

110055

Petitions and Communications received from January 4, 2011, through January 14, 2011, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on January 25, 2011.

From David Pilpel, submitting his analysis of provisions of the San Francisco Charter regarding vacancies in elective offices and the term of office of persons filling such vacancies. File No. 110007, Copy: Each Supervisor (1)

From Monica Henderson, submitting opposition to Richard Johns to HPC. File No. 101512 (2)

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to proposed legislation to implement a Civic Center Community Benefit District. File No. 101527, Copy: Each Supervisor, 7 letters (3)

From Office of the Mayor, submitting notice of transfer of function under Charter Section 4.132. (4)

From Cynthia Servetnick, submitting opposition to proposed legislation regarding CEQA procedures, appeals, and public notices. File No. 100495 (5)

From Department of Public Works, submitting the Micro-LBE set aside program quarterly report. (6)

From concerned citizens, submitting support for the Parkmerced Project. 2 letters (7)

From Office of the Controller, confirming that all newly elected and continuing Supervisors have been bonded. (8)

From Office of the Mayor, submitting the appointment of Paul Kelly to the Relocation Appeals Board. Copy: Each Supervisor, City Attorney, Rules Clerk (9)

From Office of the Controller, submitting report concerning the financial statement audit of the City Investment Pool held by the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector for the period from July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010. (10)

From T-Mobile, submitting notification of three cellular antennas to be installed at 2201 46th Avenue. (11)

From T-Mobile, submitting notification of three cellular antennas to be installed at 4001 Judah. (12)

From T-Mobile, submitting notification of three cellular antennas to be installed at 1601 47th Avenue. (13)

From Janas Page, submitting copy of letter sent to MTA requesting a four-way stop be placed at the intersection of 25th Street at Bartlett. (14)

From John Jenkel, regarding various issues. (15)

From Gavin Newsom, submitting his resignation as Mayor of San Francisco to assume the position of Lieutenant Governor of the State of California. (16)

From concerned citizens, regarding the sidewalk sitting ban. 45 letters (17)

From Sally Sommer, urging the Board of Supervisors not to take a position on proposed resolution concerning the KPFA Morning Show. File No. 101529 (18)

From Allen Jones, urging the Board of Supervisors to honor Oliver Sipple, the gay American hero who saved the life of President Ford in San Francisco on September 22, 1975. (19)

From Sue Hauser, regarding residential parking permits. (20)

From Francisco Da Costa, regarding the Board of Supervisors. (21)

From Cynthia Servetnick, regarding the Market and Octavia Historic Resource Preservation Project. File No. 101447 (22)

From Office of the Assessor-Recorder, submitting the Real Estate Watchdog Program Annual Report for FY2009-2010. (23)

From Patrick Missud, regarding anger management training for City employees. (24)

From Jim Ross, regarding the next Mayor of San Francisco. Copy: Each Supervisor (25)

From Barbara Beth, regarding Interim Mayor Ed Lee. (26)

From Abdalla Megahed, regarding various issues. (27)

From Jim Meko, regarding the Western SoMa Task Force. (28)

From Edwin Lee, submitting his resignation as City Administrator to assume the position of Interim Mayor. (29)

From Office of the Mayor, submitting the appointment of Jason Elliott to the Commission on the Environment, and Lorna Randlett to the Commission on the Status of Women. (30)

From Clerk of the Board, the following individuals have submitted a Form 700 Statement: (31)

Supervisor Chris Daly - leaving
Supervisor Sophie Maxwell- leaving
Supervisor Scott Wiener – assuming
Alice Guidry – legislative aide, leaving
John Jackson - legislative aide, leaving
Alexander Randolph – legislative aide, leaving
David Todd – legislative aide, leaving
Myrna Iton – legislative aide, assuming
Gillian Gillett – legislative aide, assuming
Viva Mogi – legislative aide, assuming

From Department of the Environment, regarding pesticide use on City properties in 2010 and review of proposed 2011 reduced risk pesticide use. (32)

From Californians Against Waste, submitting support for proposed legislation regarding Safe Drug Disposal. File No. 100455 (33)

From T-Mobile, submitting notification of three cellular antennas to be installed at 1227 Pacheco Street. (34)

From T-Mobile, submitting notification of three cellular antennas to be installed at 3060 Taraval Street. (35)

From T-Mobile, submitting notification of three cellular antennas to be installed at 2543 Pacheco Street. (36)

From T-Mobile, submitting notification of six cellular antennas to be installed at 340 Stockton Street. (37)

From Anne Murphy, urging the Board of Supervisors to ban wood burning fireplaces in San Francisco. (38)

From the Green Cross, regarding San Francisco's unregulated Medical Cannabis Dispensaries. (39)

From Office of the Controller, submitting DPH's Primary Care Behavioral Health Integration Project Phase One Summary Report. (40)

From Office of the Mayor, submitting the appointment of Thomas Pier to the Human Rights Commission, Lorna Randlett to the Library Commission, and Stephanie Simmons to the Commission on the Status of Women. Copy: Rules Clerk (41)

COB
BOS 11/new
File 110007
page

David Pilpel
2151 27th Ave
San Francisco CA 94116-1730

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 JAN - 7 PM 3: 01
BY

President David Chiu and Members
Board of Supervisors
1 Carlton B Goodlett Pl Ste 244
San Francisco CA 94102-4689

7 January 2011

Dear President Chiu and Members:

I write to offer my analysis of provisions of the San Francisco Charter (the Charter) regarding vacancies in elective offices and the term of office of persons filling such vacancies.

The Law

Charter section 13.101, Terms of Elective Office, states in part:

“Except in the case of an appointment or election to fill a vacancy, the term of office of each elected officer shall commence at 12:00 noon on the eighth day of January following the date of the election.

Subject to the applicable provisions of Section 13.102, the elected officers of the City and County shall be elected as follows:

At the general municipal election in 1995 and every fourth year thereafter, a Mayor, a Sheriff and a District Attorney shall be elected . . .”

Charter section 13.101.5, Vacancies, states in full:

“(a) If the office of Assessor-Recorder, City Attorney, District Attorney, Public Defender, Sheriff, Treasurer, or Member of the Board of Supervisors, Board of Education or Governing Board of the Community College District becomes vacant because of death, resignation, recall, permanent disability, or the inability of the respective officer to otherwise carry out the responsibilities of the office, the Mayor shall appoint an individual qualified to fill the vacancy under this Charter and state laws.

(b) If the Office of Mayor becomes vacant because of death, resignation, recall, permanent disability or the inability to carry out the responsibilities of the office, the President of the Board of Supervisors shall become Acting Mayor and shall serve until a successor is appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

(c) Any person filling a vacancy pursuant to subsection (a) or (b) of this Section shall serve until a successor is selected at the next election occurring not less than 120 days after the vacancy, at which time an election shall be held to fill the unexpired term, provided that (1) if an election for



the vacated office is scheduled to occur less than one year after the vacancy, the appointee shall serve until a successor is selected at that election or (2) if an election for any seat on the same board as the vacated seat is scheduled to occur less than one year but at least 120 days after the vacancy, the appointee shall serve until a successor is selected at that election to fill the unexpired term.

(d) If no candidate receives a majority of the votes cast at an election to fill a vacated office, the two candidates receiving the most votes shall qualify to have their names placed on the ballot for a municipal runoff election at the next regular or otherwise scheduled election occurring not less than five weeks later. If an instant runoff election process is enacted for the offices enumerated in this Section, that process shall apply to any election required by this Section.”

Finally, Charter section 13.102, Instant Runoff, contains provisions for implementing ranked-choice election of candidates.

My Analysis

Since the office of District Attorney has now become vacant “the Mayor shall appoint an individual qualified to fill the vacancy under this Charter and state laws” (Charter § 13.101.5 (a)). When the office of Mayor becomes vacant, presumably very shortly, “the President of the Board of Supervisors shall become Acting Mayor and shall serve until a successor is appointed by the Board of Supervisors.” (Charter § 13.101.5 (b)) Working backwards, no successor Mayor may be appointed until after the President of the Board of Supervisors has become Acting Mayor, which does not occur until the office of Mayor becomes vacant. Under Charter section 13.101 the term of office in the case of an appointment to fill a vacancy would not commence on January 8th but would implicitly commence upon perfection of the appointment, completion of any necessary conditions preceding taking office (such as any due diligence or divesting investments that would constitute a conflict), and a swearing-in (taking the oath of office). I believe that the term of office of the District Attorney appointed by the Mayor and the Mayor appointed by the Board of Supervisors would commence on completion of these steps but I also believe that the President of the Board of Supervisors while Acting Mayor does not serve for a term of office in the same way and is not subject to the same conditions regarding assuming office. Rather, the President of the Board of Supervisors becomes Acting Mayor immediately by operation of law and then serves until the Board of Supervisors appoints a successor Mayor.

Although the tenure of the President of the Board Supervisors serving as Acting Mayor may be brief it appears to be a necessary step prior to the appointment of a successor Mayor by the Board of Supervisors. In the absence of any language to the contrary it appears that the President of the Board of Supervisors becomes Acting Mayor under this provision immediately upon a vacancy occurring (not requiring a swearing-in), and the successor Mayor appointed by the Board of Supervisors, immediately upon taking office (requiring a swearing-in), hold the title of Acting Mayor or Mayor respectively, and assume all the powers and duties of the office of Mayor, including appointments, budgetary actions, and all other powers and duties of the Mayor.

I believe that the question of the term of office of persons filling such vacancies is even more complicated. Interpreting Charter section 13.101.5 (c), since an election for Mayor and District Attorney is scheduled to occur on November 8, 2011 pursuant to Charter section 13.101,

less than one year after the vacancies, provision (1) of Charter section 13.101.5 (c) would operate such that any "person filling a vacancy pursuant to subsection (a) or (b) of this Section [the appointee] shall serve until a successor is selected at [an election for the vacated office . . . scheduled to occur less than one year after the vacancy] . . . to fill the unexpired term." I believe this means that the District Attorney appointed by the Mayor and the Mayor appointed by the Board of Supervisors both serve until their successors are selected at the November 8, 2011 election to fill the unexpired term. It is my understanding that results of the November 8, 2011 election would be certified by the Director of Elections no later than December 6, 2011 and declared by the Board of Supervisors on December 13, 2011. As such, the voters would have selected successors to fill the unexpired terms ending January 8, 2012 (and continuing to January 8, 2016) upon declaration of the results by the Board of Supervisors on December 13, 2011.

Thus, the "person filling the vacancy" would serve until the successor elected on November 8, 2011 was sworn in on or about December 13, 2011. In fact, the second exception in Charter section 13.101 ("Except in the case of an appointment or election to fill a vacancy . . .") appears to contemplate this scenario, where an election to fill a vacancy results in an elected officer's term of office commencing not on January 8th but as soon as the election results are declared by the Board of Supervisors and a swearing-in is held. Indeed, the very purpose of an election to fill a vacancy is to fill the office as soon as possible with a person elected to serve rather than appointed to serve. I also believe that the last 5 words ("to fill the unexpired term") of Charter section 13.101.5 (c) applies to both provision (1) and provision (2) of that section given the parallel language in the 2 numbered provisions. Finally, if the intent of the voters were to provide that an appointee serves for the entire unexpired term then language other than "shall serve until a successor is selected at that election" would be used. One cannot merely ignore inconvenient language unless an absurd conclusion would be reached in statutory construction.

Conclusion

I believe that a successor Mayor may not be appointed until after the President of the Board of Supervisors has become Acting Mayor, which does not occur until the office of Mayor becomes vacant. Further, I believe that the District Attorney appointed by the Mayor and the Mayor appointed by the Board of Supervisors serve until the results of the November 8, 2011 election are declared by the Board of Supervisors on or about December 13, 2011. As such, I urge the Board of Supervisors to amend File No. 110007, lines 4 and 17, to either delete the language "for a term expiring January 8, 2012" or replace it with "until a successor is selected at the November 8, 2011 election" and let the term be determined by operation of law or otherwise.

Sincerely,



David Pilpel

cc: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Dennis Herrera, City Attorney
Miguel Márquez, Santa Clara County Counsel
John Arntz, Director of Elections


File 101512



Historical Preservation Commission

Eric.L.Mar, Michela.Alioto-Pier,
monica henderson to: David.Chiu, Carmen.Chu, Ross.Mirkarimi,
Chris.Daly, Sean.Elsbernd, bevan.dufty,

01/03/2011 03:12 PM



View: (Mail Threads)

To: Eric L. Mar, Michela Alioto Pier, David Chiu, Carmen Chu,
Ross Mirkarimi, Chris Daly, Sean Elsbernd, Bevan Dufty, David Campos,
Sophie Maxwell, and John Avalos,

Subject: Reject Historical Preservation Commission, nomination of RICHARD JOHNS
Rules Committee meeting 1/3/11 ~ please vote item 3 NO, item 4 YES
Board of Supervisors meeting 1/4/11 ~ please vote item 37 NO, item 38 YES

Dear Supervisors,

From my reading of the qualifications for the Historic Preservation Commission, it appears that Mr. Johns does not meet the required standard of qualifications as a *professional historian* for Seat no. 4. I suggest that Mr. Johns' nomination be rejected and that the BOS request that persons qualified as *professional historians*, according to the City Charter, be selected for this position. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Monica Henderson
Native of San Francisco since 1957

2

BOS-11
File 101526
✓ 101527



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Filles 101526 & 101527: Correct version: Civic Center Benefit District--Vote NO

From: melissa riley <melissajaneriley@gmail.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 01/04/2011 03:03 PM
Subject: Correct version: Civic Center Benefit District--Vote NO

Dear Clerk of the Board of Supervisors,

Please give this corrected letter to each Supervisor indicating that I urge them to vote against the Civic Center Community Benefit District today at 3:00. I ask that it be read into the record.
Thanks! MR

Much of what this CBD will do for the City is--or should be--done daily by City workers because the Civic Center is the seat of government. So what will the additional focus be? Ambassadors? The City could hire City workers to do that as it once did.

We do not need to spend a quarter of a million dollars, increasing year after year, to allow private concerns to manage our public spaces, removing control the people of SF have over their central commons. It is a form of privatization we do not need. Furthermore, it is not green in any noticeable way--a big mistake, given the need to make a rapid transition to sustainability.

Symbolically and in reality our Civic Center is the grounds for engagement with government. It is a welcoming space for all and for free speech. We must avoid private influences and agendas which may curtail our freedoms.

Please vote NO on the CC CBD.

If businesses want to form a nearby CBD let them pay for it themselves.

Sincerely,

Melissa Riley

[for identification only--Reference Librarian at San Francisco Public Library since 1982]

3

File 101527

BOS-11

Post Office Box 42791
San Francisco, California 94142
(415) 431-2990

January 3, 2011

All members of the
Board of Supervisors
City Hall
San Francisco, California

Dear Supervisors, Agenda item number 28 – file #101527

I urge all members of the Board of Supervisors to reject and vote no on the privatization of Civic Center. The so-called Civic Center Community Benefit District is anything but that.

This resolution should be rejected on the following grounds.

It is fundamentally anti-democratic by ceding security to an unaccountable private entity that answers to no public entity.

It is a gross misuse of public funds pretending to be offering services for which San Francisco taxpayers have already paid.

Civic Center has always been a public commons and essential free-speech space for all San Franciscans to respect and enjoy. This proposal will destroy that fundamental First Amendment right of all to participate in.

The sponsors of this proposal pretend to be solving a perceived public nuisance problem when all they are doing is pushing it off to another part of San Francisco to deal with.

Such lies do nothing to promote the health and well being of all San Franciscans and only tarnish the reputation and good standing of the Board in the eyes of all voters.

VOTE NO TO SAVE THE CIVIC CENTER PUBLIC COMMONS.

Yours truly,

Nick Pasquariello



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: 101255

From: Friesebam <friesebam@aol.com>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 01/04/2011 10:41 AM
Subject: 101255

Dear Board of Supervisors,
Please do not support the creation of a Civic Center Community Benefit District. What an inappropriate name for privatizing our Civic Center! It should be kept as publicly owned Commons, without private policies or security involved.
Thank you,
Chandra Friese

Deetje Boler
1280 Laguna St., #6B
San Francisco, CA 94115
567-8446

C Paels
R 10/15/26

Members
S.F. Board of Supervisors
City Hall
San Francisco, CA

Dear Supervisor: Re: Proposal to create a Civic Center Community Benefit
District - File No. 101525

Let me begin by thanking you, as this Board's tenure ends, for your efforts over the past years in your representing the public's interests and by wishing you success in the New Year.


This is to urge you to support sane social policy by rejecting the proposal to create a Community Business District for the Civic Center area. Please use the power of your elected office to stop this undemocratic proposal in its tracks. Our citizens must not be subject to unaccountable, private "security" hirelings interacting with our residents or any members of the public in what is arguably our City's most public space.

As a longtime participant in many different marches and rallies and public gatherings to petition our representatives in City Hall or, more grandly, Washington, D.C., I strenuously object to the mere notion of having private security agents intervening in my public activities as a citizen, my right to assemble to petition my government. I am proud of our City's record, over-all, in upholding civil rights. Should this extremely bad policy be adopted, I think the City can expect a lot of unwelcome activity on the part of the City Attorney's office, when suits are brought for interference with civil rights.

If the members of this Board truly wish to improve conditions in the Civic Center, they might instead turn their attention to replacing that dusty crushed-granite surface down the middle of the mall between Polk Street and Larkin Street that replaced Mayor Newsom's garden which in its turn replaced the grassy turf that used to run the length of the mall facing City Hall. As it is, when rallies or fairs take place in that area now, the dust kicked up by wind or by many people's feet as they move about on it is not just unpleasant but also arguably unhealthy. After all, that stuff prevents organic growth of anything! Why should it be good to get it on our skin and in our lungs?

But for now, suffice it to stop in its tracks this cockamamie proposal for private policing in our City's premier public space. Aren't we still trying to keep this society running as a representative democracy, not a private police state?

Thank you for your attention.

Respectfully,

Deetje Boler

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 JAN -4 PM 1:00
BY *PC*

Opposing File No. 101525, Civic Center Community Business District speakingup

File 101526

to:

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

01/04/2011 11:19 AM

Cc:

senator.yee, tom.ammiano, kimberly.alvarenga

Show Details

Let me begin by thanking you, as this Board's tenure ends, for your efforts over the past years in your representing the public's interests and by wishing you success in the New Year.

This is to urge you to support sane social policy by rejecting the proposal to create a Community Business District for the Civic Center area. Please use the power of your elected office to stop this undemocratic proposal in its tracks. Our citizens must not be subject to unaccountable, private "security" hirelings interacting with our residents or any members of the public in what is arguably our City's most public space.

As a longtime participant in many different marches and rallies and public gatherings to petition our representatives in City Hall or, more grandly, Washington, D.C., I strenuously object to the mere notion of having private security agents intervening in my public activities as a citizen, my right to assemble to petition my government. I am proud of our City's record, over-all, in upholding civil rights. Should this extremely bad policy be adopted, I think the City can expect a lot of unwelcome activity on the part of the City Attorney's office, when suits are brought for interference with civil rights.

If the members of this Board truly wish to improve conditions in the Civic Center, they might instead turn their attention to replacing that dusty crushed-granite surface down the middle of the mall between Polk Street and Larkin Street that replaced Mayor Newsom's garden which in its turn replaced the grassy turf that used to run the length of the mall facing City Hall. As it is, when rallies or fairs take place in that area now, the dust kicked up by wind or by many people's feet as they move about on it is not just unpleasant but also arguably unhealthy. After all, that stuff prevents organic growth of anything! Why should it be good to get it on our skin and in our lungs?

But for now, suffice it to stop in its tracks this cockamamie proposal for private policing in our City's premier public space. Aren't we still trying to keep this society running as a representative democracy, not a private police state?

Thank you for your attention.

Respectfully,

Deetje Boler

Fw: PRIVATIZING the PUBLIC - kirwan
SnowDogsOnRy
to:
board.of.supervisors
01/03/2011 07:20 PM
Show Details

To The Board of Supervisors: Having read this article by Mr. Kirwan which details an upcoming meeting scheduled for Tuesday January 4 at 3:00pm in the beautiful City of San Francisco, Calif.

I am concerned about the indications that maybe leaning toward *privatizing your Civic Center*.

This called to my attention a question or so that concerns me because I live in an other beautiful

City, sometimes called Rocket City USA Huntsville, Alabama. We are very proud and most

happy with the way our city fathers have met the needs and care of all public domain. We, as tax

payers are pleased and at rest in how our dollars are spent.

It appears that you as a board are attempting to change something that has worked fair and very

well for *quite* some time. Why do you wish to change what has been a level playing field for all your

people? Does this mean, if you whip this on your city, that when I come to visit and enjoy all those

that are public to visitors as they are now as well as those who live in the city, will I be put through

a surveillance before I can enter? If this is your plan, and it looks seriously that is the ultimate principle,

then, allow me to advise you I will never come to your city again.

Most Sincerely

Alice Snow Huntsville, Al.

To: Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org ; Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org ; Chris.Daly@sfgov.org ; Sean.Esbernd@sfgov.org ; Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org ; David.Campos@sfgov.org ; Sophie.Maxwell@sfgov.org ; John.Avalos@sfgov.org ; board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org ; David.Chiu ; Carmen.Chu ; Ross.Mirkarimi

Sent: Monday, January 03, 2011 9:16 AM

Subject: PRIVATIZING the PUBLIC - kirwan

PRIVATIZING the PUBLIC!




To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Fw: San Francisco, The Death of Civic Center - kirwan

From: "Jim Kirwan" <kirwanstudios@sbcglobal.net>
To: <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>, "David Chiu" <David.Chiu@sfgov.org>
Date: 01/05/2011 07:02 AM
Subject: San Francisco, The Death of Civic Center - kirwan

San Francisco

The Death of Civic Center



David Chiu,

President,
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

**RE: Yesterday you had your little meeting
Today I give you another version of what you did.
Here's what you and your gang-of-five did last night!**

David,

Last night the Board of Supervisors committed a crime-against not-just this city, but the nation as well. By a vote of 6 to 5 you passed the CBD contract onto the backs of the people, **voting in private**, while killing the freedom for 800,000 citizens of San Francisco. This will come back to haunt you and them, because some of us plan to attach this crime to all the names until you all resign.

This will become Board President, David Chiu's special piece of history, because you and your gang of five voted to take away the right of people here, to have a police force that is answerable to those they supposedly "protect." You gave our protection, in Civic Center, to a private-security force that answers only to the Board of a thoroughly corrupt CBD corporation whose only interest is in stealing the city's money to fatten their own coffers.

This Landlord Group that owns other-property in the San Francisco Civic Center has now succeeded in privatizing the entire area so that citizens with any complaints must pass through what is now corporate-property; they call it a "Community Benefit District" but it only benefits the corporation (CBD) and it strips citizens here of their rights to own and control their own government. In brief last night the City's Board of Supervisors stripped the citizens of their most precious right of all – their FREEDOM to move freely in their own Civic Center, in which City Hall is located. How long will it be before they put those crappy brass plaques into the sidewalks throughout Civic Center that say: "**PRIVATE PROPERTY, Permission to Pass must be obtained to be here**"?


Six derelict supervisors, led by Board President David Chiu broke the most basic reason for having any government anywhere. They successfully PRIVATIZED the PUBLIC, and will begin to erect barriers between the public and the people that pay their salaries and make their silly little jobs possible. This is far more than just a civic travesty: It's a crime!

This place had been a city for only five days when the Constitution was signed in 1776. It was both the Barbary Coast and the City & County of San Francisco, and it was proud to be here! That city was also about freedom and corruption; but unlike today—that City by the Bay kept corruption as a lap dog to freedom and to

reality. If this had happened there, in that Barbary Coast of a city: This morning the six people that voted to do this (last night) would have been found hanging from street lamps; and the people would have celebrated because "justice" would have been done. That might have been called frontier-justice; but whatever it was called, politicians knew enough not to mess with people's freedoms unless they were willing to face the very real possibility of a streetlight necktie party for this mistake which 'politicians' then, would have known they had made.

In fairness of course it should be said that the people that serve as San Francisco "Supervisors" are not real people. How do I know this? Because you wasted a full two hours of the public's time last night celebrating yourselves, twelve-times over, while the public waited for you to hear this issue which was finally heard, three and half hours after it was scheduled to be heard. The delay involved the "last-day-rites" of four supervisors that were leaving office. It seems that the business of the Board had to be held hostage to this highschool-reunion-version of "This is Your Life oh valued Supervisor!" (If half of the accolades had been true, this piece of garbage would never have passed).

What then actually happened was the reading of a rather long THANK YOU from the Board & the City to themselves. And being as these creatures tend to think of themselves as "City-Hall's-Family" each and every one of those leaving had to tell their life story to the assembled members of the public. Then each of the other eleven supervisors had to congratulate the exiting supervisor with vignettes concerning the wonderful and courageous careers of both themselves and the departing politicians. In the end; each of the twelve spoke copiously upon the announcement of each of the four departing people. This took two hours more of the public's time, as the Board was already running an hour and half late. But when it was finally time for the public to speak each 'speaker' got just two minutes. There were several questions asked of the Supervisors but no one chose to answer anything that was raised by the public at the microphone: which is why this soon to be very public-report seemed necessary.



One of my own questions when I became involved in this crime-against-the-city and its people was: What experience is actually required to become a supervisor? The Board gave me that answer last night. Everyone talked about the nothingness which they felt was special, in being a supervisor, but clearly no one knew the first thing about governing, or anything larger than a scrap-book of "*what I did when I was a supervisor.*" More to the point these creatures began life by being political-aides to a Supervisor or to the criminal ex-Mayor Willie Brown; but none of them have any life experience except Chris Daley who voted against this crime.

As the evening dragged on: It became abundantly clear that these fools, headed by you David—the man that detests people—Really don't know anything about the law, the real city, or the freedoms that you and they are here to supposedly protect. Why is that David?

I also learned from listening to the opposition that this crime has been in-the-works now (cutting private deals with its potential "stakeholders") for over seven years. Why was this very public issue kept so secret that it only surfaced last fall? Tell me, did the issue of **taking away the freedom of citizens even come up** when you were cutting those deals with the Friends & Foundation over at the

Library? Or was that reserved for the more private meetings with the Library Commission's Board of Special Interests? Is Coulter still running things over there? I've had some previous dealings with him and them; you might want to read about that, because the wider-world did, and tracked that story for years.
<http://www.kirwanesque.com/politics/articles/2006/art27.htm>



Congratulations on your “win” last night David – you are going to rue the day that you first began to listen to these petty landlords and their ridiculous plan to privatize this city’s public by privatizing the Civic Center. CBD’s can work well in a business-community but city government ought not to be a commercial enterprise over its basic function of protecting its citizens, from corporate-pirates as well as from other criminal elements. You should not have chosen to “overlook & purposely ignore” that most important fact. Laws are made to be challenged and re-written; and this contract for a CBD inside the city’s heart is one of those occasions because you have sided with and sponsored this corruption of the freedom and the justice that you were supposed to defend!

I wrote to you and to “the Board” several times and did not get an answer; so I thought you needed to have my objections quantified here, in order that you can come to understand the problems with your illegal and unwarranted actions: **It was illegal for you and the board to have even considered this proposal in the first place:** because no “Board of Supervisors” has ever had the right to take away the public’s freedom to be involved in their own government. I mentioned that to you all last night at the microphone – and all that you collectively did was to squirm in your overly padded (publicly-owned) chairs. Here are the previous articles that you received, but chose not to answer. (1)

I’m going to explore some kind of special action to remove this corruption of the Constitution’s of both California and the United States, because unlike you: I believe that ‘our freedom,’ that was once basic to this country, still matters. You have shown yourself to be a true enemy of that ‘freedom.’

You are a money-grubbing privately-interested corporate-ambassador, so I can easily see how this stealth project would appeal to you. You’re also “my supervisor” and I think it’s way past time I got involved in “making your day” on a regular basis – what do you think David?

Another thing that the meeting last night clarified, beyond words, is that this Board of Supervisors was caught flat-footed by what Mayor Newsom just did: Because all of you were caught standing around with no idea of how to “manage” this not-unexpected change in the Office of the Mayor for this city.

THAT IS AND WAS YOUR JOB, AS PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS –TO DEAL WITH THAT TRANSITION SMOOTHLY: Yet neither you nor the Board were able to come up with a solution that you’ve had months to prepare for—why not David!

No man can serve two masters Chiu – and since you’re such a lousy public servant why not resign from the board and officially join those that you have given the literal Keys-to-this-City to—seems like you were made to work on the Dark Side of politics anyhow; and as you might have guessed that’s one of my specialties.

I’ll be waiting for you to resign so that you can do things for yourself, in your own name, instead of hiding behind the Board of Supervisors, that you never really liked anyhow! The sooner you resign the quicker this will end.

kirwanstudios@sbcglobal.net

1) January 3: **PRIVATIZING the PUBLIC**

<http://www.kirwanesque.com/politics/articles/2011/art1.htm>

December 30: **When to Fold & When to Fight in San Francisco**

<http://www.kirwanesque.com/politics/articles/2010/art157.htm>

December 28: **The Stranglehold on San Francisco**

<http://www.kirwanesque.com/politics/articles/2010/art156.htm>



San Francisco, The Death of Civic Center.doc

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 544-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: January 5, 2011
To: Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors
From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board *Angela Calvillo*
Subject: Notice of Transfer of Function Under Charter Section 4.132

Pursuant to Charter Section 4.132, Mayor Newsom has issued a notice to the Board of Supervisors, dated January 3, 2011, announcing a plan to reorganize duties and functions between departments and other units of government within the executive branch.

Such reorganization shall become effective 30 days after its issuance unless disapproved by the Board of Supervisors during that time.

orig:Joy

Office of the Mayor
City & County of San Francisco



Gavin Newsom

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JAN -5 AM 8:16
BY _____ PL

January 3, 2011

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

Re: Notice of Transfer of Function under Charter Section 4.132

Dear Madam Clerk:

This letter constitutes a notice to the Board of Supervisors under Charter Section 4.132 of a transfer of function between departments within the Executive Branch. Specifically, eight personnel supporting the Justice Tracking Information System (JUSTIS) project and operations will be transferred from the Department of Technology (DT) to the Department of Administrative Services. These positions include:

- 1.0 FTE, 1043 IS Engineer-Senior
- 1.0 FTE, 1064 IS Programmer Analyst-Principal
- 1.0 FTE, 1053 IS Business Analyst-Senior
- 3.0 FTE, 1054 IS Business Analyst-Principal
- 1.0 FTE, 0941 Manager VI
- 1.0 FTE, 1070 IS Project Director

A few years ago DT's mission changed to focus on the implementation and maintenance of enterprise-wide infrastructure and applications. As a result, DT has gradually transferred control of department-specific projects and operations over to those departments.¹ This transfer will give the City Administrator direct control over JUSTIS so that he may oversee project management and advocate for the resources necessary to see it through to completion. However, DT will continue to provide any additional technical support that may be required.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom
Mayor

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

¹ Examples include the transfer of support staff to the Police Department, Department of Emergency Management and Department of Administrative Services.



File 100495

To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
 Cc:
 Bcc:
 Subject: DO NOT PASS Item No. 18 [BOS File No. 100495] Admin. Code - CEQA Procedures, Appeals and Public Notice

From: Cynthia Servetnick <cynthia.servetnick@gmail.com>
 To: Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org, John.Avalos@sfgov.org, David.Campos@sfgov.org, David.Chiu@sfgov.org, Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org, Chris.Daly@sfgov.org, Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org, Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org, Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org, Sophie.Maxwell@sfgov.org, Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org
 Cc: angela.calvillo@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, mbuhler@sfheritage.org, Consortium <sfpreservationconsortium@yahoogroups.com>
 Date: 01/04/2011 08:56 AM
 Subject: DO NOT PASS Item No. 18 [BOS File No. 100495] Admin. Code - CEQA Procedures, Appeals and Public Notice

President Chiu and Members of the Board:

The San Francisco Preservation Consortium again urges you not to pass Item No. 18 [BOS File No. 100495] Administrative Code - California Environmental Quality Act Procedures, Appeals, and Public Notice as 1) the provisions for public participation in the CEQA process are woefully inadequate, 2) the public has not had enough time to properly review the proposed procedures over the winter holidays, and 3) the files were improperly severed. As Attorney Sue Hestor has aptly argued, a minimum of 30 days should be afforded to the public to prepare an appeal of a CEQA document. We intend to provide additional comments and request this item be continued.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Servetnick
 eGroup Moderator

See:

<http://www.sfbos.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/bdsupvrs/bosagendas/agendas/2011/BAG010411.pdf>

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

From: cynthia.servetnick@gmail.com
 Date: Thu, 16 Dec 2010 16:29:54
 To: <Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org>; <John.Avalos@sfgov.org>; <David.Campos@sfgov.org>; <David.Chiu@sfgov.org>; <Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org>; <Chris.Daly@sfgov.org>; <Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org>; <Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org>; <Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org>; <Sophie.Maxwell@sfgov.org>; <Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org>
 Reply-To: cynthia.servetnick@gmail.com
 Cc: <sotf@sfgov.org>; <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>; <mbuhler@sfheritage.org>; Consortium<sfpreservationconsortium@yahoogroups.com>
 Subject: DO NOT PASS Item 56 [BOS File 100495] Admin Code - CEQA Procedures, Appeals + Public Notice

President Chiu and Members of the Board:

5

The San Francisco Preservation Consortium urges you not to pass Item No. 56 [BOS File No. 100495] as no one knows exactly what is in the 6th revision of this important ordinance per the attached 12-13-10 transcript from the Land Use Committee. The revised ordinance is not posted on your website at this time. This item must be continued.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Servetnick
eGroup Moderator

Re: [Administrative Code - California Environmental Quality Act Procedures, Appeals, and Public Notice] Sponsor: Alioto-Pier Ordinance amending Administrative Code Chapter 31 to provide for appeals to the Board of Supervisors of certain environmental documents and determinations under the California Environmental Quality Act, to clarify procedures and to provide public notice of environmental documents and determinations.
Question: Shall this Ordinance be PASSED ON FIRST READING?

<http://www.sfbos.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/bdsupvrs/bosagendas/agendas/2010/BAG121410.pdf>

Sent via BlackBerry from T-Mobile



Gavin Newsom, Mayor
Edward D. Reiskin, Director

January 8, 2011

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

Subject: Chapter 14B Micro-LBE Set Aside Program Quarterly Report

Administrative Code SEC. 14B.7. (K)(4) requires contract awarding departments to disclose the following information to the Board of Supervisors each quarter: (1) the number of contracts and the amount of each contract awarded under the Micro-LBE set-aside program; and (2) all public work/construction contracts equaling \$400,000 or less not awarded under this program, and all other contracts equaling \$100,000 or less not awarded under this program, accompanied by an explanation as to why the contract was not set-aside for award under this program, or if set-aside, whether it was subsequently not awarded or awarded under any other procedure.

The attached report is a summary of all contracts awarded by DPW that were eligible for set-aside. DPW awarded two Job Order Contracts ("JOCs"), one of which was set-aside for award to Micro-LBEs. The other JOC, for general construction services, was not set-aside because the work required a contractor with experience on at least five OSHPD (Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development) projects within the past ten years and no Micro-LBEs met this requirement. 55.56% (\$2,500,000) of the total dollar amount of JOCs awarded went to Micro-LBEs.

DPW awarded fourteen construction contracts for under \$400,000. Two of these contracts were federally funded and not eligible for set-aside, and the other twelve were trade packages for the Moscone Center Tenant Improvement project ("Moscone"). Ten of the twelve Moscone trade packages were not set-aside because the complexity and the demanding schedules of the projects precluded Micro-LBEs from performing the work. Two of the trade packages were set-aside and awarded to Micro-LBEs. 23.03% (\$377,800) of the total dollar amount of construction contracts awarded for under \$400,000 was awarded to Micro-LBEs. DPW did not award any professional services contracts for under \$100,000.

In terms of procurement, 12.45% (414) of DPW's commodities and general services purchases were from Micro-LBEs, which accounted for 8.05% (\$166,975.49) of the total dollar amount of purchases made under Administrative Code Chapter 21.

Sincerely,

Edward D. Reiskin
Director

cc: Theresa Sparks, Human Rights Commission



**SFDPW
Summary of DPW Contracts Eligible for Micro-LBE Set-Aside
7/1/10 through 12/31/10**

Type Of Contract	No. of Awards	No. Awarded to Micro-LBEs	% Awarded to Micro-LBEs	Total Award Amounts	Amount Awarded to Micro-LBEs	% Awarded to Micro-LBEs
Job Order Contracts						
Contract Amount not relevant	2	1	50.00%	\$3,500,000.00	\$1,500,000.00	42.86%
Construction						
Total Award \$400,000 or Less	14	2	14.29%	\$1,640,429.00	\$377,800.00	23.03%
Professional Services						
Total Award \$100,000 or Less	0	0	0.00%	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%
Chapter 21 Purchases						
Total Purchases \$100,000 or Less	3325	414	12.45%	\$2,075,464.42	\$166,975.49	8.05%
Total	3341	417	12.48%	\$7,215,893.42	\$1,666,975.49	23.10%

Detail of DPW Contracts Under Threshold Amounts

Job Order Contracts Awarded							
Award Date	Award #	ID No.	Job Title	Contractor	Award Amount	Project Manager	Explanation of Award
10/14/2010	178925	JCA10033	Job Order Contract No. J15, General Construction Services	Rodan Builders	\$2,000,000.00	Lourdes Chan	Not set-aside because no Micro-LBE firms met requirement for having worked on a least 5 OSHPD projects within the last 10 years
12/1/2010	179006	JCA11035	Job Order Contract No. J17, General Engineering Services (Micro-Lbe Set-Aside)	Bauman Landscape & Construction	\$1,500,000.00	Lourdes Chan	Awarded as Micro-LBE Set-Aside

Construction Contracts Awarded for \$400,000 or Less							
Award Date	Award #	ID No.	Job Title	Contractor	Award Amount	Project Manager	Explanation of Award
9/21/2010	178887	FCE11012	Holloway Avenue Curb Ramps Project, Federal Aid Project No. ESPL-5934 (158) Funded by ARRA	A. Ruiz Construction Co. & Associates	\$350,783.00	Ken Spielman	Not set-aside because project was federally funded
10/1/2010	178921	FCA11018-20	Moscone Center Tenant Improvements Trade Contract HVAC	Kent Lim & Company	\$28,600.00	Youcef Bouhamama	Not set-aside due to lack of availability of Micro-LBE firms to handle the complexity and the demanding schedule of the project
10/1/2010	178918	FCA11018-10	Moscone Center Tenant Improvements Trade Contract Tile	D & J Tile Co., Inc.	\$113,024.00	Youcef Bouhamama	Not set-aside due to lack of availability of Micro-LBE firms to handle the complexity and the demanding schedule of the project

Award Date	Award #	ID No.	Job Title	Contractor	Award Amount	Project Manager	Explanation of Award
10/1/2010	178916	FCA11018-19	Moscone Center Tenant Improvements Trade Contract Plumbing	ACCO Engineered Systems, Inc.	\$372,768.00	Youcef Bouhamama	Not set-aside due to lack of availability of Micro-LBE firms to handle the complexity and the demanding schedule of the project
10/1/2010	178923	FCA11018-11	Moscone Center Tenant Improvements Trade Contract Terrazzo	American Terrazzo Co. A Corp	\$124,000.00	Youcef Bouhamama	American Terrazzo is a Micro-LBE but this contract wasn't Set-Aside.
10/1/2010	178919	FCA11018-15	Moscone Center Tenant Improvements Trade Contract Specialties	Service Metal Products, Inc.	\$39,522.00	Youcef Bouhamama	Not set-aside due to lack of availability of Micro-LBE firms to handle the complexity and the demanding schedule of the project
10/1/2010	178920	FCA11018-18	Moscone Center Tenant Improvements Trade Contract Fire Protection	Allied Fire Protection	\$7,250.00	Youcef Bouhamama	Not set-aside due to lack of availability of Micro-LBE firms to handle the complexity and the demanding schedule of the project
10/1/2010	178917	FCA11018-04	Moscone Center Tenant Improvements Trade Contract Metals	T C Steel	\$39,522.00	Youcef Bouhamama	Not set-aside due to lack of availability of Micro-LBE firms to handle the complexity and the demanding schedule of the project
10/4/2010	178924	FCA11018-21	Moscone Center Tenant Improvements Trade Contract Electrical & Fire/Life Safety	Rosendin Electric, Inc.	\$102,000.00	Youcef Bouhamama	Not set-aside due to lack of availability of Micro-LBE firms to handle the complexity and the demanding schedule of the project
10/5/2010	178926	FCA11018-14	Moscone Center Tenant Improvements Trade Contract Painting and Wallcovering	A & B Painting, Inc.	\$17,673.00	Youcef Bouhamama	Not set-aside due to lack of availability of Micro-LBE firms to handle the complexity and the demanding schedule of the project
10/5/2010	178913	FCA11018-08	Moscone Center Tenant Improvements Trade Contract Mirrors, Glass, and Glazing	Guarantee Glass, Inc.	\$29,507.00	Youcef Bouhamama	Not set-aside due to lack of availability of Micro-LBE firms to handle the complexity and the demanding schedule of the project

Award Date	Award #	ID No.	Job Title	Contractor	Award Amount	Project Manager	Explanation of Award
11/5/2010	178986	MCA11024-01	Moscone Center Tenant Improvements Trade Contract - Demolition (Micro-LBE Set-Aside)	Paniagua Construction, Inc.	\$99,500.00	Youcef Bouhamama	Awarded as a Micro-LBE Set-Aside
11/12/2010		MCA11024-09	Moscone Center Tenant Improvements Trade Contract Drywall (Micro-LBE Set-Aside)	Paniagua Construction, Inc.	\$154,300.00	Youcef Bouhamama	Awarded as a Micro-LBE Set-Aside
12/7/2010	179017	FCE10017	Corbin Place Stair Replacement - No. ESPL 5934(160) - ARRA	CF Contracting	\$161,980.00	Raymond Lui	Not set-aside because project was federally funded

Professional Service Contracts Awarded for \$100,000 or Less							
Award Date	Award #	Spec No.	Job Title	Contractor	Award Amount	Project Manager	Explanation of Award

Gerald Woods
395 West Portal
San Francisco, CA 94127

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca. 94102-4689
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
C/o Angela Calvilo (Clerk of the Board of Supervisors)

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2010 JAN -5 PM 4:44

BY AK

December 22, 2010

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a long time neighbor of Parkmerced; I have noticed that Parkmerced's owners are dedicated to improving the property and I support the proposal for revitalizing the neighborhood.

As a member of the *West Portal* neighborhood, I appreciate the amount of neighborhood outreach and coordination Parkmerced has done in the past 3 years; asking questions on what we would like to see improved not only at Parkmerced, but with the surrounding neighborhood as well. They then incorporated suggestions into the plans and I'm happy to stand by their efforts.

For years, I have believed that Parkmerced needed amenities similar to other neighborhoods: community gathering places, shops and stores. The revitalization plans recognize this by creating a community center, fitness center, community gardens, "pocket parks" and more accessible green space that is genuinely inviting. Moreover, the plans for new retail stores like cafes, a bank, dry cleaner, day care, salon and restaurants will help fulfill the community's basic modern needs. With these amenities, life in Parkmerced will be more enjoyable and more convenient.


I support the need for smart housing growth in SF specifically in the southwestern area of San Francisco; near transit. In addition, this project will help our struggling workers get back on track.

Approval of the project allows Muni and other agencies to work with Parkmerced to address the needed transit improvements on 19th Ave, and seek the necessary federal funds to improve transportation on the SW side of the city.

The plan to improve housing and create a more cohesive neighborhood will have a lasting positive affect for our community. That they are really listening to what the residents want shows their commitment to improving this community.

I fully support Parkmerced's plan and urge you to approve it.

Sincerely,


Gerald Woods

Cc: David Chiu, Board President; Supervisor Mar, Supervisor Michaela Alioto-Pier, Supervisor Chu, Supervisor Mirkarimi, Supervisor Daly, Supervisor Elsbernd, Supervisor Dufty, Supervisor Campos, Supervisor Maxwell, Supervisor Avalos

(7)

Brian McGee
741 Monterey Blvd.
San Francisco, CA 94127

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca. 94102-4689
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
C/o Angela Calvilo(Clerk of the Board of Supervisors)

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JAN 10 PM 3:51
BY PC

December 22, 2010

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

As a long time neighbor of Parkmerced; I have noticed that Parkmerced's owners are dedicated to improving the property and I support the proposal for revitalizing the neighborhood.

As a member of the *Ingleside* neighborhood, I appreciate the amount of neighborhood outreach and coordination Parkmerced has done in the past 3 years; asking questions on what we would like to see improved not only at Parkmerced, but with the surrounding neighborhood as well. They then incorporated suggestions into the plans and I'm happy to stand by their efforts.

For years, I have believed that Parkmerced needed amenities similar to other neighborhoods: community gathering places, shops and stores. The revitalization plans recognize this by creating a community center, fitness center, community gardens, "pocket parks" and more accessible green space that is genuinely inviting. Moreover, the plans for new retail stores like cafes, a bank, dry cleaner, day care, salon and restaurants will help fulfill the community's basic modern needs. With these amenities, life in Parkmerced will be more enjoyable and more convenient.


I support the need for smart housing growth in SF specifically in the southwestern area of San Francisco; near transit. In addition, this project will help our struggling workers get back on track.

Approval of the project allows Muni and other agencies to work with Parkmerced to address the needed transit improvements on 19th Ave, and seek the necessary federal funds to improve transportation on the SW side of the city.

The plan to improve housing and create a more cohesive neighborhood will have a lasting positive affect for our community. That they are really listening to what the residents want shows their commitment to improving this community.

I fully support Parkmerced's plan and urge you to approve it.

Sincerely,


Brian McGee

Cc: David Chiu, Board President; Supervisor Mar, Supervisor Michaela Alioto-Pier, Supervisor Chu, Supervisor Mirkarimi, Supervisor Daly, Supervisor Elsbernd, Supervisor Dufty, Supervisor Campos, Supervisor Maxwell, Supervisor Avalos



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

COB
cpage
File - Inauguration

Ben Rosenfield
Controller

Monique Zmuda
Deputy Controller

January 4, 2011


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

RE: Certification of Surety Bond Requirements for New Supervisors

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

The Controller's Office confirms that all newly elected and continuing Supervisors have been bonded, as of January 4, 2011, as required by the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Sincerely,


Ben Rosenfield
Controller

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 JAN -4 PM 12:57
BY PN





orig - Joy
C: BOS-11, COB, Leg Dip, City ^{Dep.} Attorney
Rules Clerk, EX file, cpage
GAVIN NEWSOM

Notice of Appointment

January 8, 2011

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to Administrative Code §§24.7, 24B.1(b), I nominate Paul Kelly for appointment to the San Francisco Relocation Appeals Board.

Paul Kelly is nominated to fill the seat held previously by Essie Webb for the unexpired portion of a three-year term ending January 2, 2012.

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

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


Gavin Newsom
Mayor

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 JAN 10 AM 9:11
BY _____ PC

9

PAUL F. KELLY

ATTORNEY AT LAW

2130 Fillmore Street, No. 286
San Francisco, California 94115
(415) 624-5219 – mobile
pfk@paulfkellylaw.com

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Law Offices of Paul F. Kelly, San Francisco, California
September 2007 – present

Specializing in the representation of individuals and businesses in the litigation and trial of claims in the areas of Business and Commercial Litigation; Real Property; Employment and Compensation; Wills, Trusts and Estates; Personal Injury and Criminal Defense.

Kirkpatrick & Lockhart Preston Gates Ellis LLP, San Francisco, California
Attorney, National Trial Team, 2006 – September 2007

Trial attorney for high exposure clients including multi-national manufacturers, distributors and retailers in product liability, mass tort and catastrophic injury cases.

Gordon & Rees LLP, San Francisco, California
Senior Counsel, 2005 – 2006

Defense of personal injury and products liability cases. Trial attorney for all phases of litigation of high value cases.

San Francisco District Attorney's Office, San Francisco, California
Assistant District Attorney, 1996 – 2005


Prosecuted misdemeanor and felony criminal matters through jury trial. Conducted numerous jury trials, court trials and evidentiary hearings.

EDUCATION

Boston College Law School, Newton Centre, Massachusetts
J.D., 1992

Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts
A.B., English Literature, cum laude, 1987

Oxford University, Oxford, England
Honors Program, 1985 – 1986



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Issued: TTX: Financial Statement Audit of the City Investment Pool

From: Controller Reports/CON/SFGOV
To: Angela Calvillo/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, BOS-Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV, BOS-Legislative Aides/BOS/SFGOV, scott.wiener@yahoo.com, 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, 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, Department Heads/MAYOR/SFGOV, Tara Collins/CTYATT@CTYATT, CON-Media Contact/CON/SFGOV, CON-EVERYONE/CON/SFGOV, Jose Cisneros/TTX/SFGOV@SFGOV, Pauline Marx/TTX/SFGOV@SFGOV
Date: 01/07/2011 01:49 PM
Subject: Issued: TTX: Financial Statement Audit of the City Investment Pool
Sent by: Richard Kurylo

The Office of the Controller, City Services Auditor, has issued a report concerning the financial statement audit of the City Investment Pool held by the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector (Treasurer) for the period from July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010. This audit was performed under contract by Macias Gini & O'Connell LLP.

Macias Gini & O'Connell LLP found that the basic financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the City's Pool at June 30, 2010, and the changes in financial position for the year then ended in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. Further, the Treasurer complied with the investment requirements in the California Government Code, Sections 27130 through 27137, and with the City's Investment Policy.

To view the full report, please visit our website at
<http://co.sfgov.org/webreports/details.aspx?id=1238>

This is a send only email.

For questions regarding this report please contact: Tonia Lediju at tonia.lediju@sfgov.org or 415-554-7593, or call the Audits Unit main line at 415-554-7469.

10

T-Mobile

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2011 JAN -5 AM 11:59

BY _____
AK

December 30, 2010

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


**RE: T-Mobile West Corporation as successor in interest to Omnipoint Communications, Inc.
d/b/a T-Mobile (U-3056-C).
Notification Letter for T-Mobile Site No. SF63252A:**

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

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

A copy of this notification letter is being sent to the local government agency identified below for its information. Should 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:

- City of San Francisco, Department Public Works, Bureau of Street Use & Mapping, 875 Stevenson Street, San Francisco, CA 94103
- City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Planning Director, 1660 Mission St., 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103
- City & County of San Francisco, Attn: City Administrator, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102
- City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Clerk of the Board, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102

(=)

ATTACHMENT A

1. Project Location

Site Identification Number: SF63252A
Site Name: Pole Cap 46th Ave
Site Address: 2201 46th Ave.
County: San Francisco
Assessor's Parcel Number: 2166-001
Latitude: 37° 44' 43.54" (NAD 83)
Longitude: 122° 30' 18.00" (NAD 83)

2. Project Description

Number of Antennas to be installed: 3
Tower Design: Existing Wood Pole
Tower Appearance: Installing three panel antenna's inside radome
mounted on an existing PGE Wood Pole
Tower Height: 38 feet 7 inches
Size of Building: NA

3. Business Addresses of all Governmental Agencies

City of San Francisco, Department Public Works, Bureau of Street Use & Mapping, 875 Stevenson Street, San Francisco, CA 94103
City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Planning Director, 1660 Mission St., 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103
City & County of San Francisco, Attn: City Administrator, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102
City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Clerk of the Board, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102

4. Land Use Approvals

Date Zoning Approval Issued: 12/17/10
Land Use Permit #: 10WR-0139
If Land use Approval was not required: NA

T-Mobile

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2014 JAN -5 AM 11:59

AK

December 30, 2010

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


**RE: T-Mobile West Corporation as successor in interest to Omnipoint Communications, Inc.
d/b/a T-Mobile (U-3056-C).
Notification Letter for T-Mobile Site No. SF63120A:**

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

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

A copy of this notification letter is being sent to the local government agency identified below for its information. Should 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:

City of San Francisco, Department Public Works, Bureau of Street Use & Mapping, 875 Stevenson Street, San Francisco, CA 94103

City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Planning Director, 1660 Mission St., 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103

City & County of San Francisco, Attn: City Administrator, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102

City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Clerk of the Board, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102

12

December 30, 2010

Page 2 of 2

ATTACHMENT A

1. Project Location

Site Identification Number: SF63120A
Site Name: Pole Cap Judah
Site Address: 4001 Judah St.
County: San Francisco
Assessor's Parcel Number: 1801-001
Latitude: 37° 45' 37.29" (NAD 83)
Longitude: 122° 30' 17.73" (NAD 83)

2. Project Description

Number of Antennas to be installed: 3
Tower Design: Existing Wood Pole
Tower Appearance: Installing three panel antenna's inside radome mounted on an existing PGE Wood Pole
Tower Height: 57 feet 8 inches
Size of Building: NA

3. Business Addresses of all Governmental Agencies

City of San Francisco, Department Public Works, Bureau of Street Use & Mapping, 875 Stevenson Street, San Francisco, CA 94103
City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Planning Director, 1660 Mission St., 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103
City & County of San Francisco, Attn: City Administrator, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102
City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Clerk of the Board, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102

4. Land Use Approvals

Date Zoning Approval Issued: 12/17/10
Land Use Permit #: 10WR-0138
If Land use Approval was not required: NA

T-Mobile

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

December 30, 2010

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

BY _____
AK

2011 JAN -5 AM 11:59

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

**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. SF63444A:**

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

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

A copy of this notification letter is being sent to the local government agency identified below for its information. Should 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:

City of San Francisco, Department Public Works, Bureau of Street Use & Mapping, 875 Stevenson Street, San Francisco, CA 94103

City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Planning Director, 1660 Mission St., 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103

City & County of San Francisco, Attn: City Administrator, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102

City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Clerk of the Board, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102

13

December 30, 2010

Page 2 of 2

ATTACHMENT A

1. Project Location

Site Identification Number: SF63444A
Site Name: Pole Cap 47th Ave
Site Address: 1601 47th Ave.
County: San Francisco
Assessor's Parcel Number: 1896-001
Latitude: 37° 44' 23.65" (NAD 83)
Longitude: 122° 30' 24.69" (NAD 83)

2. Project Description

Number of Antennas to be installed: 3
Tower Design: Existing Wood Pole
Tower Appearance: Installing three panel antenna's inside radome
mounted on an existing PGE Wood Pole
Tower Height: 38 feet
Size of Building: NA

3. Business Addresses of all Governmental Agencies

City of San Francisco, Department Public Works, Bureau of Street Use & Mapping, 875 Stevenson Street, San Francisco, CA 94103
City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Planning Director, 1660 Mission St., 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103
City & County of San Francisco, Attn: City Administrator, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102
City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Clerk of the Board, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102

4. Land Use Approvals

Date Zoning Approval Issued: 12/17/10
Land Use Permit #: 10WR-0137
If Land use Approval was not required: NA



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Suggestion to make 25th & Bartlett Street intersection a four-way stop.

From: Janas Page [REDACTED]
To: Ricardo.Olea@sfmta.com, dpt.website@sfgov.org, David Campos <david.campos@sfgov.org>, Gavin Newsom <gavin.newsom@sfgov.org>
Cc: SF Board of Supervisors <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Date: 01/04/2011 03:24 PM
Subject: Re: Suggestion to make 25th & Bartlett Street intersection a four-way stop.

Now that someone has nearly been killed, will you please make this intersection a four-way stop? I still see accidents at this intersection nearly once a month.

<http://missionlocal.org/2010/12/neighbors-concerned-about-intersection-after-cyclist-accident/>

Thank you,

Janas Page
San Francisco, CA 94110

On Fri, Oct 9, 2009 at 5:36 PM, Janas Page wrote:

Hello,

I just witnessed another accident at the intersection of 25th & Bartlett. This one was pretty loud, involved two SUVs.

I wish you'd fix the intersection (add stop signs on 25th Street) or at least write back explaining why you let these accidents continue, why you haven't looked at the intersection in-person.

Janas Page
San Francisco, CA 94110

On Thu, Sep 10, 2009 at 1:20 PM, Janas Page wrote:

> Hello,

>

> [REDACTED] Last

> year I wrote suggesting the traffic controls be reassessed for this
> intersection, and my suggestion was quickly dismissed. I am prompted
> to write again after witnessing a collision between a northbound BMW
> and a westbound SmartCar just moments ago.

>

> Throughout each day, I continually hear horns honked by confused
> motorist several times over. Throughout each week and month, I
> frequently hear tire screeches and even vehicle collisions.

>

> It is my strong opinion this intersection needs to be a four-way stop,
> or at least to have a "Cross Traffic Does Not Stop" sign. Respectfully
> may ask did anyone visit this intersection last year, or was only a

> map consulted?
>
> Thank you for your attention to this matter.
>
> Ms. Janas Page
> San Francisco, CA 94110

On Tue, Mar 18, 2008 at 6:40 PM, Janas Page wrote:
Or maybe it should be made an all-way stop. It already has crosswalks.
Thank you for your attention to this matter.
~Janas Page

On Mon, Mar 17, 2008 at 9:40 AM, Olea, Ricardo <Ricardo.Olea@sfmta.com> wrote:

> Ms. Page - Thank you for your email, we'll assign someone to look into this.
> Ricardo Olea, Engineering
>
>
> _____
> From: Website, DPT
> Sent: Monday, March 17, 2008 9:02 AM
> To: Olea, Ricardo
> Subject: FW: suggesting a road sign for safety at 25th & bartlett

>
>
> Thank you for contacting the Department of Parking & Traffic, A Division of
> the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency. Please visit our website
> at www.sfmta.com

>
>
> _____
> From: Janas Page
> Sent: Sat 3/15/2008 1:49 PM
> To: dpt.website@sfgov.org
> Subject: suggesting a road sign for safety at 25th & bartlett

> Hello,

>
> [REDACTED] my roommate and I
> would like to suggest you consider adding a road sign to this intersection.
> Cars travelling north on Bartlett seem to think it's an all-way stop, and I
> don't blame them, but cars on 25th don't have a stop sign.

>
> Could we suggest a "Cross Traffic Does Not Stop" sign? Thank you,

>
> Ms. Janas Page

> San Francisco, CA 94110

> ~

CONGRESSWOMAN L. WOOLSEY
MARIN DISTRICT OFFICE
1050 NORTHGATE DR. 35708 JAN 2011
SAN RAFAEL, CA 94903
415 507 9554

2 pages
Recvd 1/4/2011
Assemblyment
Hoffm
office

'Da Vexing 9-11 Truth Campaign to end 63 years of Murder & Squander for Fascist Gain by Shock & Shame.
December 31, 2010, Abuse News #4631 by John Jenkel, 9-11bountyhunter@att.net, 800-500-7083

COURTESY OF MS SENATOR BARBARA BOXER

1700 MARKET STREET, SUITE 240
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103
PHONE (415) 463-0100, FAX (415) 956-6701
<http://boxer.senate.gov>

Recvd 1/4/2011
Senator Leno's
Office

JAN 04 2011

'Da constitution revolution is on, America

JAN 04 2011
received
Rep. Pele
office

Received
Governor
Jerry Brown
office
Jan. 04, 2011

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 JAN -4 PM 11:46
BY *[Signature]*

How to fix California

At his third inaugural as the Governor of California, Edmund G. (Jerry) Brown, Jr. delivered tough love. He vowed to support and defend the Constitution *for, not of*, the \$13.8 trillion blood debt United States, and to support and defend the Constitution *for, not of*, the \$151 billion dysfunctional State of California, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion. He added "Really! No mental reservation." 'Da ~~politicos~~ laughed.

political junkies

This extremely well qualified Governor cautioned, "In this crisis, we simply have to work together, as California first." But then he added, "members of a political party second."

No, Governor Jerry Brown! We the congressionally betrayed People of California want patriotism second, and balance third. To hell with politics.

You were on the patriotic trail that started with the Magna Carta in 1215 when you said "Really! No mental reservation." Hopefully that means Your Honor will put California first by enforcing Section 5 of Article I in the Constitution *for, not of*, the \$151 billion dysfunctional State of California that mandates: "The military is subordinate to civil power." The problem with California is it is under martial law imposed by Public Law betrayal 107-243.

The 112th House of Representatives is starting business by reading the Constitution. Hopefully our representative Lynn Woolsey will have "no mental reservation" about rising to fix 7 parts of our supreme laws that are violated by democracy ending strike-first Public betrayal 107-23. See attached.

Please maintain this constitution revolution by demanding that the United States of America stops the murder of 622 Californians in, and robbing California of \$143 billion of its resources for, unconstitutional wars of congressional choice, *never* necessity, against CIA-fabricated enemies.

Naturally, 'da 9-11 Truth Campaign

Da Vexing 9-11 Truth Campaign to end 63 years of Murder & Squander for Fascist Gain by Shock & Shame.
January 2, 2011, Abuse News #4629 by John Jenkel, 9-11bountyhunter@att.net, 800-500-7083

Our United States Representative Lynn Woolsey:

Help us end martial law. It was established by democracy ending and economy destroying *Public betrayal 107-243* by Joseph Biden, Hillary Clinton, Ellen Tauscher, and Dianne Feinstein, Jane Harman, Orrin Hatch, John Kerry, Harry Reid, Olympia Snow and 167 other members of the 111th Congress and 9-11 attempted wife killer George w. Bush on October 16, 2002.

Please make the following 7 points during the historic reading of our Constitution by our 112th House of Representatives on January 5, 2011.

Point 1. After the Preamble to "the Constitution for the United States" is read, please rise to make a point of order, as one of we the congressionally betrayed people of the United States. State that the Constitution is ordained by we the people *for, not of,* the United States. Tell your colleagues that any reference to the Constitution *of* the United States takes power away from we the betrayed people who ordain it and *suffer* when it is not supported and defended without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, as we demand.

Point 2. After clause 11 of Section 8 in Article I is read, please rise to make a second point of order as one of we the people of the United States. State that we the congressionally betrayed people ordain (*present tense!*) clause 11 to insure that, under the Constitution, no person can be ordered in harms way on foreign soil, and no public resource can be spent for the United States invasions until two thirds of each house votes to declare war. **Pubic Law 107-243** authorizes the President "**to use armed forces as he (alone) determines to be necessary.**" It violates clause 11 and every right protected by the Constitution.

Point 3. After clause 14 of Section 8 in Article I is read, please rise to make a third point of order as one of we the congressionally betrayed people of the United States. State that we the people ordain This clause to insure that, under the Constitution, military power is subordinate to the power of we the people.

Point 4. After clause 1 of Section 2 in Article II is read, please rise to make a fourth point of order as one of we the congressionally betrayed people of the United States. State that we the people ordain that "**the President shall be commander in chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the**

— militia of the several states, *when called into actual service of the United States.*” Congress has not called a commander in chief into actual service since it declared wars against Japan, Germany, Italy, Bulgaria, Romania, and Hungary in WWII. Public Law 107-234 is based on the War Powers Act which insures *“that the collective judgement of both the Congress and the President will apply to the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities.”* We the people ordain no such collective judgment and demand that this sole power of Congress is enforced.

Point 5. After the 4th Amendment is read, please rise to make a fifth point of order as one of we the congressionally betrayed people of the United States. State that we the people added the 4th Amendment to *“the Constitution for the United States”* to insure our *“persons, houses, papers, and effects,”* and our earth neighbors’ persons, houses, papers, and effects, *“against unreasonable seizures by the United States,”* and to insure that no warrants for seizure by the United States *“shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation.”* We the people consider a declaration of war upon probable cause, supported in Congress by oath or affirmation, to be a special form of warrant for seizure on foreign soil by our United States. Public Law 107-243 does not even require probable cause for seizure and is clearly constitutionally defective.

Point 6. After the 5th Amendment is read, please rise to make a sixth point of order as one of we the congressionally betrayed people of the United States. State that we the people added the 5th Amendment to *“the Constitution for the United States”* to insure that we and our earth neighbors will not be deprived of our lives, liberty, or property by the United States without due process of supreme law in our Constitution. We the angry people consider a declaration of war by Congress to be *the only due process of supreme law* that can result in our loved ones invading foreign soil to be killed and to kill our earth neighbors.

Point 7. After the 14th Amendment is read, please rise to make a seventh point of order as one of we the congressionally betrayed people of the United States. State that we the people added the 14th Amendment to *“the Constitution for the United States”* to insure that we *and our earth neighbors* will be equally protected by the supreme laws of our land. We the congressionally ignored people consider a declaration of war by Congress to be such equal protection. Public Law 107-243 is a treasonous violation of inalienable human rights.

Naturally, Colleen Fernald, Rachel Lamm, John Jenkel, and ‘da 9-11 Truth Campaign.

'Da Vexing 9-11 Truth Campaign to end 63 years of Murder & Squander for Fascist Gain by Shock & Shame.
January 2, 2011, Abuse News #4630 by **John Jenkel**, 9-11bountyhunter@att.net, 800-500-7083

My local unresponsive representative **Efren Carrillo**:

You are subject to being sentenced to death for treason under California Penal Code Section 37 *IF* you do not make every effort to initiate and support the following resolution by the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors. To wit:

WHEREAS, California Supreme Court Chief Justice-appointed Judge **Dean A. Beaupré** ordered that 2.25 acre Assessor's Parcel No. 130-180-049 "may be sold to satisfy the judgment" for \$90,676.65 in damages against **John Jenkel**, who is one of 16 inclusive Respondents in mandamus Case No. SCV-238698; and

WHEREAS, permission from a state court to sell property is not a court order to sell property, and, therefore, the seizure and sale of AP#130-180-049 by Sonoma County Sheriff-Coroner **Bill Cogbill** was an executive option by the County of Sonoma at the expense of **John Jenkel**, 'da 9-11 Bounty Hunter; and

Whereas, it is the opinion of the Sonoma County Counsel's Office that a single respondent may not be held accountable for the alleged actions of 15 other at-all-times coequal respondents and the judgement is defective;

Whereas, it is the opinion of the Sonoma County Counsel's Office that damages may not be awarded in mandamus. Relief is extraordinary by writ of mandate, certiorari, or prohibition signed by a judicial officer; and not by damages;

Whereas, said judgement for \$90,676.65 in alleged damages in mandamus Case No. SCV-238698 never had due process of a trial by jury or examination of evidence before a judicial officer of constitutional law, and were fabricated; and

Whereas, the County of Sonoma did not acquire said property by due process of law or under equal protection of the laws that mandate just compensation for **John Jenkel** determined by a jury. It was unconstitutionally seized and sold under martial law established by **Public Law 107-243**; and

Whereas, the county was publicly warned that it would be giving aid and comfort to enemies of this state by selling property that it did not lawfully own and wants to stop this persecution of a patriotic property owner;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the County of Sonoma quit claims all interest in AP#130-180-049 back to its lawful owner, **John Jenkel**.

Laurie Kellmen:

**The House is going to read the Constitution!
Help we the congressionally betrayed people
get it honored in both houses.**

Laurie Kellman, Associated Press Writer:

In 2007, you reported that United States Senator Arlen Specter from Pennsylvania "**directly challenged President Bush's declaration that 'I am the decision maker'" on "Iraq war policy."** Under constitutional law, the president never decides policy. He or she executes policy decided by a legislative body, especially to declare war. All policy for the United States is established by Congress and executed by the President. War policy is established by a declaration of war that calls the President into actual service as a commander in chief to execute specific war policy on foreign soil for the common defense of our states, including an exit policy. Since WWII, there have been no declarations of war by Congress because the United States feeds off imperialism and plundering the world.

You quoted my patriotic Senator **Barbara Boxer** urging her colleagues to "**read the Constitution. The Congress has the power to declare war. And on multiple occasions, we used our power to end conflicts."**

It took the United States murder of over 5,800 Americans and over 100,000 earth neighbors, and a depression caused by squandering over \$7 trillion of our resources on undeclared and unconstitutional wars of congressional choice, *never* necessity, triggered by 2,798 unplanned murders caused by Bush wanting to become a bachelor, and martial law under democracy ending strike-first **Public Law 107-243**, before 173 strike-first traitors in the 111th Congress got desperate enough ^{to} convince their colleagues to support and defend the Constitution and save our democracy from becoming a fascist state, or face death sentences for treason.

Consequently, the new majority in the 112th House of Representatives is pretending to be concerned about the founding principles of this country. Actually, they are wolves in sheep's clothing.

An example is "a pillar" of the tea party movement, Representative **Michele Bachmann** from Minnesota. A third term representative, according to Washington Post Staff Writers **Philip Rucker** and **Krissah Thompson**, Representative Bachmann campaigned about ending "reckless spending" and renewing her "commitment to the Constitution" but never connected "reckless spending" on unconstitutional wars of congressional choice to the failure of her colleagues to honor their oaths and public contracts to support and defend the Constitution by preventing optional undeclared wars for fascist gain, population management, religious genocide, and organized crime.

Please read our request of our Representative **Lynn Woolsey** to make 7 points of order during the reading of the Constitution and its amendments on Wednesday, January 5, 2011. We are asking her to rise and clarify what we the congressionally betrayed people ordained in 1787. "in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity" citing the Preamble to the Constitution *for, not of,* the United States of America.

In 2007, our Representative **Lynn Woolsey** claimed to be "leading the effort in Congress to end the war in Iraq." Now she needs to lead ending unconstitutional war of congressional choice, NEVER necessity, for Big Oil and Muslim haters in Iraq, and ending unconstitutional war of congressional choice, NEVER necessity, for Communist China and atheist haters in Afghanistan, all against CIA-fabricated enemies. Please help us encourage her for the sake of humanity.

Naturally, 'da 9-11 Truth Campaign

Facism in Congress

PUBLIC LAW 107-243—OCT. 16, 2002

116 STAT. 1501

SEC. 2. SUPPORT FOR UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC EFFORTS.

The Congress of the United States supports the efforts by the President to—

- (1) strictly enforce through the United Nations Security Council all relevant Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq and encourages him in those efforts; and
- (2) obtain prompt and decisive action by the Security Council to ensure that Iraq abandons its strategy of delay, evasion and noncompliance and promptly and strictly complies with all relevant Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq.

Ass backwards. The executive supports the legislative.

Only Non-violent action

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The President is authorized to use the Armed Forces of the United States as he determines to be necessary and appropriate in order to—

without a declaration of war.

- (1) defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq; and
- (2) enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq.

(b) PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION.—In connection with the exercise of the authority granted in subsection (a) to use force as may be feasible, but no later than 48 hours after exercising such authority, make available to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate his determination that—

to Big Oil by military force mass murder

- (1) reliance by the United States on further diplomatic or other peaceful means alone either (A) will not adequately protect the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq or (B) is not likely to lead to enforcement of all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq; and
- (2) acting pursuant to this joint resolution is consistent with the United States and other countries continuing to take the necessary actions against international terrorist and terrorist organizations, including those nations, organizations, or persons who planned, authorized, committed or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001.

The foundation of fascism and the root cause of our current economic crisis

(c) WAR POWERS RESOLUTION REQUIREMENTS.—(1) SPECIFIC STATUTORY AUTHORIZATION.—Consistent with section 8(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution, the Congress declares that this section is intended to constitute specific statutory authorization within the meaning of section 5(b) of the War Powers Resolution.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—Nothing in this joint resolution supersedes any requirement of the War Powers Resolution.

Martial Law in the United States

SEC. 4. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) REPORTS.—The President shall, at least once every 60 days, submit to the Congress a report on matters relevant to this joint resolution, including actions taken pursuant to the exercise of authority granted in section 3 and the status of planning for efforts that are expected to be required after such actions are completed, including those actions described in section 7 of the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-338).

President

Occupation

The United States Mass Murder and World Terrorism Act and Dictatorship Act

33/47

Exhibit E, #4

to
tion
amst
anners,
thorizes
aiders

48 GOP
29 Dems
77

Grouped By Vote Position

YEAs - 77

Traitors

China
Doll
Dianne

vs. Taliban

wants to
be my
resident.
his way.

Bounty
hunter's mate

P. →
ed →
Gov.
houl
(Ridge)
fascist

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Allard (R-CO) | Edwards (D-NC) | McCain (R-AZ) |
| Allen (R-VA) | Ensign (R-NV) | McConnell (R-KY) |
| Baucus (D-MT) | Enzi (R-WY) | Miller (D-GA) |
| Bayh (D-IN) | Feinstein (D-CA) | Murkowski (R-AK) |
| Bennett (R-UT) | Fitzgerald (R-IL) | Nelson (D-FL) |
| Biden (D-DE) | Frist (R-TN) | Nelson (D-NE) |
| Bond (R-MO) | Gramm (R-TX) | Nickles (R-OK) |
| Breaux (D-LA) | Grassley (R-IA) | Reid (D-NV) |
| Brownback (R-KS) | Gregg (R-NH) | Roberts (R-KS) |
| Bunning (R-KY) | Hagel (R-NE) | Rockefeller (D-WV) |
| Burns (R-MT) | Harkin (D-IA) | Santorum (R-PA) |
| Campbell (R-CO) | Hatch (R-UT) <i>fraud</i> | Schumer (D-NY) |
| Cantwell (D-WA) <i>Maryland</i> | Helms (R-NC) | Sessions (R-AL) |
| Carnahan (D-MO) <i>Mollings</i> | Mollings (D-SC) | Shelby (R-AL) <i>fraud</i> |
| Carper (D-DE) | Hutchinson (R-AR) | Smith (R-NH) |
| Cleland (D-GA) | Hutchison (R-TX) <i>Ky</i> | Smith (R-OR) <i>Gardone</i> |
| Clinton (D-NY) | Inhofe (R-OK) | Snowe (R-ME) <i>Olympia</i> |
| Cochran (R-MS) | Johnson (D-SD) | Specter (R-PA) |
| Collins (R-ME) <i>Suzan</i> | Kerry (D-MA) <i>fraud</i> | Stevens (R-AK) |
| Craig (R-ID) | Kohl (D-WI) | Thomas (R-WY) |
| Crapo (R-ID) | Kyl (R-AZ) | Thompson (R-TN) |
| Daschle (D-SD) <i>fraud</i> | Landrieu (D-LA) <i>Mary</i> | Thurmond (R-SC) |
| DeWine (R-OH) | Lieberman (D-CT) <i>Blanch</i> | Torricelli (D-NJ) |
| Dodd (D-CT) | Lincoln (D-AR) | Voinovich (R-OH) |
| Domenici (R-NM) | Lott (R-MS) | Warner (R-VA) |
| Dorgan (D-ND) | Lugar (R-IN) | |

phony
patriot

In court for
treason

21
facing re-election
in 2006

Double Agent
brought us
Homeland fascism

Patriots

- | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|
| Mikulski (D-MD) | Murray (D-WA) | Reed (D-RI) | Sarbanes (D-MD) | Stabenow (D-MI) | Wellstone (D-MN) | Wyden (D-OR) |
|-----------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|

1 GOP
Murdered (?)

Big Oil Bill's rep.
(Naughty boy)

Facing re-election
in 2006
10V

Vote Summary By Senator Name By Vote Position By Home State

Grouped by Home State

- | | | |
|--------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Alabama: | Sessions (R-AL), Yea | Shelby (R-AL), Yea |
| Alaska: | Murkowski (R-AK), Yea | Stevens (R-AK), Yea |
| Arizona: | Kyl (R-AZ), Yea | McCain (R-AZ), Yea |
| Arkansas: | Hutchinson (R-AR), Yea | Lincoln (D-AR), Yea |
| California: | Boxer (D-CA), Nay | Feinstein (D-CA), Yea |
| Colorado: | Allard (R-CO), Yea | Campbell (R-CO), Yea |
| Connecticut: | Dodd (D-CT), Yea | Lieberman (D-CT), Yea |
| Delaware: | Biden (D-DE), Yea | Carper (D-DE), Yea |
| Florida: | Graham (D-FL), Nay | Nelson (D-FL), Yea |
| Georgia: | Cleland (D-GA), Yea | Miller (D-GA), Yea |



US Debt Clock.org

STATE DEBT CLOCKS

CALIFORNIA



STATE FLAG



STATE SEAL

POPULATION

37,344,741

UNEMPLOYED

2,233,049

FOOD STAMP RECIPIENTS

3,600,320

GDP

\$1,936 Billion

DEBT

\$364.8 Billion

DEBT TO GDP RATIO

18.8%

REVENUE

\$41.8 Billion

SPENDING

\$493.03 Billion

DEBT PER CITIZEN

\$9,770

MORTGAGE/LOAN CALCULATOR

AUTO SALES

ABOUT

ENERGY OUTPUT

GOLD/PRECIOUS METALS

493,013 billion spending
 341,791 billion revenue
 \$151,222 billion deficit/yr

3,600,320 \$364,847,846,489 \$1,936,720,575,130 37,344,737 18.8384350
 2,233,050 \$341,790,904,695 \$
 493,012,976,801 \$9,770

AL AK AZ AR CA CO CT DE FL GA HI ID IL IN IA KS KY LA ME MD MA MI MN MS MO
 MT NE NV NH NJ NM NY NC ND OH OK OR PA RI SC SD TN TX UT VT VA WA WV WI WY

Office of the Mayor
City & County of San Francisco



Gavin Newsom


January 10, 2011

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

Dear Supervisors,

I am resigning my position as Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco, effective this date, so as to assume the role of Lieutenant Governor of the State of California.

Sincerely,


Gavin Newsom
Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco

cc: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 200, San Francisco, California 94102-4641
gavin.newsom@sfgov.org • (415) 554-6141

16

Overturn San Francisco's Discriminatory Sidewalk Sitting Ban

monka blanke

to:

Board.of.Supervisors

01/09/2011 11:25 PM

Please respond to monka blanke

Show Details

Security:

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

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.

monka blanke
hasselt, Belgium

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at www.change.org/petitions/view/overturn_san_franciscos_discriminatory_sidewalk_sitting_ban. To

respond, email responses@change.org and include a link to this petition.



17

Overturn San Francisco's Discriminatory Sidewalk Sitting Ban

Emil Jimmy Jakob Kleinknecht

to:

Board.of.Supervisors

01/12/2011 09:30 PM

Please respond to Emil Jimmy Jakob Kleinknecht

Show Details

Security:

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

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.

Emil Jimmy Jakob Kleinknecht
, NY

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at www.change.org/petitions/view/overturn_san_franciscos_discriminatory_sidewalk_sitting_ban. To

respond, email responses@change.org and include a link to this petition.



17



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Overturn San Francisco's Discriminatory Sidewalk Sitting Ban

Today, the BOS email box received fourteen letters with this same message.

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

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

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 01/18/2011 11:59 AM -----

From: Tamela Mullin <mail@change.org>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 01/14/2011 11:32 PM
Subject: Overturn San Francisco's Discriminatory Sidewalk Sitting Ban

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.

Tamela Mullin
ST Joseph, MI

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at
www.change.org/petitions/view/overturn_san_franciscos_discriminatory_sidewalk_sitting_ban.



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: for all supervisors re: Pacifica/KPFA

File 101529
epage

From: sally sommer <s_sommer@sbcglobal.net>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 01/03/2011 02:29 PM
Subject: for all supervisors re: Pacifica/KPFA

Reasons to abstain or vote no on Sup. Avalos resolution on Pacifica/KPFA.

There are ongoing talks between Pacifica management and the union that involve union contract interpretation. That issue is being dealt with in the framework of the contract. Do you really want to publicly introject your resolution in favor of one party to those negotiations, especially when it will only serve to appear that you are taking sides in this dispute and increasing divisiveness, when in fact, your opinion will and should have no influence in these negotiations anyway.

In your recommendation for mediation, it is important that you be aware that mediation requires no preconditions, whereas your resolution calling for 'bringing the Morning Show' crisis to a favorable conclusion' assumes that there has not been a favorable conclusion. And consider, there is NO Morning Show crisis, there IS a financial crisis. The problem with mediation as you suggest is, if it is mediation with the union concerning the union contract, the local station board and listeners are not party to union mediations, if it is community mediation, it is non-binding, so the resolution is not clear.

If you feel you must pass some resolution, I urge you to take the 'high road' and put the viability of this venerable, irreplaceable institution first, to resolve that all parties settle their differences asap. The democratic structures that were fought for, won, and put into place 10 years ago, the by-laws and the democratically elected local and national boards were put into place specifically to maintain the independence of the Pacifica network and keep it free of any governmental influence.

The last resolution, "Further resolved, That the SF Board of Supervisors urges these entities (national and local management, paid union staff, *unpaid staff*, local station board, and listeners) to continue the effort to stabilize the financial standing of the station and strengthen the station's efforts to bring grassroots, commercial free programming to the Bay Area and beyond." would be a perfect resolution and public statement.

Thank you for your concern for the life of this, only one of its kind, essential institution.

Sally Sommer

18



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Honoring Oliver Sipple

From: Allen Jones <jones-allen@att.net>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 01/05/2011 03:16 PM
Subject: Honoring Oliver Sipple

Supervisors,

My new year started out at City Hall as I attended the first of the year San Francisco Board of Supervisors meeting. I wanted to bring to the attention of city officials that I thought the city owed a posthumous honor to a resident and hero.

I must admit these mostly; young whippersnapper politicians were too fast for me. I could keep up with the speed of city politics but there was something weird or different at this particular meeting. I could be wrong but it might have been the fact that they just could not wait to get to the part of the agenda where they were trying to name a new mayor for the resigning Mayor Gavin Newson.

The board rearranged procedure, where they took comments before the calendar item of possible nomination for a successor mayor. I stood in line to speak my two minutes, which was a follow up to my earlier e-mail to all board members, which went something like this:

I am 54 and have been a resident of San Francisco for nearly fifty years. For as long as I could remember, I have always been ashamed of the fact that I am a homosexual. Then I read the sad story of former marine and decorated Vietnam veteran Oliver Sipple. My shame has shifted.

On September 22, 1975, Oliver W. Sipple grabbed the hand of Sarah Jane Moore as she attempted to assassinate President Gerald R. Ford outside the Westin St. Francis Hotel at Union Square in San Francisco. Oliver Sipple was never honored for his heroics simply because he was homosexual and I believe San Francisco owes him a special kind of thank you.

How can a man save the life of the president in of all places, San Francisco and instead of being honored, he was dishonored. I finished speaking feeling ignored and 99% sure that none of them even heard of Tony Bennett.

19

San Francisco should honor Oliver Sipple by naming a street, cable car, which is difficult but not impossible; or the soon to be completed Powell Street Promenade. near where his heroics took place in his honor.

I believe in the power of a little thank you. Moreover, if the city of San Francisco could say, Thank you Oliver Sipple for saving the life of the President of the United States. loud enough, the whole nation could hear it and look into its own shameful treatment of gays.

Nevertheless, if San Franciscans cannot say thank you or show respect to a homosexual for his bravery, then it should be no surprise that when Tony Bennett Sings "I left my heart in San Francisco" more people wonder why.

Allen Jones
(415) 756-7733
<http://casegame.squarespace.com>
jones-allen@att.net



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Visiting family in SF

From: "Susan Hauser" <cuptsue@comcast.net>
To: <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
Date: 01/03/2011 07:31 PM
Subject: Visiting family in SF

To Whom It May Concern:

My daughter and family live in SF. Once a week we travel from the South Bay to SF to babysit our 18 month old granddaughter. In the past few months the city has posted and enforced a two hour parking curfew. Now when I or my husband go to babysit our granddaughter if she is sleeping we must leave her alone in her flat while we look for another place to park our car. We feel this is unreasonable and dangerous to leave her alone. We propose that homeowners/renters get two passes per household that allows family, friends or nannies to visit a family. In our city of Cupertino and in Cambridge MA where another family member lived they are given two passes per household to allow the homeowners to have visitors.

We are suggesting that the usually progressive city of SF consider this solution, so children are not left alone and unprotected while cars are searching for parking.

Respectfully,
Sue Hauser
cuptsue@comcast.net
408-996-2633

20

Shame of the SF Board of Supervisors.

Francisco Da Costa

to:

BOS BOS, SFBOS BOS, David Chiu, Angela Calvillo, Michela Alioto-Pier, Sean Elsbernd, John Avalos, \David Campos\, Carmen Chu, Chris Daly, Bevan Dufty, Eric Mar, Sophie Maxwell, Ross Mirkarimi, Edwin Lee, Michael Hennessey, Ed Harrington

01/05/2011 08:12 AM

Show Details

Shame on the SF Board of Supervisors:

<http://www.indybay.org/newsitems/2011/01/05/18668337.php>

Francisco Da Costa


(21)







File 101447

NEPA/NHPA Compliance, Item No. 14, Accept and Expend Grant - Market and Octavia Historic Resource Preservation Project - \$83,529 [BOS File No. 101447]

Supervisor David Chiu,
Cynthia Servetnick to: Michela.Alioto-Pier, Supervisor David Campos, Carmen.Chu, Supervisor Eric L. mwdonaldson, "john.rahaim", bill.wycko, Tim Frye, Moses Corrette, Cc: Linda Avery, "marlena.byrne", c.chase, awmartinez, jmbuckley9, cdamkroger, karlhasz, diane, "Wolfram, Andrew", rm, c_olague, 01/04/2011 08:21 AM



4 attachments

-  SFSTC Apt District DPR 523-D.pdf
-  MO_Historic_Districts.pdf
-  NPS M-O Grant.pdf
-  SFSTC Apt District 1-4-11.pdf

President Chiu and Members of the Board:

Save the Laguna Street Campus is a California Nonprofit Public Benefit Corporation dedicated to preserving the public use and historical resources of the San Francisco State Teachers College National Register Historic District (National Register District) also known as the Laguna Street Campus. Located in the heart of the Market and Octavia Historic Resource Preservation Project Area, the campus has been used as a community facility for over 150 years.

We are pleased the City has been awarded a Preserve America Historic Preservation Fund Grant from the National Park Service (NPS) per Item No. 14 on the January 4, 2011 agenda. However, we do not support the use of these grant funds to designate the proposed discontiguous local San Francisco State Teachers College Vicinity (Apartments District (Apartments District)).

Acceptance of the grant requires compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) as well as the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). On December 14, 2010, we asked the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) to request independent peer review of the proposed Apartments District which we believe is not only without merit, but also would adversely impact the National Register District as a fair argument can be made that the Apartments District could be cited to justify contextually-inappropriate higher-density development on the National Register District site which was rezoned for private use on April 15, 2008. We believe said adverse impact has not been properly evaluated.

22

Discontiguous districts are rare. Architectural Historian Carol Roland-Nawi, Ph.D. who authored the National Register and Local Landmark nominations for the campus noted the properties within the proposed Apartments District have no formal association with the campus. She suggested the City consult census data to better understand the correlation between the residents of the apartment buildings and the school as it is well-known that San Francisco State Teachers College/San Francisco State College was a commuter school. As shown on the attached map, there are other more well-documented proposed historic districts within the Market and Octavia Historic Resource Preservation Project Area that are far more worthy of public funding.

In accordance with NEPA and the NHPA, the City must ensure that no environmentally impacting activities or choice limiting activities take place prior to NEPA environmental clearance if they will use National Park Service (NPS) funds. The grant requires the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and NPS to review and approve the City's proposal. Under Section 106 of the NHPA, the SHPO must concur that the proposal will have "no adverse effect" on the National Register District in order to expend grant monies.

Finally, we informed the HPC of our intention to resubmit the local landmark designation request for the campus to the HPC in 2011 for reconsideration. As you may recall, on May 16, 2007 the former Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (LPAB) voted to recommend local landmark designation under Article 10 of the Planning Code of all five contributory buildings to the National Register District. The LPAB also voted to recommend designation of a local historic district corresponding to the National Register District. However, on September 11, 2007 the Board of Supervisors voted to locally landmark only three of the five contributory buildings—Richardson Hall, Woods Hall and Woods Hall Annex—which is inconsistent with the National Register District and the Secretary of Interiors Standards. Thank you in advance for taking these issues into consideration.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Servetnick, Director


Attachments:

Preserve America Historic Preservation Fund Application and Grant
Market and Octavia Historic Resource Preservation Project Map
Proposed Discontiguous Local San Francisco State Teachers College Vicinity
Apartments Historic District DPR 523-D Form

cc:

Milford Wayne Donaldson, FAIA, SHPO, State Office of Historic
Preservation
John Rahaim, Director, San Francisco Planning Department
Bill Wycko, Environmental Review Officer, San Francisco
Planning Department
Tim Frye, Acting Preservation Coordinator, San Francisco
Planning Department
Moses Corrette, Preservation Planner, San Francisco Planning Department
Marlena Byrne, Deputy City Attorney
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission
San Francisco Planning Commission
Mike Buhler, San Francisco Architectural Heritage

San Francisco Preservation Consortium
Save the Laguna Street Campus
Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association
Carol Roland-Nawi, Ph.D.



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Annual Watchdog Report 09-10

From: Phil Ting/ASRREC/SFGOV
To: Angela Calvillo/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV
Cc: Michael Jine/ASRREC/SFGOV@SFGOV, Zoon Nguyen/ASRREC/SFGOV@SFGOV, Julie Van Nostern/CTYATT@CTYATT, David Chai/ASRREC/SFGOV@SFGOV
Date: 01/12/2011 11:17 AM
Subject: Annual Watchdog Report 09-10
Sent by: Michael Hunt

Angela,

Attached is the Annual Watchdog Report 09-10. Should you have any questions, please feel free to call or email my office.



Annual Watchdog Report 2009-2010.pdf

Thank you,

Phil

Phil Ting
Assessor-Recorder
City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
phone: (415) 554-4999
fax: (415) 554-5553

23



MEMORANDUM

Date: January 10, 2011
To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
From: Phil Ting, Assessor-Recorder
Subject: 2009-2010 Annual Report of Real Estate Watchdog Cases
Chapter 10, Section 10.177-2(f) of the San Francisco Administrative Code

For the period July 1, 2009 to December 31, 2010, Standards Division received seven complaints through the Real Estate Watchdog Program. The status of each complaint is summarized below.

1. Complaint #2745 closed and not eligible for a reward. Information was known to the assessor.
2. Complaint #2789 closed and not eligible for a reward. No change in ownership occurred.
3. Complaint #2921 closed and not eligible for a reward. Information was known to the assessor.
4. Complaint #2921 closed and not eligible for a reward. Information was known to the assessor.
(two complaints filed under same number)
5. Complaint #A0005 closed and not eligible for a reward. Transfer tax not covered under ordinance.
6. Complaint #2990 closed and not eligible for a reward. Information was known to the assessor.
7. Complaint #3056 open, pending investigation.
8. Complaint #A0004 closed and not eligible for a reward. Information was known to the assessor.
NOTE: A0004 was received 6/30/2008 and resolved 6/29/2010.

Since the inception of the Real Estate Watchdog Program in 2006, there have been a total of sixty-two complaints received. Sixty-one cases have been resolved. Two cases were eligible for a reward. One of those two cases did not want to apply for reward. One case resulted in escape assessments totaling \$1,070,897.68, and the second case resulted in escape assessments totaling \$3,451.34 for a net total of **\$1,137,950.72 in back taxes collected.**

RP 21 (3/06)



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Citation #793159312, plate #6NQK479, Ingleside Police Case #110012761

From: pat missud <missudpat@yahoo.com>
To: cityattorney@sfgov.org, john@avalos08.com, board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 01/05/2011 09:46 AM
Subject: Citation #793159312, plate #6NQK479, Ingleside Police Case #110012761

Please see the attached. Your City agents need anger management training.

Thanks in advance,
Patrick Missud



SFMTA1-5-11.pdf

24

✓ BOS 11
C Pages

January 3, 2011
For Immediate Release

Press Contact:
Jim Ross (415) 377-6968
jim@jimrossconsulting.com

Jim Ross Consulting Launches Next Mayor San Francisco

Website, nextmayorsf.com features San Franciscans discussing the issues they want to see the next mayor tackle

San Francisco—Today, Jim Ross Consulting announced the launch of Next Mayor San Francisco. This web-based project asks San Franciscans to discuss the issues they want the next mayor to make a priority.

“With the imminent selection of a new mayor by the Board of Supervisors and the upcoming election, it is important that the issues of everyday San Franciscans are considered.” Said Jim Ross, who went on to say, “The videos are insightful and those who we’ve talked with are informed and interested.”

Videos can be found at www.nextmayorsf.com or <http://www.youtube.com/nextmayorsf>

Videos have been edited for length but not for content.

Jim Ross Consulting will be at City Hall, Polk Street Steps, on January 4, 2011 from 1PM until 3PM interviewing San Franciscans on the issues they believe should be a top priority for the next Mayor of San Francisco. The media is welcome to observe and talk with interested individuals.

Jim Ross Consulting is a full service Public Affairs, Public Relations and Political Consulting Firm. Jim Ross is a nationally recognized expert in campaign management, political strategy and public affairs. He managed Gavin Newsom’s 2003 campaign for Mayor of San Francisco.

For more information about the firm, please visit: www.jimrossconsulting.com

#####

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 JAN - 4 PM 12:44
BY _____

25

www.NextMayorSF.com

- In a matter of weeks, City leaders will seek to pick an interim Mayor for 2011 to finish Gavin Newsom's term
- In less than a year, City voters will elect a new Mayor for a full four year term. Six candidates are already running.

NextMayorSF.com is your chance to sound off on what you think is important for our City and our political leadership. Log onto NextMayorSF.com to post your opinions or upload a video. Not controlled by a candidate or a political interest group, this is a site dedicated to allowing San Franciscans to have a say about important issues facing their City, present their preferences in terms of policy priorities for City leaders or even who exactly the Board of Supervisors should pick to be Mayor.

Someone will be our next Mayor; this is your chance to be heard!



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: No vote for Ed Lee as interim Mayor

From: Barbara Beth <babethsemail@yahoo.com>
To: David.Chiu@sfgov.org, bevan.dufty@sfgov.org, board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 01/04/2011 10:38 PM
Subject: No vote for Ed Lee as interim Mayor

Dear Supervisor,

As a San Francisco resident, I am deeply concerned with this last minute choice to vote for Ed Lee for Interim Mayor.

Ed Lee swings to the conservative side and would not be a good choice for San Francisco. Voting for a conservative candidate is not representing the majority of the San Francisco population.

Please, vote for a more progressive Interim Mayor, not Ed Lee.

Thank you for your time,

Barbara Beth
1705 Brooks Street Apt E
San Francisco, CA 94129

26

RECEIVED
MAYOR'S OFFICE

January 12, 2011

11 JAN 12 PM 2:37

Dear San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee,

I am glad to tell you CONGRATULATIONS and welcome you and your family as the new mayor to my city. As I said in my testimony on Public Comments yesterday, I am the oldest community activist and homeless advocate. I see with my own eyes that a lot of people come around to tell you congratulations and also to look for a job for themselves.

I'd like to remind you that your new demonstrations should be stronger than before as the city wanted. I don't have any problems with the police department. I have no criminal records or misdemeanors in my 28 years in the U.S.

I have the right to give you my opinion and to remind you that the city in 1996 had less crimes than it does now because we had a strong Chief of Police named Fred Lau. I hope and wish to see him return to the job. I know him very well and I decided to volunteer to help my city against the Russian Mafia in 1996 because of him. For that, I believe that Fred Lau deserves the spot more than others. He knows the city and the city loves him.

Another reason for this letter is to ask that you don't make a big mistake by letting George Smith become Director of the Mayor's Office on Homelessness again. In the time he was there, he took advantage by hiring 2 or 3 of his family members with big contracts and he left the office without helping the homeless. He lied to the media about it when he didn't solve the problems. I also refused to be his assistant because he wanted to use my experience to resolve the homeless problem for him. Furthermore, 4 or more of the former supervisors including, Fiona Ma, Chris Daly, and Bevan Dufty, decided to fire him on 1AM after they got the evidence that he did not do his job.

Lastly, Mission Rock used to be the worst shelter in history. George Smith hired his companion, David Lee, to be in charge of the shelter. Enough is enough.

Sincerely,

Abdalla Megahed
Abdalla Megahed

CC: Full Board of Supervisors
California Governor Jerry Brown
Attorney General Kamala Harris

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 JAN 12 PM 2:45
BY *JBC*

27



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: WSoMa planning (this week) ... please forward

From: Jim Meko <Jim.Meko@comcast.net>
To: David Chiu <David.Chiu@sfgov.org>, Jane.Kim@sfgov.org, Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org, Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org, Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org, John Avalos <John.Avalos@sfgov.org>, David Campos <David.Campos@sfgov.org>, Sean Elsbernd <Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org>, Eric Mar <Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org>, Ross Mirkarimi <Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org>, Board of Supervisors <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, Carmen Chu <Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org>
Date: 01/10/2011 12:54 PM
Subject: WSoMa planning (this week) ... please forward

Complete Neighborhood Fabric Committee meeting ([click here for agenda](#))

Thursday, January 13, 2011

6:00 PM in Room 421 of City Hall

The Western SoMa rezoning process is nearly complete. Environmental review of the Draft Community Plan, which the Planning Commission initiated on September 18, 2008, is almost finished. Hearings before the Commission and Board of Supervisors will begin by the middle of this year. In the meantime, the Task Force continues to address the fine-grained details of the Plan.

The Complete Neighborhood Fabric Committee meets this week. At the request of some interested parties, a review of arts and entertainment policies in the draft Plan begins with consideration of additional measures that might further the objectives of the Plan, suggestions for mitigating conflicts between incompatible uses in mixed use neighborhoods and a discussion of how to achieve legislative and policy changes beyond the scope of the community plan.

The public is always welcome to participate in this community-driven process. Everyone is allowed to vote on items being considered by our subcommittees.

A sad note: Sue Contreras, who has represented the parks and open space constituency on the Task Force since late 2006, is in Intensive Care at California Pacific Medical Center. She is at the Pacific Campus at 2333 Buchanan Street, Room 351. Cards and prayers would be appreciated.

TASK FORCE VACANCIES: Seats representing bicycle and transportation interests, community-based organizations, families, youth, SRO residents, the disabled, seniors and the area known as "SoMa West" are currently open. Supervisor Jane Kim also has two vacancies to be filled. The Western SoMa Task Force is enabled by Board of Supervisors Resolution 731-04. Visit our website for more information.

<http://www.sfgov.org/site/westernsoma>

To be removed from this list, send an email to jim.meko@comcast.net with the word

28

BOS 11 page



OFFICE OF THE CITY ADMINISTRATOR



Gavin Newsom, Mayor
Edwin M. Lee, City Administrator

January 11, 2011

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 JAN 11 PM 1:57
BY apl

Ms. Amy Brown
Director of Real Estate
City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 362
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Brown:

I intend to leave my position as City Administrator and assume the office of Successor Mayor. As there will soon be a vacancy in the appointed City Administrator position, I hereby designate you as the second-in-command of the Office of the City Administrator; thus, pursuant to California Government Code § 24105, you will serve as acting City Administrator upon my resignation as City Administrator.

Sincerely,

Edwin M. Lee
City Administrator

- c: Hon. David Chiu, Acting Mayor and President of the Board of Supervisors
- Ms. Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
- Members, Board of Supervisors
- Steve Nakajima, Director of Human Resources, GSA

29

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: January 12, 2011
To: Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors
From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board *A. Calvillo*
Subject: APPOINTMENTS BY THE MAYOR

The Mayor has submitted appointments to the following Boards and Commissions:

- Jason Elliott, Commission on the Environment, term ending April 20, 2011
- Lorna Randlett, Commission on the Status of Women, term ending January 22, 2011

Under the Board's Rules of Order, a Supervisor can request a hearing on an appointment by notifying the Clerk in writing.

Upon receipt of such notice, the Clerk shall refer the appointment to the Rules Committee so that the Board may consider the appointment and act within thirty days of the appointment as provided in Section 3.100(17) of the Charter.

Please notify me in writing by 12:00 p.m., Tuesday, January 18, 2011, if you wish any appointment to be scheduled.

Attachments

30

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



Orig: Rules Clerk
C: COB, Lay Dep
GAVIN NEWSOM

Notice of Appointment

January 6, 2011

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 JAN - 7 AM 9:40
BY RSB

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

Pursuant to the Charter Section 3.100 (17), I hereby notify you of the following appointments that I have made, in accordance with the 1996 Charter:

- Jason Elliott to the Commission on the Environment. Mr. Elliott is appointed to the seat held previously by Jane Martin for the unexpired portion of a four-year term ending April 20, 2011.
- ^{LORNA RUIZ} Lauren Randlett to the Commission on the Status of Women. Mrs. Randlett is appointed to the seat held previously by Dorka Keehn for the unexpired portion of a four-year term ending January 22, 2011.

Please see the attached resumes which will illustrate that these appointees' qualifications allow them to represent the communities of interest, neighborhoods and diverse populations of the City and County.

Should you have any questions, please contact my Director of Appointments, Matthew Goudeau at 415-554-6674.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom
Mayor



Notice of Appointment

January 6, 2011

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to the Charter Section 3.100 (17), I hereby notify you of the following appointments that I have made, in accordance with the 1996 Charter:

- Jason Elliott to the Commission on the Environment. Mr. Elliott is appointed to the seat held previously by Jane Martin for the unexpired portion of a four-year term ending April 20, 2011.
- *Lorna Ent*
Lauren Randlett to the Commission on the Status of Women. Mrs. Randlett is appointed to the seat held previously by Dorka Keehn for the unexpired portion of a four-year term ending January 22, 2011.

I am confident that these appointees will serve our community well. Attached are their qualifications to serve, which demonstrate how these appointments represents the communities of interest, neighborhoods and diverse populations of the City and County of San Francisco.

I encourage your support and am pleased to advise you of these appointments.


Gavin Newsom
Mayor

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 JAN - 7 AM 9:40
BY *ME*

JASON ELLIOTT

(415) 238-4432 • JASON.M.ELLIOTT@GMAIL.COM
231 SCOTT ST APT 2 • SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94117

RECENT WORK HISTORY

OFFICE OF MAYOR GAVIN NEWSOM CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Mayor's Policy Advisor 2009 – current

Formulate Citywide policies for the Mayor on his key priorities and provide advice to the Mayor on a variety of issues. Responsible for keeping the Mayor apprised of daily operations of many City departments' work and ensuring that the Mayor's Office's position is represented accurately in key decisions by City agencies and external stakeholders. Shepherd certain policy initiatives from the drafting stages all the way through the legislative process. Serve as voting member on the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) as Mayor's representative.

GAVIN NEWSOM FOR GOVERNOR *Deputy Campaign Manager/Policy Director*

2008 – 2009

As policy director for Mayor's gubernatorial campaign, was responsible for formulating the campaign's policy on a wide array of state issues and briefing the candidate. Also represented the candidate in policy-based meetings with stakeholder groups and advocacy organizations. Prepared remarks for candidate for public appearances and responded requests for issue-specific briefings.

OFFICE OF GOVERNOR ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER *Summer Fellow to Special Advisor*

2007

Fellow in the Executive Office of California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger's Special Advisor for Jobs & Economic Growth. Wrote policy memos for the Special Advisor and provided research support for the Advisor's staff. Worked as briefer for Special Advisor and Lieutenant Governor for their roles as members on the Commission for Economic Development. Focused on job creation in California and greenhouse gas reduction through market mechanisms.

NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL *Communications Consultant*

2006

Served as a writer for NRDC Director of Communications. Wrote speeches for President of NRDC. Drafted policy brochures for mailings related to various environmental advocacy initiatives. Worked on media targeting to raise awareness of pro-green agenda. Involved in polling analysis and op-ed writing.

NEW YORK CITY MAYOR'S RACE

Special Assistant to the Democratic Nominee for Mayor 2005

Served as Mayoral candidate Fernando Ferrer's full-time traveling aide (body man) handling candidate briefings, political calls, travel logistics and managing the press corps at public events. Served as liaison between campaign staff and the candidate. Traveled with candidate to every event throughout the campaign. Managed all content and visual aspects of the campaign website. Wrote rapid response drafts of press releases, statements, and blogs.

EDUCATION

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT (2006 – 2008)

Masters Degree in Public Policy with concentration in social policy

Coursework in quantitative policy analysis, budgeting, econometrics, finance, microeconomics

Winner of 2008 Frederick Fischer Memorial Prize for best University-wide writing on poverty and social policy

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, COLUMBIA COLLEGE (2001 – 2005)

Bachelor's Degree in American Government
Six semesters on Dean's List

Lorna M. Ho Randlett

San Francisco, CA (415)728-3771

SUMMARY

Strategic communications specialist for the top global management consulting firm in the world, McKinsey & Company. Have served the Knowledge, Strategy, Public and Social Sector practices and the West Coast and Mid-Atlantic regions. Areas of concentration include thought leader and stakeholder cultivation and pro-bono client engagements on governance for non profit organizations. Experienced leader / advisor in presentation and oral communication for directors and partners. Specialize in client relationships and high profile event team management.

AREAS OF STRENGTH

- ♦ Risk and Reputation Management
- ♦ Event Best Practices
- ♦ Goal/Planning Setting and Management
- ♦ Presentation/Communications Training
- ♦ Profile Building
- ♦ MOU Term Negotiations
- ♦ Development Training
- ♦ Stake Holder Relationship Building

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

McKinsey and Company

2006 - Current

McKinsey & Company is a management consulting firm that helps many of the world's leading corporations and organizations address their strategic challenges, from reorganizing for long-term growth to improving business performance and maximizing revenue. With consultants deployed in more than 40 countries across the globe, McKinsey advises more than 70 percent of Fortune's magazine's most admired companies on strategic, operational, organizational and technological issues. For eight decades, the firm's primary objective has been to serve as an organization's most trusted external advisor on critical issues facing senior management.

External Relations Manager (2006 – current)

Manage external relations and reputation management for senior director of the firm in his role as leader of the firm's knowledge development efforts overseeing the McKinsey Global Institute and the firm's communications, which includes the *McKinsey Quarterly*. Supported director's client work focused on service to public sector organizations in helping dozens of government, corporate, and nonprofit clients solve their most difficult management challenges.

- Performed external relationship management on director's external relations needs as Chairman Emeritus of the Bay Area Council, Chairman of the Economic Institute of the Bay Area, and vice-chair of the Stanford Graduate School of Business Advisory Council, board member for The New America Foundation, Common Cause, California Forward, the Bay Area Science and Innovation Consortium, ChildrenNow, and The California Business for Educational Excellence Foundation and a Trustee for the Committee for Economic Development.
- Supported director's communications and risk and reputation management needs for

extensive portfolio on globalization, productivity, economic development and competitiveness, corporate social responsibility, regulation, education, health care, financial services, and corporate strategy.

Director of the Office of Public Engagement, SFUSD (2002-2006)

Responsible for all communication for the San Francisco Unified School District, serving on the executive leadership committee for the superintendent of schools.

- Developed, wrote and oversaw all strategic communication plans and product for the central office of the district.
- Oversaw communications team and advised superintendent's executive committee for SFUSD.
- Managed external relations for key stakeholders of SFUSD including the Business Advisory Council, which lead the campaign for two bond measures totaling more than 750 million dollars in additional funds for SFUSD.
- Performed all risk and reputation management and written and media interviews as spokesperson for SFUSD.

President, LMH Consulting (2001-2006)

- Key advisor on strategic communications and earned media to executive clients.

Anchor, Yahoo Inc. (1999-2001)

- Delivered financial and technology news for Yahoo Inc. web based streaming live network and principal member of initial entrepreneurial Yahoo Finance Vision team.

ADDITIONAL TRAINING

- Stanford University, School of Education Seminar on Advances in Primary Education, 2008
- Executive Leadership Training on Efficiency and Effectiveness, 2005
- University of Missouri, Columbia – School of Journalism, Newsroom Management 1993

EDUCATION

B.S. University of California, Santa Cruz

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 544-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: January 13, 2011
To: Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors
From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board *Angela Calvillo*
Subject: Form 700

This is to inform you that the following individuals have submitted a Form 700 Statement:

Supervisor Sophie Maxwell – Leaving
Supervisor Chris Daly – Leaving
Alice Guidry – Legislative Aide – Leaving
John Jackson – Legislative Aide – Leaving
Alexander Randolph – Legislation Aide – Leaving
David Todd – Legislative Aide – Assuming/Leaving
Supervisor Scott Wiener – Assuming
Myrna Iton – Legislative Aide – Assuming
Gillian Gillett – Legislative Aide – Assuming
Viva Mogi – Legislative Aide - Assuming



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Materials for Public Hearing on 2011 SF Pesticide List

From: "Chris Geiger & Jessian Choy, SF Dept. of Environment" <chris.geiger@sfgov.org>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 01/11/2011 06:23 PM
Subject: Materials for Public Hearing on 2011 SF Pesticide List

This email is to remind you of the upcoming annual hearing on San Francisco's 2011 Reduced Risk Pesticide List (see below). To view the draft 2011 list, [CLICK HERE](#)

-OR-

Paste this link into your browser:

<https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&pid=explorer&chrome=true&srcid=0B2h8oOefE8bUYWMyYT VmY2EtM2VIYS00ZGUzLWFIOTUtYjFkMTMyYmlzMTQw&hl=en>

Sincerely,

Chris Geiger
Manager, SF Integrated Pest Management Program

Public Hearing

Review of 2010 Pesticide Use on San Francisco City Properties & Review of the Proposed 2011 SF Reduced Risk Pesticide List

Tuesday, January 18, 4:30-6:30 pm
Rm 421, City Hall, 1 Dr C B Goodlett Pl., San Francisco

RSVP by Tuesday, Jan. 11
(recommended but not required)

[Click here](#) (instead of contacting SFE):

<https://sftoxicsreduction.wufoo.com/forms/rsvp-for-the-next-sf-ipm-public-hearing>

Agenda-

1. **Use of "Most Limited" (L*) Pesticides on City Properties**
 - City departments that used these products in 2010 will provide justification for use.
 - Question & answer period
2. **Use of Exempted Pesticides**
 - City departments that received exemptions in 2010 for products that are not in the SF Reduced Risk Pesticide List will provide justifications for their use.
 - Question & answer period
3. **Review of draft 2010 Reduced-Risk Pesticide List (ATTACHMENT C)**

32

- Review of additions, deletions and changes with rationale.
- Discussion

4. Public Comment

- Comments on other issues related to pesticide use on City properties

NOTE: ATTACHMENTS RELATING TO THIS AGENDA WILL BE EMAILED IN EARLY JANUARY.

[Click here to forward this email.](#)

[If someone forwarded this email to you, click here](#) for email alerts.

We look forward to seeing you!

Jessian Choy and Chris Geiger

[Green Purchasing](#), [Integrated Pest Management](#), [Toxics Disposal Programs](#) for SF City Depts.

Phone: (415)355-3776

This message was sent from Chris Geiger & Jessian Choy, SF Dept. of Environment to Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org. It was sent from: Jessian Choy, San Francisco Dept. of the Environment 11 Grove St., San Francisco, CA 94102. You can modify/update your subscription via the link below.

Email
Marketi
ng by

Manage your subscription

View this message in the iContact Community:

[View message](#)

[Comment on this message](#)

[Receive as RSS](#)

Share this message with others:

[del.icio.us](#)

[Digg](#) [reddit](#)

[Facebook](#) [StumbleUpon](#)



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: San Francisco Safe Drug Disposal Ordinance - Support (File #100455)

From: "Sue Vang" <suevang@cawrecycles.org>
To: <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: <edwin.lee@sfgov.org>, <gail.johnson@sfgov.org>, "Mark Murray" <murray@cawrecycles.org>
Date: 01/12/2011 02:09 PM
Subject: San Francisco Safe Drug Disposal Ordinance - Support (File #100455)

Dear Board of Supervisors,

On behalf of Californians Against Waste, please accept the attached letter of support for San Francisco's Safe Drug Disposal ordinance (File #100455).

We thank you for your leadership on this issue and respectfully urge you to vote in favor of the Drug Disposal Ordinance.

Best Regards,

Sue Vang
Policy Associate | Californians Against Waste
921 11th Street, Suite 420 | Sacramento, CA 95814
(p) 916-443-5422 | (f) 916-443-3912
www.cawrecycles.org

Get updates and support us on Facebook, Twitter, or Causes!



CAW Letter of Support SF SDD 11211.pdf



Californians Against Waste

Conserving Resources. Preventing Pollution. Protecting the Environment.

100455

January 12, 2011

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

Re: Safe Drug Disposal Ordinance – Support

Dear Supervisors,

Californians Against Waste (CAW) strongly urges you to support the San Francisco Safe Drug Disposal ordinance. The use of pharmaceutical drugs in the United States has exploded in recent years—more than doubling in sales from 2000 to 2008—and this will only continue to grow as our population ages. While the amount of pharmaceuticals in our homes has increased, there is still no proper method to dispose of unused and expired drugs.

The traditional methods of flushing drugs down the drain or throwing them in the trash create an array of threats to public health and safety, and the environment. Wastewater treatment plants are not designed to treat drugs that are flushed down toilets and sinks, and drugs disposed in landfills can leach into the groundwater system. Pharmaceutical compounds have already been detected in our waterways and soils. Furthermore, drugs that aren't properly disposed of can pose a health hazard when abused by unintended users.

This ordinance is modeled on the successful British Columbia initiative that has operated a manufacturer-funded drug disposal program since 1996. The British Columbia program proves that drug disposal programs can be run smoothly and efficiently. At a cost of \$315,000 Canadian dollars that is divided among the pharmaceutical manufacturers, a non-profit organization operates a program for a province with a population of 4.4 million.

Programs similar to the British Columbia drug disposal program can be found elsewhere in Canada and internationally. Unfortunately, attempts in the U.S. for similar drug disposal programs have been stopped by expensive lobbying efforts from the industry. This ordinance is an opportunity for San Francisco to lead the way where state and federal governments have failed to act.

While it is in no one's interest to unnecessarily increase the cost of pharmaceuticals, the public is already paying the cost of mismanagement. The pharmaceutical industry has proven to be one of the most profitable sectors of the economy in the last decade, and requiring this sector to internalize the cost of proper end-of-life management of their products would represent less than .01% in the cost of pharmaceuticals.

It is time to stand up to the pharmaceutical industry and require that manufacturers fund the proper disposal of their products. We thank you for your leadership on this issue, and urge you to support the Safe Drug Disposal ordinance.

Sincerely,

Mark Murray
Executive Director

cc: Mayor Edwin Lee

33

T-Mobile

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

December 29, 2010

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

**RE: T-Mobile West Corporation as successor in interest to Omnipoint Communications, Inc.
d/b/a T-Mobile (U-3056-C) Notification Letter for T-Mobile Site No. SF23257D**


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

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

(b) No land use approval is required because

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

Sincerely,



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

Enclosed: Attachment A

cc: City of San Francisco, Department Public Works, Bureau of Street Use & Mapping, 875 Stevenson Street,
San Francisco, CA 94103
City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Planning Director, 1660 Mission Street, 5th Floor,
San Francisco, CA 94103
City & County of San Francisco, Attn: City Administrator, 1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room 244,
San Francisco, CA 94102
City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Clerk of the Board, 1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room 244,
San Francisco, CA 94102

34

ATTACHMENT A

1. Project Location

Site Identification Number: SF23257D
Site Name: Pacheco Pole Cap
Site Address: 1227 Pacheco Street, San Francisco, CA 94116
County: San Francisco
Assessor's Parcel Number: 2135-013
Latitude: 37° 45' 02.15" (NAD 83)
Longitude: 122° 28' 20.87" (NAD 83)

2. Project Description

Number of Antennas to be installed: 3
Tower Design: Existing Wood Pole
Tower Appearance: Installing three (3) panel antenna inside a radome mounted
on an existing PGE Wood Pole.
Tower Height: 39 feet
Size of Buildings: 24.36 sq feet

3. Business Addresses of all Governmental Agencies

City of San Francisco, Department of Public Work Bureau of Street Use & Mapping 875 Stevenson Street, Room 460 San Francisco, CA 94103	City & County of San Francisco Attn: Planning Director 1660 Mission Street, 5th Floor San Francisco, CA 94103
City & County of San Francisco Attn: City Administrator 1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Pl, Room 244 San Francisco, CA 94102	City & County of San Francisco Attn: Clerk of the Board 1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Pl, Room 244 San Francisco, CA 94102

4. Land Use Approvals

Date Zoning Approval Issued: 12/17/10
Land Use Permit #: 10WR-0140
If Land use Approval was not required:



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

December 29, 2010

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

RE: T-Mobile West Corporation as successor in interest to Omnipoint Communications, Inc. d/b/a T-Mobile (U-3056-C) Notification Letter for T-Mobile Site No. SF53320D


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

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

(b) No land use approval is required because

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

Sincerely,



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

Enclosed: Attachment A

cc: City of San Francisco, Department Public Works, Bureau of Street Use & Mapping, 875 Stevenson Street,
San Francisco, CA 94103
City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Planning Director, 1660 Mission Street, 5th Floor,
San Francisco, CA 94103
City & County of San Francisco, Attn: City Administrator, 1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room 244,
San Francisco, CA 94102
City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Clerk of the Board, 1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room 244,
San Francisco, CA 94102

ATTACHMENT A

1. Project Location

Site Identification Number: SF53320D
Site Name: PGE Cap 41st
Site Address: 3060 Taraval Street, San Francisco, CA 94116
County: San Francisco
Assessor's Parcel Number: 2369-014
Latitude: 37° 44' 32.06" (NAD 83)
Longitude: 122° 29' 57.15" (NAD 83)

2. Project Description

Number of Antennas to be installed: 3
Tower Design: Existing Wood Pole
Tower Appearance: Installing three (3) panel antenna inside a radome mounted
on an existing PGE Wood Pole.
Tower Height: 44 Feet
Size of Buildings: 24.36 sq feet

3. Business Addresses of all Governmental Agencies

City of San Francisco, Department of Public Work Bureau of Street Use & Mapping 875 Stevenson Street, Room 460 San Francisco, CA 94103	City & County of San Francisco Attn: Planning Director 1660 Mission Street, 5th Floor San Francisco, CA 94103
City & County of San Francisco Attn: City Administrator 1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Pl, Room 244 San Francisco, CA 94102	City & County of San Francisco Attn: Clerk of the Board 1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Pl, Room 244 San Francisco, CA 94102

4. Land Use Approvals

Date Zoning Approval Issued: 12/17/10
Land Use Permit #: 10WR-0141
If Land use Approval was not required:

T-Mobile

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

January 6, 2011

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

BY lpe
2010 JAN 13 PM 12:18

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO


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. SF23250J

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

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

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

Sincerely,



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

Enclosed: Attachment A

- cc: City of San Francisco, Department Public Works, Bureau of Street Use & Mapping, 875 Stevenson Street, San Francisco, CA 94103
- City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Planning Director, 1660 Mission Street, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103
- City & County of San Francisco, Attn: City Administrator, 1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102
- City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Clerk of the Board, 1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102

36

ATTACHMENT A

1. Project Location

Site Identification Number: SF23250J
Site Name: PGE Pole 2543 Pacheco St
Site Address: 2543 Pacheco St, San Francisco, CA 94116
County: San Francisco
Assessor's Parcel Number: 2149-014
Latitude: 37° 44' 59.74" (NAD 83)
Longitude: 122° 29' 16.31" (NAD 83)

2. Project Description

Number of Antennas to be installed: 3
Tower Design: Existing Wood Pole
Tower Appearance: Installing three (3) panel antenna inside a radome mounted
on an existing PGE Wood Pole.
Tower Height: 39 Feet
Size of Buildings: 24.36 sq feet

3. Business Addresses of all Governmental Agencies

City of San Francisco, Department of Public Work
Bureau of Street Use & Mapping
875 Stevenson Street, Room 460
San Francisco, CA 94103

City & County of San Francisco
Attn: Planning Director
1660 Mission Street, 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

City & County of San Francisco
Attn: City Administrator
1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Pl, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

City & County of San Francisco
Attn: Clerk of the Board
1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Pl, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

4. Land Use Approvals

Date Zoning Approval Issued: 12/17/10
Land Use Permit #: 10WR-0142
If Land use Approval was not required:

T-Mobile

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

December 29, 2010

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

BY 

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2010 JAN 13 PM 12:18

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. SF13176H

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

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

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

Sincerely,



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

Enclosed: Attachment A

cc: City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Planning Director, 1660 Mission Street, 5th Floor,
San Francisco, CA 94103
City & County of San Francisco, Attn: City Administrator, 1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room 244,
San Francisco, CA 94102
City & County of San Francisco, Attn: Clerk of the Board, 1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room 244,
San Francisco, CA 94102

ATTACHMENT A

1. Project Location

Site Identification Number: SF13176H
Site Name: Taj Hotel
Site Address: 340 Stockton Street, San Francisco, CA 94108
County: San Francisco
Assessor's Parcel Number: 0294-013
Latitude: 37° 47' 21.21" (NAD 83)
Longitude: 122° 24' 24.01" (NAD 83)

2. Project Description

Number of Antennas to be installed: 6
Tower Design: Rooftop
Tower Appearance: Installing six (6) panel antennas will be installed in three separate sectors (two located on the roof & four will be flush-mounted). All will be painted to match the building.
Tower Height: 195 Feet
Size of Buildings: 132.05 sq feet

3. Business Addresses of all Governmental Agencies

City & County of San Francisco	City & County of San Francisco	City & County of San Francisco
Attn: Planning Director	Attn: City Administrator	Attn: Clerk of the Board
1660 Mission St.	1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Pl.	1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Pl.
5th Floor	Room 244	Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94103	San Francisco, CA 94102	San Francisco, CA 94102

4. Land Use Approvals

Date Zoning Approval Issued: 12/13/10
Land Use Permit #: Permit to Alter (Minor Alteration) 2010.1037H
If Land use Approval was not required:

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2010 JAN 12 PM 2:46

BY AK

Board of Supervisors,

I agree with you on your recent decisions to ban plastic bags & your strong stance on smoking.

I really wish you would do a ban on wood burning fireplaces.

I live next to two people who could care less about the pollution they cause.

The smoke comes into my house no matter what I do to seal up all cracks.

I know the smoke from fireplaces is far worse than cigarette smoke & affects more people. One fire is probably equal to thousands of cigarettes.

Please consider banning these dangerous wood burning fires.

Thank you,
Anne Murphy



Request for action on SF's unregulated Medical Cannabis Dispensaries!
Kevin Reed to: Board.of.Supervisors

01/10/2011 07:33 PM

Kevin Reed Request for action on SF's unregulated Medical Cannabis Dispensaries!

1 attachment



BOS 011011.pdf

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I hope this note finds you all in great spirits & health. Please review the attached PDF file (a letter from The Green Cross). Medical cannabis patients and the people of San Francisco need you.

Thank you,
Kevin Reed

President - The Green Cross
CA Non Profit - Public Benefit Corporation

www.TheGreenCross.org

(415) 846-7671 cell

cc: Dennis Herrera - City Attorney

cc: George Gascon - District Attorney



THE GREEN CROSS
MEDICAL CANNABIS DELIVERY
415.648.4420
THEGREENCROSS.ORG
10AM TO 7PM

January 10, 2011

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

We hope this letter finds you in good spirits and having had a pleasant holiday season. We are writing to you today because we are concerned about the future of San Francisco's Medical Cannabis permitting process. Specifically, it has come to our attention that certain delivery-only dispensaries are maintaining primary business operations outside the City and County of San Francisco, but are serving patients within the City and County.

Currently, all of the City's Medical Cannabis Dispensaries ("MCDs") are contributing in so many ways in our community (including providing services, paying sales and payroll taxes, and paying permitting fees), and are abiding by the strict regulations that you and other City officials have promulgated. We are proud that San Francisco has led the way in terms of providing clear regulations regarding MCDs, and therefore legitimizing the services we provide to our patients. However, such regulations become moot when a MCD or service provider merely has to move its offices outside San Francisco proper in order to avoid these regulations. This loophole in the permitting process discourages MCD owners from establishing cooperatives within the City limits, which ultimately reduces City revenue while allowing MCDs to go virtually unregulated.

Anyone who claims to host their offices outside of City limits are exempt from having to play by San Francisco's rules and regulations regarding MCDs established by the Board of Supervisors. Entities established outside the City's borders do not have to abide by rules regarding advertising, fees, inspections, labeling requirements, transaction limits, etc. We encourage the Board of Supervisors to address this loophole as soon as possible to avoid any detrimental effect on the City's existing facilities and services, especially those which currently are provided for low-income patients. A list of known entities that are allegedly domiciled outside of the City and County of San Francisco, but are providing unregulated services within the City and County of San Francisco, are attached hereto as Exhibit A.

We believe the proliferation of so many unregulated delivery services that do not have to play by the rules is a slap in the face to our City and what you on the Board of Supervisors have tried to do to regulate this area. This is a matter of fairness, but more importantly, of public health.

We need your help and assistance to deal with this situation as soon as possible. Although the Medical Cannabis Task Force recently asked the City Attorney for clarification on this topic (letter attached hereto as Exhibit B), we are contacting you now because we believe this matter must be dealt with expeditiously.

It is our opinion that the City has not been targeted by Federal authorities regarding medical cannabis because the City has enacted a sensible regulation policy, and City officials have led collectives in a very good direction. We are so proud of the City's leadership on the




THE GREEN CROSS
MEDICAL CANNABIS DELIVERY
415.648.4420
THEGREENCROSS.ORG
10AM TO 7PM

topic of medical cannabis and the Board of Supervisors' commitment to the safe distribution of medical cannabis to so many terminally ill patients. People all over this country, and in fact, all over the world, are watching San Francisco as an amazing example of how medical cannabis can be distributed right, *i.e.* with regulation and without taking it away from the people and giving it to corporations or big government.

We are so honored to have been part of this great City's piece of history in the making. Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

Kevin Reed
(415) 846-7671 cell
President, The Green Cross
San Francisco Medical Cannabis Task Force Member
Core Member & Treasurer, SF Americans for Safe Access



THE GREEN CROSS
MEDICAL CANNABIS DELIVERY
415.648.4420
THEGREENCROSS.ORG
10AM TO 7PM

EXHIBIT A

A few examples of the unregulated services mentioned above are:

- www.foggydazedelivery.com
- www.sfgreendelivery.org
- www.kine2b.com
- www.Lifted420.org
- www.greenonwheels.org
- www.northstoneorganics.com
- www.theunioncollective.org
- www.thecannybus.org
- www.nr2you.org
- www.othersidecannabis.com
- www.naturesrelief.org
- www.thepineappleexpress.org
- www.sweetcollectivesf.org
- www.C420online.com
- www.greenticketbakery.com
- www.theislandofhealth.com
- www.tandc.org
- Green Solution Delivery Service Medical Marijuana Delivery (415) 574-7581
- Elisa Baker's SF delivery online collective



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Monique Zmuda
Deputy Controller

January 13, 2011

The Honorable Edwin Lee
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco
Room 200, City Hall

The Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors
Room 244, City Hall

The Honorable Members, San Francisco Health Commission
101 Grove Street, Room 311

Dear Mayor Lee, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The Controller's Office is working with the Department of Public Health (DPH) on a project to integrate mental health care and substance abuse treatment with primary health care services for clients of San Francisco's public health system. I am providing with this letter a summary of the activities, findings, and recommendations to date from this effort.

DPH has a long history of providing mental health and substance abuse (also called behavioral health) services to primary care patients. Longstanding practice has been to provide these services through separate systems. However, research and experience shows that patients' needs overlap – that physical and psychological health should be addressed in an integrated fashion. Done well, integrated services can result in significantly better patient outcomes and in more efficient resource usage throughout the Public Health system.

Currently, a patient with mental health needs seeking care at a DPH primary care clinic might have to return or go to a different location, increasing the likelihood of no-shows and of patients not getting treated. Second, although a patient's behavioral health and primary care treatment plans may be closely related – e.g., chronic pain and medication management associated with a herniated disk, or depression associated with high blood pressure – it is likely that these plans would not be integrated nor would providers have the opportunity to collaborate to improve the patient's outcomes. Individuals who might benefit from behavioral health support might not seek treatment because of the social stigma associated with seeing a mental health provider. Often, primary care providers are challenged to address behavioral health needs without adequate time, training, or support.

In 2009 the Controller's Office contracted with Public Consulting Group to provide DPH with expert analysis and technical assistance to implement integrated care in DPH's primary care clinics. Goals are to increase patient access to behavioral health services, improve coordination between behavioral health and primary care providers, and improve patients' health and experience.

40

With successful implementation of integration, each DPH community clinic will be staffed with behavioral health professionals that can provide same-day, on demand consultation to both patients and primary care providers. Patients will have almost immediate access to behavioral health services and referral to more specialized services. In special interventions aimed at high impact groups such as diabetes management, smoking cessation, and chronic pain, behavioral health professionals and other clinic staff will offer group classes, group medical appointments, and other services. Behavioral health professionals will have the cultural and language skills to best meet patient needs.

In the report, Public Consulting Group summarizes findings from 11 DPH community clinic assessments. Findings include that there are significant wait times for appointments and a high volume of no-shows for behavioral health appointments. Significantly, there is support among clinic staff for moving to delivery of integrated care. Public Consulting Group recommends the following:

- Staff primary care clinics with behavioral health staff that meet the needs of patient populations served;
- Develop special interventions for patients in high-impact groups such as chronic pain and depression;
- Implement a performance measurement system to measure outcomes, access, and satisfaction for patients/ providers; and
- Provide training for behavioral health, primary care, and other clinic staff.

DPH is well underway with implementing these recommendations, and project activities are expected to extend through 2012.

Should you have any questions regarding the report, please contact Michelle Schurig (554-7577) or Catherine Spaulding (554-4022).


Sincerely,



Ben Rosenfield
Controller

cc:

Mayor
Board of Supervisors
Health Commission
Civil Grand Jury
Budget Analyst
Public Library



Department of Public Health
Primary Care Behavioral Health
Integration Project

Phase One – Summary Report

January 13, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background.....	2
Activities to Date	3
Findings at DPH COPC Primary Care Clinics.....	6
Primary Care System-wide Recommendations	8
Future Planned Activities.....	9
About the Consultants	9
 <i>Appendices</i>	
Appendix A: Integration Checklist	i
Appendix B: Staffing Plan for DPH COPC Clinics.....	viii
Appendix C: High Priority Populations	ix
Appendix D: Performance Goals and Objectives.....	x
Appendix E: Acronyms	xi

Background

Primary Care Behavioral Health Integration Project. In 2009, the Office of the Controller and the Department of Public Health (DPH) of the City and County of San Francisco contracted with Public Consulting Group (PCG) to conduct the DPH Primary Care Behavioral Health Integration Project. This project builds upon current integration efforts and provides expert analysis and technical assistance to implement the Primary Care Behavioral Health Integration Model (see below). Primary care clinics included in the project are those within DPH's Community Oriented Primary Care (COPC) system, San Francisco General Hospital, and the San Francisco Community Consortium Clinics (SFCCCcs).

What is primary care behavioral health integration? Historically, primary care and behavioral health services have been provided through two separate systems. This separation exists despite the clear connections between a person's physical, psychological, and social situations. Many individuals who might benefit from behavioral health support do not access such services because of the social stigma associated with seeing a mental health provider. The primary goal of integrating behavioral health into DPH's primary care system is to increase patient access to behavioral health services, improve coordination of care between behavioral health and primary care providers, and improve the health outcomes of primary care patients.

Primary Care Behavioral Health Integration Model. The Primary Care Behavioral Health Integration Model (PCBH Integration Model) provides a platform for implementation of evidence-based behavioral health interventions. It involves delivery of brief interventions by a primary care behaviorist (PCB), either a psychologist or a licensed social worker, who functions as a member of the primary care team. PCBs have an open schedule and are available to see patients during their medical appointments upon referral from the PCP (primary care provider). PCBs are physically located in the clinic and work in the primary care exam rooms. This seamless approach to same-day service significantly improves delivery of behavioral health services to primary care patients. The approach also shifts the burden of providing behavioral health services from PCPs to PCBs, thus, allowing the PCPs to meet patients' medical needs in a timely manner.

Primary care behaviorist services. PCBs provide brief intervention services (30 minute visits) for patients and consultation services to PCPs. Services include providing information, assisting with problem-solving, and developing self-management and other skills with patients to improve their quality of life. Typically, patients see PCBs one to four times for individual consultation visits. PCBs are available for drop-in follow-up visits as well. PCBs and PCPs provide "pathway" programs to high impact patient groups such as depression, diabetes management and chronic pain. PCB pathway services may include assessment, individual interventions, group classes, group medical visits, and coaching. PCBs also assist PCPs in linking patients with serious mental disorders to specialty clinic services and re-integrating them with the PCP/PCB once they are stabilized.

Activities to Date

Since December 2009, PCG has worked closely with DPH and the Controller's Office to:

- Conduct 17 Readiness Reviews (see next section) at primary care clinics within DPH's COPC system, San Francisco General Hospital, and select SFCCCs.
- Tailor the PCBH Integration Model to patients served in DPH clinics.
- Conduct a series of workshops to expose behavioral health providers to the PCBH Integration Model and PCB clinical skills.
- Conduct training sessions at six DPH COPC clinics to introduce staff to the PCBH Integration Model and prepare them for implementation of the PCBH Integration Model. Training at the remaining five COPC clinics will occur in January 2010.
- Identify and discuss coordination issues with existing behavioral health programs and providers.
- Define performance measures and set up a system for evaluating the effectiveness of integration.
- Prepare an in-depth PCBH Integration Model program manual, including information on clinic roles and responsibilities, training requirements, clinical activities, policies and procedures, outcome measurements, and quality assurance.
- Plan the development of a mobile information technology application to be used by the PCBs in clinics for screening, assessment, and collecting patient data.

Readiness Reviews. To prepare clinics for implementation of the PCBH Integration Model, PCG spent up to three days onsite at each participating clinic conducting Readiness Reviews. The objectives of the Readiness Reviews were to:

- Familiarize staff with the PCBH Integration Model.
- Obtain a snapshot of clinic operations and provide a description of the current interface of primary care and behavioral health services.
- Assess facilitating factors related to implementation of the PCBH Integration Model as well as identify challenges. For example, the current location of behavioral health providers in the primary care exam room area facilitates implementation, while PCPs being unable to access behavioral health providers for same day visits presents a challenge to implementation. Other factors include the availability and role of any behavioral health staff already on site at the clinic, behavioral health primary care policies and procedures and productivity standards, and assessment and referral practices.
- Create a qualitative and quantitative baseline of integration relative to the PCBH Integration Model by surveying PCPs, nursing staff, psychosocial staff, and clerical/administrative staff; shadowing staff as they perform their jobs; and interviewing individual staff members including leadership team members, PCPs, nursing staff, psychosocial staff, and clerical/administrative staff.
- Develop relationships with clinic staff. At each clinic, PCG met with the full clinic staff, the clinic leadership team, and the clinic staff by discipline, including the PCPs as well as nursing, psychosocial, and clerical/administrative staff.

As of November 30, 2010, Readiness Reviews were conducted at all 11 DPH COPC clinics, two San Francisco General Hospital clinics, and four SFCCC clinics:

DPH COPC:

- Castro-Mission Health Center
- Chinatown Public Health Center
- Curry Senior Center
- Housing and Urban Health
- Larkin Street Clinic/ Community Health Programs for Youth
- Maxine Hall Health Center
- Ocean Park Health Center
- Potrero Hill Health Center
- Silver Avenue Family Health Center
- Southeast Health Center
- Tom Waddell Health Center

San Francisco General Hospital:

- San Francisco General Adult Medical Center
- San Francisco General Children's Health Center

SFCCC:

- Glide Health Services
- Lyon-Martin Health Center
- Mission Neighborhood Health Center
- South of Market Health Center

PCBH Integration Model Checklist. Readiness Reviews included completion of the PCBH Integration Model Checklist (see Appendix A) based on observation and questions asked of each clinic's medical director. The checklist will continue to be used to evaluate the extent to which integration-related policies, procedures, and activities currently in place are consistent with the PCBH Integration Model. The checklist includes seven domains:

1. Training
2. Competency skills
3. System and facility
4. Management
5. Program evaluation
6. Communication
7. Population impact

Findings at DPH COPC Primary Care Clinics

PCG identified the following system-wide findings as a result of conducting Readiness Reviews at 11 DPH COPC clinics:

- ***Clinic variability.*** There is significant variability among the DPH COPC clinics in the scope of services, the profile of patients served, and the availability of resources, including behavioral health resources. For example, some clinics have specialized programs for specific patient types such as women or children, while others tend to serve specific populations such as the homeless. In addition, the roles of existing PCBH staff (i.e., onsite medical social workers and, in some instances, co-located psychiatric social workers) vary significantly among clinics.
- ***Broad, clinic-based support of PCBH implementation.*** There is broad support for implementation of the PCBH Integration Model among PCPs, nursing staff, operations staff, and behavioral health staff. The staff tend to believe that greater integration of primary care and behavioral health services will benefit patient care.
- ***Strong primary care staff support.*** PCPs and nursing staff believe that implementation of the PCBH Integration Model will improve patient access to behavioral health services. PCPs believe that implementation will improve patient flow and increase their ability to meet productivity standards. In addition, they believe that implementation of the PCBH Integration Model will improve patient outcomes, particularly for patients with chronic diseases and/or behavioral health problems. PCPs and registered nurses (RNs) also feel that job satisfaction is likely to improve.
- ***Moderate behavioral health staff support.*** There was less support of the PCBH Integration Model among behavioral health staff currently based in primary care clinics. However, their interest appeared to improve when they were provided with more information about the PCBH Integration Model and were assured that they would be provided with training to prepare staff for new roles.
- ***PCBH productivity data lacking.*** Productivity data concerning existing primary care-based behavioral health staff is unavailable or limited. Lack of information is related to: 1) separation of the behavioral health staff from the primary care teams; 2) separate appointment scheduling systems with many behavioral health staff keeping their own paper schedules; and (3) lack of consistent billing procedures for behavioral health services. Moreover, there is no system in place to regularly monitor behavioral health staff productivity or outcomes.

- **Significant appointment wait-times.** Patients often have significant waiting periods for appointments with PCPs and current primary care-based behavioral health providers (ranging from one day to four months). This is especially true for new patients.
- **High volume of “no show” appointments.** The current service delivery system for primary care-based behavioral health services is associated with a high volume of “no show” appointments (ranging from 20% to 50%), as most appointments are scheduled and same-day visits are reserved only for the most urgent patients. The net result is a low rate of penetration of behavioral health services into the clinics’ population and a concentration of behavioral health services on a small segment of primary care patients.
- **Physical space limitations.** Most DPH COPC clinics have limited physical space available to perform routine functions. Often, the results are behavioral health providers being located at a distance from primary care exam rooms. The physical separation of behavioral health and primary care staff and the separate appointment scheduling systems make coordination and integration of their efforts challenging.
- **Silo delivery systems.** Relationships between primary care clinics and the DPH Community Behavioral Health Services (CBHS) centers are variable and, for the most part, limited. Physical separation, lack of real-time communication procedures, and lack of a common record system result in strained relationships and problems with continuity of care for patients.
- **Clinic security.** Some clinic staff expressed concern about patients demonstrating disruptive behaviors in waiting and exam rooms. Clinic security staff does provide useful services to address these issues when they arise. However, PCPs would like for these patients to have more access to behavioral health services so that they can learn skills for successful and safe use of primary care services.
- **Cultural and linguistic competency.** Cultural and language issues are important to address in moving forward with implementation of the PCBH Integration Model. For example, it is important for staff to understand how different cultures and populations perceive physical and mental health care and how those perceptions will affect their willingness to seek treatment.

Primary Care System-wide Recommendations

PCG recommends the following to assure successful implementation of the PCBH Integration Model in the DPH COPC clinics:

- ***Staff each of the DPH COPC clinics with PCBs and behaviorist assistants.*** The number of PCBs and behaviorist assistants (BAs) at each clinic should be based on the needs of the patient population served at that clinic. Appendix B shows the recommended staffing levels and special qualifications at each DPH COPC clinic.
- ***Develop pathway programs involving PCBs and BAs.*** Pathway programs should target chronic pain, depression, anxiety and worry, disease management, and other conditions identified as priorities in clinic-specific Readiness Review results. A pathway program is a set of assessment and intervention activities designed to improve outcomes for patients in a high impact group. It includes specific services provided by PCBs, BAs, and other primary care team members such as PCPs, RNs, and medical evaluation assistants (MEAs). See Appendix C for the high priority populations suggested by survey respondents as a result of the DPH COPC Readiness Reviews.
- ***Implement the performance measurement system.*** This system is defined in the PCBH program manual and includes measures on patient outcomes, access, patient/provider experience and satisfaction, and fidelity to the PCBH Integration Model. See Appendix D for an overview of the goals and objectives of the performance review plan for monitoring and evaluating the PCBH program over time.
- ***Implement training.*** Since the PCBH Integration Model is a significant change in the service delivery system at primary care clinics, DPH should conduct core competency-based training for PCBs and BAs and targeted training with PCPs, RNs, and MEAs prior to and during onsite training for PCBs and BAs.

Future Planned Activities

Implementation of the PCBH Integration Model at DPH COPC clinics will begin in January 2011. PCG will provide intensive, onsite training to the new PCBs that will focus on the development of core competencies. PCG will also train the clinics' PCPs and nursing staff. These trainings will include information on how to practice support tools that help PCPs and nursing staff engage the PCBs and further develop their skills for delivery of evidence-based behavior change interventions. DPH COPC patients will begin experiencing the benefit of this additional medical resource by the end of January 2011. Training and support of the PCBs will continue into 2012.

About the Consultants

PCG has been supporting health and human services agencies across the United States for the last 25 years. With over 800 consultants across 27 offices, PCG helps improve the efficiency and effectiveness of organizations that serve the public. For this project, PCG teamed with Dr. Patricia Robinson and Dr. Kirk Strosahl of Mountainview Consulting Group of Yakama, Washington. Drs. Robinson and Strosahl have worked with hundreds of primary care clinics around the world and have conducted major PCBH initiatives with community clinics, Kaiser Permanente, and the United States Air Force.

Appendix A
Primary Care Behavioral Health Program – Integration Checklist

_____ Health Center (Dates: _____)

BASELINE

1. Didactic Training and Background Experience

Parameter	Question	Yes	No
1. BHP Workshop	Has the Behavioral Health Provider (BHP) been to a workshop on primary care behavioral health services?		
2. BHP Training	Has the BHP received didactic training on BHP practice competencies?		
3. RN Training	Has one or more RNs received didactic training on BHP practice competencies?		
4. BHP Reading	Has the BHP read one or more books on integration of behavioral health services into primary care?		
5. BHP PCBH Residency	Has the BHP worked previously in internship, residency, post-doc or other work settings where s/he received training in delivery of BH services in PC?		
6. PCP Workshop	Have 50% of the PCPs been to a brief workshop on primary care behavioral health services?		
7. PCP Training	Have one or more of the PCPs received didactic training on PCBH practice competencies?		
8. PCP Reading	Have one or more of the PCPs read one or more books on integration of behavioral health services into primary care?		
9. PCP PCBH Residency	Have one or more of the PCPs worked previously in residency or in other clinics where BHP services were available?		
10. PCP Referral Scripts	Have PCPs received scripts to reduce stigma when referring a patient to a BHP?		
11. PCP BHP Role Scripts	Have PCPs received scripts to help them accurately describe the BHP role to patients they refer?		

Appendix A
Primary Care Behavioral Health Program – Integration Checklist

2. Practice Competencies

Parameter	Question	Yes	No
12. BHP Competency	Has the BHP been evaluated using the BHP Core Competency Tool (by direct observation or video tapes)?		
13. BHP Competency	Has the BHP achieved Basic Competency ratings or a minimum of 3 in all areas?		
14. BHP Mentor Service	Does the BHP have access to a mentor (BHP with long-term experience and training) concerning development of skills in weak areas?		
15. RN Competency	Have one or more of the RNs been evaluated using the RN Core Competency Tool (by direct observation or video tapes)?		
16. PCP Competency	Have one or more of the PCPs been evaluated using the PCP Core Competency Tool (by direct observation or video tapes)?		
17. PCP Competency	Have one or more of the PCPs achieved Basic Competency ratings or a minimum of 3 in all areas?		
18. PCP Support	Do the PCPs have access to a PCP with experience and interest in working with a BHP?		

3. Clinic System and Facility Factors

Parameter	Question	Yes	No
19. Minimum Staffing Standard	Does your clinic have Behavioral Health Provider (BHP) services 20+ hours / week?		
20. Optimal Staffing Standard	Does your clinic have full-time BHP services?		
21. Co-Location of Service	Is the practice location for the BHP located in the exam room area of the clinic?		
22. Shared Appt Systems	Is there one system for making both primary care and behavioral health appointments?		
23. Schedule Template	Is there a specific person responsible for making the BHP schedule template?		
24. Immediate Access	Does the BHP template include a minimum of 40% same-day visits?		
25. Same-Day Appointments	Does the clinic have a system for scheduling BHP same-day visits?		
26. Same-Day Follow-Ups	Does the clinic have a system for scheduling same-day follow-up appointments with the BHP?		
27. Chart Note Integration	Are BHP chart notes placed in the same location as PCP chart notes?		
28. BHP Chart Note Access	Are BHP chart notes available in the medical record within 24 hours of BHP-patient contact?		

Appendix A
Primary Care Behavioral Health Program – Integration Checklist

29. Schedule Accessibility	Can PCPs (directly or through assistance from aid or technician) quickly & easily access BHP schedule information?		
30. Open Scheduling	Do PCPs (directly or through assistance from aid or technician) routinely schedule appointments directly into the BHP schedule?		
31. Program Staffing	Do PCPs believe that the BHP staffing is adequate?		
32. Scheduling Support	Does the BHP have scheduling and reception support on par with PCPs in the clinic?		
33. Triage Support	Does the BHP have medical assistant or technician support in keeping with that available to PCPs in the clinic?		
34. Facilities Design	Does the BHP have access to the space needed to conduct on site psycho-educational classes & group medical appointments?		
35. Access to Group Space	Does the BHP have access to the space needed to conduct on site group appointments at the time preferred for patients served in groups?		
36. Equipment	Does the BHP have access to equipment available to PCPs in the clinic (computer, printer)?		
37. Equipment	Does the BHP have a pager or cell phone so that s/he can be reached immediately by PCPs?		
38. Equipment	Does the BHP have bulletin board space available for posting BH information for PCPs, nursing and assistant staff?		
39. Equipment	Does the BHP have wall-hanger space for displaying outcome instruments and patient education materials?		

Appendix A
Primary Care Behavioral Health Program – Integration Checklist

4. Management Practices

Parameter	Question	Yes	No
40. Policy Manual	Does the clinic have a policy manual concerning BHP services?		
41. Billing / Coding	Does the policy manual specify billing and coding strategies for BHP services?		
42. Quality Assurance	Does the policy manual specify a quality assurance process for BHPs?		
43. Staffing Standard	Does the policy manual specify a staffing standard for determining BHP staffing (e.g., 6 hours / week / 1000 unduplicated clinic users)?		
44. Access to Manual	Do all providers in the clinic have access to the PCBH policy manual?		
45. Manual Revisions	Is there an inclusive plan for routinely updating the policy manual?		
46. Access to Administrator	Does the BHP have regular meetings with clinic management to discuss issues related to system operations and other issues?		
47. Administrator Feedback.	Does the clinic administrator provide the BHP with productivity data on a monthly basis?		
48. Timely Evaluations	Are performance evaluations for the BHP provided in a timely manner on an annual basis?		
49. Barriers to Integration	Does the clinic administrator address identified integration barriers effectively?		
50. Training Support RNs	Does the clinic administrator support necessary training related to integration for nurses and technicians?		
51. Training Support PCPs	Does the clinic administrator support necessary training related to integration for PCPs?		
52. PCP Feedback	Do PCPs routinely receive feedback on number of referrals to BHP per month?		
53. Productivity Standards	Does the clinic have established productivity standards for the BHP?		

5. Program Evaluation

Parameter	Question	Yes	No
54. Plan	Does the clinic have a written program evaluation plan?		
55. Evaluation	Is the program evaluated yearly?		
56. Distribution	Do all stakeholders receive yearly program evaluation results?		
57. Fidelity	Does the program evaluation include measures of program model fidelity?		
58. Link to Practice Management	Does the program evaluation plan include distribution of practice management information to BHPs (including productivity and model fidelity) on a monthly or quarterly basis?		
59. Link to Clinical Practice	Are BHPs able to access information about specific patient populations targeted for development of new services that include BHP services (e.g., chronic pain patients, diabetics)?		

Appendix A
Primary Care Behavioral Health Program – Integration Checklist

6. Communication Practices

Parameter	Question	Yes	No
60. PCP same-day referral	Do PCPs routinely refer patients for same-day visits with the BHP?		
61. PCP use of BHP for urgent consults	Do PCPs use established protocols for contacting the BHP for urgent consults (even when the BHP is not in the clinic)?		
62. Curbside Consultation	Do PCPs routinely discuss patient care issues with the BHP prior to and after same-day referrals or prior to scheduled initial visits?		
63. Same-day Feedback	Do BHPs routinely provide same-day feedback on scheduled patients?		
64. Same-day Feedback	Do BHPs routinely provide same-day feedback on same-day patients?		
65. BHP Expertise	Do PCPs routinely request advice from the BHP concerning care they deliver to patients with behavior change issues (even if they are not referring the patient for a BH consult)?		
66. BHP Expertise	Do PCPs routinely request that the BHP assist with researching a question related to treatment?		
67. BHP Expertise	Do PCPs ask the BHP to develop patient education materials?		
68. BHP Expertise	Do PCPs ask the BHP to provide brief continuing education presentations on topics of interest?		
69. BHP Meetings	Does the BHP attend all PCP meetings?		
70. BHP Actions	Does the BHP routinely speak, even briefly, at PCP meetings?		
71. BHP Education	Does the BHP routinely provide brief written statements about the evidence for treating BH related problems (half-page handouts, bulletin board items, e-mails)?		
72. BHP Champion	Does the BHP routinely consult with a PCP that is a champion for BHP services?		
73. PCBH Steering Committee	Does the clinic have a PCBH steering committee that meets at least quarterly for a half hour to discuss directions for the program?		

7. Population Impact

Parameter	Question	Yes	No
74. Screening	Have the PCPs been surveyed by the BHP in the past 2 years concerning patient populations they would like to better identify and serve?		
75. Screening	Does the BHP use standard screeners for common adult conditions (e.g., the PHQ-9 and GAD-7)?		
76. Screening	Does the BHP make standard screeners available to PCPs and nursing staff?		
77. Screening	Do PCPs use the same screeners for common adult conditions as the BHP (e.g., the PHQ-9 and GAD 7)?		

Appendix A
Primary Care Behavioral Health Program – Integration Checklist

78. Screening	Is there one or more passive screening strategies in practice in the clinic (e.g., a substance abuse poster in exam rooms)?		
79. Screening	Are BHPs involved on a same-day basis when Adult Physical, or Well-Child screening results indicate the need for assistance (e.g., risk for becoming obese, symptoms of trauma, parenting problems, etc.)?		
80. Assessment	Does the BHP use a standard assessment measure (e.g., the Duke Health Profile) at the beginning of all consults with adults?		
81. Assessment	Does the BHP use a standard assessment measure (e.g., the Pediatric Symptom Checklist) at the beginning of all consults with children and youth)?		
82. Assessment	Does the BHP use gold standard measures for common conditions (e.g., the Vanderbilt for children suspected of having ADHD)?		
83. Assessment	Does the BHP make child screeners and assessment measures available to PCPs (e.g., by placing them in wall hanging files and training PCP assistants and / or by advocating for their inclusion in EMRs)?		
84. Referral (prevention)	Are patients routinely referred to BHP for assistance with developing healthy lifestyle behaviors (e.g., creating social support, establishing exercise programs and patterns of healthy eating)?		
85. Referral (risk)	Are patients routinely referred to BHP for assistance with changing health risk behaviors (e.g., smoking, excessive drinking, unsafe sexual practices)?		
86. Referral (chronic)	Are patients routinely referred to the BHP for development of skills for self-managing chronic disease (e.g., diabetes, hypertension, chronic pain)?		
87. Referral (somatic)	Are patients routinely referred to the BHP for assistance with managing somatic complaints that have a lifestyle or stress component (e.g., headaches, IBS, insomnia)?		
88. Referral (MH)	Are patients routinely referred to BHP for assistance with common mental health problems (e.g., anxiety, depression, trauma)?		
89. Referral (SAHC)	Are patients routinely referred to BHP for assistance with substance abuse problems?		
90. Referral (Social Needs)	Are patients routinely referred to BHP for assistance with meeting social and basic needs (e.g., housing, durable medical equipment, etc.)		
91. Referral (Psych)	Are adult patients routinely screened for behavioral health problems (e.g., depression, PTSD, alcohol and drug abuse) prior to or during a medical visit?		
92. Referral (bio / protocol)	Do PCPs use biomedical markers to trigger referrals to the BHP (e.g., A1-C > 8 or BMI > 29)?		
93. Pathways (risk)	Does the clinic have one or more pathways involving use of BHP services concerning health risk behaviors (e.g., problematic use of alcohol)?		

Appendix A
Primary Care Behavioral Health Program – Integration Checklist

94. Pathways (chronic)	Does the clinic have one or more pathways involving use of BHP services concerning chronic disease (e.g., an established practice of referring all newly diagnosed diabetes for a BHP consult or a chronic pain pathway involving monthly group visits)?		
95. Pathways (somatic)	Does the clinic have one or more pathways involving use of BHP services for patients with somatic problems (e.g., an established practice of referring all patients with insomnia for a BH consult)?		
96. Pathways (Psych)	Does the clinic have one or more pathways involving use of BHP services for patients presenting with psychological symptoms (e.g., a PHA/PDHRA pathway or depression / trauma symptom pathway that calls for specific measurements and specific interventions)?		
97. Groups	Does the BHP offer at least one group service?		
98. Groups	Does the clinic offer at least one group based service involving co-delivery of services from the BHP and a PCP?		
99. Penetration Targets	Does the clinic have established penetration targets for BHP services?		
100. Penetration Feedback	Do clinic providers receive feedback about penetration targets on a regular basis?		

Notes:

Appendix B PCBH Integration – Staffing Plan for DPH COPC Clinics

Health Center	Implement	Target	Current 2022 Sr Med SW	Current 2022 Sr PsysWs	Current 2520 MedSWs	Current 2530 PsysWs	Vacant 2920 MedSWs	Vacant 2930 PsysWs	New 2930 PsysWs	Transfer CBHS Clinicians	Total PCBs	Not Included	BAs Health Worker II	Special Qualifications
1 Castro-Mission Health Center	Feb-11	2.0		1.00						1.0	2.0		1.0	HIV, Spanish
2 Ocean Park Health Center	Feb-11	2.0		0.90				1.0			1.9		1.0	Russian, Cantonese
3 Chinatown Public Health Center	Feb-11	2.0		1.00						1.0	2.0		1.0	Cantonese, Mandarin
4 Maxine Hall Health Center	Feb-11	3.0	0.80				1.0			1.0	2.8		2.0	Spanish, Cantonese, Homeless
5 Silver Avenue Family Health Center	Feb-11	2.0					1.0			1.0	2.0		1.0	Women/Children, Spanish, Cantonese
6 Potrero Hill Health Center	Feb-11	2.0		1.00					1.0		2.0		2.0	Adults, Spanish, Cantonese
7 Larkin Street Clinic	Feb-11	1.0								1.0	1.0			Youth
8 Southeast Health Center	Feb-11	3.0		1.00					2.0		3.0		2.0	Adults, African American, Southeast Asian, Spanish
9 Curry Senior Center	Feb-11	1.0							1.0		1.0		1.0	Older Adults, Southeast Asian
TOTAL FY10-11		18.0	0.80	4.90	-	-	2.0	1.0	4.0	5.0	17.7		11.0	6 HWII positions have job reqs. others will be 9924s
10 Housing & Urban Health Clinic	FY11-12	2.0								2.0	2.0		1.0	Homeless, HIV
11 Tom Waddell Health Center	FY11-12	6.0		4.00					1.0	1.0	6.0		4.0	Homeless, HIV, Spanish, Transgender
TOTAL FY11-12		8.0	-	4.00	-	-	-	-	1.0	3.0	8.0		5.0	
GRAND TOTAL		26.0	0.80	8.90	-	-	2.0	1.0	5.0	8.0	25.7		16.0	

Appendix C
High Priority Populations

High Need Patient Populations	Number of Survey Respondents (DPH COPC Readiness Reviews only)
Attention Deficit Hypertension Disorder	7
Anger Problems	24
Anxiety/Worry	49
Child Behavior Problems	14
Chronic Pain	56
Depression	56
Disease Management	41
Family/Relationship Problems	20
Housing Problems	15
Hypertension	10
Overweight/Obesity	15
Parenting Stress	4
Sleep Problems	18
Substance Abuse	28
Violence/Trauma	18
Total Number of Survey Respondents	74

Appendix D

PCBH Integration Performance Goals and Objectives

I. Patient Outcomes	Objective
1. Patients' health related quality of life indicators improve through provision of PCBH model of care	A. Adult primary care patients who receive services from a PCB show improvement in their health-related quality of life
	B. Children/youth who receive services from a PCB show improvement in their psychosocial wellbeing
	C. Patients participating in Pathways (self care – self management) show improvement in one or more areas of health
	D. Patients who are identified as high risk/high cost who are only engaged in urgent/emergent services (e.g., HUMS patients) are connected to a PCP
II. Access	Objective
1. Access to PCPs improves	A. PCPs demonstrate an increase in the average number of patient encounters per clinical hour
	B. Wait times for PCP appointments decrease
	C. High users of primary care visits who participate in Pathways demonstrate a reduction in PCP visits
2. Access to behavioral health services for patients in the primary care setting improves	A. Patients who have no histories in CBHS have their behavioral health issues detected and addressed in the PCBH model of care
	B. Patients who have only urgent/emergent histories in CBHS have their behavioral health issues detected and addressed in the PCBH model of care
	C. Patients in need of specialty behavioral health services are referred and connected
III. Experience and Satisfaction	Objective
1. Patients experience the PCBH model of care as beneficial	A. Patients (or their parents) express overall satisfaction with services provided in the PCBH program
2. PCPs experience the PCBH model of care as beneficial	A. PCPs report reduced barriers to use of PCBH services
	B. PCPs indicate a stronger likelihood of working with the PCBH staff to develop and support a behavior change plan for their patients
	C. PCPs indicate confidence in the PCBH program as beneficial to most of their patients
	D. PCPs indicate belief that PCBH services help them provide better primary care to their patients
3. PCBH staff (PCB and BA) experience the PCBH model of care as beneficial	A. PCBH staff express satisfaction with providing PCBH services
	B. PCBH staff indicate confidence that PCBH services are beneficial to their patients
	C. PCBH staff indicate confidence that PCBH services are beneficial to PCPs
IV. Fidelity to the Model	Objective
1. PCPs utilize the PCBH Program	A. PCPs refer a minimum of 10% of their patients to the behaviorist
2. PCBs demonstrate fidelity to the PCBH model	A. Less than 5% of patients who see a PCB see the PCB for more than 11 individual visits / year
	B. PCBs complete eight or more face-to-face patient visits/day in year one; and ten in year two
	C. 50% of new referrals to PCBs receive a PCB visit on the same day of the medical visit (i.e., via a "warm hand-off")
	D. On average, less than 15% of patients seen by the PCB are referred to Specialty CBHS

Appendix E

Acronyms

BA – Behaviorist Assistant

BH – Behavioral Health

BHP – Behavioral Health Provider

CBHS – Community Behavioral Health Services

DPH – Department of Public Health

DPH COPC – Department of Public Health Community Oriented Primary Care

HUMS – High Utilizers of Multiple Systems

MEA – Medical Evaluation Assistant

PCB – Primary Care Behaviorist

PCBH – Primary Care Behavioral Health

PCBH Integration Model – Primary Care Behavioral Health Integration Model

PCG – Public Consulting Group

PCP – Primary Care Provider

RN – Registered Nurse

SFCCC – San Francisco Community Consortium Clinics

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: January 12, 2011
To: Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors
From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board *Angela Calvillo*
Subject: APPOINTMENTS BY THE MAYOR

The Mayor has submitted appointments to the following Commissions:

- Thomas Pier, Human Rights Commission, term ending September 2, 2011
- Lorna Randlett, Library Commission, term ending January 5, 2014
- Stephanie Simmons, Commission on the Status of Women, January 22, 2011

Under the Board's Rules of Order, a Supervisor can request a hearing on an appointment by notifying the Clerk in writing.

Upon receipt of such notice, the Clerk shall refer the appointment to the Rules Committee so that the Board may consider the appointment and act within thirty days of the appointment as provided in Section 3.100(17) of the Charter.

Please notify me in writing by 12:00 p.m., Tuesday, January 17, 2011, if you wish any appointment to be scheduled.

Attachments

41



Notice of Appointment

January 8, 2011

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to the Charter Section 3.100 (17), I hereby make the following appointments:

Thomas Pier to the Human Rights Commission. Mr. Pier is appointed to fill a seat held previously by Jamal Dajani, for the unexpired portion of a four-year term ending September 2, 2011.

Lorna Randlett to the Library Commission. Ms. Randlett is appointed to fill a seat held previously by Beverly Hayon, for the unexpired portion of a four-year term ending January 5, 2014.

Stephanie Simmons to the Commission on the Status of Women. Ms. Simmons is appointed to fill a seat held previously by Lorna Randlett, for the unexpired portion of a four-year term ending January 22, 2011.

I am confident that Mr. Pier, Ms. Randlett and Ms. Simmons will serve our community well. Attached are their qualifications to serve, which demonstrate how the appointments represents the communities of interest, neighborhoods and diverse populations of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Gavin Newsom
Mayor

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 JAN 10 AM 9:11
BY [Signature]

THOMAS PAUL PIER
1980 Vallejo St.
San Francisco, CA 94123
tppier@yahoo.com

SUMMARY

Plaintiffs' antitrust attorney with substantial prior employment history in public affairs, communications, and politics.

EDUCATION

Juris Doctorate
University of San Francisco
May, 2004

M.A. Journalism
University of Texas, Austin
May, 1995

B.A. Public Policy
Brown University
May, 1995

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

Attorney
Alioto Law Firm
2005-Present

Represents plaintiffs in consumer antitrust actions, including merger, price-fixing and unfair business practices prosecution in various industries including airline, consumer electronics, pharmaceuticals, and environmental control systems.

Campaign manager, communication director, journalist
1991-2000

Campaign manager/communications director for various political campaigns, including *Reilly for Mayor* (San Francisco, 1999), *Alioto for Secretary of State* (1998), *Alioto for Congress* (CA1, 1996), *Hamburg for Congress* (CA1, 1994), *Woo for Mayor* (Los Angeles, 1993), *Brown for President* (1992). On-air reporter & co-anchor, KPFFK -FM Radio (Los Angeles, 1991).

Commercial Fisherman
Dutch Harbor Alaska
1985-1988

PERSONAL

Married, three children (ages 9, 7, and 4). Avid bay swimmer (Cliff House to Bay Bridge, 2 hours, 42 minutes) and sailor (single-handed Newport Beach-Manzanillo, roundtrip).

Lorna M. Ho Randlett

Lorna_Randlett@Mckinsey.com San Francisco, CA (415)728-3771

SUMMARY

Strategic communications specialist for the top global management consulting firm in the world, McKinsey & Company. Have served the Knowledge, Strategy, Public and Social Sector practices and the West Coast and Mid-Atlantic regions. Areas of concentration include thought leader and stake-holder cultivation and pro-bono client engagements on governance for non profit organizations. Experienced leader / advisor in presentation and oral communication for directors and partners. Specialize in client relationships and high profile event team management.

AREAS OF STRENGTH

- ♦ Risk and Reputation Management
- ♦ Event Best Practices
- ♦ Goal/Planning Setting and Management
- ♦ Presentation/Communications Training
- ♦ Profile Building
- ♦ MOU Term Negotiations
- ♦ Development Training
- ♦ Stake Holder Relationship Building

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

McKinsey and Company

2006 - Current

McKinsey & Company is a management consulting firm that helps many of the world's leading corporations and organizations address their strategic challenges, from reorganizing for long-term growth to improving business performance and maximizing revenue. With consultants deployed in more than 40 countries across the globe, McKinsey advises more than 70 percent of Fortune's magazine's most admired companies on strategic, operational, organizational and technological issues. For eight decades, the firm's primary objective has been to serve as an organization's most trusted external advisor on critical issues facing senior management.

External Relations Manager (2006 – current)

Manage external relations and reputation management for senior director of the firm in his role as leader of the firm's knowledge development efforts overseeing the McKinsey Global Institute and the firm's communications, which includes the *McKinsey Quarterly*. Supported director's client work focused on service to public sector organizations in helping dozens of government, corporate, and nonprofit clients solve their most difficult management challenges.

- Performed external relationship management on director's external relations needs as Chairman Emeritus of the Bay Area Council, Chairman of the Economic Institute of the Bay Area, and vice-chair of the Stanford Graduate School of Business Advisory Council, board member for The New America Foundation, Common Cause, California Forward, the Bay Area Science and Innovation Consortium, ChildrenNow, and The California Business for Educational Excellence Foundation and a Trustee for the Committee for Economic Development.
- Supported director's communications and risk and reputation management needs for extensive portfolio on globalization, productivity, economic development and

competitiveness, corporate social responsibility, regulation, education, health care, financial services, and corporate strategy.

Director of the Office of Public Engagement, SFUSD (2002-2006)

Responsible for all communication for the San Francisco Unified School District, serving on the executive leadership committee for the superintendent of schools.

- Developed, wrote and oversaw all strategic communication plans and product for the central office of the district.
- Oversaw communications team and advised superintendent's executive committee for SFUSD.
- Managed external relations for key stakeholders of SFUSD including the Business Advisory Council, which lead the campaign for two bond measures totaling more than 750 million dollars in additional funds for SFUSD.
- Performed all risk and reputation management and written and media interviews as spokesperson for SFUSD.

President, LMH Consulting (2001-2006)

- Key advisor on strategic communications and earned media to executive clients.

Anchor, Yahoo Inc. (1999-2001)

- Delivered financial and technology news for Yahoo Inc. web based streaming live network and principal member of initial entrepreneurial Yahoo Finance Vision team.

ADDITIONAL TRAINING

- Stanford University, School of Education Seminar on Advances in Primary Education, 2008
- Executive Leadership Training on Efficiency and Effectiveness, 2005
- University of Missouri, Columbia – School of Journalism , Newsroom Management 1993

EDUCATION

B.S. University of California, Santa Cruz

**Stephanie M. Simmonstc67 Seward Street
San Francisco, California 94114
415-244-0888 (C)
Stephims218@gmail.com**

Skills: Proven track record in identifying and assessing the needs of large customer base, demonstrating best possible solutions to suit their needs, and **closing** the business; ability to manage multiple projects/task efficiently. Excellent written and verbal communication skills; ability to manage large, diverse groups of people; quality controls, including, but not limited to, hiring and professional staff development, including training and performance appraisals and implementation of principles of Human Resource management. Adhere to the highest levels of internal and external customer service.

Employment History and Highlights

November 2010 to Present Manpower, Inc., San Francisco, CA

Branch Manager

Senior Manager responsible for the effective management and profitable operation of the San Francisco office.

Responsible for developing and implementing a business plan that will result in achieving profit results consistent with established expectations
Responsible for the implementation of consistent business development programs to maximize billable hours and sales growth, thereby increasing market share and operating profits
Responsible for the management and development of permanent staff
Responsible for the implementation and management of Manpower's Corporate Service Standards, including the Quality Performance Program.

September 2009 to November 2010 GBR Smith Group, LLC, Walnut Creek, CA

Senior Search Consultant

Senior Recruiter dedicated to finding and placing top notch professionals in the fields of Engineering, Construction Management, Energy/Utilities, and Petrochemicals, while adhering to the highest levels of customer service.

January 2008-May 2009 Partech, Inc., San Francisco, CA

High Level Business to Business Sales Focused in the Quick Service Industry; Hospitality Sales & Marketing Partech Point of Sales, Quota \$1.4 million

Responsible for account development and management for Quick Service franchisees in Northern California and Nevada

Marketing of products to local franchises through their individual trade shows
Identification of prospective clients
Analyze enterprise and deduce the most appropriate business solutions
Demonstration of how selected business solutions will positively impact corporation
Proposals
Completion of sale
Manage installation of system
Continued account maintenance subsequent to install

75% of Quota achieved in first year; Top 3 on Sales Team

February 2005-January 2008 MICROS Systems, Inc, Columbia, MD and San Francisco, CA
Hospitality Sales & Marketing MICROS Point of Sales, Quota \$700,000

Responsible for account development and management in the San Francisco Bay Area
Identification of prospective clients
Surveying of prospective clients
Demonstration of product
Proposals
Completion of sale
Manage installation of system
Continued account maintenance subsequent to install

Silver Club Award- 110% of quota

October 2002-February 2005, Data Business Systems

Hospitality Sales & Marketing, Positouch Point of Sales

Responsible for account development and management in Washington, DC and Maryland
Identification of prospective clients
Surveying of prospective clients
Demonstration of product
Proposals
Completion of sale
Manage installation of system
Continued account maintenance subsequent to install

October 2001-October 2002, Mobility, Inc. (dba. Flexcar)

12 "Employment History and Highlights
Marketing/Member Relations Manager

Responsible for the individual account management of 1200+ individual members
Maintained database for members
Processed all new members; Applicant phase to Active member phase
Responsible for all communications between members and Flexcar
Created special promotions to benefit existing members and to solicit new members

Responsible for business account development and management
Identification of prospective clients
Proposals
Marketing plans
Implementation and Management

Program Manager

Aide in all aspects of initial launch of car-sharing service in the Washington, DC market
Insuring proper business licenses in place
Production and installation of signage
Responsible for editing print collaterals for Washington, DC market
Help to develop initial strategies for marketing of program

1989-2001, Houston's Restaurants, Inc. (currently, Hillstone Restaurant Group)

December 1998 to May 2001, Senior Assistant/Service Manager
Average Sales: \$95,000-\$150,000 per week

Worked from server to Senior Assistant/ Service Manager in the 12 years employed with Houston's
Managed one of the highest revenue producing sites for Houston's Restaurant; specifically,
Developing and overseeing the highest grossing bar in the corporation.
Increased profitability by streamlining cost

Organized and oversaw the training of staff
Improved service evaluations for teams ranging 40 to 70 staff members
Enhanced service teams knowledge of Houston's brand and product
Reduced employee attrition and increased employee retention
Oversaw accuracy of recipes and presentation in preparation of menu items
Responsible for composing and monitoring monthly budgets
Implemented service upgrades
Secured placement for more than 25 employees displaced by the closing of Houston's Georgetown

Seminars:

Stephen Coveys "Seven Habits of Highly Effective People"
Enlightened Leadership Seminar

Education:

California State University at Los Angeles
University of Maryland at College Park