

10/498

Petitions and Communications received from November 16, 2010, through November 29, 2010, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on December 7, 2010.

From Office of the Mayor, submitting notice that Mayor Newsom will be out of state from November 20, 2010, until November 27, 2010. Supervisor Carmen Chu and Supervisor Sean Elsbernd will serve as Acting-Mayor. Copy: Each Supervisor, City Attorney (1)

From Health Commission, submitting resolution regarding transfer of its outpatient dialysis services to DaVita will have a detrimental impact on the health of the community. Copy: Each Supervisor (2)

From Health Commission, submitting resolution approving the relocation of Laguna Honda Hospital and Rehabilitation Center to the new site at 375 Laguna Honda Boulevard. (3)

From Department of Public Health, submitting the quarterly report for Laguna Honda Rehabilitation Center's compliance with the reversal of the admission policy priorities that took place February 22, 2005. Copy: Each Supervisor (4)

From Aaron Goodman, regarding the Parkmerced project. 2 letters (5)

From Kimo Crossman, commenting that it's no longer legal to "clean up an inbox for space." (6)

From Aaron Goodman, regarding Crown Heights subsidized apartments. (7)

From Mackenzie & Albritton, regarding the appeal of 10 Bernal Heights Boulevard. File No. 101045, Copy: Each Supervisor (8)

From T-Mobile, submitting notification of two cellular antennas to be installed at 77 Beale Street. (9)

From Phyllis & Tom Hunt, regarding the Master Plan for hospitals in San Francisco. (10)

From The Animal Company, submitting support for the recology plan to transport San Francisco's landfill by rail to the Ostrom Road facility in Yuba County. File No. 101225, Copy: Budget and Finance Committee Members and Clerk (11)

From Office of the Controller, submitting the quarterly review of the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector's Schedule of Cash, Investments, and Accrued Interest Receivable as of September 30, 2009, December 31, 2009, and March 31, 2010. (12)

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, 4letters (13)

From San Francisco Convention and Visitors Bureau, regarding the Board of Directors decision to change the name of this organization to San Francisco Travel Association, effective January 11, 2011. (14)

From concerned citizens, submitting support for the Safe Drug Disposal Ordinance. File No. 100455, Copy: Each Supervisor, Approximately 70 letters (15)

From Department of Elections, submitting certification that the petition for the San Francisco Unified School District Student Assignment System Initiative Petition did have sufficient valid signatures to qualify for the November 8, 2011 Election. Copy: Each Supervisor (16)

From concerned citizens, urging the Board of Supervisors to take action to overturn the sidewalk sitting ban. 2 letters (17)

From State Department of Finance, regarding the Redevelopment Agency's Supplemental Educational Revenue Augmentation Funds for FY2010-2011. Copy: Each Supervisor (18)

From Department of Public Health, submitting the quarterly HIV/AIDS Surveillance Report. (19)

From Espanola Jackson, regarding the San Francisco local hiring policy for construction. File No. 101311, Copy: Budget and Finance Committee (20)

From Municipal Transportation Agency, responding to inquiry regarding the frequency and number of times the MTA has "short-turned" their LRV lines over the last two years. (Reference No. 20100928-001) (21)

From San Francisco Unified School District, submitting the Williams Annual Report. Copy: Each Supervisor (22)

From concerned citizens, submitting support for closing the recycling center next to Kezar Stadium. File No. 101491, 19 letters (23)

From concerned citizens, submitting support for the appointment of Rodney Fong to the Planning Commission. File No. 101237, Copy: Each Supervisor, 8 letters (24)

From James Chaffee, regarding the misuse of the democratic process. Copy: Each Supervisor (25)

From Jerry Cauthen, regarding the Municipal Transportation Agency and the proposed Central Subway. (26)

From Office of the Controller, submitting its audit report on the Public Utilities Commission leases with Hanson Aggregates Mid-Pacific, Inc. (27)

From Office of the Controller, submitting its audit report on whether Laguna Honda Hospital and Rehabilitation Center has administered the Laguna Honda Hospital Gift Fund in accordance with the Administrative Code. (28)

Number not used. (29)

From State Fish and Game Commission, regarding changes that were made to the south coast marine protected areas. Copy: each Supervisor (30)

From Police Commission, submitting resolution appointing Thomas Mazzucco as President and Joe Marshall as Vice President of the San Francisco Police Commission. Copy: Each Supervisor (31)

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to an "out of state" contractor/operators entering into an agreement/lease with Stow Lake Boathouse, LLC, for the operation of the Stow Lake Boathouse Concession Management of the Harding Park Golf Course. File No. 101416, 2 letters (32)

From Patrick, regarding Laguna Honda Hospital patient gift fund scandal. (33)

From Vicki Leidner, regarding proposed process by the Board of Supervisors to nominate an Interim Mayor. File Nos. 101456, 101457 (34)

From Terrie Frye, submitting support for the current Board of Supervisor's selection of an Interim Mayor. (35)

From Paul Barnett, submitting opposition to expanding parking meter hours to Sunday. (36)

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 (37)

From State Fish and Game Commission, submitting notice of proposed regulatory action relating to Stewarts Point State Marine Reserve and Conservation Area. (38)

From Office of the Budget and Legislative Analyst, submitting a report on the Performance Audit of San Francisco's Early Care and Education Programs. (39)

Office of the Mayor
City & County of San Francisco



C-11-12
BOS-11
City Attorney
GAB
Gavin Newsom
Leg Deputy

November 17, 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 19 PM 4:00
BY _____ *PC*

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 9:00 AM on Saturday, November 20, 2010, until 11:59AM Tuesday, November 23, 2010.

I hereby designate Supervisor Sean Elsbernd as Acting-Mayor from 12:00PM on Tuesday, November 23, 2010, until 8:35PM Saturday, November 27, 2010. In the event I am delayed, I designate Supervisor Elsbernd 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

①

BDS-11
C-Page

James M. Illig
President

Edward A. Chow, M.D.
Vice President

Sonia E. Melara, MSW
Commissioner

Margine A. Sako
Commissioner

David J. Sanchez, Jr., Ph.D.
Commissioner


Steven Tierney, Ed.D.
Commissioner

Catherine M. Waters, R.N., Ph.D.
Commissioner

HEALTH COMMISSION

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Gavin C. Newsom, Mayor**

Department of Public Health



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

Mark Morewitz, MSW
Executive Secretary

TEL (415) 554-2666
FAX (415) 554-2665

Web Site: <http://www.sfdph.org>

November 5, 2010

The Honorable David Chiu, President
Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear President Chiu,

The Health Commission held Proposition Q hearings to consider the transfer of outpatient dialysis services from CPMC to DaVita on 8/17/10, 9/7/10, 9/21/10, and 11/2/10. Although CPMC representatives attended each of these meetings, DaVita repeatedly refused to come before the Health Commission to discuss the impending transfer of outpatient dialysis services. After lengthy consideration of the situation, the Health Commission determined that the transfer will have a detrimental impact to the San Francisco community. Attached is the Health Commission Resolution 11-10: "DETERMINING THAT THE TRANSFER OF THE DIALYSIS UNIT AT CALIFORNIA MEDICAL CENTER WILL HAVE A DETRIMENTAL IMPACT ON THE HEALTH CARE SERVICE OF THE COMMUNITY."

If you have any further questions regarding this issue, please feel free to contact me at 554-2666.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "James M. Illig".

James M. Illig
President
San Francisco Health Commission

2

Attachments (1)

cc: Supervisor Michela Alioto-Pier
Supervisor David Campos
Supervisor Carmen Chu
Supervisor Bevan Duffy
Supervisor Eric Mar
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Supervisor David Avalos
Supervisor Sophie Maxwell
Supervisor Chris Daly
Supervisor Sean Elsbernd
Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi

HEALTH COMMISSION
City and County of San Francisco
Resolution No. 11-10

**DETERMINING THAT THE TRANSFER OF THE DIALYSIS UNIT AT CALIFORNIA MEDICAL CENTER WILL
HAVE A DETRIMENTAL IMPACT ON THE HEALTH CARE SERVICE OF THE COMMUNITY**

WHEREAS, On August 2, 2010 California Pacific Medical Center notified the Health Commission that due to new CMS regulations, changes in reimbursement and the need to invest in replacing and upgrading facilities and equipment, it intends to transfer ownership and management of its outpatient dialysis services on its Pacific and Davies campuses to DaVita, a private company; and

WHEREAS, CPMC currently offers outpatient dialysis services to a total of 245 hemodialysis and 30 peritoneal patients at its Pacific and Davies campuses; and

WHEREAS, it is undetermined whether DaVita will sign a ten-year lease to operate outpatient dialysis services in the same locations; and


WHEREAS, it is undetermined whether DaVita will employ the same physicians who worked in the CPMC outpatient dialysis services; and

WHEREAS, DaVita has offered employment to the other staff who worked in the CPMC outpatient dialysis clinics in an effort to provide continuity to the dialysis patients; and


WHEREAS, there are no outpatient dialysis services offered by any other non-profit hospital in San Francisco; and

BE IT RESOLVED, that the transfer by CPMC of its outpatient dialysis services to DaVita will have a detrimental impact on the health of the community.

I hereby certify that the San Francisco Health Commission at its meeting of November 2, 2010 adopted the foregoing resolution.



Mark Morewitz
Executive Secretary to the Health Commission



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Health Commission Resolution 17-10 Regarding the Relocation of Services of Laguna Honda Hospital and Rehabilitation Center

From: Mark Morewitz/DPH/SFGOV
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Cc: Angela Calvillo/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV
Date: 11/08/2010 03:58 PM
Subject: Health Commission Resolution 17-10 Regarding the Relocation of Services of Laguna Honda Hospital and Rehabilitation Center

Please see the attached Health Commission resolution 17-10 "Resolution Approving Relocation of Laguna Honda Hospital and Rehabilitation Center Services to the New Buildings at the Same Address, 375 Laguna Honda Boulevard, San Francisco, Ca 94116."

Mark Morewitz, MSW
Health Commission Executive Secretary
101 Grove Street, Room 309
San Francisco, Ca 94102
Office(415) 554-2666
Fax (415) 554-2665



Resolution 17-10 for Relocation of LHH Services 11.02.10.doc

U. LAXU members
BOS-11, CPages

City and County of San Francisco
Department of Public Health



Gavin Newsom
Mayor

Laguna Honda Hospital and Rehabilitation Center
Mivic Hirose, RN, CNS, Executive Administrator

October 29, 2010

Honorable Carmen Chu
Member, Board of Supervisors

Honorable Eric Mar
Member, Board of Supervisors

Honorable Sophie Maxwell
Member, Board of Supervisors

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

Re: Resolution #050396

Dear Supervisors Chu, Mar, and Maxwell:

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

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

2003: 54%	2007: 58%
2004: 73%	2008: 57%
2005: 63%	2009: 54%
2006: 59%	January - September 2010: 52%

The age distribution shows an increased trend of residents over 50 years of age. In 2004, 83% of the residents were over 50 years of age, compared to 89% of the residents in this category from January to September 2010.

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

Sincerely,

Mivic Hirose
Executive Administrator

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 NOV - 1 PM 1:19
BY _____
 MC

4



Gavin Newsom
Mayor

Attachments:

- A. Sources of New SNF Admissions to Laguna Honda
 - A-1 Three Quarters of 2010
 - A-2 2009
 - A-3 2008
 - A-4 2007
 - A-5 2006
- B. Laguna Honda Distribution of Residents by Race
 - B-1 9/30/10 and 9/30/09 Snapshot
 - B-2 9/30/08 and 9/30/07 Snapshot
- C. Laguna Honda Gender Distribution
Deciles of Age by percent from 2001 to September 30, 2010
- D. Laguna Honda Age Distribution
By Calendar Year from 2001 to September 30, 2010

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

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

Source of Admission	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	%										
Board and Care	1	3	2				1	2					9	2%										
Cal Pac Acute	2	1				2	1	2	1				9	2%										
Cal Pac SNF					2								2	0%										
Chinese Hospital Acute	1						1						2	0%										
Chinese Hospital SNF													0	0%										
Home	3	2	3	3	1	4	4	4	3				27	5%										
Home Health													0	0%										
Kaiser Acute					1			1					2	0%										
Kaiser SNF													0	0%										
Mt. Zion Acute	2		1	2				2	1				8	2%										
Other Misc	6	2			1	1		1					10	2%										
Other SNF	1		2	1			1						7	1%										
Seton Acute													0	0%										
SFGH Acute	23	43%	27	47%	24	35%	24	35%	29	50%	28	41%	35	64%	0%	249	47%							
SFGH SNF	4	8%	2	4%	2	3%	4	7%	2	4%	1	2%	5	7%	0%	25	5%							
St. Francis Acute	1		3	2	1		3	3	2				16	3%										
St. Francis SNF													0	0%										
St. Luke's Acute			2	1	2		2	2					9	2%										
St. Luke's SNF			1	2	1								4	1%										
St. Mary's Acute	3		1	9	4	3	2	5	2				32	6%										
St. Mary's SNF													0	0%										
Seton Acute													0	0%										
Seton SNF													0	0%										
UC Med Acute	7		12	22	16	8	8	14	11				114	22%										
UC Med SNF													0	0%										
VA Hospital Acute													0	0%										
VA Hospital SNF													0	0%										
TOTAL	53	51%	57	51%	69	38%	59	49%	49	51%	56	64%	58	59%	69	48%	55	64%	0	0%	0	0%	525	100%

ATTACHMENT A-1

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

Source of Admission	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	%	
Board and Care															
Cal Pac Acute	3	1		2		1	1	2		1		1	12	3%	
Cal Pac SNF		1		1		3			1				6	1%	
Chinese Hospital Acute													0	0%	
Chinese Hospital SNF													0	0%	
Home	2	2	1	3	2	1	3	3	2	4	4	4	31	7%	
Home Health													0	0%	
Kaiser Acute						1	1						2	0%	
Kaiser SNF													0	0%	
Mt. Zion Acute				1	1	1	1	1	2				6	1%	
Other Misc									1	1	7	4	13	3%	
Other SNF	1			1	2		3	1		2		2	11	2%	
Seton Acute							1						2	0%	
SFGH Acute	26	53%	25	12	9	14	15	17	21	16	28	26	237	50%	
SFGH SNF		0%	1	2	3	5		0%	0%	1	3%	2	18	4%	
St. Francis Acute	1			4	1	1	1	1		2			11	2%	
St. Francis SNF											1		1	0%	
St. Luke's Acute	1			1	1	1	1	1	2	1		2	10	2%	
St. Luke's SNF					1								1	0%	
St. Mary's Acute	3	5	5	1					2	3	1	3	23	5%	
St. Mary's SNF													0	0%	
Seton Acute													0	0%	
Seton SNF													0	0%	
UC Med Acute	15	7	11	3	1	4	4	3	7	7	13	10	85	18%	
UC Med SNF													0	0%	
VA Hospital Acute													0	0%	
VA Hospital SNF													0	0%	
TOTAL	49	53%	44	32	20	32	32	47%	30	38	45%	55	472	100%	

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

Source of Admission	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	%														
Board and Care	1		1		1	1					1		5	2%														
Cal Pac Acute	1		3				1	1	1	1	1	1	10	4%														
Cal Pac SNF												1	1	0%														
Chinese Hospital Acute	1		1				1						3	1%														
Chinese Hospital SNF												1	1	0%														
Home	1	3	1	1	1	2	3	3	1	1	2	1	20	8%														
Home Health													0	0%														
Kaiser Acute				1									1	0%														
Kaiser SNF													0	0%														
Mt. Zion Acute					2		1				1		4	2%														
Other Misc									2	2	1	1	6	3%														
Other SNF													0	0%														
Seton Acute													0	0%														
SFGH Acute	7	58%	12	60%	8	53%	18	60%	18	64%	10	45%	8	53%	13	53%	13	53%	7	47%	10	47%	10	47%	134	57%		
SFGH SNF		0%		0%		0%		0%		0%				0%	0%		0%									0	0%	
St. Francis Acute	2		1	3	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	14	6%														
St. Francis SNF													0	0%														
St. Luke's Acute	1		1	1				1					4	2%														
St. Luke's SNF									1				1	0%														
St. Mary's Acute	1			1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	3%														
St. Mary's SNF													0	0%														
Seton Acute													0	0%														
Seton SNF													0	0%														
UC Med Acute	1		1	4	4	4	6	1	2	2	1	3	25	11%														
UC Med SNF													0	0%														
VA Hospital Acute												1	1	0%														
VA Hospital SNF													0	0%														
TOTAL	12	56%	20	60%	15	53%	30	60%	28	64%	22	45%	15	57%	19	53%	19	53%	15	68%	15	47%	18	47%	18	47%	236	100%

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

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

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

*Excluding internal transfers


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

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


ATTACHMENT A-5

*Excluding internal transfers


Laguna Honda Hospital Distribution of Residents by Race as of 9/30/2010
(n = 746)




Laguna Honda Hospital Distribution of Residents by Race as of 9/30/2009
(n = 769)




Laguna Honda Hospital Distribution of Residents by Race as of 9/30/2008
(n = 845)



Laguna Honda Hospital Distribution of Residents by Race as of 9/30/2007
(n = 1016)




**Laguna Honda Hospital
Gender Distribution of Residents
2001 - First 9 Months of 2010**



ATTACHMENT C

Laguna Honda Hospital Age Distribution of Residents 2001 - First 9 Months of 2010



ATTACHMENT D

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2010 NOV 18 PM 1:08

Tuesday Nov. 18th, 2010

Re: Item #21 Parkmerced - 2008.0021EMTZW BY AK

SF Planning Commissioners, SF Historic Preservation Commission, SF Board of Supervisors;

I would like to submit the following comments on the meeting discussion for 5:30pm on Parkmerced, in case of any inability to comment on the multiple issues. I will briefly summarize the issues within the context of your meeting thursday.

URBAN DESIGN

- The current discussion lacks any sincere approach to a preservation based alternative. I would like you to look closely at the option I have submitted in regards to the urban design options eliminated. The urban design segment of the SF General Plan states clearly in multiple sections the need to preserve and protect unique areas and urban planned communities such as Parkmerced. The developer treats Parkmerced like a chalkboard and wipes it clean practically. This is not "urban-design" and provides little creative problem solving in the cumulative approach that can be taken between sites such as Stonestown, SFSU-CSU and Parkmerced together to lessen the impact on one district and neighborhood.
- Figure 01.01.A / Land-Use Plan (page 7) shows a singular option for a mixed use district at the center of Parkmerced. There has not been any indication of the ADDITIONAL commercial areas planned along Holloway and Buckingham by the SFSU-CSU Masterplan and there joint cumulative impacts on the EXISTING commercial core area bordered at Cambon Drive/19th and Feliz Ave. This diagram and the alternatives explored did not include any analysis of locating the commercial core along the eastern edge of Parkmerced, especially at Cambon Drive, and the three larger parcels at the southeast corner of the site. The alternative I submitted directly provides a study of this area as the central commercial core, utilizing layering of transit, parking and new development above 19th ave. along the main corridor and by reworking the south-eastern most towers of the site near the Brotherhood way intersection.
- Figure 01.01.A/ Land-Use Plan (page 7) also does not indicate any alternatives such as direct routing along 19th Ave. as the shorter and most efficient route directly to connect regional transit. The images provided in my alternative submitted prior indicate the feasibility of utilizing the parking structures and vertical transitions in height to provide additional Muni train storage, and separation grade wise of transit, and pedestrian traffic in the area while connecting neighborhoods across 19th and juniper serra blvd. into a new plaza and urban area above ground through routing traffic on both major thoroughfares underground. By placing the station stops inbetween SFSU-CSU and Stonestown and the second stop at Cambon, you lessen the station stops and provide more direct routing in the process. This can be done to align the tracks to the western side of 19th avenue, and prohibit the un-needed intrusion of light-rail into the residential community. As noted prior most residents walk, and the majority of car use is SFSU-CSU student based.

of urban street zones. This will also impact the safety and security of the site with the increased foot-traffic throughout the site. Once again the option I provide details a southern/easterly location of such amenities so that they are focused on transit/traffic routes existing, and provide equal dispersion of such amenities between districts and neighborhoods, especially due to the joint cumulative impacts of SFSU-CSU and the future Stonestown areas.

- Figure 02.32.A-Off-Site Improvements Plan (page 81) indicates clearly along especially the eastern edge if widened a bit more at the south-eastern towers the potential redevelopment area I consider essential in the future planning of Parkmerced. The air-rights alone can provide a deterrent from wholesale demolition of Parkmerced's garden units. The indication is that this area should be more clearly studied in the option G-a provided by me, and per the diagrams and sections provided on page 82, 84, 88, and 223 (Variant) proposal which also clearly indicates that this area is an exceptional area as indicate in my sketches I provide along the pinch-point of traffic on 19th and Junipero Serra Blvd. The alternate shows only a shifted train line, yet provides little indication of playing with the borders of the site, to improve transit/traffic, parking and lessen impact on the actual Parkmerced area. This requires your attention as Planners to ensure that the most sustainable alternative transit/housing/development wise is not missed in the ignoring of the least visibly developed portion of the SOM plan, but indicative of the most desirable areas for transit hub location due to the massive intersection at the brotherhood cloverleaf.
- 03.02 – building controls – lot coverage + useable open-space (page 104) there is as noted in my memo's little accuracy in the definition and calculations used by the developer in the analysis of open-space loss to the residents of Parkmerced. The sell-off of land, the in-adequate definitions of private and public areas, and shared community space show a total intentional ignoring of the existing tenant or resident experience in the garden units. I highly suggest a study of the areas by independent means be made to ascertain the measurements of these areas per unit type of the garden units. There is distinct loss of open-space, in the proposal, and little analysis on what is really lost per unit overall or individually. Private space, hardscape, softscape, and planters, walkways, courtyards, internal, and external should be calculated properly and independently of the developers interests, to ensure proper and adequate "equitable" understanding of the exchanges being proposed. Pages 146, 147 and 148 give only round-about numbers on the open-space dedicated after demolition, and little understanding of what is lost currently.
- The documents provided provide also little information on the current "lot-coverage" as shown in Figure 03.02.A / Lot Coverage Plan (page 105) . There should be accurate independent info. on the current lot coverages per unit/individual and analysis on the types and areas of fine-grained open-space transitions on site.
- There is little (zero) discussion of the landscape site and its importance in the documents. The HRE is relegated to a side document and provides little impetus in the existing documents on what is important in terms of preservation, or any analysis on the condition or need to look carefully at what is proposed for demolition. This is ignoring CEQA and adequate review of alternatives and comprehensive review of the impacts, and community concerns raised.

documents on open space both clearly mis-marked the internal areas, and hardscape areas as not open-space related. This is a critical issue in regards to the measure or accuracy of what residents are LOSING in the process of redevelopment.

- The developer agreement states that residents will receive a new washer/dryer and dishwasher in every unit. How is this sustainable, and what equates this to the loss of open-space in the entire development, or to the individual. Who has the right to state that there is "too-much-open-space" and therefore this is a fair equivalent. This is not accountability, it is bait-and-switch, or possibly another more accurate term FRAUD...
- MV.01 performance (page68) improperly denotes a "participatory design process". The majority of the meetings held were run by Stellar Management. The majority of the meetings were presentation based, with limited Q+A sessions, and notes and lists purged of comments and negative rhetoric by the developer.
- Definition of terms (page 72) – incorrectly defines both "embodied energy" and "initial embodied energy" in that they both are defined ignoring preservation issues in terms of the costs of demolishing older buildings environmentally which is noted by many preservation organizations and sustainability groups as being "unsound" and is an inaccurate descriptor utilized to eliminate in this EIR the inclusion of data that supports the issue of the impact of demolition on the environment.
- Bioswales, Water, Energy Solar, Insulation, and many other items discussd can all be implemented WITHOUT demolition of the garden units. The lack of true sustainability improvements was notable in the renovations to date which ignored many sustainable principles in implementation. Many roofs were done without solar voltaics, or water retention by Stellar management. Most of the renovation work was quick applied cosmetic and extremely wastefull. The bioswales at Lake Merced's northern lot, provide a good indication that they are labor intensive, and lack adequate post installation maintenance. Water improvements, solar, and preservation based retrofitting of units environmentally should be seriously considered over demolition. Tax-based credit incentives through federal sources, and are available and should be utilized to ensure the least invasive project and most sustainable alternative.

I will here summarize for this section, I refer you back to my issues submitted and the plans submitted for this hearing to ensure you look adequately at the alternatives submitted in the documents I sent. Per the statements made under the developer agreement, the proposal is **NOT** in compliance with CEQA, and the FEIR does **NOT** thoroughly analyze the impacts on the historic district boundaries and outline of Parkmerced. Feasible mitigation measures have **NOT** been adequately reviewed or provided for analysis. I strongly reject the documents of SOM and Stellar Management as flawed and improperly submitted as inadequate analysis of the impacts and loss of historic resources.

Sincerely

Aaron Goodman



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Parkmerced Hearing Nov. 18th - Submitted Comments (A.Goodman)

From: Aaron Goodman <amgodman@yahoo.com>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Cc: linda.avery@sfgov.org
Date: 11/18/2010 02:37 AM
Subject: Parkmerced Hearing Nov. 18th - Submitted Comments (A.Goodman)

SF Historic Preservation Commission, SF Planning Commission, SF Board of Supervisors;

Please find the attached comments on Urban Planning, Open-Space and Sustainability on the Parkmerced project. (As I did not receive a notice or email on whether we will be allowed to speak on multiple issues at this hearing and given more than one public speaking period, I am submitting some comments on the documents) These are not all inclusive as I have not had the opportunity to review adequately all the documents since the comments and responses items were issued.

Sincerely

Aaron Goodman
amgodman@yahoo.com



111710_sfplan.pdf



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:

Subject: GalAware Will Fight Cities' Email Destruction - Voice of OC | Orange County's Nonprofit
Investigative News Agency: Who Says You Can't Fight City Hall: californians aware, terry
francke, california public records act, email, destruction of e

From: Kimo Crossman <kimo@webnetic.net>
To: Bruce Brugman <bruce@sfbg.com>, Steve Jones <steve@sfbg.com>, tredmond@sfbg.com,
Sarah Phelan <sarah@sfbg.com>, Rebecca Bowe <rebeccab@sfbg.com>, Angela Calvillo
<Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org>, Matt Dorsey <Matt.Dorsey@sfgov.org>, Barry Fraser
<Barry.Fraser@sfgov.org>, Chris Vein <chris.vein@sfgov.org>, Richard Knee
<rak0408@earthlink.net>, "Bruce Wolfe, MSW" <sotf@brucewolfe.net>, SOTF <sotf@sfgov.org>,
Ethics Commission <ethics.commission@sfgov.org>, Board of Supervisors
<Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, Eric Brooks <brookse32@aim.com>, Joshua Arce
<josh@brightlinedefense.org>, Oliver Luby <oliverlear@yahoo.com>, Paul Zarefsky
<Paul.Zarefsky@sfgov.org>, "buck.delventhal" <buck.delventhal@sfgov.org>, rwhartzjr
<rwhartzjr@sbcglobal.net>, Tenants 769NorthPoint <tenants769np@yahoo.com>, James Chaffee
<chaffeej@pacbell.net>, Peter Warfield <libraryusers2004@yahoo.com>
Date: 11/17/2010 08:39 AM
Subject: CalAware Will Fight Cities' Email Destruction - Voice of OC | Orange County's Nonprofit
Investigative News Agency: Who Says You Can't Fight City Hall: californians aware, terry francke,
california public records act, email, destruction of e
Sent by: kimocrossman@gmail.com

BOS and Ethics Clerks please make this part of the Policy Body Communications File

It's no longer legal to "Clean up an inbox for space"

http://voiceofoc.org/countywide/who_says_you_can_t_fight_city_hall/article_d5f504dc-f1b2-11df-8a5e-001cc4c002e0.html

6



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Stellar Management (East Coast Operations) - west coast has been "flipped"

From: Aaron Goodman <amgodman@yahoo.com>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 11/17/2010 12:06 AM
Subject: Stellar Management (East Coast Operations) - west coast has been "flipped"

Stellar Management (not the current owner of Parkmerced, but the management "team" ongoing).....

--- On Tue, 11/16/10, Sue Susman <sue@janak.org> wrote:

From: Sue Susman <sue@janak.org>
Subject: Gluck raises rents at Tivoli Towers
To: "orgs" <activists@save-ml.org>
Date: Tuesday, November 16, 2010, 8:59 PM

Apologies for any e-mail duplications.

NY Daily News, November 16, 2010, page 37

Rent Hikes Stump Tenants at B'klyn Tower

by Jake Pearson
Daily News Writer

CONFUSED RESIDENTS at a Crown Heights subsidized apartment tower are scrambling to figure out their rents after a new landlord bought the 320-unit building this month.

Laurence Gluck's Stellar Management purchased the gritty 33-story Tivoli Towers after agreeing to spend \$15 million extra in renovations — in exchange for raising rent to market rates.

To ease the rent increase and keep it affordable, the city is working with tenants to see if they qualify for Section 8 vouchers that will cover the increases. But the city plan has many residents scratching their heads.

"Honestly, I don't know what's going to happen," said lifelong resident Terri Blackmore, 40, who will now fork over \$444 extra monthly rent for a two-bedroom apartment on the 11th floor, even with

a \$200 voucher.

"I am discouraged but what can I do? If I leave and look for another place, it's going to be the same thing."

Blackmore used to pay \$656 monthly rent at Tivoli Towers, a Mitchell-Llama apartment building on Crown St. But under the new management, Blackmore's rent shot up to \$1,300 and the \$200 voucher isn't enough help for the social worker, who earns \$50,000 a year and has two kids in college.

"My parents are here too [and] they're on a fixed income," Blackmore said. "What are they supposed to do?"

No tenant who qualifies for the voucher will see their rent cost more than one-third of their income, said a spokesperson for the city Department of Housing Development and Preservation.

"I think most tenants are optimistic but there's some concern because it's all so new," said tenant leader Alice Mitchell, noting repairs to the building's notoriously broken elevators have already begun.

Building repairs have not been made since the 1970s and advocates said they would wait to see if the new landlord followed through on his promise to clean up Tivoli Towers — and help residents meet their new rents.

A Stellar Management spokesman said 70% of the tenants had been "pre-approved for the vouchers and we're working with the remaining 30% to get enrolled. ... The landlord has also . . . set up an assistance program" to help tenants make up the difference.

Assemblyman Hakim Jeffries (D-Crown Heights) said he was cautiously optimistic.

"Larry Gluck does not inspire a great deal of confidence," said Jeffries. "But the city has ensured us that the quality of life for the Tivoli Towers residents will dramatically improve and it's our job to make sure that we hold the city to that."

file 101045
BOS-11
page



Letter from Paul Albritton Regarding Today's Agenda - Clearwire Facility
Reception Desk to: Board.of.Supervisors
Cc: "Paul Albritton"
Please respond to reception
11/16/2010 01:08 PM

Reception Desk Letter from Paul Albritton Regarding Today's Agenda - Clearwire Facility

1 attachment



MA Letter to BOS Clearwire.pdf

Hello. Attached please find a letter from attorney Paul Albritton to the Board of Supervisors regarding the appeal of the 10 Bernal Heights Boulevard Clearwire facility to be heard at today's Board meeting.

Please contact the reception desk here at Mackenzie & Albritton regarding transmit of this letter.

Reception Desk
for Paul Albritton
Mackenzie & Albritton LLP
San Francisco
(415) 288-4000
reception@mallp.com

8

MACKENZIE & ALBRITTON LLP

423 WASHINGTON STREET, SIXTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111

TELEPHONE 415/288-4000
FACSIMILE 415/288-4010

November 16, 2010

VIA E-MAIL AND HAND DELIVERY

President of the Board David Chiu
Supervisors Eric Mar, Michela Alioto-Pier,
Carmen Chu, Ross Mirkarimi, Chris Daly,
Sean Elsbernd, Bevan Dufty, David Campos,
Sophie Maxwell and John Avalos
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

*Re: Planning Case No. 2010.0306C, Appeal of Conditional Use Permit and
CEQA Exemption for 10 Bernal Heights Boulevard Clearwire Facility
Hearing Date: November 16, 2010*

Dear Supervisors:

We write to you on behalf of our client Clear Wireless LLC ("Clearwire"), to urge you to re-affirm the well reasoned and unanimous decision of the Planning Commission to grant Clearwire a conditional use permit ("CUP") and issue a categorical exemption under CEQA to replace 5 antennas on an existing 50-foot telecommunications tower at 10 Bernal Heights Boulevard in Bernal Heights Park (the "Project"). While we were hopeful that Clearwire could reach an amicable settlement of this appeal through the efforts of Supervisor Campos and through Clearwire's influence on tower owner American Tower Corporation (who immediately began to remedy neighbor concerns), as of the date of this letter, no such settlement has been reached, and we are compelled to state our client's legal position for the record.

The existing tower supports 71 approved antennas, and Clearwire simply proposes to replace 5 panel antennas approved in the existing use permit with 5 smaller dish antennas. The net effect will be to *reduce the total surface area of the antennas*, and the Project will have no significant impacts of any kind. Indeed, the Project will be essentially unnoticeable, as confirmed in the attached photo-simulations (Exhibit A). We therefore urge you to reject both the appeal of the permit by Robin Mackey (the "CUP Appeal") and the appeal of the CEQA determination by Erick Arguello (the "CEQA Appeal").

The CUP Appeal is entirely without merit. The antenna tower at 10 Bernal Heights Boulevard was originally permitted for microwave horns in 1960. An updated conditional use permit in October 2009 allows 71 antennas on the existing 50-foot tower. Because it is collocated on public property, the Clearwire facility was approved as a Preference 1 location under the San Francisco Wireless Telecommunications Services Siting Guidelines (“WTS Guidelines”). As confirmed by the Department of Public Health (“DPH”) the Clearwire antennas will not create any risk to public health, and, in fact, will *reduce* the potential exposure to radio frequency emissions from the existing facility. With reduced emissions and visual impact from that permitted in 2009, the Clearwire modifications will only make the site more compatible with the neighborhood than when re-permitted in 2009. As both Planning Department staff and the Planning Commission correctly found, the Project meets all criteria for approval.

The CEQA Appeal is similarly without merit. The existing 71-antenna facility was approved with a Categorical Exemption under CEQA in October 2009. As noted, the aesthetic and EMF impacts from the Clearwire antennas will reduce the antenna profile and RF emissions from the site. There is simply no potential for increased impacts from the Clearwire antennas and this modification clearly falls within several categorical exemptions under CEQA, including the Class 1, 3, and 11 exemptions that City Planning Dept. staff determined to apply.

There is no factual or legal basis for appellant’s argument that the microwaves pose an additional risk due to earthquakes. The City authorized microwave antennas on this tower in 1960, and this has never posed a problem in the intervening 50 years. In addition, Clearwire’s antennas will automatically shut off in the event they are mis-directed for any reason. Finally, appellant’s concern about the alleged health risk of microwaves is preempted by the federal Telecommunications Act (the “Act”).¹

This brings us to a broader point: a denial of the CUP – or further delay in its finality – based on the CUP Appeal or the CEQA Appeal will violate federal law. First, as set forth above, there is simply no evidence for denial, let alone the “substantial evidence” required under the Act.² Second, any denial, where the Clearwire antennas will be less intrusive than the facilities permitted for other carriers less than one year ago, clearly constitutes discrimination between functionally equivalent wireless providers in violation of federal law.³

¹ See 47 U.S.C. § 332(c)(7)(B)(iv); *AT&T Wireless Servs. of Cal., LLC v. City of Carlsbad* (S.D. Cal. 2003) 308 F. Supp. 2d 1148, 1159 (alleged impact on property values based on fear of radio waves does not constitute substantial evidence).

² See 47 USC § 332(c)(7)(B)(iii).

³ See 47 USC 332(c)(7)(B)(i)(I).

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
November 16, 2010

Page 3

Finally, as alluded to above, once a facility has been shown to comply with federal emission standards, a local jurisdiction cannot regulate the placement of wireless facilities based upon the environmental effects of radio frequency emissions.⁴ Having demonstrated compliance through submission of a report by Hammett & Edison Consulting Engineers, whose conclusions were confirmed by DPH, the effects of emissions from the site, whether alleged to be cumulative or alone, provide no basis for either denial of the CUP or additional CEQA review, with the attendant delay.⁵

For all of the above reasons, we ask that you uphold the unanimous decision of the planning Commission and reject the CUP Appeal and CEQA Appeal.



Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul Albritton". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "P" and a long, sweeping underline.

Paul B. Albritton

⁴ See note 1, above.

⁵ The Act also requires that the City take final action on the CUP within a "reasonable period of time." 47 USC § 332(c)(7)(B)(iii). The FCC interprets this to mean within 90 days of filing the application in the case of a collocation application such as this. See *In Re: Petition for Declaratory Ruling to Clarify Provisions of Section 332(c)(7)(B) to Ensure Timely Siting Review, Etc.*, FCC 09-99 (FCC November 18, 2009).




view from Manchester Street looking southwest at site


clearw're

CA-SFO0581 ATC Bernal Heights
99 Moultrie Street, San Francisco, CA

Existing




Proposed




view from Bernal Heights Blvd. looking north at site

clearw're CA-SFO0581 ATC Bernal Heights
99 Moultrie Street, San Francisco, CA.

Existing




Proposed



view from property looking east at site

clearw're

CA-SFD0581 ATC Bernal Heights
99 Moultrie Street, San Francisco, CA

AdvanceSim 
Photo Computerized Estimation
Contact: 925.700.7000

T-Mobile

T-MOBILE WEST CORPORATION,
a Delaware Corporation
1855 Gateway Boulevard, 9th Floor
Concord, CA 94520

November 10, 2010

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 NOV 19 PM 2:44
BY *VC*

**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. SF13027B:**

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
Minor modification to an existing site that is principally permitted and does not require further land use approval per the City Zoning Administrator.

A copy of this notification letter is being sent to the local government agency identified below for its information. Should the Commission or the local government agency have any questions regarding this project, or if anyone disagrees 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 Delaware corporation

Enclosed: Attachment A

CC:
Edwin Lee, City Manager, City of San Francisco, 1 Carlton B Goodlett Pl, San Francisco, CA 94102
Jon Rahaim, Planning Director, City of San Francisco, 1 Carlton B Goodlett Pl, San Francisco, CA 94102
Karen J. Hong Yee, City Clerk, City of San Francisco, 1 Carlton B Goodlett Pl, San Francisco, CA 94102

9

ATTACHMENT A

1. Project Location

Site Identification Number: SF13027B
Site Name: PG&E Beale Street
Site Address: 77 Beale Street, San Francisco, CA 94105
County: San Francisco
Assessor's Parcel Number: Block 3711 Lot 014
Latitude: 37° 47' 30.91" N
Longitude: 122° 23' 45.78" W

2. Project Description

Number of Antennas to be installed: 2
Tower Design: Concrete Multi-Story Building
Tower Appearance: Antennas Flush Mounted to Parapet Wall
Tower Height: Top of Parapet 34' Top of Antennas 34'
Size of Building: 11' x 4' Lease Area

3. Business Addresses of all Governmental Agencies

City of San Francisco Edwin Lee, City Manager 1 Carlton B Goodlett Pl. San Francisco, CA 94102	City of San Francisco Jon Rahaim, Planning Director 1 Carlton B Goodlett Pl. San Francisco, CA 94102	City of San Francisco Karen J. Hong Yee, City Clerk 1 Carlton B Goodlett Pl. San Francisco, CA 94102
---	---	---

4. Land Use Approvals

Date Zoning Approval Issued: October 25, 2010
Land Use Permit #: N/A

If Land use Approval was not required: Minor modification to an existing site that is principally permitted and does not require further land use approval per the City Zoning Administrator. Zoning approved in-kind replacement of facilities as part of Building Permit.



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 101057: Master plan for hospitals

From: Phyllis and Tom Hunt <h-2660@sbcglobal.net>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 11/15/2010 05:00 PM
Subject: Master plan for hospitals

I don't believe the legislation before you concerning the Master Plan for hospitals is ready to be implemented. work in progress by on new hospitals by Cal Pacific and UCSF also need to be considered. Both organizatio

Phyllis Hunt.

San Francisco, CA

10

THE ANIMAL COMPANY
4298 24TH ST.
SAN FRANCISCO, CA. 94114

File 101225
B+F Comm / B+F Club
copy

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2010 NOV 16 PM 3:00

BY
AK

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

Dear Board of Supervisors:

My name is Rick French and I am the owner of The Animal Company, a pet store located at 4298 24th Street, in Noe Valley. We have been serving our customers and their pets since 1977. I am proud to say that, with the help of San Francisco-based Recology, my store has surpassed the City's mandated landfill diversion rate of seventy-five percent.

I am writing to you in hopes that you will approve the City of San Francisco's contract with San Francisco-based Recology to collect and ship the City's landfill to the state-of-the-art Ostrom Road facility in Yuba County.

Throughout Recology's history in San Francisco, the company has always focused on what is best for San Francisco. The company employs over 1,000 San Franciscans, oversees 18 reuse and recycling programs, and has, in partnership with the San Francisco Department of the Environment, led the successful efforts to reach the City's landfill diversion goals.

I believe that Recology's plan to transport the San Francisco's landfill by rail further highlights its continued dedication to environmental stewardship. The proposal will promote the message that the City supports highly sustainable practices and provide economic benefits to the City at the same time. I am familiar with the plan and believe that awarding the landfill contract to Recology is a victory for all of San Francisco.

Please approve the contract without delay.

Sincerely,



Rick French
The Animal Company

(11)



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:

Subject: Issued: Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector: Quarterly Reviews of the Schedule of Cash, Investments, and Accrued Interest Receivable as of September 30, 2009. December 31, 2009, and March 31, 2010

From: Controller Reports/CON/SFGOV
To: Angela Calvillo/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, BOS-Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV, BOS-Legislative Aides/BOS/SFGOV, Steve Kawa/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Greg Wagner/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Tony Winnicker/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Starr Terrell/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Francis Tsang/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Michael Cohen/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, ggiubbini@sftc.org, Severin Campbell/BudgetAnalyst/SFGOV@SFGOV, Debra Newman/BudgetAnalyst/SFGOV@SFGOV, sfdocs@sfpl.info, gmetcalf@spur.org, Tara Collins/CTYATT@CTYATT, CON-Media Contact/CON/SFGOV, CON-EVERYONE/CON/SFGOV, Jose Cisneros/TTX/SFGOV@SFGOV, Pauline Marx/TTX/SFGOV@SFGOV
Date: 11/18/2010 11:14 AM
Subject: Issued: Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector: Quarterly Reviews of the Schedule of Cash, Investments, and Accrued Interest Receivable as of September 30, 2009. December 31, 2009, and March 31, 2010
Sent by: Patti Erickson

The Office of the Controller, City Services Auditor, has issued three reports concerning the quarterly reviews of the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector's Schedule of Cash, Investments, and Accrued Interest Receivable as of September 30, 2009, December 31, 2009, and March 31, 2010. These reviews were performed under contract by Macias Gini O'Connell LLP.

The reviews indicate that Macias Gini & O'Connell LLP is not aware of any material modifications that should be made to the Schedules mentioned above in order for them to be in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.

To view the full reports, please visit the following websites:

<http://co.sfgov.org/webreports/details.aspx?id=1213>

<http://co.sfgov.org/webreports/details.aspx?id=1212>

<http://co.sfgov.org/webreports/details.aspx?id=1211>

This is a send only email.

For questions regarding this report please contact: Elisa Sullivan at elisa.sullivan@sfgov.org or 415-554-7654, or call the Audits Unit main line at 415-554-7469.

Thank you.

12



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: current legislation

From: "Jonathan Reynolds" <binnyswaa@hotmail.com>
To: <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
Date: 11/17/2010 12:05 AM
Subject: current legislation

It has come to my attention that after the board of supervisors passed the bill regarding toys and fast food meals, the Mayor vetoed the bill. The Mayor vetoed the bill citing that politicians have no place regulating nutrition, and a large outpouring of citizens seem to agree with the Mayor's decision. This is followed by the Board of Supervisors vowing to overturn the veto, and apply the ordinance anyway.

The LEADER and CITIZENS of your city have shown displeasure with your decisions.. This leads me to only one question, that I BEG an answer to:

Are you daft, ignorant, deaf, blind, or all of the above?

Happy Meals
Dennis Tobin
to:
Board.of.Supervisors
11/24/2010 10:25 AM
Show Details

Congratulations! You "sillyvisors" continue to relegate the once great City to laughable status. Let's see, it is a haven for shiftless vagrants, a sanctuary for illegal aliens, the "fruiter" capital of the world and now you're "fruit loops" policy chastises Ronald McDonald and dictates what people can eat. At least SF has The Giants. Nothing else works as it should.

Dennis Tobin
Santa Rosa

C-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: 778413

Nov 25 2010 9:12PM.

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:

From what I can see you are the ones who voted to ban toys in kids meals. Who do you think you are and what gives you the right? I dont live in California but this decision is crazy. This is unconstitutional and you do not have the right to decide things like this. There is nothing wrong with the toys. They are safe, not illegal, or causing harm to anyone. Its the parents choice on what their children eat not yours. This will be turned over by the supreme court you know and you will all look like a bunch of idiots as you already do. Your all so foolish and should just reverse this silly decision now. How can you seriously tell Mcdonalds or anyone they can not put toys in kids meals unless they meet your calorie requirements? Thats a bit out of control. Understand you do not have the right to do that. This is America wether you like it or not. The ones who voted for this should be fired and forced to work at Mcdonalds giving out toys in kids meals as punishment for your ignorent behavior. Please respond to this. I would love to hear what you have to say.

Customer Contact Information:

First Name:	Daniel
Last Name:	Laurel III
Primary Phone:	734-347-4848
Alternate Phone:	
Address Number:	
Street Name:	
City, State:	
ZIP Code:	
Email:	dlaurel79@yahoo.com

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



A New Era Begins with a New Name for the SFCVB

Joe D'Alessandro

to:

board.of.supervisors

11/17/2010 03:45 PM

Please respond to marketing


Show Details

Security:

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



This message contains graphics. If you do not see the graphics, [click here to view.](#)

**Only in San Francisco**

Dear Members,

Over the past 100 years, the San Francisco Convention & Visitors Bureau has grown and developed as the sales and marketing agency for San Francisco's tourism industry. Today, the word "Bureau" doesn't accurately describe who we are. In fact, we are far from 'bureaucratic.'

So I am happy to report that the Board of Directors voted unanimously today to change the name of this organization to the San Francisco Travel Association, effective January 11, 2011.

The new name is one outcome of our yearlong Centennial Project, which is designed to prepare the organization to best meet the challenges of the next 100 years. The project will enhance every aspect of the Bureau's value and effectiveness. It incorporates strategic planning, technology planning, visitor research, convention sales benchmarking and process assessment, organizational realignment, membership structure and branding.

This is the most comprehensive review of our business that we've ever done – and other CVBs across the country are looking to San Francisco to again lead the way in developing the industry's best practices.

As Matt Stiker, our executive vice president and chief marketing officer, said at the meeting this morning, "The key points driving the name change were ensuring and protecting the organization's future relevance in a changing world, while also communicating our curatorial perspective and unique point-of-view."

Although the organization's name will officially be the San Francisco Travel Association, it will be branded primarily as San Francisco Travel.

14

The name "San Francisco Travel" means that we are about every aspect of traveling to San Francisco. Whether it's leisure travel, meetings and conventions, group tours, domestic or international, editorial or viral, we've got a hand in making it happen.

The new name grew out of extensive research and evaluation of nationwide and industry trends and best practices, as well as surveys and focus groups. As one focus group respondent said, "The company serves as a bridge between visitors and the city...to act as a bridge between us and all there is available there."

The change from San Francisco Convention & Visitors Bureau to San Francisco Travel will come in phases, with the complete transformation to coincide with the launch of our completely redesigned website in January, 2011.

The Board was also presented with a new logo for the organization, developed by San Francisco-based advertising and design agency Eleven. The new logo features a grid of nine squares which can be used to showcase nine different images or a single image in a window pane effect.

Here's a preview of the new design:



Courtney Buechert, president of Eleven, described it this way: "This new logo allows us to illustrate San Francisco's diversity and strengths and to dramatically deliver the impact of an icon like the Golden Gate Bridge."

Please join me in congratulating the Board of Directors in taking this bold move toward making this organization more relevant, valuable and visible.

Sincerely,



Joe D'Alessandro
President & CEO

Tell Your Network!




Facebook



LinkedIn



Twitter



Support the SF Safe Drug Disposal Ordinance
John Downing to: board.of.supervisors
Please respond to j_down

11/22/2010 03:14 PM

View: (Mail Threads)

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

Dear Supervisors,

As a member of the Surfrider Foundation San Francisco Chapter, I urge you to support the San Francisco Safe Drug Disposal ordinance, file # 100455.

Many households and businesses have gotten into the habit of flushing unused medications down the toilet or drain. However, wastewater treatment plants and septic systems generally are not designed to treat this kind of waste. As a result the waste drugs are only partially destroyed in the sewage treatment process, and therefore are still present in wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Depending on the location, this effluent stream is discharged to the ocean or the bay where the pharmaceuticals can effect the health of marine life. If these water bodies are used to supply drinking water, individuals consuming that water can be exposed to the mix of discarded drugs.

Providing a safe, easy program for proper disposal of unwanted prescription medications is key to improving the safety and quality of our waters.

I urge you to vote in favor of the Safe Drug Disposal ordinance when it comes before the San Francisco Board of Supervisors.

Thank you for your consideration.

John Downing
3657 20th Street #4
San Francisco, CA 94110

15



JOHN ARNTZ
Director

BOS-11
Cpage

HAND DELIVERED

November 18, 2010

ANGELA CALVILLO, CLERK OF THE BOARD
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

BY TRC
2010 NOV 18 AM 11:08
RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO


RE: CERTIFICATION FOR THE **SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT STUDENT ASSIGNMENT SYSTEM INITIATIVE PETITION.**

Enclosed is a copy of the letter sent to the proponent of the above named petition, certifying that the petition did contain sufficient valid signatures to qualify for the upcoming November 8, 2011 Election to be held in the City and County of San Francisco.

If you should have any questions or need additional information, please call me at (415) 554-5665.

Sincerely,


John Arntz
Director of Elections

By: 
Deborah Brown
Voter Services Manager

Encl.: Copy of Certified letter to Proponent

Cc: Honorable Gavin Newsom; Mayor
John Arntz, Director of Elections
Dennis Herrera, City Attorney

16



CERTIFIED MAIL: 7001 1940 0001 0678 3504

November 18, 2010

Tami A. Gin
334 11th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94118

Re: CERTIFICATION FOR THE *SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT STUDENT ASSIGNMENT SYSTEM INITIATIVE PETITION*.

Dear Ms. Gin,

As provided in *California Elections Code, Chapter 2, Article 1, Section 9115 (a)*, a random sample of 500 signatures (of the total 12,737 submitted) for the *San Francisco Unified School District Student Assignment System Initiative Petition* established that the number of valid signatures of registered San Francisco voters was sufficient for the initiative to qualify for the next regularly scheduled election.

Based on this statistical sampling, the total number of valid signatures submitted on this petition was determined to be greater than the 7,168 signatures required for the initiative to be included in the November 8, 2011 Election.

I hereby certify that the *San Francisco Unified School District Student Assignment System Initiative Petition* qualify for the November 8, 2011 Election in the City and County of San Francisco.


If you should have any questions, please contact me at (415) 554-5665.

Sincerely,

John Arntz
Director of Elections

By: 

Deborah Brown
Voter Services Manager



cc: Honorable Gavin Newsom; Mayor
John Arntz, Director of Elections
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Dennis Herrera, City Attorney



Overtun San Francisco's Discriminatory Sidewalk Sitting Ban
marta rodriguez to: Board.of.Supervisors
Please respond to yomamarodriguez1

11/19/2010 08:35 AM

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.

marta rodriguez
po box 84
citrus heights, CA 95611



Overturn San Francisco's Discriminatory Sidewalk Sitting Ban

Caleb Laieski to: Board.of.Supervisors

11/21/2010 12:45 PM

Please respond to claieski

Caleb Laieski	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.

Caleb Laieski
P.O. Box 72028
Phoenix, AZ 85050



DEPARTMENT OF
FINANCE
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, GOVERNOR
STATE CAPITOL B ROOM 1145 B SACRAMENTO CA B 95814-4998 B WWW.DOF.CA.GOV

BOS-11
page

November 12, 2010

TO ALL COUNTY AUDITORS, REDEVELOPMENT AGENCIES, AND THEIR LEGISLATIVE BODIES:


Chapter 21, Statutes of 2009, requires redevelopment agencies to shift \$350 million in property tax revenues to K-12 schools during the 2010-11 fiscal year via the Supplemental Educational Revenue Augmentation Funds (SERAF) that the Chapter created in each county. The Director of Finance is required to determine the amount each redevelopment agency shall transfer to the SERAF, and is further required to notify each redevelopment agency and legislative body of those amounts.

In accordance with the above requirements, the attached document provides the amount determined for your redevelopment agency.

Each redevelopment agency must allocate the specified amount to the county auditor-controller for deposit into the SERAF on or before May 10, 2011. By March 1, 2011 the legislative body shall either report to the county auditor-controller how the redevelopment agency intends to fund its SERAF obligation, or report that the legislative body intends to fund the SERAF obligation on behalf of the redevelopment agency pursuant to Section 33692 of the Health and Safety Code (HSC).

If a redevelopment agency determines that it will not be able to allocate to the SERAF the full amount required, it may enter into an agreement with its legislative body by February 15, 2011, for the legislative body to fund either the full SERAF obligation, or a portion thereof. Alternatively, pursuant to HSC Section 33690 (c), a redevelopment agency that makes a finding that insufficient monies are available to fund its SERAF obligation may borrow from monies contained in its Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund. Redevelopment agencies also may borrow from the amount otherwise required to be remitted in 2010-11 to its Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund. All borrowed funds must be fully repaid by June 30, 2016.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Chris Hill, Principal Program Budget Analyst, at (916) 322-2263.


ANA MATOSANTOS
Director

Attachment

BY _____
AK

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 NOV 15 PM 4:06

18

**2010-11 Redevelopment Agency SERAF Shift
Health and Safety Code Section 33690.5**

	2006-07 Tax Increment Net of Pass-Throughs	2006-07 Gross Tax Increment	175,000,000 on Net Tax Increment Based on Net Factor (0.0465534652)	175,000,000 on Net Tax Increment Based on Gross Factor (0.0369323105)	Total SERAF
--	--	-----------------------------	---	---	-------------

Redevelopment Agency Name

San Francisco County
Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco

68,160,355

74,257,510

3,173,101

2,742,501

5,915,602

RECEIVED
 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
 SAN FRANCISCO
 2010 NOV 11 AM 10:21
 BY

QUARTERLY HIV/AIDS SURVEILLANCE REPORT

San Francisco Department of Public Health

HIV/AIDS Cases Reported Through September 2010

Contents	Page
Surveillance Summary.....	1
Table 1: Adult/Adolescent HIV/AIDS Cases by Transmission Category.....	2
Table 2: AIDS Cases by Gender and Year of AIDS Diagnosis.....	3
Table 3: HIV/AIDS Cases by Gender and Year of Initial HIV Diagnosis.....	3
Table 4: AIDS Cases by Transmission Category and Race/Ethnicity.....	4
Table 5: HIV Non-AIDS Cases by Transmission Category and Race/Ethnicity.....	4
Table 6: AIDS Cases by Transmission Category and Year of AIDS Diagnosis.....	5
Table 7: HIV/AIDS Cases by Transmission Category and Year of Initial HIV Diagnosis.....	6
Table 8: AIDS Cases by Gender, Age Group and Race/Ethnicity.....	7
Table 9: HIV Non-AIDS Cases by Gender, Age Group and Race/Ethnicity.....	8
Table 10: AIDS Cases by Race/Ethnicity and Year of AIDS Diagnosis.....	9
Table 11: HIV/AIDS Cases by Race/Ethnicity and Year of Initial HIV Diagnosis.....	9
Table 12: AIDS Incidence, Mortality, and Prevalence by Year.....	10
Table 13: AIDS Cases by Initial AIDS-Defining Condition and Year of AIDS Diagnosis.....	11
Table 14: Cumulative AIDS Indicator Conditions among Persons with AIDS.....	12
Table 15: Living Adult/Adolescent HIV/AIDS Cases by Transmission Category.....	13
Table 16: Living HIV/AIDS Cases by Transmission Category and Race/Ethnicity.....	13
Table 17: Living HIV/AIDS Cases by Gender, Age Group and Race/Ethnicity.....	14

The HIV/AIDS Surveillance Report is published quarterly by the
 San Francisco Department of Public Health, HIV Epidemiology Section
 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 500, San Francisco, CA 94102; Phone (415) 554-9050, FAX (415) 431-0353
 Director of Health: Mitchell Katz, MD; Section Director: Susan Scheer, PhD, MPH;
 Surveillance Unit Director: Ling Hsu, MPH;
 Program Coordinators: Maree Kay Parisi, Viva Delgado, MPH;
 Epidemiologists: Miao-Jung Mia Chen, PhD, MPH, Anne Hirozawa, MPH, Alison Hughes, MPH,
 Priscilla Lee Chu, DrPH, MPH, Sharon Pipkin, MPH, Annie Vu, MPH
The HIV/AIDS Surveillance Report is accessible via internet:
www.sfdph.org/dph/comupg/oprograms/hivepisecc/default.asp

City and County of San Francisco

Department of Public Health



Gavin Newsom

Mitchell M. Katz

Mayor

Director

October 26, 2010

Dear Colleague,

We want to inform you of a recent change to the *Quarterly AIDS Surveillance Report*. Starting with the September 30, 2010 issue, we have included data pertaining to persons diagnosed with HIV (not AIDS) in addition to data for persons with AIDS. Additional data for the characteristics of persons diagnosed with HIV non-AIDS and trends in diagnoses of HIV infection can be found in the following tables:

- Table 1. Adult/Adolescent HIV/AIDS Cases by Transmission Category
- Table 3. HIV/AIDS Cases by Gender and Year of Initial HIV Diagnosis
- Table 5. HIV Non-AIDS Cases by Transmission Category and Race/Ethnicity
- Table 7. HIV/AIDS Cases by Transmission Category and Year of Initial HIV Diagnosis
- Table 9. HIV Non-AIDS Cases by Gender, Age Group and Race/Ethnicity
- Table 11. HIV/AIDS Cases by Race/Ethnicity and Year of Initial HIV Diagnosis
- Table 15. Living Adult/Adolescent HIV/AIDS Cases by Transmission Category
- Table 16. Living HIV/AIDS Cases by Transmission Category and Race/Ethnicity
- Table 17. Living HIV/AIDS Cases by Gender, Age Group and Race/Ethnicity

Our role as the HIV Epidemiology Section is to monitor the HIV/AIDS epidemic and to disseminate the information we collect in a meaningful way. We believe that these changes to our *Quarterly HIV/AIDS Surveillance Report* help to accomplish that goal and hope it will be helpful in planning for needs of groups most severely affected by the HIV epidemic. If you have questions concerning our reports, please contact the HIV Epidemiology Section at (415) 554-9050.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Ling Hsu in black ink.

Ling Hsu, MPH
Director, HIV Surveillance Unit

Handwritten signature of Susan Scheer in black ink.

Susan Scheer, PhD, MPH
Director, HIV Epidemiology Section

HIV/AIDS Surveillance Summary

San Francisco (as of 09/30/2010)

Cumulative cases ¹ :	
AIDS	28,671
HIV non-AIDS ²	5,816
Cumulative AIDS deaths:	19,234
Living HIV/AIDS cases	15,211


California³ (as of 06/30/2010)

Cumulative cases:	
AIDS	157,719
HIV non-AIDS	40,590
Cumulative AIDS deaths:	87,991
Living HIV/AIDS cases:	109,014

United States⁴

Cumulative AIDS cases (as of 12/31/2008):	1,077,972
Cumulative AIDS deaths (as of 12/31/2007):	582,540
Living HIV/AIDS cases (as of 12/31/2007):	580,730

San Francisco AIDS Incidence, Mortality, and Prevalence by Year, 1980-2010⁵



1. Includes SF residents diagnosed in SF and SF residents diagnosed in other jurisdictions.
2. Includes HIV non-AIDS cases reported by name. HIV non-AIDS cases reported by a non-name code between July 2002 and April 2006 whose names have not been ascertained are not included.
3. CA data source: www.cdph.ca.gov/data/statistics/Pages/OAHIVAIDSStatistics.aspx.
4. US data source: CDC HIV Surveillance Report, 2008, vol. 20. www.cdc.gov/hiv/topics/surveillance/resources/reports/.
5. Reporting for recent year is incomplete. See Table 12 for actual numbers per year.

**HIV/AIDS Quarterly Surveillance Report
Summary of San Francisco Residents with HIV/AIDS*
Reported as of 09/30/2010**

Table 1. Adult/Adolescent HIV/AIDS Cases (>12 years) by Transmission Category, San Francisco, 1980-2010

Transmission Category	AIDS		HIV non-AIDS#	
	No.	(%)	No.	(%)
Gay or bisexual male	21039	(73.5)	4203	(72.4)
Heterosexual male injection drug user	1411	(4.9)	231	(4.0)
Heterosexual female injection drug user	701	(2.4)	163	(2.8)
Gay or bisexual male injection drug user	4145	(14.5)	658	(11.3)
Lesbian or bisexual injection drug user	61	(0.2)	15	(0.3)
Transgender (1)	410	(1.4)	140	(2.4)
Hemophiliac	16	(0.1)	2	(0.0)
Heterosexual contact male (2)	151	(0.5)	48	(0.8)
Heterosexual contact female (2)	313	(1.1)	119	(2.1)
Transfusion recipient	143	(0.5)	1	(0.0)
Risk not reported/Other (3)	243	(0.8)	223	(3.8)
Total	28633	(100)	5803	(100)

* Residents of San Francisco at time of HIV/AIDS diagnosis.

Includes HIV non-AIDS cases reported by name. Excludes HIV non-AIDS cases reported by a non-name code between July 2002 and April 2006 whose names have not been ascertained.

- (1) Transgender information was collected since September 1996. Data prior to this are incomplete.
- (2) Includes persons who have had heterosexual contact with a person with HIV/AIDS or with a person who is at risk for HIV.
- (3) Includes persons for whom risk information is incomplete (due to death, refusal to be interviewed or loss to follow-up), cases still under investigation, or interviewed patients who offered no plausible risk for HIV.

HIV/AIDS Quarterly Surveillance Report
Summary of San Francisco Residents with HIV/AIDS*
Reported as of 09/30/2010

Table 2. AIDS Cases by Gender and Year of AIDS Diagnosis, San Francisco, 1980-2010

Gender	Year of AIDS Diagnosis					
	< 2000 No. (%)	2000 No. (%)	2001 No. (%)	2002 No. (%)	2003 No. (%)	2004 No. (%)
Male	22772 (95.5)	481 (86.5)	455 (88.3)	443 (89.1)	497 (88.6)	424 (88.3)
Female	822 (3.4)	52 (9.4)	45 (8.7)	36 (7.2)	40 (7.1)	39 (8.1)
Transgender (1)	251 (1.1)	23 (4.1)	15 (2.9)	18 (3.6)	24 (4.3)	17 (3.5)
Total	23845 (100)	556 (100)	515 (100)	497 (100)	561 (100)	480 (100)

Gender	Year of AIDS Diagnosis					
	2005 No. (%)	2006 No. (%)	2007 No. (%)	2008 No. (%)	2009 No. (%)	2010 No. (%)
Male	421 (89.4)	395 (90.4)	397 (90.0)	360 (87.8)	277 (89.6)	135 (90.6)
Female	37 (7.9)	30 (6.9)	31 (7.0)	41 (10.0)	23 (7.4)	8 (5.4)
Transgender (1)	13 (2.8)	12 (2.7)	13 (2.9)	9 (2.2)	9 (2.9)	6 (4.0)
Total	471 (100)	437 (100)	441 (100)	410 (100)	309 (100)	149 (100)

Table 3. HIV/AIDS Cases by Gender and Year of Initial HIV Diagnosis#, San Francisco, 2005-2010

Gender	Year of Initial HIV Diagnosis					
	2005 No. (%)	2006 No. (%)	2007 No. (%)	2008 No. (%)	2009 No. (%)	2010 No. (%)
Male	487 (90.0)	472 (91.5)	458 (87.9)	447 (90.3)	410 (89.9)	218 (89.0)
Female	41 (7.6)	35 (6.8)	42 (8.1)	38 (7.7)	28 (6.1)	20 (8.2)
Transgender (1)	13 (2.4)	9 (1.7)	21 (4.0)	10 (2.0)	18 (3.9)	7 (2.9)
Total	541 (100)	516 (100)	521 (100)	495 (100)	456 (100)	245 (100)

* Residents of San Francisco at time of HIV/AIDS diagnosis.

Includes persons with a diagnosis of HIV (not AIDS), an initial diagnosis of HIV (not AIDS) and later diagnosed with AIDS, and concurrent diagnosis of HIV and AIDS. The initial year of HIV diagnosis was determined based on the earliest date of HIV antibody test, viral load or CD4 test, initiation of antiretroviral therapy, or patient self-report of a positive HIV test.

(1) Transgender information was collected since September 1996. Data prior to this are incomplete.

HIV/AIDS Quarterly Surveillance Report Summary of San Francisco Residents with HIV/AIDS* Reported as of 09/30/2010

Table 4. AIDS Cases by Transmission Category and Race/Ethnicity, San Francisco San Francisco, 1980-2010

Transmission Category (1)	White No. (%)	African American No. (%)	Latino No. (%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander No. (%)	Native American No. (%)
Adult/Adolescent					
Gay or bisexual male	16161 (79.8)	1562 (43.1)	2586 (73.5)	698 (77.0)	55 (43.3)
Injection drug user (IDU)	741 (3.7)	1040 (28.7)	248 (7.1)	40 (4.4)	18 (14.2)
Gay or bisexual male IDU	3030 (15.0)	694 (19.2)	466 (13.2)	73 (8.1)	46 (36.2)
Lesbian or bisexual IDU	28 (0.1)	22 (0.6)	6 (0.2)	2 (0.2)	2 (1.6)
Hemophiliac	8 (0.0)	2 (0.1)	5 (0.1)	1 (0.1)	0 (0.0)
Heterosexual (2)	118 (0.6)	188 (5.2)	111 (3.2)	45 (5.0)	4 (3.1)
Transfusion recipient	68 (0.3)	23 (0.6)	27 (0.8)	19 (2.1)	0 (0.0)
Risk not reported/Other (3)	79 (0.4)	79 (2.2)	58 (1.6)	23 (2.5)	1 (0.8)
Pediatric (0-12 years) (4)	8 (0.0)	13 (0.4)	10 (0.3)	5 (0.6)	1 (0.8)
Total	20241 (100)	3623 (100)	3517 (100)	906 (100)	127 (100)

Table 5. HIV Non-AIDS Cases# by Transmission Category and Race/Ethnicity, San Francisco

Transmission Category (1)	White No. (%)	African American No. (%)	Latino No. (%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander No. (%)	Native American No. (%)
Adult/Adolescent					
Gay or bisexual male	2898 (79.0)	346 (44.5)	694 (76.1)	245 (80.3)	18 (56.3)
Injection drug user (IDU)	165 (4.5)	171 (22.0)	40 (4.4)	6 (2.0)	5 (15.6)
Gay or bisexual male IDU	467 (12.7)	111 (14.3)	92 (10.1)	25 (8.2)	8 (25.0)
Lesbian or bisexual IDU	5 (0.1)	5 (0.6)	4 (0.4)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Hemophiliac	2 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Heterosexual (2)	34 (0.9)	79 (10.2)	33 (3.6)	16 (5.2)	1 (3.1)
Transfusion recipient	0 (0.0)	1 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Risk not reported/Other (3)	97 (2.6)	61 (7.9)	44 (4.8)	12 (3.9)	0 (0.0)
Pediatric (0-12 years) (4)	2 (0.1)	3 (0.4)	5 (0.5)	1 (0.3)	0 (0.0)
Total	3670 (100)	777 (100)	912 (100)	305 (100)	32 (100)

* Residents of San Francisco at time of HIV/AIDS diagnosis.
 # Includes HIV non-AIDS cases reported by name. Excludes HIV non-AIDS cases reported by a non-name code between July 2002 and April 2006 whose names have not been ascertained.
 (1) Persons with more than one risk factor (other than the combinations listed in the tables) are tabulated only in the most likely transmission category.
 (2) Includes persons who have had heterosexual contact with a person with HIV/AIDS or with a person who is at risk for HIV.
 (3) Includes persons for whom risk information is incomplete (due to death, refusal to be interviewed or loss to follow-up), cases still under investigation, or interviewed patients who offered no plausible risk for HIV.
 (4) Includes children who have hemophilia or other coagulation disorder, have received a blood transfusion, or who have acquired their infection from an infected mother during the perinatal period.

HIV/AIDS Quarterly Surveillance Report
Summary of San Francisco Residents with HIV/AIDS*
Reported as of 09/30/2010

Table 6. AIDS Cases by Transmission Category and Year of AIDS Diagnosis, San Francisco, 1980-2010

Transmission Category (1)	Year of AIDS Diagnosis					
	< 2000 No. (%)	2000 No. (%)	2001 No. (%)	2002 No. (%)	2003 No. (%)	2004 No. (%)
Adult/Adolescent						
Gay or bisexual male	18168 (76.2)	337 (60.6)	311 (60.4)	306 (61.6)	365 (65.1)	316 (65.8)
Injection drug user (IDU)	1560 (6.5)	83 (14.9)	68 (13.2)	63 (12.7)	77 (13.7)	51 (10.6)
Gay or bisexual male IDU	3512 (14.7)	104 (18.7)	93 (18.1)	101 (20.3)	85 (15.2)	85 (17.7)
Lesbian or bisexual IDU	38 (0.2)	3 (0.5)	3 (0.6)	2 (0.4)	3 (0.5)	1 (0.2)
Hemophiliac	15 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Heterosexual (2)	257 (1.1)	19 (3.4)	19 (3.7)	15 (3.0)	21 (3.7)	14 (2.9)
Transfusion recipient	141 (0.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.2)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Risk not reported/Other (3)	119 (0.5)	9 (1.6)	20 (3.9)	8 (1.6)	9 (1.6)	13 (2.7)
Pediatric (0-12 years) (4)	35 (0.1)	1 (0.2)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.2)	0 (0.0)
Total	23845 (100)	556 (100)	515 (100)	497 (100)	561 (100)	480 (100)

Transmission Category (1)	Year of AIDS Diagnosis					
	2005 No. (%)	2006 No. (%)	2007 No. (%)	2008 No. (%)	2009 No. (%)	2010 No. (%)
Adult/Adolescent						
Gay or bisexual male	296 (62.8)	287 (65.7)	288 (65.3)	258 (62.9)	202 (65.4)	82 (55.0)
Injection drug user (IDU)	54 (11.5)	39 (8.9)	42 (9.5)	32 (7.8)	34 (11.0)	15 (10.1)
Gay or bisexual male IDU	86 (18.3)	80 (18.3)	70 (15.9)	72 (17.6)	43 (13.9)	36 (24.2)
Lesbian or bisexual IDU	3 (0.6)	2 (0.5)	0 (0.0)	4 (1.0)	2 (0.6)	0 (0.0)
Hemophiliac	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.3)	0 (0.0)
Heterosexual (2)	19 (4.0)	21 (4.8)	32 (7.3)	27 (6.6)	16 (5.2)	8 (5.4)
Transfusion recipient	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Risk not reported/Other (3)	13 (2.8)	8 (1.8)	9 (2.0)	17 (4.1)	11 (3.6)	8 (5.4)
Pediatric (0-12 years) (4)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Total	471 (100)	437 (100)	441 (100)	410 (100)	309 (100)	149 (100)

* Residents of San Francisco at time of HIV/AIDS diagnosis.

- (1) Persons with more than one risk factor (other than the combinations listed in the tables) are tabulated only in the most likely transmission category.
- (2) Includes persons who have had heterosexual contact with a person with HIV/AIDS or with a person who is at risk for HIV.
- (3) Includes persons for whom risk information is incomplete (due to death, refusal to be interviewed or loss to follow-up), cases still under investigation, or interviewed patients who offered no plausible risk for HIV.
- (4) Includes children who have hemophilia or other coagulation disorder, have received a blood transfusion, or who have acquired their infection from an infected mother during the perinatal period.

HIV/AIDS Quarterly Surveillance Report
Summary of San Francisco Residents with HIV/AIDS*
Reported as of 09/30/2010

Table 7. HIV/AIDS Cases by Transmission Category and Year of Initial HIV Diagnosis#, San Francisco, 2005-2010

Transmission Category (1)	Year of Initial HIV Diagnosis					
	2005 No. (%)	2006 No. (%)	2007 No. (%)	2008 No. (%)	2009 No. (%)	2010 No. (%)
Adult/Adolescent						
Gay or bisexual male	380 (70.2)	367 (71.1)	349 (67.0)	357 (72.1)	329 (72.1)	154 (62.9)
Injection drug user (IDU)	35 (6.5)	40 (7.8)	38 (7.3)	29 (5.9)	24 (5.3)	24 (9.8)
Gay or bisexual male IDU	70 (12.9)	65 (12.6)	65 (12.5)	45 (9.1)	56 (12.3)	31 (12.7)
Lesbian or bisexual IDU	5 (0.9)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.2)	3 (0.6)	3 (0.7)	0 (0.0)
Hemophiliac	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Heterosexual (2)	30 (5.5)	24 (4.7)	40 (7.7)	31 (6.3)	18 (3.9)	17 (6.9)
Transfusion recipient	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Risk not reported/Other (3)	20 (3.7)	19 (3.7)	28 (5.4)	30 (6.1)	26 (5.7)	19 (7.8)
Pediatric (0-12 years) (4)	1 (0.2)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Total	541 (100)	516 (100)	521 (100)	495 (100)	456 (100)	245 (100)

* Residents of San Francisco at time of HIV/AIDS diagnosis.

Includes persons with a diagnosis of HIV (not AIDS), an initial diagnosis of HIV (not AIDS) and later diagnosed with AIDS, and concurrent diagnosis of HIV and AIDS. The initial year of HIV diagnosis was determined based on the earliest date of HIV antibody test, viral load or CD4 test, initiation of antiretroviral therapy, or patient self-report of a positive HIV test.

- (1) Persons with more than one risk factor (other than the combinations listed in the tables) are tabulated only in the most likely transmission category.
- (2) Includes persons who have had heterosexual contact with a person with HIV/AIDS or with a person who is at risk for HIV.
- (3) Includes persons for whom risk information is incomplete (due to death, refusal to be interviewed or loss to follow-up), cases still under investigation, or interviewed patients who offered no plausible risk for HIV.
- (4) Includes children who have hemophilia or other coagulation disorder, have received a blood transfusion, or who have acquired their infection from an infected mother during the perinatal period.

HIV/AIDS Quarterly Surveillance Report
Summary of San Francisco Residents with HIV/AIDS*
Reported as of 09/30/2010

Table 8. AIDS Cases by Gender, Age Group and Race/Ethnicity, San Francisco, 1980-2010

Male Age at AIDS Diagnosis (Years)	White No. (%)	African American No. (%)	Latino No. (%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander No. (%)	Native American No. (%)	Total (1) No. (%)
0 - 12	4 (0.0)	4 (0.1)	5 (0.2)	4 (0.5)	1 (0.9)	19 (0.1)
13 - 19	12 (0.1)	1 (0.0)	13 (0.4)	1 (0.1)	2 (1.8)	30 (0.1)
20 - 24	306 (1.6)	69 (2.3)	120 (3.7)	26 (3.2)	5 (4.5)	529 (2.0)
25 - 29	1660 (8.4)	248 (8.4)	454 (14.1)	85 (10.5)	22 (20.0)	2498 (9.2)
30 - 39	8819 (44.7)	1162 (39.4)	1524 (47.3)	357 (44.2)	51 (46.4)	12019 (44.4)
40 - 49	6488 (32.9)	982 (33.3)	808 (25.1)	248 (30.7)	24 (21.8)	8608 (31.8)
50 - 59	1968 (10.0)	379 (12.9)	242 (7.5)	64 (7.9)	4 (3.6)	2681 (9.9)
60 +	484 (2.5)	104 (3.5)	58 (1.8)	22 (2.7)	1 (0.9)	673 (2.5)
Male subtotal	19741 (100)	2949 (100)	3224 (100)	807 (100)	110 (100)	27057 (100)
Female Age at AIDS Diagnosis (Years)	White No. (%)	African American No. (%)	Latino No. (%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander No. (%)	Native American No. (%)	Total (1) No. (%)
0 - 12	4 (1.0)	9 (1.7)	5 (2.9)	1 (1.6)	0 (0.0)	19 (1.6)
13 - 19	1 (0.3)	2 (0.4)	2 (1.2)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	5 (0.4)
20 - 24	15 (3.9)	10 (1.8)	10 (5.8)	5 (7.8)	1 (7.1)	41 (3.4)
25 - 29	40 (10.3)	45 (8.3)	26 (15.0)	11 (17.2)	1 (7.1)	125 (10.4)
30 - 39	154 (39.8)	203 (37.2)	59 (34.1)	25 (39.1)	8 (57.1)	456 (37.9)
40 - 49	103 (26.6)	187 (34.3)	43 (24.9)	15 (23.4)	4 (28.6)	357 (29.7)
50 - 59	40 (10.3)	66 (12.1)	15 (8.7)	4 (6.3)	0 (0.0)	129 (10.7)
60 +	30 (7.8)	23 (4.2)	13 (7.5)	3 (4.7)	0 (0.0)	72 (6.0)
Female subtotal	387 (100)	545 (100)	173 (100)	64 (100)	14 (100)	1204 (100)
Transgender (2) Age at AIDS Diagnosis (Years)	White No. (%)	African American No. (%)	Latino No. (%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander Native American No. (%)	Total (1) No. (%)	
13 - 29	22 (19.5)	28 (21.7)	32 (26.7)	13 (34.2)	97 (23.7)	
30 - 39	55 (48.7)	48 (37.2)	57 (47.5)	17 (44.7)	182 (44.4)	
40 +	36 (31.9)	53 (41.1)	31 (25.8)	8 (21.1)	131 (32.0)	
Transgender subtotal	113 (100)	129 (100)	120 (100)	38 (100)	410 (100)	

* Residents of San Francisco at time of HIV/AIDS diagnosis.

(1) Total includes persons with multiple or unknown race.

(2) Transgender information was collected since September 1996. Certain age or race/ethnic groups are combined for transgender cases because of small number.

HIV/AIDS Quarterly Surveillance Report
Summary of San Francisco Residents with HIV/AIDS*
Reported as of 09/30/2010

Table 9. HIV Non-AIDS Cases# by Gender, Age Group and Race/Ethnicity, San Francisco

Male Age at Initial HIV Diagnosis (Years)	White No. (%)	African American No. (%)	Latino No. (%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander No. (%)	Native American No. (%)	Total (1) No. (%)
0 - 12	1 (0.0)	2 (0.3)	1 (0.1)	1 (0.4)	0 (0.0)	5 (0.1)
13 - 19	28 (0.8)	20 (3.5)	20 (2.5)	9 (3.3)	0 (0.0)	79 (1.5)
20 - 24	295 (8.4)	52 (9.0)	104 (12.9)	30 (11.2)	5 (18.5)	497 (9.4)
25 - 29	550 (15.6)	83 (14.3)	174 (21.6)	63 (23.4)	5 (18.5)	899 (16.9)
30 - 39	1556 (44.1)	203 (35.1)	345 (42.9)	124 (46.1)	12 (44.4)	2278 (42.9)
40 - 49	812 (23.0)	154 (26.6)	134 (16.6)	37 (13.8)	5 (18.5)	1165 (21.9)
50 - 59	235 (6.7)	48 (8.3)	23 (2.9)	5 (1.9)	0 (0.0)	313 (5.9)
60 +	54 (1.5)	17 (2.9)	4 (0.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	76 (1.4)
Male subtotal	3531 (100)	579 (100)	805 (100)	269 (100)	27 (100)	5312 (100)
Female Age at Initial HIV Diagnosis (Years)	White No. (%)	African American No. (%)	Latino No. (%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander No. (%)	Native American No. (%)	Total (1) No. (%)
0 - 12	1 (0.9)	1 (0.7)	4 (6.2)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	8 (2.2)
13 - 19	2 (1.8)	5 (3.4)	2 (3.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	9 (2.5)
20 - 24	12 (10.9)	12 (8.1)	12 (18.5)	1 (4.3)	0 (0.0)	39 (10.7)
25 - 29	21 (19.1)	15 (10.1)	12 (18.5)	5 (21.7)	0 (0.0)	54 (14.8)
30 - 39	35 (31.8)	47 (31.8)	23 (35.4)	7 (30.4)	3 (75.0)	121 (33.2)
40 - 49	24 (21.8)	47 (31.8)	8 (12.3)	6 (26.1)	0 (0.0)	87 (23.9)
50 - 59	15 (13.6)	18 (12.2)	4 (6.2)	3 (13.0)	1 (25.0)	42 (11.5)
60 +	0 (0.0)	3 (2.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (4.3)	0 (0.0)	4 (1.1)
Female subtotal	110 (100)	148 (100)	65 (100)	23 (100)	4 (100)	364 (100)
Transgender (2) Age at Initial HIV Diagnosis (Years)	White No. (%)	African American No. (%)	Latino No. (%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander Native American No. (%)	Total (1) No. (%)	
13 - 29	12 (41.4)	23 (46.0)	21 (50.0)	5 (35.7)	64 (45.7)	
30 +	17 (58.6)	27 (54.0)	21 (50.0)	9 (64.3)	76 (54.3)	
Transgender subtotal	29 (100)	50 (100)	42 (100)	14 (100)	140 (100)	

* Residents of San Francisco at time of HIV/AIDS diagnosis.

Includes HIV non-AIDS cases reported by name. Excludes HIV non-AIDS cases reported by a non-name code between July 2002 and April 2006 whose names have not been ascertained.

(1) Total includes persons with multiple or unknown race.

(2) Transgender information was collected since September 1996. Certain age or race/ethnic groups are combined for transgender cases because of small number.

HIV/AIDS Quarterly Surveillance Report
Summary of San Francisco Residents with HIV/AIDS*
Reported as of 09/30/2010

Table 10. AIDS Cases by Race/Ethnicity and Year of AIDS Diagnosis, San Francisco, 1980-2010

Race/Ethnicity	Year of AIDS Diagnosis					
	< 2000 No. (%)	2000 No. (%)	2001 No. (%)	2002 No. (%)	2003 No. (%)	2004 No. (%)
White	17576 (73.7)	317 (57.0)	296 (57.5)	293 (59.0)	283 (50.4)	261 (54.4)
African American	2736 (11.5)	113 (20.3)	99 (19.2)	89 (17.9)	105 (18.7)	78 (16.3)
Latino	2641 (11.1)	93 (16.7)	74 (14.4)	76 (15.3)	126 (22.5)	110 (22.9)
Asian/Pacific Islander	619 (2.6)	25 (4.5)	34 (6.6)	30 (6.0)	35 (6.2)	21 (4.4)
Native American	92 (0.4)	2 (0.4)	5 (1.0)	2 (0.4)	6 (1.1)	4 (0.8)
Total (1)	23845 (100)	556 (100)	515 (100)	497 (100)	561 (100)	480 (100)

Race/Ethnicity	Year of AIDS Diagnosis					
	2005 No. (%)	2006 No. (%)	2007 No. (%)	2008 No. (%)	2009 No. (%)	2010 No. (%)
White	273 (58.0)	244 (55.8)	253 (57.4)	214 (52.2)	160 (51.8)	71 (47.7)
African American	82 (17.4)	80 (18.3)	79 (17.9)	77 (18.8)	61 (19.7)	24 (16.1)
Latino	86 (18.3)	79 (18.1)	73 (16.6)	67 (16.3)	60 (19.4)	32 (21.5)
Asian/Pacific Islander	24 (5.1)	22 (5.0)	28 (6.3)	40 (9.8)	14 (4.5)	14 (9.4)
Native American	3 (0.6)	6 (1.4)	0 (0.0)	3 (0.7)	3 (1.0)	1 (0.7)
Total (1)	471 (100)	437 (100)	441 (100)	410 (100)	309 (100)	149 (100)

Table 11. HIV/AIDS Cases by Race/Ethnicity and Year of Initial HIV Diagnosis#, San Francisco, 2005-2010

Race/Ethnicity	Year of Initial HIV Diagnosis					
	2005 No. (%)	2006 No. (%)	2007 No. (%)	2008 No. (%)	2009 No. (%)	2010 No. (%)
White	300 (55.5)	298 (57.8)	278 (53.4)	250 (50.5)	231 (50.7)	119 (48.6)
African American	83 (15.3)	74 (14.3)	79 (15.2)	79 (16.0)	74 (16.2)	37 (15.1)
Latino	110 (20.3)	103 (20.0)	100 (19.2)	110 (22.2)	97 (21.3)	53 (21.6)
Asian/Pacific Islander	29 (5.4)	31 (6.0)	46 (8.8)	42 (8.5)	39 (8.6)	31 (12.7)
Native American	5 (0.9)	4 (0.8)	0 (0.0)	3 (0.6)	2 (0.4)	1 (0.4)
Total (1)	541 (100)	516 (100)	521 (100)	495 (100)	456 (100)	245 (100)

* Residents of San Francisco at time of HIV/AIDS diagnosis.

Includes persons with a diagnosis of HIV (not AIDS), an initial diagnosis of HIV (not AIDS) and later diagnosed with AIDS, and concurrent diagnosis of HIV and AIDS. The initial year of HIV diagnosis was determined based on the earliest date of HIV antibody test, viral load or CD4 test, initiation of antiretroviral therapy, or patient self-report of a positive HIV test.

(1) Total includes persons with multiple or unknown race.

HIV/AIDS Quarterly Surveillance Report
Summary of San Francisco Residents with HIV/AIDS*
Reported as of 09/30/2010

Table 12. AIDS Incidence, Mortality, and Prevalence by Year, San Francisco, 1980-2010

Year	Number of AIDS Cases Reported per Year	Number of AIDS Cases Diagnosed per Year (1)	Number of AIDS Deaths Occurred per Year (1)	Number of Persons Living with AIDS (1)
1980	0	3	0	3
1981	21	26	8	21
1982	75	99	32	88
1983	197	274	111	251
1984	451	557	273	535
1985	673	859	534	860
1986	981	1236	807	1289
1987	1287	1629	877	2041
1988	1408	1763	1038	2766
1989	1584	2161	1275	3652
1990	1686	2046	1364	4334
1991	1685	2284	1505	5113
1992	1638	2327	1641	5799
1993	4271	2073	1599	6273
1994	1915	1787	1592	6468
1995	1633	1564	1481	6551
1996	1241	1081	987	6645
1997	1060	804	422	7027
1998	794	695	401	7321
1999	723	577	356	7542
2000	626	556	348	7750
2001	497	515	322	7943
2002	440	497	323	8117
2003	533	561	302	8376
2004	557	480	305	8551
2005	500	471	312	8710
2006	424	437	288	8859
2007	538	441	269	9031
2008	559	410	225	9216
2009	356	309	152	9373
2010	318	149	85	9437
Total	28671	28671	19234	

* Residents of San Francisco at time of HIV/AIDS diagnosis.
 (1) Data in recent years is incomplete due to delay in cases/deaths reporting.

HIV/AIDS Quarterly Surveillance Report
Summary of San Francisco Residents with HIV/AIDS*
Reported as of 09/30/2010

Table 13. AIDS Cases by Initial AIDS-Defining Condition and Year of AIDS Diagnosis, San Francisco, 1980-2010

Initial AIDS-Defining Condition	Year of AIDS Diagnosis		
	1980-1989 No. (%)	1990-1995 No. (%)	1996-2010 No. (%)
Bacterial infections, recurrent, <13 years [HIV+(1)]	1 (0.0)	4 (0.0)	3 (0.0)
Candidiasis of bronchi, trachea, or lungs	15 (0.2)	6 (0.0)	4 (0.1)
Candidiasis of esophagus	221 (2.6)	217 (1.8)	92 (1.2)
Cervical cancer, invasive [HIV+]	1 (0.0)	1 (0.0)	4 (0.1)
Coccidioidomycosis, disseminated or extrapulmonary [HIV+]	4 (0.0)	2 (0.0)	2 (0.0)
Cryptococcosis, extrapulmonary	197 (2.3)	130 (1.1)	53 (0.7)
Cryptosporidiosis, intestinal (>1 mo. duration)	105 (1.2)	176 (1.5)	53 (0.7)
Cytomegalovirus (except liver, spleen, lymph nodes), >1 month of age	101 (1.2)	93 (0.8)	11 (0.1)
CMV retinitis with loss of vision [HIV+]	34 (0.4)	67 (0.6)	12 (0.2)
HIV encephalopathy [HIV+]	181 (2.1)	163 (1.3)	48 (0.6)
Herpes simplex: chronic (>1 mo.), bronchitis, pneumonitis, esophagitis	49 (0.6)	39 (0.3)	12 (0.2)
Histoplasmosis, disseminated or extrapulmonary [HIV+]	10 (0.1)	8 (0.1)	8 (0.1)
Isosporiasis, intestinal (>1 mo. duration) [HIV+]	8 (0.1)	8 (0.1)	5 (0.1)
Kaposi's sarcoma (2)	1852 (21.5)	765 (6.3)	229 (2.9)
Lymphoid interstitial pneumonia/pulmonary lymphoid hyperplasia, <13 years	3 (0.0)	1 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Lymphoma, Burkitt's (non-Hodgkin's) [HIV+]	55 (0.6)	27 (0.2)	26 (0.3)
Lymphoma, immunoblastic (non-Hodgkin's) [HIV+]	200 (2.3)	153 (1.3)	68 (0.9)
Lymphoma, primary in brain (2)	19 (0.2)	12 (0.1)	10 (0.1)
Mycobacterium avium complex or M. kansasii, disseminated or extrapulmonary	139 (1.6)	103 (0.9)	18 (0.2)
Mycobacterium tuberculosis, pulmonary [HIV+]	43 (0.5)	117 (1.0)	59 (0.7)
Mycobacterium tuberculosis, disseminated or extrapulmonary [HIV+]	62 (0.7)	61 (0.5)	26 (0.3)
Mycobacterium other species, disseminated or extrapulmonary [HIV+]	12 (0.1)	14 (0.1)	1 (0.0)
Pneumocystis carinii pneumonia	3611 (42.0)	1586 (13.1)	508 (6.4)
Pneumonia, recurrent [HIV+]	33 (0.4)	123 (1.0)	91 (1.1)
Progressive multifocal leukoencephalopathy	37 (0.4)	8 (0.1)	5 (0.1)
Salmonella sepsis, recurrent [HIV+]	6 (0.1)	1 (0.0)	1 (0.0)
Toxoplasmosis of brain, >1 month of age	147 (1.7)	74 (0.6)	22 (0.3)
Wasting syndrome [HIV+]	223 (2.6)	333 (2.8)	129 (1.6)
CD4 T lymphocyte count <200 or percent <14 [HIV+]	1235 (14.3)	7788 (64.5)	6483 (81.2)
Any AIDS indicator condition, HIV-negative and CD4 count <400 (3)	3 (0.0)	1 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Total	8607 (100)	12081 (100)	7983 (100)

* Residents of San Francisco at time of HIV/AIDS diagnosis.

(1) [HIV+]: Indicator conditions that require laboratory evidence of HIV infection.

(2) Laboratory evidence of HIV infection in persons > 60 years of age.

(3) In the absence of other causes of immunocompromise.

HIV/AIDS Quarterly Surveillance Report
Summary of San Francisco Residents with HIV/AIDS*
Reported as of 09/30/2010

Table 14. Cumulative AIDS Indicator Conditions among Persons with AIDS, San Francisco, 1980-2010

AIDS Indicator Condition (1)	Total No. (%)
Bacterial infections, recurrent, <13 years [HIV+(2)]	11 (0.0)
Candidiasis of bronchi, trachea, or lungs	138 (0.5)
Candidiasis of esophagus	2568 (9.0)
Cervical cancer, invasive [HIV+]	12 (0.0)
Coccidioidomycosis, disseminated or extrapulmonary [HIV+]	63 (0.2)
Cryptococcosis, extrapulmonary	1865 (6.5)
Cryptosporidiosis, intestinal (>1 mo. duration)	1374 (4.8)
Cytomegalovirus (except liver, spleen, lymph nodes), >1 month of age	2453 (8.6)
CMV retinitis with loss of vision [HIV+]	2486 (8.7)
HIV encephalopathy [HIV+]	2481 (8.7)
Herpes simplex: chronic (>1 mo.), bronchitis, pneumonitis, esophagitis	436 (1.5)
Histoplasmosis, disseminated or extrapulmonary [HIV+]	158 (0.6)
Isosporiasis, intestinal (>1 mo. duration) [HIV+]	67 (0.2)
Kaposi's sarcoma (3)	6718 (23.4)
Lymphoid interstitial pneumonia/pulmonary lymphoid hyperplasia, <13 years	5 (0.0)
Lymphoma, Burkitt's (non-Hodgkin's) [HIV+]	546 (1.9)
Lymphoma, immunoblastic (non-Hodgkin's) [HIV+]	1133 (4.0)
Lymphoma, primary in brain (3)	391 (1.4)
Mycobacterium avium complex or M. kansasii, disseminated or extrapulmonary	5079 (17.7)
Mycobacterium tuberculosis, pulmonary [HIV+]	656 (2.3)
Mycobacterium tuberculosis, disseminated or extrapulmonary [HIV+]	479 (1.7)
Mycobacterium other species, disseminated or extrapulmonary [HIV+]	332 (1.2)
Pneumocystis carinii pneumonia	11000 (38.4)
Pneumonia, recurrent [HIV+]	1009 (3.5)
Progressive multifocal leukoencephalopathy	310 (1.1)
Salmonella sepsis, recurrent [HIV+]	58 (0.2)
Toxoplasmosis of brain; >1 month of age	1160 (4.0)
Wasting syndrome [HIV+]	4336 (15.1)

* Residents of San Francisco at time of HIV/AIDS diagnosis.

(1) Cases may have more than one condition.

(2) [HIV+]: Indicator conditions that require laboratory evidence of HIV infection.

(3) Laboratory evidence of HIV infection in persons > 60 years of age.

HIV/AIDS Quarterly Surveillance Report
Summary of San Francisco Residents with HIV/AIDS*
Reported as of 09/30/2010

Table 15. Living Adult/Adolescent HIV/AIDS Cases (>12 years) by Transmission Category, San Francisco

Transmission Category	No.	(%)
Gay or bisexual male	10978	(72.3)
Heterosexual male injection drug user	649	(4.3)
Heterosexual female injection drug user	420	(2.8)
Gay or bisexual male injection drug user	1957	(12.9)
Lesbian or bisexual injection drug user	43	(0.3)
Transgender (1)	337	(2.2)
Hemophiliac	5	(0.0)
Heterosexual contact male (2)	143	(0.9)
Heterosexual contact female (2)	296	(2.0)
Transfusion recipient	18	(0.1)
Risk not reported/Other (3)	328	(2.2)
Total	15174	(100)

Table 16. Living HIV/AIDS Cases by Transmission Category and Race/Ethnicity, San Francisco

Transmission Category	White No. (%)	African American No. (%)	Latino No. (%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander No. (%)	Native American No. (%)
Adult/Adolescent					
Gay or bisexual male	7623 (79.1)	895 (43.6)	1859 (75.6)	605 (77.8)	43 (48.9)
Injection drug user (IDU)	404 (4.2)	494 (24.1)	121 (4.9)	24 (3.1)	15 (17.0)
Gay or bisexual male IDU	1358 (14.1)	358 (17.4)	275 (11.2)	68 (8.7)	23 (26.1)
Lesbian or bisexual IDU	18 (0.2)	17 (0.8)	5 (0.2)	1 (0.1)	2 (2.3)
Hemophiliac	3 (0.0)	2 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Heterosexual (2)	92 (1.0)	180 (8.8)	113 (4.6)	47 (6.0)	4 (4.5)
Transfusion recipient	6 (0.1)	3 (0.1)	5 (0.2)	4 (0.5)	0 (0.0)
Risk not reported/Other (3)	131 (1.4)	95 (4.6)	69 (2.8)	23 (3.0)	0 (0.0)
Pediatric (0-12 years) (4)	5 (0.1)	10 (0.5)	12 (0.5)	6 (0.8)	1 (1.1)
Total	9640 (100)	2054 (100)	2459 (100)	778 (100)	88 (100)

* Residents of San Francisco at time of HIV/AIDS diagnosis.

- (1) Transgender information was collected since September 1996. Data prior to this are incomplete.
- (2) Includes persons who have had heterosexual contact with a person with HIV/AIDS or with a person who is at risk for HIV.
- (3) Includes persons for whom risk information is incomplete (due to death, refusal to be interviewed or loss to follow-up), cases still under investigation, or interviewed patients who offered no plausible risk for HIV.
- (4) Includes children who have hemophilia or other coagulation disorder, have received a blood transfusion, or who have acquired their infection from an infected mother during the perinatal period.

HIV/AIDS Quarterly Surveillance Report
Summary of San Francisco Residents with HIV/AIDS*
Reported as of 09/30/2010

Table 17. Living HIV/AIDS Cases by Gender, Age Group and Race/Ethnicity, San Francisco

Male Current Age (Years)	White No. (%)	African American No. (%)	Latino No. (%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander No. (%)	Native American No. (%)	Total (1) No. (%)
0 - 12	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (0.0)
13 - 19	3 (0.0)	4 (0.3)	2 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	9 (0.1)
20 - 24	40 (0.4)	29 (1.8)	36 (1.6)	12 (1.8)	1 (1.4)	121 (0.9)
25 - 29	166 (1.8)	45 (2.9)	99 (4.5)	38 (5.6)	4 (5.5)	361 (2.6)
30 - 39	996 (10.7)	168 (10.7)	449 (20.4)	161 (23.6)	9 (12.3)	1836 (13.1)
40 - 49	3427 (36.8)	527 (33.6)	939 (42.6)	274 (40.2)	39 (53.4)	5267 (37.6)
50 - 59	3217 (34.6)	579 (36.9)	517 (23.5)	139 (20.4)	18 (24.7)	4501 (32.2)
60 +	1455 (15.6)	217 (13.8)	161 (7.3)	58 (8.5)	2 (2.7)	1902 (13.6)
Male subtotal	9304 (100)	1569 (100)	2204 (100)	682 (100)	73 (100)	13999 (100)
Female Current Age (Years)	White No. (%)	African American No. (%)	Latino No. (%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander No. (%)	Native American No. (%)	Total (1) No. (%)
0 - 12	0 (0.0)	1 (0.3)	2 (1.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (0.3)
13 - 19	1 (0.4)	2 (0.5)	5 (3.2)	1 (1.7)	0 (0.0)	11 (1.3)
20 - 24	1 (0.4)	6 (1.6)	3 (1.9)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	10 (1.1)
25 - 29	8 (3.1)	16 (4.3)	14 (9.0)	4 (6.7)	0 (0.0)	43 (4.9)
30 - 39	46 (17.8)	43 (11.7)	26 (16.8)	13 (21.7)	2 (16.7)	135 (15.4)
40 - 49	112 (43.2)	114 (30.9)	50 (32.3)	22 (36.7)	5 (41.7)	309 (35.4)
50 - 59	66 (25.5)	144 (39.0)	37 (23.9)	14 (23.3)	5 (41.7)	271 (31.0)
60 +	25 (9.7)	43 (11.7)	18 (11.6)	6 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	92 (10.5)
Female subtotal	259 (100)	369 (100)	155 (100)	60 (100)	12 (100)	874 (100)
Transgender (2) Current Age (Years)	White No. (%)	African American No. (%)	Latino No. (%)	Asian/ Pacific Islander Native American No. (%)	Total (1) No. (%)	
13 - 39	21 (27.3)	37 (31.9)	43 (43.0)	13 (33.3)	119 (35.2)	
40 +	56 (72.7)	79 (68.1)	57 (57.0)	26 (66.7)	219 (64.8)	
Transgender subtotal	77 (100)	116 (100)	100 (100)	39 (100)	338 (100)	

* Residents of San Francisco at time of HIV/AIDS diagnosis.

(1) Total includes persons with multiple or unknown race.

(2) Transgender information was collected since September 1996. Certain age or race/ethnic groups are combined for transgender cases because of small number.

ESPANOLA JACKSON
3231 Ingalls Street, San Francisco, CA 94124
espanolajackson@sbcglobal.net

November 26, 2010

C-Page

BY _____
2010 NOV 29 PM 12:22

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

File # 101311

Copy

Theresa Sparks
Executive Director
Human Rights Commission
City & County of San Francisco
25 Van Ness Avenue, Room 800
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: **Research to Verify San Francisco Local Hiring Performances**

Dear Ms. Sparks,

As you know, a final public hearing that addresses San Francisco's local hiring policy for construction is scheduled for Wednesday, December 1, 2010 at a Budget Committee Hearing at 12:00 P.M. I support local hiring, as long as "local" means that when projects are being implemented in Bayview Hunters Point, for instance, that contractors subject to such a mandate hire construction employees who actually reside in the Bayview Hunters Point community. I also recommend that specific project communities receive ongoing performance reports that answer the following questions:

1. Does historical workforce composition data for specific public works projects show how Community Based Organization (CBO) participation impacted previous local hiring practices? How does CBO participation compare to the performance of CityBuild? When making the comparison, is there a disparity in employment among the various ethnic groups, including those defined as "disadvantaged workers," that should have benefited from local hiring practices?
2. Do training opportunities linked to previous local hiring requirements lead to future job placements as Apprentices or Journeymen in San Francisco communities, or other locations outside of the City?
3. What is the impact on local hiring practices when general contractors are also required to meet LBE, SBE, MBE or WBE participation goals?

I have asked Lindley Robertson, Owner of The Labor Compliance Managers (an LBE located at 4911 3rd Street, San Francisco, CA 94124), to research the information listed above. I would also like her to provide recommendations on how to track or inspect compliance with local hiring mandates in San Francisco. Please support her research as we address these concerns in our community.

Yours truly,

Espanola Jackson

Espanola Jackson
Community Member & Advocate
Phone: (415) 467-0535

cc: Board of Supervisors -- Budget & Finance Committee
Office of Economic & Workforce Development
Public Utilities Commission
Redevelopment Agency


20

Gavin Newsom | Mayor
Tom Nolan | Chairman
Jerry Lee | Vice-Chairman
Cameron Beach | Director
Cheryl Brinkman | Director
Malcolm Heinicke | Director
Bruce Oka | Director
Nathaniel P. Ford Sr. | Executive Director/CEO

MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 23, 2010

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

FROM: Nathaniel P. Ford Sr.
Executive Director/CEO 

RE: SFMTA Response to BOS Inquiry
Reference #20100928-001

BOS Inquiry #20100928-001:

This memo is in response to BOS Inquiry #20100928-001 submitted by Supervisor Carmen Chu and Supervisor John Avalos on September 28, 2010 requesting that the Municipal Transportation Agency research the frequency and number of times the MTA has "short-turned" their LRV lines over the last two years, as well as the MTA's policy on notification of the riders of these disruptions and plans to minimize impacts.

SFMTA Response:

The following is a brief explanation of why it is necessary to turn Muni trains short of the end terminals. Specifically, the focus of this information will be on the L Taraval, M Oceanview and N Judah lines in the outbound direction.

The Muni LRV system is comprised of five lines converging within the Metro Tunnel. A single delay within the tunnel affects all five lines when they leave the system. Each line is also affected by external problems outside of our control. These range from traffic congestion to non-SFMTA accidents.

To mitigate the impact of delay, specific actions have to be taken to re-balance the lines to assure that service is returned to a normal headway between vehicles. The ability to make up time to meet the schedule is very limited due to the mode of the vehicle. In mixed flow traffic, we are regulated like any motor vehicle by stop signs, traffic signals and stopping at the Muni customer stops.

Other actions have to be taken to balance the schedule. These actions can include holding other trains at the Terminal and spacing the service until the late train catches up. In some cases this tactic works, however by extending the headway between vehicles, it can result in overcrowding on the other vehicles on that line.

The most efficient way to restore scheduled headways as quickly as possible is to utilize an industry standard of turning trains short of the end of the line at a location where there is the least impact to our passengers and returns the spacing between trains back to normal.

Procedures are in place as to who has the authority to turn a train short of the terminal, where the turn will take place and why the action is necessary. There are three parties involved in the decision to turn the train short of the end of the line, those being the Control Center, the Line Management Center and the Field Inspector.

The location of the short turn is dependent on how late the train is, how many other trains are late, how many the trains running in close proximity are late and how many passengers there are on each vehicle. In most cases, usually only one vehicle is late and requires a turn. The closest switchback track to the end of the line is utilized to return the vehicle to a normal headway. This location also impacts the least amount of passengers, less than nine percent on each line. Switching back mid-line would impact a far greater number of passengers. A train is also not turned unless there is a train behind in close proximity, less than five minutes, to accommodate the displaced passengers.

The following is customer and trip data per line:

N Judah:

The N Judah carries approximately 45,100 passengers daily. There are a total of 304 trips operated daily on approximately seven minute headways. Our average customer capacity is approximately 1,980 per hour.

L Taraval:

The L Taraval carries approximately 27,950 passengers daily. There are a total of 262 trips operated daily on approximately eight minute headways. Our hourly customer demand is 1,760 per hour.

M Oceanview:


The M Oceanview carries approximately 28,480 passengers daily. There are a total of 218 trips operated daily on approximately ten minute headways. Our average customer demand is 1,320 per hour.

Number of Trains Switched per Line:

N Judah:

In 2009, there were a total of 226 trains that were short-turned of their terminal. This was done for various reasons, including traffic delays, subway delays and mechanical breakdowns. In 2009, the N Judah made approximately 70,545 trips. This indicates that less than a third of a percent of N Judah trains were turned short of the Terminal.


In January through October 2010, there have been a total of 378 trains switched back short of the terminal. Through October, there had been 60,125 trips on the N Judah, with two thirds of a percent rate of trains being short-turned.



L Taraval:

In 2009, there were a total of 97 trains that were short-turned of their terminal, for similar incidents as listed above. The total number of L Taraval trips for the year was 60,970. This indicates that less than a third of a percent of L Taraval trains were turned short of their terminal.

From January to October 2010, there were a total of 177 trains turned short of the terminal. The total number of trips from January to October was 51,535 with just over a third of a percent rate of turning back trains. However, the numbers for the 2010 L Taraval service are increased due to the St. Francis Circle Construction project, which nearly doubled the rush hour capacity on the L Taraval line.




M Oceanview:

In 2009, there were a total of 73 trains that were short-turned before the end of the line for the similar reasons for the N Judah line as listed above. The total trips for 2009 was 50,585 trips with less than a third of a percent of the trains being turned back short of the terminals.


From January to October 2010, there were a total of 61 trains turned short of the terminal. The total number of trips from January to October was 43,675 with a turnback percentage of less than a third of a percent.

The numbers for the M Oceanview line reflect the changes in the service due to the St. Francis Circle Project.



Passenger Complaints from 311

We asked 311 for the lists of complaints that they received regarding the switchback of trains. We have broken those complaints down by each line:



After investigating the complaints received by 311 regarding trains that were short turned, the most common complaints were:

- Announcements were infrequent and there was little communication between Operators and customers;
- The destinations signs on the LRVs were incorrect;
- Two back-to-back trains were switched back;
- Customers had to wait too long for the next train;
- The T Third Line had too many switched back trains in a row at 3rd and 23rd Streets; and
- Switching back trains after 10:00 p.m. may be unsafe for waiting customers.

Also note that additional complaints would be received from customers travelling inbound if we failed to turn back trains to fill gaps in service.

Action Items

Going forward, the SFMTA will be taking the following actions to minimize the impact of switchbacks on customers:

- Ensuring vehicle destination signs display the correct final destination for the train;
- Operator announcements en route to advise customers of the switchback destinations and location of the following train;
- If possible, establish the switchback prior to departure from Embarcadero Station, so that platform signs, on-board announcements and LRV signs display the correct information of the final destination of the train;

- Do not turn a train unless there is a following train within five minutes of the train being turned; and
- Immediate implementation of a standby train at the N Judah and L Taraval outer terminals to fill gaps in service and reduce the need to turn back trains at Sunset Boulevard.

BOS-11
C Page



SFUSD SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Susan Wong, Executive Director
Office of Equity Assurance
555 Franklin Street
San Francisco, California 94103
T: (415)355-7334 F: (415)355-7333
wongs@sfusd.edu

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 NOV 24 PM 2:33
BYND

November 22, 2010

Memorandum

To: Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

From: Susan Wong

Cc: Angela Miller
Deputy General Counsel, SFUSD

Subject: *Williams* Annual Report, November 2010

Pursuant to California Education Code Section 1240, the Board of Supervisors shall receive an informational copy of the annual report that describes 1) the sufficiency of instructional materials; 2) the condition of facilities in the San Francisco Unified School District; and 3) the documentation verification for helping all students in the Class of June 2010 to pass the CAHSEE (California High School Exit Exam). The annual report outlines the findings of the independent auditors who visited 30 SFUSD schools ranked in deciles 1, 2 or 3 based on the 2009 Academic Performance Index. These visits occurred during the first four weeks of school, and at least 25% of the visits were unannounced.

Please distribute the attached reports to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Encl: *Williams* Annual Report

22

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
San Francisco, California 94102

Special Order of Business
Regular Meeting of the Board of Education
October 26, 2010

SUBJECT: *Williams* Independent Auditors Oversight Requirements

REQUESTED ACTION: That the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District accepts the reports from the Independent Auditors for the *Williams* oversight visits for SY 2010-2011 of the District's thirty "deciles 1-3" schools based on the 2009 API.

BACKGROUND: California Education Code Section 1240 requires that the District contract with independent auditors to visit schools identified as "deciles 1-3" schools on the 2009 API ranking and report the results of the visits to the County Board of Education.

The purpose of the visits as specified in California Education Code Section 1240 is to monitor for:


1. The sufficiency of textbooks and instructional materials as defined in Education Code Section 60119;
2. The condition of a facility that poses an emergency or urgent threat to the health and safety of pupils or staff as defined by Education Code Section 17592.72;
3. The accuracy of data reported on the school accountability report card (SARC) with respect to the availability of sufficient textbooks and instructional materials, and the safety, cleanliness and adequacy of school facilities, including "good repair" as required by Education Code Sections 17014, 17032.5, 17070.75, and 17089.
4. (i) The extent to which pupil who have not passed the high school exit examination by the end of 12th grade are informed that they are entitled to receive intensive instructions and services up to two consecutive academic years after completion of grade 12 or until the pupil has passed both parts of the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE), whichever comes first, pursuant to paragraph (4) and (5) of subdivision (d) of Education Code Section 37254, and (ii) The extent to which pupils who have elected to receive intensive instruction and services pursuant to paragraph (5) and (5) of subdivision (d) of Education Code 37254 are being served.

The District has contracted with two independent auditors to complete the required visits:

1. Mr. James Taylor is a retired school administrator with San Francisco Unified School District. He monitored for the sufficiency of standards-aligned instructional materials. He also monitored for the services provided to students who did not pass the CAHSEE upon completion of grade 12.
2. Mr. George Kalligeros is a DSA-certified inspector with many years of school facilities experience. Mr. Kalligeros conducted visits to monitor for adequacy of facilities.

All visits began shortly after the start of the Fall 2010 semester and some were not completed within four weeks of the start of school as required by Ed Code Section 1240. The required twenty-five percent of visits were unannounced. The findings during these visits related to instructional materials, facilities conditions, and accuracy of SARC data are summarized in the attached reports from the inspectors.

The inspectors also compared the School Accountability Report Cards (SARCs) that were posted on the SFUSD website in Spring 2010 with the results of the inspections that occurred in Spring 2009 and Fall 2009. The information posted on the SARCs was accurate and reflected the data from the facilities inspection and the textbooks/instructional materials inspection of the previous year.



Date: October 18, 2010

To: Members of the San Francisco Board of Education
Carlos A. Garcia, Superintendent, San Francisco Unified School District
Board of Supervisors, County of San Francisco

CC: Susani Wong, Executive Director, Office of Equity
Daisy Santos, Supervisor, Curriculum Resources and Media
Maribel Medina, General Counsel, Legal Office
Angie Miller, Sr. Deputy Counsel, Legal Office

From: James M. Taylor, Jr.

Re: 1) 2010-2011 *Williams* Instructional Materials Inspection Report for Deciles 1-3
Schools
2) Documentation Review to Implement the *Valenzuela* Settlement Legislation

As part of the *Williams v California* settlement, California Education Code Section 1240 requires a textbook and instructional materials inspection of the "deciles 1-3" schools at the beginning of each school year. The deciles 1-3 list of schools is based on the 2009 Base Academic Performance Index (API).

The purpose of my visits to the 30 elementary, middle, and high schools was to ensure that students have access to "sufficient" standards-aligned instructional materials in four core subject areas (English language arts, mathematics, history/social science, and science) and in health and foreign language, and to determine the availability of science laboratory equipment. "Sufficient instructional materials" means every pupil, including English language learners, has standards-aligned textbooks, instructional materials, or both, to use in class and to take home. I visited each school an average of two to three times depending on need. I visited one schools five times in order to provide support for new administrators who were putting new procedures into place.

Although I made my first visits to some of the schools during the week of August 16, 2010, most of the school administrators were involved with enrolling students, helping new teachers, looking for lost students, and just too busy to speak with me about textbooks. I conducted visits between August 23 and September 17, 2010, with additional return visits for some schools throughout September and early October. Although Ed Code 1240 requires all visits to be done by the first

four weeks of school, an exception was made for this year since it was the transitional year for all district schools to begin a week earlier on August 16. At least 25% of the visits were unannounced.

There was no district wide new adoption of core curriculum materials purchased centrally for every student for implementation in August 2010.

New health instructional materials were purchased for all high schools in Spring 2008. One class set per teacher was provided since the budget did not allow for the purchase of one book per student. Due to class size increase extra books were ordered for Marshall HS on Sept. 20, 2010. Thus all high school students taking health education have textbooks to use in class, but not to take home. Burton High School received a loan of 58 health books from Mission HS.

Two high schools were short in books for world languages. Marshall HS was short in textbooks for French and Spanish. Extras books were ordered on Sept. 16, 2009. Mission HS was short on books for Chinese. O'Connell HS was short on books for French. Extra books were ordered on Sept. 20, 2010. All 30 schools had sufficient books in the core academic area of English in all grade levels. In addition to the textbooks, I viewed instructional materials such as map puzzles, globes, computer generated learning games, board games, consumable workbooks, science activities kits, and manipulatives to accompany some of the math and science texts in the elementary schools. The binder with the individual school inspections is available for review in the Office of Equity Assurance. (According to a survey of the high school science department heads, most schools have the basic equipment and materials needed for biology, chemistry, and physics.)

Accountability for the assignment, distribution, and retrieval of textbooks was achieved through hand counts and documentation audits led by classroom staff, school site administration, and staff from District Textbook Office, and independent site visits. All secondary schools submitted a copy of their textbook distribution/ retrieval policy along with their current practice of handling lost textbooks.

The visits found that all sites supplied students, staff, parents and community members with ample information concerning the *Williams* settlement. Informational signs were posted in all classrooms and common areas in English and in Spanish and/or Chinese as needed depending on the population of the school. A large percentage of the school staff were at least familiar with, if not quite knowledgeable about the purpose of the visits.

The District continues to improve processes for ensuring that all students receive sufficient textbooks. Communication between schools sites and the District Textbook Office appeared to be effective and highly responsive in nature. The Textbook Office has been proactive in past years ensuring all schools receive adequate numbers of newly adopted textbooks in a timely manner. Ms. Daisy Santos, the Supervisor of the District Textbook Office and her staff has also worked diligently with schools to order replacement textbooks in a timely manner. At several individual schools, the staff has developed extremely effective textbook management systems that have increased efficiency and is supported by communication with the District Textbook Office. There remain areas for improvement:

- There was a delay in the release of district funds for purchasing instructional materials. Funds were not released until July 28, 2010.
- In some schools, high turnover of staff (administrators, clerks, and teachers) led to increased confusion at the start of the school year, including late orders for replacement textbooks and late identification and distribution of textbooks.
- There should be more accountability at the school sites, and ultimately with students for replacing lost or damaged textbooks. The District spends thousands of dollars annually to purchase replacement textbooks for schools that could and should be spent on more meaningful expenditures.
- New classes were formed in some schools after August 16 that required the ordering of additional books.
- There was some confusion as to the implementation of the Lau Plan in which some teachers believed that they were entitled to two sets of books, one in English and one in Spanish.

Because this year's textbook purchase and timely distribution of materials was not as smooth as it has been in past years, appropriate district staff will draft new administrative regulations that will guide the textbook ordering process for the 2011-2012 school year.

Attached in the appendix is a summary of "Sufficiency of Instructional Materials."

County Superintendent Documentation Review to Implement the Valenzuela Settlement Legislation

Education Code section 1240(c) (2) (E) and 1240(c) (2) (J) adds new monitoring responsibilities for county superintendents beginning in the 2007-2008 school year. Statute requires the County Superintendent to annually verify that pupils in county offices of education, school districts, and charter schools who attended participating local educational agencies (LEAs) and who have not passed one or both parts of the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE) by the end of grade 12 are informed of their eligibility to receive intensive instruction and services for up to two consecutive academic years after the completion of grade 12 or until they pass the CAHSEE, whichever comes first. In addition, County Superintendents will verify that pupils who elect to be served in this program are provided services. Participating LEAs are defined as those agencies that receive funding under the CAHSEE intensive instruction and services program.

Beginning in 2008-2009, the annual visit by County Superintendents to schools in Decile 1-3 for compliance with *Williams* will include determinations of the extent to which students have been informed and served. All students with graduation dates on or after January 1, 2008 are required to take and pass the CAHSEE in order to receive a diploma.

On July 28, 2009 Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed Assembly Bill 2 of the 2009-10 Fourth Extraordinary Session (ABX4 2) (Chapter 2, Statutes of 2009). ABX4 2 enacted California Education Code Section 60852.3, which, beginning in 2009-2010, would exempt an eligible student from meeting the CAHSEE requirement as a condition for graduation. An eligible student as defined in the law is a student with a disability who has an individualized program (IEP) or Section 504 Plan that indicates that the student has satisfied or will satisfy all other state and local requirements to receive a high school diploma on or after July 1, 2009. Students with disabilities are required to take the CAHSEE in grade ten for purposes of fulfilling the requirements of the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

The primary focus of the documentation review is to verify the following:

1. A notice of eligibility for services was sent to each eligible student before the end of each school term and is posted, as required.
2. Students who elected to receive services are served.
3. A revised Uniform Complaint Procedures (UCP) policy is in use and UCP notices are posted in classrooms.

The following *Williams* High Schools participated in the documentation review:

1. Burton HS
2. June Jordan School for Equity
3. Thurgood Marshall Academic High School
4. Mission High School
5. John O'Connell High School

Of the 3782 students in the city's public high schools (not counting charter schools) in the Class of June 2010, 70 students did not pass the CAHSEE. 12 of the 70 students attended one of the *Williams* high school listed above and 58 attended other district high schools.

Please see "Valenzuela Visitation Checklist and Documentation Verification for Class of June 2010" in the appendix of this report.

All of the high schools were in compliance with the spirit and the substance of the *Valenzuela* Settlement.



Sufficiency of Instructional Materials

Education Code 60119 (c)(1)

Each pupil, including English Learners, has a standards-aligned textbook or instructional material, or both, to use in class and to take home in the four subject areas: reading/language arts, mathematics, science, and history/social science.

	School	Yes	No	Comments
1	Bryant ES	✓		
2	Buena Vista ES	✓		
3	Carver ES	✓		
4	Chavez ES	✓		
5	Cleveland ES	✓		
6	El Dorado ES		✓	On Sept. 26, 2010, the school received the 20 copies of <i>Grade 3 Science Resource Book FOSS</i> , and the 20 copies of <i>Our Communities, Grade 3 (Social Studies)</i> .
7	Fairmount S	✓		
8	Flynn ES	✓		
9	Harte ES	✓		
10	Hillcrest ES	✓		
11	King ES	✓		
12	Marshall ES	✓		
13	Muir ES	✓		
14	Parks ES	✓		
15	Sanchez ES	✓		
16	Denman MS	✓		
17	Everett MS	✓		
18	Francisco MS	✓		
19	King MS	✓		
20	Mann MS	✓		

	School	Yes	No	Comments
21	Visitacion Valley MS	✓		
22	Burton HS	✓		Mission HS loan them Burton HS 58 Health Books for this year.
23	June Jordan Sch for Equity	✓		
24	Marshall HS		✓	On October 7, 2010, Thurgood Marshall received all of their ordered textbooks. Prior to that time, the students use teacher prepared materials and other textbooks. 35 physiology textbooks were ordered due to the popularity of the class with sufficient students to offer another section.
25	Mission HS		✓	Math Dept. is in a transition year of realigning their course sequences to meet A-G requirements for UC. Because 9 th graders take either algebra or geometry, the plan is to have all 10 th graders take adv. algebra. 11 th graders could then take geometry or precalculus. Science Dept is also realigning their science courses so that all 9 th graders will take conceptual physics, 10 th graders take biology, and 11 th graders take chemistry, with all classes meeting the A-G requirements. Currently, students are not without textbooks. They are using various textbooks until the 200 copies of <i>Discovering Advanced Algebra</i> books and 130 copies of <i>Precalculus Graphing and Data Analysis</i> arrive.
26	O'Connell HS		✓	The Science Dept. is offering its 9 th graders a class on marine biology which will meet the A-G requirements for UC. While they are awaiting the delivery of 159 copies <i>Life on an Ocean Planet</i> , the students do have materials and books to use in class and to take home.
27	Willie Brown Academy 4-8	✓		
28	Carmichael ES K-8	✓		
29	International Studies 6-12	✓		
30	Revere ES K-8		✓	By Sept. 21, 2010, the school received the 3 math books for the 3 rd and 10 math books for the 4 th grade. The shortage was due to an increase in enrollment of special education students.



Date: October 1, 2010

To: Members of the San Francisco Board of Education
Carlos Garcia, Superintendent, San Francisco Unified School District
Board of Supervisors, County of San Francisco

CC: David Goldin, Chief Facilities Officer
Susan Wong, Executive Director, Office of Equity Assurance
John Bitoff, Executive Director, Maintenance and Operations
Larry Burnett, Maintenance Manager, Building and Grounds
Angie Miller, Sr. Deputy General Counsel

From: George Kalligeros, Facilities Inspector

Re: *2010-2011 Williams Facilities Inspection Report for Deciles 1-3 Schools*

In accordance with California Education Code Section 1240, I have conducted visits of schools identified as "decile 1-3" schools in San Francisco Unified School District based on their 2006 API rankings. The priority objective of the visits was to determine the status of the following circumstances:

- the condition of a facility that poses an emergency or urgent threat to the health and safety of pupils or staff and
- the accuracy of SARC data with respect to the safety, cleanliness, and adequacy of school facilities, including good repair.

The visits were conducted between August 18, 2010 and September 13, 2010. The visits were completed within four weeks from the first day of school as required by Ed Code Section 1240.

During this time, George Mattis and I inspected thirty deciles 1-3 schools, two more schools than the previous year. In order to monitor the adequacy of facilities, we inspected all classrooms, as well as the cafeteria, gymnasium, auditorium, playground, library, administrative offices, ancillary support areas, all restrooms, and teacher's lounges. We did not inspect storage rooms, the custodian's closet, or areas that were under construction. As required by the Ed Code, twenty-five percent of school visits were unannounced.

Inspection Instrument

For our inspection, we used the Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT), revised as of July 1, 2009, that was developed by the Office of Public School Construction to determine if a school facility is in "good repair" as defined by Education Code (EC) Section 17002(d)(1) and to rate the facility pursuant to EC Section 1700(d)(2). Each room or area in the school was inspected for these 15 components.

Criteria for Scoring

Good Repair Standard outlines the school facility systems and components, as specified in EC Section 17002(d)(1) that should be considered in the inspection of a school facility to ensure it is maintained in a manner that assures it is clean, safe, and functional. Each of the 15 sections in the Good Repair Standard provides a description of a minimum standard of good repair for various school facility categories. The 15 sections are:

Section		Section	
1	Gas Leaks	9	Sinks/Fountains
2	Heating, vent. air condit (HVAC)	10	Fire Safety
3	Sewer	11	Hazardous Material
4	Interior Surfaces	12	Structural Damage
5	Overall Cleanliness	13	Roofs
6	Pest/Vermin Infestation	14	Playground/School Grounds
7	Electrical	15	Windows/Doors/Gates/Fence
8	Restrooms		

When George and I evaluated a room or area in the school using these good repair standards, we marked "√" for no deficiency, a "D" for some deficiency, an "X" for extreme deficiency, and "NA" for non-applicable. Each school received a "percent of System in Good Repair" for each section: number of "√"s divided by (total Areas minus "NA"s.) The 15 sections were further grouped into 8 categories:

- Systems: gas leaks, HVAC, sewers
- Interior: interior surfaces
- Cleanliness: over all cleanliness, pest/vermin infestation
- Electrical: electrical
- Restrms/fountains: restrooms, sinks/fountains
- Safety: fire safety, hazardous materials
- Structural: structural damage, roofs
- External: playgrounds/school grounds, windows/doors/gate/fences

The average score of the 8 categories determined the school score and school rating.

Listed below is a table that shows the percentage, description, and rating scale:

Percentage	Description	Rating
99.00%-100%	The school meets most or all standards of good repair. Deficiencies noted, if any, are not significant and/or impact a very small area of the school.	Exemplary
90.00% -	The school is maintained in good repair with a number	Good

98.99%	of non-critical deficiencies noted. These deficiencies are isolated, and /or resulting from minor wear and tear, and/or in the process of being mitigated.	
75.00%-89.99%	The school is not in good repair. Some deficiencies noted are critical and/or widespread. Repairs and/or additional maintenance are necessary in several areas in the school site.	Fair
0%-74.99%	The school facilities are in poor condition. Deficiencies of various degrees have been noted throughout the site. Major repairs and maintenance are necessary throughout campus.	Poor

Changes in the Scoring and Ratings Effective July 1, 2009

The FIT was revised by the Office of Public School Construction in May 2009 to be used effective July 1, 2009. The reasons for recalibrating the FIT was that it was too easy for most schools to obtain a high score, thus minimizing the deficiencies and decreasing the urgency of having staff act on the repairs. While in previous years the school score was determined by averaging 15 sections, the current method is to combine sections that are similar and the average is determined mathematically for 8 systems, not 15 sections. See Appendix 2 for a comparison of scores between this year and three previous years.

Ratings for the Deciles 1-3 Schools

The average score for the 30 schools was 94.0% and a ranking of "Good." Seven schools from 2009-2010 school year were deleted and 9 new "Deciles 1-3" schools were added. See Appendix 2 for the new schools that were added.

The distribution of ratings is:

Number of schools	Rating
4	Exemplary
18	Good
8	Fair
0	Poor

Compared to 2009-2010, (based on the remaining 21 schools – see Appendix 3) 12 schools retained the same rating, 6 schools increased a step in rating (example: went from good to exemplary), and 3 schools dropped a step in their rating (example: went from good to fair).

See the Appendix 1 – 3 for specific scores and ratings.

Extreme Deficiencies in the Good Repair Standard

Some of the conditions cited in the Good Repair Standard represent items that are critical to the health and safety of pupils and staff. Any deficiencies in these items require immediate attention and left unmitigated could cause severe and immediate injury, illness or death of the occupants. These critical conditions are identified with underlined text followed by an (X) on the Good Repair Standard. Extreme deficiencies were noted in the

following categories by number of occurrences. Work orders were generated to correct these deficiencies.

Category	# of Rooms	Examples of Extreme Deficiencies
Mech/Hvac	2	Ventilation system out of order or not regulated properly.
Interior Surfaces	1	Protruding copper pipes at Kitchen floor – Tripping Hazard
Electrical	1	Wheel chair lift out of order.
Fire Safety	6	6 areas with Emergency Exit signs broken or inoperative both electrical and emergency power.
Playgrounds/School Grounds	1	Broken concrete stair treads on outside Gym staircase – Tripping Hazard

There were no Schools with a Rating of “Poor”

Accuracy of the School Accountability Report Cards

In reviewing the 2009-2010 facilities inspection reports completed by me for the same schools in September 2009 and in reviewing the School Accountability Report Cards that are currently on the SFUSD website, both sets of documents are accurate in that the same information and rankings are recorded.

Summary

1. With the exception of the eight schools that had “extreme deficiencies” in specific areas the other 22 schools were in good repair.
2. Beginning with this year, all “extreme deficiencies” noted during the inspections were reported immediately to the Office of Equity and Buildings and Grounds so that repairs could begin without further delays. This lessened the chance for students and staff to be further harmed or inconvenienced.
3. By visiting the same schools and reviewing last year’s inspections, it was gratifying to see some of the improvements that were made since last year. For example, June Jordan HS now has new bathrooms that are ADA compliant and all modernization work has been completed.
4. SFUSD has complied with the *Williams* Settlement in its facilities inspection of all schools, including the of deciles 1-3 schools. The Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT) was

used during the past four years. SFUSD administrators and managers participate in the inspections of all schools in the district other than those who are in deciles 1-3. It appears that there is a high degree of organization, cooperation, and pride within the various departments that are working together to detect the deficiencies and to implement the repairs that are needed. While the coordination of the facilities inspection and *Williams* complaints are sent to the Office of Equity Assurance, Buildings and Grounds staff is responsible for generating the work orders and deploying staff to correct the deficiencies. The Department of Research, Planning and Accountability is responsible for posting the facilities inspection information on the Student Accountability Report Cards for all of the schools on the district website and for refining the FIT instrument for ease of use and accuracy and consistency in scoring.

We thank the school staffs for welcoming us to their schools at the beginning of the school year in September. A complete binder of the individual school inspections is with Susan Wong at the Office of Equity Assurance and another one with Larry Burnett at Buildings and Grounds.

Appendix 1 -" Deciles 1 - 3" Schools Listed by Score and Rating

	SCHOOL	SCORE	RATING
1	Jordan HS	100.0	Exemplary
2	Bryant ES	99.4	Exemplary
3	Sanchez ES	99.4	Exemplary
4	Fairmount ES	99.2	Exemplary
5	Buena Vista ES	98.9	Good
6	Cleveland ES	98.9	Good
7	Marshall ES	98.8	Good
8	Hillcrest ES	98.7	Good
9	Burton HS	98.4	Good
10	Carmichael ES	98.4	Good
11	Chavez ES	97.7	Good
12	Francisco MS	97.6	Good
13	Parks ES	97.4	Good
14	Mission HS	97.0	Good
15	Muir ES	96.9	Good
16	Harte ES	96.0	Good
17	Brown, Willie ES	95.6	Good
18	O'Connell HS	95.6	Good
19	Carver ES	95.1	Good
20	King MS	93.6	Good
21	Everett MS	93.0	Good
22	King ES	92.0	Good
23	Int Studies Acad HS	86.7	Fair
24	Mann MS	86.7	Fair
25	El Dorado ES	86.4	Fair
26	Denman MS	86.1	Fair
27	Visitacion Valley MS	86.0	Fair
28	Marshall HS	85.8	Fair
29	Revere ES	85.3	Fair
30	Flynn ES	80.7	Fair
	Average of 30 Schools	94.0	Good

Appendix 2 - "Deciles 1-3" Schools Listed Alphabetically with Previous Years Scores

SCHOOL	2010 Score	2010 Rating	2009 Score	2009 Rating	Difference 2010-2009	2008 Rating	2008 Rating	2007 Score	2007 Rating
1 Brown, Willie ES	95.6	Good	98.5	Good	-2.9	93.1	Good	97.0	Good
2 Bryant ES	99.4	Exemplary	97.5	Good	1.9	95.1	Good	96.0	Good
3 Buena Vista ES	98.9	Good	98.9	Good	0	96.3	Good	88.0	Good
4 Burton HS	98.4	Good	New						
5 Carmichael ES	98.8	Good	New						
6 Carver ES	95.1	Good	95.5	Good	-0.4	96.0	Good	91.4	Good
7 Chavez ES	97.7	Good	New						
8 Cleveland ES	98.9	Good	80.2	Fair	18.7	79.1	Fair	85.6	Good
9 Denman MS	86.1	Fair	New						
10 El Dorado ES	86.4	Fair	New						
11 Everett MS	93.0	Good	60.6	Poor	32.4	99.2	Exemplary	94.0	Good
12 Fairmount ES	99.2	Exemplary	99.6	Exemplary	-0.4	92.0	Good	89.0	Good
13 Flynn ES	80.7	Fair	87.2	Fair	-6.5	99.7	Exemplary	93.0	Good
14 Francisco MS	97.6	Good	New						
15 Harte ES	96.0	Good	New						
16 Hillcrest ES	98.7	Good	98.1	Good	0.6	92.8	Good	95.0	Good
17 Int. Studies Acad. HS	86.7	Fair	81.6	Fair	5.1	96.8	Good	95.0	Good
18 Jordan HS	100.0	Exemplary	99.2	Exemplary	0.8	71.4	Fair	98.0	Exemplary
19 King ES	92.0	Good	New						
20 King MS	93.6	Good	New						
21 Mann MS	86.7	Fair	87.0	Fair	-0.3	92.8	Good	93.0	Good
22 Marshall Acad. HS	85.8	Fair	86.1	Fair	-0.3	92.8	Good	97.0	Good
23 Marshall ES	98.8	Good	99.1	Exemplary	-0.3	99.2	Exemplary	94.0	Good
24 Mission HS	97.0	Good	72.1	Poor	24.9	99.4	Exemplary	95.0	Good
25 Muir ES	86.9	Fair	90.1	Good	-3.2	76.5	Fair	93.0	Good
26 O'Connell HS	95.6	Good	99.3	Exemplary	-3.7	85.8	Good	88.0	Good
27 Parks ES	97.4	Good	83.3	Fair	14.1	93.0	Good	96.0	Good
28 Revere ES	84.4	Fair	85.3	Fair	-0.9	99.2	Exemplary	94.0	Good
29 Sanchez ES	99.4	Exemplary	99.0	Exemplary	0.4	99.3	Exemplary	92.0	Good
30 Visitacion Valley MS	86.0	Fair	62.0	Poor	24.0	85.3	Good	82.0	Fair

Appendix 3 - Change in Good Repair Status from Previous Year

<u>SCHOOL</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>UP/DOWN</u>
Brown, Willie ES	Good	Good	Same
Bryant ES	Good	Exemplary	Up
Buena Vista ES	Good	Good	Same
Carver ES	Good	Good	Same
Cleveland ES	Fair	Good	Up
Everett MS	Poor	Good	Up
Fairmount ES	Exemplary	Exemplary	Same
Flynn ES	Fair	Fair	Same
Hillcrest ES	Good	Good	Same
Int. Studies Acad. HS	Fair	Fair	Same
Jordan HS	Exemplary	Exemplary	Same
Mann MS	Fair	Fair	Same
Marshall Acad HS	Fair	Fair	Same
Marshal ES	Exemplary	Good	Down
Mission HS	Poor	Good	Up
Muir ES	Good	Fair	Down
O'Connell HS	Exemplary	Good	Down
Parks ES	Fair	Good	Up
Revere ES	Fair	Fair	Same
Sanchez ES	Exemplary	Exemplary	Same
Visitation Valley MS	Poor	Fair	Up
Summary			
Schools with same ranking as previous year:		12	57%
Schools with higher ranking than previous year:		6	29%
Schools with lower ranking than previous year:		3	14%
Overall District Percentage Average for 2010:		94.0%	Good
Overall District Percentage Average for 2009:		88.5%	Fair

Seven schools from 2009 were deleted from "Deciles 1-3" listing of schools for 2010-2011.
 Nine new "Deciles 1-3" schools were added for 2010-2011 listing for inspection.

State of California Facility Inspection Tool (revised May 2009)			
<u>Rating</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>2009-2011 Percentage</u>	<u>2007-2009 Percentage</u>
Exemplary:	The school meets most or all standards of good repair.	99% - 100%	98%-100%
Good:	The school is maintained in good repair with a number of non critical deficiencies noted.	90% - 98.99%	85%-97.99%
Fair:	The school is not in good repair. Some deficiencies noted. Repairs and/or additional mainenance are necessary in several areas.	75% - 89.99%	67%-84.99%
Poor:	The school facilities are in poor condition. Deficiencies of various degrees have been noted throughout the site. Major repairs and maintenance are necessary throughout the campus.	0% - 74.9%	0%-66.9%

Valenzuela Visitation Checklist and Documentation Verification for Class of June 2010

High Schools	Notice of student eligibility posted in main office	Uniform Complaint Notice with Valenzuela provisions posted in classrooms	CAHSEE Intensive Instruction and Services provided to post grade 12 students	Written or phone communication to post grade 12 students regarding intensive instructions and services	Spreadsheet or other record tracking of student names, addresses, and results of subsequent attempts	List of students that did not pass CAHSEE from ETS or SFUSD	Copy of LEA student eligibility letter mailed home
Burton High School	Binder with student names kept in principal and assistant principal's office.	Posted in every space that is accessible to the public.	Beacon offers a Saturday CAHSEE institute.	Letter to each student is mailed at the start of each school year.	Logs are kept by 11 th and 12 th grade counselors.	Maintained in binder in Main Office.	Central Office mails home to each eligible student. Only 2 students failed CAHSEE.
June Jordan School for Equity	Yes	Yes	Offered to the one student who did not pass; waiting for summer school results/	Written and phoned one student.	One student monitored by his former advisor.	Received from SFUSD	Personal contact from advisor. All students passed CAHSEE after the summer.

High Schools	Notice of student eligibility posted in main office	Uniform Complaint Notice with <i>Valenzuela</i> provisions posted in classrooms	CAHSEE Intensive Instruction and Services provided to post grade 12 students	Written or phone communication to post grade 12 students regarding intensive instructions and services	Spreadsheet or other record tracking of student names, addresses, and results of subsequent attempts	List of students that did not pass CAHSEE from ETS or SFUSD	Copy of LEA student eligibility lettermailed home
Thurgood Marshall Academic High School	Yes	New copies posted in all classrooms	Onsite Saturday class in January 2011	Counselor sent to home.	Recorded in binder kept by counselors	Recorded in binder kept by counselors	Yes 7 students failed CAHSEE.
Mission High School	Yes	Yes	City College provides CAHSEE Prep call on Saturday, 9 – noon, Aug. 21 – Dec. 18, 2010.	Phone record kept on site	Certificate of Completion List used to monitor who needs to pass CAHSEE.	SFUSD	Sample of June 21, 2010 letter from John Burke at RPA. Only 1 student failed CAHSEE.
O'Connell High School	Informational Flyer is posted. Names are stored electronically.	Yes	After school classes provided; City College Program; testing at O'Connell.	Phone logs maintained by counselors.	Available in Counseling Office	SFUSD	Central Office mails letter home. Only 2 students failed CAHSEE.

CVIA

COLE VALLEY IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION P.O. BOX 170611, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94117

File 101491

24 November 2010

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

Dear Supervisors,

The Cole Valley Improvement Association has been working for decades to repurpose the area of Golden Gate Park presently used for industrial activities by HANC. The recycling center is a source of continuous noise and truck traffic in to the neighborhood. The use is non-conforming with the Master Plan for Golden Gate Park.

The new plan for the area includes a continuation of the Native Plant Nursery and community garden activities that would benefit the neighborhood and school children from the entire city. This would be in keeping with the Kezar Stadium mandate as primarily a facility for the use of the youth of the City. In addition the center would offer education and support for composting, the one part of the recycling that needs extra help.

The recycling center does not recycle anything that is not picked up at the curb by Recolcogy. As such it encourages the use of cars to drive materials to the site, where materials get sorted and trucked away. This approach to recycling is certainly not Green by any definition of the word. In addition materials are actually brought in by truck from other areas only to be processed and picked up by even larger trucks. It is time for this industrial use to end.

We wanted to make sure you know that we are aligned with the other neighborhood groups in this effort to return park land to appropriate use.

Yours truly,
Lena Emmery

Lena Emmery, President

REPRESENTING THE GREATER HAIGHT ASHBURY COMMUNITY

23



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 101491: Support closing of the recycling center

From: Sunil Paul <sunilpaul@springventuresllc.com>
To: "Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org" <Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Date: 11/27/2010 04:38 PM
Subject: Support closing of the recycling center

I am a neighbor (1506 willard). I strongly support changing the
recycle center to some other use. The idea of a community garden
sounds great.

sunil paul

Sent from my iPhone



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 101491: Comment on the upcoming HANC discussion for Rec and Park

From: "Leavitt Andrew" <leavitta@labmed2.ucsf.edu>
To: Recpark.commission@sfgov.org, Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 11/27/2010 11:07 AM
Subject: Comment on the upcoming HANC discussion for Rec and Park

Dear all

I am writing to express my thoughts regarding HANC, the recycling center located near Kezar Stadium.

It is my understanding that the city (Rec and Park) will meet soon to evaluate HANC and other possible uses for the site HANC occupies adjacent to Kezar.

I wish to express my strong opinion that HANC is an outdated, unnecessary operation that does far more harm than good. In the modern era with curbside recycling, HANC is not needed. While not its intention, HANC promotes illegal recycling theft in the neighborhoods that surround HANC (Cole Valley, Inner Sunset, Haight, etc.). Please discontinue HANC's occupancy/use of this site.

I am under the impression that Rec and Park is considering a community garden and education center. I do not see the need or reason for such an investment of Rec and Park's limited resources. The space could simply be left as open space, maybe incorporated (with limited \$\$\$ investment) into the surrounding area of Kezar.

I hope you take this information to heart. Lets use our space and resources wisely. But, by all means, PLEASE DISCONTINUE HANC'S PRESENCE NEAR KEZAR. IT HAS OUTLIVED ITS USEFULNESS AND HAS BECOME A BLIGHT ON THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

Respectfully

Andy Leavitt
Cole Valley Resident



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 101491: SAVE HANC

File
101491

From: Denise D Anne <ddanne1@sbcglobal.net>
To: Board of Supervisors <boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org>
Date: 11/26/2010 08:36 PM
Subject: SAVE HANC

November 26, 2010

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

City Hall

San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Member of San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT) is dedicated to urban environmental issues. The Haight- Ashbury Neighborhood enjoys widespread support and is actively supported by the San Francisco Department of the Environment.

Since Haight Asbnury Neighborhood recycling center and others like it have been established there has been our need for good urban stewardship.

San Francisco Tomorrow supports HANC Recycling Center at its present location next to Kezar Stadium and as an urban treasure.

The Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council shares SFT's vision of urban environmental sustainability. SFT

endeavor.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Clary, President

San Francisco Tomorrow

41 Sutter Street, Suite 1579

San Francisco, CA 94104-4903



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 101491: Support for Kezar changes

From: Catherine Martin <catherine@martinink.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@SFGov.org, RecPark.Commission@SFGov.org, Info@BVNASF.com
Date: 11/25/2010 03:54 PM
Subject: Support for Kezar changes

I support plans to re-purpose the Kezar recycling site in Golden Gate Park to a community garden and resource center. My reasons are as follows:

For many years, the Kezar recycling center was an innovative leader, providing one of the only locations where local residents and businesses could recycle. We congratulate the recycling center for that innovation and leadership, but times have changed.

Curbside recycling now is provided to all customers by the City's waste disposal service, Recology/Sunset Scavenger/Golden Gate Disposal, as part of a Citywide recycling commitment which diverts an amazing 77% of San Francisco's waste from landfill to recycling. The Kezar recycling center no longer is appropriate in its current location in a residential neighborhood, and especially in Golden Gate Park.

Since most residents and businesses now recycle curbside, the Kezar location has become an industrial operation with noise, truck traffic bringing recycling materials in and then back out again, and attracting other nuisances. This is not appropriate in a residential area, and in San Francisco's crown jewel of parks.

A significant number of individuals illegally poach and raid curbside recycling and city trash containers, then bring their collections to Kezar for cash. This creates noise, disturbing residents (often during the night), and often leaving unrecyclable trash on the street. It also contributes to a personally negative, enabling cycle for many of these illegal recycling poachers. Some use their recycling payments to further destructive lifestyles of substance abuse, and illegal camping in Golden Gate Park and other nearby areas (including Buena Vista Park).

This is NOT about punishing or opposing HANC, nor about abusing the rights of the homeless (including many who voluntarily choose that lifestyle, then infringe on the rights of other citizens to clean and peaceful enjoyment of parks and other public areas). It is about a very inappropriate industrial use in a key location in Golden Gate Park. HANC has been on notice about this incompatibility for a long time. It should acknowledge the conflict and move its operations voluntarily. But it has not acted, and so the S.F. Recreation and Park Department is initiating an appropriate eviction.

A new Community Garden such as proposed by Rec/Park staff is a much more appropriate use for the current Kezar recycling space. The admirable Native Plants Nursery portion of HANC's current operation would be welcome to remain at Kezar when the recycling operation relocates to an appropriate industrial location. That would be an exciting addition to other planned elements of a new community garden and resources area.

Sincerely,
Catherine Martin
Upper Haight resident

File 101491



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 101491: please repurpose HANC space as parkland - we support rec & park's plan!

From: Ann Morris <bartronmorris@yahoo.com>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org, Phil Ginsburg <Phil.Ginsburg@sfgov.org>, Gavin Newsom <gavin.newsom@sfgov.org>
Cc: Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi <ross.mirkarimi@sfgov.org>, sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org, michela.alioto-pier@sfgov.org, chris.daly@sfgov.org, bevan.dufty@sfgov.org, eric.mar@sfgov.org, sophie.maxwell@sfgov.org
Date: 11/24/2010 10:54 PM
Subject: please repurpose HANC space as parkland - we support rec & park's plan!

dear supervisors, mayor newsom and rec & park board:

i hope that you consider these opinions when hearing rec & park's plan for the current HANC recycling space appropriate park use.

thank you for hearing us.

Please eliminate the Haight Ashbury recycling center ("Recycle center's end?" Nov. 23).
It is a blight on the neighborhood and an attraction to rodents and homeless carts.

Curtis Lee, San Francisco

Give land back to the community

The recycling center in Golden Gate Park at Frederick Street should be given back to the neighborhood in the Haight. Its mission has become obsolete, causing problems rather than solutions. Long ago, it served a purpose. How? Our family lives in the Haight. It provides no benefit to the people living in the Haight/Cole Valley. The resident had to pay a considerable amount to build a wrought-iron, locked gate to keep people out of our trash. The result? The Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council Recycling Center sits on 35,000 square feet of prime Golden Gate Park. Such a precious piece of land being wasted by a project that no longer adds value to the neighborhood. We want it back.

Karen Growney, San Francisco

A more appropriate use

As a neighborhood leader around Buena Vista Park near Kezar, I know that my informed neighbors support the city's proposed community garden resource center, including the admirable existing native plant nursery. The recycling center is an inappropriate industrial use in a city park. The recycling operators at Kezar have been on notice for years that they should not have to be evicted but should recognize the changes that time and progress bring and value the park.

Richard Magary, San Francisco

Let's move from beer cans to beets

The proposal to reclaim almost 3/4 acre of parkland at the corner of Golden Gate Park for community garden plots is a great idea. For many in this recession, growing some of your own food provides vital additions to a family's diet. Whatever the reason, a citywide recreation survey conducted in 2004 found the need for more community gardening space to be the highest. Open space in our city is not easy to come by. The recycling center has been a fine program, but it has never been a conforming park use. Rec & Park's proposal to create garden plots. It's time for "B" to stand for beets in our parkland and not beer cans.

Isabel Wade, founder, Neighborhood Parks Council, San Francisco

KEZAR RECYCLING CENTER

Jay Stevens

to:

Board.of.supervisors, Recpark.commission

11/22/2010 01:57 PM

Show Details

File 101491
page

To Whom It May Concern:

I understand there will be a hearing regarding the recycling center next to Kezar Stadium.

I feel strongly that the center should be shut down.

Garbage collection takes care of recycling, so the only purpose of the center is to collect recyclables pilfered from neighborhood garbage cans in the middle of the night. I know. I live in Cole Valley and listen to the garbage can rummagers every week the night before garbage collection.

Sincerely,

Jay Stevens

New Uses for HANC Recycling Center Site
Ellena Ochoa
to:
Recpark.commission, Board.of.supervisors
11/19/2010 07:49 PM
Show Details

File 101491
page

Dear Commissioners,

It is time to reclaim park land currently used by the HANC Recycling Center.

Household and business recycling has become citywide policy and—with the financial support of San Francisco's property owners—the curbside recycling program has been established. No longer is the HANC Recycling Center providing the valuable neighborhood service it once did. It is now functioning as a processing and transfer station, bringing trucks into the neighborhood six days a week and breaking glass for hours each day.

This is an outdated services held over from a past time when it was located across from an abandoned school and next to a derelict stadium. There are many more appropriate uses of this valuable park land, such as a community garden.

The time has come for the Recycling Center to give back its space to Golden Gate Park and relocate in an industrial part of the city where its trucks, processing and transferring functions can flourish unimpeded in a non-residential neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ellena Ochoa
849 Cole Street
SF, CA 94117
ellenao@gmail.com

Hanc recycling center lease
David Rumsey
to:
Board.of.supervisors
11/20/2010 07:45 AM
Show Details

File 101491
cpage

Dear Supervisors,

It is time to reclaim park land currently used by the HANC Recycling Center.

Household and business recycling has become citywide policy and—with the financial support of San Francisco's property owners—the curbside recycling program has been established. No longer is the HANC Recycling Center providing the valuable neighborhood service it once did. It is now functioning as a processing and transfer station, bringing trucks into the neighborhood six days a week and breaking glass for hours each day.

This is an outdated services held over from a past time when it was located across from an abandoned school and next to a derelict stadium. There are many more appropriate uses of this valuable park land, such as a community garden.

The time has come for the Recycling Center to give back its space to Golden Gate Park and relocate in an industrial part of the city where its trucks, processing and transferring functions can flourish unimpeded in a non-residential neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration.

David Rumsey
24 Beulah Street
San Francisco, CA 94117
415 386 1750
415 531 1842 cell
415 386 1781 fax
david@davidrumsey.com
www.davidrumsey.com

HANC Recycling Center

Serena Unger

to:

Recpark.commission, Board.of.supervisors

11/19/2010 04:50 PM

Show Details

File 101491
cpage

Dear Commissioners and Board of Supervisors:

It is time to reclaim park land currently used by the HANC Recycling Center.

Household and business recycling has become citywide policy and—with the financial support of San Francisco's property owners—the curbside recycling program has been established. No longer is the HANC Recycling Center providing the valuable neighborhood service it once did. It is now functioning as a processing and transfer station, bringing trucks into the neighborhood six days a week and breaking glass for hours each day. It also draws recycling bin "poachers" to the neighborhood which can be seen every day stealing from residential and commercial recycling bins and carting (with stolen grocery carts) stolen recyclables to the HANC Recycling Center. This reduces income to Recology by millions of dollars every year that helps to make recycling a viable operation in the city.

HANC Recycling Center is an outdated services held over from a past time when it was located across from an abandoned school and next to a derelict stadium. There are many more appropriate uses of this valuable park land, such as a community garden.

The time has come for the Recycling Center to give back its space to Golden Gate Park and relocate in an industrial part of the city where its trucks, processing and transferring functions can flourish unimpeded in a non-residential neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration.

Serena Unger
San Francisco, CA
(415) 336-2981

HANC Recycling Center
m gilkey
to:
recpark.commission, Board.of.supervisors
11/20/2010 02:31 PM
Show Details

File 101491
page

Dear Parks/Rec Commission & The Board of Supervisors-

I am writing to you regarding the HANC recycling on the edge of the Upper Haight, and Golden Gate Park, which is really no longer necessary, with curbside recycling, is rented at below market rates, and does not conform to the character of the present neighborhood, or the city master plan. Some of the materials brought into be recycled are pilfered from area residents curb side City recycling canisters, by the homeless, or trucks, both large and small, which peruse the neighborhood for cardboard, etc. The time when the HANC recycling center was a vital part of a greener neighborhood effort has passed.

Like the Hayes Valley Garden Project, we'd much prefer to see a garden be put in that place, as it would be a welcome addition to the neighborhood. An even better idea would be if the adjacent grass area between Frederick and Lincoln were also included as a garden, as that part of the park does not get sufficient water, or attention at present.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Mark Gilkey

Re: HANC recycling center
Ilya Kaltman
to:
Board.of.supervisors
11/21/2010 12:47 PM
Show Details

*File 101491
page*

Dear Supervisors,

We have been residents of the upper Haight for 40 years and have been walking by the HANC recycling center all this time. We are in complete sympathy with the following statement expressed by the the Cole Valley Improvement Association:

It is time to reclaim park land currently used by the HANC Recycling Center.

Household and business recycling has become citywide policy and—with the financial support of San Francisco's property owners—the curbside recycling program has been established. No longer is the HANC Recycling Center providing the valuable neighborhood service it once did. It is now functioning as a processing and transfer station, bringing trucks into the neighborhood six days a week and breaking glass for hours each day.

This is an outdated services held over from a past time when it was located across from an abandoned school and next to a derelict stadium. There are many more appropriate uses of this valuable park land, such as a community garden.

The time has come for the Recycling Center to give back its space to Golden Gate Park and relocate in an industrial part of the city where its trucks, processing and transferring functions can flourish unimpeded in a non-residential neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ilya Kaltman
Jack Vognsen
Belgrave Ave San Francisco

Golden Gate Park should replace the HANC Recycling Center
Abby Smith Rumsey
to:
Board.of.supervisors
11/22/2010 02:28 PM
Cc:
"Abby Smith Rumsey"
Show Details

*File 101491
cpage*

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write as a resident of the Upper Haight/Cole Valley neighborhood, less than 2 blocks from Golden Gate Park. I urge you to let us reclaim Golden Gate Park land for our use, to end the HAND Recycling Center, and to let us have a more appropriate space: a sustainable garden and education center.

Please consider:

The present use is non-conforming and as such the master plan calls for its elimination.

The industrial nature of the operation is disruptive to the adjoining residential neighbors with frequent noise and truck traffic. HANC picks up materials from all over the City and brings it into the Park through our neighborhoods. The material is sorted and then removed by even bigger trucks.

The property is rented at far below market rent on a month to month lease that can be terminated at will by the Recreation and Parks Department.

Since recycling is now city wide and at the doorstep of each dwelling the recycling center is at best redundant. There is nothing green about driving to the center with items that would be picked up at the curb with the regular run from Recology.

A lot of the material brought to the recycling center is pilfered from the bins in front of homes. **This is theft and contributes to degradation of the neighborhood and higher garbage rates.** Materials recycled through the garbage company help to offset the cost of collection.

The sustainable garden and education center will be a wonderful asset that the entire City can enjoy.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours, Abby Rumsey

Abby Smith Rumsey
24 Beulah Street
San Francisco CA 94117

T: (415) 831-4439
F: (415) 386-1781
M: (415) 971-0759

HANC Recycling Center in GG Park
TEyres
to:
Recpark.commission, Board.of.supervisors
11/22/2010 03:04 PM
Show Details

*File 101491
cpage*

Dear Commissioners and Board Members:

I understand that on Dec 2 there will be a decision about the future of the HANC Recycling Center near Kezar Stadium. An alternative use of the space could be a community garden and/or education about ecology.

I wonder why we need a recycling center at that location. We San Francisco property owners pay for curbside recycling, and it works very well.

My vote is to put the space to better use and relocate the recycling center to a less residential and tourist area of the city.

Best regards,
Tresa Eyres
85 Piedmont Street
San Francisco, CA 94117

C-page

File 101491



Time to Close Down HANC
Cecile Bodington
to:
Board.of.supervisors
11/24/2010 07:48 AM
Show Details

Dear Supervisors,

I understand that the HANC recycling center is being looked at as an appropriate use of GG Park. In my opinion, it is NOT. We do not need a recycling center in a residential and park area. We have an effective curbside recycling program that is being stripped of it's products by scavengers. The night before my garbage pick-up I am often awoken by people rifling through the recycling bins, cherry picking the most valuable items to sell at HANC. Stop this illegal behavior now.

Golden Gate Park has a master plan that should be followed. Make the Kezar area conform, not exempt. I am tired to the trucks and traffic that HANC brings into an area that is meant to be an oasis in the city not an industrial way station.

Sincerely,

Cecile

Cecile Ojeda Bodington, PT
255 Frederick St
San Francisco, CA 94117
cecile@sbcglobal.net

C page

File 101491



Your McDonalds Decision
GLenn Jackson
to:
board.of.supervisors
11/24/2010 05:45 AM
Show Details

Hi,

Thankfully, I am not a resident of San Francisco. Your desire for a few Supervisors to decide what is good for people is completely beyond what freedom stands for. I guess you don't like individual responsibility and choice. Oh well. Just to let you know, that I and everyone I know will not visit your city in the future. You guys are way outside normal.

Glenn Jackson

File 101491
Cpage

Re: Important Issue regarding Golden Gate Park

allenrlo

to:

cviasf, ablakeley, DCrommie, EmmeryL, jdowney324, Ccanepa50, KCrommie, CGstudio2, Mhesse, DCHall284, editor

11/19/2010 06:48 PM

Cc:

Recpark.commission, Board.of.supervisors

Show Details

All

I live about 75 yards away from HANC on Arguello. We have owned our home since 1987. I really dont have a problem with HANC. They are basically good neighbors. Yes, there are homeless lined up in the early morning to sell their bottles, cans etc, but have never had a problem with them (nor with our 3 children who passed by often on the way to the park). I walk past the entrance of HANC on an almost daily basis as I go for my morning run.

Moreover you mention curbside recycle. Sunset Scavenger has strict limits on how much recycle materials we can place in our bins or we must pay extra. After a holiday or party, when we have an overload of paper, bottles, etc, its real convenient just to drive or walk down to the HANC and drop it off. Now if HANC closes, I imagine l/we will have to pay more.

It seems like the real issue behind this is that neighbors are against the homeless. A possible solution is for HANC to accept recycle materials, but not pay cash for them. That might end the pilfering of homeowner's bins. (In our 23 years of living on Arguello our bins have rarely bin pilfered).

About 200 yards to the east of the HANC, just past the main entrance to Kezar Stadium is a large parking lot. I'd rather see your efforts into getting that area as park land

Allen Low
1242 Arguello
SF

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

From: cviasf@aol.com

To: ablakeley@mcguire.com; DCrommie@aol.com; EmmeryL@aol.com; jdowney324@aol.com; Ccanepa50@aol.com; KCrommie@aol.com; CGstudio2@aol.com; Mhesse@pacbell.net; DCHall284@aol.com

Sent: Fri, Nov 19, 2010 4:24 pm

Subject: Important Issue regarding Golden Gate Park

19 November 2010

Dear CVIA Members,

The time has finally come for the Recreation and Parks Department to push forward with new, more appropriate use for the area now occupied by the HANC recycling center. The proposed new use would be a community garden and education center which would be in keeping with the location in Golden Gate Park. A strong showing of support from the neighborhood will be critical for this monumental change to transpire. Therefore we ask you all to send e-mails to the Recreation and Parks Commissioners and the Board of Supervisors to show your support. Their contact information is listed below. We anticipate the hearing date to be on December 2nd at 2pm in room 416 at City Hall, so please get your comments to the Board and Commission before then. Plan to attend the hearing if at all possible. This is an important issue that will benefit the neighborhood and Golden Gate Park well into the future.

The points that could be noted in your letters are:

1. The present use is non-conforming and as such the master plan calls for its elimination.
2. The industrial nature of the operation is disruptive to the adjoining residential neighbors with frequent noise and truck traffic. HANC picks up materials from all over the City and brings it into the Park through our neighborhoods. The material is sorted and then removed by even bigger trucks.
3. The property is rented at far below market rent on a month to month lease that can be terminated at will by the Recreation and Parks Department.
4. Since recycling is now city wide and at the doorstep of each dwelling the recycling center is at best redundant. There is nothing green about driving to the center with items that would be picked up at the curb with the regular run from Recology.
5. A lot of the material brought to the recycling center is pilfered from the bins in front of homes. This is theft and contributes to degradation of the neighborhood and higher garbage rates. Materials recycled through the garbage company help to offset the cost of collection.
6. The sustainable garden and education center will be a wonderful asset that the entire City can enjoy.

Here is a sample letter you can send in but we encourage you to customize it: Dear Commissioners,

It is time to reclaim park land currently used by the HANC Recycling Center.

Household and business recycling has become citywide policy and—with the financial support of San Francisco's property owners—the curbside recycling program has been established. No longer is the HANC Recycling Center providing the valuable neighborhood service it once did. It is now functioning as a processing and transfer station, bringing trucks into the neighborhood six days a week and breaking glass for hours each day.

This is an outdated services held over from a past time when it was located across from an abandoned school and next to a derelict stadium. There are many more appropriate uses of this valuable park land, such as a community garden.

The time has come for the Recycling Center to give back its space to Golden Gate Park and relocate in an industrial part of the city where its trucks, processing and transferring functions can flourish unimpeded in a non-residential neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration.

Your letters should be emailed to both of these:

Recpark.commission@sfgov.org

and

Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

HANC Recycling Center in Golden Gate Park
DOERTE G MURRAY

to:

recpark.commission, Supervisors Board of, Gavin Newsom, Phil Ginsburg
11/21/2010 01:13 PM

Cc:

Improvement Assn Cole Valley, Plan C
Show Details

File 101491
epage

Dear Rec and Park Commissioners,

I urge you to TERMINATE the lease between RPD and HANC and stipulate for HANC to vacate the lot within Golden Gate Park by December 31, 2010. Over the years I have repeatedly contacted RPD, RP Commission, and politicians, to return HANC's Recycling Center, an industrial center within a residential area, to its original use, parkland.

Following is a list of all my concerns if you keep the status quo:

1. The Golden Gate Park Master Plan lists HANC as a non-conforming use. It is time to return the corner to a conforming use.
2. San Francisco has a citywide recycling program making HANC obsolete.
3. HANC has repeatedly violated the lease agreement with RPD. Just to name a few items:
 - a. HANC to move 30% of their operation to Amador St, an industrial site. This was never done.
 - b. HANC to increase the numberr of recycling bins in Golden Gate Park to 50 (FIFTY). According to my records, HANC had a high of 12 in 1995, which was DECREASED to 8 in 1999. Today there are 2.
 - c. HANC agreed to service these bins weekly, which was never done. Instead pilferers emptied the bins and brought them to the Recycling Center for free.
 - d. HANC to clean up the Kezar corner weekly. This was never done.
4. HANC used to receive City funds to the tune of \$250,000.00 per year. I suggest that this money is used to decrease San Francisco's deficit.

I am in Golden Gate Park on a daily basis. Almost daily I have to move into the mud, because somebody with a shopping cart, loaded with recyclables hanging of of it is using the whole width of the pedestrian walkway heading to the HANC Recycling Center.

I see the same people every day. Nobody can tell me that these people consume all the things what they are carrying. It is very likely that the recyclables are pilfered on a regular basis That means that everybody who pays the garbage bill is hit with higher fees.

An industrial enterprise has no business in Golden Gate Park.

Therefore I urge you to terminate the lease between HANC and RPD and have them move out of Golden

Gater Park as soon as possible.

Thank you for listening.

Doerte Murray
526 Clayton Street
San Francisco, CA 94117
415-626-3607



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 101491: Terminate HANC industrial recycling in Golden Gate Park

From: "Tom O'Connor" <tom@oconnorart.com>
To: <Board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Date: 11/28/2010 08:48 PM
Subject: Terminate HANC industrial recycling in Golden Gate Park

Please terminate the recycling center in Golden Gate Park. It serves no use and has no place there.

Tom O'Connor
O'Connor & Associates Art Advisors, Inc.
2261 Market St. #322
San Francisco, CA 94114
Tel: 415-661-1086
Fax: 415-661-2066
www.oconnorart.com

Fisherman's Wharf

COMMUNITY BENEFIT DISTRICT

November 22, 2010

Board of Supervisors
City of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca. 94102-4689

Re: Support for Rodney Fong's Appointment to the Planning Commission


Dear Board of Supervisors:

On this Tuesday's Board of Supervisor's calendar you will be voting for the appointment of Rodney Fong to the Planning Commission.

Rodney has been engaged in San Francisco for decades and has been proven success within the Fisherman's Wharf community. Rodney's efforts have extended beyond Fisherman's Wharf with the ability to "do what is best for San Francisco's long term future".

The Fisherman's Wharf Community Benefit District supports and encourages you to vote to appoint Rodney Fong to the Planning Commission.

Sincerely,



David Barbey
President



Kevin Carroll
Executive Director

Cc: Angela Calvillo
FWCBD Board of Directors

24



NORTHPOINT
INVESTORS

File 101237
BOS-11
page

November 23, 2010

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

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

On this Tuesday's Board of Supervisor's calendar you will be voting for the appointment of Rodney Fong to the Planning Commission.

Rodney has been engaged in San Francisco for decades and has been a proven success within the Fisherman's Wharf community. Rodney's efforts have extended far beyond Fisherman's Wharf with the ability to "do what is best for San Francisco's long term future".

On behalf of Northpoint Investors, I would like to express wholehearted support of this action and encourage you to vote to appoint Rodney Fong to the Planning Commission.

Thank you,

Aline Estournes
Commercial Property Manager

P.O. Box 193532
San Francisco, California, 94119-3532
(415) 255-7666 • fax (415) 553-3970



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 101237: YES

From: "Bob" <bob@castagnolas.com>
To: <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Date: 11/22/2010 11:03 AM
Subject: YES

Please write a letter in support of Rodney Fong.
Bob Brooks

Castagnola's
San Francisco, CA 94133
415-776-5015



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 101237: Support for Rodney Fong

From: "Jeff Sears" <jeff@blazingsaddles.com>
To: <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Date: 11/22/2010 10:25 AM
Subject: Support for Rodney Fong

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisor,
On this Tuesday's Board of Supervisor's calendar you will be voting for the appointment of Rodney Fong to the Planning Commission.
Rodney has been engaged in San Francisco for decades and has been a proven success within the Fisherman's Wharf community. Rodney's efforts have extended beyond Fisherman's Wharf with the ability to "do what is best for San Francisco long term future".
The Fisherman's Wharf Community Benefit District supports and encourages you to vote to appoint Rodney Fong to the Planning Commission.
Thank you.



Jeff Sears
Blazing Saddles Bike Rentals and Tours
2715 Hyde Street
San Francisco, CA 94109
tel. 415.202.8888
fax 415.929.8687
www.blazingsaddles.com



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 101237; Document2 [Compatibility Mode]

From: Thomas Creedon <tcreedon@scomas.com>
To: "board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org" <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Date: 11/22/2010 10:44 AM
Subject: Document2 [Compatibility Mode]



I support the appointment of Rodney Fong to the Planning Commission see attachment Doc2.docx



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 101237: Rodney Fong

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 11/23/2010 01:44 PM -----

From: "Brandy Marts" <brandy@thestinkingrose.com>
To: <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
Date: 11/22/2010 02:50 PM
Subject: Rodney Fong

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

On this Tuesday's Board of Supervisor's calendar you will be voting for the appointment of Rodney Fong to the Planning Commission.

I have known Rodney for many years as I am the Marketing Director for a group of eight restaurants, five of which are in San Francisco and two of those are within the Fisherman's Wharf area. I have always found him to be a consummate professional as well as being a huge asset to San Francisco.

I support and encourage you to vote to appoint Rodney Fong to the Planning Commission.

Sincerely,

Brandy Marts
Director of Marketing
The Stinking Rose
Crab House at Pier 39
Franciscan Crab Restaurant
Bobo's
Calzone's
The Dead Fish
The Sausalito Crab Company



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 101237: 23 November 2010, Board of Supervisor's vote to appoint Mr. Rodney Fong to the Planning Commission

From: Tom Escher <tescher@redandwhite.com>
To: Board of Supervisors <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Date: 11/22/2010 12:02 PM
Subject: 23 November 2010, Board of Supervisor's vote to appoint Mr. Rodney Fong to the Planning Commission

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisor,
Tomorrow, November 23, 2010, the Board of Supervisor's calendar shows that you will be voting for the appointment of Rodney Fong to the Planning Commission.
I encourage you to vote for Mr. Rodney Fong's appointment to the Planning Commission. Rodney can do the job....just look at his record.
We support and encourage you to vote to appoint Rodney Fong to the Planning Commission.
Thank you.

Thomas C. Escher

Red and White Fleet

Pier 43 1/2, Historic Fisherman's Wharf
San Francisco, CA 94133
Direct: 415.901.5249
Cellular: 415.341.2782
Main: 415.673.2900
Fax: 415.447.0619

San Francisco's Original Sightseeing Adventure since 1892!

Become a Fan: www.facebook.com/redandwhite

Follow us: www.twitter.com/redandwhitefleet

303-11
c-page



Chaffee -- Misuse of Democratic Process

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
11/23/2010 09:00 PM

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

Dear President Chiu,

I have observed the Board's misuse of proper democratic procedures with some alarm. That you would do it when choosing the future Mayor of our City moves me to address my concern here.

It is increasing common for some of your members to misuse the Motion to Table in order to apply its attribute of not being a debatable motion when it is inappropriate. This is a highly regrettable abuse of democracy.

Let me begin by quoting from Robert's Rules of Order, Ninth Ed., page 207:

"The motion to Lay on the Table enables the assembly to lay the pending question aside temporarily when something else of immediate urgency has arisen, . . .

....

"Such action violates the rights of the minority and individual members if it is for any other purpose than the one stated in the first sentence of this section. In ordinary assemblies, the motion to Lay on the Table is out of order if the evident intent is to kill or avoid dealing with a measure."

Robert's Rules of Order goes on to explain that the proper motion for such a purpose is either to Postpone Indefinitely or to Postpone to a Certain Time, but, of course, both of those motions are debatable. The essence of deliberative process, or indeed, democracy is respect for the minority or dissenting opinion. To misapply a Motion to Table to effectively shut someone up robs the public not only of the representation of that Supervisor, but of the collective balancing of information and insight that the deliberative process is supposed to represent. To see members of the Board of Supervisors show such disrespect for each other not only sets a bad example for the rest of the city about what proper process is, but it sets a bad example for the respect that we all owe to each other in a democracy. Not only other public bodies, but high school students may be watching and think it is alright because the Supervisors do it.

Frankly, this is something that I would expect to see at a Library Commission meeting.

Sincerely,

James Chaffee

25

C-page



Central Subway
Cauthn1
to:
board.of.supervisors
11/24/2010 08:21 AM
Cc:
sfjberk
Show Details

On Nov 23, 2010, at 10:13 PM, Cauthn1@aol.com wrote:

Dear Supervisors:

Below is the statement I gave at the TA meeting today. I'm sending it partly because it occurred to me that I may have tried to cram too much into two minutes.

The more we look at the early figures and claims, the more it appears that two City agencies...perhaps egged on by the CCDC...sold Chinatown and its supporters a bill of goods. No one wants to object just for objection's sake. So, if our numbers are wrong it would be productive to rebut us. I for one would welcome it, particularly with respect to the escalating O&M cost estimates and decreasing ridership projections.

Hearing nothing in rebuttal only reinforces the view that those who conducted the public meetings and wrote the EIR/EIS....thereby misleading both Chinatown and the federal government....were either lying or incompetent or both. As you probably know, many people left the meeting this morning disgusted and frustrated. As of now everyone believes that the merits of the project are no longer a consideration (if they ever were) and that the **only** thing driving the project are anticipated real estate profits, the lure of federal New Starts money and the CCDC's expectation that it will receive follow-up HUD money.

Unless this perception changes, things are apt to escalate into a full-fledged free-for-all.

Jerry Cauthen, PE
510 208 5441

Statement to the TA Plans and Programs Committee

November 23, 2010

On Thursday Nov 18th there was a Central Subway Group meeting,

26

presided over by program Manager John Funghi. At the meeting we again expressed doubt that the Subway would cut Muni operating costs and again asked for a breakdown of the claimed savings.

In response Mr. Funghi reassured everyone that "by carrying people more efficiently", the Subway would cut costs. In answer to our request for back-up, he referred us to the MTA's New Starts Report, submitted to the federal government in September.

We have now completed an initial review of that report and in a minute I will tell you what we found but first, a bit of history.


The draft EIR, published in mid 2007, showed the Subway as saving Muni \$23.8 million a year by Year 2030. This astounding benefit was repeatedly broadcast by Mr. Funghi and others at dozens of public meetings.

Pursuant to our subsequent challenge of that figure, an entirely different number appeared in the final EIR, published a year later. Instead of saving \$23.8 million a year the new version showed the Subway as saving only \$3.18 million a year, a drop of over \$20 million a year. However it was still a savings and again the benefit was trumpeted at dozens of additional public meetings.

Two months ago the MTA submitted its New Starts Report. So new we see that the subway would actually **increase** Muni's O&M costs by almost \$7 million a year.

Yet as recently as last week, people were still being told of cost savings. This is just one example of the many inaccuracies and distortions that have misled people into believing that Chinatown and the rest of San Francisco would benefit from this uniquely weak and ill-conceived project.

GPC



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Fw: Issued: San Francisco Public Utilities Commission: Hanson Aggregates Mid-Pacific, Inc., Did Not Make All Required Lease Payments, Resulting in up to \$634,511 in Underpayments, Potential Underpayments and Other Recoveries; and the PUC Did Not Properly Manage Its Leases
Subject:

From: Controller Reports/CON/SFGOV
To: Angela Calvillo/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, BOS-Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV, BOS-Legislative Aides/BOS/SFGOV, Steve Kawa/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Greg Wagner/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Tony Winnicker/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Starr Terrell/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Francis Tsang/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Michael Cohen/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Jennifer Entine Matz/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, ggiubbini@sftc.org, Severin Campbell/BudgetAnalyst/SFGOV@SFGOV, Debra Newman/BudgetAnalyst/SFGOV@SFGOV, sfdocs@sfpl.info, gmetcalf@spur.org, Tara Collins/CTYATT@CTYATT, CON-Media Contact/CON/SFGOV, CON-EVERYONE/CON/SFGOV, EHarrington@sfgwater.org, TRydstrom@sfgwater.org, NHom@sfgwater.org, gdowd@sfgwater.org, MHoush@sfgwater.org, john.gillan@hanson.biz, bill.butler@hanson.biz, jim.sims@hanson.biz, nigel.wills@hanson.biz
Date: 11/23/2010 09:52 AM
Subject: Issued: San Francisco Public Utilities Commission: Hanson Aggregates Mid-Pacific, Inc., Did Not Make All Required Lease Payments, Resulting in up to \$634,511 in Underpayments, Potential Underpayments and Other Recoveries; and the PUC Did Not Properly Manage Its Leases
Sent by: Richard Kurylo

The Office of the Controller, City Services Auditor (CSA), presents its audit report on the PUC leases with Hanson Aggregates Mid-Pacific, Inc., (Hanson). The audit found that Hanson has not complied with all lease terms, resulting in up to \$634,511 in underpayments, potential underpayments and other recoveries. Hanson did not correctly report all royalties due and paid rent, property tax, and royalty payments late. As a result of the audit findings, Hanson owes late fees and interests on rent, property tax, and royalty payments, and may be required to reimburse the PUC for audit costs. The audit also concludes that the PUC did not properly manage its leases with Hanson.

To view the full report, please visit our website at:
<http://co.sfgov.org/webreports/details.aspx?id=1216>

This is a send-only email address.

For questions regarding this report please contact: Tonia Lediju, Director of Audits, at tonia.lediju@sfgov.org, or 415-554-5393 or call the Audits Unit's main line at 415-554-7469.

Thank you.

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

27


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

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH:

Laguna Honda Hospital Needs to Improve the Management of Its Gift Fund



November 22, 2010

28

Copy

File

101096



Information Request Form
board.of.supervisors
to:
board.of.supervisors
11/23/2010 08:59 PM
Show Details

To:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Email:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
FIRST_NAME:John
LAST_NAME:Ferrucci
ADDRESS:170-A Day Street
CITY:San Francisco
STATE:CA
ZIP:94131
PHONE_NUMBER:415 648-4370
FAX:
CONTACT_EMAIL:johnfj77@att.net
DATE_OF_RECORD:
FILENUMBER:
RESOLUTIONNUMBER:
ORDINANCENUMBER:
MOTIONNUMBER:
SEE_FILE_ON:San Francisco
PICK_UP_INFORMATION ON:

ADDITIONAL_INFORMATION:Yes
ADDITIONAL_INFORMATION_DETAIL:Mission Statement: The Board of Supervisors responds to the needs of the people of the City and County of San Francisco, establishes city policies, and adopts ordinances and resolutions. Where does the Mission statement state that you (the Board of Supervisors for San Francisco, California)have any right to control my food? Did the People of the city go to you to ask to control our food? Are any of you Doctors? Is this not the privilege of parent. What gives the Board of Supervisor the RIGHT to control what a parent is responsible for. There should be a ballot REVERING the SILLY Kid's meal ordinance. I will be VOTING AGAINST ALL THAT VOTED FOR THIS ORDINANCE! I do expect a response from the boards concerning my question. I am a native San Franciscan, I survived the MUNI strike.

29

epage

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

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER



Governor

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

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Fish and Game Commission

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 NOV 23 PM 3:00
BY _____

November 22, 2010

TO ALL AFFECTED AND INTERESTED PARTIES:

During the regulatory process to amend Section 632, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, regarding south coast marine protected areas, changes were made to the originally proposed regulatory language.

Because these regulations are different from, yet sufficiently related to, the originally proposed regulations, the Administrative Procedure Act requires that we make the changes available to you for a 15-day written comment period.

*original
in
OB
Office*

Enclosed for your review is a disc containing the updated informative digest and the modified proposed regulatory language, with new additions shown in bold double underline and deletions shown in bold strike-out.

Please refer to the original notice for additional information.

If you would like hard copies of these documents, you may request them by contacting the Commission office at the letterhead address, phone number, fax number or e-mail address.

You may submit written comments to the Commission office and/or attend the December 15, 2010 hearing in Santa Barbara and offer testimony.

Sincerely,

Sherrie Fonbuena

Sherrie Fonbuena
Associate Governmental Program Analyst

Enclosures

30



Bos-11
cpage

The Police Commission

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

November 18, 2010

Honorable Mayor Gavin Newsom
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco
#1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 200
San Francisco, CA 94102

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

THOMAS MAZZUCCO
President
DR. JOE MARSHALL
Vice President
PETRA DEJESUS
Commissioner
ANGELA CHAN
Commissioner
JAMES HAMMER
Commissioner
CAROL KINGSLEY
Commissioner
R. JAMES SLAUGHTER
Commissioner
Lieutenant Timothy Falvey
Secretary

Dear Mayor Newsom and Supervisors:

At the meeting of the Police Commission on Wednesday, November 10, 2010, the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLUTION NO. 114-10

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT OF THE POLICE COMMISSION

RESOLVED, that Commissioner Thomas P. Mazzucco shall serve as President of the San Francisco Police Commission.

AYES: Commissioners Marshall, Mazzucco, DeJesus, Chan, Hammer, Kingsley, Slaughter

ELECTION OF VICE PRESIDENT OF THE POLICE COMMISSION

RESOLVED, that Commissioner Joe Marshall shall serve as Vice President of the San Francisco Police Commission.

AYES: Commissioners Mazzucco, Marshall, Kingsley, Slaughter
NAYS: Commissioners DeJesus, Chan, Hammer

Very truly yours,

Lt. Tim Falvey / 1071

Lieutenant Timothy Falvey
Secretary
San Francisco Police Commission

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 NOV 29 AM 9:46
BY _____

1071/ret

31

101416

Stow Lake Operation
Dick Millet
to:
eric.L.mar
11/25/2010 11:49 AM

Cc:
john avalos, boardofsupervisors, david campos, carmen.chu, david chiu, Board of Supervisors, Board of Supervisors, Board of Supervisors, Board of Supervisors, Board of Supervisors, Board of Supervisors, Board of Supervisors
Show Details

Dear Supervisor,;

The operation of Stow Lake by and "Out of State" contractor has come to my attention!
This brings with it Use Changes which I don't believe to be friendly/respectful to the SF community and it's interests. I have problems with Out of Town contractor/operators vs. local contractor/operators, especially when running our local facilities. I alway like to know where these contractor/operators live; I find they don't think and can't think locally and can't keep our interest in mind; that's even goes beyond taking their profit out of town, "Out of State" contract/operation is even worse.
dickmillet





SFGate: The boathouse blues
Suzanne R. Dumont to: Pres. Chiu & Supervisors

11/28/2010 10:22 AM

Suzanne R. Dumont SFGate: The boathouse blues

Please view this piece about our beloved Stow Lake boathouse that Rec & Park is threatening to lease to a New Mexico based souvenir chain!

This article was sent to you by someone who found it on SFGate.
The original article can be found on SFGate.com here:
<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/g/a/2010/11/28/cityexposed.DTL>

Sunday, November 28, 2010 (SF Gate)
The boathouse blues
Mike Kepka, Chronicle Staff

2010/11/28

A recent Tuesday at 3:53 p.m.: It was one of those perfect fall days at the Stow Lake boathouse. Most of the usual suspects - Ernie, Jack, Dixie, Charlie, Penny - had already been by to pay their daily respects with a wave or a cup of coffee by the time Lynn Miller, a regular since 1956, decided today was the day he would give an impromptu bagpipe concert. Everyone stopped in their tracks, then reverently clapped as his pipes went down and the sun was laid to rest behind the trees. "You just never know who you're gonna see. We get all kinds out here," said general manager Jeff Fones. He's proud to have spent the past 15 years serving an odd lot of folks who might not fit in anywhere else, he says. "It's important to have places like this." These days, the regulars are uneasy because the word is out that the kitschy snack bar's lease of 67 years isn't likely to be renewed. "It's a great institution," Miller said, "and we'd hate to lose it."

/templates/types/living/pages/cityexposed/cityexposed20.tmp1

Copyright 2010 SF Gate

New on Thanksgiving-Eve: MD who uncovered Laguna Honda Hospital patient gift fund scandal files wrongful termination lawsuit

pmonette-shaw

to:

undisclosed-recipients;

11/24/2010 04:13 PM

Please respond to Pmonette-shaw

Show Details

History: This message has been forwarded.

New on Examiner.com Thanksgiving-Eve:

"MD who uncovered Laguna Honda Hospital patient gift fund scandal files wrongful termination lawsuit"

On November 16, 2010 doctor Derek Kerr — a former physician in good standing at Laguna Honda Hospital for over 21 years — filed a lawsuit in San Francisco County Superior Court, alleging retaliatory termination of employment.

Dr. Kerr's lawsuit is posted on stopLHHdownsize.com as an enclosure to this article.

Read more ... at <http://www.examiner.com/hospital-in-san-francisco/patrick-monette-shaw>

Patrick

If you haven't already subscribed to receive e-mail alerts from Examiner.com when I post new articles, please do so using the "subscribe" button above the article's title on Examiner.com. To unsubscribe to my own e-mail alerts if my coverage isn't of interest to you, just send me an e-mail.

33



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc: *File 101496 +*
Subject: *File 101457: proposed process by board vote for mayor*

From: vicki leidner <vleidner@astound.net>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 11/22/2010 12:58 PM
Subject: proposed process by board vote for mayor

dear board members,

i have reviewed the board clerk's proposed rules for appointing an interim mayor and do not like the process. may i suggest that all board members have the opportunity to both nominate and vote for whomever they want. you could use ranked choice voting, with first, second, and third choice ranking among all the potential nominees. each board member would have fair and equal right to choose, including themselves if they are among the nominees. you should use the same method members of the public have to choose their elected officials.

the proposals sent by the clerk of the board are overly contrived. the idea of choosing board members who are nominated to then vote in order to have a quorum discriminates unjustly against other members. all board members should have equal right to vote on the nominees.

respectfully,
vicki leidner

34

the next mayor

terrie frye

to:

Supes

11/16/2010 01:15 PM

Cc:

Eric Mar, michela.alioto-pier, David Chiu, Carmen Chu, Ross Mirkarimi, Chris Daly, sean.elsbernd,

Bevan Dufty, David Campos, sophie.maxwell, John Avalos

Show Details

Hi,

I wholeheartedly support this CURRENT board's selection of the interim mayor!!!

Terrie Frye

"In a bed, in a bed, by the waterside I will lay my head, listen to the river sing sweet songs to rock my soul." - Robert Hunter

35



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Meters

From: Paul Barnett <paulb865@yahoo.com>
To: mtaboard@sfmta.com, board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org, gavin.newsom@sfgov.org
Date: 11/16/2010 11:31 PM
Subject: Meters

MTA Board/Board of Supervisors/Mayor Newsom

Good evening. I am writing because I am strongly against the new proposed meter structure because I think it masks some of the greater problems which are being sublimated and then passed on to the citizens of this city. Many people, including myself, feel that we are subsidizing some of the ridiculously high salaries that some officials in government are making which are not commensurate with the job being done. In other areas we know that there is somewhere but hidden, levels of corruption that exist where government people may be pocketing money. I feel that the extended meters, meters on sunday, and increases in fares of meters are done to make up for any of the misdoings and misfortunes the good government of the city has experienced. On the outside, there's a claimed need for more funding, while instead we should be looking inside at some of the fraud, waste, and abuse going on. I don't believe you can say there's none at all that exists and if you can't say there's none, why should we the citizens of this city pay for the mistakes of others. I think we need to correct those mistakes first and then come ask the hard working citizen for more money. Get some way to monitor monies

and appropriations while capping salaries within reasonable amounts. I work security and make about 30,000 a year. I am happy and content with life. Can you honestly sleep at night, knowing you may not have done everything you can to stop this from happening, if it hasn't been? Your sons and daughters will have to pay just like us at these meters. Stores will lose money and business because no one can afford the ridiculous hikes, making an already suffering economy, to suffer worse. It does affect all and there seems to be no reasonable effort to prevent this in place with the meter hikes. Thanks for your time. Paul

36

e-page

101096



Please Support Healthy Meal Incentive Act
Antoinette Sobalvarro to: board.of.supervisors
Please respond to antoinette.sobalvarro

11/18/2010 11:42 AM

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to urge you to vote in favor on the Healthy Meal Incentive Act tomorrow.

According to the 2007 California Health Interview Survey, 15 percent of adolescents in the greater Bay area between 12 and 17 years of age are overweight or obese. Childhood obesity increases children's chances of experiencing chronic health problems later in life including heart disease and diabetes.

The San Francisco County Board of Supervisors is voting tomorrow on the Healthy Meal Incentive Act. This ordinance will improve the health of children and adolescents by setting healthy nutritional standards for children's meals sold at restaurants accompanied by toys or other incentive items.

Please help ensure that meals marketed to children in San Francisco meet healthy nutritional standards by supporting the Healthy Meal Incentive Act.

Sincerely,
Antoinette Sobalvarro
160 Monterey Blvd
Apt 19
San Francisco, CA 94131-3252

37

Congratulations

Edlin, Nancy

to:

Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

11/20/2010 10:38 AM

Show Details

File 101096

Good afternoon, San Francisco Board of Supervisors. I just read about your ban on McDonald's offering toys in Happy Meals in the November 19, 2010 edition of *The Week*. I commend your effort here in helping parents to keep their kids just a little bit healthier.

We have been lucky in our family to have avoided McDonald's and similar "restaurants," and I understand that such a hard line approach is not feasible for all families to maintain. It is my understanding that you acted on this issue with the best interests of the residents of San Francisco firmly in view, and I think that you are fulfilling a valuable supportive role that will benefit your constituents.

Nancy Beatty Edlin
Carlisle, PA

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



Governor

JON K. FISCHER,
ACTING EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
1416 Ninth Street
Box 944209
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090
(916) 653-4899
(916) 653-5040 Fax
fgc@fgc.ca.gov

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Fish and Game Commission

November 18, 2010

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 NOV 19 PM 2:52
BY _____

TO ALL AFFECTED AND INTERESTED PARTIES:

This is to provide you with a copy of the notice of proposed regulatory action relative to Section 632, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to Stewarts Point State Marine Reserve and Stewarts Point State Marine Conservation Area, which will be published in the California Regulatory Notice Register on November 19, 2010.

Please note the dates of the public hearings related to this matter and associated deadlines for receipt of written comments.

Ms. Marija Vojkovich, Regional Manager, Marine Region, Department of Fish and Game, (805) 568-1246 has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations.

Sincerely,

Sherrie Fonbuena
Associate Governmental Program Analyst

Attachment

38

**TITLE 14. Fish and Game Commission
Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Fish and Game Commission (Commission), pursuant to the authority vested by Sections 200, 202, 203.1, 205(c), 219, 220, 1590, 1591, 2860, 2861 and 6750, Fish and Game Code, and Sections 36725(a) and 36725(e), Public Resources Code, and to implement, interpret or make specific Sections 200, 202, 203.1, 205(c), 219, 220, 1580, 1583, 2861, 5521, 6653, 8420(e) and 8500, Fish and Game Code, and Sections 36700(e), 36710(e), 36725(a) and 36725(e), Public Resources Code, proposes to amend Section 632, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to Stewarts Point State Marine Reserve.

Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

On June 24, 2010 the Commission adopted Emergency Regulations for the Stewarts Point State Marine Reserve (SMR). The adoption of these regulations was based on public support and tribal request. After working to adhere to Department of Fish and Game (Department) feasibility guidance and working with other non-government organizations, the Kashia Band of Pomo Indians of the Stewarts Point Rancheria developed a proposal that would allow access to traditional subsistence and ceremonial locations that had previously been incorporated into the Stewarts Point SMR, a no-take marine protected area (MPA).

The Kashia Band of Pomo Indians proposal requested that the no-take Stewarts Point SMR be modified so that a section of the shoreline would become a State Marine Conservation Area (SMCA) that allowed for recreational take (Table 1). Their proposed boundary ran from the mean high tide line out to a distance of 300 feet. However, in order to meet previous Department design feasibility guidance on designing MPAs, the Commission opted to extend the offshore boundary out to a line that approximates 1000 feet. Even though these modifications allowed for an SMCA to occur within an area that was previously a no-take reserve, there was no overall change to the connectivity of the MPA network. This was achieved because the original Stewarts Point SMR exceeded minimum size guidelines for connectivity as outlined by the Master Plan Science Advisory Team. However it should be noted that the level of protection for the modified SMCA was reduced from very high to low due to the allowed recreational take for all users.

Table 1. Proposed regulations for the Stewarts Point SMR/SMCA complex.

MPA Name	Proposed Allowed Take	SAT Level of Protection
Stewarts Point State Marine Reserve	Take of all living marine resources is prohibited	Very High
Stewarts Point State Marine Conservation Area	Take of all living marine resources is prohibited EXCEPT the recreational take from shore only of: marine aquatic plants other than sea palm, marine invertebrates, finfish by hook and line, surf smelt by beach net, and species authorized in Section 28.80 of these regulations by hand-held dip net.	Low

The proposed regulation will make permanent the emergency regulations described above.

NOTICE IS GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held at the Hotel Mar Monte, 1111 East Cabrillo Boulevard, Santa Barbara, California, on Thursday, December 16, 2010, at 8:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard.

NOTICE IS ALSO GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held in the Resources Building Auditorium, 1416 Ninth Street, First Floor, Sacramento, California, on Thursday, February 3, 2011 at 8:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard. It is requested, but not required, that written comments be submitted on or before January 28, 2011 at the address given below, or by fax at (916) 653-5040, or by e-mail to FGC@fgc.ca.gov. Written comments mailed, faxed or e-mailed to the Commission office, must be received before 5:00 p.m. on February 1, 2011. All comments must be received no later than February 3, 2011 at the hearing in Sacramento, CA. If you would like copies of any modifications to this proposal, please include your name and mailing address.

The regulations as proposed in strikeout-underline format, as well as an initial statement of reasons, including environmental considerations and all information upon which the proposal is based (rulemaking file), are on file and available for public review from the agency representative, Jon K. Fischer, Acting Executive Director, Fish and Game Commission, 1416 Ninth Street, Box 944209, Sacramento, California 94244-2090, phone (916) 653-4899. Please direct requests for the above mentioned documents and inquiries concerning the regulatory process to Jon K. Fischer or Sherrie Fonbuena at the preceding address or phone number. **Ms. Marija Vojkovich, Regional Manager, Department of Fish and Game, Marine Region, telephone (805) 568-1246 has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations.** Copies of the Initial Statement of Reasons, including the regulatory language, may be obtained from the address above. Notice of the proposed action shall be posted on the Fish and Game Commission website at <http://www.fgc.ca.gov>.

Availability of Modified Text

If the regulations adopted by the Commission differ from but are sufficiently related to the action proposed, they will be available to the public for at least 15 days prior to the date of adoption. Any person interested may obtain a copy of said regulations prior to the date of adoption by contacting the agency representative named herein.

If the regulatory proposal is adopted, the final statement of reasons may be obtained from the address above when it has been received from the agency program staff.

Impact of Regulatory Action

The potential for significant statewide adverse economic impacts that might result from the proposed regulatory action has been assessed, and the following initial determinations relative to the required statutory categories have been made:

- (a) Significant Statewide Adverse Economic Impact Directly Affecting Business, Including the Ability of California Businesses to Compete with Businesses in Other States:

The proposed action will not have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states. The proposed regulation affects approximately 25 square nautical miles. The impacts are anticipated to be minor.

- (b) Impact on the Creation or Elimination of Jobs within the State, the Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses, or the Expansion of Businesses in California: None.
- (c) Cost Impacts on a Representative Private Person or Business:

The Commission is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.
- (d) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State:

Any additional costs to State agencies for enforcement, monitoring, and management of MPAs are difficult to estimate and depend on not only the impacts of the proposed regulation but also other regulations and processes.
- (e) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies: None.
- (f) Programs Mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts: None.
- (g) Costs Imposed on any Local Agency or School District that is Required to be Reimbursed Under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4, Government Code: None.
- (h) Effect on Housing Costs: None.

Effect on Small Business

It has been determined that the adoption of these regulations may affect small business. The Commission has drafted the regulations in Plain English pursuant to Government Code sections 11342.580 and 11346.2(a)(1).

Consideration of Alternatives

The Commission must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the Commission, or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Commission, would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action.

FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

Jon K. Fischer
Acting Executive Director

Dated: November 9, 2010

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2010 NOV 17 PM 2:08

BY *PN*

Performance Audit

of

**San Francisco's Early Care and Education
Programs**

Prepared for the

Board of Supervisors
of the City and County of San Francisco

by the

San Francisco Budget and Legislative Analyst

November 17, 2010

3.9