Mark Kaplan <rockwellproperties@gmail.com>  
Date: 11/02/2010 10:04 AM  
Subject: Supporting The Children of San Francisco's Tenderloin Area District 6

SAN FRANCISCO CITY ACADEMY November 2 2010

San Francisco City Accademy (K-8),  
WebPage: <http://www.sfcityacademy.com>

I wondered how 'The San Francisco City Academy' is doing supporting the school financially in order to keeps school doors open to service young minds of the future. I asked because one day in August of 2010, I was walking down Eddy street where the school is located, and there was a woman and her fellow constituents and a very large table of different kinds of sliced cake that she was trying to sell for a dollar a piece in order to raise funds for the school. I have to assume that there was a problem possibly in keeping this school for very young children open in the 'Tenderloin Area District #6'. Well I purchased a piece of cake, but even after I purchased the cake this little school in the Tenderloin stayed on my mind, even to this day, that is why I'm writing you now wondering how well you did in creating new finances for 'The San Francisco City Academy (K-8)'.

It is my belief the most valuable asset a community has is it's schools open to educate young children and young people in general. It is because education in the United States is such a failure for many years, that we might be experiencing some of the social problems we as a United States Nation are facing today. Of course it is also my belief that teachers can only act as guides in educating young people of school age. It is the parents that are responsible for re-enforcing in their children what the teacher has taught. But as you know, because of the United States unfair economy for the middle class and poor, that most parents have to have two and even three jobs, just to barely make ends meet - how can they find the time to

19

stay with their children more often and guide them in they're school work assignments.

I am going to pass this email around in Internet world, hoping that someone will have some sought of way and means to strengthen the educational endeavors threw donations in support of 'San Francisco City Academy (K-8)' in the Tenderloin Area of San Francisco. In my opinion educational institutions on all levels are the very back bone of the United States or any nation, not to support educational programs by way of government financing is suicide for any local community, state, or Federal Government. It is from educational institutions that the future leaders of a community, state, or national government must depend on to exist as a foundation in support of the people it leads.

I am encouraging the people who read this message to pass this message far and wide in support in donations for 'The San Francisco City Academy (K-8)', in anything you can spare or time you can give to support our communities priceless treasure, the children.

THANKYOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR CONSIDERATIONS AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT IN ANYTHING YOU CAN DONATE TO 'The San Francisco City Academy (K-8)'

San Francisco City Accademy (K-8),  
WebPage: <http://www.sfcityacademy.com>

Sciences Directly Appropriate for Environmental Studies/Social Advocation:

IVAN EDGAR PRATT, "XERISCAPE / BUDDHA, INC." IEP55@juno.com, Internet direct quote and paraphrase transcription "?" information, Sustainable Systems Environmental Ecology, WebPage:  
[http://www.brookscoble.com/cgi-brookscoble/course\\_products\\_bc.pl?fid=M20b&product\\_isbn\\_issn=0534376975&discipline\\_number=22](http://www.brookscoble.com/cgi-brookscoble/course_products_bc.pl?fid=M20b&product_isbn_issn=0534376975&discipline_number=22)

Merritt College Ecology Department & Matriculations,  
WebPage: <http://www.ecomerritt.org/>,  
Social psychology, WebPage: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social\\_psychology](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_psychology)  
Sierra Club Membership, WebPage: <http://www.sierraclub.org>,  
Geophysics, WebPage: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Geophysics> ,  
Astrophysics, WebPage: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Astrophysics> ,  
NAM MYOHO RENGE KYO, <http://www.sgi-usa.org>



Dr. David Schneider  
OPTOMETRIST

(510) 848-6733 • ds6956@earthlink.net

10/20/10

1736 HEARST AVENUE • BERKELEY, CA 94703

DEAN BO OF SUPES -

I URGE YOU TO:

- 1) SUPPORT NEW, RESTORED PUBLIC PARK @ SHARP PARK,
- 2) CHARGE FOR PARKING IN EASTERN END OF GORDIN  
BAY PART AND IN THE MARINA.

Sincerely -

DR SCHNEIDER

BY DR

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO  
2010 NOV - 1 PM 3:03

(20)

**COMMISSIONERS**  
Jim Kellogg, President  
Discovery Bay  
Richard Rogers, Vice President  
Montecito  
Michael Sutton, Member  
Monterey  
Daniel W. Richards, Member  
Upland  
Jack Baylis, Member  
Los Angeles

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER



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

### To: Interested and Affected Parties

Notice of Change of Date of Discussion Hearing for  
**Subsection 7.50(b)(1.5), Title 14, Re: Alameda Creek**  
(OAL File Number Z-2010-1019-04)

A Notice mailed on October 29, 2010 indicated that the Commission would hear discussion regarding Alameda Creek at its November 17-18, 2010 Fish and Game Commission meeting. This meeting has been cancelled. The Noticed Discussion Hearing noticed for the Commission's December 16, 2010 meeting at the Hotel Mar Monte, 1111 East Cabrillo Blvd., Santa Barbara, CA is still scheduled. The public may present oral comments at this meeting, or send comments by mail to the above address, or by e-mail to [fgc@fgc.ca.gov](mailto:fgc@fgc.ca.gov), or by fax to 916-653-5040.

The new Adoption Hearing date will be determined at the December meeting, and posted to the Commission's website at [www.fgc.ca.gov](http://www.fgc.ca.gov), and provided by mail to all Interested and Affected Parties in a notice mailing following the December meeting.

FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

Jon K. Fischer  
Acting Executive Director

Dated: November 1, 2010

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO  
2010 NOV - 1 PM 3:37  
BY [initials]

21



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: Fw: Please ....no water treatment facilities in my precious Golden Gate Park

---

From: MaryJane O'Keefe <mjopix@gmail.com>  
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org  
Date: 11/02/2010 10:49 AM  
Subject: Please ....no water treatment facilities in my precious Golden Gate Park

---

As a native San Franciscan who was also raised in SF in both the Richmond (graduate from Washington High School) and Sunset, I beg you not to change the park anymore than it has already been changed...We do not need a water treatment place in GOLDEN GATE PARK...Who's brilliant idea was that? It just seems crazy to me...

Sincerely,  
MaryJane O'Keefe

22



West Side Water Treatment Plant

daororke

to:

Board.of.Supervisors

11/01/2010 01:53 PM


Cc:

ggppa

Show Details

Please consider locating this plant OUTSIDE of Golden Gate Park.

Thank you,  
Dennis O'Rorke  
1360 mcAllister Street,  
San Francisco  
94115



**Recycled Water Treatment Facility in Golden Gate Park**

Allan Ridley to: rec.park, Board.of.Supervisors, Gavin.newsom,  
carrie.dovzak

11/02/2010 07:56 PM

Cc: ggppa

Allan Ridley	Recycled Water Treatment Facility in Golden Gate Park
--------------	---

A perfectly functional water treatment facility in Golden Gate Park is already there! Just modify it for recycled water as necessary and USE IT. In this time of financial hardship, it would be economic folly to do otherwise.

Thanks for your consideration,  
Allan Ridley



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: Proposed Westside recycled water treatment plant in Golden Gate Park

---

From: Diana Scott <dmscott01@yahoo.com>  
To: Recreation and Park Commission <rec.park@sfgov.org>, Board of Supervisors <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, Mayor Gavin Newsom <Gavin.newsom@sfgov.org>, Planning Department <carrie.dovzak@sfgov.org>, Carmen Chu <info@carmenchu2010.com>  
Cc: ggppa@earthlink.net  
Date: 11/04/2010 11:55 AM  
Subject: Proposed Westside recycled water treatment plant in Golden Gate Park

---

Dear Members of the Recreation and Park Commission, Supervisors, Mayor Newsom, Members of the Planning Department, and Supervisor Chu:

I am unable to attend the presentation today concerning the water recycling plant proposed for Golden Gate Park, but have read some of the materials being circulated by the PUC and attended an earlier staff presentation at which the project was described.

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the intrusion into parkland of this industrial use, not many years after residents succeeded reclaiming the space for public use in the '90s.

Parkland is not merely space to be liquidated (literally!) when commercial opportunity arises, even when the intended use has an anticipated environmental benefit.

Maintenance of parkland itself -- as native species habitat and for passive recreation, contemplation, and appreciation of nature by city dwellers and visitors (not to mention absorption of rainfall that is naturally diverted from the sewer system into the aquifer) -- is in and of itself, a "higher" environmental use!

The main stated uses of the recycled water from this plant would be to serve golf courses, the Zoo, and perhaps the park itself; these needs can likely be met by more limited, less intrusive decentralized recycling technologies at the mentioned sites themselves -- ones which are less expensive, require fewer chemicals and polluting toxic discharges, and less automotive transport for construction and routine maintenance -- beginning with rainwater catchment.

Although from an engineering point of view, the park is a convenient location in relation to the Westside sewage treatment plant, other "open space" areas -- possibly even the Presidio -- might better serve the associated "educational center" use proposed for this industrial project. The best education center, however, would take a wider view to suggest decentralized water reclamation technologies and a regional watershed approach that is more genuinely sustainable, rather than an older centralized engineering solution.

Moreover, the plant proposal, only one possible option in an unstated range, doesn't acknowledge its associated environmental costs -- apart from loss of accessible, unencumbered parkland to human and other species -- that include:

- large amounts of chemicals and electricity used in the treatment process;
- associated disposal impacts and light and sound pollution;
- delicate maintenance requirements;
- susceptibility to disruption and additional costs -- financial, environmental, and wider water-system impact -- in case of emergency shut down.

Seawater intrusion into coastal aquifers is a known danger that an expanded water harvesting and

delivery system may exacerbate; coastal erosion is already an acknowledged, unsolved problem.

Drawing water from the aquifer below the park, to mix with recycled water for commercial sale, may in fact conflict with the best interests of residents of the City of San Francisco in the long term, even if it generates revenues for fiscally strapped city agencies in the relatively short term.

To summarize: the proposal to build a water recycling plant in Golden Gate Park:

- is not an appropriate use of precious city parkland;
- has associated environmental costs that may exceed purported green benefits, and
- needs to be re-examined in the context of other regional water reclamation options, including decentralized treatment and site-specific rainwater collection, that will protect and conserve both precious parkland and existing urban aquifers.

Diana Scott  
3657 Wawona  
San Francisco, CA 94116



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: Do not build a recycled water plant in Golden Gate Park!

---

From: Sharon Muczynski <muczynski.sharon@gmail.com>  
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, rec.park@sfgov.org, Gavin.newsom@sfgov.org,  
carrie.dovzak@sfgov.org  
Date: 11/03/2010 03:37 PM  
Subject: Do not build a recycled water plant in Golden Gate Park!

---

This is the most outlandish, disgusting thing to put in a serene park. GEEZ!

Please do not put this ugly monstrosity in the park. You will ruin it!

Heartfelt Pleading,

Sharon Muczynski



**GOLDEN GATE PARK - PROPOSED WESTSIDE RECYCLED WATER PROJECT**

Yope Posthumus to: recpark.commission

11/04/2010 10:39 AM

Cc: Board.of.Supervisors, Gavin Newsom, carrie.dovzak, ggppa,  
eric.L.Mar, Carmen Chu



Regarding Item #8 on the General Calendar for the November 4th  
Commission Meeting

Dear President Buell and Commissioners:

We consider you to be the guardians of Golden Gate Park and hope that you will preserve the Park for us and all future generations. Please keep the western end of the Park pastoral as the Master Plan says. The Park is a refuge from all the paving and buildings that we are expose to every day as city dwellers. The proposed water treatment plant does not belong in Golden Gate Park unless it is underground. If not underground, please put it somewhere else.

Thank you,

Kathleen and Johannes Posthumus  
636 46th Avenue  
San Francisco 94121

Proposed water treatment plant in GG Park

jane jens

to:

Board.of.Supervisors

11/03/2010 03:15 PM

Cc:

ggpa

Show Details

Please do not locate the proposed water treatment plant in the western part of Golden Gate Park. Our wonderful Park is one of the few places left in San Francisco consisting of a large open public space. It would be a shame to use this precious community recreational resource for an industrial use when the plant could be located elsewhere. Thank you.

Chaffee -- Library Commission v. Decency -- The Defense Needs Your Help -- Spread the Word  
James Chaffee

to:

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

11/08/2010 12:35 AM

Cc:

deetje, frandacosta, grossman356, home, "Jason Grant Garza", jaygarza, kimo, Libraryusers2004, "Nicholas Pasquariello", "P Warfield", rak0408, "Ray Hartz", "Richard McRee", SCau1321, sfmeskunas, tien, "Timothy Gillespie 1", bbegin, "Bruce Brugmann", "Katie Worth", "Marisa Lagos", matierandross, rgordon

Show Details

# Library Commission v. Decency

**The Defense Needs Your Help — Come to the Ethics Commission  
Monday, November 8, City Hall, Room 408, 5:30 p.m.**

⇒ A complaint against the Library Commission will be heard before the Ethics Commission on Monday, November 8, to determine whether a violation of the right to make public comment was a sufficiently egregious abridgment of open government to warrant action by the Ethics Commission. This complaint stems from a referral by the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force which found not only "willful failure" to comply with the Sunshine Ordinance, but failure to respect the order of determination of the Task Force.

⇒ The Ethics Commission's staff investigation examined the facts and issued its report which stated that Library Commission President Jewell Gomez' conduct "*falls below the standard of decency, good faith and right action impliedly required of all public officials.*" If we are to have civil public discourse, the "standard of decency" has to be taken seriously.

⇒ The Library Commission has a long history of preventing public comment and a wide panoply of violations of openness, public records violations, and a contempt for proper process.

⇒ The Library Commission up until now has been able to avoid any accountability for its actions by a counter-attack of slander and denigration of the citizens who might bring such complaints. The fact that this history of counter-attacks has been largely successful is in itself an outrage and a scandal. Almost every schoolchild knows that a respect for democracy must necessarily involve a respect for the dissenting view and the minority opinion. The conventional wisdom and the popular view does not need to be defended.

23



⇒ The anti-democratic innuendo that the Library Commission and its kindred elements seek to promulgate is that the complainant deserves it. If that is true then no one is safe. It is an artificial game that the monied interests that thrive on exclusivity do to anyone and everyone. This is the one instance where enforcement has gotten this far because the complainant and the victim of this abuse was a distinguished chair of the Library Citizen's Advisory Committee and active in the landmarking controversy over North Beach Branch, so the motivation and the flagrancy of the violation were obvious.

⇒ There is always a justification for a denial of rights, hence, the common saying, a denial of rights for one, is a denial of rights for all. If we can't defend decency in this instance, they will do it to you next.

James Chaffee

Lennar has no intention of doing anything at Hunters Point Naval Shipyard.

Francisco Da Costa

to:

Francisco Da Costa

11/06/2010 06:47 AM

Show Details

**Lennar has NO intention of doing anything  
at the Shipyard:**

<http://www.indybay.org/newsitems/2010/11/06/18663298.php>

Francisco Da Costa

24

Michele Garside  
590 Wisconsin Street  
San Francisco, CA 94107

October 25, 2010

Re: Keep Golden Gate Park artificial turf free and with "dark skies"

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,


San Francisco has less public park space per resident than almost any other major city. We need to preserve our grassy fields and lands. Please do not accept the plans to cover grass with artificial turf and install lights in practically the only "dark sky" area in the City. The proposed soccer field complex does not need to be placed near Ocean Beach in Golden Gate Park.

While it may be true that the private high schools and soccer teams in SF need extra places to play, approving such an aberrant alteration to Golden Gate Park is not the way to address the need. The City has its whole south eastern section in growth mode. Place the soccer complex on the sunny eastern section of the City where there is plenty of room to create a wonderful sports and recreation area. Use artificial turf there if it is so much better for the game, but don't ever cover an inch of our beautiful park with artificial turf and don't make a sports stadium with flood lights where the quiet of nature is paramount.

Please be sensitive to how limited open space is in our fair City. Please keep our park as it was designed. Do not negate this precious resource. Please make sure Golden Gate Park is artificial turf free and the skies over the Park remain as dark as possible.

Thank you for your leadership.

Sincerely,



Michele Garside

BY \_\_\_\_\_ Ak

RECEIVED  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SAN FRANCISCO  
2010 NOV -5 PM 3:11

25