

File No. 110419

Petitions and Communications received from March 29, 2011, through April 4, 2011, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on April 12, 2011.

Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted.

From Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector, submitting the Cash Shortage and Overage Fund Balance Report for October 2010 through January 2011. Copy: Each Supervisor (1)

From Public Utilities Commission, submitting the FY2009-2010 Water Enterprise Annual Disclosure Report. Copy: Each Supervisor (2)

From Planning Department, regarding an update to the 2009 Housing Element. (3)

From Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector, submitting their Investment Report as of February 2011. Copy: Each Supervisor (4)

*From concerned citizens, urging the Board of Supervisors to take action to restore the wetlands at Sharp Park Golf Course. Approximately 950 letters (5)

From Doug MacTavish, regarding Muni bus drivers. (6)

From Medical Cannabis Task Force, regarding improving communication between the Board of Supervisors and the Medical Cannabis Task Force. (7)

From Brightline Defense Project, regarding proposed legislation that urges Avalon Bay Communities to utilize sub-contractors that compensate workers consistent with area standard wages. File No. 110283, Copy: Each Supervisor (8)

From concerned citizens, concerning the Botanical Gardens fees. File No. 110255, Copy: Each Supervisor, 3 letters (9)

From Molly Burke, regarding BART. (10)

From Bobby Lehmann, regarding the phone company's upgrade. File No. 110114 (11)

From Paul Davis, submitting copy of letter sent to the Golden Gate Bridge District regarding incompetent management. Copy: Each Supervisor (12)

*From concerned citizens, regarding the Parkmerced project. 40 letters (13)

From concerned citizen, regarding shark fin soup. (14)

From Doug Mac Tavish, regarding "No Smoking" signs at transit stops. (15)

From concerned citizens, regarding sidewalk sitting ban. Copy: Each Supervisor, 3 letters (16)

From Brightline Defense Project, regarding stock options and local hiring. (17)

From concerned citizens, submitting support for the Planning Commission's decision that the proposed project at 1653 Grant Avenue is exempt from environmental review. File No. 110307, Copy: Each Supervisor, 6 letters (18)

From Verizon Wireless, submitting notification of six cellular antennas to be installed at 1950 Kearny Street. (19)

From Francisco Da Costa, regarding radioactive readings about 18,000 above normal. (20)

From Francisco Da Costa, regarding the Rules Committee and Ethics Commission. (21)

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to proposed legislation that bans the delivery of unwanted Yellow Pages in San Francisco. File No. 110114, Copy: Each Supervisor, 15 letters (22)

From concerned citizens, submitting support for proposed legislation that bans the delivery of unwanted Yellow Pages in San Francisco. File No. 110114, 9 letters (23)

From State Office of Parks and Recreation, submitting notice that the South San Francisco Opera House was placed on the National Register of Historic Places. (24)

From Clerk of the Board, the following individuals have submitted a Form 700 Statement: (25)

Robert Selna, Legislative Aide - assuming

John Avalos, Supervisor - annual

David Campos, Supervisor - annual

David Chiu, Supervisor - annual

Sean Elsbernd, Supervisor - annual

Eric Mar, Supervisor - annual

Carmen Chu, Supervisor - annual

Camelin Blackstone, Legislative Aide - annual

Victor Lim, Legislative Aide - annual

Valle Brown, Legislative Aide - annual

Arthur Louie, Budget Analyst - annual

Debra Newman, Budget Analyst - annual
Dawn Duran, AAB - annual
Shelia Chung-Hagen, Legislative Aide - annual
Rick Galbreath, Legislative Aide - annual
Les Hilger, Legislative Aide - annual
Jon Lau, Legislative Aide - annual
Catherine Rauschuber, Legislative Aide - annual
Raquel Redondiez, Legislative Aide - annual
Judson True, Legislative Aide - annual
Leah Pimental, LAFCo - annual
Jason Fried, LAFCo - annual
John Dalessi, LAFCo - annual
Jill Jay, Deputy Director - leaving
Mervin Conlan, AAB - assuming
Gregory Blaine, AAB - annual
Donna Crowder, AAB - annual
Lawrence Lee, AAB - annual
Richard Lee, AAB - annual
John McGary, AAB - annual
Louisa Mendoza, AAB - annual
Jeffrey Morris, AAB - annual
Alfredo Perez, AAB - annual
Diane Robinson, AAB - annual
Margaret Ruxton, AAB - annual
Scott Spertzel, AAB - annual
Joseph Tham, AAB - annual

BOS-11
cpay



Office Of The Treasurer/Tax Collector

City and County of San Francisco

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 7426, San Francisco, CA 94120-7426

Street Address: One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102-4638

Phone Number: (415) 554-4478

JOSÉ CISNEROS, TREASURER

March 1, 2011

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAR 30 AM 9:33

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Pursuant to the provision of the City and County of San Francisco Administrative Code Section 10.82, the Treasurer's Office submits the Cash Shortage and Overage Fund balance and activities reported to this office for the month of October 2010.

Beginning Balance.....	\$ 423.80
Less: Shortage	\$ (139.41)
Add: Overages.....	\$ 129.00
Ending Balance	<u>\$ 413.39</u>

Thank you.

Connie D. Carranza
Principal Account Clerk

cc: Ben Rosenfield, Controller
Pauline Marx, Chief Assistant Treasurer
Controller's Internal Audit Division
Government Information Center

Enc: Detail Report

1

Office Of The Treasurer/Tax Collector



City and County of San Francisco

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 7426, San Francisco, CA 94120-7426

Street Address: One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102-4638

Phone Number: (415) 554-4478

JOSÉ CISNEROS, TREASURER

March 1, 2011

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAR 30 AM 9:33
BY [Signature]

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Pursuant to the provision of the City and County of San Francisco Administrative Code Section 10.82, the Treasurer's Office submits the Cash Shortage and Overage Fund balance and activities reported to this office for the month of November 2010.

Beginning Balance.....	\$ 413.39
Less: Shortage	\$ (39.00)
Add: Overages.....	\$ 23.00
Ending Balance	<u>\$ 397.39</u>

Thank you.

Connie D. Carranza
Principal Account Clerk

cc: Ben Rosenfield, Controller
Pauline Marx, Chief Assistant Treasurer
Controller's Internal Audit Division
Government Information Center

Enc: Detail Report

Office Of The Treasurer/Tax Collector



City and County of San Francisco

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 7426, San Francisco, CA 94120-7426

Street Address: One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102-4638

Phone Number: (415) 554-4478

JOSÉ CISNEROS, TREASURER

March 1, 2011

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAR 30 AM 9:33
BY [Signature]

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Pursuant to the provision of the City and County of San Francisco Administrative Code Section 10.82, the Treasurer's Office submits the Cash Shortage and Overage Fund balance and activities reported to this office for the month of December 2010.

Beginning Balance.....	\$ 397.39
Less: Shortage	\$ (1.00)
Add: Overages.....	\$ 59.00
Ending Balance	<u>\$ 455.39</u>

Thank you.

Connie D. Carranza
Principal Account Clerk

cc: Ben Rosenfield, Controller
Pauline Marx, Chief Assistant Treasurer
Controller's Internal Audit Division
Government Information Center

Enc: Detail Report

City and County of San Francisco
Office of the Treasurer/Tax Collector
Revolving Fund for Cashier Shortage & Overage
Received in Dec 2010

I. Shortage

Date Received	Date of Occurrence	Department	Name	Amount
12/20/10	10/04/10	Parking & Traffic	Mary Shepherd	\$ 1.00
Total shortage for the month of Dec 2010				\$ 1.00

II. Overage

Date Received	Date of Occurrence	Department	Name	Amount
12/03/10	11/12/10	Superior Court - Traffic	Cynthia Pughsley	\$ 4.00
12/03/10	11/12/10	Superior Court - Traffic	Nelik Gabriel	\$ 4.00
12/03/10	10/13/10	Superior Court - Traffic	Debra Hilt	\$ 3.00
12/03/10	10/21/10	Superior Court - Traffic	Debra Hilt	\$ 20.00
12/03/10	09/08/10	Superior Court - Traffic	Connie Lan	\$ 28.00
Total overage for the month of Dec 2010				\$ 59.00
Net of Shortage and Overage for the month of Dec 2010				\$ 58.00

Office Of The Treasurer/Tax Collector



City and County of San Francisco

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 7426, San Francisco, CA 94120-7426

Street Address: One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102-4638

Phone Number: (415) 554-4478

JOSÉ CISNEROS, TREASURER

March 1, 2011

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAR 30 AM 9:33
pc

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Pursuant to the provision of the City and County of San Francisco Administrative Code Section 10.82, the Treasurer's Office submits the Cash Shortage and Overage Fund balance and activities reported to this office for the month of January 2011.

Beginning Balance.....	\$ 455.39
Less: Shortage	\$ (100.00)
Add: Overages.....	\$ 39.00
Ending Balance	<u>\$ 394.39</u>

Thank you.

Connie D. Carranza
Principal Account Clerk

cc: Ben Rosenfield, Controller
Pauline Marx, Chief Assistant Treasurer
Controller's Internal Audit Division
Government Information Center

Enc: Detail Report

Office Of The Treasurer/Tax Collector



City and County of San Francisco

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 7426, San Francisco, CA 94120-7426

Street Address: One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102-4638

Phone Number: (415) 554-4478

JOSÉ CISNEROS, TREASURER

March 1, 2011

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
01 MAR 30 AM 9:33
PC

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Pursuant to the provision of the City and County of San Francisco Administrative Code Section 10.82, the Treasurer's Office submits the Cash Shortage and Overage Fund balance and activities reported to this office for the month of February 2011.

Beginning Balance.....	\$ 394.39
Less: Shortage	\$ (41.00)
Add: Overages.....	\$ 0.00
Ending Balance	<u>\$ 353.39</u>

Thank you.

Connie D. Carranza
Principal Account Clerk

cc: Ben Rosenfield, Controller
Pauline Marx, Chief Assistant Treasurer
Controller's Internal Audit Division
Government Information Center

Enc: Detail Report



Boson page

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

1155 Market St., 11th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103 • Tel. (415) 554-3155 • Fax (415) 554-3161 • TTY (415) 554.3488



March 25, 2011

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

EDWIN M. LEE
MAYOR

FRANCESCA VIOTOR
PRESIDENT

ANSON MORAN
VICE PRESIDENT

ANN MOLLER CAEN
COMMISSIONER

ART TORRES
COMMISSIONER

VINCE COURTNEY
COMMISSIONER

ED HARRINGTON
GENERAL MANAGER

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

For your records, enclosed are the FY09-10 Annual Disclosure Reports for the Water and Wastewater Enterprises of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. In accordance with the continuing disclosure obligations related to our outstanding revenue bonds, these reports were uploaded to Electronic Municipal Market Access (EMMA) on March 21, 2011.

If you have any questions regarding these Annual Disclosure Reports, please contact me at (415) 554-3155 or by e-mail at trydstrom@sfwater.org. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Todd Rydstrom
Assistant General Manager,
Business Services
Chief Financial Officer

Enclosures

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAR 29 PM 3:19
AK

Public Utilities Commission of the
City and County of San Francisco

Water Enterprise

Annual Disclosure Report

For Fiscal Year Ending
June 30, 2010





SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

1155 Market St., 11th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103 • Tel. (415) 554-3155 • Fax (415) 554-3161 • TTY (415) 554.3488



March 21, 2011

VIA: MSRB EMMA

Dear Investors, Friends, and Interested Parties:

We are pleased to present the Annual Disclosure Report for fiscal year ending June 30, 2010 for the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco (SFPUC), Water Enterprise. This filing relates to the following associated base CUSIP number:

SFPUC Water Enterprise 79765R

This Annual Disclosure Report is being provided by the SFPUC in connection with our undertaking entered into in accordance with Rule 15c2-12, promulgated by the U.S. Securities Exchange Commission. The information provided in this Annual Disclosure Report speaks only as of its date, March 21, 2011. The delivery of this Annual Disclosure Report may not, under any circumstances, create an implication that there has been no other change to the information provided in any final official statement. Other than as set forth in the Continuing Disclosure Agreement, SFPUC has not agreed to notify the secondary market of subsequent changes to the information in this Annual Disclosure Report.

The filing of this Report does not constitute or imply any representation (1) that any or all of the information provided is material to investors, (2) regarding any other financial, operating or other information relating to the security for the referenced securities, (3) that no changes, circumstances or events have occurred which may have a bearing on the security for the referenced securities or an investor's decision to buy, sell, or hold the referenced securities.

Any statements regarding the referenced securities, other than a statement made by the City in an official release or subsequent notice or annual report, published in a financial newspaper of general circulation and/or filed with the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board (MSRB) or on Electronic Municipal Market Access (EMMA), are not authorized by the SFPUC. The SFPUC shall not be responsible for the accuracy, completeness, or fairness of any such unauthorized statement.

If you have any questions regarding this Annual Disclosure Report, please contact Todd Rydstrom, Assistant General Manager, Business Services & Chief Financial Officer, at (415) 554-3155 or by e-mail at trydstrom@sfwater.org.

EDWIN M. LEE
MAYOR

FRANCESCA VIETOR
PRESIDENT

ANSON MORAN
VICE PRESIDENT


ANN MOLLER CAEN
COMMISSIONER

ART TORRES
COMMISSIONER

VINCE COURTNEY
COMMISSIONER

ED HARRINGTON
GENERAL MANAGER

Sincerely,



Edward M. Harrington
General Manager

Enclosure

CC: José Cisneros, Treasurer
Ben Rosenfield, Controller
Dennis J. Herrera, City Attorney
Nadia Sesay, Director, Office of Public Finance
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Page intentionally left blank.

City and County of San Francisco

Edwin M. Lee, Mayor

Board of Supervisors

David Chiu, President

John Avalos
David Campos
Malia Cohen
Carmen Chu
Sean Elsbernd

Mark Farrell
Jane Kim
Eric Mar
Ross Mirkarimi
Scott Wiener

Dennis J. Herrera, City Attorney
José Cisneros, Treasurer

Public Utilities Commission

Francesca Vietor, President
Anson Moran, Vice President
Ann Moller Caen, Commissioner
Art Torres, Commissioner
Vince Courtney, Commissioner

City and County Officials

Amy Brown, Acting City Administrator
Ben Rosenfield, Controller

Public Utilities Commission Staff

Edward M. Harrington, General Manager
Michael Carlin, Deputy General Manager & Chief Operating Officer
Steven Ritchie, Assistant General Manager, Water
Juliet Ellis, Assistant General Manager, External Affairs
Barbara Hale, Assistant General Manager, Power
Harlan Kelly, Jr., Assistant General Manager, Infrastructure
Tommy Moala, Assistant General Manager, Wastewater
Todd Rydstrom, Assistant General Manager, Business Services & Chief Financial Officer

**Water Annual Disclosure Report
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2010**

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) hereby provides this Annual Disclosure Report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010 in connection with obligations undertaken pursuant to Continuing Disclosure Certificates for revenue bonds issued by SFPUC's Water Enterprise, as provided in the table below. Audited Financial Statements for the years ending June 30, 2009 and June 30, 2010 are submitted separately.

<i>Name of Bonds</i>	<i>Original Par (\$000s)</i>	<i>Dated Date</i>	<i>Official Statement Date</i>	<i>Trustee</i>	<i>Source of Undertaking</i>
Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 1991 Series	\$70,146	April 24, 1991	May 8, 1991	n/a	n/a
Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2001 Series A	\$140,000	August 7, 2001	July 1, 2001	US Bank	Continuing Disclosure Certificate, August 7, 2001
Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2002 Series A	\$164,000	August 8, 2002	July 10, 2002	US Bank	Continuing Disclosure Certificate, August 8, 2002
Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2002 Refunding Series B	\$85,260	August 8, 2002	July 10, 2002	US Bank	Continuing Disclosure Certificate, August 8, 2002
Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2006 Series A	\$507,815	March 15, 2006	February 28, 2006	US Bank	Continuing Disclosure Certificate, March 15, 2006
Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2006 Refunding Series B	\$110,065	March 15, 2006	February 28, 2006	US Bank	Continuing Disclosure Certificate, March 15, 2006
Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2006 Series C	\$48,730	August 3, 2006	July 19, 2006	US Bank	Continuing Disclosure Certificate, August 3, 2006
Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2009 Series A	\$412,000	August 19, 2009	August 11, 2009	US Bank	Continuing Disclosure Certificate, August 1, 2009
Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2009 Series B	\$412,000	September 15, 2009	September 1, 2009	US Bank	Continuing Disclosure Certificate, September 1, 2009
Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2010 Series A	\$56,945	June 17, 2010	June 9, 2010	US Bank	Continuing Disclosure Certificate, June 1, 2010
Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds – Build America Bonds (BABs), 2010 Series B	\$417,720	June 17, 2010	June 9, 2010	US Bank	Continuing Disclosure Certificate, June 1, 2010
Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco Water Revenue Bonds, 2010 Refunding Series C	\$14,040	June 17, 2010	June 9, 2010	US Bank	Continuing Disclosure Certificate, June 1, 2010

**Water Annual Disclosure Report
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2010**

For the convenience of bondholders, the following table provides CUSIP numbers for revenue bonds outstanding during the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2010. No assurance as to the accuracy or completeness of such CUSIP numbers is given. The base CUSIP number for these bonds is

79765R

<i>Maturity November 1</i>	<i>1991 Series</i>	<i>2001 Series A</i>	<i>2002 Series A</i>	<i>2002 Series B</i>	<i>2006 Series A</i>	<i>2006 Series B</i>	<i>2006 Series C</i>	<i>2009 Series A</i>	<i>2009 Series B</i>	<i>2010 Series A</i>	<i>2010 Series B</i>	<i>2010 Series C</i>
2009		FL8	GS2	HY8	JL4	KL2	NB1					
2010		FM6	GT0	HZ5	JM2	KM0	NC9					
2011		FN4	GU7	JA8	JN0	KN8	ND7	PM5	QN2	RP6		
2012			GV5	JB6	JP5	KP3	NE5	PN3	QP7	RQ4		SK6
2013			GW3	JC4	JQ3	KQ1	NF2	PP8	QQ5	RR2		SL4
2014			GX1	JD2	JR1	KR9	NG0	PQ6	QR3	RS0		SM2
2015			GY9	JE0	JS9	KS7	NH8	PR4	QS1	RT8		SN0
2016			GZ6		JT7	KT5	NJ4	PS2	QT9	RU5	SP5	
2017			HA0		JU4	KU2	NK1	PT0	QU6	RV3	SQ3	
2018	DN6		HB8		JV2	KV0	NL9	PU7	QV4	RW1	SR1	
2019	FC8		HC6		JW0	KW8	NM7	PV5	QW2	RX9	SS9	
2020			HD4		JX8	KX6	NN5	PW3	QX0	RY7	ST7	
2021			HE2		JY6	KY4	NP0	PX1	QY8	RZ4		
2022			HF9		JZ3	KZ1	NQ8	PY9	QZ5	SA8		
2023			HG7		KA6	LA5	NR6	PZ6	RA9	SB6		
2024					KB4	LB3	NS4	QA0	RB7	SC4		
2025			HJ1		KC2	LC1	NT2	QB8	RC5	SD2	SU4	
2026			HK8		KD0	LD9	NU9	QC6	RD3	SE0		
2027		GE3	HL6		KE8			QD4	RE1	SG5		
2028								QE2	RF8	SH3		
2029								QF9	RG6	SJ9		
2030								QG7	RH4	SF7		
2031		GJ2			KF5			QH5	RJ0			
2032			HR3					QJ1	RK7			

Continued on next page...

**Water Annual Disclosure Report
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2010**

The following tables are provided pursuant to the Continuing Disclosure Certificates executed in connection with the SFPUC's Water Revenue Bonds.

**SFPUC WATER ENTERPRISE
HISTORIC WHOLESALE AND RETAIL WATER SALES
FOR FISCAL YEARS ENDED JUNE 30 (IN MGD)**

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2010 % of Total</u>
Retail customers						
Residential	46.2	45.5	43.5	43.0	41.5	18.8%
Commercial	20.2	20.0	21.5	20.7	19.4	8.8%
Suburban Retail	2.7	3.1	3.3	3.0	2.2	1.0%
Municipal ⁽¹⁾	2.4	2.5	5.4	5.6	5.3	2.4%
Industrial	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1%
Docks & Shipping	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0%
Retail water sales[†]	71.8	71.3	74.1	72.6	68.6	31.2%
Wholesale customers						
California Water Service	34.6	37.9	37.7	36.0	32.6	14.8%
Hayward Municipal Water	18.0	18.2	19.3	19.0	17.3	7.8%
City of Palo Alto	11.9	13.0	12.7	11.6	11.0	5.0%
Alameda County Water	10.6	13.7	12.9	11.3	10.8	4.9%
City of Sunnyvale	9.4	9.4	10.5	10.7	9.9	4.5%
City of Redwood City	10.9	11.7	11.0	10.3	9.6	4.4%
City of Mountain View	10.2	10.8	10.5	9.9	8.9	4.1%
City of Milpitas	6.5	6.9	7.0	6.9	6.3	2.9%
Estero Muni Improvement District	5.2	5.6	5.5	5.1	4.9	2.2%
City of Daly City	6.2	6.2	4.5	4.4	5.1	2.3%
All Other Wholesale Customers	41.0	42.4	41.7	38.8	35.0	15.9%
Wholesale water sales	164.5	175.8	173.4	164.0	151.3	68.8%
Total water sales⁽²⁾	236.3	247.1	247.5	236.6	219.9	100.0%
% Change from prior year	-1.4%	4.6%	0.1%	-4.4%	-7.0%	

[†] Totals may not add due to independent rounding.

(1) Includes two City departments located outside San Francisco, the San Bruno Jail and San Francisco International Airport, with combined annual sales between 1.3 and 1.5 mgd.

(2) Unaccounted for water was 7.1 mgd in FY 2005-06, 5.2 mgd in FY 2006-07, 5.4 mgd in FY 2007-08, 5.7 mgd in FY 2008-09, and 4.2 mgd in 2009-10, as determined by SFPUC Customer Service. Unaccounted for water includes water delivery system leaks and water not billed or tracked in the system (i.e., water used for fire fighting, flushing water system pipes). Unaccounted for water has averaged approximately 9% per year over the last thirty years. For 2009-10, 4.2 mgd represents an unaccounted for water loss of less than 2%.

Source: SFPUC Financial Services

**SFPUC WATER ENTERPRISE
HISTORICAL AND APPROVED PERCENTAGE INCREASES (DECREASES)
IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE WATER RATES**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Retail Rates</i>	<i>Wholesale Rates</i> ⁽⁴⁾
July 1991	14.0%	39.7%
July 1992	18.0	19.2
July 1993	13.7	(33.2)
July 1994	14.0	19.1
July 1995	0.0	0.0
July 1996	7.6	0.0
July 1997	0.0	0.0
July 1998	0.0 ⁽¹⁾	(13/0)
July 1999	0.0 ⁽¹⁾	35.0
July 2000	0.0 ⁽¹⁾	4.4
July 2001	8.7 ⁽¹⁾	2.8
July 2002	8.6 ⁽¹⁾	0.0
July 2003	0.0 ⁽¹⁾	25.7
July 2004	0.0 ⁽¹⁾	2.7
July 2005	15.0 ⁽¹⁾	(9.7) ⁽⁵⁾
July 2006	15.0 ⁽¹⁾	18.8
July 2007	15.0 ⁽²⁾	6.3
July 2008	15.0	10.0
July 2009	15.0 ⁽³⁾	15.7
July 2010	15.0 ⁽³⁾	15.2
July 2011	12.5 ⁽³⁾	
July 2012	12.5 ⁽³⁾	
July 2013	6.5 ⁽³⁾	

⁽¹⁾ Proposition H, approved by San Francisco voters on June 2, 1998, froze retail water rates at then-current levels, subject to certain exceptions (including a limited exception to raise rates to pay debt service on voter-approved debt), through July 1, 2006.

⁽²⁾ Adjustment effective July 14, 2007.

⁽³⁾ Based on five-year rate schedule covering July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2014 approved in May 2009.

⁽⁴⁾ Wholesale rates are set prospectively based on an estimate of the Wholesale Revenue Requirement.

⁽⁵⁾ Adjustment effective April 1, 2005.

Source: SFPUC Audited Financial Statements and SFPUC Financial Services

**Water Annual Disclosure Report
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2010**

**SFPUC WATER ENTERPRISE
ACCOUNTS AND BILLING BY USER TYPE
FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2010**

<i>User Type</i>	<i>Active Accounts</i>	<i>Billings (000s)⁽¹⁾</i>	<i>Billings as Percent of Total</i>
San Francisco Residential:			
Multi-Family Residential	40,844	\$43,741	17.6%
Single Family Residential	109,440	31,565	12.7%
<i>Subtotal Residential</i>	150,284	\$75,306	30.4%
San Francisco Non-Residential:			
Commercial	19,971	35,467	14.3%
Municipal Customers	1,767	6,410	2.6%
Building and Construction	181	304	0.1%
Industrial	85	310	0.1%
Docks and Ships	1	89	0.0%
<i>Subtotal Non-Residential:</i>	22,005	42,580	17.2%
Suburban Retail:	310	5,311	2.1%
Wholesale:	81	124,800	50.3%
Total	172,680	\$247,997	100.0%

⁽¹⁾ Billings shown on a cash basis; revenues are on accrual basis in accordance with GAAP.

Source: SFPUC Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, June 30, 2010

**Water Annual Disclosure Report
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2010**

**SFPUC WATER ENTERPRISE
OUTSTANDING INDEBTEDNESS
FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2010**

<i>Series of Bonds</i>	<i>Purpose</i>	<i>Initial Principal Amount</i>	<i>Principal Outstanding as of June 30, 2010</i>
Water Revenue Bonds, 1991 Series A	Repair and replacement of water facilities	\$ 70,145,682 ⁽¹⁾	\$ 7,100,000 ⁽²⁾
Water Revenue Bonds, 2001 Series A	System Reliability Project and Safe Water Project	140,000,000	60,235,000
Water Revenue Bonds, 2002 Series A	System Reliability Project and Safe Water Project	164,000,000	144,260,000
Water Revenue Bonds, 2002 Refunding Series B	Refund previously outstanding Bonds of the SFPUC	85,260,000	45,050,000
Water Revenue Bonds, 2006 Series A	Water system improvements under Proposition A	507,815,000	488,555,000
Water Revenue Bonds, 2006 Refunding Series B	Refund previously outstanding Bonds of the SFPUC	110,065,000	101,100,000
Water Revenue Bonds, 2006 Refunding Series C	Refund previously outstanding Bonds of the SFPUC	48,730,000	41,185,000
Water Revenue Bonds, 2009 Series A	Water system improvements under Proposition A	412,000,000	412,000,000
Water Revenue Bonds, 2009 Series B	Water system improvements under Proposition A	412,000,000	412,000,000
Water Revenue Bonds, 2010 Series A	Water system improvements under Proposition E	56,945,000	56,945,000
Water Revenue Bonds, 2010 Series B (Build America Bonds)	Water system improvements under Proposition E	417,720,000	417,720,000
Water Revenue Bonds, 2010 Refunding Series C	Refund previously outstanding Bonds of the SFPUC	14,040,000	14,040,000
Total		\$2,438,720,682	\$2,200,190,000⁽³⁾

(1) Issued as capital appreciation bonds.

(2) Represents full accreted value at maturity.

(3) Subordinate Debt: The Water Enterprise maintains a \$500 million commercial paper program, which is subordinate to the outstanding revenue bonds. As of March 21, 2011, \$150,000,000 in commercial paper was outstanding.

Source: SFPUC, Financial Services

Water Annual Disclosure Report
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2010

SFPUC WATER ENTERPRISE
HISTORICAL REVENUES, OPERATING & MAINTENANCE EXPENSES AND DEBT SERVICE
COVERAGE FOR FISCAL YEARS ENDING JUNE 30 (DOLLARS IN 000'S)⁽¹⁾

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Operating and Investment Revenues					
Charges for Services	\$189,603	\$202,787	\$216,819	\$247,664	\$248,369
Rental Income	8,763	9,929	9,645	9,399	8,584
Other Revenues	3,467	3,815	7,752	8,092	7,655
Capacity Fees ⁽²⁾	1	-	213	626	610
Investing Activities ⁽²⁾	11,665	24,547	12,456	7,088	9,823
Total Revenue	<u>\$213,499</u>	<u>\$241,078</u>	<u>\$246,885</u>	<u>\$272,869</u>	<u>\$275,041</u>
Operating and Maintenance Expense					
Personal Services	\$75,941	\$87,200	\$102,233	\$106,869	\$108,178
Contractual Services	10,047	12,437	11,292	13,619	13,087
Material and Supplies	11,176	10,661	11,506	12,671	12,748
Depreciation	41,877	43,895	45,958	49,100	52,571
Services of Other Departments	35,517	33,242	34,698	40,103	47,574
General and Administrative ⁽³⁾	5,037	4,523	8,209	2,982	25,917
Other	7,339	10,540	9,156	22,971	17,895
Total Operating & Maintenance Expense	<u>\$186,934</u>	<u>\$202,498</u>	<u>\$223,052</u>	<u>\$248,315</u>	<u>\$277,970</u>
Operating and Investment Income	\$26,565	\$38,580	\$23,833	\$24,554	\$(2,929)
Coverage Calculation⁽⁴⁾					
+Operating and Investment Income	\$26,565	\$38,580	\$23,833	\$24,554	\$(2,929)
+Adjustment to Investing Activities ⁽⁵⁾	(1,272)	(212)	6,971	2,021	2,896
+Depreciation & Non-Cash Expenses	46,286	52,631	54,295	54,055	60,448
+Changes in Working Capital	(26,441)	2,814	7,605	2,348	17,320
= "Net Revenue"	<u>\$45,138</u>	<u>\$93,813</u>	<u>\$92,704</u>	<u>\$82,978</u>	<u>\$77,735</u>
+Other Available Funds ⁽⁶⁾	63,888	56,868	65,344	66,779	60,951
Funds Available for Debt Service	<u>\$109,026</u>	<u>\$150,681</u>	<u>\$158,048</u>	<u>\$149,757</u>	<u>\$138,686</u>
Revenue Bond Debt Service	\$35,374	\$65,115	\$64,193	\$69,585	\$69,621
Revenue Bond Debt Service Coverage	3.08	2.31	2.46	2.15	1.99

⁽¹⁾ Operating and Investment Income presented in this table differs from the Change in Net Assets presented in the Statement of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Net Assets on page 16 of the Audited Financial Statements. This table presents Debt Service Coverage as defined under the Indenture and excludes certain elements of nonoperating revenue and expenses included in the Statements of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Net Assets. An example of an excluded element is Grant Revenue.

⁽²⁾ Capacity Fees reported as nonoperating revenue for the fiscal years presented above; implemented in 2008.

⁽³⁾ Decrease in G&A beginning in 2006 results from reallocation of overhead expenses to various expense categories. G&A in 2010 included additional settlement reserves.

⁽⁴⁾ Indenture defines "Net Revenue" on a cash basis.

⁽⁵⁾ Adjustment of Investing Activities to a cash basis.

⁽⁶⁾ As per the indenture, in addition to current year cash flow, the coverage calculation permits the inclusion of funds not budgeted to be spent in the next 12 months and legally available to pay debt service.

Source: SFPUC, Audited Financial Statements.

**SFPUC WATER ENTERPRISE
WATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (WSIP) BUDGET AND SPENDING
SUMMARY AS OF JULY 5, 2010**

	June 2009 Total Approved	Expended / Encumbered	Unencumbered Remaining Balance
Regional Projects	\$ 3,514	\$ 1,471	\$ 2,043
Local Projects	600	317	283
Financing Costs	472	124	348
Total	\$ 4,586	\$ 1,912	\$ 2,674

Note: Certain amounts set forth in the table are projections. Actual results may differ materially from these projections.

Source: SFPUC, Financial Services

**SFPUC WATER ENTERPRISE
STATUS OF WSIP PROJECTS AS OF JULY 1, 2010**

Active Phase	Number of Projects		Value of Projects ⁽¹⁾ (in thousands)	
	Local Program	Regional Program	Local Program	Regional Program
Planning	1	2	\$ 23,000	\$ 36,000
Design	5	7	238,000	1,055,000
Bid & Award	1	3	10,000	553,000
Construction	5	14	117,000	1,256,000
Close-Out	10	5	100,000	115,000
Completed	17	10	80,000	68,000
Multiple	1	5	33,000	431,000
Total†:	40	46	\$ 600,000	\$ 3,514,000

† Totals may not add due to independent rounding.

(1) Project value based on the 2009 Approved WSIP Budget

Source: SFPUC, Q4 FY2009-10 WSIP Quarterly Report

**SFPUC WATER ENTERPRISE
PERFORMANCE OF WSIP PROJECTS AS OF JULY 1, 2010
COMPARED TO JUNE 2009 APPROVED BUDGET'S PLAN**

Phase	Local Program		Regional Program	
	% Planned	% Completed	% Planned	% Completed
All Phases	52.3%	48.7%	30.4%	26.8%
Project Management	62.0%	55.4%	57.1%	53.4%
Planning	79.2%	77.8%	100.0%	97.6%
Environmental	52.4%	28.8%	89.9%	81.0%
Right-of-Way	10.4%	0.5%	51.7%	45.2%
Design	65.5%	50.4%	96.3%	90.2%
Bid and Award	64.5%	62.1%	67.1%	66.0%
Construction Management	54.3%	52.5%	20.7%	17.4%
Construction	48.1%	46.6%	18.5%	15.0%
Close-Out	57.7%	45.2%	25.8%	26.3%
Program Management ⁽¹⁾	-	-	46.0%	45.9%

(1) The WSIP Regional Program tracks an additional Program Management phase.

Source: SFPUC, Q4 2009-10 WSIP Quarterly Supplemental Report

Subsequent Events

**SFPUC WATER ENTERPRISE
REVENUE BOND ISSUANCES FOLLOWING JUNE 30, 2010**

<i>Series of Bonds</i>	<i>Purpose</i>	<i>Issue Date</i>	<i>Initial Principal Amount</i>
Water Revenue Bonds, 2010 Series D	Water system improvements under Proposition E and refund previously outstanding Bonds of the SFPUC	August 4, 2010	\$ 102,725,000
Water Revenue Bonds, 2010 Series E (Build America Bonds)	Water system improvements under Proposition E	August 4, 2010	344,200,000
Water Revenue Bonds, 2010 Series F	Water system improvements under Proposition E	December 22, 2010	180,960,000
Water Revenue Bonds, 2010 Series G (Build America Bonds)	Water system improvements under Proposition E	December 22, 2010	351,470,000


**SFPUC WATER ENTERPRISE
COMMERCIAL PAPER PROGRAM**

In May 2003, the SFPUC established a \$250,000,000 Commercial Paper Program for the Water Enterprise. In December 2008, the program authorization was increased by an additional \$250,000,000 to \$500,000,000.

On June 30, 2010, no Commercial Paper was outstanding. Following June 30, 2010, the SFPUC issued taxable Commercial Paper notes on four occasions, as shown in the table below:

<i>Issuance Date</i>	<i>Amount Issued</i>	<i>Outstanding Par</i>
August 31, 2010	\$ 25,000,000	\$ 25,000,000
November 4, 2010	95,000,000	120,000,000
March 10, 2011	22,000,000	142,000,000
March 15, 2011	8,000,000	150,000,000

As of March 21, 2011, there was \$150,000,000 in outstanding Commercial Paper.



Public Utilities Commission of the
City and County of San Francisco

Wastewater Enterprise

Annual Disclosure Report

For Fiscal Year Ending
June 30, 2010





SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

1155 Market St., 11th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103 • Tel. (415) 554-3155 • Fax (415) 554-3161 • TTY (415) 554.3488



March 21, 2011

VIA: MSRB EMMA

EDWIN M. LEE
MAYOR

FRANCESCA VIETOR
PRESIDENT

ANSON MORAN
VICE PRESIDENT

ANN MOLLER CAEN
COMMISSIONER

ART TORRES
COMMISSIONER

VINCE COURTNEY
COMMISSIONER

ED HARRINGTON
GENERAL MANAGER

Dear Investors, Friends, and Interested Parties:

We are pleased to present the Annual Disclosure Report for fiscal year ending June 30, 2010 for the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco (SFPUC), Wastewater Enterprise. This filing relates to the following associated base CUSIP numbers:

SFPUC Wastewater Enterprise

797709 and 79768H


This Annual Disclosure Report is being provided by the SFPUC in connection with our undertaking entered into in accordance with Rule 15c2-12, promulgated by the U.S. Securities Exchange Commission. The information provided in this Annual Disclosure Report speaks only as of its date, March 21, 2011. The delivery of this Annual Disclosure Report may not, under any circumstances, create an implication that there has been no other change to the information provided in any final official statement. Other than as set forth in the Continuing Disclosure Agreement, SFPUC has not agreed to notify the secondary market of subsequent changes to the information in this Annual Disclosure Report.

The filing of this Report does not constitute or imply any representation (1) that any or all of the information provided is material to investors, (2) regarding any other financial, operating or other information relating to the security for the referenced securities, (3) that no changes, circumstances or events have occurred which may have a bearing on the security for the referenced securities or an investor's decision to buy, sell, or hold the referenced securities.

Any statements regarding the referenced securities, other than a statement made by the City in an official release or subsequent notice or annual report, published in a financial newspaper of general circulation and/or filed with the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board (MSRB) or on Electronic Municipal Market Access (EMMA), are not authorized by the SFPUC. The SFPUC shall not be responsible for the accuracy, completeness, or fairness of any such unauthorized statement.

If you have any questions regarding this Annual Disclosure Report, please contact Todd Rydstrom, Assistant General Manager, Business Services and Chief Financial Officer, at (415) 554-3155 or by e-mail at trydstrom@sfgwater.org.

Sincerely,



Edward M. Harrington
General Manager

Enclosure

CC: José Cisneros, Treasurer
Ben Rosenfield, Controller
Dennis J. Herrera, City Attorney
Nadia Sesay, Director, Office of Public Finance
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Page intentionally left blank.

City and County of San Francisco

Edwin M. Lee, Mayor

Board of Supervisors

David Chiu, President

John Avalos
David Campos
Malia Cohen
Carmen Chu
Sean Elsbernd

Mark Farrell
Jane Kim
Eric Mar
Ross Mirkarimi
Scott Wiener

Dennis J. Herrera, City Attorney
José Cisneros, Treasurer

Public Utilities Commission

Francesca Vietor, President
Anson Moran, Vice President
Ann Moller Caen, Commissioner
Art Torres, Commissioner
Vince Courtney, Commissioner

City and County Officials

Amy Brown, Acting City Administrator
Ben Rosenfield, Controller

Public Utilities Commission Staff

Edward M. Harrington, General Manager
Michael Carlin, Deputy General Manager & Chief Operating Officer
Tommy Moala, Assistant General Manager, Wastewater
Juliet Ellis, Assistant General Manager, External Affairs
Barbara Hale, Assistant General Manager, Power
Harlan Kelly, Jr., Assistant General Manager, Infrastructure
Steven Ritchie, Assistant General Manager, Water
Todd Rydstrom, Assistant General Manager, Business Services & Chief Financial Officer

**Wastewater Annual Disclosure Report
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2010**

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) hereby provides this Annual Disclosure Report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010 in connection with obligations undertaken pursuant to Continuing Disclosure Certificates for revenue bonds issued by SFPUC's Wastewater Enterprise, as provided in the table below. Audited Financial Statements for the years ending June 30, 2009 and June 30, 2010 are submitted separately.

<i>Name of Bonds</i>	<i>Original Par (\$000s)</i>	<i>Dated Date</i>	<i>Official Statement Date</i>	<i>Trustee</i>	<i>Source of Undertaking</i>
Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco Clean Water Revenue Bonds, 2003 Refunding Series A	\$396,270	January 28, 2003	January 14, 2003	US Bank	Continuing Disclosure Certificate, January 28, 2003
Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco Wastewater Revenue Bonds, 2010 Series A	\$47,050	June 8, 2010	May 26, 2010	US Bank	Continuing Disclosure Certificate, June 8, 2010
Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco Wastewater Revenue Bonds, 2010 Series B (Federally Taxable – Build America Bonds – Direct Payment)	\$192,515	June 8, 2010	May 26, 2010	US Bank	Continuing Disclosure Certificate, June 8, 2010

Wastewater Annual Disclosure Report
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2010

For the convenience of bondholders, the following table provides CUSIP numbers for revenue bonds outstanding as of June 30, 2010. No assurance as to the accuracy or completeness of such CUSIP numbers is given.

<i>Maturity October 1</i>	<i>Wastewater 2003 Refunding Series A</i>	<i>Wastewater 2010 Series A</i>	<i>Wastewater 2010 Series B (BABs)</i>
	Base CUSIP: 797709		Base CUSIP: 79768H
2009	AD4		
2010	AE2		
2011	AF9		
2012	AG7		
2013	AH5		
2014	AJ1		
2015	AK8		
2016	AL6	AM0	
2017	AM4	AN8	
2018	AN2	AP3	
2019	AP7	AQ1	
2020	AQ5	AR9	
2021	AR3	AS7	
2022	AS1		AA6
2023	AT9		AB4
2024	AU6		AC2
2025	AV4		AD0
2026			AE8
2027			AF5
2028			AG3
2029			AH1
2030			AJ7
2035			AK4
2040			AL2

The following tables are provided pursuant to the Continuing Disclosure Certificates executed in connection with the SFPUC's Wastewater Revenue Bonds:

**SFPUC WASTEWATER ENTERPRISE
DEBT SERVICE REQUIREMENTS ON OUTSTANDING BONDS**

Fiscal Year Ending June 30	Senior State Loans Repayment Obligations	2003 Series A Bonds	2010 Series A Bonds		2010 Series B Bonds		Combined Repayment Obligations And Debt Service ⁽²⁾⁽³⁾
			Principal	Interest ⁽²⁾	Principal	Interest ⁽²⁾	
2010	\$16,505,200	\$50,312,700					\$66,817,900
2011	16,503,560	38,146,750		\$1,852,574		\$4,882,895	61,385,779
2012	10,982,879	32,968,850		2,276,200		7,028,606	53,256,535
2013	9,421,497	33,036,275		2,276,200		9,856,477	54,590,449
2014	9,040,461	33,149,025		2,276,200		10,555,891	55,021,577
2015	6,287,512	33,257,163		2,276,200		10,685,426	52,506,300
2016	5,267,636	33,397,894		2,276,200		10,685,426	51,627,155
2017	3,619,138	17,022,313	\$6,935,000	2,102,825		10,685,426	40,364,701
2018	1,751,426	17,093,919	7,295,000	1,747,075		10,685,426	38,572,845
2019	1,751,426	17,154,306	7,630,000	1,412,100		10,685,426	38,633,258
2020	1,751,426	17,239,138	7,980,000	1,060,000		10,685,426	38,715,989
2021	1,751,426	17,315,788	8,390,000	650,750		10,685,426	38,793,389
2022		17,402,213	8,820,000	220,500		10,685,426	37,128,138
2023		15,801,213			\$7,280,000	10,516,166	33,597,378
2024		2,969,100			7,505,000	10,168,662	20,642,762
2025		2,976,919			7,745,000	9,800,666	20,522,584
2026		3,593,363			8,000,000	9,408,913	21,002,276
2027					8,270,000	8,991,893	17,261,893
2028					8,560,000	8,550,033	17,110,033
2029					8,860,000	8,083,973	16,943,973
2030					9,180,000	7,592,303	16,772,303
2031					9,520,000	7,073,293	16,593,293
2032					9,875,000	6,522,827	16,397,827
2033					10,250,000	5,944,233	16,194,233
2034					10,640,000	5,343,646	15,983,646
2035					11,045,000	4,720,202	15,765,202
2036					11,470,000	4,072,896	15,542,896
2037					11,910,000	3,396,552	15,306,552
2038					12,365,000	2,690,150	15,055,150
2039					12,845,000	1,956,539	14,801,539
2040					13,340,000	1,194,555	14,534,555
2041					13,855,000	403,181	14,258,181
Total ⁽¹⁾	\$84,633,588	\$382,836,925	\$47,050,000	\$20,426,824	\$192,515,000	\$234,237,952	\$961,700,288

(1) Totals may not add due to rounding

(2) Net of capitalized interest payments. Calculation of interest due shown without the Build America Bonds federal subsidy relating to the 2010 Series B Bonds.

(3) Subordinate Debt: The Wastewater Enterprise maintains a \$150 million commercial paper program, which is subordinate to the outstanding revenue bonds and state loans. As of March 21, 2011, there was no commercial paper outstanding.

**Wastewater Annual Disclosure Report
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2010**

**SFPUC WASTEWATER ENTERPRISE
ACCOUNTS AND BILLING BY USER TYPE
FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2010**

<i>User Type</i>	<i>Active Accounts</i>	<i>Billings (000s)⁽¹⁾</i>	<i>Billings as Percent of Total</i>
Multi-Family Residential	36,271	\$70,499	34.9%
Single-Family Residential	110,324	49,103	24.3%
<i>Subtotal Residential</i>	146,595	\$119,602	59.3%
Commercial	15,416	75,330	37.3%
Municipal Customers	717	6,784	3.4%
Suburban (watershed keepers) ⁽¹⁾	9	2	0.0%
Total	162,737	\$201,718	100.0%

⁽¹⁾ In addition to suburban customers, service is provided to North San Mateo County Sanitation District, Bayshore Sanitary District and the City of Brisbane.

Source: SFPUC Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, June 30, 2010

**Wastewater Annual Disclosure Report
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2010**

**SFPUC WASTEWATER ENTERPRISE
HISTORICAL AND ADOPTED SEWER RATES
(PER HUNDRED CUBIC FEET OF WATER CONSUMPTION)**

FY Ending June 30	Lifeline Rate ⁽¹⁾		Residential Rate		Non-Residential Rate	
	Rate \$/ccf	% Increase (Decrease)	Rate \$/ccf	% Increase (Decrease)	Rate \$/ccf	% Increase (Decrease)
2000	1.86	0.0	4.83	0.0	5.35	0.0
2001	1.86	0.0	4.83	0.0	5.35	0.0
2002	1.86	0.0	4.83	0.0	5.35	0.0
2003	1.86	0.0	4.83	0.0	5.35	0.0
2004	1.86	0.0	4.83	0.0	5.35	0.0
2005	2.15	15.6	5.37	11.2	5.82	8.8

FY Ending June 30	Tier 1		Tier 2		Tier 3		Non-Residential Rate	
	Rate \$/ccf	% Increase (Decrease)	Rate \$/ccf	% Increase (Decrease)	Rate \$/ccf	% Increase (Decrease)	Rate \$/ccf	% Increase (Decrease)
2006	2.54	6.3	6.36	6.6	7.27	21.9	7.31	13.0
2007	2.88	13.4	7.19	13.1	8.22	13.1	8.26	13.0
2008 ⁽²⁾	3.14	8.0	7.84	8.0	8.96	8.0	8.80	6.5
2009	3.42	9.0	8.55	9.0	9.77	9.0	9.60	9.0

FY Ending June 30	Tier 1		Tier 2 ⁽³⁾		Non-Residential Rate \$/ccf
	Single-Family Rate \$/ccf	Multiple-Family Rate \$/ccf	Single-Family Rate \$/ccf	Multiple-Family Rate \$/ccf	
2010 ⁽⁴⁾	6.05	5.66	8.35	7.45	9.60

⁽¹⁾ First 300 cubic feet of water consumption per dwelling unit per month were billed at the lifeline rate and all excess use at the regular residential rate.

⁽²⁾ Adjustment effective July 14, 2007.

⁽³⁾ Tier 2 and tier 3 are combined effective July 1, 2009.

⁽⁴⁾ Singly-Family Residential and Multiple-Family Residential rates were differentiated effective July 1, 2009.

Source: SFPUC Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, June 30, 2010

Note: On July 1, 2005 (FY 2005-2006), the SFPUC changed its basis of billing from water units to discharge units and implemented a three-tiered rate structure for residential customers to promote conservation.

Wastewater Annual Disclosure Report
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2010

SFPUC WASTEWATER ENTERPRISE
HISTORICAL REVENUE, OPERATING & MAINTENANCE EXPENSE AND DEBT SERVICE
COVERAGE FOR FISCAL YEARS ENDED JUNE 30 (DOLLARS IN 000'S)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Operating and Investment Revenues					
Sewer Service Charges	\$159,281	\$176,344	\$187,810	\$199,332	\$202,363
Other Revenues	5,421	5,692	6,181	5,621	5,180
Investing Activities	5,385	5,749	4,099	1,992	2,056
Capacity Fees	430	11,375	8,558	3,701	2,300
Total Revenue	<u>\$170,517</u>	<u>\$199,160</u>	<u>\$206,648</u>	<u>\$210,646</u>	<u>\$211,899</u>
Operating and Maintenance Expenses					
Salary and Fringe Benefits	\$44,798	\$58,789	\$69,383	\$69,141	\$70,992
Contractual Services	7,962	11,536	11,973	13,828	12,018
Materials and Supplies	8,565	9,526	9,539	5,754	9,888
Depreciation and Amortization	37,228	36,683	38,758	38,815	40,748
Services of Other PUC or Other Departments	24,105	28,010	26,021	31,634	32,305
General and Administrative ⁽¹⁾	13,725	4,143	1,719	2,302	2,500
Other ⁽²⁾	4,571	2,913	7,852	7,826	17,061
Total O&M Expense	<u>\$140,954</u>	<u>\$151,600</u>	<u>\$165,245</u>	<u>\$169,300</u>	<u>\$185,512</u>
Operating and Investment Income	\$29,563	\$47,560	\$41,403	\$41,346	\$26,387
Coverage Calculation⁽³⁾					
+ Operating and Investment Income	\$29,563	\$47,560	\$41,403	\$41,346	\$26,387
+ Depreciation and Non-Cash Expenses	38,643	37,461	40,395	41,429	52,912
+ Changes in Working Capital	(3,859)	(2,461)	6,223	4,699	976
+ Adjustment to Investment Income ⁽⁴⁾	(361)	(959)	1,297	161	225
+ SRF Loan Payments	(20,132)	(20,132)	(16,505)	(16,505)	(16,505)
= "Net Revenue"	<u>\$43,854</u>	<u>\$61,469</u>	<u>\$72,813</u>	<u>\$71,130</u>	<u>\$63,995</u>
+ Other Available Funds ⁽⁵⁾	21,497	35,691	34,699	48,016	49,272
Funds Available for Bond Debt Service	<u>\$65,351</u>	<u>\$97,160</u>	<u>\$107,512</u>	<u>\$119,146</u>	<u>\$113,267</u>
Revenue Bond Debt Service	\$17,219	\$50,163	\$50,198	\$50,311	\$50,313
Debt Service Coverage	3.80	1.94	2.14	2.37	2.25

(1) Decrease in G&A beginning in 2007 results from a reallocation of overhead expenses to various expense categories.

(2) Other expenses in 2010 reflect an increase in capital projects for maintenance and repair.

(3) Indenture defines Net Revenue on a cash basis.

(4) Adjustment to Investing Activities Revenues to cash basis.

(5) Per Indenture, in addition to current year cash flow, the coverage calculation permits the inclusion of all funds except for Trust and Agency Funds not budgeted to be spent in such 12 months and legally available to pay debt service.

Source: SFPUC, Financial Services

Subsequent Events

SFPUC WASTEWATER ENTERPRISE COMMERCIAL PAPER PROGRAM

In February 2007, the SFPUC established a \$150,000,000 Commercial Paper Program for the Wastewater Enterprise. On June 30, 2010, there was no Commercial Paper outstanding.

As of March 21, 2011, no Commercial Paper was outstanding.

SFPUC WASTEWATER ENTERPRISE SPRINGING AMENDMENT TO INDENTURE

On October 1, 2010, Section 1.02(a) of the First Amendment to Indenture by and between the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco and U.S. Bank National Association, as Trustee, dated as of May 1, 2010, became effective. Section 1.02(a) states:

The definition of "Required Reserve" is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Required Reserve" means, with respect to Series of Bonds issued prior to the effective date of the amendments set forth in Section 1.02 of the First Amendment to Indenture dated as of May 1, 2010 (the "First Amendment"), between the Commission and the Trustee, but only until the effective date of the amendments set forth in Section 1.02 of the First Amendment, for any Series of Bonds, as of any date of calculation, an amount equal to the lesser of:

(i) Maximum Annual Debt Service on all such Series of Bonds (excluding from such calculation Parity State Loans, if any) then Outstanding; or

(ii) 125% of Average Annual Debt Service on all such Series of Bonds (excluding from such calculation Parity State Loans, if any) then Outstanding;

provided, that (i) on and after the effective date of the amendments set forth in Section 1.02 of the First Amendment, "Required Reserve" shall mean, with respect to a Series of Bonds issued prior to the effective date of the amendments set forth in Section 1.02 of the First Amendment, 50% of Maximum Annual Debt Service on all such Series of Bonds (excluding from such calculation Parity State Loans, if any) then Outstanding, and (ii) in no event shall the Commission, in connection with issuance of a Series of Additional Bonds, be obligated to deposit an amount in the Bond Reserve Fund which is in excess of the amount permitted by the applicable provisions of the Code to be so deposited from the proceeds of tax-exempt bonds without having to restrict the yield of any investment purchased with any portion of such deposit.

"Required Reserve" means, with respect to Series of Bonds issued on or after the effective date of the amendments set forth in Section 1.02 of the First Amendment, for any Series of Bonds, as of any date of calculation, the amount, if any, required to be deposited into a Reserve Account for that Series of Bonds, as defined in and provided by the Supplemental Indenture pursuant to which such Series of Bonds is issued; provided, however, that in no event shall the Commission, in connection with issuance of a Series of Additional Bonds, be obligated to deposit an amount in the Bond Reserve Fund which is in excess of the amount permitted by the applicable provisions of the Code to be so deposited from the proceeds of tax-exempt bonds without having to restrict the yield of any investment purchased with any portion of such deposit.



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAR 31 PM 12:29
KPC

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

Date: March 30, 2011

Re: 2009 Housing Element Update
--Commission Adopted CEQA Findings and draft Ordinance

Staff Contact: Kearstin Dischinger, Planner, (415) 558-6284
Kearstin@sfgov.org

Reviewed by: Sarah Dennis-Phillips, Senior Planner (415) 558-6314

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

On March 24, 2011, the San Francisco Planning Commission adopted the 2009 Update of the Housing Element of the General Plan, and certified a full Environmental Impact Report on the project. The 2009 update of the Housing Element includes Part 1: Data and Needs Analysis, which contains a description and analysis of San Francisco's population, household and employment trends, existing housing characteristics, and housing needs; Part 2: Objectives & Policies, which sets forth the policy framework to address the needs identified in Part 1; and a series of Appendices including implementing programs as actionable steps towards addressing housing issues.

This update, required by the State, has been the product of a comprehensive community-based planning effort, led by the Planning Department, in cooperation with the Mayor's Office of Housing and in consultation with a roundtable of other City agencies. Work began in September 2008 when staff convened a 15 member Community Advisory Body (CAB) made up of representatives nominated by each Supervisor to assist staff on draft development. In the two years that followed, the Department also hosted 14 stakeholder sessions focusing on the needs and policy interests of special interest housing groups and organizations; facilitated over 30 public workshops and presentations throughout the City, with several in each supervisorial district; invited community members to provide input at monthly office hours, through an online and written survey, or through written comments; and hosted two "Director's Forums" which enabled the Planning Director to hear directly from the public.

The 2009 update of the Housing Element is required by State Law. Without full approval by our local governing bodies, San Francisco is listed as "out of compliance" by the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). This impacts the City's eligibility for state housing, community development and infrastructure funding programs. Full approval, including adoption by the Board of Supervisors, will confirm our continued dedication towards meeting the State of California's objectives towards housing and community development, and will reinstate our eligibility for these funds.

As adopted by the Planning Commission, the 2009 Housing Element begins with four principles:

1. prioritization of permanently affordable housing;
2. recognition and preservation of neighborhood character;
3. integration of planning for housing with jobs, transportation and infrastructure; and
4. development of housing that facilitates our City as a model of sustainability.

The majority of the policies represent these core values and were, in themselves, not the subject of debate. However, the diversity of opinion in San Francisco means that not every policy represents consensus. At the heart of the controversy that remained at the Planning Commission hearing on March 24th were the seemingly opposite goals of enabling growth to address housing needs and preserving established neighborhood character.

This dichotomy of viewpoints is not unique to San Francisco - municipalities throughout the nation are plagued by this conflict: supporting growth in areas well-served by transit to promote a more sustainable future; and the desire to minimize change in established neighborhoods. The 2009 Housing Element attempts to provide a path forward on both issues, by mandating a clear, inclusive, community-driven process for any changes that will enable growth, and by providing policy considerations that are intended to protect what is most valuable about each individual neighborhood.

- Supporting growth through community plans: The Planning Department has in recent years planned for growth through community plans such as the Better Neighborhoods and Eastern Neighborhoods Plans. These plans direct development to areas well-served by transit, to ensure "complete neighborhoods" with supportive infrastructure and other improvements, and to relieve pressure on neighborhoods less able to accommodate growth. This process has provided a way for stakeholders to help direct the future of their area. Participants have been vocal about their support of the practice.

To provide certainty to citizens who feared that the Housing Element would cause increases in density to their neighborhoods without input, the document mandates that this process must continue to be used in the event of proposed changes to land use controls, such as increased housing density or height. It also dictates that any such changes must be generated through a community based planning process initiated in partnership with the neighborhood, initiated by the Board of Supervisors. It states that any changes to land use policies and controls that result from the community planning process may be proposed only after an open and publicly noticed process, after review of a draft plan and environmental review, and with comprehensive opportunity for community input.

- Preserving neighborhood character: Protection of neighborhood character became a major issue for neighborhoods in the wake of the 2004 Housing Element, which promoted a number of one-size-fits-all strategies that might not be appropriate for some neighborhoods, such as encouraging higher residential density in neighborhood commercial districts, allowing flexibility in the number and size of units (density controls), and considering legalization of secondary units.

The 2009 Housing Element removed these policies, directed that all such changes should only be considered as a part of community planning processes as described above, and included numerous new policies intended to further reinforce the City's support of each neighborhood's individual character. It clarifies support for individual community efforts that support good planning principles, provides a process for Department adoption of neighborhood-specific design standards, acknowledges neighborhood Covenants Conditions and Restrictions (while clarifying that the Planning Department cannot legally enforce CC&Rs), and states that densities in established residential areas should promote compatibility with prevailing

neighborhood character, specifying that existing height and bulk patterns should be maintained in RH-1 and RH-2 areas.

CONTINUED ISSUES FOR CLARIFICATION

Despite continued outreach and discussion over the past two and a half years, there remain numerous misconceptions about the document, particularly that the document will enable change in established neighborhoods. Despite policies enabling growth only through a community planning process, and numerous policies preserving neighborhood character, a repeated misunderstanding is that the document contains recommendations for increased growth and density in the neighborhoods. In fact 2009 Housing Element does not contain any recommendations for increased density, height or changes in zoning, nor does it modify land use or the Planning Code. Furthermore, it mandates that consideration of such changes should only happen through a community planning process, as described above.

To further clarify, the Element provides policy background for housing programs and decisions; and to provide broad direction towards meeting the City's housing goals. It helps to guide discretionary decisions made by the City's Planning Commission and other decisionmakers, and helps them prioritize approval of certain kinds of housing projects over others. It does not enable change at the risk of neighborhood character, and instead provides numerous new policies to help preserve that character.

BOS-U - email
cpage


CCSF Investment Report for the month of February 2011

Brian Starr to: Brian Starr

Ben Rosenfield, Board of Supervisors, cynthia.fong, dgriffin, graziolij, Greg

Cc: Wagner, Harvey Rose, Jose Cisneros, Kurian Joseph, Michelle Durgy, ras94124, sfdocs, Tonia Lediju, TRydstrom, Pauline Marx

03/28/2011 03:24 PM



All,

Attached please find the CCSF Investment Report for the month of February 2011.



CCSF Monthly Investment Report 022811.pdf

Thank you,

Brian Starr
Investment Analyst
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall - Room 140
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4638
415-554-4487 (phone)
415-554-5660 (fax)
brian.starr@sfgov.org

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



José Cisneros, Treasurer

Pauline Marx, Chief Assistant Treasurer
Michelle Durgy, Chief Investment Officer

Investment Report for the month of February 2011

March 25, 2011

The Honorable Edwin M. Lee
Mayor of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4638

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4638

Ladies and Gentlemen,

In accordance with the provisions of California State Government Code Section 53646, we forward this report detailing the City's pooled fund portfolio as of February 28, 2011. These investments provide sufficient liquidity to meet expenditure requirements for the next six months and are in compliance with our statement of investment policy and California Code.

This correspondence and its attachments show the investment activity for the month of February 2011 for the portfolios under the Treasurer's management. All pricing and valuation data is obtained from Interactive Data Corporation.

CCSF Investment Earnings Statistics

(in \$ million)	Pooled Fund		All Funds	
	Fiscal YTD	February 2011	Fiscal YTD	February 2011
Average Daily Balance	\$ 4,250	\$ 4,788	\$ 4,272	\$ 4,788
Net Earnings	37.50	5.47	37.65	5.47
Earned Income Yield	1.33%	1.49%	1.32%	1.49%

CCSF Pooled Fund Statistics

(in \$ million)	% of Portfolio	Book Value	Market Value	Coupon*	Yield to Maturity*	Days to Maturity*
Investment Type						
U.S. Treasuries	9.2%	\$ 429	\$ 427	1.09%	1.11%	738
Federal Agencies	64.8%	3,027	3,010	1.59%	1.41%	1,051
TLGP	19.8%	918	922	2.05%	1.45%	339
State & Local Agency						
Government Obligations	1.1%	50	50	3.00%	1.63%	103
Public Time Deposits	0.2%	10	10	0.71%	0.71%	154
Negotiable CDs	4.8%	225	225	0.41%	0.41%	225
Money Market Funds	0.0%	2	2	0.16%	0.16%	1
Totals	100.0%	\$ 4,661	\$ 4,646	1.59%	1.34%	828

* denotes weighted averages

In the remainder of this report, we provide additional information and analytics at the security-level and portfolio-level, as recommended by the California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission.

Very truly yours,

José Cisneros
Treasurer

cc: Treasury Oversight Committee: Joe Grazioli, Don Griffin, Todd Rydstrom, Richard Sullivan
Ben Rosenfield, Controller, Office of the Controller
Tonia Lediju, Internal Audit, Office of the Controller
Cynthia Fong, Deputy Director for Finance & Administration, San Francisco County Transportation Authority
Harvey Rose, Budget Analyst
San Francisco Public Library

Compliance Report Pooled Fund



As of February 28, 2011

<i>(in \$ million)</i>							
Security Type	Par Value	Book Value	Market Value	Market/Book Price	Current % Allocation	Max. Policy Allocation	Compliant?
U.S. Treasuries	\$ 430	\$ 429	\$ 427	99.68	9.19%	100%	Yes
Federal Agencies	3,018	3,027	3,010	99.44	64.78%	70%	Yes
TLGP	906	918	922	100.37	19.84%	30%	Yes
State & Local Agency Government Obligations	50	50	50	99.84	1.08%	20%	Yes
Public Time Deposits	10	10	10	100.00	0.22%	100%	Yes
Negotiable CDs	225	225	225	100.00	4.84%	30%	Yes
Bankers Acceptances	-	-	-	-	0.00%	40%	Yes
Commercial Paper	-	-	-	-	0.00%	25%	Yes
Medium Term Notes	-	-	-	-	0.00%	15%	Yes
Repurchase Agreements	-	-	-	-	0.00%	100%	Yes
Reverse Repurchase/ Securities Lending Agreements	-	-	-	-	0.00%	\$75mm	Yes
Money Market Funds ¹	2	2	2	100.00	0.05%	100%	Yes
LAIF	-	-	-	-	0.00%	\$50mm	Yes
TOTAL	\$ 4,642	\$ 4,661	\$ 4,646	99.68	100.00%	-	Yes



Note: The full Investment Policy can be found at <http://www.sftreasurer.org/>, in the Investment Report section of the About Us menu.

¹ PFM Prime Series - Institutional Class, 0.05% of fund's net assets

Portfolio Analysis Pooled Fund



Yield Curves



Investment Portfolio

Pooled Fund

As of February 28, 2011

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issue Name	Settle	Maturity	Duration	Coupon	Par Value	Book Value	Amortized	
			Date	Date					Book Value	Market Value
U.S. Treasury	912795V99	B 031011	3/31/10	3/10/11	0.00	0.00	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 49,817,489	\$ 49,817,489	\$ 50,000,000
U.S. Treasury	912828LF5	T N 1.125 06 30 2011	12/31/10	6/30/11	0.33	1.13	30,000,000	30,023,933	30,016,000	30,096,000
U.S. Treasury	912828LV0	T 1 08 31 11	10/29/09	8/31/11	0.50	1.00	100,000	100,316	100,086	100,400
U.S. Treasury	912828LV0	T 1 08 31 11	10/29/09	8/31/11	0.50	1.00	99,900,000	100,200,481	99,981,949	100,299,600
U.S. Treasury	912828KA7	T 1.125 12 15 11	12/9/09	12/15/11	0.79	1.13	50,000,000	50,378,906	50,148,782	50,350,000
U.S. Treasury	912828LB4	T 1.5 07.15.12	3/23/10	7/15/12	1.37	1.50	50,000,000	50,441,406	50,262,232	50,765,000
U.S. Treasury	912828PJ3	T BILL 1.375 11 30 15	12/16/10	11/30/15	4.60	1.38	50,000,000	49,519,531	49,569,660	48,515,000
U.S. Treasury	912828PJ3	TB 1.375 11 30 15	12/16/10	11/30/15	4.60	1.38	50,000,000	49,519,531	49,569,660	48,515,000
U.S. Treasury	912828PJ3	TREASURY NOTE 1.375 11 30 2015	12/23/10	11/30/15	4.60	1.38	50,000,000	48,539,063	48,637,603	48,515,000
Subtotals					1.96	1.09	\$ 430,000,000	\$ 428,540,657	\$ 428,103,461	\$ 427,156,000
Federal Agency	31398AVQ2	FNMA 1.75 3 23 11	11/19/09	3/23/11	0.00	1.75	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 50,770,000	\$ 50,034,642	\$ 50,046,875
Federal Agency	31398AVQ2	FNMA 1.75 3 23 2011 Bullet	11/20/09	3/23/11	0.00	1.75	20,000,000	20,314,600	20,014,183	20,018,750
Federal Agency	3128X8P22	FHLMC 1.125	11/20/09	6/1/11	0.26	1.13	28,600,000	28,779,471	28,629,590	28,671,500
Federal Agency	31331YZ86	FFCB Bullet 3.875 8 25 11	11/19/09	8/25/11	0.49	3.88	50,000,000	52,705,000	50,743,455	50,875,000
Federal Agency	3134A4JT2	FHLMC 5.75 01 15 12	6/10/10	1/15/12	0.87	5.75	20,000,000	21,479,608	20,810,744	20,925,000
Federal Agency	31331JGD9	FFCB 2 Year Bullet .95 Coupon	3/9/10	3/5/12	1.01	0.95	17,050,000	17,016,071	17,032,732	17,145,906
Federal Agency	31331JGD9	FFCB 2 Year Bullet Fixed .95	3/9/10	3/5/12	1.01	0.95	58,000,000	57,893,860	57,945,981	58,326,250
Federal Agency	31331JLW1	FFCB 1.125 2NC1 American	4/29/10	4/26/12	0.00	1.13	74,370,000	74,221,260	74,283,780	74,462,963
Federal Agency	3134G1DZ4	FHLMC 2NC1Y 1X call 1.17	5/18/10	5/18/12	0.00	1.17	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,078,125
Federal Agency	880591DT6	TVA 6.79 5 23 12	8/4/10	5/23/12	1.19	6.79	20,500,000	22,725,275	22,018,463	22,149,609
Federal Agency	3133XXME4	FHLB 1.42 fixed 2.5 NC 1 Year	6/10/10	9/24/12	0.00	1.42	20,230,000	20,215,922	20,220,362	20,242,644
Federal Agency	3133XY4B8	FHLB 1.5 2.5NC1	4/15/10	10/15/12	0.00	1.50	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,156,250
Federal Agency	3136FMNR1	FNMA 2.5NC1 Berm 1.56	4/19/10	10/19/12	0.00	1.56	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,156,250
Federal Agency	31398A6V9	FNMA FLOAT 0.3816668 12 03 201	12/21/10	12/3/12	1.76	0.37	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,009,542	50,031,250
Federal Agency	31398A6V9	FNMA FLOAT 0.3835 12 03 12	12/23/10	12/3/12	1.76	0.36	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,010,653	50,031,250
Federal Agency	31331G2R9	FFCB 1.875 12.07.12	3/26/10	12/7/12	1.75	1.88	37,000,000	37,333,370	37,218,531	37,774,688
Federal Agency	31331JAB9	FFCB 1.625 Bullet 12.12	4/16/10	12/24/12	1.80	1.63	50,000,000	50,048,500	50,032,761	50,843,750
Federal Agency	3134G1U69	FHLMC FLOAT 0.36 01 10 2013	1/11/11	1/10/13	1.86	0.36	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,500	50,015,625
Federal Agency	3134G1U69	FHLMC FLOAT QTR 0.36 01 10 2013	1/12/11	1/10/13	1.86	0.36	50,000,000	49,989,900	49,991,565	50,015,625
Federal Agency	31398AF23	FNMA 3NC1.5 1X 1.80	2/8/10	2/8/13	1.92	1.80	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,312,500
Federal Agency	31398AF23	FNMA 1.8 2 8 13	2/8/10	2/8/13	1.92	1.80	25,000,000	24,987,500	24,991,902	25,156,250
Federal Agency	3134G1HD9	FHLMC .750 3 28 11 AMORT CALL	7/20/10	3/28/13	0.00	0.75	50,000,000	50,066,500	50,007,153	50,015,625
Federal Agency	3134G1KL7	FHLMC 1.5 07 12 13	7/12/10	7/12/13	2.34	1.50	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,125,000
Federal Agency	3134G1KL7	FHLMC 1.5 7 12 13	7/12/10	7/12/13	2.34	1.50	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,125,000
Federal Agency	31398AV90	FNMA 1.3 7 16 13	7/16/10	7/16/13	2.35	1.30	25,000,000	24,987,500	24,990,100	25,085,938
Federal Agency	31398AV90	FNMA 1.3 7 16 13	7/16/10	7/16/13	2.35	1.30	50,000,000	49,975,000	49,980,201	50,171,875
Federal Agency	31398A2H4	FNMA 1.35 08 16 13	8/16/10	8/16/13	0.00	1.35	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,023,438
Federal Agency	31398A2H4	FNMA 1.35 8 16 13	11/16/10	8/16/13	0.00	1.35	50,000,000	50,127,250	50,000,000	50,046,875
Federal Agency	3136FPYX9	FNMA STRNT 0.5 12 03 13	12/3/10	12/3/13	2.75	0.50	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,578,125
Federal Agency	31315PLT4	FARMER MAC 1.25 12 06 2013	12/6/10	12/6/13	2.73	1.25	35,000,000	34,951,700	34,955,446	34,682,813
Federal Agency	31331J6A6	FFCB 1.30 12 23 13	12/23/10	12/23/13	2.77	1.30	75,000,000	74,976,563	74,978,017	74,976,563
Federal Agency	313371UC8	FHLB 0.875 12 27 13	11/18/10	12/27/13	2.80	0.88	75,000,000	74,865,000	74,877,251	74,226,563
Federal Agency	3136FP4E4	FNMA 1.75 12 30 13	1/28/11	12/30/13	2.77	1.75	30,000,000	30,157,980	30,124,938	30,046,875
Federal Agency	31398A3R1	FNMA 1.35 3 21 2011	11/10/10	3/21/14	2.99	1.35	24,500,000	24,564,827	24,554,916	24,316,250
Federal Agency	31398AWH1	FNMA 2.9 4 7 14	11/4/10	4/7/14	0.00	2.90	19,750,000	19,966,855	19,845,058	19,793,203
Federal Agency	3134G1GX6	FHLMC 2.05 6 30 14	6/30/10	6/30/14	3.23	2.05	37,900,000	37,900,000	37,900,000	38,053,969
Federal Agency	3133724E1	FHLB 06 30 2014	12/31/10	6/30/14	3.27	1.21	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,437,500
Federal Agency	3136FM3R3	FNMA 1.75 8 18 14	8/18/10	8/18/14	3.38	1.75	53,270,000	53,507,584	53,380,656	53,003,650

Investment Portfolio Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issue Name	Settle	Maturity	Duration	Coupon	Par Value	Book Value	Amortized	
			Date	Date					Book Value	Market Value
Federal Agency	313370JS8	FHLB 1.375 09 12 2014	12/8/10	9/12/14	3.45	1.38	26,095,000	26,129,068	26,249,602	25,842,205
Federal Agency	31398A3Q3	FNMA 1.50 9 23 14	11/4/10	9/23/14	3.47	1.50	27,435,000	27,627,045	27,604,349	26,989,181
Federal Agency	313371CN4	FHLB 1.38 10 21 14	11/4/10	10/21/14	3.56	1.35	45,525,000	45,598,751	45,614,981	44,657,180
Federal Agency	31331JX99	FFCB 1.23 11 04 2014	11/4/10	11/4/14	0.00	1.23	110,025,000	109,722,431	109,746,662	107,686,969
Federal Agency	3128X3L76	FHLMC 5. 11 13 2014	12/23/10	11/13/14	3.41	5.00	21,910,000	24,606,902	24,599,568	24,450,191
Federal Agency	3128X3L76	FHLMC 5.0 11 13 2014	12/23/10	11/13/14	3.41	5.00	1,000,000	1,123,090	1,122,755	1,115,938
Federal Agency	31331J4S9	FFCB 1.40 12 08 14	12/16/10	12/8/14	3.68	1.40	27,000,000	26,986,500	26,995,597	26,628,750
Federal Agency	31331J4S9	FFCB 1.4 12 08 14	12/8/10	12/8/14	3.68	1.40	19,000,000	18,956,680	18,959,141	18,738,750
Federal Agency	313371PC4	FHLB 0.875 12 12 14	11/22/10	12/12/14	3.72	0.88	25,000,000	24,617,500	24,651,576	24,187,500
Federal Agency	313371W51	FHLB 1.25 12 12 14	12/6/10	12/12/14	3.69	1.25	50,000,000	49,725,000	49,765,239	49,093,750
Federal Agency	313371W51	FHLB 1.25 12 12 14	12/8/10	12/12/14	3.69	1.25	75,000,000	74,391,000	74,467,170	73,640,625
Federal Agency	3133XVNU1	FHLB 2.75 12 12 2014	11/23/10	12/12/14	3.61	2.75	25,400,000	26,848,308	26,752,407	26,233,438
Federal Agency	3133XVNU1	FHLB 2.75 12 12 2014	11/23/10	12/12/14	3.61	2.75	2,915,000	3,079,668	3,068,765	3,010,648
Federal Agency	3133XVNU1	FHLB 2.75 12 12 2014	12/8/10	12/12/14	3.61	2.75	25,000,000	26,332,000	26,256,535	25,820,313
Federal Agency	3133XVNU1	FHLB 2.75 12 12 2014	12/8/10	12/12/14	3.61	2.75	50,000,000	52,674,000	52,522,504	51,640,625
Federal Agency	313371W93	FHLB 1.34 12 15 2014	12/15/10	12/15/14	3.71	1.34	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	73,593,750
Federal Agency	31331J6Q1	FFCB 1.72 12 29 2014	12/29/10	12/29/14	3.72	1.72	27,175,000	27,157,065	27,157,826	27,056,109
Federal Agency	31331J6Q1	FFCB 1.72 12 29 2014	12/29/10	12/29/14	3.72	1.72	70,000,000	69,988,800	69,989,275	69,693,750
Federal Agency	31331JE33	RBC YCD PUC CAPI	9/16/10	3/16/15	3.90	1.75	50,000,000	49,975,000	49,977,527	49,234,375
Federal Agency	3136FMA38	FNMA 2.5 6 25 12	6/25/10	6/25/15	4.14	2.50	49,080,000	49,018,650	49,027,016	49,080,000
Federal Agency	3136FMX90	FNMA STRNT 1.75 7 27 15	7/27/10	7/27/15	4.26	1.75	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,132,813
Federal Agency	3136FMX90	FNMA STRNT 1.75 7 27 15	7/27/10	7/27/15	4.26	1.75	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,132,813
Federal Agency	3136FM6G4	FNMA 2.125 8 1 15	8/10/10	8/10/15	4.27	2.13	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	24,828,125
Federal Agency	3137EACM9	FHLMC 1.75 09 10 15	12/15/10	9/10/15	4.34	1.75	50,000,000	49,050,000	49,322,637	49,062,500
Federal Agency	313370JB5	FHLB 1.75 09 11 2015	12/15/10	9/11/15	4.34	1.75	75,000,000	73,587,000	74,126,642	73,359,375
Federal Agency	31315PGT0	FARMER MAC 2.125 09 15 15	9/15/10	9/15/15	4.32	2.13	45,000,000	44,914,950	44,922,728	44,901,563
Federal Agency	31398A4M1	FNMA 1.625 10 26 2015	12/15/10	10/26/15	4.45	1.63	25,000,000	24,317,500	24,402,001	24,312,500
Federal Agency	31398A4M1	FNMA 1.625 10 26 2015	12/23/10	10/26/15	4.48	1.63	42,000,000	40,924,380	41,073,813	40,845,000
Federal Agency	31398A4M1	FNMA 1.625 10 26 2015	12/23/10	10/26/15	4.48	1.63	50,000,000	48,701,500	48,880,088	48,625,000
Federal Agency	31331J2R3	FFCB 1.62 11 16 15	11/16/10	11/16/15	4.54	1.62	32,400,000	32,116,500	32,132,802	31,448,250
Federal Agency	31331J2S1	FFCB 1.50 11 16 2015	12/15/10	11/16/15	4.55	1.50	25,000,000	24,186,981	24,252,616	24,148,438
Federal Agency	313371ZY5	FHLB 1.875 12 11 15	12/3/10	12/11/15	4.58	1.88	25,000,000	24,982,000	24,982,864	24,500,000
Federal Agency	313371ZY5	FHLB 1.875 12 11 15	12/14/10	12/11/15	4.58	1.88	50,000,000	49,871,500	49,905,573	49,000,000
Subtotals					2.39	1.69	\$ 3,018,130,000	\$ 3,026,736,863	\$ 3,023,113,380	\$ 3,009,835,739
TLGP	17314JAA1	C 1.625 03.30.11 TLGP	4/16/09	3/30/11	0.08	1.63	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 50,225,000	\$ 50,009,151	\$ 50,500,000
TLGP	17314JAA1	C 1.625 03.30.11 TLGP	10/22/09	3/30/11	0.08	1.63	35,000,000	35,423,500	35,023,438	35,350,000
TLGP	17313YAC5	CITIGROUP FDG INC GTD TLGP	6/29/09	6/3/11	0.26	1.25	50,000,000	49,957,000	49,994,259	50,312,500
TLGP	17313YAC5	CITIGROUP FDG INC GTD TLGP	6/29/09	6/3/11	0.26	1.25	50,000,000	49,957,000	49,994,259	50,312,500
TLGP	38146FAF8	GS 1.625 07.15.11 TLGP	4/16/09	7/15/11	0.38	1.63	50,000,000	50,204,500	50,033,917	50,270,200
TLGP	61757UAF7	MORGAN STANLEY FDIC GTD TLG	3/16/09	9/22/11	0.56	2.00	25,000,000	25,037,750	25,008,412	25,249,024
TLGP	36967HAD9	GE TLGP 3 12 09 11	7/30/09	12/9/11	0.77	3.00	50,000,000	51,602,500	50,526,111	51,062,500
TLGP	4042EPAA5	HSBC 3.125 12 16 11 TLGP	9/16/09	12/16/11	0.79	3.13	50,000,000	51,969,550	50,695,700	51,500,000
TLGP	36967HAN7	GENL ELEC CAP CORP FDIC TLGP	3/24/09	3/12/12	1.02	2.25	35,000,000	35,185,150	35,064,393	35,653,135
TLGP	61757UAN0	MORGAN STANLEY FDIC GTD TLGP	3/19/09	3/13/12	1.03	0.50	25,000,000	25,040,325	25,013,984	25,070,313
TLGP	61757UAP5	MS 2.25 3 13 12	11/4/09	3/13/12	1.03	2.25	20,000,000	20,431,800	20,189,791	20,376,740
TLGP	61757UAP5	MS TLGP 2.25 03 13 12	11/6/09	3/13/12	1.03	2.25	50,000,000	51,084,000	50,477,566	50,941,850
TLGP	905266AA0	Union Bank TLGP Float 03 16 12	3/23/09	3/16/12	1.04	0.50	25,000,000	25,033,725	25,011,799	25,058,594
TLGP	064244AA4	BK OF THE WEST.BNP 2.15 03.27.12	4/2/09	3/27/12	1.07	2.15	5,000,000	5,026,950	5,009,692	5,096,094
TLGP	064244AA4	BK OF THE WEST.BNP 2.15 03.27.12	4/2/09	3/27/12	1.07	2.15	20,000,000	20,108,000	20,038,840	20,384,375

Investment Portfolio

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issue Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Duration	Coupon	Par Value	Book Value	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
TLGP	90390QAA9	USSA CAPITAL CO	4/28/09	3/30/12	1.07	2.24	16,000,000	16,125,600	16,046,497	16,230,000
TLGP	17313JAE9	C 2.125 04.30.12 TLGP	4/2/09	4/30/12	1.15	2.13	25,000,000	25,117,500	25,044,533	25,437,500
TLGP	06050BAG6	BAC 2.1 04.30.12 TLGP	4/2/09	4/30/12	1.15	2.10	25,000,000	25,093,000	25,035,247	25,468,750
TLGP	481247AK0	J P MORGAN CHASE TLGP	3/24/09	6/15/12	1.28	2.20	25,000,000	25,119,000	25,047,640	25,524,825
TLGP	38146FAA9	GS 3.25 06.15.12 TLGP	3/22/10	6/15/12	1.27	3.25	50,000,000	52,215,000	51,281,225	52,000,000
TLGP	481247AK0	JPM 2.2 06152012	4/21/10	6/15/12	1.28	2.20	50,000,000	51,097,500	50,659,059	51,049,650
TLGP	06050BAJ0	BAC 2.375 06.22.12 TLGP	4/14/09	6/22/12	1.30	2.38	50,000,000	50,685,000	50,281,644	51,228,100
TLGP	36967HBB2	GE TLGP 2% 09.28.2012	3/22/10	9/28/12	1.55	2.00	25,000,000	25,366,000	25,229,296	25,555,300
TLGP	36967HBB2	GE TLGP 2.0 Bullet 092812	4/20/10	9/28/12	1.55	2.00	75,000,000	76,010,250	75,663,491	76,665,900
TLGP	36967HAV9	GE TLGP 2.125 12 21 12	11/6/09	12/21/12	1.78	2.13	25,000,000	25,293,750	25,147,002	25,500,000
Subtotals					0.92	2.05	\$ 906,000,000	\$ 918,369,350	\$ 911,616,946	\$ 921,797,849
State/Local Agency	13063BHX3	CAL RANS 3. 5 25 2011	11/23/10	5/25/11	0.24	3.00	10,000,000	10,074,600	10,034,650	10,048,700
State/Local Agency	13063BHX3	CAL RANS 3. 5 25 2011	11/23/10	5/25/11	0.24	3.00	15,000,000	15,111,900	15,051,975	15,073,050
State/Local Agency	13063BHY1	CAL RANS 3. 06 28 2011	11/23/10	6/28/11	0.33	3.00	15,000,000	15,110,250	15,060,460	15,099,300
State/Local Agency	13063BHY1	CAL RANS 3. 06 28 2011	11/23/10	6/28/11	0.33	3.00	10,000,000	10,073,500	10,040,306	10,066,200
Subtotals					0.28	3.00	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 50,370,250	\$ 50,187,392	\$ 50,287,250
Public Time Deposit		BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO CD	5/18/10	5/18/11	0.22	1.65	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Public Time Deposit		FIRST NATIONAL BANK 0.70 7 29 11	7/31/10	7/31/11	0.42	0.70	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Public Time Deposit		FIRST NATIONAL BANK 0.7 8 3 11	8/4/10	8/4/11	0.43	0.70	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Subtotals					0.42	0.71	\$ 10,100,000	\$ 10,100,000	\$ 10,100,000	\$ 10,100,000
Negotiable CD	78009J2E4	RBC CAP MKTS NEGO CD MON FLOAI	12/28/10	6/28/11	0.33	0.26	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000
Negotiable CD	78009JY90	RBC CAP MKTS NEGO CD 0.34 9 6 11	12/9/10	9/6/11	0.52	0.33	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000
Negotiable CD	25152XMF4	DEUTSCHE BANK NEGO CD QTR FLOI	12/28/10	9/28/11	0.58	0.45	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000
Negotiable CD	0605C02G6	B OF A NEGO CD 09 06 12	9/2/10	9/4/12	1.51	0.75	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
Subtotals					0.62	0.41	\$ 225,000,000	\$ 225,000,000	\$ 225,000,000	\$ 225,000,000
Money Market Fund		PFM PRIME FUND 06 30 11	7/23/10	3/1/11	0.00	0.16	2,281,388	2,281,388	2,281,388	2,281,388
Subtotals					0.00	0.16	\$ 2,281,388	\$ 2,281,388	\$ 2,281,388	\$ 2,281,388
Grand Totals					1.94	1.59	\$ 4,641,511,388	\$ 4,661,398,508	\$ 4,650,302,566	\$ 4,646,458,225

Monthly Investment Earnings Pooled Fund

For month ended February 28, 2011

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issue Name	Par Value	Coupon	YTM ¹	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Earned Interest	Amort. Expense	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Earned Income /Net Earnings
U.S. Treasury	912795V99	B 031011	\$ 50,000,000	0.00	0.38	3/31/10	3/10/11	\$ 14,856	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,856
U.S. Treasury	912828LF5	T N 1.125 06 30 2011	30,000,000	1.13	0.96	12/31/10	6/30/11	26,105	(3,702)	-	22,403
U.S. Treasury	912828LG3	T 1 7 31 11	-	1.00	0.60	11/19/09	7/31/11	46,409	568,475	(351,563)	263,321
U.S. Treasury	912828LV0	T 1 08 31 11	100,000	1.00	0.83	10/29/09	8/31/11	77	(13)	-	64
U.S. Treasury	912828LV0	T 1 08 31 11	99,900,000	1.00	0.83	10/29/09	8/31/11	77,226	(12,539)	-	64,687
U.S. Treasury	912828KA7	T 1.125 12 15 11	50,000,000	1.13	0.75	12/9/09	12/15/11	43,269	(14,415)	-	28,854
U.S. Treasury	912828LB4	T 1.5 07.15.12	50,000,000	1.50	1.11	3/23/10	7/15/12	58,011	(14,626)	-	43,385
U.S. Treasury	912828PJ3	T BILL 1.375 11 30 15	50,000,000	1.38	1.58	12/16/10	11/30/15	52,885	7,433	-	60,317
U.S. Treasury	912828PJ3	TB 1.375 11 30 15	50,000,000	1.38	1.58	12/16/10	11/30/15	52,885	7,433	-	60,317
U.S. Treasury	912828PJ3	TREASURY NOTE 1.375 11 30 2015	50,000,000	1.38	2.00	12/23/10	11/30/15	52,885	22,688	-	75,573
Subtotals			\$ 430,000,000					\$ 424,607	\$ 560,732	\$ (351,563)	\$ 633,776
Federal Agency	31398AVQ2	FNMA 1.75 3 23 11	\$ 50,000,000	1.75	0.60	11/19/09	3/23/11	\$ 72,917	\$ (44,090)	\$ -	\$ 28,827
Federal Agency	31398AVQ2	FNMA 1.75 3 23 2011 Bullet	20,000,000	1.75	0.57	11/20/09	3/23/11	29,167	(18,051)	-	11,116
Federal Agency	3128X8P22	FHLMC 1.125	28,600,000	1.13	0.71	11/20/09	6/1/11	26,813	(9,006)	-	17,807
Federal Agency	31331YZ86	FFCB Bullet 3.875 8 25 11	50,000,000	3.88	0.78	11/19/09	8/25/11	161,458	(117,609)	-	43,850
Federal Agency	3134A4JT2	FHLMC 5.75 01 15 12	20,000,000	5.75	1.07	6/10/10	1/15/12	95,833	(70,940)	-	24,893
Federal Agency	31331JGD9	FFCB 2 Year Bullet .95 Coupon	17,050,000	0.95	1.05	3/9/10	3/5/12	13,498	1,307	-	14,805
Federal Agency	31331JGD9	FFCB 2 Year Bullet Fixed .95	58,000,000	0.95	1.04	3/9/10	3/5/12	45,917	4,088	-	50,005
Federal Agency	31331JLW1	FFCB 1.125 2NC1 American	74,370,000	1.13	1.23	4/29/10	4/26/12	69,722	5,721	-	75,443
Federal Agency	3134G1DZ4	FHLMC 2NC1Y 1X call 1.17	50,000,000	1.17	1.17	5/18/10	5/18/12	48,750	-	-	48,750
Federal Agency	880591DT6	TVA 6.79 5 23 12	20,500,000	6.79	0.72	8/4/10	5/23/12	115,996	(94,693)	-	21,303
Federal Agency	3133XXME4	FHLB 1.42 fixed 2.5 NC 1 Year	20,230,000	1.42	1.45	6/10/10	9/24/12	23,939	471	-	24,410
Federal Agency	3133XY4B8	FHLB 1.5 2.5NC1	100,000,000	1.50	1.50	4/15/10	10/15/12	125,000	-	-	125,000
Federal Agency	3136FMNR1	FNMA 2.5NC1 Berm 1.56	100,000,000	1.56	1.56	4/19/10	10/19/12	130,000	-	-	130,000
Federal Agency	31398A6V9	FNMA FLOAT 0.3816668 12 03 201	50,000,000	0.37	0.37	12/21/10	12/3/12	14,216	-	-	14,216
Federal Agency	31398A6V9	FNMA FLOAT 0.3835 12 03 12	50,000,000	0.36	0.36	12/23/10	12/3/12	14,178	-	-	14,178
Federal Agency	31331G2R9	FFCB 1.875 12.07.12	37,000,000	1.88	1.53	3/26/10	12/7/12	57,813	(9,457)	-	48,355
Federal Agency	31331JAB9	FFCB 1.625 Bullet 12.12	50,000,000	1.63	1.59	4/16/10	12/24/12	67,708	(1,381)	-	66,327
Federal Agency	3134G1U69	FHLMC FLOAT 0.36 01 10 2013	50,000,000	0.36	0.36	1/11/11	1/10/13	14,000	-	-	14,000
Federal Agency	3134G1U69	FHLMC FLOAT QTR 0.36 01 10 2013	50,000,000	0.36	0.37	1/12/11	1/10/13	14,000	388	-	14,388
Federal Agency	31398AF23	FNMA 3NC1.5 1X 1.80	50,000,000	1.80	1.80	2/8/10	2/8/13	75,000	-	-	75,000
Federal Agency	31398AF23	FNMA 1.8 2 8 13	25,000,000	1.80	1.82	2/8/10	2/8/13	37,500	319	-	37,819
Federal Agency	3128X9ZK9	FHLMC 1.8 2 25 13 3NC1	-	1.80	1.80	2/25/10	2/25/13	90,000	-	-	90,000
Federal Agency	3134G1HD9	FHLMC .750 3 28 11 AMORT CALL	50,000,000	0.75	0.70	7/20/10	3/28/13	31,250	(7,418)	-	23,832
Federal Agency	3134G1KL7	FHLMC 1.5 07 12 13	50,000,000	1.50	1.50	7/12/10	7/12/13	62,500	-	-	62,500
Federal Agency	3134G1KL7	FHLMC 1.5 7 12 13	50,000,000	1.50	1.50	7/12/10	7/12/13	62,500	-	-	62,500
Federal Agency	31398AV90	FNMA 1.3 7 16 13	25,000,000	1.30	1.32	7/16/10	7/16/13	27,083	319	-	27,403
Federal Agency	31398AV90	FNMA 1.3 7 16 13	50,000,000	1.30	1.32	7/16/10	7/16/13	54,167	639	-	54,805
Federal Agency	31398A2H4	FNMA 1.35 08 16 13	25,000,000	1.35	1.35	8/16/10	8/16/13	28,125	-	-	28,125
Federal Agency	31398A2H4	FNMA 1.35 8 16 13	50,000,000	1.35	1.26	11/16/10	8/16/13	56,250	(20,747)	-	35,503
Federal Agency	3136FPYX9	FNMA STRNT 0.5 12 03 13	50,000,000	0.50	0.50	12/3/10	12/3/13	20,833	-	-	20,833
Federal Agency	31315PLT4	FARMER MAC 1.25 12 06 2013	35,000,000	1.25	1.30	12/6/10	12/6/13	36,458	1,234	-	37,692
Federal Agency	31331J6A6	FFCB 1.30 12 23 13	75,000,000	1.30	1.31	12/23/10	12/23/13	81,250	599	-	81,849
Federal Agency	313371UC8	FHLB 0.875 12 27 13	75,000,000	0.88	0.93	11/18/10	12/27/13	54,688	3,330	-	58,018
Federal Agency	3136FP4E4	FNMA 1.75 12 30 13	30,000,000	1.75	1.56	1/28/11	12/30/13	43,750	(28,911)	-	14,839
Federal Agency	31398A3R1	FNMA 1.35 3 21 2011	24,500,000	1.35	1.27	11/10/10	3/21/14	27,563	(13,856)	-	13,706
Federal Agency	31398AWH1	FNMA 2.9 4 7 14	19,750,000	2.90	2.56	11/4/10	4/7/14	47,729	(39,428)	-	8,301
Federal Agency	3134G1GX6	FHLMC 2.05 6 30 14	37,900,000	2.05	2.05	6/30/10	6/30/14	64,746	-	-	64,746

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issue Name	Par Value	Coupon	YTM ¹	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Earned Interest	Amort. Expense	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Earned Income /Net Earnings
Federal Agency	3133724E1	FHLB 06 30 2014	50,000,000	1.21	1.21	12/31/10	6/30/14	50,417	-	-	50,417
Federal Agency	3136FM3R3	FNMA 1.75 8 18 14	53,270,000	1.75	1.63	8/18/10	8/18/14	77,685	(18,226)	-	59,460
Federal Agency	313370JS8	FHLB 1.375 09 12 2014	26,095,000	1.38	1.34	12/8/10	9/12/14	29,901	(694)	-	29,206
Federal Agency	31398A3Q3	FNMA 1.50 9 23 14	27,435,000	1.50	1.31	11/4/10	9/23/14	34,294	(16,648)	-	17,646
Federal Agency	313371CN4	FHLB 1.38 10 21 14	45,525,000	1.35	1.31	11/4/10	10/21/14	51,216	(1,427)	-	49,789
Federal Agency	31331JX99	FFCB 1.23 11 04 2014	110,025,000	1.23	1.30	11/4/10	11/4/14	112,776	5,799	-	118,574
Federal Agency	3128X3L76	FHLMC 5. 11 13 2014	21,910,000	5.00	1.71	12/23/10	11/13/14	91,292	(53,141)	-	38,151
Federal Agency	3128X3L76	FHLMC 5.0 11 13 2014	1,000,000	5.00	1.71	12/23/10	11/13/14	4,167	(2,425)	-	1,741
Federal Agency	31331J4S9	FFCB 1.40 12 08 14	27,000,000	1.40	1.41	12/16/10	12/8/14	31,500	260	-	31,760
Federal Agency	31331J4S9	FFCB 1.4 12 08 14	19,000,000	1.40	1.46	12/8/10	12/8/14	22,167	830	-	22,997
Federal Agency	313371PC4	FHLB 0.875 12 12 14	25,000,000	0.88	1.26	11/22/10	12/12/14	18,229	7,232	-	25,461
Federal Agency	313371W51	FHLB 1.25 12 12 14	50,000,000	1.25	1.39	12/6/10	12/12/14	52,083	5,249	-	57,332
Federal Agency	313371W51	FHLB 1.25 12 12 14	75,000,000	1.25	1.46	12/8/10	12/12/14	78,125	11,640	-	89,765
Federal Agency	3133XVNU1	FHLB 2.75 12 12 2014	25,400,000	2.75	1.30	11/23/10	12/12/14	58,208	(27,400)	-	30,808
Federal Agency	3133XVNU1	FHLB 2.75 12 12 2014	2,915,000	2.75	1.31	11/23/10	12/12/14	6,680	(3,115)	-	3,565
Federal Agency	3133XVNU1	FHLB 2.75 12 12 2014	25,000,000	2.75	1.38	12/8/10	12/12/14	57,292	(25,458)	-	31,834
Federal Agency	3133XVNU1	FHLB 2.75 12 12 2014	50,000,000	2.75	1.37	12/8/10	12/12/14	114,583	(51,107)	-	63,476
Federal Agency	313371W93	FHLB 1.34 12 15 2014	75,000,000	1.34	1.34	12/15/10	12/15/14	83,750	-	-	83,750
Federal Agency	31331J6Q1	FFCB 1.72 12 29 2014	27,175,000	1.72	1.74	12/29/10	12/29/14	38,951	344	-	39,295
Federal Agency	31331J6Q1	FFCB 1.72 12 29 2014	70,000,000	1.72	1.72	12/29/10	12/29/14	100,333	215	-	100,548
Federal Agency	31331JE33	RBC YCD PUC CAPI	50,000,000	1.75	1.76	9/16/10	3/16/15	72,917	426	-	73,343
Federal Agency	3136FMA38	FNMA 2.5 6 25 12	49,080,000	2.50	2.53	6/25/10	6/25/15	102,250	941	-	103,191
Federal Agency	3136FMX90	FNMA STRNT 1.75 7 27 15	25,000,000	1.75	1.75	7/27/10	7/27/15	36,458	-	-	36,458
Federal Agency	3136FMX90	FNMA STRNT 1.75 7 27 15	25,000,000	1.75	1.75	7/27/10	7/27/15	36,458	-	-	36,458
Federal Agency	3136FM6G4	FNMA 2.125 8 1 15	25,000,000	2.13	2.13	8/10/10	8/10/15	44,271	-	-	44,271
Federal Agency	3137EACM9	FHLMC 1.75 09 10 15	50,000,000	1.75	2.17	12/15/10	9/10/15	72,917	15,376	-	88,292
Federal Agency	313370JB5	FHLB 1.75 09 11 2015	75,000,000	1.75	2.17	12/15/10	9/11/15	109,375	22,856	-	132,231
Federal Agency	31315PGT0	FARMER MAC 2.125 09 15 15	45,000,000	2.13	2.17	9/15/10	9/15/15	79,688	1,304	-	80,992
Federal Agency	31398A4M1	FNMA 1.625 10 26 2015	25,000,000	1.63	2.22	12/15/10	10/26/15	33,854	10,760	-	44,614
Federal Agency	31398A4M1	FNMA 1.625 10 26 2015	42,000,000	1.63	2.19	12/23/10	10/26/15	56,875	17,035	-	73,910
Federal Agency	31398A4M1	FNMA 1.625 10 26 2015	50,000,000	1.63	2.19	12/23/10	10/26/15	67,708	20,564	-	88,273
Federal Agency	31331J2R3	FFCB 1.62 11 16 15	32,400,000	1.62	1.80	11/16/10	11/16/15	43,740	4,347	-	48,087
Federal Agency	31331J2S1	FFCB 1.50 11 16 2015	25,000,000	1.50	2.20	12/15/10	11/16/15	31,250	12,668	-	43,918
Federal Agency	313371ZY5	FHLB 1.875 12 11 15	25,000,000	1.88	1.89	12/3/10	12/11/15	39,063	275	-	39,337
Federal Agency	313371ZY5	FHLB 1.875 12 11 15	50,000,000	1.88	1.93	12/14/10	12/11/15	78,125	1,974	-	80,099
Subtotals			\$3,018,130,000					\$ 4,060,911	\$ (516,722)	\$ -	\$ 3,544,190
TLGP	17314JAA1	C 1.625 03.30.11 TLGP	\$ 50,000,000	1.63	1.39	4/16/09	3/30/11	\$ 67,708	\$ (8,836)	\$ -	\$ 58,872
TLGP	17314JAA1	C 1.625 03.30.11 TLGP	35,000,000	1.63	0.78	10/22/09	3/30/11	47,396	(22,630)	-	24,766
TLGP	17313YAC5	CITIGROUP FDG INC GTD TLGP	50,000,000	1.25	1.30	6/29/09	6/3/11	52,083	1,710	-	53,794
TLGP	17313YAC5	CITIGROUP FDG INC GTD TLGP	50,000,000	1.25	1.30	6/29/09	6/3/11	52,083	1,710	-	53,794
TLGP	38146FAF8	GS 1.625 07.15.11 TLGP	50,000,000	1.63	1.44	4/16/09	7/15/11	67,708	(6,983)	-	60,725
TLGP	61757UAF7	MORGAN STANLEY FDIC GTD TLG	25,000,000	2.00	1.94	3/16/09	9/22/11	41,667	(1,149)	-	40,518
TLGP	36967HAD9	GE TLGP 3 12 09 11	50,000,000	3.00	1.61	7/30/09	12/9/11	125,000	(52,053)	-	72,947
TLGP	4042EPAA5	HSBC 3.125 12 16 11 TLGP	50,000,000	3.13	1.34	9/16/09	12/16/11	130,208	(67,171)	-	63,037
TLGP	36967HAN7	GENL ELEC CAP CORP FDIC TLGP	35,000,000	2.25	2.07	3/24/09	3/12/12	65,625	(4,782)	-	60,843
TLGP	61757UAN0	MORGAN STANLEY FDIC GTD TLGP	25,000,000	0.50	0.37	3/19/09	3/13/12	9,765	(1,036)	-	8,729
TLGP	61757UAP5	MS 2.25 3 13 12	20,000,000	2.25	1.32	11/4/09	3/13/12	37,500	(14,059)	-	23,441
TLGP	61757UAP5	MS TLGP 2.25 03 13 12	50,000,000	2.25	1.31	11/6/09	3/13/12	93,750	(35,375)	-	58,375
TLGP	905266AA0	Union Bank TLGP Float 03 16 12	25,000,000	0.50	0.39	3/23/09	3/16/12	9,759	(867)	-	8,892

Monthly Investment Earnings Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issue Name	Par Value	Coupon	YTM ¹	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Earned Interest	Amort. Expense	Realized Gain/(Loss)	Earned Income /Net Earnings
TLGP	064244AA4	BK OF THE WEST.BNP 2.15 03.27.12	5,000,000	2.15	1.96	4/2/09	3/27/12	8,958	(692)	-	8,266
TLGP	064244AA4	BK OF THE WEST.BNP 2.15 03.27.12	20,000,000	2.15	1.96	4/2/09	3/27/12	35,833	(2,774)	-	33,059
TLGP	90390QAA9	USSA CAPITAL CO	16,000,000	2.24	1.96	4/28/09	3/30/12	29,867	(3,296)	-	26,571
TLGP	17313UAE9	C 2.125 04.30.12 TLGP	25,000,000	2.13	1.97	4/2/09	4/30/12	44,271	(2,927)	-	41,344
TLGP	06050BAG6	BAC 2.1 04.30.12 TLGP	25,000,000	2.10	1.97	4/2/09	4/30/12	43,750	(2,317)	-	41,433
TLGP	481247AK0	J P MORGAN CHASE TLGP	25,000,000	2.20	2.05	3/24/09	6/15/12	45,833	(2,826)	-	43,007
TLGP	38146FAA9	GS 3.25 06.15.12 TLGP	50,000,000	3.25	1.23	3/22/10	6/15/12	135,417	(76,005)	-	59,412
TLGP	481247AK0	JPM 2.2 06152012	50,000,000	2.20	1.16	4/21/10	6/15/12	91,667	(39,097)	-	52,570
TLGP	06050BAJ0	BAC 2.375 06.22.12 TLGP	50,000,000	2.38	1.93	4/14/09	6/22/12	98,958	(16,464)	-	82,495
TLGP	36967HBB2	GE TLGP 2% 09.28.2012	25,000,000	2.00	1.41	3/22/10	9/28/12	41,667	(11,127)	-	30,540
TLGP	36967HBB2	GE TLGP 2.0 Bullet 092812	75,000,000	2.00	1.44	4/20/10	9/28/12	125,000	(31,712)	-	93,288
TLGP	36967HAV9	GE TLGP 2.125 12 21 12	25,000,000	2.13	1.79	11/6/09	12/21/12	44,271	(6,227)	-	38,044
Subtotals			\$ 906,000,000					\$ 1,545,744	\$ (406,984)	\$ -	\$ 1,138,760
State/Local Agency	13063BHX3	CAL RANS 3. 5 25 2011	\$ 10,000,000	3.00	1.51	11/23/10	5/25/11	\$ 25,000	\$ (11,414)	\$ -	\$ 13,586
State/Local Agency	13063BHX3	CAL RANS 3. 5 25 2011	15,000,000	3.00	1.51	11/23/10	5/25/11	37,500	(17,121)	-	20,379
State/Local Agency	13063BHY1	CAL RANS 3. 06 28 2011	15,000,000	3.00	1.76	11/23/10	6/28/11	37,500	(14,226)	-	23,274
State/Local Agency	13063BHY1	CAL RANS 3. 06 28 2011	10,000,000	3.00	1.76	11/23/10	6/28/11	25,000	(9,484)	-	15,516
Subtotals			\$ 50,000,000					\$ 125,000	\$ (62,245)	\$ -	\$ 72,755
Public Time Deposit		BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO CD	\$ 100,000	1.65	1.65	5/18/10	5/18/11	\$ 128	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 128
Public Time Deposit		FIRST NATIONAL BANK 0.70 7 29 11	5,000,000	0.70	0.70	7/31/10	7/31/11	2,722	-	-	2,722
Public Time Deposit		FIRST NATIONAL BANK 0.7 8 3 11	5,000,000	0.70	0.70	8/4/10	8/4/11	2,722	-	-	2,722
Subtotals			\$ 10,100,000					\$ 5,573	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,573
Negotiable CD	78009J2E4	RBC CAP MKTS NEGO CD MON FLOAT	\$ 50,000,000	0.26	0.26	12/28/10	6/28/11	\$ 10,111	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,111
Negotiable CD	78009JY90	RBC CAP MKTS NEGO CD 0.34 9 6 11	50,000,000	0.33	0.33	12/9/10	9/6/11	12,811	-	-	12,811
Negotiable CD	25152XMF4	DEUTSCHE BANK NEGO CD QTR FLOA	100,000,000	0.45	0.45	12/28/10	9/28/11	35,000	-	-	35,000
Negotiable CD	0605C02G6	B OF A NEGO CD 09 06 12	25,000,000	0.75	0.75	9/2/10	9/4/12	14,583	-	-	14,583
Subtotals			\$ 225,000,000					\$ 72,505	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 72,505
Money Market Fund		PFM PRIME FUND 06 30 11	\$ 2,281,388	0.16	0.16	7/23/10	3/1/11	\$ 287	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 287
Subtotals			\$ 2,281,388					\$ 287	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 287
Grand Totals			\$ 4,641,511,388					\$ 6,234,627	\$ (415,219)	\$ (351,563)	\$ 5,467,846

¹ Yield to maturity is calculated at purchase

Investment Transactions

For month ended February 28, 2011

Transaction Type	Settle Date	Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issuer Name	Beginning Par Value	Transactional Par Value	Interest	Gain/(Loss)	(Premium)/Discount	(Amort.)/Accretion	Transaction Amount	Ending Par Value
Interest	2/1/2011	Money Market Fund		PFM PRIME FUND 06 30 11	\$ 2,281,075	\$ -	\$ 313	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 313	\$ 2,281,075
Interest	2/4/2011	Public Time Deposit		FIRST NATIONAL BANK 0.7	5,000,000	-	8,944	-	-	-	8,944	5,000,000
Interest	2/8/2011	Federal Agency	31398AF23	FNMA 3NC1.5 1X 1.80	50,000,000	-	450,000	-	-	-	450,000	50,000,000
Interest	2/8/2011	Federal Agency	31398AF23	FNMA 1.8 2 8 13	25,000,000	-	225,000	-	-	-	225,000	25,000,000
Interest	2/10/2011	Federal Agency	3136FM6G4	FNMA 2.125 8 1 15	25,000,000	-	265,625	-	-	-	265,625	25,000,000
Interest	2/16/2011	Federal Agency	31398A2H4	FNMA 1.35 08 16 13	25,000,000	-	168,750	-	-	-	168,750	25,000,000
Interest	2/16/2011	Federal Agency	31398A2H4	FNMA 1.35 8 16 13	50,000,000	-	337,500	-	-	-	337,500	50,000,000
Interest	2/18/2011	Federal Agency	3136FM3R3	FNMA 1.75 8 18 14	53,270,000	-	466,113	-	-	-	466,113	53,270,000
Interest	2/25/2011	Federal Agency	31331YZ86	FFCB Bullet 3.875 8 25 1	50,000,000	-	968,750	-	-	-	968,750	50,000,000
Interest	2/25/2011	Federal Agency	3128X9ZK9	FHLMC 1.8 2 25 13 3NC1	75,000,000	-	675,000	-	-	-	675,000	75,000,000
Interest	2/28/2011	U.S. Treasury	912828LV0	T 1 08 31 11	100,000	-	500	-	-	-	500	100,000
Interest	2/28/2011	U.S. Treasury	912828LV0	T 1 08 31 11	99,900,000	-	499,500	-	-	-	499,500	99,900,000
Interest	2/28/2011	Negotiable CD	78009J2E4	RBC CAP MKTS NEGO CD MON	50,000,000	-	11,194	-	-	-	11,194	50,000,000
Reinvestment	2/1/2011	Money Market Fund		PFM PRIME FUND 06 30 11	2,281,075	313	-	-	-	-	(313)	2,281,388
Call	2/25/2011	Federal Agency	3128X9ZK9	FHLMC 1.8 2 25 13 3NC1	75,000,000	(75,000,000)	-	-	-	-	75,000,000	-
Sale	2/15/2011	U.S. Treasury	912828LG3	T 1 7 31 11	120,000,000	(120,000,000)	49,724	(351,563)	801,563	-	120,499,724	-
Grand Totals	0	Purchases				\$ (194,999,687)	\$ 4,126,913	\$ (351,563)	\$ 801,563	\$ -	\$ 199,576,600	
	1	Sales										
	1	Maturities / Calls										
	(2)	Change in number of positions										

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



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Please Save The Sharp Park Wetlands

The Clerk's Office has received 852 form emails like the one below from 4/2/11 to 4/4/11. This is in addition to the 127 received from 4/4-4/5/11. They can be viewed in the Clerk's Office upon request.

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 04/05/2011 11:52 AM -----

From: Genevieve Woolsey <gwoolsey11@verizon.net>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 04/03/2011 06:44 PM
Subject: Please Save The Sharp Park Wetlands

Dear Board of Supervisors

I am writing to urge the City of San Francisco to turn the Sharp Park Golf Course over to its next door neighbor, the National Park Service. The Sharp Park Wetlands provide critical habitat for the endangered California Red-Legged Frog and a variety of other wildlife. Both frogs and wetlands are rapidly disappearing in California and worldwide, so it is disconcerting that the City of San Francisco is currently using taxpayer dollars to pump the Sharp Park Wetlands dry, killing endangered frogs in the process, and violating state and federal laws.

The Sharp Park Golf Course has a long history of environmental and economic troubles, and the time has clearly come for the City of San Francisco to change course. By closing the golf course and handing the land over to the National Park Service, the City of San Francisco would relieve itself of its current financial, legal and environmental burden, and it would also clearly mark itself as a world leader in environmental protection efforts.

The restored Sharp Park Wetlands would be a safe haven for threatened wildlife and would provide valuable recreational opportunities to San Francisco residents and tourists alike. This would not only improve the quality of life for San Francisco's residents, it would increase the long-term economic value of the property.

On behalf of all those who enjoy nature and wildlife, thanks for your consideration.

Genevieve Woolsey

Brandon, FL 33510
US



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Muni Union thug/drivers

From: Doug MacTavish <mactavco@yahoo.com>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 03/29/2011 04:11 PM
Subject: Muni Union thug/drivers

Drivers dont stop at stops, lower steps, late/ahead of schedule,
at \$26 per hour. Ronald Reagan had the guts to stop Unions
crime against treasury and citizens.



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Letter from Medical Cannabis Task Force

From: Medical Cannabis TaskForce/ADMSVC/SFGOV
To: Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV
Date: 03/29/2011 02:50 PM
Subject: Letter from Medical Cannabis Task Force
Sent by: Carol Lei

Greetings:

I am contacting you on behalf of the San Francisco Medical Cannabis Task Force (MCTF) to facilitate improving communication and efficiency between our bodies to enable the MCTF to timely achieve its legislated directives.

We are a thirteen member panel composed of a wide variety of medical cannabis advocates and experts appointed by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. The MCTF started out as a working group led by Supervisor Campos in 2009 resulting in legislation to create the Task Force passed on January 27th 2010, with our first meeting taking place in July 2010. The MCTF members are comprised of community organizers, patient advocates, dispensary operators, cultivators, delivery services and a medical professional. We meet at San Francisco City Hall, Room 400 on every third Friday at 9:30am [next meeting April 15th]. There are currently four committees working to support the Task Force, they include the Legal & Legislative, Patient Advocacy, Cultivation, & Outreach Committees which are comprised of Task Force members and members of the general public. The MCTF has been tasked to address medical cannabis concerns in San Francisco. We have two MCTF members appointed as spokespersons; Stephanie Tucker and David Goldman.

Our focus is to review existing local medical cannabis laws and draft amendments or new legislation on medical cannabis policies. We are also required to submit an annual report due to the Board of Supervisors by July 2011. In the coming months we will be seeking your input and guidance by inviting you to participate in our meetings as we develop policy recommendations on medical cannabis to the Board of Supervisors. Some of the issues we will address have been defined for us in our legislation such as cultivation regulations, taxation, developing a mediation process and newer issues like delivery.

As the MCTF is giving their opinion on multiple topics, we have communicated with many City Departments such as DPH, Planning, Building and Police. Our goal is to establish a formal working relationship between your office and the MCTF. It would be ideal to have help in the following ways:

- Please assign a liaison with your office or department, to whom we can make inquiries and give regular updates.

7

- Providing any topics that should be brought to the MCTF's attention as an agenda item.
- Addressing the MCTF as a guest speaker on issues pertinent to your department. The MCTF meets the third Friday of every month at 9:30 am.
- Informing us of the preferred way to communicate with your office or department (email, phone, in person visit, specific contact, etc.).
- Providing us with all relevant office policies of which we should be aware of (e.g. two weeks for written responses, only open in the morning).

Please review the attached documents:

- a. Schedule of meetings, chairs, contact information for all members and



spokespersons. MCTF_Chair_Schedule.doc



- b. A copy of the MCTF legislation BOS MCTF ord roster.pdf

Please review the following linked documents:

- a. MCTF minutes & Committee minutes, www.sfgov.org/mctf
- b. San Francisco Medical Cannabis Act,
http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/MCD/MCD-Article_33.pdf and
<http://www.sfdph.org/dph/files/EHSdocs/MedCannabis/finalregs.pdf>
- c. Prop 215,
<http://www.cdph.ca.gov/programs/MMP/Pages/CompassionateUseact.aspx>
- d. California State Senate Bill SB420,
http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/03-04/bill/sen/sb_0401-0450/sb_420_bill_200310_12_chaptered.html
- e. Attorney General Guidelines,
http://ag.ca.gov/cms_attachments/press/pdfs/n1601_medicalmarijuanaguidelines.pdf

We look forward to working with you in the near future. It is important that we collaborate and allow all the voices from the San Francisco community to be heard. We need your input in order for San Francisco to continue being a leader in the implementation of responsible and thoughtful medical cannabis policies.

We would appreciate your prompt response identifying an appropriate liason from your department. Please contact me at sagenetsf@gmail.com or 415.240.9111. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Tucker – MCTF Spokesperson

brightline DEFENSE PROJECT

1028A Howard Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
P 415.252.9700
F 415.252.9775
www.brightlinedefense.org

File 110283
BOS-11

February 24, 2011

Bryan Moore
Project Manager
AvalonBay Communities
185 Berry Street
Suite 3500
San Francisco, CA 94107

Re: *1150 Ocean Avenue Development*

Dear Mr. Moore:

Brightline Defense Project is a policy advocacy organization committed to protecting and empowering communities through strategies such as the city's recently passed local hiring law. We write with respect to your ongoing mixed residential and commercial project at 1150 Ocean Avenue in San Francisco's Ingleside district, a community saturated and surrounded by extremely qualified construction workers.

Many remember the excitement when your project was approved by the Planning Commission back in May of 2009 with the expectation of much-needed local jobs building 173 units of housing and nearly 30,000 square feet of commercial space. Now that work has commenced, however, we have heard from many community members that are concerned about wages and working conditions on your project.

Brightline supports safeguards for workers in the form of area standard wages, benefits, and working condition protections. We find and firmly believe that work performed by union workers employed by union contractors is the best way to ensure these safeguards, and working with our local unions is also the best way that a developer or contractor can engage qualified local workers in order to build projects in a way that meets the community's expectation.


We have heard from local workers that AvalonBay is prepared to enter the next phase of construction with non-union contractors and that has us very concerned. We would like to sit down with you as soon as possible to hear AvalonBay's thoughts on engaging San Francisco's union workforce to complete your exciting project, and how you might work with non-union contractors to do their jobs better by working with our local trade unions.

Very truly yours,



Joshua Arce
Executive Director

Cc: San Francisco Planning Commission



TODAY - Support Local Union Members, Agenda Item 9

Sup. Eric Mar (Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org), Sup. Mark
Joshua Arce to: Farrell (Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org), Sup. David
Chiu (David.Chiu@sfgov.org), Sup. Carmen Chu
"Raquel.Redondiez@sfgov.org", "Frances.Hsieh@sfgov.org",
Cc: "AvalosStaff@sfgov.org", "Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org",
"Sheila.Chung.Hagen@sfgov.org", "Victor.Lim@sfgov.org",

03/29/2011 09:53 AM

View: (Mail Threads)

Dear Supervisors,

Yesterday, the Sierra Club joined Carpenters Local 22, Laborers Local 261, and Brightline Defense Project in publicly supporting today's Agenda Item #9, Sup. John Avalos' resolution on behalf of workers at the Avalon Bay Communities project at 1150 Ocean Avenue. Two weeks ago, we wrote to you to highlight that Avalon Bay is a perfect opportunity for the City and County of San Francisco to support a local and sustainable middle class by taking a stand in support of wage, benefit, and working condition protections on important projects that we greenlight in our communities. This is particularly true in the case of projects like 1150 Ocean Avenue that are promoted as part of a sustainable transportation plan.

In the two weeks since today's resolution was continued, Avalon Bay has escalated its pattern of bad faith with respect to the community, labor, and San Francisco policy makers. We have since learned that despite warrants to the contrary to members of the Board's City Operations and Neighborhood Services Committee, Avalon Bay has not reached out to labor to discuss the increasing harm to workers at 1150 Ocean nor has Avalon Bay made itself available for discussions with any stakeholders. This is unacceptable, yet is par for the course based on our experience with Avalon Bay (see emails attached below) and based on general expectations with respect to developers who are willing to cut costs and increase profits on the backs of working men and women by undercutting area standard wages.

Again, we find that union contractors are best positioned to deliver wage and working condition safeguards on construction projects, just as the best thing that any contractor concerned with complying with the City's new local hiring law can do is sign signatory with our local unions. Two weeks ago we highlighted that one of the fundamental flaws of the housing bubble and subsequent collapse was the undercutting of workers' wages on private construction matched by skyrocketing housing prices and, by virtue of reason, increased and unsustainable profits for developers between those margins.

Allowing workers' wages to be undermined leading up to the recent economic downturn does nothing for our communities, for housing affordability, or for our working men and women. Please support fair, livable, and area standard wages, benefits, and working conditions for our local construction workers, and take a strong step toward a sustainable San Francisco middle class by approving Agenda Item #9

today.

Thank you,

Joshua Arce
Executive Director

From: Joshua Arce
Sent: Wednesday, March 02, 2011 5:24 PM
To: Bryan_Moore@AVALONBAY.COM
Cc: duane_carlson@avalonbay.com
Subject: RE: working conditions at 1150 Ocean Avenue project

Dear Bryan:

Thank you for the response, but it actually does not answer our concerns. You cited some of the applicable law but did not lay out any safeguards that AvalonBay is using to guarantee the rights of workers on your project.

In fact, since I first wrote to you we have learned that you are considering using at least one non-union contractor with a questionable track record with respect to wages and we fear that your project is taking a turn for the worse.

We advocate the use of union contractors precisely because of the protections afforded to workers by membership in the union and the elevated respect for following the laws laid out in your email which is most consistently found among union contractors. Our initial inquiry as to the project's community hiring performance under First Source found lackluster results and this figure is certain to plummet once framing begins unless AvalonBay commits to a new and better approach, one that will fit the needs of the working people of San Francisco."

I understand your desire to keep bidding "competitive," but we believe that bids which undermine area standard wages and include no benefits for workers are not "competitive" but in fact hurt local workers and ultimately the community. And there is no better way for contractors and sub-contractors to comply with First Source and local hiring policies than to sign signatory with the local unions.

Again, we would like to sit down with you and some of the workers who first alerted us to the problems at 1150 Ocean at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Joshua Arce
Executive Director

From: Bryan_Moore@AVALONBAY.COM [mailto:Bryan_Moore@AVALONBAY.COM]
Sent: Monday, February 28, 2011 4:13 PM
To: Joshua Arce

Cc: duane_carlson@avalonbay.com
Subject: Re: working conditions at 1150 Ocean Avenue project

Joshua,

Thank you for your interest in 1150 Ocean Avenue project.

1150 Ocean Avenue has been bid as an "Open Merit Project" meaning that both union and nonunion bidders are selected for bidding.

AvalonBay's policy on award of contracts to subcontractors are generally based on experience, quality and price. We have no problem

awarding union work, however, the bidding needs to be competitive. Our project now has both union and nonunion workers, working together

and excited about having work in the Bay Area.

All contractors selected are required to meet State and Federal laws regarding hiring/wages and San Francisco's requirements for First Source Hiring .

The working conditions on site meet or exceed CAL/OSHA standards.

We share the neighborhoods excitement of bringing market/below market rate rental housing and a grocery store to the Ingleside district.

Hopefully I have answered all of your concerns.

Bryan Moore

Senior Project Manager - LEED

AP

AvalonBay Communities, Inc.

185 Berry Street, Suite 3500

San Francisco, CA 94107

Phone: 415.284.9089

Cell: 415.272.0814

Fax: 415.546.4138

bryan_moore@avalonbay.com

From: Joshua Arce <josh@brightlinedefense.org>
To: "bryan_moore@avalonbay.com" <bryan_moore@avalonbay.com>
Cc: "duane_carlson@avalonbay.com" <duane_carlson@avalonbay.com>
Date: 02/24/2011 01:24 PM
Subject: working conditions at 1150 Ocean Avenue project

February 24, 2011

Bryan Moore
Project Manager
AvalonBay Communities
185 Berry Street
Suite 3500
San Francisco, CA 94107

Re: *1150 Ocean Avenue Development*

Dear Mr. Moore:

Brightline Defense Project is a policy advocacy organization committed to protecting and empowering communities through strategies such as the city's recently passed local hiring law. We write with respect to your ongoing mixed residential and commercial project at 1150 Ocean Avenue in San Francisco's Ingleside district, a community saturated and surrounded by extremely qualified construction workers.

Many remember the excitement when your project was approved by the Planning Commission back in May of 2009 with the expectation of much-needed local jobs building 173 units of housing and nearly 30,000 square feet of commercial space. Now that work has commenced, however, we have heard from many community members that are concerned about wages and working conditions on your project.

Brightline supports safeguards for workers in the form of area standard wages, benefits, and working condition protections. We find and firmly believe that work performed by union workers employed by union contractors is the best way to ensure these safeguards, and working with our local unions is also the best way that a developer or contractor can engage qualified local workers in order to build projects in a way that meets the community's expectation.

We have heard from local workers that AvalonBay is prepared to enter the next phase of construction with non-union contractors and that has us very concerned. We would like to sit down with you as soon as possible to hear AvalonBay's thoughts on engaging San Francisco's union workforce to complete your exciting project, and how you might work with non-union contractors to do their jobs better by working with our local trade unions.

Very truly yours,

Joshua Arce
Executive Director



Cc: San Francisco Planning Commission brightline letter re non-union contractors at 1150 ocean avenue.pdf



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: cost data for Botanical Gardens Ordinance #110255 - request to re-calendar to provide ten days prior notice to the public

From: Anmarie Mabbutt <tenniselement@yahoo.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Cc: angela.calvillo@sfgov.org, victor.young@sfgov.org, john.avalos@sfgov.org
Date: 03/30/2011 01:45 PM
Subject: Re: cost data for Botanical Gardens Ordinance #110255 - request to re-calendar to provide ten days prior notice to the public

Dear Board President Chiu and members of the Board of Supervisors,

Since the data in support of the fees proposed in Ordinance #110255 was not received by the Board of Supervisors until the evening of March 29, 2011, even if the Clerk's Office immediately placed this information in the legislative file, it does not satisfy the ten days prior requirement of Government Code Section 54986 and violates the Board's own published Notice of Public Hearing for the scheduled consideration of Ordinance #110255 by the Budget & Finance Committee on April 6, 2011. **The public is clearly entitled to this data at least ten days prior to the consideration of the Ordinance by the Board.**

I respectfully request that this item, the consideration of Ordinance #110255, be removed from the Budget & Finance Committee calendar for April 6, 2011. This item should not be considered until the data has been available in the file to the public at least "ten days" prior to the consideration of the Ordinance by the Budget and Finance Committee.

Please include this letter as part of the legislative file for Ordinance #110255.

Thank you for your time.
Sincerely,

Anmarie Mabbutt

--- On **Wed, 3/30/11**, **Victor.Young@sfgov.org** <**Victor.Young@sfgov.org**> wrote:

From: Victor.Young@sfgov.org <Victor.Young@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: cost data for Botanical Gardens Ordinance #110255
To: "Anmarie Mabbutt" <tenniselement@yahoo.com>
Cc: Madeleine.Licavoli@sfgov.org
Date: Wednesday, March 30, 2011, 12:35 PM

Ms. Mabbutt:

Attached is a copy of the above mentioned file which includes the information requested.

⑨

Victor Young
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., Room 244
San Francisco CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-7723 | Fax: (415) 554-7714
victor.young@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

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

From: Anmarie Mabbutt <tenniselement@yahoo.com>
To: victor.young@sfgov.org
Date: 03/22/2011 09:48 AM
Subject: cost data for Botanical Gardens Ordinance #110255

Dear Victor,

Once the Recreation and Parks Department has responded to the Clerk's Office request for the data in support of the fees required under Code Section 54986 for the Botanical Gardens Ordinance #110255, if you would please forward the data/information to me.

Thanks for your help.

Anmarie



To: Carmen Chu/BOS/SFGOV, Ross Mirkarimi/BOS/SFGOV, Jane Kim/BOS/SFGOV, Scott Wiener/BOS/SFGOV, David Chiu/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc: Victor Young/BOS/SFGOV,
Bcc:
Subject: Arboretum Budget / Fee - Please add this letter on the record, Budget & Finance Committee

All-BOS-11
File 110225
cpay

From: sandy weil <sweil46117@aol.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 04/01/2011 04:33 PM
Subject: re: Arboretum Budget / Fee - Please add this letter on the record, Budget & Finance Committee

Please forward to All Supervisors. Thank you.

From: Sandy Weil

Re: Arboretum Budget provided to Victor Young by Katerine Petrucione dated 3/29/11
"Draft - For your information only. Please do not distribute."

Dear Supervisors and Especially Budget and Finance Committee Members:

As stated in the email to Victor... here is the budget for maintaining the Botanical gardens:

Salaries: \$808,286

Fringe: \$392, 897

Department Overhead!!! \$464,468

Materials and Supplies: \$12,300

Total: \$1,677,951

And a notation is made that an 11th gardener is provided by an annual gift from SFBS.

This budget of 1.6M shows that there is \$464,000 of "department overhead" that is not broken down in any detail.

Before you vote, it is critical in these economic times, that you have much more detailed information on how this "Department Overhead" is spent.

That is a quarter of the budget! For any kind of informative discussion / decision to take on how our tax dollars are spent, it seems imperative to have detailed information on how this money is spent.

The majority of people I have talked with, both locals and visitors, do not want a fee imposed to visit the gardens.

We have seen that the projections made by RPD management and SFBS of a fee generating revenue have been way off.

We have seen them waste tens of thousands of dollars on PR, when instead that money could have been used towards the gardens.

Instead of imposing a fee, I would recommend the following be tried for a 6 month period May-Nov 2011...

There are beautiful donation "collection flowers" at the entrances to the Arboretum.

The Arboretum and Rec and Park have a large pool of wonderful volunteers. During peak visiting days/hours have a volunteer stationed near each of the donation flowers. As the people are leaving the gardens, very politely and discreetly, the volunteers can say with a smile...

if you enjoyed the gardens today, we hope you will consider making a contribution to keep them

beautiful, thank you, have a great day!

I would bet, with a gentle "ask", that people would be dropping in \$1,5 and 10 dollars. This would save on fee collecting salaries, save on the full expenses of the entrance fee of approximately \$226,000 a year! (according to SF Botanical Gardens Admissions Income Statement, projection June 30, 2011)

So you see, between understanding what is \$464,468 "Department Overhead" and trying a new way of generating donations to support the garden, you may have the money needed to run the gardens on a fiscally responsible budget.

Please vote against the fee.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sandy Weil, SF Native

S.H.A.R.P.

SUNSET HEIGHTS ASSOCIATION OF RESPONSIBLE PEOPLE
1661 7th Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94122 - www.sharpsf.com

*File 110225
BOS-11
page 1/1*

April 5, 2011

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 APR -5 AM 10:45
BY AK

RE: Support for Arboretum Fees

Dear Supervisors:

The Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP) supports charging admissions fees at the Botanical Garden to non-residents.

It is very easy to look at pre-Prop 13 San Francisco through rose-colored glasses. It is much harder to face the stark reality of a city with a budget deficit, and an underfunded pension system. There is no question that there will be future cuts in city services putting MUNI and other critical programs at risk.

If we truly want the San Francisco Botanical Garden to thrive, we need to encourage everyone to join the SF Botanical Garden Society at the highest level they can afford, sign up as volunteers, and make permanent the admissions fees for non-residents.

Sincerely,

Chooi Eng Grosso
Chooi-Eng Grosso
Board Member,
on behalf of the SHARP Board of Directors

March 29, 2011

File 110225
B/F clerk
CPages, BOS 11

Dear Supervisors:

As a native San Franciscan I love to show off my city; to people who are visiting, some who are new to the area, and some who just haven't explored all that this great place has to offer. One of my favorite outings is to The Arboretum in Golden Gate Park. It is a perfect place to go for a picnic and walk that makes one feel as if she is far away from the hustle and bustle of the city, surrounded by calm and peace. When my son was in a stroller, my friend and I used the Arboretum all the time to take the boys for an afternoon. They would hide amongst the giant redwoods and giggle under the tall bamboo. We go there still to run and roll around in green grassy fields, without the constant worry of stepping in dog poop!

Recently I tried to bring some new friends who have recently moved here from New York, with our kids, for an afternoon in the Arboretum. When we tried to walk in, we were carded, and since my friends are here for a job that lasts only a year, their ID's are still out of town. As a result they were told they would have to pay for the four of them. A very fun and affordable family activity became an expensive endeavor.

Most of my friends have left San Francisco to raise their families, but my husband (also a native) and I chose to stay. In the suburbs it is so much easier to raise a child. Better public schools and clean, free parks. It is a constant financial struggle to live here, but we feel it is worth it!

The park belongs to the people of San Francisco and I know that is what John McLaren had in mind when he created it. Open a coffee shop for money, but please leave the park free!

Sincerely,

Usha Korinthias and Chris Korinthias
359 Jersey #3
San Francisco, CA 94114

Usha Korinthias
Chris Korinthias

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAR 31 PM 3:05
BY *[Signature]*

BART Wins Award for Real Estate Deal that Saves Taxpayers Almost \$8 Million

Molly M Burke

to:

angela.calvillo, Mark.Farrell, Board.of.Supervisors, Carmen.Chu, Jane.Kim, david.noyola, David.Campos, David.Chiu, Eric.L.Mar, Edwin.Lee, John.Avalos, martha.cohen, Scott.Wiener, Ross.Mirkarimi, Sean.Elsbernd, Malia.Cohen, Mayoredwinlee

03/29/2011 03:35 PM

Cc:

Kerry Hamill, Roddrick Lee, Jennifer Barton

Show Details

BART Wins Award For Real Estate Deal That Saves Taxpayers Almost \$8 Million

OAKLAND, CA – Bay Area taxpayers can now be more confident BART is spending their money wisely: the Agency has been honored by *the San Francisco Business Times* for a real estate deal that will save almost \$8 million on the rental costs on its administrative offices over the next seven years. The publication recognized the deal as “The Best Office Lease/Inner East Bay” in its March 25, 2011 special edition.

BART's Real Estate Department saw the economic downturn as an opportunity to renegotiate the lease with the Swig Company at Kaiser Center in Oakland. The original lease for 300,000 square feet of office space on 14 floors for 700 employees was signed in 2002. It was due to expire in 2014. “We thought it would be a good time for us to review our lease and explore other locations,” Real Estate Department Manager Laura Giraud said. “We looked at other properties throughout the Bay Area, but once we factored in the cost of moving, etc., we negotiated new terms that took advantage of the economic climate to save money in the future.”

The new lease is good through 2021, includes one year free rent and \$4 million dollars credit for previous and future tenant improvements.

“I congratulate BART's Real Estate Department for their proactive approach, which is saving the taxpayers and our riders their hard-earned dollars,” BART Board President Bob Franklin said.

The real estate deal isn't the only way BART has found savings without cutting service or laying off workers: it ended Fiscal Year 10 with a \$4.5 million operating budget surplus. On capital projects, BART's Earthquake Safety Program is performing so well that additional work will be able to be completed within the program's existing budget and the Warm Springs Extension project is \$112 million under budget on the first of its two major contracts. For more information on BART's finances, see www.bart.gov/financials.

10

Molly M. Burke
BART
Government & Community Relations
(510) 464-6172



Please encourage phone company's upgrade
Mark Lehmann to: Ms. Angela Calvillo

File 110114
cpage

03/29/2011 02:30 AM

Ms. Calvillo,

One thing that seems to have fallen by the wayside is companies that actually can and want to invest in California and specifically in San Francisco. When a company comes along and wants to invest, please don't let them slip away. We have a phone network that is ready for a turbo boost. In other places that aren't even nearly as big or on the ball as SF, their phone company can also do cool things like deliver Internet TV through the phone line.

That sounds a lot like where the future is so let's do what San Franciscans do - out with the old and in with the new. I hope I can count on you to encourage, not discourage, a much needed upgrade.

Thank you.

Sincerely, Bobby Lehmann

Bobby Lehmann
25 Scenic Way
San Francisco, CA 94121

11

BOS-11
cpages

RECEIVED
PAUL M. DAVIS BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
ATTORNEY AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO
448 IGNACIO BLVD. #201
NOVATO, CALIFORNIA 94945
2011 MAR 29 PM 3:12
BY AK
TELEPHONE: (415) 884-2555

March 28, 2011



Board of Directors
Golden Gate Bridge District
Post Office Box 9000
San Francisco, California 94129-0601

In re: Incompetent Management

Gentlemen:

On Sunday, March 27, 2011, at 5:00 p.m. , the traffic was backed up from the toll plaza all the way to Mill Valley.

After a thirty minute ride that should not have taken more than five minutes, I finally reached the toll plaza, only to observe that toll booth no. 4 was closed. THIS IS UNBELIEVABLE!!!!!!

It is obscene that your overpaid, over-benefitted, underworked, incompetent fools cannot keep all lanes open during peak periods.

The state should take over the district. That would reduce overall operating costs significantly without any reduction in quality. The state could not possibly do a worse job than the overpaid, over-benefitted, underworked, incompetent fools who now work there.

I look forward to your immediate response.

Very truly yours,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY
PAUL M. DAVIS

- cc: Mark Leno (Senate District 3)
- Marin County Board of Supervisors
- ✓ San Francisco Board of Supervisors

12

File 110206



Stop the demolition of a national eligible masterplanned community.

Herbert Weiner to: board.of.supervisors

04/01/2011 09:19 AM

Please respond to Herbert Weiner

History:

This message has been forwarded.

View: (Mail Threads)

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

Help protect and advocate for adequate working class housing in San Francisco.,

Please help to prevent the unnecessary destruction of housing, and a landscape designed by a master-class landscape architect Thomas Dolliver Church. Help advocate for better infrastructural changes along 19th Avenue and proper direct regional connection to transit hubs to reduce traffic and congestion that flows along this arterial corridor from the north bay to silicon valley. Demand better housing to be built that provides dense development that does not destroy the open-space that is critical in urban areas for families. Require that alternatives that focus on "INFILL" and a more balanced development layout that spreads the density into more than one neighborhood disproportionately. Ensure that the ecological impacts, and carbon footprint of the development proposal is independently reviewed and adequately assessed. Ensure that there will be housing that is affordable and meant to increase the level of affordability and quality of housing constructed in urban areas and suburbs nationwide by stopping the predatory equity lending that occurs in such large scale redevelopment projects and helps refocus our building strategies towards re-engineering the suburban scale of sprawl outside our urban cores.

Thank you for your support and interest in housing, jobs, and the environment.

Sincerely

Aaron Goodman

This is a bad proposal, placing the rest of the city at risk. Demolition of units of Parkmerced wont stop with this projects. It will spread to the rest of the city. Witness the proposal by Sean Elsbernd and Ed Lee to go after units in the Sunset and Richmond. If you must have this proposal, lets demolish the units of the very rich first, and convert these properties to affordable housing after their destruction. The Parkmerced proposal is a part and parcel of the agenda to move middle and lower income people out of the city. This plan is quite funny on the face of its proposal. But it will be tragic if it is implemented.

Herbert Weiner


13



Save Sharks Don't Serve Them



SANTA CLARITA
CALIF 940
MAR 2011 PM



RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2011 MAR 28 PM 3:20

AK

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

More than 100,000,000 sharks are killed every year for their fins.
Currently, we are on a path to kill them all by 2048.
Let's vote to Save Sharks, and ban Shark Fin Soup.

Send this card to your local representative

via UGENA.org/sharks

UGENA
UNITED
GLOBAL
ENVIRONMENTAL
NEWS
AGENCY



14

C-page



No Smoking Compliance at Transit Stops
Doug MacTavish
to:
board.of.supervisors
03/31/2011 02:46 PM
Show Details

Police just drive by eating donuts and ogling women while passengers choke on smoke.

This is adverse, oppressive and badly cheats SF.

(15)

✓ C-pages
BDS-11

Subject: Overturn San Francisco's Discriminatory Sidewalk Sitting Ban
From: Darryl Abrams
To: Board.of.Supervisors
Date: 04/04/2011 10:14 AM

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.

Darryl Abrams
Cleveland, OH

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at www.change.org/petitions/overturn-san-franciscos-discriminatory-sidewalk-sitting-ban. To respond, email responses@change.org and include a link to this petition.

16



Overturn San Francisco's Discriminatory Sidewalk Sitting Ban
Nuno Fernandes to: Board.of.Supervisors
Please respond to Nuno Fernandes

04/04/2011 12:45 AM

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.

Nuno Fernandes
Lisboa, Portugal

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at www.change.org/petitions/overturn-san-franciscos-discriminatory-sidewalk-sitting-ban. To respond, email responses@change.org and include a link to this petition.

Subject: Overturn San Francisco's Discriminatory Sidewalk Sitting Ban

From: Adam Christians

To: Board.of.Supervisors

Date: 04/03/2011 10:29 AM

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.

Adam Christians
Cedar Rapids, IA

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at www.change.org/petitions/overturn-san-franciscos-discriminatory-sidewalk-sitting-ban. To respond, email responses@change.org and include a link to this petition.

brightline

DEFENSE PROJECT

1028A Howard Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
P 415.252.9700
F 415.252.9775
www.brightlinedefense.org

March 31, 2011

Mark Pincus, CEO
Zynga Inc.
365 Vermont Street
San Francisco, CA 94107

Dear Mr. Pincus,

Brightline Defense Project is a San Francisco-based community advocacy organization that works to promote sustainability and opportunity in otherwise vulnerable and disadvantaged neighborhoods. We most recently worked on the new local hiring law sponsored by Supervisor John Avalos that guarantees blue-collar and green-collar jobs for local residents on city-funded public works projects.

This week, Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi introduced legislation that proposes a two-year moratorium on the portion of San Francisco's payroll tax attributable to stock compensation, and Supervisors David Chiu, Mark Farrell, and Jane Kim have indicated their desire to address the stock option issue as well. While there is no consensus as to the effectiveness of a blanket payroll tax exemption, particularly in light of the City's budget crisis, policy makers have identified that San Francisco's unique tax on employees' sale of stock compensation has in the past driven away technology companies that were incubated locally only to leave town on the verge of a public stock offering.


It has been suggested that the stock option tax impacts Zynga's long-term prospects in San Francisco. But we also know that Zynga has committed itself to social causes and positive change globally, making us feel compelled to ask the following question:

What do you think about hiring San Francisco residents?

That is to say, if the City grants a temporary moratorium on taxing stock options, would Zynga agree to hire San Francisco workers and, in the case of entry-level positions, would you give participants in the City's workforce development system from local disadvantaged communities a chance to show you what they can do? Much of the local hiring discussion to date has been about percentages, so we also have to ask—would you be willing commit to 100% local hiring?

Local hiring is supported by Mayor Edwin Lee and nearly every San Francisco Supervisor. We look forward to the opportunity to sit down to hear your thoughts on these ideas and to possibly help the City shape its approach to local hiring in the non-construction sector.

Very truly yours,



Joshua Arce
Executive Director

CC: Mayor Edwin Lee, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 page



stock option tax and local hiring

Joshua Arce

to:

mark@zynga.com

03/31/2011 12:45 PM

Cc:

"Mayor Edwin Lee (mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org)", "Sup. Eric Mar (Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org)", "Sup. Mark Farrell (Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org)", "Sup. David Chiu (David.Chiu@sfgov.org)", "Sup. Carmen Chu (Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org)", "Sup. Ross Mirkarimi (Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org)", "Sup. Jane Kim (Jane.Kim@sfgov.org)", "Sup. Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org", "Sup. Scott Wiener (Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org)", "Sup. David Campos (David.Campos@sfgov.org)", "Sup. Malia Cohen (Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org)", "Sup. John Avalos (John.Avalos@sfgov.org)", "board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org"

Show Details

1 Attachment



brightline local hiring letter to zynga.pdf

March 31, 2011

Mark Pincus, CEO
Zynga Inc.
365 Vermont Street
San Francisco, CA 94107

Dear Mr. Pincus,

Brightline Defense Project is a San Francisco-based community advocacy organization that works to promote sustainability and opportunity in otherwise vulnerable and disadvantaged neighborhoods. We most recently worked on the new local hiring law sponsored by Supervisor John Avalos that guarantees blue-collar and green-collar jobs for local residents on city-funded public works projects.

This week, Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi introduced legislation that proposes a two-year moratorium on the portion of San Francisco's payroll tax attributable to stock compensation, and Supervisors David Chiu, Mark Farrell, and Jane Kim have indicated their desire to address the stock option issue as well. While there is no consensus as to the effectiveness of a blanket payroll tax exemption, particularly in light of the City's budget crisis, policy makers have identified that San Francisco's unique tax on employees' sale of stock compensation has in the past driven away technology companies that were incubated locally only to leave town on the verge of a public stock offering.

It has been suggested that the stock option tax impacts Zynga's long-term prospects in San Francisco. But we also know that Zynga has committed itself to social causes and positive change globally, making us feel compelled to ask the following question:

What do you think about hiring San Francisco residents?

That is to say, if the City grants a temporary moratorium on taxing stock options, would Zynga agree to hire San

Francisco workers and, in the case of entry-level positions, would you give participants in the City's workforce development system from local disadvantaged communities a chance to show you what they can do? Much of the local hiring discussion to date has been about percentages, so we also have to ask—would you be willing commit to 100% local hiring?


Local hiring is supported by Mayor Edwin Lee and nearly every San Francisco Supervisor. We look forward to the opportunity to sit down to hear your thoughts on these ideas and to possibly help the City shape its approach to local hiring in the non-construction sector.

Very truly yours,

Joshua Arce
Executive Director

CC: Mayor Edwin Lee, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

✓ c-page
Bos-11



Oppose Appeal Of 501 Greenwich project
Awadalla Awadalla
to:
Carmen Chu
04/03/2011 03:42 PM
Cc:
David.Chiu, board.of.supervisors
Show Details

110307

1 Attachment



appeal of 501 Greenwich project.pdf

Hello Supervisor Carmen Chu,

Attached to this E-mail is a letter from the OSMPA, opposing the appeal of 501 Greenwich project, and the support of T-Mobile antenna in this location and in the future locations in the sunset.

Thanks

Awadalla
President OSMPA

18



April 3, 2011

To whom it may concern,

The Outer Sunset Merchant and Professional Association (OSMPA), voted to reject the appeal of 501 Greenwich project (Also Known as 1653 Grant). We believe that is unnecessary to re require an Environmental Impact Report.

We Support the proposed T-Mobile Antenna in the above location, and the commission's decision made on February 17th. We believe that the more cellular coverage, the better for merchants and business in general.

Please reject the appeal.

Sincerely,

Awadalla M. Awadalla

President (OSMPA)

Cell: 415-720-5680

Fax: 415-276-9887

awadalla@sbcglobal.net

BOS-11
C-page



1653 Grant Ave.
Wilfred James


to:
David Chiu, Board.of.supervisors
04/04/2011 11:39 AM
Show Details

#110307

From: SFSPier33@aol.com
Date: April 3, 2011 8:10:53 PM PDT
To: Wilfred James
Subject: 1653 Grant Ave.

I support the denial of the appeal, and ask to uphold the 5-2 vote by the planning commission. I cannot find any negative environmental impact. The improvement of service is needed.

Wm. T. Dawson
1846 Grant Ave.
San Francisco, Ca. 94133



1653 grant avenue
Wilfred James
to:
David Chiu, Board.of.supervisors
04/04/2011 11:38 AM
Show Details

110307

Begin forwarded message:

From: FL Fox <flfent1@gmail.com>
Date: April 3, 2011 10:55:44 PM PDT
To: Wilfred James>
Subject: 1653 grant avenue

as a condo owner-resident of north beach since 1988, dear board of supervisors: please deny THD's appeal regarding 1653 grant avenue, and uphold the planning commission's 5-2 vote thank you

F.L.Fox



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Joy Lamug/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Fw: Oppose Appeal of 1653 Grant Avenue T-Mobile antennas

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 04/05/2011 12:34 PM -----

From: ABD SIX <sf_district6@yahoo.com>
To: BoardofSupervisors <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Alliance For A Better District 6 <sf_district6@yahoo.com>
Date: 03/31/2011 12:18 PM
Subject: Oppose Appeal of 1653 Grant Avenue T-Mobile antennas

Dear Board of Supervisors:

Please refer to attached letter.

If there are any question please contact the Alliance for a Better District 6 at the below contact information.

Michael Nulty

Executive Director

ALLIANCE FOR A BETTER DISTRICT 6
P.O. Box 420782; San Francisco, CA 94142-0782
(415) 820-1560 Voice / (415) 820-1565 Fax
<http://allianceforabetterdistrict6.blogspot.com/>
<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/District6inSF>
<http://womenoftheyear.cfsites.org/>

To incorporate the interests of District 6's low income households onto San Francisco public, social and land use policy.

<http://www.linkedin.com/in/michaelnulty>
<http://www.facebook.com/michael.nulty>
<http://twitter.com/sfdistrict6>

<http://sfdistrict6.slide.com>



3-30-10_1653GrantAntenna.doc

**Alliance for a
Better District 6**

SF Board of Supervisors
City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

March 30, 2010

Re: Oppose Appeal of 1653 Grant Avenue T-Mobile antennas

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

The Alliance for a Better District 6 is writing in opposition to the appeal of the Environmental Impact Report of the 1653 Grant Avenue project proposing to add a T-Mobile micro wireless telecommunications service facility consisting of an Omni antenna shrouded inside a faux vent pipe structure and equipment cabinets.

T-Mobile has a plan to improve leading edge mobile phone and data coverage for the North Beach and Telegraph Hill neighborhoods. The small microcell wireless antenna are proposed for a rooftop on 1653 Grant Avenue (Also known as 501 Greenwich) to improve wireless infrastructure to meet customer needs and improve coverage.

The Alliance for a Better District 6 believes it is just unreasonable to require an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) of a tiny antenna that is just 30 inches tall and enclosed in a rooftop vent just five (5) feet in height and obscured from view by casual observers.

We thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Dean Clark
Board President

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2011 APR -4 PM 3:58

BY bc

verizonwireless

1120 Sanctuary Pkwy
Suite 150
MC: GASA5REG
Alpharetta, GA 30009
(770) 797-1070

March 28, 2011

Ms. Anna Hom
Consumer Protection and Safety Division
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
alh@cpuc.ca.gov

Re: Notification Letter for **Pier 29** GTE Mobilnet of California Limited Partnership (U-3002-C), of San Francisco-Oakland, CA MSA

This is to provide the Commission with notice according to the provisions of General Order No. 159.A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California ("CPUC") for the project described in Attachment A.

A copy of this notification letter is also being provided to the appropriate local government agency for its information. Should there be any questions regarding this project, or if you disagree with any of the information contained herein, please contact Chrissy Agricola of Verizon Wireless at (770) 797-1049.

Very truly yours,



Chrissy Agricola
Verizon Wireless
MTS Network Compliance

Attachment A

CPUC CELL SITE REPORT GTE Mobilnet of California Limited Partnership (U-3002-C)

PROJECT LOCATION: Pier 29 - I/B

SITE NAME: Pier 29
SITE ADDRESS: 1950 Kearny Street
LOCATION: San Francisco, CA 94133
COUNTY: San Francisco
APN: 0037-004
COORDINATES: 37° 55' 03.73"/122° 20' 30.89" (NAD83)

1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

GTE Mobilnet of California Limited Partnership (U-3002-C) proposes the construction, installation, and maintenance of a new unmanned wireless telecommunications facility consisting of four (4) new panel antennas and two (2) new GPS antennas mounted inside a faux chimney on an existing parking deck. In addition associated radio equipment cabinet will be mounted on an existing concrete floor at ground level.

ANTENNAS: Four (4) panel antennas
Two (2) GPS antennas
TOWER DESIGN: N/A
TOWER APPEARANCE: N/A
TOWER HEIGHT: N/A
BUILDING SIZE: Five story parking garage
OTHER: Associated radio equipment

Notification Letter
GTE Mobilnet of California Limited Partnership (U-3002-C)
March 28, 2011
Page 3

3. BUSINESS ADDRESSES OF ALL LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES:

Cc: John Rahaim
Planning Director
City of San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103-2479

Amy L. Brown
City Administrator
City of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103-2479

Office of the County Clerk
City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 168
San Francisco, CA 94102-4678

LAND USE APPROVALS:

Type: Administrative Review through BP process
Issued: 3/2/11
Effective: 3/2/11
Agency: San Francisco Planning Department
Permit No.: 2011-02220694
Resolution No.: N/A

C-page



Radiative Readings

Francisco Da Costa

to:

Francisco Da Costa

04/01/2011 09:41 AM

Cc:

Ed Harrington, Edwin Lee, Harlan Kelly, Karen Kubick, Tommy Moala, Scott Hanks, Jae Ryu, Michael Hennessey, Michael Housh, David Chiu, Ross Mirkarimi, Eric Mar, Carmen Chu, Angela Calvillo, SFBOS BOS, Ben Rosenfield, Dennis Herrera, Matt Dorsey, "Jue, Tyrone", Sean.Elsbernd, John Rizzo, John Avalos, "\"David Campos\"", Rajiv Bhatia, Jared Blumenfeld, Dana Barton, Clancy Tenley, Karen Henry, "Michael J. Lythcott", Wilma Subra, Jaron Browne, Espanola Jackson, Nyese Nyese, Greg Suhr

Show Details

Check this out:

Radio Active about 18,000 above normal readings:

<http://enews.com/radioactive-iodine-131-in-rainwater-sample-near-san-francisco-is-18100-above-federal-drinking-water-standard>

Francisco Da Costa

20

C-page



The Rules Committee and the corrupt Ethics Commission.
Francisco Da Costa
to:
Francisco Da Costa
04/03/2011 05:59 PM
Show Details

The biased Rules Committee and the corrupt Ethics Commission:

<http://www.indybay.org/newsitems/2011/04/03/18676228.php>

Francisco Da Costa

21



Educate. Empower.

File 110114
BOS-11
Alisa Cpage

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 MAR 30 PM 3:09

Executive Director
Tim Paulson

President
Mike Casey
Unite Here 2

Secretary Treasurer
Olga Miranda
SEIU 87

VP for Political Activities
Conny Ford
OPEIU 3

VP for Affiliate Support
Larry Mazzola, Sr.
Plumbers 38

VP for Community Activities
Howard Wallace
Pride at Work

Executive Committee
Alan Benjamin
OPEIU 3

Rafael Cabrera
TVU 250-A

Vince Courtney
Laborers 261

F.X. Crowley
IATSE 16

Gus Goldstein
AFT 2121

Art Gonzalez
IAM 1414

Michael Hardeman
Sign & Display 510

Dennis Kelly
United Educators of SF

Gunnar Lundberg
Sailors Union of the Pacific

Rosa Faye Marshall
CLUW

Frank Martin del Campo
LCLAA

Larry Mazzola, Jr.
Plumbers 38

Robert Morales
Teamsters 350

Bob Muscat
IFPTE 21

Ken Oku
Operating Engineers 3

John O'Rourke
IBEW 6

Fred Pecker
ILWU 6

Eileen Prendiville
California Nurses Association

Michael Sharpe
UFCW 648

Michael Theriault
SF Building Trades Council

John Ulrich
UFCW 101

James Wright
SEIU 1877

Sergeant at Arms
Hene Kelly
United Educators of SF

Trustees
Ron Lewis, IBEW 6
David Williams, SEIU 1021
Claire Zvanski, IFPTE 21

Secretary Treasurer Emeritus
Walter L. Johnson

March 28, 2011

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I'm currently being informed by IBEW Local 1269 about the job loss for union members that would occur if the legislation requiring San Franciscans to "opt in" to receive the Yellow Pages is passed in its current form.

In these times the biggest issues for American and San Francisco workers is "JOBS" and to sacrifice good union jobs to facilitate other policy goals is the wrong way to proceed.

The San Francisco Labor Council opposes the current legislation.

Acknowledging that I was out of the country when this issue was raised, I am also informed that IBEW 1269 is willing to work with President Chiu, the Board and others on the current practice of Yellow Page distribution.

In addition I am pleased that if this legislation passes that any implementation will be delayed so that the IBEW can work with the city to address the above issues in a way that ensures no loss of jobs.

Sincerely,

Tim Paulson
Executive Director

cc: Peter Pusateri, IBEW 1269
Mike Mowrey, IBEW Int'l, 9th District
Art Pulaski, California Federation of Labor

opeiu3afl-cio(11)



22

File 110114



Not everyone has a computer and Internet!
yvonne alvarez to: Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo

04/01/2011 10:30 AM

Clerk of the Board Calvillo,

Small businesses make up most of the jobs in San Francisco. So why would the Board want to take away the one of th most popular ways for a small business to advertise?. It works and it's how poverty level people in San Franciscans find information.

Seriously, don't they have enough roadblocks standing in their way?

Sincerely,

yvonne alvarez
15334 Knollview Pl
Fontana, CA 92336

File 110114



Not everyone has a computer and Internet!
paul sherman to: Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo

03/31/2011 12:42 PM

Clerk of the Board Calvillo,

Small businesses make up most of the jobs in San Francisco. So why would the Board want to take away the one of th most popular ways for a small business to advertise?. It works and it's how poverty level people in San Franciscans find information.

Seriously, don't they have enough roadblocks standing in their way?

Sincerely,

paul sherman
300 esplanade ave
Oxnard, CA 93036



Please pause before you vote
Lauren Barnes to: Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo

File 110114

03/31/2011 04:35 PM

Clerk of the Board Calvillo,

If you are considering restricting the yellow pages, then I urge you to pause and read this message. As your constituent, I must point out that thousands of San Francisco small businesses rely on their Yellow Pages advertising to attract business and generate sales from local consumers. It is the most local form of advertising. If you need evidence of its usefulness flip through your own Yellow Pages and see how many businesses are using it to attract customers. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors has no business cutting people off from the type of information, goods, services, businesses and community information found in the directories. Please refocus your efforts on trying to help your constituents, not impede them.

Sincerely,

Lauren Barnes
3609 Farquhar Ave
Los Alamitos, CA 90720



Please pause before you vote
Denise sherman to: Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo

File 110114

04/01/2011 10:23 AM

Clerk of the Board Calvillo,

If you are considering restricting the yellow pages, then I urge you to pause and read this message. As your constituent, I must point out that thousands of San Francisco small businesses rely on their Yellow Pages advertising to attract business and generate sales from local consumers. It is the most local form of advertising. If you need evidence of its usefulness flip through your own Yellow Pages and see how many businesses are using it to attract customers. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors has no business cutting people off from the type of information, goods, services, businesses and community information found in the directories. Please refocus your efforts on trying to help your constituents, not impede them.

Sincerely,

Denise Sherman
796 Sterling Hills Dr
Camarillo, CA 93010



Chinese/Spanish/LGBT without their directories?
Kevin Myrick to: Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo

04/01/2011 10:04 AM

File 110114

Clerk of the Board Calvillo,

Is it true that you're considering a vote to restrict the yellow pages? Isn't that illegal or something? Of course that probably wouldn't stop the supervisors. Please just know that I think that is not a good idea.

San Francisco is already known as a place that is unfriendly to and hard to do business. The Board has put all kinds of regulations on small businesses, and taking away a popular marketing and advertising tool just reinforces the city's reputation as being business UN-friendly. Even if you're not worried about that, I would think you'd take significant pause before cutting off old people and people who use the Chinese and Spanish directories. I can't imagine that this is a risk you want to have on your watch.

Sincerely,

Kevin Myrick
27155 Sapphire St
Menifee, CA 92584



Chinese/Spanish/LGBT without their directories?
Charles McKeen to: Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo

File 110114

04/01/2011 10:19 AM

Clerk of the Board Calvillo,

Is it true that you're considering a vote to restrict the yellow pages? Isn't that illegal or something? Of course that probably wouldn't stop the supervisors. Please just know that I think that is not a good idea.

San Francisco is already known as a place that is unfriendly to and hard to do business. The Board has put all kinds of regulations on small businesses, and taking away a popular marketing and advertising tool just reinforces the city's reputation as being business UN-friendly. Even if you're not worried about that, I would think you'd take significant pause before cutting off old people and people who use the Chinese and Spanish directories. I can't imagine that this is a risk you want to have on your watch.

Sincerely,

Charles McKeen
341 Beta Ct
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420



Why make it worse for businesses to find customers?
Rochelle Ameti to: Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo

File 110114

03/31/2011 04:07 PM

Clerk of the Board Calvillo,

Do you really think that every single San Francisco small business does online advertising? I'm sure there are hundreds that don't even have a website. Cutting off the phone book will eliminate one of the most popular forms of advertising for small businesses ever. You're going to do more damage than you are good if you eliminate the Yellow Pages, and that is not what San Francisco small businesses need in a slow growth economy. Please vote against restricting phone directories.

Not a good idea.

Sincerely,

Rochelle Ameti
7910 E Cramer St
Long Beach, CA 90808



People DO use the yellow pages!
Rosario Arzate, C to: Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo

File 110114

04/01/2011 09:25 AM

Clerk of the Board Calvillo,

It would be one thing to eliminate the phone book if nobody used it. But why do you think the Yellow Pages are so thick? Because it works and businesses know it. Especially small business. Old people love it. And guess what, so do younger people. Because you don't have to wait for a signal and you don't have to read it on a tiny screen of your cell phone and you don't have to eat your data bucket of minutes - so just let the phone directories keep coming. They get used. Thanks.

Sincerely,

Rose Arzate
5642 Oakhill Ct
Orcutt, CA 93455



Help make SF a better place to do business
Mike Gutierrez to: Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo

File 110114

04/01/2011 09:48 AM

Clerk of the Board Calvillo,

Please stop before you unintentionally make SF an even more difficult place to do business than it already is. This is regarding restricting yellow pages. As your constituent, I'm saying to you, "just don't."

Many businesses don't have Twitter accounts, web sites and Facebook pages. But virtually all of them have a Yellow Pages listing. The digital divide isn't closed yet: there are still people who don't have Internet access. Plus, if you're like me, it is oftentimes easier, quicker and less hassle to just grab the directory, flip the pages and find what you need vs. powering up the computer, hoping you have a connection that isn't too slow, etc. Please try to be a part of the solution to get us all through the economic recession, vs. adding to it. Thank you.

Sincerely,

mike gutierrez
1388 Burdock St
Beaumont, CA 92223



What do you do when you can't Google it?
Bernadette Mungcal to: Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo

File 110114

04/01/2011 10:16 AM

Clerk of the Board Calvillo,

Not everyone has a computer and not everyone has Internet. So what do people do if they can't "Google" something? They let their fingers do the walking. Do not take the Yellow Pages away from those who have no options...unless you've got a plan for getting Internet, computers and smartphones to everyone who doesn't have one. Don't make it hard to get the yellow pages that make no sense. Thanks.

Sincerely,

Bernadette Mungcal
15821 Ventura Blvd Ste 170
Encino, CA 91436



As a voter I oppose banning the yellow Pages.
Yvonne Appel to: Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo

File 110114

04/01/2011 11:03 AM

Clerk of the Board Calvillo,

Anything that makes it harder for small businesses to do business in San Francisco is a bad idea. Before you make a drastic decision to mess around with a popular and successful form of advertising, you should do some research and see how many small businesses in the City advertise in the Yellow Pages and compare that to how many of those also have websites or do any kind of online advertising. I think you'll be surprised to learn how many small businesses you'd be cutting off.

This would affect the Chinese directories, Spanish and gay/lesbian directories. Why in the world would you want to do that? Bad idea, move on please.

Thanks.

Sincerely,

Yvonne Appel
681 E Maple St
Oxnard, CA 93033

File 110114



Please help small business not hurt them
Rick Mercer to: Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo

04/01/2011 11:08 AM

Clerk of the Board Calvillo,

I urge you and your fellow Supervisors to help the City's small businesses. For businesses the yellow pages directory is a good place to advertise and for residents it's a good place to look for the business or service we need. Besides I know those directories are recycled and recyclable. The economy is so bad, please - let's not put more people out of work.

Thanks.

Sincerely,

Rick Mercer
16291 Countess Dr Unit 303
Huntington Beach, CA 92649

File 110114



A note from your constituent
Kay McCutcheon to: Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo

03/29/2011 10:51 AM

Clerk of the Board Calvillo,

As a voter, I see no need for you to try to restrict phone directories. I checked and right on the cover you can tell them if you don't want one. That's smart, it isn't hidden and hard to find. It works. Please move on and work to help the economy - that's all any of us care about, having a job, making ends meet and decent schools for our kids.

Here's how you opt out of the phone book if people need to know. There's a website for it (<http://www.yellowpagesoptout.com>).

Sincerely,

Kay McCutcheon
8215 Pawtucket Dr
Huntington Beach, CA 92646



Cracking down on phone directories makes no sense
Patrick King to: Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo

03/29/2011 08:47 AM

File 110114

Clerk of the Board Calvillo,

Regarding this issue of trying to make it harder to get a copy of the Yellow Pages in SF, I feel compelled to ask, "what for?" They are recyclable and made of like the most recycled paper there is out there. So if you're trying to hurt the city's poor and neglected and leave them stranded with no way to hunt for the stuff they need, then go forward. But as your constituent, it is important to me that you know, I do not approve. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Patrick King
18201 Cherry St
Hesperia, CA 92345

C-pages
Bos-11



I Support a Ban on Unwanted Yellow Pages
Dick Lee to: Board.of.Supervisors
Please respond to Dick Lee

04/03/2011 08:24 PM

History: This message has been forwarded.

Greetings,

#110114

I recently heard of Supervisor David Chiu's proposal to ban the delivery of unwanted Yellow Pages. I applaud him for introducing it, and I'm writing to voice my support for this landmark nation.

A vast and growing majority of Americans now get their information online, via high-speed Internet connections. In this context, the automatic delivery of phone books on doorsteps every single year represents an enormous waste.

Cities can reduce their carbon footprint and save trees by ending needless phone book printing. Residents can stop feeling aggravated by receiving piles of phone books they do not want and did not ask for. And all taxpayers benefit from the money the city will save on recycling costs.

Yellow Page distributors have a history of opposing local efforts to limit their distribution abilities. That's why I am writing early to demonstrate my support for this measure. It also will set a great example for cities around the nation to take similar steps.

Thank you for your time,

Dick Lee
Grand Rapids, MI

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at www.change.org/petitions/end-waste-support-a-landmark-ban-on-unwanted-phone-books. To respond, email responses@change.org and include a link to this petition.

23



I Support a Ban on Unwanted Yellow Pages
Katy Saunders to: Board.of.Supervisors
Please respond to Katy Saunders

04/03/2011 04:29 AM

History:

This message has been forwarded.

Greetings,

I recently heard of Supervisor David Chiu's proposal to ban the delivery of unwanted Yellow Pages. I applaud him for introducing it, and I'm writing to voice my support for this landmark nation.

A vast and growing majority of Americans now get their information online, via high-speed Internet connections. In this context, the automatic delivery of phone books on doorsteps every single year represents an enormous waste.

Cities can reduce their carbon footprint and save trees by ending needless phone book printing. Residents can stop feeling aggravated by receiving piles of phone books they do not want and did not ask for. And all taxpayers benefit from the money the city will save on recycling costs.

Yellow Page distributors have a history of opposing local efforts to limit their distribution abilities. That's why I am writing early to demonstrate my support for this measure. It also will set a great example for cities around the nation to take similar steps.

Thank you for your time,

Katy Saunders
Denver, CO

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at www.change.org/petitions/end-waste-support-a-landmark-ban-on-unwanted-phone-books. To

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



I Support a Ban on Unwanted Yellow Pages
Kim O'Connor to: Board.of.Supervisors
Please respond to Kim O'Connor

04/02/2011 11:04 PM

History: This message has been forwarded.

Greetings,

I recently heard of Supervisor David Chiu's proposal to ban the delivery of unwanted Yellow Pages. I applaud him for introducing it, and I'm writing to voice my support for this landmark nation.

A vast and growing majority of Americans now get their information online, via high-speed Internet connections. In this context, the automatic delivery of phone books on doorsteps every single year represents an enormous waste.

Cities can reduce their carbon footprint and save trees by ending needless phone book printing. Residents can stop feeling aggravated by receiving piles of phone books they do not want and did not ask for. And all taxpayers benefit from the money the city will save on recycling costs.

Yellow Page distributors have a history of opposing local efforts to limit their distribution abilities. That's why I am writing early to demonstrate my support for this measure. It also will set a great example for cities around the nation to take similar steps.

Thank you for your time,

Kim O'Connor
N. Saanich, Canada

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at www.change.org/petitions/end-waste-support-a-landmark-ban-on-unwanted-phone-books. To respond, email responses@change.org and include a link to this petition.



I Support a Ban on Unwanted Yellow Pages

max quijano to: Board.of.Supervisors
Please respond to max quijano

04/01/2011 10:24 PM

History:

This message has been forwarded.

Greetings,

I recently heard of Supervisor David Chiu's proposal to ban the delivery of unwanted Yellow Pages. I applaud him for introducing it, and I'm writing to voice my support for this landmark nation.

A vast and growing majority of Americans now get their information online, via high-speed Internet connections. In this context, the automatic delivery of phone books on doorsteps every single year represents an enormous waste.

Cities can reduce their carbon footprint and save trees by ending needless phone book printing. Residents can stop feeling aggravated by receiving piles of phone books they do not want and did not ask for. And all taxpayers benefit from the money the city will save on recycling costs.

Yellow Page distributors have a history of opposing local efforts to limit their distribution abilities. That's why I am writing early to demonstrate my support for this measure. It also will set a great example for cities around the nation to take similar steps.

Thank you for your time,

max quijano
toronto, Canada

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at www.change.org/petitions/end-waste-support-a-landmark-ban-on-unwanted-phone-books. To

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



I Support a Ban on Unwanted Yellow Pages
Melanie Lortie to: Board.of.Supervisors
Please respond to Melanie Lortie

04/01/2011 08:04 PM

History:

This message has been forwarded.

Greetings,

I recently heard of Supervisor David Chiu's proposal to ban the delivery of unwanted Yellow Pages. I applaud him for introducing it, and I'm writing to voice my support for this landmark nation.

A vast and growing majority of Americans now get their information online, via high-speed Internet connections. In this context, the automatic delivery of phone books on doorsteps every single year represents an enormous waste.

Cities can reduce their carbon footprint and save trees by ending needless phone book printing. Residents can stop feeling aggravated by receiving piles of phone books they do not want and did not ask for. And all taxpayers benefit from the money the city will save on recycling costs.

Yellow Page distributors have a history of opposing local efforts to limit their distribution abilities. That's why I am writing early to demonstrate my support for this measure. It also will set a great example for cities around the nation to take similar steps.

Thank you for your time,

Melanie Lortie
NY, NY

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at www.change.org/petitions/end-waste-support-a-landmark-ban-on-unwanted-phone-books. To respond, email responses@change.org and include a link to this petition.



I Support a Ban on Unwanted Yellow Pages

Danielle Tran to: Board.of.Supervisors
Please respond to Danielle Tran

04/01/2011 08:45 AM

History:

This message has been forwarded.

Greetings,

I recently heard of Supervisor David Chiu's proposal to ban the delivery of unwanted Yellow Pages. I applaud him for introducing it, and I'm writing to voice my support for this landmark nation.

A vast and growing majority of Americans now get their information online, via high-speed Internet connections. In this context, the automatic delivery of phone books on doorsteps every single year represents an enormous waste.

Cities can reduce their carbon footprint and save trees by ending needless phone book printing. Residents can stop feeling aggravated by receiving piles of phone books they do not want and did not ask for. And all taxpayers benefit from the money the city will save on recycling costs.

Yellow Page distributors have a history of opposing local efforts to limit their distribution abilities. That's why I am writing early to demonstrate my support for this measure. It also will set a great example for cities around the nation to take similar steps.

Thank you for your time,

Danielle Tran
Calgary, CA

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at www.change.org/petitions/end-waste-support-a-landmark-ban-on-unwanted-phone-books. To respond, email responses@change.org and include a link to this petition.



I Support a Ban on Unwanted Yellow Pages

Ella Reeves to: Board.of.Supervisors
Please respond to Ella Reeves

04/01/2011 08:34 AM

History: This message has been forwarded.

Greetings,

I recently heard of Supervisor David Chiu's proposal to ban the delivery of unwanted Yellow Pages. I applaud him for introducing it, and I'm writing to voice my support for this landmark nation.

A vast and growing majority of Americans now get their information online, via high-speed Internet connections. In this context, the automatic delivery of phone books on doorsteps every single year represents an enormous waste.

Cities can reduce their carbon footprint and save trees by ending needless phone book printing. Residents can stop feeling aggravated by receiving piles of phone books they do not want and did not ask for. And all taxpayers benefit from the money the city will save on recycling costs.

Yellow Page distributors have a history of opposing local efforts to limit their distribution abilities. That's why I am writing early to demonstrate my support for this measure. It also will set a great example for cities around the nation to take similar steps.

Thank you for your time,

Ella Reeves
Vancouver, CA

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at www.change.org/petitions/end-waste-support-a-landmark-ban-on-unwanted-phone-books. To respond, email responses@change.org and include a link to this petition.



To: Alisa Somera/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110114 2 emails

File 110114

From: "Sioux D." <mail@change.org>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 03/30/2011 03:29 AM
Subject: I Support a Ban on Unwanted Yellow Pages

Greetings,

I recently heard of Supervisor David Chiu's proposal to ban the delivery of unwanted Yellow Pages. I applaud him for introducing it, and I'm writing to voice my support for this landmark nation.

A vast and growing majority of Americans now get their information online, via high-speed Internet connections. In this context, the automatic delivery of phone books on doorsteps every single year represents an enormous waste.

Cities can reduce their carbon footprint and save trees by ending needless phone book printing. Residents can stop feeling aggravated by receiving piles of phone books they do not want and did not ask for. And all taxpayers benefit from the money the city will save on recycling costs.

Yellow Page distributors have a history of opposing local efforts to limit their distribution abilities. That's why I am writing early to demonstrate my support for this measure. It also will set a great example for cities around the nation to take similar steps.

Thank you for your time,

Sioux D.
Adelaide, Australia

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at www.change.org/petitions/end-waste-support-a-landmark-ban-on-unwanted-phone-books. To

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

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 03/30/2011 01:53 PM -----

From: lyn elsworth <mail@change.org>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 03/30/2011 12:35 PM
Subject: I Support a Ban on Unwanted Yellow Pages

Greetings,

I recently heard of Supervisor David Chiu's proposal to ban the delivery of unwanted Yellow Pages. I applaud him for introducing it, and I'm writing to voice my support for this landmark nation.

A vast and growing majority of Americans now get their information online, via high-speed Internet connections. In this context, the automatic delivery of phone books on doorsteps every single year represents an enormous waste.

Cities can reduce their carbon footprint and save trees by ending needless phone book printing. Residents can stop feeling aggravated by receiving piles of phone books they do not want and did not ask for. And all taxpayers benefit from the money the city will save on recycling costs.

Yellow Page distributors have a history of opposing local efforts to limit their distribution abilities. That's why I am writing early to demonstrate my support for this measure. It also will set a great example for cities around the nation to take similar steps.

Thank you for your time,

lyn elsworth
cresaptown, MD

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at www.change.org/petitions/end-waste-support-a-landmark-ban-on-unwanted-phone-books. To respond, email responses@change.org and include a link to this petition.

**OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

P.O. BOX 942896
SACRAMENTO, CA 94296-0001
(916) 445-7000 Fax: (916) 445-7053
calshpo@parks.ca.gov



April 1, 2011

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

RE: South San Francisco Opera House Listing on the
National Register of Historic Places

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 APR -4 PM 3:06
BY _____
AK

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I am pleased to notify you that on March 21, 2011, the above-named property was placed on the National Register of Historic Places (National Register). As a result of being placed on the National Register, this property has also been listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, pursuant to Section 4851(a)(2) of the Public Resources Code.

Placement on the National Register affords a property the honor of inclusion in the nation's official list of cultural resources worthy of preservation and provides a degree of protection from adverse effects resulting from federally funded or licensed projects. Registration provides a number of incentives for preservation of historic properties, including special building codes to facilitate the restoration of historic structures, and certain tax advantages.

There are no restrictions placed upon a private property owner with regard to normal use, maintenance, or sale of a property listed in the National Register. However, a project that may cause substantial adverse changes in the significance of a registered property may require compliance with local ordinances or the California Environmental Quality Act. In addition, registered properties damaged due to a natural disaster may be subject to the provisions of Section 5028 of the Public Resources Code regarding demolition or significant alterations, if imminent threat to life safety does not exist.

If you have any questions or require further information, please contact the Registration Unit at (916) 445-7008.

Sincerely,


Milford Wayne Donaldson, FAIA
State Historic Preservation Officer

Enclosure: National Register Notification of Listing

24

April 1, 2011

The Director of the National Park Service is pleased to send you the following announcements and actions on properties for the National Register of Historic Places. For further information contact Edson Beall via voice (202) 354-2255, or E-mail: <Edson_Beall@nps.gov> This and past Weekly Lists are also available here: <http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/nrlist.htm>

Our physical location address is:

National Park Service 2280, 8th floor
National Register of Historic Places
1201 "I" (Eye) Street, NW,
Washington D.C. 20005

WEEKLY LIST OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON PROPERTIES: 3/21/11 THROUGH
3/25/11

KEY: State, County, Property Name, Address/Boundary, City, Vicinity, Reference
Number, NHL, Action, Date, Multiple Name

CALIFORNIA, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY,
Pacific Electric Etiwanda Depot,
7092 Etiwanda Ave,
Rancho Cucamonga, 11000119,
LISTED, 3/21/11

CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY,
South San Francisco Opera House,
4701-4705 Third St and 1601 Newcomb Ave, San Francisco, 11000117, LISTED,
3/21/11

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

Date: April 1, 2011

Page 1

To: Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors

From: *AC* Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Subject: Form 700

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

Robert Selna – Assuming
Supervisor John Avalos – Annual
Supervisor David Campos – Annual
Supervisor David Chiu – Annual
Supervisor Sean Elsbernd – Annual
Supervisor Eric L. Mar – Annual
Supervisor Carmen Chu – Annual
Camelin Blackstone – Annual
Victor Lim – Annual
Vallie Brown – Annual
Arthur Louie – Annual
Debra Newman – Annual
Dawn Duran – Annual
Sheila Chung-Hagen – Annual
Rick Galbreath – Annual
Les Hilger – Annual
Jon Lau – Annual
Catherine Rauschuber – Annual
Raquel Redondiez – Annual
Judson True – Annual
Leah Pimental – LAFCo – Annual
Jason Fried – LAFCo – Annual
John Dalessi – LAFCo – Annual
Jill Jay – Leaving

25

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

Date: April 1, 2011

Page 2

To: Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors

From: ~~AK~~ Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Subject: Form 700

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

Mervin Conlan – AAB – Assuming
Gregory Blaine – AAB – Annual
Donna Crowder – AAB – Annual
Lawrence Lee – AAB – Annual
Richard Lee – AAB – Annual
John McGary – AAB - Annual
Louisa Mendoza – AAB – Annual
Jeffrey Morris – AAB – Annual
Alfredo Perez – AAB – Annual
Diane Robinson – AAB – Annual
Margaret Ruxton – AAB – Annual
Scott Spertzel – AAB – Annual
Joseph Tham – AAB – Annual

25