

Petitions and Communications received from September 6, 2011, through September 19, 2011, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on September 27, 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 Department of Public Works, submitting status of repairing potholes at the intersection of Grattan and Shrader Streets. (Reference No. 20110906-007) (1)

From Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector, submitting its Investment Report as of August 2011. (2)

From Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, submitting a request for immediate extension of Noise Ordinance Task Force's sunset date. (3)

From Clerk of the Board, submitting notification of amendments to Ethics Commission Regulations VI.A and XIV.C. (4)

From Office of Economic and Workforce Development, submitting a letter that funding provided in the budget for FY2011-2012 adopted by the Board is adequate for the office to meet service levels. (5)

From Ethics Commission, submitting its FY2010-2011 Annual Report. (6)

From Clerk of the Board, the following individuals have submitted a Form 700 Statements: (7)

Mike Alonso, Redistricting Task Force Member - Assuming
Eric McDonnell, Redistricting Task Force Member - Assuming
Sonia Melara, Redistricting Task Force Member - Assuming
David Pilpel, Redistricting Task Force Member - Assuming
Melissa Tidwell, Redistricting Task Force Member - Assuming
Jenny Lam, Redistricting Task Force Member - Assuming
Marily Mondejar, Redistricting Task Force Member - Assuming

From Ariella Hyman, Bicycle Advisory Committee, submitting a letter of resignation. (8)

*From United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, submitting a summary edition and three volumes entitled Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Muir Woods National Monument, Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement. (9)

From Michelle London, submitting opposition to a new cell phone tower at 3901 Mission. (10)

From concerned citizens, submitting support for wireless upgrades. 2 letters. (11)

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to nudity in San Francisco. File No. 110967, 3 letters. (12)

From concerned citizens, submitting support for bird safe buildings. File No. 110785, 3 letters. (13)

*From concerned citizens, submitting support preserving Sharp Park wetlands and wildlife. File No. 110966, 860 letters. (14)

*From concerned citizens, submitting support for San Francisco Animal Control and Welfare Humane Pet Acquisition proposal. 17 letters (15)

From concerned citizens, submitting letters concerning aggressive transients loitering on the streets. 2 letters (16)

From Jim and Ninfa Wood, submitting a letter concerning the noise level of patrons outside of club Ruby Skye. (17)

From John and Catherine Sanger, submitting a letter withdrawing as appellants from CEQA and Tentative Parcel Map Appeals for 1171 Sansome Street. File Nos. 110945 and 110835 (18)

From Jeannette Luini, submitting a letter of concerning recycling plastic bags. (19)

From California Public Utilities Commission, submitting notification of filing of Pacific Gas and Electric Company's, Gas Transmission Pipeline Safety Enhancement Plan. (20)

From Michel and Associates, P.C., on behalf of the California Rifle and Pistol Association Foundation, submitting opposition to safety storage and enhanced lethality ammunition findings. File No. 110901 (21)

From Frank Hung, submitting opposition to transitional age youth housing in the vicinity of bars, night clubs, and alcohol drinking establishments. (22)

From J.R. Rubang, submitting a letter concerning unfair treatment to injured United Airline personnel based out of San Francisco. File No. 093175. (23)

From Ralph and Arlene Reed, submitting support for false advertising by limited services pregnancy centers. File No. 110899. (24)

File No. 111028

*From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to false advertising by limited services pregnancy centers. File No. 110899, 152 letters. (25)

From Controller's Office of Public Finance, submitting a copy of the Debt Policy of the City and County of San Francisco. (26)

*(An asterisked item represents the cover sheet to a document that exceeds 25 pages. The complete document is available at the Clerk's Office Room 244, City Hall.)

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY # 20110906-007

Rodis, Nathan

to:

Board of Supervisors

09/15/2011 01:48 PM

Cc:

"Mirkarimi, Ross", Mirkarimistaff

Show Details

Good day!

This pothole work has been completed. Thank you.

Nathan

*Nathan Rodis | Department of Public Works | Director's Office
City Hall, Suite 348, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102
tel: (415) 554-6932 | www.sfdpw.org | fax: (415) 554-6944*

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY

For any questions, call the sponsoring supervisor

TO: Edward Reiskin
Municipal Transportation Agency

FROM: Clerk of the Board

DATE: 9/7/2011

REFERENCE: 20110906-007

FILE NO.

Due Date: 10/7/2011

This is an inquiry from a member of the Board of Supervisors made at the Board meeting on 9/6/2011.

Supervisor Mirkarimi requests the following information:

Requesting the Department of Public Works to report on the status of repairing potholes at the following locations.

*Potholes, Lights and Sidewalk issues
Western crosswalk at Grattan & Shrader*

Please indicate the reference number shown above in your response, direct the original via email to Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org and send a copy to the Supervisor(s) noted above.

Your response to this inquiry is requested by 10/7/2011



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: CCSF Investment Report for the month of August 2011

From: Brian Starr/TTX/SFGOV
To: brian.starr@sfgov.org <brian.starr@sfgov.org>
Cc: Ben Rosenfield/CON/SFGOV@SFGOV, Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, cynthia.fong@sfcta.org, dgriffin@ccsf.edu, grazioij@sfusd.edu, Greg Wagner/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Harvey Rose/BudgetAnalyst/SFGOV@SFGOV, Jose Cisneros/TTX/SFGOV@SFGOV, Michelle Durgy/TTX/SFGOV@SFGOV, ras94124@aol.com, sfdocs@sfpl.info, Tonia Lediju/CON/SFGOV@SFGOV, TRydstrom@sfwater.org, Pauline Marx/TTX/SFGOV@SFGOV
Date: 09/15/2011 02:36 PM
Subject: CCSF Investment Report for the month of August 2011

All,

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



CCSF Monthly Investment Report for 2011-August.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

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



José Cisneros, Treasurer

Investment Report for the month of August 2011

September 15, 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 August 31, 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 August 2011 for the portfolios under the Treasurer's management. All pricing and valuation data is obtained from Interactive Data Corporation.

CCSF Pooled Fund Investment Earnings Statistics

	Current Month		Prior Month	
(in \$ million)	<u>Fiscal YTD</u>	<u>August 2011</u>	<u>Fiscal YTD</u>	<u>July 2011</u>
Average Daily Balance	\$ 4,001	\$ 4,041	\$ 3,960	\$ 3,960
Net Earnings	8.62	4.40	4.22	4.22
Earned Income Yield	1.27%	1.28%	1.26%	1.26%

CCSF Pooled Fund Statistics

(in \$ million)	% of	Book	Market	Wtd. Avg.	Wtd. Avg.	
Investment Type	Portfolio	Value	Value	Coupon	YTM	WAM
U.S. Treasuries	8.4%	\$ 351	\$ 358	1.42%	1.19%	971
Federal Agencies	69.4%	2,914	2,954	1.58%	1.44%	1,216
TLGP	16.0%	683	679	2.25%	1.50%	245
Public Time Deposits	0.0%	0	0	0.50%	0.50%	316
Negotiable CDs	3.5%	150	150	0.32%	0.32%	21
Commercial Paper	1.2%	50	50	0.00%	0.49%	19
Medium Term Notes	1.6%	68	67	3.73%	0.64%	329
Totals	100.0%	\$ 4,215	\$ 4,260	1.64%	1.37%	971

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

Portfolio Summary



Pooled Fund

As of August 31, 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	\$ 350	\$ 351	\$ 358	102.09	8.41%	100%	Yes
Federal Agencies	2,907	2,914	2,954	101.39	69.35%	70%	Yes
TLGP	671	683	679	99.54	15.95%	30%	Yes
State & Local Agency Government Obligations	-	-	-	-	0.00%	20%	Yes
Public Time Deposits	0	0	0	100.00	0.01%	100%	Yes
Negotiable CDs	150	150	150	100.01	3.52%	30%	Yes
Bankers Acceptances	-	-	-	-	0.00%	40%	Yes
Commercial Paper	50	50	50	100.24	1.17%	25%	Yes
Medium Term Notes	66	68	67	-	1.58%	15%	Yes
Repurchase Agreements	-	-	-	-	0.00%	100%	Yes
Reverse Repurchase/Securities Lending Agreements	-	-	-	-	0.00%	\$75mm	Yes
Money Market Funds	-	-	-	-	0.00%	100%	Yes
LAIF	-	-	-	-	0.00%	\$50mm	Yes
TOTAL	\$ 4,194	\$ 4,215	\$ 4,260	101.06	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.

Portfolio Analysis Pooled Fund



Yield Curves



Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

As of August 31, 2011

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issue Name	Settle	Maturity	Duration	Coupon	Par Value	Book Value	Amortized	
			Date	Date					Book Value	Market Value
U.S. Treasuries	912828KA7	US TSY NT	12/9/09	12/15/11	0.29	1.13	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 50,378,906	\$ 50,054,056	\$ 50,155,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828LB4	US TSY NT	3/23/10	7/15/12	0.87	1.50	50,000,000	50,441,406	50,166,115	50,600,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828QE3	US TSY NT	6/1/11	4/30/13	1.66	0.63	25,000,000	25,095,703	25,096,694	25,185,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828JT8	US TSY NT	6/1/11	11/30/13	2.20	2.00	25,000,000	25,851,563	25,767,119	25,995,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828PQ7	US TSY NT	6/1/11	1/15/14	2.35	1.00	25,000,000	25,226,563	25,204,828	25,460,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828LC2	US TSY NT	6/1/11	7/31/14	2.82	2.63	25,000,000	26,382,813	26,272,762	26,672,500
U.S. Treasuries	912828PJ3	US TSY NT	12/16/10	11/30/15	4.13	1.38	50,000,000	49,519,531	49,588,283	51,410,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828PJ3	US TSY NT	12/16/10	11/30/15	4.13	1.38	50,000,000	49,519,531	49,588,283	51,410,000
U.S. Treasuries	912828PJ3	US TSY NT	12/23/10	11/30/15	4.13	1.38	50,000,000	48,539,063	48,743,253	51,410,000
Subtotals					2.59	1.42	\$ 350,000,000	\$ 350,955,078	\$ 350,481,394	\$ 358,297,500
Federal Agencies	3134A4JT2	FHLMC BONDS	6/10/10	1/15/12	0.38	5.75	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 21,479,608	\$ 20,344,566	\$ 20,425,000
Federal Agencies	31331JGD9	FFCB 2 YEAR BULLET FIXED	3/9/10	3/5/12	0.51	0.95	17,050,000	17,016,071	17,041,319	17,113,938
Federal Agencies	31331JGD9	FFCB 2 YEAR BULLET FIXED	3/9/10	3/5/12	0.51	0.95	58,000,000	57,893,860	57,972,845	58,217,500
Federal Agencies	880591DT6	TENN VALLEY AUTHORITY	8/4/10	5/23/12	0.71	6.79	20,500,000	22,725,275	21,396,197	21,454,531
Federal Agencies	31398A6V9	FNMA FRN QTR FF+20	12/21/10	12/3/12	1.25	0.30	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,984,375
Federal Agencies	31398A6V9	FNMA FRN QTR FF+20	12/23/10	12/3/12	1.25	0.30	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,984,375
Federal Agencies	31331G2R9	FFCB	3/26/10	12/7/12	1.25	1.88	37,000,000	37,333,370	37,156,383	37,740,000
Federal Agencies	31331JAB9	FFCB BULLET	4/16/10	12/24/12	1.30	1.63	50,000,000	50,048,500	50,023,683	50,875,000
Federal Agencies	3134G1U69	FHLMC FRN QTR FF+19	1/11/11	1/10/13	1.36	0.29	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,984,375
Federal Agencies	3134G1U69	FHLMC FRN QTR FF+19	1/12/11	1/10/13	1.36	0.29	50,000,000	49,989,900	49,993,114	49,984,375
Federal Agencies	3134G1U69	FHLMC FRN QTR FF+19	3/22/11	1/10/13	1.36	0.29	35,000,000	35,015,925	35,011,992	34,989,063
Federal Agencies	3137EABM0	FHLMC BONDS	5/13/11	6/28/13	1.77	3.75	25,000,000	26,608,250	26,378,500	26,585,938
Federal Agencies	31398AV90	FNMA CALL	7/16/10	7/16/13	1.86	1.30	25,000,000	24,987,500	24,992,199	25,195,313
Federal Agencies	31398AV90	FNMA CALL	7/16/10	7/16/13	1.86	1.30	50,000,000	49,975,000	49,984,398	50,390,625
Federal Agencies	3134G2BC5	FHLMC STRNT	3/30/11	9/30/13	2.08	0.50	22,850,000	22,850,000	22,850,000	22,850,000
Federal Agencies	3136FPYX9	FNMA	12/3/10	12/3/13	0.00	0.50	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000
Federal Agencies	31315PLT4	FARMER MAC	12/6/10	12/6/13	2.23	1.25	35,000,000	34,951,700	34,963,555	35,535,938
Federal Agencies	31331J6A6	FFCB	12/23/10	12/23/13	2.28	1.30	75,000,000	74,976,563	74,981,951	76,382,813
Federal Agencies	313371UC8	FHLB	11/18/10	12/27/13	2.30	0.88	75,000,000	74,865,000	74,899,137	75,796,875
Federal Agencies	3135G0AZ6	FNMA FRN QTR T-BILL+21	3/4/11	3/4/14	2.50	0.26	25,000,000	24,985,000	24,987,477	24,976,563
Federal Agencies	3135G0AZ6	FNMA FRN QTR T-BILL+21	3/4/11	3/4/14	2.50	0.26	25,000,000	24,992,500	24,993,739	24,976,563
Federal Agencies	313373WY4	FHLB CALL NT	6/13/11	3/13/14	2.50	1.15	14,600,000	14,623,652	14,603,085	14,604,563
Federal Agencies	31398A3R1	FNMA AMORT TO CALL	11/10/10	3/21/14	2.51	1.35	24,500,000	24,564,827	24,500,000	24,913,438
Federal Agencies	3133724E1	FHLB	12/31/10	6/30/14	2.79	1.21	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	51,000,000
Federal Agencies	3137EACU1	FHLMC BONDS	6/2/11	7/30/14	2.88	1.00	75,000,000	74,946,000	74,950,258	76,031,250
Federal Agencies	313370JS8	FHLB	12/8/10	9/12/14	2.96	1.38	26,095,000	26,129,068	26,122,448	26,755,530
Federal Agencies	31398A3Q3	FNMA AMORT TO CALL	11/4/10	9/23/14	2.98	1.50	27,435,000	27,627,045	27,448,080	27,452,147
Federal Agencies	313371CN4	FHLB AMORT TO CALL	11/4/10	10/21/14	3.07	1.35	45,525,000	45,598,751	45,583,409	45,581,906
Federal Agencies	3128X3L76	FHLMC BONDS	12/23/10	11/13/14	2.97	5.00	21,910,000	24,606,902	24,128,634	24,950,013
Federal Agencies	3128X3L76	FHLMC BONDS	12/23/10	11/13/14	2.97	5.00	1,000,000	1,123,090	1,101,261	1,138,750
Federal Agencies	31331J4S9	FFCB	12/16/10	12/8/14	3.20	1.40	27,000,000	26,986,500	26,988,906	27,582,188
Federal Agencies	31331J4S9	FFCB	12/8/10	12/8/14	3.20	1.40	19,000,000	18,956,680	18,964,597	19,409,688
Federal Agencies	313371PC4	FHLB	11/22/10	12/12/14	3.24	0.88	25,000,000	24,617,500	24,690,591	25,242,188
Federal Agencies	313371W51	FHLB	12/6/10	12/12/14	3.22	1.25	50,000,000	49,725,000	49,775,426	50,796,875
Federal Agencies	313371W51	FHLB	12/8/10	12/12/14	3.22	1.25	75,000,000	74,391,000	74,501,992	76,195,313
Federal Agencies	3133XVNU1	FHLB	11/23/10	12/12/14	3.15	2.75	25,400,000	26,848,308	26,572,347	26,987,500
Federal Agencies	3133XVNU1	FHLB	11/23/10	12/12/14	3.15	2.75	2,915,000	3,079,668	3,048,292	3,097,188
Federal Agencies	3133XVNU1	FHLB	12/8/10	12/12/14	3.15	2.75	25,000,000	26,332,000	26,089,240	26,562,500

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issue Name	Settle	Maturity	Duration	Coupon	Par Value	Book Value	Amortized	Market Value
			Date	Date					Book Value	
Federal Agencies	3133XVNU1	FHLB	12/8/10	12/12/14	3.15	2.75	50,000,000	52,674,000	52,186,657	53,125,000
Federal Agencies	313371W93	FHLB	12/15/10	12/15/14	3.22	1.34	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	76,664,063
Federal Agencies	31331J6Q1	FFCB	12/29/10	12/29/14	3.24	1.72	27,175,000	27,157,065	27,160,084	28,007,234
Federal Agencies	31331J6Q1	FFCB	12/29/10	12/29/14	3.24	1.72	70,000,000	69,988,800	69,990,686	72,143,750
Federal Agencies	3136FMA38	FNMA	6/25/10	6/25/15	3.68	2.50	49,080,000	49,018,650	49,033,198	49,908,225
Federal Agencies	3136FM6G4	FNMA	8/10/10	8/10/15	3.80	2.13	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,226,563
Federal Agencies	31331KTY6	FFCB CALL	8/10/11	8/10/15	3.84	1.44	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,125,000
Federal Agencies	3137EACM9	FHLMC BONDS	12/15/10	9/10/15	3.87	1.75	50,000,000	49,050,000	49,192,775	51,812,500
Federal Agencies	313370JB5	FHLB	12/15/10	9/11/15	3.87	1.75	75,000,000	73,587,000	73,799,236	77,554,688
Federal Agencies	31315PGT0	FARMER MAC	9/15/10	9/15/15	3.85	2.13	45,000,000	44,914,950	44,931,299	46,912,500
Federal Agencies	31398A4M1	FNMA	12/15/10	10/26/15	4.01	1.63	25,000,000	24,317,500	24,417,416	25,742,188
Federal Agencies	31398A4M1	FNMA	12/23/10	10/26/15	4.01	1.63	42,000,000	40,924,380	41,077,692	43,246,875
Federal Agencies	31398A4M1	FNMA	12/23/10	10/26/15	4.01	1.63	50,000,000	48,701,500	48,886,580	51,484,375
Federal Agencies	31331J2R3	FFCB	11/16/10	11/16/15	4.07	1.62	32,400,000	32,116,500	32,161,369	32,491,125
Federal Agencies	31331J2S1	FFCB	12/15/10	11/16/15	4.07	1.50	25,000,000	24,186,981	24,304,613	25,523,438
Federal Agencies	313371PL4	FHLB CALL NT	6/10/11	11/18/15	4.08	1.55	15,570,000	15,515,505	15,533,042	15,604,059
Federal Agencies	313371ZY5	FHLB	12/3/10	12/11/15	4.11	1.88	25,000,000	24,982,000	24,984,670	25,664,063
Federal Agencies	313371ZY5	FHLB	12/14/10	12/11/15	4.11	1.88	50,000,000	49,871,500	49,889,897	51,328,125
Federal Agencies	3135G0BH5	FNMA CALL NT	6/10/11	4/11/16	4.34	2.60	25,000,000	25,400,000	25,398,031	25,312,500
Federal Agencies	313373ZN5	FHLB	6/6/11	6/6/16	4.54	2.03	35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	36,389,063
Federal Agencies	3135G0BK8	FNMA CALL NT	6/10/11	6/6/16	4.52	2.25	10,000,000	10,078,200	10,062,770	10,121,875
Federal Agencies	3134G2LW0	FHLMC CALL	7/26/11	6/29/16	4.61	2.00	27,345,000	27,358,673	27,398,198	27,558,633
Federal Agencies	31315PA25	FAMCA NT	7/27/11	7/27/16	4.69	2.00	15,000,000	14,934,750	14,936,036	15,346,875
Federal Agencies	3136FRA86	FNMA CALL	8/11/11	7/27/16	4.66	2.25	67,325,000	67,829,938	67,826,103	67,745,781
Federal Agencies	3134G2SP8	FHLMC CALL	7/28/11	7/28/16	4.69	2.00	50,000,000	50,022,500	50,021,068	50,671,875
Federal Agencies	3136FRJ95	FNMA CALL	8/15/11	8/15/16	4.74	2.01	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	101,031,250
Federal Agencies	31331KUB4	FFCB CALL	8/15/11	8/15/16	4.77	1.75	29,775,000	29,802,914	29,801,618	29,961,094
Federal Agencies	3134G2UT7	FHLMC STEP CALL	8/17/11	8/17/16	4.85	1.00	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,046,875
Federal Agencies	3134G2UT7	FHLMC STEP CALL	8/17/11	8/17/16	4.85	1.00	30,270,000	30,270,000	30,270,000	30,298,378
Federal Agencies	3134G2VB5	FHLMC CALL	8/24/11	8/24/16	4.74	2.20	25,000,000	25,066,406	25,063,519	25,179,688
Federal Agencies	3134G2WF5	FHLMC CALL	8/24/11	8/24/16	4.79	1.75	5,050,000	5,050,000	5,050,000	5,073,672
Federal Agencies	3134G2WJ7	FHLMC STEP CALL	8/24/11	8/24/16	4.82	1.50	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,078,125
Federal Agencies	3134G2VB5	FHLMC CALL	8/24/11	8/24/16	4.74	2.20	25,000,000	25,085,938	25,082,201	25,179,688
Federal Agencies	3134G2YE6	FHLMC CALL	8/24/11	8/24/16	4.82	1.50	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	49,875,000
Federal Agencies	3134G2YG1	FHLMC CALL	8/24/11	8/24/16	4.83	1.42	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	99,781,250
Federal Agencies	3134G2XB3	FHLMC CALL NT	8/24/11	8/24/16	4.79	1.80	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,195,313
Subtotals					3.19	1.58	\$ 2,906,770,000	\$ 2,913,755,660	\$ 2,910,498,378	\$ 2,954,154,891
TLGP	61757UAF7	MORGAN STANLEY FDIC GTD TLG	3/16/09	9/22/11	0.06	2.00	\$ 25,000,000	\$ 25,037,750	\$ 25,000,862	\$ 25,023,438
TLGP	36967HAD9	GENERAL ELECTRIC TLGP	7/30/09	12/9/11	0.27	3.00	50,000,000	51,602,500	50,184,046	50,359,375
TLGP	4042EPAA5	HSBC TLGP	9/16/09	12/16/11	0.29	3.13	50,000,000	51,969,550	50,254,290	50,359,375
TLGP	36967HAN7	GENL ELEC CAP CORP FDIC TLGP	3/24/09	3/12/12	0.53	2.25	35,000,000	35,185,150	35,032,965	35,366,406
TLGP	61757UAN0	MORGAN STANLEY FDIC GTD TLGF	3/19/09	3/13/12	0.53	0.45	25,000,000	25,040,325	25,007,177	25,035,156
TLGP	61757UAP5	MORGAN STANLEY TLGP	11/4/09	3/13/12	0.53	2.25	20,000,000	20,431,800	20,097,406	20,212,500
TLGP	61757UAP5	MORGAN STANLEY TLGP	11/6/09	3/13/12	0.53	2.25	50,000,000	51,084,000	50,245,100	50,531,250
TLGP	905266AA0	UNION BANK TLGP FLOAT	3/23/09	3/16/12	0.54	0.45	25,000,000	25,033,725	25,006,101	25,015,625
TLGP	064244AA4	BANK OF THE WEST TLGP	4/2/09	3/27/12	0.57	2.15	5,000,000	5,026,950	5,005,143	5,047,656
TLGP	064244AA4	BANK OF THE WEST TLGP	4/2/09	3/27/12	0.57	2.15	20,000,000	20,108,000	20,020,609	20,190,625
TLGP	90390QAA9	USSA CAPITAL CO	4/28/09	3/30/12	0.58	2.24	16,000,000	16,125,600	16,024,837	16,150,000
TLGP	17313UAE9	CITIGROUP TLGP	4/2/09	4/30/12	0.66	2.13	25,000,000	25,117,500	25,025,298	25,300,781

Investment Inventory

Pooled Fund

Type of Investment	CUSIP	Issue Name	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Duration	Coupon	Par Value	Book Value	Amortized Book Value	Market Value
TLGP	06050BAG6	BANK AMERICA CORP TLGP	4/2/09	4/30/12	0.66	2.10	25,000,000	25,093,000	25,020,023	25,300,781
TLGP	481247AK0	J P MORGAN CHASE TLGP	3/24/09	6/15/12	0.78	2.20	25,000,000	25,119,000	25,029,069	25,371,094
TLGP	38146FAA9	GOLDMAN SACHS TLGP	3/22/10	6/15/12	0.78	3.25	50,000,000	52,215,000	50,781,765	51,148,438
TLGP	481247AK0	J P MORGAN TLGP	4/21/10	6/15/12	0.78	2.20	50,000,000	51,097,500	50,402,137	50,742,188
TLGP	06050BAJ0	BANK AMERICA CORP TLGP	4/14/09	6/22/12	0.80	2.38	50,000,000	50,685,000	50,173,455	50,843,750
TLGP	36967HBB2	GENERAL ELECTRIC TLGP BULLET	3/22/10	9/28/12	1.06	2.00	25,000,000	25,366,000	25,156,176	25,472,656
TLGP	36967HBB2	GENERAL ELECTRIC TLGP BULLET	4/20/10	9/28/12	1.06	2.00	75,000,000	76,010,250	75,445,099	76,417,969
TLGP	36967HAV9	GENERAL ELECTRIC TLGP	11/6/09	12/21/12	1.29	2.13	25,000,000	25,253,750	25,106,081	25,593,750
Subtotals					0.66	2.25	\$ 671,000,000	\$ 682,602,350	\$ 674,017,639	\$ 679,482,813
Public Time Deposits		BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO CD	5/18/11	5/18/12	0.71	0.75	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000
Public Time Deposits		FIRST NAT. BANK OF NOR. CAL. PT	8/4/11	8/3/12	0.92	0.40	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Subtotals					0.86	0.50	\$ 350,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 350,000
Negotiable CDs	78009JY90	RBC CAP MKTS NCD	12/9/10	9/6/11	0.00	0.26	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 50,001,214
Negotiable CDs	25152XMF4	DEUTSCHE BANK NCD FRN QTR	12/28/10	9/28/11	0.08	0.35	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,018,375
Subtotals					0.05	0.32	\$ 150,000,000	\$ 150,000,000	\$ 150,000,000	\$ 150,019,589
Commercial Paper	22532CWK6	CREDIT AGRICOLE DISC CP	3/23/11	9/19/11	0.05	0.00	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 49,877,500	\$ 49,877,500	\$ 49,994,750
Subtotals					0.05	0.00	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 49,877,500	\$ 49,877,500	\$ 49,994,750
Medium Term Notes	36962G2L7	GE MTN	8/22/11	4/10/12	0.60	5.00	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 10,277,200	\$ 10,448,585	\$ 10,220,313
Medium Term Notes	36962G4E1	GE MTN	8/24/11	8/13/12	0.94	3.50	55,750,000	57,282,568	57,307,652	57,169,883
Subtotals					0.89	3.73	\$ 65,750,000	\$ 67,559,768	\$ 67,756,237	\$ 67,390,195
Grand Totals					2.55	1.64	\$ 4,193,870,000	\$ 4,215,100,356	\$ 4,202,981,148	\$ 4,259,689,738

Monthly Investment Earnings

Pooled Fund

For month ended August 31, 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. Treasuries	912828LV0	US TSY NT	\$ -	1.00	0.83	10/29/09	8/31/11	\$ 82	\$ (14)	\$ -	\$ 67
U.S. Treasuries	912828LV0	US TSY NT	-	1.00	0.83	10/29/09	8/31/11	81,440	(13,434)	-	68,006
U.S. Treasuries	912828KA7	US TSY NT	50,000,000	1.13	0.75	12/9/09	12/15/11	47,643	(15,959)	-	31,684
U.S. Treasuries	912828LB4	US TSY NT	50,000,000	1.50	1.11	3/23/10	7/15/12	63,179	(16,194)	-	46,986
U.S. Treasuries	912828QE3	US TSY NT	25,000,000	0.63	0.42	6/1/11	4/30/13	13,162	(4,244)	-	8,918
U.S. Treasuries	912828JT8	US TSY NT	25,000,000	2.00	0.62	6/1/11	11/30/13	42,350	(28,914)	-	13,436
U.S. Treasuries	912828PQ7	US TSY NT	25,000,000	1.00	0.65	6/1/11	1/15/14	21,060	(7,324)	-	13,736
U.S. Treasuries	912828LC2	US TSY NT	25,000,000	2.63	0.85	6/1/11	7/31/14	55,282	(37,082)	-	18,200
U.S. Treasuries	912828PJ3	US TSY NT	50,000,000	1.38	1.58	12/16/10	11/30/15	58,231	8,229	-	66,460
U.S. Treasuries	912828PJ3	US TSY NT	50,000,000	1.38	1.58	12/16/10	11/30/15	58,231	8,229	-	66,460
U.S. Treasuries	912828PJ3	US TSY NT	50,000,000	1.38	2.00	12/23/10	11/30/15	58,231	25,119	-	83,350
Subtotals			\$ 350,000,000					\$ 498,891	\$ (81,589)	\$ -	\$ 417,302
Federal Agencies	31331YZ86	FFCB BULLET	\$ -	3.88	0.78	11/19/09	8/25/11	\$ 129,167	\$ (100,807)	\$ -	\$ 28,359
Federal Agencies	31344AJT2	FHLMC BONDS	20,000,000	5.75	1.07	6/10/10	1/15/12	95,833	(78,541)	-	17,293
Federal Agencies	31331JGD9	FFCB 2 YEAR BULLET FIXED	17,050,000	0.95	1.05	3/9/10	3/5/12	13,498	1,447	-	14,945
Federal Agencies	31331JGD9	FFCB 2 YEAR BULLET FIXED	58,000,000	0.95	1.04	3/9/10	3/5/12	45,917	4,526	-	50,443
Federal Agencies	880591DT6	TENN VALLEY AUTHORITY	20,500,000	6.79	0.72	8/4/10	5/23/12	115,996	(104,838)	-	11,158
Federal Agencies	31398A6V9	FNMA FRN QTR FF+20	50,000,000	0.30	0.30	12/21/10	12/3/12	12,736	-	-	12,736
Federal Agencies	31398A6V9	FNMA FRN QTR FF+20	50,000,000	0.30	0.30	12/23/10	12/3/12	12,736	-	-	12,736
Federal Agencies	31331G2R9	FFCB	37,000,000	1.88	1.53	3/26/10	12/7/12	57,813	(10,471)	-	47,342
Federal Agencies	31331JAB9	FFCB BULLET	50,000,000	1.63	1.59	4/16/10	12/24/12	67,708	(1,530)	-	66,179
Federal Agencies	3134G1U69	FHLMC FRN QTR FF+19	50,000,000	0.29	0.29	1/11/11	1/10/13	12,306	-	-	12,306
Federal Agencies	3134G1U69	FHLMC FRN QTR FF+19	50,000,000	0.29	0.30	1/12/11	1/10/13	12,306	430	-	12,735
Federal Agencies	3134G1U69	FHLMC FRN QTR FF+19	35,000,000	0.29	0.25	3/22/11	1/10/13	8,614	(748)	-	7,866
Federal Agencies	31398AF23	FNMA	-	1.80	1.80	2/8/10	2/8/13	17,500	-	-	17,500
Federal Agencies	31398AF23	FNMA	-	1.80	1.82	2/8/10	2/8/13	8,750	(6,147)	12,500	15,103
Federal Agencies	3137EABM0	FHLMC BONDS	25,000,000	3.75	0.69	5/13/11	6/28/13	78,125	(64,164)	-	13,961
Federal Agencies	31398AV90	FNMA CALL	25,000,000	1.30	1.32	7/16/10	7/16/13	27,083	354	-	27,437
Federal Agencies	31398AV90	FNMA CALL	50,000,000	1.30	1.32	7/16/10	7/16/13	54,167	707	-	54,874
Federal Agencies	3134G2BC5	FHLMC STRNT	22,850,000	0.50	0.50	3/30/11	9/30/13	9,521	-	-	9,521
Federal Agencies	3136FPYX9	FNMA	50,000,000	0.50	0.50	12/3/10	12/3/13	20,833	-	-	20,833
Federal Agencies	31315PLT4	FARMER MAC	35,000,000	1.25	1.30	12/6/10	12/6/13	36,458	1,366	-	37,824
Federal Agencies	31331J6A6	FFCB	75,000,000	1.30	1.31	12/23/10	12/23/13	81,250	663	-	81,913
Federal Agencies	313371UC8	FHLB	75,000,000	0.88	0.93	11/18/10	12/27/13	54,688	3,687	-	58,375
Federal Agencies	3135G0AZ6	FNMA FRN QTR T-BILL+21	25,000,000	0.26	0.29	3/4/11	3/4/14	5,579	424	-	6,003
Federal Agencies	3135G0AZ6	FNMA FRN QTR T-BILL+21	25,000,000	0.26	0.27	3/4/11	3/4/14	5,579	212	-	5,791
Federal Agencies	313373WY4	FHLB CALL NT	14,600,000	1.15	1.09	6/13/11	3/13/14	13,992	(7,970)	-	6,022
Federal Agencies	31398A3R1	FNMA AMORT TO CALL	24,500,000	1.35	1.27	11/10/10	3/21/14	27,563	-	-	27,563
Federal Agencies	3133724E1	FHLB	50,000,000	1.21	1.21	12/31/10	6/30/14	50,417	-	-	50,417
Federal Agencies	3137EACU1	FHLMC BONDS	75,000,000	1.00	1.02	6/2/11	7/30/14	62,500	1,451	-	63,951
Federal Agencies	3136FM3R3	FNMA AMORT TO CALL	-	1.75	1.63	8/18/10	8/18/14	44,022	226,519	(237,584)	32,956
Federal Agencies	313371PT7	FHLB CALL NT	-	1.00	1.08	6/10/11	8/22/14	5,833	(1,112)	25,000	29,721
Federal Agencies	313370JS8	FHLB	26,095,000	1.38	1.34	12/8/10	9/12/14	29,901	(769)	-	29,132
Federal Agencies	31398A3Q3	FNMA AMORT TO CALL	27,435,000	1.50	1.31	11/4/10	9/23/14	34,294	(18,432)	-	15,862
Federal Agencies	313371CN4	FHLB AMORT TO CALL	45,525,000	1.35	1.31	11/4/10	10/21/14	51,216	(1,580)	-	49,636
Federal Agencies	3128X3L76	FHLMC BONDS	21,910,000	5.00	1.71	12/23/10	11/13/14	91,292	(58,835)	-	32,457
Federal Agencies	3128X3L76	FHLMC BONDS	1,000,000	5.00	1.71	12/23/10	11/13/14	4,167	(2,685)	-	1,481
Federal Agencies	31331J4S9	FFCB	27,000,000	1.40	1.41	12/16/10	12/8/14	31,500	288	-	31,788

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 Agencies	31331J4S9	FFCB	19,000,000	1.40	1.46	12/8/10	12/8/14	22,167	919	-	23,086
Federal Agencies	313371PC4	FHLB	25,000,000	0.88	1.26	11/22/10	12/12/14	18,229	8,006	-	26,236
Federal Agencies	313371W51	FHLB	50,000,000	1.25	1.39	12/6/10	12/12/14	52,083	5,811	-	57,895
Federal Agencies	313371W51	FHLB	75,000,000	1.25	1.46	12/8/10	12/12/14	78,125	12,887	-	91,012
Federal Agencies	3133XVNU1	FHLB	25,400,000	2.75	1.30	11/23/10	12/12/14	58,208	(30,336)	-	27,872
Federal Agencies	3133XVNU1	FHLB	2,915,000	2.75	1.31	11/23/10	12/12/14	6,680	(3,449)	-	3,231
Federal Agencies	3133XVNU1	FHLB	25,000,000	2.75	1.38	12/8/10	12/12/14	57,292	(28,186)	-	29,106
Federal Agencies	3133XVNU1	FHLB	50,000,000	2.75	1.37	12/8/10	12/12/14	114,583	(56,583)	-	58,000
Federal Agencies	313371W93	FHLB	75,000,000	1.34	1.34	12/15/10	12/15/14	83,750	-	-	83,750
Federal Agencies	31331J6Q1	FFCB	27,175,000	1.72	1.74	12/29/10	12/29/14	38,951	381	-	39,331
Federal Agencies	31331J6Q1	FFCB	70,000,000	1.72	1.72	12/29/10	12/29/14	100,333	238	-	100,571
Federal Agencies	31331JE33	FFCB BD CALL	-	1.75	1.76	9/16/10	3/16/15	36,458	(4,857)	25,000	56,601
Federal Agencies	3136FMA38	FNMA	49,080,000	2.50	2.53	6/25/10	6/25/15	102,250	1,042	-	103,292
Federal Agencies	3136FM6G4	FNMA	25,000,000	2.13	2.13	8/10/10	8/10/15	44,271	-	-	44,271
Federal Agencies	31331KTY6	FFCB CALL	100,000,000	1.44	1.44	8/10/11	8/10/15	84,000	-	-	84,000
Federal Agencies	3137EACM9	FHLMC BONDS	50,000,000	1.75	2.17	12/15/10	9/10/15	72,917	17,023	-	89,940
Federal Agencies	313370JB5	FHLB	75,000,000	1.75	2.17	12/15/10	9/11/15	109,375	25,305	-	134,680
Federal Agencies	31315PGT0	FARMER MAC	45,000,000	2.13	2.17	9/15/10	9/15/15	79,688	1,444	-	81,131
Federal Agencies	31398A4M1	FNMA	25,000,000	1.63	2.22	12/15/10	10/26/15	33,854	11,913	-	45,767
Federal Agencies	31398A4M1	FNMA	42,000,000	1.63	2.19	12/23/10	10/26/15	56,875	18,860	-	75,735
Federal Agencies	31398A4M1	FNMA	50,000,000	1.63	2.19	12/23/10	10/26/15	67,708	22,768	-	90,476
Federal Agencies	31331J2R3	FFCB	32,400,000	1.62	1.80	11/16/10	11/16/15	43,740	4,813	-	48,553
Federal Agencies	31331J2S1	FFCB	25,000,000	1.50	2.20	12/15/10	11/16/15	31,250	14,025	-	45,275
Federal Agencies	313371PL4	FHLB CALL NT	15,570,000	1.55	1.63	6/10/11	11/18/15	20,111	1,042	-	21,153
Federal Agencies	313371ZY5	FHLB	25,000,000	1.88	1.89	12/3/10	12/11/15	39,063	304	-	39,367
Federal Agencies	313371ZY5	FHLB	50,000,000	1.88	1.93	12/14/10	12/11/15	78,125	2,185	-	80,310
Federal Agencies	3135G0BH5	FNMA CALL NT	25,000,000	2.60	2.25	6/10/11	4/11/16	54,167	(40,523)	-	13,644
Federal Agencies	313373ZN5	FHLB	35,000,000	2.03	2.03	6/6/11	6/6/16	59,208	-	-	59,208
Federal Agencies	3135G0BK8	FNMA CALL NT	10,000,000	2.25	2.08	6/10/11	6/6/16	18,750	(6,697)	-	12,053
Federal Agencies	3134G2LV0	FHLMC CALL	27,345,000	2.00	1.99	7/26/11	6/29/16	45,575	(1,250)	-	44,325
Federal Agencies	31315PA25	FAMCA NT	15,000,000	2.00	2.09	7/27/11	7/27/16	25,000	1,107	-	26,107
Federal Agencies	3136FRA86	FNMA CALL	67,325,000	2.25	2.09	8/11/11	7/27/16	84,156	(62,744)	-	21,413
Federal Agencies	3134G2SP8	FHLMC CALL	50,000,000	2.00	1.99	7/28/11	7/28/16	83,333	(1,268)	-	82,065
Federal Agencies	3136FRJ95	FNMA CALL	100,000,000	2.01	2.01	8/15/11	8/15/16	89,333	-	-	89,333
Federal Agencies	31331KUB4	FFCB CALL	29,775,000	1.75	1.73	8/15/11	8/15/16	23,158	(1,297)	-	21,862
Federal Agencies	3134G2UT7	FHLMC STEP CALL	50,000,000	1.00	1.00	8/17/11	8/17/16	19,444	-	-	19,444
Federal Agencies	3134G2UT7	FHLMC STEP CALL	30,270,000	1.00	1.00	8/17/11	8/17/16	11,772	-	-	11,772
Federal Agencies	3134G2VB5	FHLMC CALL	25,000,000	2.20	2.14	8/24/11	8/24/16	10,694	(2,887)	-	7,807
Federal Agencies	3134G2WF5	FHLMC CALL	5,050,000	1.75	1.75	8/24/11	8/24/16	1,718	-	-	1,718
Federal Agencies	3134G2WJ7	FHLMC STEP CALL	25,000,000	1.50	1.50	8/24/11	8/24/16	7,292	-	-	7,292
Federal Agencies	3134G2VB5	FHLMC CALL	25,000,000	2.20	2.13	8/24/11	8/24/16	10,694	(3,736)	-	6,958
Federal Agencies	3134G2YE6	FHLMC CALL	50,000,000	1.50	1.50	8/24/11	8/24/16	14,583	-	-	14,583
Federal Agencies	3134G2YG1	FHLMC CALL	100,000,000	1.42	1.42	8/24/11	8/24/16	27,611	-	-	27,611
Federal Agencies	3134G2XB3	FHLMC CALL NT	25,000,000	1.80	1.80	8/24/11	8/24/16	8,750	-	-	8,750
Subtotals			\$2,906,770,000					\$ 3,556,182	\$ (310,296)	\$ (175,084)	\$ 3,070,802
TLGP	6175UAF7	MORGAN STANLEY FDIC GTD TLG	\$ 25,000,000	2.00	1.94	3/16/09	9/22/11	\$ 41,667	\$ (1,272)	\$ -	\$ 40,395
TLGP	36967HAD9	GENERAL ELECTRIC TLGP	50,000,000	3.00	1.61	7/30/09	12/9/11	125,000	(57,631)	-	67,369
TLGP	4042EPA5	HSBC TLGP	50,000,000	3.13	1.34	9/16/09	12/16/11	130,208	(74,368)	-	55,840
TLGP	36967HAN7	GENL ELEC CAP CORP FDIC TLGP	35,000,000	2.25	2.07	3/24/09	3/12/12	65,625	(5,295)	-	60,330

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	61757UAN0	MORGAN STANLEY FDIC GTD TLGP	25,000,000	0.45	0.22	3/19/09	3/13/12	9,677	(1,147)	-	8,530
TLGP	61757UAP5	MORGAN STANLEY TLGP	20,000,000	2.25	1.32	11/4/09	3/13/12	37,500	(15,565)	-	21,935
TLGP	61757UAP5	MORGAN STANLEY TLGP	50,000,000	2.25	1.31	11/6/09	3/13/12	93,750	(39,166)	-	54,585
TLGP	905266AA0	UNION BANK TLGP FLOAT	25,000,000	0.45	0.26	3/23/09	3/16/12	9,585	(960)	-	8,625
TLGP	064244AA4	BANK OF THE WEST TLGP	5,000,000	2.15	1.96	4/2/09	3/27/12	8,958	(766)	-	8,192
TLGP	064244AA4	BANK OF THE WEST TLGP	20,000,000	2.15	1.96	4/2/09	3/27/12	35,833	(3,072)	-	32,762
TLGP	90390QAA9	USSA CAPITAL CO	16,000,000	2.24	1.96	4/28/09	3/30/12	29,867	(3,649)	-	26,218
TLGP	17313UAE9	CITIGROUP TLGP	25,000,000	2.13	1.97	4/2/09	4/30/12	44,271	(3,241)	-	41,030
TLGP	06050BAG6	BANK AMERICA CORP TLGP	25,000,000	2.10	1.97	4/2/09	4/30/12	43,750	(2,565)	-	41,185
TLGP	481247AK0	J P MORGAN CHASE TLGP	25,000,000	2.20	2.05	3/24/09	6/15/12	45,833	(3,129)	-	42,704
TLGP	38146FAA9	GOLDMAN SACHS TLGP	50,000,000	3.25	1.23	3/22/10	6/15/12	135,417	(84,148)	-	51,268
TLGP	481247AK0	J P MORGAN TLGP	50,000,000	2.20	1.16	4/21/10	6/15/12	91,667	(43,286)	-	48,381
TLGP	06050BAJ0	BANK AMERICA CORP TLGP	50,000,000	2.38	1.93	4/14/09	6/22/12	98,958	(18,227)	-	80,731
TLGP	36967HBB2	GENERAL ELECTRIC TLGP BULLET	25,000,000	2.00	1.41	3/22/10	9/28/12	41,667	(12,319)	-	29,347
TLGP	36967HBB2	GENERAL ELECTRIC TLGP BULLET	75,000,000	2.00	1.44	4/20/10	9/28/12	125,000	(35,110)	-	89,890
TLGP	36967HAV9	GENERAL ELECTRIC TLGP	25,000,000	2.13	1.79	11/6/09	12/21/12	44,271	(6,894)	-	37,377
Subtotals			\$ 671,000,000					\$ 1,258,504	\$ (411,809)	\$ -	\$ 846,695
Public Time Deposits		FIRST NATIONAL BANK PTD	\$ -	0.40	0.40	7/30/11	8/2/11	\$ 56	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 56
Public Time Deposits		FIRST NATIONAL BANK PTD	-	0.70	0.70	8/4/10	8/4/11	292	-	-	292
Public Time Deposits		BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO CD	100,000	0.75	0.75	5/18/11	5/18/12	65	-	-	65
Public Time Deposits		FIRST NAT. BANK OF NOR. CAL. PT	250,000	0.40	0.40	8/4/11	8/3/12	78	-	-	78
Subtotals			\$ 350,000					\$ 490	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 490
Negotiable CDs	78009JY90	RBC CAP MKTS NCD	\$ 50,000,000	0.26	0.26	12/9/10	9/6/11	\$ 11,014	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,014
Negotiable CDs	25152XMF4	DEUTSCHE BANK NCD FRN QTR	100,000,000	0.35	0.35	12/28/10	9/28/11	29,823	-	-	29,823
Subtotals			\$ 150,000,000					\$ 40,837	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 40,837
Commercial Paper	22532CWK6	CREDIT AGRICOLE DISC CP	\$ 50,000,000	0.00	0.49	3/23/11	9/19/11	\$ 21,097	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 21,097
Subtotals			\$ 50,000,000					\$ 21,097	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 21,097
Medium Term Notes	36962G2L7	GE MTN	\$ 10,000,000	5.00	0.61	8/22/11	4/10/12	\$ 12,500	\$ (11,948)	\$ -	\$ 552
Medium Term Notes	36962G4E1	GE MTN	55,750,000	3.50	0.65	8/24/11	8/13/12	37,941	(34,537)	-	3,404
Subtotals			\$ 65,750,000					\$ 50,441	\$ (46,485)	\$ -	\$ 3,956
Grand Totals			\$ 4,193,870,000					\$ 5,426,442	\$ (850,178)	\$ (175,084)	\$ 4,401,179

¹Yield to maturity is calculated at purchase

Investment Transactions

For month ended August 31, 2011

Transaction	Settle Date	Maturity Date	Type of Investment	Issuer Name	CUSIP	Par Value	Coupon	YTM	Price	Interest	Transaction Amount
Purchase	8/4/2011	8/3/2012	Public Time Deposits	FIRST NAT. BANK OF NOR.		\$ 250,000	0.40	0.40	\$ 100.00	\$ -	\$ 250,000
Purchase	8/10/2011	8/10/2015	Federal Agencies	FFCB CALL	31331KTY6	100,000,000	1.44	1.44	100.00	-	100,000,000
Purchase	8/11/2011	7/27/2016	Federal Agencies	FNMA CALL	3136FRA86	67,325,000	2.25	2.09	100.75	-	67,888,847
Purchase	8/15/2011	8/15/2016	Federal Agencies	FNMA CALL	3136FRJ95	100,000,000	2.01	2.01	100.00	-	100,000,000
Purchase	8/15/2011	8/15/2016	Federal Agencies	FFCB CALL	31331KUB4	29,775,000	1.75	1.73	100.09	-	29,802,914
Purchase	8/17/2011	8/17/2016	Federal Agencies	FHLMC STEP CALL	3134G2UT7	50,000,000	1.00	1.00	100.00	-	50,000,000
Purchase	8/17/2011	8/17/2016	Federal Agencies	FHLMC STEP CALL	3134G2UT7	30,270,000	1.00	1.00	100.00	-	30,270,000
Purchase	8/22/2011	4/10/2012	Medium Term Notes	GE MTN	36962G2L7	10,000,000	5.00	0.61	102.77	-	10,460,533
Purchase	8/24/2011	8/24/2016	Federal Agencies	FHLMC CALL	3134G2VB5	25,000,000	2.20	2.14	100.27	-	25,066,406
Purchase	8/24/2011	8/24/2016	Federal Agencies	FHLMC CALL	3134G2WF5	5,050,000	1.75	1.75	100.00	-	5,050,000
Purchase	8/24/2011	8/24/2016	Federal Agencies	FHLMC STEP CALL	3134G2WJ7	25,000,000	1.50	1.50	100.00	-	25,000,000
Purchase	8/24/2011	8/24/2016	Federal Agencies	FHLMC CALL	3134G2VB5	25,000,000	2.20	2.13	100.34	-	25,085,938
Purchase	8/24/2011	8/24/2016	Federal Agencies	FHLMC CALL	3134G2YE6	50,000,000	1.50	1.50	100.00	-	50,000,000
Purchase	8/24/2011	8/24/2016	Federal Agencies	FHLMC CALL	3134G2YG1	100,000,000	1.42	1.42	100.00	-	100,000,000
Purchase	8/24/2011	8/13/2012	Medium Term Notes	GE MTN	36962G4E1	55,750,000	3.50	0.65	102.75	-	57,342,189
Purchase	8/24/2011	8/24/2016	Federal Agencies	FHLMC CALL NT	3134G2XB3	25,000,000	1.80	1.80	100.00	-	25,000,000
Subtotals						\$698,420,000	1.85	1.54	\$ 100.36	\$ -	\$701,216,827
Call	8/8/2011	2/8/2013	Federal Agencies	FNMA	31398AF23	50,000,000	1.80	1.80	100.00	-	50,000,000
Call	8/8/2011	2/8/2013	Federal Agencies	FNMA	31398AF23	25,000,000	1.80	1.82	99.95	-	25,000,000
Call	8/16/2011	3/16/2015	Federal Agencies	FFCB BD CALL	31331JE33	50,000,000	1.75	1.76	99.95	-	50,000,000
Call	8/18/2011	8/18/2014	Federal Agencies	FNMA AMORT TO CALL	3136FM3R3	53,270,000	1.75	1.63	100.45	-	53,270,000
Call	8/22/2011	8/22/2014	Federal Agencies	FHLB CALL NT	313371PT7	10,000,000	1.00	1.08	99.75	-	10,000,000
Subtotals						\$188,270,000	1.73	1.71	\$ 100.09	\$ -	\$188,270,000
Maturity	8/2/2011	8/2/2011	Public Time Deposits	FIRST NATIONAL BANK PTD		5,000,000	0.40	0.40	100.00	167	5,000,167
Maturity	8/4/2011	8/4/2011	Public Time Deposits	FIRST NATIONAL BANK PTD		5,000,000	0.70	0.70	100.00	8,944	5,008,944
Maturity	8/25/2011	8/25/2011	Federal Agencies	FFCB BULLET	31331YZ86	50,000,000	3.88	0.78	105.41	968,750	50,968,750
Maturity	8/31/2011	8/31/2011	U.S. Treasuries	US TSY NT	912828LV0	100,000	1.00	0.83	100.32	500	100,500
Maturity	8/31/2011	8/31/2011	U.S. Treasuries	US TSY NT	912828LV0	99,900,000	1.00	0.83	100.30	499,500	100,399,500
Subtotals						\$160,000,000	1.87	0.80	\$ 101.88	\$ 1,477,861	\$161,477,861
Interest	8/1/2011	-	Money Market Funds	PFM PRIME FUND		-	-	-	-	130	130
Interest	8/8/2011	2/8/2013	Federal Agencies	FNMA	31398AF23	50,000,000	1.80	1.80	100.00	450,000	450,000
Interest	8/8/2011	2/8/2013	Federal Agencies	FNMA	31398AF23	25,000,000	1.80	1.82	99.95	225,000	225,000
Interest	8/10/2011	8/10/2015	Federal Agencies	FNMA	3136FM6G4	25,000,000	2.13	2.13	100.00	265,625	265,625
Interest	8/16/2011	3/16/2015	Federal Agencies	FFCB BD CALL	31331JE33	50,000,000	1.75	1.76	99.95	364,583	364,583
Interest	8/18/2011	8/18/2014	Federal Agencies	FNMA AMORT TO CALL	3136FM3R3	53,270,000	1.75	1.63	100.45	466,113	466,113
Interest	8/22/2011	8/22/2014	Federal Agencies	FHLB CALL NT	313371PT7	10,000,000	1.00	1.08	99.75	20,000	50,000
Subtotals						\$213,270,000	1.78	1.76	\$ 100.08	\$ 1,791,451	\$ 1,821,451
Grand Totals	16		Purchases								
	0		Sales								
	10		Maturities / Calls								
	6		Change in number of positions								

SUNSHINE ORDINANCE
TASK FORCE



BOS-11, Leg Dep, COB
~~Rules Clerk~~, cpage, SOTF
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-7724
Fax No. (415) 554-7854
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

September 14, 2011

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

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

Dennis J. Herrera, City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
San Francisco City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 234
San Francisco, CA 94102

Steven Tierney, Ed.D., President, Health Commission
Barbara A. Garcia, MPA, Director of Health
Tomás Aragón, M.D., Health Officer
San Francisco Department of Public Health
101 Grove Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Request for Immediate Extension of Noise Ordinance Task Force Sunset Date
(Sunshine Ordinance Complaint No. 11043, Gamez v. Dept. of Public Health)

Dear Mayor Lee, Members of the Board of Supervisors, Mr. Herrera, and DPH Officials,

The Sunshine Ordinance Task Force recommends you take urgent and immediate action to extend the sunset date for the Noise Ordinance Task Force ("NOTF"), currently scheduled to sunset in November 2011 pursuant to San Francisco Police Code Section 2918(c) unless continued by the Board of Supervisors ("Board").

The NOTF was created by the Board in 2008 to assist the Director of Public Health with implementation of the noise control ordinance and provides annual reports to the Board regarding progress in protecting the City's noise environment. As a policy body established by ordinance and a resolution of the Board, the NOTF is subject to the Sunshine Ordinance under Section 67.3(d). Yet, from its beginning, the NOTF has been in violation of state and local public meeting laws because members were unaware the NOTF was subject to the Sunshine Ordinance.

Active citizens brought these violations to the attention of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force at hearings on July 26th and August 23rd of this year. On June 21st, Eileen Shields, Public Information Officer for the Department of Public Health ("DPH"), responded to citizen complaints, acknowledging DPH's failure to comply with Sunshine Ordinance public meeting

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 SEP 14 PM 4:14
BY PAJ

requirements. NOTF meeting agendas and minutes were not regularly posted and its meetings were not made known to the public,

Section 2918 requires the NOTF to meet quarterly. Its potential final meeting is scheduled for this Thursday, September 15th, allowing almost no time for public participation before the NOTF sunsets. Based on testimony from members of the public and DPH officials, the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force recommends the Board and other public officials request the NOTF's work continue past the November 2011 sunset date. The extension is necessary and should be long enough to allow members of the public to become engaged in the NOTF's work and make contributions to any noise control recommendations it makes to the Director of Health and the Board. The noise control ordinance exists to protect the public and the public deserves an opportunity for full participation in implementation of the ordinance.

The Sunshine Ordinance Task Force also makes this recommendation for an extension pursuant to the City and County of San Francisco's declaration that public participation is fundamental to democracy: "The right of the people to know what their government and those acting on behalf of their government are doing is fundamental to democracy, and with very few exceptions, that right supersedes any other policy interest government officials may use to prevent public access to information." (Sunshine Ordinance Section 67.1(d).)

Finally, and importantly, the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force urges the Board to take measures to ensure that all future task force groups follow the Sunshine Ordinance, including requiring adequate open government law training for all future task force members.

Thank you for time and immediate attention to this matter. Please contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force Administrator at sotf@sfgov.org or (415) 554-7724 with any questions or concerns.



Hope Johnson, Chair
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force

cc: Alicia Gamez, Complainant
Dr. Rajiv Bhatia, Respondent
Tom Rivard, Respondent

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



BOS-11 COB
3 Dep. Cpage
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 544-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 13, 2011
To: Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors
From: *AC*/Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Subject: Ethics Commission – Amendments to Ethics Commission Regulations
VI.A and XIV.C

On September 13, 2011, the Clerk's Office received the attached document from the Ethics Commission adopting amendments to two of the Ethics Commission's Regulations for Investigations and Enforcement Proceedings; Regulation VI.A regarding Executive Director Determination and Calendaring, and Regulation XIV.C concerning Stipulated Orders.

Under the San Francisco Charter Section 15.102, regulations adopted by the Ethics Commission become effective 60 days after the date of its adoption unless before the expiration of the 60-day period, November 11, 2011, two thirds of all Members of the Board of Supervisors vote to veto the regulation.

If you wish to hold a hearing on this matter, please notify me in writing by **5:00 pm, Friday, October 14, 2011.**



ETHICS COMMISSION CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BENEDICT Y. HUR
CHAIRPERSON

JAMIE S. STUDLEY
VICE-CHAIRPERSON

BEVERLY HAYON
COMMISSIONER

DOROTHY S. LIU
COMMISSIONER

CHARLES L. WARD
COMMISSIONER

JOHN ST. CROIX
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Date: September 13, 2011

To: Members, Board of Supervisors

From: John St. Croix, Executive Director
By: Mabel Ng, Deputy Executive Director

Re: Amendments to Ethics Commission Regulations VI.A and XIV.C

At its meeting on September 12, 2011, the Ethics Commission, by a 4-0 vote, approved the following amendments to its Enforcement Regulations. Under the Charter, the Commission may adopt, amend and rescind rules and regulations to govern procedures of the Commission. A rule or regulation adopted by the Commission shall become effective 60 days after the date of its adoption unless before the expiration of this 60-day period, two-thirds of all members of the Board of Supervisors vote to veto the rule or regulation. S.F. Charter § 15.102.

Under the Ethics Commission's current enforcement regulations, when Commission members review staff's recommendations about the possible dismissal or settlement of a complaint, any two Commissioners may cause the item to be calendared for consideration by the full Commission at a closed session at the next Commission meeting. If two Commissioners do not ask to calendar the item, then staff's recommendation regarding the dismissal or settlement becomes final. At its August 2011 meeting, Commissioners expressed interest in amending the regulations so that only one member's request would be required to calendar an enforcement matter for discussion in closed session. The amended changes to sections VI.A and XIV.C of the Ethics Commission's Regulations for Investigations and Enforcement Proceedings would accomplish that goal.

VI. DETERMINATION THAT THERE IS NOT PROBABLE CAUSE TO BELIEVE A VIOLATION OF LAW HAS OCCURRED

A. **Executive Director Determination and Calendaring.** If the Executive Director determines that there is not probable cause to believe that a violation of law has occurred, the Executive Director shall inform the Commission of that determination and provide clear and concise reasons supporting that determination. Thereafter any ~~two or more members~~ member of the Commission may cause the item to be calendared for consideration by the full Commission in a closed session at the next Commission meeting held no sooner than ten days after the date the Executive Director informs the Commission of the Executive Director's determination. A Commissioner's requests that a complaint be calendared for consideration by the full Commission must be

received by the Executive Director not less than five days prior to the date of the meeting, so that the Executive Director may comply with the applicable notice and agenda requirements.

XIV. STIPULATED ORDERS

C. Once the Executive Director enters into a stipulated agreement with a respondent, the Executive Director shall inform the Commission of this stipulation. Thereafter, any ~~two or more~~ members of the Commission may cause the stipulation to be calendared for consideration by the full Commission in a closed session at the next Commission meeting occurring no sooner than ten days from the date the Executive Director informs the Commission of the stipulated agreement. ~~If there is a vacancy on the Commission or if a member must recuse himself or herself from consideration of the stipulated order, one member of the Commission may cause the stipulation to be calendared.~~ A Commissioner's² requests that a stipulated agreement be calendared for consideration by the full Commission must be received by the Executive Director no fewer than five days prior to the date of the meeting, so that the Executive Director may comply with the applicable notice and agenda requirements.

S:\Enforcement\Investigations.Enforcement.Regulations\Possible Reg Change 8.2011\mem to BoS 9.13.2011 mtg.doc

August 31, 2011

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

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244

Ben Rosenfield, Controller
City Hall, Room 316
RE: Adopted Budget for FY 2011-12

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 SEP 13 AM 9:26
ay [signature]

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I hereby certify, in conformance with San Francisco Charter Section 9.115 and San Francisco Administrative Code Section 3.14, that the funding provided in the budget for FY 2011-12 as adopted by the Board of Supervisors is adequate for my department to meet service levels as proposed to the Board.

I anticipate that I shall make no requests for supplemental appropriations barring unforeseen circumstances.

Sincerely,



Jennifer Entine Matz
Director

cc: Rick Wilson, Mayor's Budget Director





To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc: Angela Calvillo/BOS/SFGOV,
Subject: Ethics Commission Annual Report

From: John St.Croix/ETHICS/SFGOV
To: Mayor Edwin Lee/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV
Date: 09/15/2011 05:12 PM
Subject: Ethics Commission Annual Report

Please find attached the annual report for the Ethics Commission for FY 2010-11.

Thank you.
John St. Croix
Executive Director, San Francisco Ethics Commission
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220
San Francisco, CA 94102-6053



final 9.2011.doc



San Francisco Ethics Commission

**Annual Report
July 1, 2010 - June 30, 2011**

The Ethics Commission is pleased to present this report on the activities, progress, and accomplishments of its sixteenth year of operation to the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and citizens of San Francisco.

**Benedict Y. Hur
Chairperson**

San Francisco Ethics Commission
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220
San Francisco, CA 94102

Email: ethics.commission@sfgov.org
Web site: www.sfethics.org
Telephone: 415/252-3100
Fax: 415/252-3112

SAN FRANCISCO ETHICS COMMISSION ANNUAL REPORT FY 2010-2011

The Ethics Commission serves the citizens of San Francisco, City employees, elected and appointed officials, and candidates for public office by enforcing the City's governmental ethics laws, providing education about their provisions, and serving as a repository for information.

The Commission acts as filing officer for campaign finance disclosure statements; audits statements for compliance with state and local laws; administers City laws regulating lobbyists and campaign consultants; investigates complaints alleging ethics law violations; serves as the filing officer for financial disclosure statements required from City officials; raises public awareness of ethics laws; researches and proposes ethics-related legislative changes; and provides ethics advice to candidates, office-holders, public officials, City and County employees and the general public.

The Commission is pledged to a high standard of excellence in government accountability, and to that end has worked not only to implement the law, but also to amend existing law or create new law that will further the principle of the voters' right to know and to ensure integrity in government decision-making and in the campaigns of those who wish to govern.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE SIXTEENTH YEAR

The Commission delivered a diverse array of work products and services to the citizens of San Francisco, managing to meet its mandates during a year of budget cutbacks and other resource limitations:

- Enforced reporting requirements for political committees, campaign consultants, lobbyists, and City officials;
- Conducted compliance audits of candidate and ballot measure committees;
- Continued the constant review of the Campaign Finance Reform Ordinance, making recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on changes to strengthen, clarify, and update campaign finance law. Drafted and adopted regulations to implement such changes;
- Created a ballot proposal to update and streamline the Campaign Consultant Ordinance;
- Conducted on-going sessions of its educational program on conflicts of interest, incompatible activities, candidate and treasurer information, campaign finance, public finance, on-line filing, lobbying, and other issues under its jurisdiction;
- Provided informal written or oral advice and responded to requests for informal and formal written advice letters;
- Added improvements to the new web site at www.sfethics.org and continued to extend the nature and number of documents available on-line;
- Facilitated interested persons meetings for the general public to provide input on issues under consideration by the Commission;
- Conducted hearings on requests for waivers from conflict of interest laws;

- Considered and adopted or provided comment on legislative changes recommended by the Board of Supervisors;
- Responded to hundreds of citizen inquiries; and
- Conducted an in-depth policy analysis and followed through with a number of policy updates and changes. Set the following policy priorities for the Commission and staff:
 1. Mayoral Public Financing Program
 2. Campaign Consultant Ordinance
 3. Staff Building
 4. Education and Outreach

MANDATES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE COMMISSION

The Commission is managing to meet its mandates with 17 staff members, down from the 18 staff members who were present three years ago. Incremental budget decreases have led to a loss of staffing. The Commission manages to meet solidly its obligations but is limited in the number and scope of new initiatives and improvements that it can make due to budget shortfalls that currently affect all of City government. While accomplishments are not as sweeping as in prior years, the Commission managed to conduct its business and produce some new efficiencies and improvements.

On June 30, 2011, the Civil Grand Jury issued a report entitled "San Francisco's Ethics Commission: The Sleeping Watch Dog," which is available at <http://www.sfsuperiorcourt.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=2860>. On August 12, 2011, the Commission issued its response, which is available at <http://www.sfethics.org/ethics/2011/09/ethics-commission-response-to-the-2010-2011-civil-grand-jury-report.html>.

Campaign Finance Regulation and Reporting

The Commission enforces the City's Campaign Finance Reform Ordinance (CFRO), San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code section 1.100 et seq., which sets voluntary ceilings on campaign expenditures by candidates and imposes mandatory limits on contributions to candidates.

The Commission regularly reviews the operation of the CFRO, enacts enabling regulations, and proposes substantive and operational changes. It also advises on amendments proposed by the Board of Supervisors.

This year, staff has continued its review of the CFRO, and conducted two interested persons meetings about possible amendments to consolidate several of the reporting requirements mandated under the Ordinance. These draft amendments will likely come before the Commission for review and discussion in October 2011. Recently, at its July 2011 meeting, the Commission approved amendments relating to the City's partial public financing program to place a cap on the amount of public funds that may be disbursed to each certified candidate. This legislation is pending before the Board of Supervisors.

Earlier in the year, at its October 2010 meeting, the Commission approved changes to section 1.126 of the CFRO. These amendments, if enacted, would allow campaign contributions to be made by individuals affiliated with non-profit organizations that contract with local agencies; allow such contributions to come from parties that contract with state agencies whose board members are appointed by local elected officials; refine the scope of the contractor contribution ban so that it applies only to contracts or a series of contracts worth \$100,000 or more; and amend related filing and disclosure requirements. At this point, the Board of Supervisors is not expected to consider these improvements and, therefore, they will not be enacted in the foreseeable future.

Under the Charter, the Commission serves as filing officer for five categories of local candidates and committees:

1. Candidates seeking election to local office and their controlled committees,
2. Committees formed or existing primarily to support or oppose candidates seeking election to local office,
3. Committees formed or existing primarily to support or oppose qualification or passage of a ballot measure being voted on only in San Francisco,
4. County general-purpose committees active only in San Francisco, and
5. Candidates and candidate committees for county central committee office.

As filing officer, the Commission promotes compliance by candidates and committees and maintains records of reports filed. It audits campaign statements and imposes late fines and/or penalties for failure to adhere to filing deadlines and reporting requirements.

Regular semi-annual filings for active committees occurred on August 2, 2010 and January 31, 2011. Quarterly filing deadlines occurred on October 5 and 21, 2010 for committees primarily formed to support or oppose a ballot measure(s) not yet voted upon. The Commission reminded committees of the deadlines, sent out notices to delinquent filers, and posted reports on its web site, www.sfethics.org.

Staff continued to send out advance notices through mail, email and phone calls in order to reduce the number of late filings.

Campaign Finance – (See discussions above.) The Commission will consider staff recommendations to amend the CFRO at its October 2011 meeting.

Conflicts of Interest – The Commission continued to provide trainings on Statements of Incompatible Activities. Also, during the year, the Commission approved:

- An amendment to section 3.216(b)-5 of the Government Ethics Ordinance (“GEO”), San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code section 3.200 et seq., to clarify that all gift cards and gift certificates are to be treated as cash under this section of the ordinance that addresses gifts from restricted sources.

- An amendment to section 3.234(b)(2) of the GEO to permit an appointed Mayor who does not seek candidacy for that office to obtain full-time City employment within one year of leaving office. The amendment restricts the former Mayor to obtaining a position that, in the first year, pays no more than the salary that he or she received immediately prior to appointment as Mayor.
- A request for a waiver from the one-year post-employment ban on compensation from contractors under GEO section 3.234(a)(3) by Doug Shoemaker, head of the Mayor's Office of Housing, so that he could assume a position as President of Mercy Housing California.
- Requests for waivers from the one-year post-employment communications ban and the ban on compensation from contractors under sections 3.234(a)(2) and 3.234(a)(3) of the GEO, respectively, by Office of Economic and Workforce Development employee Kyri S. McClellan so that she could assume the executive, director position on the San Francisco America's Cup Organizing Committee.

Public Financing

For the November 2, 2010 election 22 candidates for the Board of Supervisors qualified to receive public funding totaling \$1,477,713, an average of \$67,169 per eligible candidate. While some of these funds were disbursed in FY 09-10, most of the disbursements, a total of \$1,081,472, occurred during FY 10-11. The per candidate available disbursement limit (PCADL) for the November 2010 election was \$293,288 and the highest amount of public funds distributed to any candidate was \$140,572. Candidate spending in the election totaled \$3,581,175 and third party spending totaled \$1,305,460. The highest level to which the Ethics Commission raised a candidate's Individual Expenditure Ceiling was \$493,000.

Beginning in February 2011, the Commission began the administration of the public financing program for candidates for Mayor in the November 2011 election. For the FY 10-11, the Commission disbursed a total of \$2,686,699 in public funds to eight eligible mayoral candidates.

The Commission conducted several trainings and provided other outreach on the supervisorial and mayoral programs.

Audit Program

The Commission serves as the filing officer of campaign statements that are filed by San Francisco candidates and other committees that support or oppose local ballot measures or candidates. The Commission conducts audits of committees that are selected under a random selection process and mandatory audits of publicly funded candidates.

Statement of Economic Interests (SEI), Sunshine Ordinance Declaration, and Certificate of Ethics Training

Elected officials, department heads, and members of decision-making boards and commissions file the SEI, Sunshine Ordinance Declaration, and Certificate of Ethics Training with the Ethics

Commission to provide financial interest information and to verify that they have completed governmental ethics training. Some original SEIs filed by elected officials are forwarded to the Fair Political Practices Commission, the state agency that regulates SEIs.

On the SEIs, filers list financial interests such as stocks, investment property, gifts, and income. SEIs are public documents that provide financial interest information to ensure that public officials are not making governmental decisions that inure to their own benefit.

Both the Sunshine Ordinance Declaration and Certificate of Ethics Training verify that the filer has read the Sunshine Ordinance and watched the governmental ethics training video "Rules of Conduct for Public Officials." This training, found on the City Attorney's website, provides information on governmental ethics laws, public disclosure rules, and public meeting requirements. Customarily the Ethics Commission coordinates with the City Attorney's office to present a revised training every two years. The "Rules of Conduct for Public Officials" training was last hosted on March 2, 2009, and the next training will be provided sometime in spring of 2012. In the mean time, filers may meet the requirements found on both forms by watching the most recent version available on the City Attorney's web site or linked from the Commission's web site.

The 693 SEIs, 414 Sunshine Ordinance Declarations, and 299 Certificates of Ethics Training filed with the Ethics Commission this year are available on the Commission's website. As of June 30, 21 members of boards and commissions did not file their annual SEIs. (This number was reduced to three as of August 26, 2011.)

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting

Lobbyists are required by ordinance to register with the City and file monthly reports of any activity intended to influence local legislative or administrative action. The Commission reviews lobbyist statements to ensure completeness and accuracy.

During its previous extensive review of the Lobbyist Ordinance, the Commission determined that it would move to an electronic filing format, which took effect on January 1, 2010. This change has allowed for more timely filings and greater public access to each lobbyist's disclosures. The electronic database allows the public to conduct customized searches for information rather than laborious manual searches through paper filings. Staff has worked with the filing system provider to streamline the electronic filing system and continues to listen to feedback by the public and registered lobbyists to ensure both users and the public are able to access the system with greater ease.

Campaign Consultant Registration and Reporting

The Campaign Consultant Ordinance, passed in 1997, requires any individual or entity that earns \$1,000 or more in a calendar year in exchange for providing campaign consultant services to register with the Ethics Commission and file quarterly disclosure statements. The Campaign Consultant Ordinance is the result of a voter referendum and therefore is not subject to changes

without additional voter approval. A ballot measure with proposed amendments to the Ordinance will be on the November 2011 ballot.

Campaign consultants are required to report names of clients, services provided for those clients, payments promised or received, political contributions, gifts made to local officials, and other information. Staff prepares a summary of the quarterly statements and posts the summary on the Commission's website. For the 2010-2011 fiscal year, there was an average of 33 consultants registered with the Commission and over \$4.2 million in payments reported as promised or received.

In early August 2011, staff conducted an audit of all 2011 campaign statements filed with the Ethics Commission. Staff continues to ensure that all consultants required to be registered with the Commission file their registration forms and pay their registration fees.

Investigations and Enforcement

The Ethics Commission has the authority to investigate complaints that allege violations of certain state and local laws that relate to campaign finance, conflicts of interests, lobbyists, campaign consultants, and governmental ethics. In addition, the Whistleblower Ordinance directs the Commission to investigate charges of retaliation directed against complainants. During the 2010-2011 fiscal year, staff resolved 20 cases. This number does not include the myriad of other cases that come before staff but that were determined not to be within the jurisdiction of the Commission. The Commission entered into six settlement agreements during the year.

Enforcement Regulations

Staff is currently reviewing and preparing updates of its enforcement regulations regarding complaints alleging willful violations of the Sunshine Ordinance. The Sunshine Ordinance Task Force delivered its recommendations on these proposed regulations on August 1, 2011. The Commission will likely consider these amendments in the near future.

Education and Outreach

The Commission's commitment to educate the public about San Francisco's ethics laws and to support campaign reform and government accountability efforts is consistent with City and state policy.

In addition to in-person and web trainings, the Commission provides information to elected officials, members of boards and commissions, City departments, candidates, treasurers, lobbyists, campaign consultants, and members of the public about ethics-related laws and requirements on a day-to-day basis.

Compared to last year, staff conducted an additional 43 workshops. Of the total 68 trainings provided this year, 58 were in-person trainings or meetings. Ten trainings are videos available on the Commission's website.

Because the Educator/Outreach Coordinator continued to administer the Statements of Economic Interests, Sunshine Ordinance Declarations, and Certificates of Ethics Training, all time-consuming tasks, resources were focused on producing online training videos that can be viewed anytime on the web. This year, the Commission posted web training videos that range from 26 minutes to 56 minutes each. The ten training videos on the web and in-person trainings have received positive feedback for their accessibility, usefulness, and ability to provide complex information in an approachable manner.

Advice and Opinions

The Commission is charged with interpreting and applying the conflict laws under its jurisdiction, requiring that it consider requests for waivers, which it routinely does, and that it issue formal and informal written advice on matters requiring interpretation.

Commission staff is available each workday to answer public inquiries about San Francisco ethics laws. During the course of the year, the number of inquiries runs into the hundreds. In the fiscal year, the Commission issued three informal advice letters, one relating to conflicts of interest, a second relating to the Lobbyist Ordinance, and a third relating to the Campaign Consultant Ordinance. All of the Commission's advice letters are available on its website.

Electronic Advances

The Commission continued to expand its on-line services available to the public and aggressively pursue new technologies to enhance services despite significant budget constraints.

The Commission renewed its contract with Netfile to maintain and enhance the Commission's campaign finance, Statement of Economic Interests, and lobbyist electronic filing systems. In FY 10-11, the electronic filing system processed over 2,000 campaign finance, Form 700, and lobbyist electronic filings, which were instantly made available to the public on the Commission's on-line database. In addition, the Commission scanned and made paper filings, including campaign consultant filings, available on-line.

During the winter, Commission staff actively worked with the Fair Political Practices Commission Chairman's Task Force to make recommendations to support paperless electronic filing statewide. In January 2011, the Commission enhanced its Interested Persons E-mail List to allow the public to sign-up on the Commission's web site and receive automated notices. A month later, the Commission launched an on-line payment system to pay fines, settlements, and registration fees by credit/debit card or e-check.

The Commission's web site remained a popular resource:

- Users visited the system 58,086 times during the year, a ten percent increase over FY 09-10; and
- There were 151,048 "pageviews" of the website, a nine percent increase over FY 09-10.

The Commission also made use of a variety of social networks and on-line services to disseminate information to the public including:

- **Interested Persons E-mail List:** The public may subscribe to the Ethics Commission's Interested Persons E-mail List to obtain important notices, press releases and meeting agendas via e-mail;
- **Twitter:** Over 400 Twitter users receive news updates regarding the Commission's work on Twitter;
- **Facebook:** Over 250 Facebook users receive news updates regarding the Commission's work on Facebook;
- **YouTube:** Staff has developed trainings on video that members of the public and City staff can view from their office or home on the Commission's web site or YouTube channel;
- **Google Calendar:** A calendar is available on the Commission's web site to track important deadlines, interested persons meetings, training opportunities, events, and Commission meetings. The calendar can be viewed on the Commission's web site; or anyone may subscribe to the calendar and receive updates automatically from within his or her own calendar application or mobile phone;
- **RSS (Really Simple Syndication) Feeds:** Updates to the Commission's web site are published via RSS. Anyone may subscribe to all new postings to the web site, or to a variety of subtopics; and
- **Audio Recordings and iTunes:** Since June 2009, audio recordings of Commission meetings have been published on the web as a podcast and are accessible in the iTunes Podcast Directory. Audio recordings are usually posted to the Internet within 24-48 hours of the meeting. The public may subscribe to the podcast to receive notification when new recordings are available and listen to meetings on computers, mobile phones, and a variety of audio devices.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The Commission is charged with making policy recommendations on issues under its jurisdiction. The Commission endeavors to create new legislation that makes campaign finance and ethics laws and regulations more effective while being easier to comprehend and also works as a partner with the Board of Supervisors in effecting positive changes to the Administrative Code, the Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code and other statutes governing the City. Policy Priorities adopted for this year include:

1. **Mayoral Public Financing Program** – staff has to be ready for an intensified season of what is already a very busy program that is highly technical and difficult to administer. Additional complications may well result because of the Supreme Court's June 27, 2011 decision in *Arizona Free Enterprise Club's Freedom Club PAC, et al. v. Bennett*, which overturned Arizona's public financing program. This will perhaps entail swift and complicated changes to how the program is administered in mid-election.
2. **Campaign Consultant Ordinance** – once the Commission's proposal for the ballot is ratified, the Commission may no longer express any public opinion for or against the ballot

measure; the measure must speak for itself. If it passes, the Commission will then need to adopt regulations to govern the program and staff will have to implement the new procedures, including the development of software to integrate the new program into our current Online Filing System. Should the measure fail, the Commission may opt to “return to the drawing board.”

3. Staff building – in prior discussions, the Commission has acknowledged that unexpectedly high staff turnover made it necessary to allow time for staff-building. The long-term stability and capability of the staff requires that newer employees develop a deft understanding of the laws we oversee and a stable performance record that the Commission – and the public – can count on. It also requires that long-term staff feel supported and energized in their duties and that all staff reflect high morale and satisfaction in order to achieve maximum productivity.

4. Education and Outreach – the Commission has frequently restated its commitment to this area and conducted several discussions about it last year, essentially reaching the conclusion that work in this area is satisfactory but that it is also an ongoing priority.

The Commission never stops reviewing campaign finance laws and regulations, consistently performs research and outreach on conflict-of-interest issues, and is always mindful of the need for quality enforcement.

AFFILIATIONS

The Commission is a member of the Council on Governmental Ethics Laws (COGEL) but due to budget limitations no longer attends the annual convention.

BUDGET

The Commission's annual approved budget totals are as follows:

FY 94 – 95	157,000
FY 95 - 96	261,000
FY 96 - 97	313,274
FY 97 - 98	394,184
FY 98 - 99	475,646
FY 99 - 00	610,931
FY 00 - 01	727,787
FY 01 - 02	877,740
FY 02 - 03	1,156,295
FY 03 - 04	909,518
FY 04 - 05	1,052,389
FY 05 - 06	1,382,441
FY 06 - 07	8,416,109* (1,711,835 non-grant funding)
FY 07 - 08	3,592,078 (2,261,877 non-grant funding)
FY 08 - 09	5,453,874 (2,241,818 non-grant funding)
FY 09 - 10	6,011,566 (2,283,368 non-grant funding)
FY 10 - 11	4,177,819 (2,201,325 non-grant funding)**

*Includes 6,704,274 front-loaded funding for Mayoral Election Campaign Fund

**Agencies Citywide absorbed across-the-board budget cuts.

MEMBERSHIP AND ADMINISTRATION

Commission membership was as follows:

<u>Commissioner</u>	<u>Appointed By</u>	<u>Dates of Service</u>
Jamienne S. Studley	City Attorney	1-2007 to 2-2008 2-2008 to 2-2014
Eileen Hansen Dorothy S. Liu	Board of Supervisors	2-2005 to 4-2011 4-2011 to 2-2017
Susan J. Harriman Beverly Hayon	Mayor	3-2006 to 11-2010 1-2011 to 2-2012
Charles L. Ward	District Attorney	7-2006 to 2-2007 2-2007 to 2-2013
Benedict Y. Hur	Assessor-Recorder	3-2010 to 2-2016

Commissioner Ben Hur was elected to serve as Chair at the February 14, 2011 meeting and Commissioner Jamienne Studley was elected as Vice-Chair.

The Ethics Commission had a staff of 17, supported by interns throughout the year. Staff included Executive Director John St. Croix; Deputy Executive Director Mabel Ng; Assistant Deputy Director Shaista Shaikh; Auditors John Chan, Angeles Huang, and Amy Li; Public Finance Clerk Marvin Ford; Office Manager Jen Taloa; Campaign Finance Officer Jarrod Flores; Fines Collection Officer Ernestine Braxton; Campaign Finance Assistants Teresa Shew and Connie Ward; Chief Enforcement Officer Richard Mo; Assistant Investigators Garrett Chatfield and Catherine Argumedo; IT Officer Steven Massey; and Education and Outreach Coordinator Judy Chang. In addition to the above, the Commission had the privilege of working with the following interns: Rose Chan, a graduate of the USF School of Law; Johnny Hosey, a graduate of San Francisco State University; Dakotta Alex, a student at the Graduate Theological Union/UC Berkeley; and Perry Wong, an undergraduate at New York University.

FUTURE INITIATIVES

The Commission will continue to fulfill its mandated duties in the forthcoming years, with a particular focus on achieving the following priority objectives:

- The Commission is dedicated to increasing public confidence in its mission and to delivering fairness both in its actions and the perception of its actions.


- The Commission will actively demonstrate its commitment to the education of the public, the regulated community, the City's leadership body and the employees of the City and County through continued educational forums, seminars, on-line tutorials and other outreach mechanisms in order to strengthen both the understanding of and adherence to the laws under the Commission's jurisdiction.
- The Commission will continue the ongoing process of reviewing, updating and renewing the Campaign Finance Reform Ordinance in order to keep pace with changes in policy, technology, civic needs and campaign modernization.
- The Commission will expand its communications and improve its relations with the general public and work to ensure that there is general understanding in the community about the Commission's work, mission and decision-making processes.
- The Commission will work continually to expand the scope of its enforcement and investigation activity, to analyze the needs and accomplishments in this area and to make productive use of staff and other resources.
- The Commission will place new emphasis on resolving conflicts of interest and also the appearance of conflicts of interest by City agencies, officials, department heads and candidates and campaigns through both the education and investigations processes.
- The Commission will continue to conduct reviews of the Lobbyist Ordinance and draft regulations related to the Campaign Consultant program in order to seek improved disclosure and reporting requirements.
- The Commission will continue to work with various City departments, boards and commissions to inform members and employees of the various ethics rules that govern them. The Commission and staff will take advantage of training, education and other opportunities that will help advance their capabilities.
- The Commission will endeavor to provide timely and comprehensible advice.
- The Commission will work to secure sufficient budget resources to meet its mandates.
- The Commission will continue to monitor the application of laws within its jurisdiction and will continue to propose amendments and regulations as appropriate.

Respectfully Submitted,

John St. Croix, Executive Director

San Francisco Ethics Commission

FY 10-11



S:\Commission\Annual Report\2010-2011\final 9.2011.doc

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

Date: Sept. 16, 2011
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:

Mike Alonso - Assuming Office – Redistricting Task Force
Eric McDonnell - Assuming Office – Redistricting Task Force
Sonia Melara - Assuming Office – Redistricting Task Force
David Pilpel - Assuming Office – Redistricting Task Force
Melissa Tidwell - Assuming Office – Redistricting Task Force
Jenny Lam - Assuming Office – Redistricting Task Force
Marily Mondejar - Assuming Office – Redistricting Task Force



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Linda Wong/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: resignation from BAC

From: Ariella Hyman <ariellahyman@gmail.com>
To: Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org
Cc: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, Bert Hill <echill@sfhills.org>
Date: 09/13/2011 11:58 AM
Subject: resignation from BAC

Hello Supervisor Mar,

I very much enjoyed serving as the District 1 representative on the Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) for the past year and a half. Unfortunately I have to step down now because I am overextended and cannot put the time and effort into BAC activities that I feel is warranted. I want to thank you so much for the wonderful opportunity of serving on BAC, and I do hope when things are less hectic for me I can return to this very important work.

Please let me know if there are any other steps I should take to effectuate my resignation.

In appreciation,

Ariella Hyman



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: GGNRA Muir Woods National Monument

On Sept. 12, the Clerk's Office received a Summary Edition and three volumes entitled GGNRA Muir Woods National Monument, Draft General Mgmt. Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement dated August 2011. If you would like to view these, please let me know. If you are interested; digital versions of the Summary Edition and the DGMP/EIS volumes are available online at the project website; <http://parkplanning.gov/goga> There are limited printed copies available at the park headquarters in Fort Mason. Our office copy will become part of the Sept. 27, 2011 Cpages.

Best Regards,

Peggy Nevin
Executive Assistant
Board of Supervisors
415-554-7703
peggy.nevin@sfgov.org

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

National Park Service • U.S. Department of the Interior



RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 SEP 12 10 09 AM
PC

GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA MUIR WOODS NATIONAL MONUMENT

DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
SUMMARY EDITION



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: sept hearing

From: Michelle Londono <michelle@proactiveway.com>
To: "board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org" <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Date: 09/14/2011 11:51 AM
Subject: sept hearing

September 13, 2011

San Francisco Planning Commission;

I am a resident of San Francisco and a parent of Fairmount Elementary.

I am writing to object to the placement of a new cell phone tower at 3901 Mission.

It is unnecessary, inappropriate, undesirable and unsafe.

There is an excess of antennas already located in this area.

There is an excess of antennas located within two miles of Fairmount Elementary School. There are 446 antennas and 36 towers. There is no reason for more to continue to litter our city skyline and further increase children's exposure to cell phone antenna radiation.

A concerned resident,
Michelle Londoño

Make Safety a Priority in San Francisco and Support Wireless Upgrades

davidepstein1

to:

Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

09/15/2011 04:18 PM

Show Details

September 15, 2011

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo

City Hall

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Angela Calvillo,

Building a strong technology infrastructure such as cell sites can not only benefit consumers and businesses, but can also greatly improve the effectiveness of public safety agencies.

If first responders have a wireless network they can depend on for real-time interaction with the city's residents, San Francisco will be a safer, better place to live and work. This is why I believe proposed cell sites like the one in the King Street Corridor are essential to the success, improvement, and safety of our city.

Sincerely

David Epstein

145 Hampshire St

Unit B

San Francisco, CA 94103-4811

Improving cell coverage is good for the local economy

aharris399

to:

Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

09/14/2011 02:27 PM

Show Details

September 14, 2011

Clerk of the Board Angela Calvillo

City Hall

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Dear Angela Calvillo,

It's no surprise that cell coverage isn't ideal in San Francisco. Consumers today are relying on their smartphones and iPads at increasing rates. San Francisco needs more wireless antennas to keep up with these demands. To the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I extend my gratitude in advance for agreeing that we need improved coverage. I want what is best for San Francisco and a strong, wireless network that allows us to use cutting-edge devices. Please listen to our needs and support bringing more coverage and faster data speeds to our city.

Sincerely,

Tony Harris

1546 Dolores Street

San Francisco, CA 94110-4913



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File #110967 Regulating Public Nudity - PLEASE DISTRIBUTE TO ALL SUPERVISORS

From: Marvis Phillips <marvisphillips@gmail.com>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/15/2011 05:30 PM
Subject: File #110967 Regulating Public Nudity - PLEASE DISTRIBUTE TO ALL SUPERVISORS

Dear Supervisors,

I am very concerned about the changes to Section 1071.1 of the Police Code, Subsection B, and the impacts those changes will have on Fairs and Festivals, such as Dore Alley and Folsom Street Fair, as well as San Francisco Pride Celebration and Parade Event.

Sincerely,

Marvis J. Phillips
Community Watch Block Captain, Tenderloin



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110967 - Nudity in San Francisco

From: "Gail Nittle" <gnittle@gmail.com>
To: <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Date: 09/15/2011 06:36 PM
Subject: Nudity in San Francisco

Recently, my sister brought to my attention something that is happening in San Francisco that is very disturbing. Public nudity. Evidently, the police have been advised not to enforce the public nudity laws. So now, when I come to visit my sister (who lives near San Francisco), I can anticipate a display of nudity with impunity!

I'm sad and disappointed that your city has decided to ignore the rules of common decency and consideration for others' sensibilities. What a shame that families will no longer feel comfortable walking around your beautiful city, especially with their children. I know that now, I will not be visiting your city when I come to visit my sister and her family and would certainly not take my grandchildren, as I had planned to do. I'm glad I made trip to San Francisco last year, when I could see all the sites that are so unique to San Francisco without having to worry about encountering an unwelcome display of bare essentials.

I hope you'll reconsider your policy.

Sincerely,

Gail Nittle



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110967: nudity

From: suzy.rice@comcast.net
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/16/2011-03:20 PM
Subject: nudity

Dear Board,

I implore you, as people who work for the good of our society, to ban nudity in San Francisco. There is no way that this can be construed as a positive development for our children, families, workers, or tourists. In fact, it is one more step towards untenable degeneration of society at all levels. It is your responsibility to see that anarchy does not destroy our city, which has already crept into so many of San Francisco's fabric. My family has been here since the 1800s and we have witnessed a negative trend that has permitted to continue because of the governing bodies who do not care, have no common sense, or are lazy.

I hope you all do the right thing,

Sincerely,

S. Rice



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Alisa Somera/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110785: Support Bird-Safe Building Standards

From: Chris Stergalas <cstergalas@defenders.org>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/19/2011 07:16 AM
Subject: Support Bird-Safe Building Standards
Sent by: Defenders of Wildlife <ecommunications@defenders.org>

Sep 19, 2011

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a supporter of Defenders of Wildlife and a San Francisco resident, I am writing today to urge you to support the Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings.

Tens of millions of birds are killed each year when they collide with buildings and windows. Many are night-migrating species that migrate from Central and South America to breeding grounds in the U.S. and Canada. These include federally listed species and birds of conservation concern.

Millions of birds depend on the San Francisco Bay estuary system, not only during migration but throughout the winter. San Francisco's Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings direct the most serious efforts to those areas that are most at risk.

The Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings are based on sound scientific research, are well founded and are strongly supported by many architects and other members of the construction industry.

These standards provide guidance to help make smart choices when it comes to designing buildings. They also offer guidance on other remedies such as window treatments, lighting design, and lighting operation.

Please support the Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings to prevent the deaths of thousands of migratory birds each year in the Bay Area.

Sincerely,

Mr. Chris Stergalas
1130 17th Street NW
Washington, MD 20708
(734) 934-9452



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Alisa Somera/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110785: support of the Standards for Bird-safe Buildings

From: "Cheesemans' Ecology Safaris" <info@cheesemans.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/16/2011 04:25 PM
Subject: support of the Standards for Bird-safe Buildings

Dear members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

We are in full support of the SF Planning Dept Standards for Bird-safe Building. We are writing to urge you to approve the proposed SF Standards for Bird-safe Buildings at your meetings on Tuesday, September 20.

We are very interested in the welfare of birds like millions of other Americans who love them in their backyards and elsewhere. Birds help generate billions of dollars to the US economy every year. It would be fantastic if San Francisco led other Bay Area cities in approving the proposed SF Standards for Bird-safe Building.

Very best regards,

Gail & Douglas Cheeseman

--

Cheesemans' Ecology Safaris
20800 Kittridge Road
Saratoga, CA 95070 USA

www.cheesemans.com

info@cheesemans.com

408-741-5330 or 800-527-5330

Skype name ~ CheesemansEcologySafaris



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Alisa Somera/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110785: Yes on Bird-Safe Buildings

From: Ulistac <ulistac@yahoo.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/17/2011 09:43 AM
Subject: Yes on Bird-Safe Buildings

I often come to the City as much to watch birds as much as to watch the SF Giants and explore your museum. Migratory birds are beautiful and interesting creatures eagerly welcomed by millions of Americans into their backyards every year; they help generate billions of dollars annually to the U.S. economy.

I hope San Francisco will be the leader among our Bay Area Cities in approving the proposed San Francisco Standards for Bird-safe Buildings. I will urge my own city to follow in San Francisco's footsteps.

Thank you,

Clysta Seney
307 Los Padres Blvd.
Santa Clara, CA 95050



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110966: Support Sharp Park Legislation

The Clerk's Office has received 860 form emails like the one below.

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 09/15/2011 10:11 AM -----

From: franklin knight <bfrankk@earthlink.net>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/15/2011 09:58 AM
Subject: Support Sharp Park Legislation

I support restoring Sharp Park -- to expand and improve the recreation opportunities at the site and in San Francisco, as well as to help recover endangered species. I hope you share these values and will vote to pass the proposed Sharp Park restoration legislation. Currently, Sharp Park is beset by numerous problems: It loses money and drains funding from the Recreation and Park budget, the operation of the golf course harms endangered species, and the site is threatened by sea-level rise and climate change. Community groups, scientists and restoration experts concur that the major expenditures needed to keep an unsustainable golf course in play here for a few more years can no longer be justified.

The Sharp Park legislation gives us the opportunity to partner with the National Park Service to create a better public park that everyone can enjoy, while allowing San Francisco to redirect scarce recreation dollars back to parks and recreation facilities within the city. The legislation increases access to affordable golf by giving Pacifica residents access to San Francisco's other municipal courses at San Francisco resident rates. The legislation makes sense for the environment, for San Francisco taxpayers and for fuller public enjoyment of Sharp Park. I hope you'll support this important legislation.

franklin knight
1325 york st.
san francisco, CA 94110-4229



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110966: Restore Sharp Park into a National Park

The Clerk's Office has received 11 form emails like the one below.

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 09/15/2011 10:04 AM -----

From: Brandi Campbell <candybramble@gmail.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/14/2011 11:55 AM
Subject: Restore Sharp Park into a National Park
Sent by: Brandi Campbell <candybramble@gmail.com@change.org>

Greetings,

Sharp Park Golf Course is owned by San Francisco but located in Pacifica, California. With a glut of golf courses around the Bay Area, we are working to transform Sharp Park from a money-losing, endangered species-killing golf course into a new National Park that provides recreational amenities everyone can enjoy. By partnering with the National Park Service, San Francisco can redirect the money it saves back to neighborhood parks and community centers, and we all get a new National Park! Let us collectively support the restoration of Sharp Park so valuable species can thrive and all people can enjoy the beautiful gifts nature has to offer.

San Francisco, California

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at www.change.org/petitions/restore-sharp-park. To respond, email responses@change.org and include a link to this petition.



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110966: Restore Sharp Park into a National Park

From: Joe Clement <joe@onetwothree.net>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/12/2011 08:30 PM
Subject: Restore Sharp Park into a National Park
Sent by: Joe Clement <joe=onetwothree.net@change.org>

Greetings,

Sharp Park Golf Course is owned by San Francisco but located in Pacifica, California. With a glut of golf courses around the Bay Area, we are working to transform Sharp Park from a money-losing, endangered species-killing golf course into a new National Park that provides recreational amenities everyone can enjoy. By partnering with the National Park Service, San Francisco can redirect the money it saves back to neighborhood parks and community centers, and we all get a new National Park! Let us collectively support the restoration of Sharp Park so valuable species can thrive and all people can enjoy the beautiful gifts nature has to offer.

San Francisco, California

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at www.change.org/petitions/restore-sharp-park. To respond, email responses@change.org and include a link to this petition.



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110966 Emails

From: Matthew Zlatunich <webmaster@wildequity.org>
To: Clerk Of <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
Date: 09/12/2011 08:18 PM
Subject: Please Support Legislation Restoring Sharp Park!
Sent by: webmaster@wildequity.org

Dear Clerk Of:

Dear Supervisor:

I support restoring Sharp Park, and I hope you will as well. Sharp Park is beset by numerous problems: it loses money, it harms endangered species, and it is threatened by sea level rise and climate change. Everyone recognizes that at some point the golf course will need to go: but some still think it's worth it to throw good money after bad to keep an unsustainable golf course in play for a few more years.

But I know you know better, and that's why I'm asking you to support the new legislation to restore Sharp Park. The legislation gives us the opportunity to partner with Sharp Park's adjacent land owner, the National Park Service, to build a new public park that everyone can enjoy, while allowing San Francisco to redirect it's scarce recreation dollars back home, where the money really belongs. It also increases access to affordable golf by giving Pacifica residents access to San Francisco's other municipal courses at San Francisco resident rates. It's a sensible idea that is better for the environment, better for City coffers, and better for the game of golf. I hope you will support this important legislation.

Sincerely,
Matthew Zlatunich

From: Linda Wheeldon <lwheeldon@rogers.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/12/2011 10:42 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.

Linda Wheeldon

Toronto, ON M6R 1K1
CA

From: Regina Powell <powellregina51@yahoo.com>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/13/2011 08:22 AM
Subject: Support Sharp Park Legislation

I support restoring Sharp Park -- to expand and improve the recreation opportunities at the site and in San Francisco, as well as to help recover endangered species. I hope you share these values and will vote to pass the proposed Sharp Park restoration legislation. Currently, Sharp Park is beset by numerous problems: It loses money and drains funding from the Recreation and Park budget, the operation of the golf course harms endangered species, and the site is threatened by sea-level rise and climate change. Community groups, scientists and restoration experts concur that the major expenditures needed to keep an unsustainable golf course in play here for a few more years can no longer be justified.

The Sharp Park legislation gives us the opportunity to partner with the National Park Service to create a better public park that everyone can enjoy, while allowing San Francisco to redirect scarce recreation dollars back to parks and recreation facilities within the city. The legislation increases access to affordable golf by giving Pacifica residents access to San Francisco's other municipal courses at San Francisco resident rates. The legislation makes sense for the environment, for San Francisco taxpayers and for fuller public enjoyment of Sharp Park. I hope you'll support this important legislation.

Regina Powell
2016 Dalis DR
Concord, CA 94520-5418

From: Constance Franklin <cfjanuary@att.net>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/13/2011 08:37 AM
Subject: Support Sharp Park Legislation

As an ex-resident of San Francisco, but a frequent visitor because my brother still lives in San Francisco, I grew up playing in Golden Gate park, and still to this day, when I am in San Francisco, it is a place I immensely enjoy. I am writing in particular about support of restoring Sharp Park. Please, expand and improve the recreation opportunities at the site and in San Francisco. As an advocate for wildlife, and a frequent nature walker, it is very important to me to help recover endangered species. I anticipate you share these values for our California Parks and will vote to pass the proposed Sharp Park restoration legislation. Currently, Sharp Park has lost money and drains funding from the Recreation and Park budget, and further, the golf course harms endangered species, and is threatened by sea-level rise and climate change. All of this concerns me greatly. Community groups, scientists

and restoration experts concur that the major expenditures needed to keep an unsustainable golf course in play here for a few more years can no longer be justified.

The Sharp Park legislation gives us the opportunity to partner with the National Park Service to create a better public park that all of us can enjoy, while allowing San Francisco to redirect scarce recreation dollars back to parks and recreation facilities within the city. The legislation increases access to affordable golf by giving Pacifica residents access to San Francisco's other municipal courses at San Francisco resident rates. The legislation makes sense for the environment, for San Francisco taxpayers and for fuller public enjoyment of Sharp Park. Please, support this important legislation.

Constance Franklin
808 1/2 Laguna Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90026

From: Michael Slaughter <buyer@ma42.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/07/2011 09:15 PM
Subject: Restore Sharp Park into a National Park
Sent by: Michael Slaughter <buyer=ma42.com@change.org>

Greetings,

Sharp Park Golf Course is owned by San Francisco but located in Pacifica, California. With a glut of golf courses around the Bay Area, we are working to transform Sharp Park from a money-losing, endangered species-killing golf course into a new National Park that provides recreational amenities everyone can enjoy. By partnering with the National Park Service, San Francisco can redirect the money it saves back to neighborhood parks and community centers, and we all get a new National Park! Let us collectively support the restoration of Sharp Park so valuable species can thrive and all people can enjoy the beautiful gifts nature has to offer.

George Carlin was right about golf and golfers--and he didn't even know Sharp Park. Golf also reminds me of the poignant Industrial Revolution quatrain: The factory lies so near the links That almost every day The working children can look out And see the men at play.

Pacifica, California

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at www.change.org/petitions/restore-sharp-park. To respond, email responses@change.org and

include a link to this petition.

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 09/12/2011 02:54 PM -----

From: Tom Wishing <tomwishing@hotmail.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/08/2011 11:41 AM
Subject: Restore Sharp Park into a National Park
Sent by: Tom Wishing <tomwishing@hotmail.com@change.org>

Greetings,

Sharp Park Golf Course is owned by San Francisco but located in Pacifica, California. With a glut of golf courses around the Bay Area, we are working to transform Sharp Park from a money-losing, endangered species-killing golf course into a new National Park that provides recreational amenities everyone can enjoy. By partnering with the National Park Service, San Francisco can redirect the money it saves back to neighborhood parks and community centers, and we all get a new National Park! Let us collectively support the restoration of Sharp Park so valuable species can thrive and all people can enjoy the beautiful gifts nature has to offer.

This makes sense on all levels, protecting endangered species, saving money, and providing a resource that many more people will benefit from than just golfers. You can't stop the ocean from going where it wants to go anyway. Mother Natures always bats last!

San Francisco, California

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at www.change.org/petitions/restore-sharp-park. To respond, email responses@change.org and include a link to this petition.

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 09/12/2011 02:54 PM -----

From: Concerned Citizen <katiebgc@aol.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/10/2011 03:20 PM
Subject: Restore Sharp Park into a National Park
Sent by: Concerned Citizen <katiebgc=aol.com@change.org>

Greetings,

Sharp Park Golf Course is owned by San Francisco but located in Pacifica, California. With a glut of golf courses around the Bay Area, we are working to transform Sharp Park from a money-losing, endangered species-killing golf course into a new National Park that provides recreational amenities everyone can enjoy. By partnering with the National Park Service, San Francisco can redirect the money it saves back to neighborhood parks and community centers, and we all get a new National Park! Let us collectively support the restoration of Sharp Park so valuable species can thrive and all people can enjoy the beautiful gifts nature has to offer.

New City, New York

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at www.change.org/petitions/restore-sharp-park. To respond, email responses@change.org and include a link to this petition.



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110996 - Sharp Park

From: Bassam Imam <CleanEarth1400@hotmail.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/08/2011 03:35 AM
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 wetlands and the wildlife therein are a beautiful and important gift from GOD. Please try to be thankful.

Best Regards,

Bassam Imam

Bassam Imam

Montreal, QC H3H 2N4
CA

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 09/12/2011 02:29 PM -----

From: Lauren Friedman <mostesoteric@hotmail.com>
To: <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Date: 09/08/2011 07:48 AM
Subject: Sharp Park

Dear Supervisors,

I support restoring Sharp Park, and I hope you will as well. Sharp Park is beset by numerous problems: it loses money, it harms endangered species, and it is threatened by sea level rise and climate change. Everyone recognizes that at some point the golf course will need to go: but some still think it's worth it to throw good money after bad to keep an unsustainable golf course in play for a few more years. While many people want places to play golf, there are various alternatives available. The Sharp Park golf course is only needed because it is convenient for a small minority.

But I know you know better, and that's why I'm asking you to support the new legislation to restore Sharp Park. The legislation gives us the opportunity to partner with Sharp Park's adjacent land owner, the National Park Service, to build a new public park that everyone can enjoy, while allowing San Francisco to redirect it's scarce recreation dollars back home, where the money really belongs. It also increases access to affordable golf by giving Pacifica residents access to San Francisco's other municipal courses at San Francisco resident rates. It's a sensible idea that is better for the environment, better for City coffers, and better for the game of golf. I hope you will support this important legislation.

Lauren Friedman



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110966: Hop to it, Mayor & Board: Act Smart, Be Sharp!

From: Susan Clay <sbhclay@comcast.net>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/19/2011 02:06 AM
Subject: Hop to it, Mayor & Board: Act Smart, Be Sharp!

Dear Board of Supervisors

Your city has such a superb reputation for doing the right thing for the right reasons.

Voting to return Sharp Park GC to wetlands for the public to enjoy and for wildlife to thrive in would continue your fine tradition of right-doing.

If I were a taxpayer to San Fran coffers, I'd be upset that my money was being used to pump a beautiful, needed wetlands DRY -- killing endangered frogs in the process. Yup, I'd be HOPPING MAD!

As you well know, the Sharp Park Golf Course has a long history of environmental and economic troubles.

Clearly, the time has come for the City of San Francisco to change course -- literally and figuratively.

Do the right thing for all: close the golf course and hand management of the land over to the National Park Service. You'll be relieving your citizens of a financial, legal and environmental nightmare -- and will continue your record as a world leader in environmental protection efforts.

As citizens of this world, it's our obligation to our planet and to future generations to leave Sharp Park in better shape than when we arrived here.

On behalf of all those who enjoy nature and wildlife, thanks for DOING THE RIGHT THING!!!!

Now, let's hop to it, you fine frog-loving folks!

Susan Clay



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110966: Restore Sharp Park into a National Park

The Clerk's Office has received two form emails like the one below.

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 09/16/2011 04:24 PM -----

From: Melissa Fan <melissa.s.fan@gmail.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/16/2011 01:10 PM
Subject: Restore Sharp Park into a National Park
Sent by: Melissa Fan <melissa.s.fan@gmail.com@change.org>

Greetings,

Sharp Park Golf Course is owned by San Francisco but located in Pacifica, California. With a glut of golf courses around the Bay Area, we are working to transform Sharp Park from a money-losing, endangered species-killing golf course into a new National Park that provides recreational amenities everyone can enjoy. By partnering with the National Park Service, San Francisco can redirect the money it saves back to neighborhood parks and community centers, and we all get a new National Park! Let us collectively support the restoration of Sharp Park so valuable species can thrive and all people can enjoy the beautiful gifts nature has to offer.

Daly city, California

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at www.change.org/petitions/restore-sharp-park. To respond, email responses@change.org and include a link to this petition.



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110966: Restore Sharp Park into a National Park

The Clerk's office has received 6 form emails like the one below.

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 09/19/2011 06:36 PM -----

From: Logan Babkes <lrbabkes@gmail.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/18/2011 08:50 PM
Subject: Restore Sharp Park into a National Park
Sent by: Logan Babkes <lrbabkes@gmail.com@change.org>

Greetings,

Sharp Park Golf Course is owned by San Francisco but located in Pacifica, California. With a glut of golf courses around the Bay Area, we are working to transform Sharp Park from a money-losing, endangered species-killing golf course into a new National Park that provides recreational amenities everyone can enjoy. By partnering with the National Park Service, San Francisco can redirect the money it saves back to neighborhood parks and community centers, and we all get a new National Park! Let us collectively support the restoration of Sharp Park so valuable species can thrive and all people can enjoy the beautiful gifts nature has to offer.

San Francisco, California

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at www.change.org/petitions/restore-sharp-park. To respond, email responses@change.org and include a link to this petition.



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110966: Only 8% of Americans Golf. We need more Parks! Protect Sharp Park Wetlands for future generations of non-golfers!

From: Crystal Ritchie <crystalrose5@hotmail.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/19/2011 11:20 AM
Subject: Only 8% of Americans Golf. We need more Parks! Protect Sharp Park Wetlands for future generations of non-golfers!

Dear Board of Supervisors

Dear Mayor,

Only 8% of the public golfs***, but many more people use bay trails, enjoy hiking, biking, walking their dogs, and wildlife viewing. Please protect these wetlands for future generations of non-golfers (which is 92% of us) and for the endangered Red Legged Frogs, and other threatened creatures.

As a supporter of SAVE THE FROGS! (www.savethefrogs.com), I am writing to urge you to support Supervisor John Avalos' proposed legislation that would re-purpose the Sharp Park Golf Course to a new public park managed by the National Park Service that all can enjoy. 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 management of 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.

Frogs already face an array of threats from climate change to habitat destruction; pesticide use; over-collection for frog legs and dissections; invasive species; and infectious diseases spread by human activity. Frogs eat mosquitoes, provide us with medical advances, serve as food for birds and fish, and their tadpoles filter our drinking water. Plus kids love frogs, and it is our obligation to them to leave this planet in better shape than when we arrived here.

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

***Golflink.com says that there are 28 million golfers in the U.S., and the latest U.S. population is aprox. 312 million. = 8% of Americans that golf.

Crystal Ritchie



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110966: Please vote YES to Save The Sharp Park Wetlands

The Clerk's Office has received 732 form emails like the one below.

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 09/20/2011 09:56 AM -----

From: Jessica Jansen <js.jansen@solcon.nl>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/19/2011 11:58 AM
Subject: Please vote YES to Save The Sharp Park Wetlands

Dear Board of Supervisors

As a supporter of SAVE THE FROGS! (www.savethefrogs.com), I am writing to urge you to support Supervisor John Avalos' proposed legislation that would re-purpose the Sharp Park Golf Course to a new public park managed by the National Park Service that all can enjoy. 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 management of 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.

Frogs already face an array of threats from climate change to habitat destruction; pesticide use; over-collection for frog legs and dissections; invasive species; and infectious diseases spread by human activity. Frogs eat mosquitoes, provide us with medical advances, serve as food for birds and fish, and their tadpoles filter our drinking water. Plus kids love frogs, and it is our obligation to them to leave this planet in better shape than when we arrived here.

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

Jessica Jansen



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Please Support Humane Pet Acquisition Proposal

The Clerk's Office has received 10 form emails like the one below.

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

From: Stacey McRae <semcrae@aol.com>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/11/2011 09:27 AM
Subject: Please Support Humane Pet Acquisition Proposal
Sent by: In Defense of Animals <takeaction@idausa.org>

Sep 11, 2011

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Supervisors,

As a San Francisco voter and supporter of In Defense of Animals (IDA), I strongly encourage you to support San Francisco Animal Control and Welfare's Humane Pet Acquisition Proposal.

There is an oversupply of adoptable pets in the city, requiring ACC to unnecessarily euthanize many adoptable animals at taxpayers' expense. Meanwhile, "new" pets are bred in often horrible conditions and then sold in this city at pet stores and from small breeders, all for profit. This is grossly inconsistent with how the city of St. Francis of Assisi feels towards animals, yet most San Franciscans aren't aware of this when they decide to purchase a pet.

San Francisco Animal Control and Welfare's proposal focuses on having San Franciscans adopt our pets rather than purchasing them. This will result in:

- More adoptions and less euthanasia
- A decrease in cost for Animal Control and Welfare
- Pet stores as partners in reducing euthanasia
- Healthier pets with fewer behavioral problems

Sec. 48 of the San Francisco Health Code already prohibits the sale of rabbits and certain birds as pets. Other cities like Albuquerque, Austin, Los Angeles, and South Lake Tahoe have already prohibited the sale of dogs and cats. So San Francisco has several precedents that support strong and decisive action for all species.

Please support the San Francisco Humane Pet Acquisition Proposal and make San Francisco a leader in animal welfare.

Sincerely,

Ms. Stacey McRae
45154 Crystal Springs Dr
Indio, CA 92201-0804



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Please Support Humane Pet Acquisition Proposal

From: Alixine Sasonoff <alixine@msn.com>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/12/2011 02:59 PM
Subject: Please Support Humane Pet Acquisition Proposal
Sent by: In Defense of Animals <takeaction@idausa.org>

Sep 12, 2011

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Supervisors,

As a San Francisco voter and supporter of In Defense of Animals (IDA), I strongly encourage you to support San Francisco Animal Control and Welfare's Humane Pet Acquisition Proposal.

There is an oversupply of adoptable pets in the city, requiring ACC to unnecessarily euthanize many adoptable animals at taxpayers' expense. Meanwhile, "new" pets are bred in often horrible conditions and then sold in this city at pet stores and from small breeders, all for profit. This is grossly inconsistent with how the city of St. Francis of Assisi feels towards animals, yet most San Franciscans aren't aware of this when they decide to purchase a pet.

San Francisco Animal Control and Welfare's proposal focuses on having San Franciscans adopt our pets rather than purchasing them. This will result in:

- More adoptions and less euthanasia
- A decrease in cost for Animal Control and Welfare
- Pet stores as partners in reducing euthanasia
- Healthier pets with fewer behavioral problems

Sec. 48 of the San Francisco Health Code already prohibits the sale of rabbits and certain birds as pets. Other cities like Albuquerque, Austin, Los Angeles, and South Lake Tahoe have already prohibited the sale of dogs and cats. So San Francisco has several precedents that support strong and decisive action for all species.

Please support the San Francisco Humane Pet Acquisition Proposal and make San Francisco a leader in animal welfare.

Sincerely,

Ms. Alixine Sasonoff
3701 SW Three Tree Point Ln
Burien, WA 98166-3137



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Please Support Humane Pet Acquisition Proposal

The Clerk's Office has received 15 form emails like the one below.

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 09/16/2011 04:09 PM -----

From: Nicole Bell <davenicky@talktalk.net>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/16/2011 12:41 PM
Subject: Please Support Humane Pet Acquisition Proposal
Sent by: In Defense of Animals <takeaction@idausa.org>

Sep 16, 2011

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Supervisors,

As a San Francisco voter and supporter of In Defense of Animals (IDA), I strongly encourage you to support San Francisco Animal Control and Welfare's Humane Pet Acquisition Proposal.

There is an oversupply of adoptable pets in the city, requiring ACC to unnecessarily euthanize many adoptable animals at taxpayers' expense. Meanwhile, "new" pets are bred in often horrible conditions and then sold in this city at pet stores and from small breeders, all for profit. This is grossly inconsistent with how the city of St. Francis of Assisi feels towards animals, yet most San Franciscans aren't aware of this when they decide to purchase a pet.

San Francisco Animal Control and Welfare's proposal focuses on having San Franciscans adopt our pets rather than purchasing them. This will result in:

- More adoptions and less euthanasia
- A decrease in cost for Animal Control and Welfare
- Pet stores as partners in reducing euthanasia
- Healthier pets with fewer behavioral problems

Sec. 48 of the San Francisco Health Code already prohibits the sale of rabbits and certain birds as pets. Other cities like Albuquerque, Austin, Los Angeles, and South Lake Tahoe have already prohibited the sale of dogs and cats. So San Francisco has several precedents that support strong and decisive action for all species.

Please support the San Francisco Humane Pet Acquisition Proposal and make San Francisco a leader in animal welfare.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Nicole Bell
14 Saint Johns Drive
Dunfermline, None 55555



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Please Support Humane Pet Acquisition Proposal

The Clerk's Office has received two form emails like the one below.

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 09/19/2011 06:32 PM -----

From: Jisook Woo <[redacted]@yahoo.com>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/17/2011 12:12 AM
Subject: Please Support Humane Pet Acquisition Proposal
Sent by: In Defense of Animals <takeaction@idausa.org>

Sep 17, 2011

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Supervisors,

As a San Francisco voter and supporter of In Defense of Animals (IDA), I strongly encourage you to support San Francisco Animal Control and Welfare's Humane Pet Acquisition Proposal.

There is an oversupply of adoptable pets in the city, requiring ACC to unnecessarily euthanize many adoptable animals at taxpayers' expense. Meanwhile, "new" pets are bred in often horrible conditions and then sold in this city at pet stores and from small breeders, all for profit. This is grossly inconsistent with how the city of St. Francis of Assisi feels towards animals, yet most San Franciscans aren't aware of this when they decide to purchase a pet.

San Francisco Animal Control and Welfare's proposal focuses on having San Franciscans adopt our pets rather than purchasing them. This will result in:

- More adoptions and less euthanasia
- A decrease in cost for Animal Control and Welfare
- Pet stores as partners in reducing euthanasia
- Healthier pets with fewer behavioral problems

Sec. 48 of the San Francisco Health Code already prohibits the sale of rabbits and certain birds as pets. Other cities like Albuquerque, Austin, Los Angeles, and South Lake Tahoe have already prohibited the sale of dogs and cats. So San Francisco has several precedents that support strong and decisive action for all species.

Please support the San Francisco Humane Pet Acquisition Proposal and make San Francisco a leader in animal welfare.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Jisook Woo

2011 SEP 13 PM 2:53
PC

Sept. 12, 2011

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
c/o Clerk of the Board, Angela Calvillo

Dear Board Members:

Although I live in Marin County, I am frequently in San Francisco for events as I am a symphony, ACT and ballet subscriber. This summer, I was also a tour guide for visitors from Germany and Belgium. In this regard, I am writing to you and to the Board of Supervisors to comment on the issue of transients loitering on San Francisco streets. It is quite disturbing to visit this beautiful City and to be accosted and affronted by people that are frankly, scary. In particular, our visitors from Europe were appalled when they walked from their hotel near Union Square through the City to Golden Gate park and back as they were presented with people that made them feel afraid. People of all ages/genders were on the streets asking for money/needing to be showered/sitting with scraggly animals/themselves wearing filthy clothing and seemingly having no where to go or to be but on the streets of San Francisco. The European visitors asked us why the City would allow this to happen. In their cities, Cologne and Brussels, people who need care are cared for and placed in suitable care facilities or locations. Their cities are clean and safe. We explained that San Francisco has ways to care and provide for homeless people but the people have the right to refuse. That was the big difference. Somehow, the overall public good is lost to the right of the individual. What happened to laws that protect the general public? San Francisco needs to take a serious look at this issue and change course.

The enclosed editorial from the Chronicle expresses this concern very well. In fact, I was surprised and gratified to see that the local newspaper is asking and raising some of the same questions that I am expressing in this letter to you.

Sincerely,



Mary Ann Sinkkonen

14 Tennyson Dr.

Mill Valley, CA 94941

msinkkonen@earthlink.net

San Francisco Chronicle

THE VOICE OF THE WEST

Founded in 1865 by Charles and M.H. deYoung

A HEARST NEWSPAPER

Ward H. Bushee
Editor and Executive Vice President

John Diaz
Editorial Page Editor

Stephen R. Proctor
Managing Editor

Meredith White
Deputy Managing Editor

Frank J. Vega, Chairman and Publisher

Mark Adkins, President

VICE PRESIDENTS

Jeff Bergin ... Senior VP, Advertising **Kelly Harville** ... Marketing
Chris Blaser ... Senior VP, Circulation **Calvin Siemer** ... Legal Affairs
Elizabeth A. Cain ... Chief Financial Officer

EDITORIAL *On Homelessness in San Francisco*

The issue that won't go away

Hotel Nikko General Manager Anna Marie Presutti tells a Chronicle reporter that tourist complaints about aggressive panhandlers "have gone to a different level." The San Francisco Travel Association reports an uptick in complaints from visitors who are accosted on the streets.

You don't have to be a tourist to notice what locals experience every day. Downtown often feels like an obstacle course.

"There's a marked increase in people's observations of people panhandling, sitting and lying on the street, acting strangely, public urination and public defecation — the whole litany of behaviors that has become really problematic," Tim Falvey of the Union Square Business Improvement District said.

What to do? If passing laws

alone could reduce panhandling and antisocial behavior, San Francisco would not have an overabundance of panhandlers. Last year, 54 percent of San Francisco voters supported a sit-lie ordinance that restricts sitting on sidewalks from 7 a.m. to 11 p.m. In 2003, the electorate passed a law against aggressive panhandling. In 2002, San Franciscans approved then-Mayor Gavin Newsom's Care Not Cash plan, which cut welfare checks in return for housing.

Falvey thinks that one solution

could be to educate tourists about not giving spare change to panhandlers.

Tourism is up 20 percent compared with last year, according to the Travel Association. President Joe D'Alessandro likes to remind residents that tourism dollars have helped balance the city budget and fund homeless programs. If the city's reputation as a haven for the homeless discourages tourism, everyone gets hurt. The word is out. Travel chat lines are filled with complaints about aggressive panhandlers downtown.

Conversely, when San Franciscans travel, they often wonder how other cities have managed to cut down on the number of street people they see. Why is it, San Franciscans ask themselves, that



Brant Ward/The Chronicle

New York has cleaned up its streets while Baghdad by the Bay grows increasingly less civil? It's time for the 11 candidates for mayor to lay out their strategies for addressing a problem that is not going away.



Pictures - Panhandling is bad for mental health

Panhandler Boycott to: carmen.chu, chustaff, David.Campos,
david.chiu, Ed Lee, Eric.L.Mar, jane.kim,
John.Avalos, Malia.Cohen, Mark.Farrell,
Cc: board.of.supervisors, Captain, cnevius, Scott James

09/19/2011 10:20 AM

<http://panhandlerboycott.wordpress.com/2011/09/19/panhandling-is-bad-for-mental-health-geary-street/>

These pictures document a few moments with an aggressive panhandler on Geary street.

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2011 SEP 13 PM 2:53

cc

BY

Jim & Ninfa Wood

955 Dogwood Drive

Murphys, CA 95247

Phone 209-728-8237

Email ninfa1939@comcast.net

10 September 2011

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

Dear Board Members:

As you can see from the top of this letter, we do not live in San Francisco. However, my husband and I are frequent visitors to The City which we love so much. We attend Giants games, visit the many museums, attend the theater, and enjoy the many restaurants as well as enjoy the many other things to do in San Francisco.

While there, we stay at a hotel near Ruby Skye, the night club at 420 Mason Street. On some Thursday nights and definitely Friday and Saturday nights, the night club hosts parties. The patrons inside the club are no problem; however, the patrons outside the club party as though they are inside the club until 3 or later in the morning keeping us awake throughout the night. Is there not some noise ordinance in the city that the owners of Ruby Skye are in violation of? If so, possibly a letter to the owners/operators of Ruby Skye advising them of their violations would be in order, and possible consequences.

I have written similar letters to Chief Greg Suhr and Mayor Ed Lee.

I thank you in advance for any assistance you can give to this matter.

Very truly yours,


Ninfa Wood
NINF A WOOD

Orig: Joy, COB, Leg Dep.
(via email) BOS-11, C. Adams
File 110835 page
File 110945

JOHN M. SANGER, TRUSTEE
DECLARATION OF JOHN M. SANGER TRUST, UTD 10/24/03 & CATHERINE S.
SANGER
576 SACRAMENTO STREET
SEVENTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111-3023
TEL. 415.693.9300 FAX 415.693.9322

September 15, 2011

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4603

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 SEP 15 PM 2:47
BY 

**Re: APPEAL OF PROPOSED TENTATIVE MAP/PARCEL MAP AND
EXEMPTION FROM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW BY GENERAL
RULE EXCLUSION FOR THE SAME**

FILE NO. 110835
APPLICATION NO. 2008.01554S
1171 SANSOME STREET, AKA 1111 SANSOME STREET
BLOCK 113, LOT 40

Dear Ms. Cavillo:


My daughter Catherine and I are two of the appellants who filed an appeal with respect to the referenced item, both with respect to the potential approval of the Proposed Parcel Map for 1171 Sansome Street (aka 1111 Sansome Street) and the exemption from environmental review granted for the same by the Department of City Planning, Office of Environmental Review.

We hereby withdraw as appellants with respect to this matter. We have communicated our decision to the other appellants but are not authorized to speak for them.

Thank you for your courtesy.

Sincerely,


John M. Sanger


Catherine S. Sanger
By John M. Sanger, her attorney-in-fact

**JOHN M. SANGER
REAL ESTATE**

JOHN M. SANGER, TRUSTEE
DECLARATION OF JOHN M. SANGER TRUST, UTD 10/24/03
576 SACRAMENTO STREET
SEVENTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111-3023
TEL. 415.693.9300 FAX 415.693.9322
sanger@sanger-olson.com

September 15, 2011**FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL TO:**

Name	Firm	Telephone	Fax Number
Angela Cavillo	Clerk, San Francisco Board of Supervisors	554-5184	554-5163

From: John M. Sanger & Catherine S. Sanger**Re:** Withdrawal of Appeal by John & Catherine Sanger**# of Pages:** 2 (including this cover sheet)**C/M #:** 0097/**Message:** Please see attached letter.



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Recycling plastic bags

From: "jeannelu@aol.com" <jeannelu@aol.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/14/2011 04:27 PM
Subject: Recycling plastic bags

It seems that a good portion of the garbage in my black garbage now consists of plastic bags. Why is this when the major grocery stores and pharmacies like Walgreens no longer give out plastic bags? I big source is the daily newspaper. Each day the newspaper arrives neatly protected in a long thin plastic bag. This is something new--in the old days the newspaper was delivered with a rubber band around it and was only in a plastic bag on wet days. Whatever the reason, I find that my collection of plastic bags now is even greater now than it was before the plastic bag legislation. Also I don't bring my plastic bags to the grocery store to recycle anymore because I am not certain that the plastic bags that I have are recyclable. It seems to me that there is a simple solution to this problem. Require that all plastic bags distributed in San Francisco be of the type that can be recycled. Require the garbage company to accept packages (bags stuffed inside of bags) in the blue recycling. Do a little advertising showing people how to stuff the plastic bags inside each other before they are thrown in the blue recycling. End of problem.

Jeannette Luini

BOS-11
cpage

SEPTEMBER 8, 2011
TO: STATE, COUNTY AND CITY OFFICIALS

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

NOTIFICATION OF FILING OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY'S
GAS TRANSMISSION PIPELINE SAFETY ENHANCEMENT PLAN
R.11-02-019

2011 SEP 14 PM 2:59
RC

What is the Pipeline Safety Enhancement Plan Filing?

On June 9, 2011, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) issued its Decision Determining Maximum Allowable Operating Pressure Methodology and Requiring Filing Of Natural Gas Transmission Pipeline Replacement Or Testing Implementation Plans (D.11-06-017). D.11-06-017 requires all California natural gas transmission operators to develop and file an Implementation Plan setting forth criteria for which segments of natural gas pipelines that were not strength tested, or lack sufficient details related to performance of any such test, are identified for strength testing or replacement. D.11-06-017 also states that the Implementation Plan must include interim safety enhancement measures that will enhance public safety during the implementation period and that the Implementation Plan must consider retrofitting pipelines to allow for in-line inspection tools and, where appropriate, automated shut-off valves.

DETAILED INFORMATION ABOUT THIS FILING

On August 26, 2011, PG&E filed its proposed, two-phase, Pipeline Safety Enhancement Plan (or Implementation Plan) with the CPUC in compliance with D.11-06-017, requesting changes to its Gas Transmission and Storage (GT&S) rates effective January 1, 2012. Phase 1 (2011-2014) targets pipeline segments that are in highly populated urban areas, have vintage seam welds that do not meet modern standards, or are "grandfathered" under current regulations and have not been strength tested. Phase 2 (commencing in 2015) targets pipeline segments that have been previously strength tested or are in rural areas.

In this filing, PG&E seeks approval of the work scope proposed for both phases of the Implementation Plan, and proposes a three-year adjustment to rates for 2012 through 2014 for Phase 1 work. Cost recovery for Phase 2 will be addressed in a subsequent filing with the Commission. PG&E also presents how the costs to operate its transmission and storage business will be assigned to each customer class.

The Implementation Plan focuses on the following key areas:

Pipeline Modernization Program – During Phase 1, PG&E proposes to strength test 783 miles, replace 186 miles, upgrade 199 miles of pipe to allow for in-line inspection, and in-line inspect 234 miles.

Valve Automation Program – During Phase 1, PG&E proposes to automate 228 valves, which includes remote-controlled valves (RCV) in urban areas and automatic shut-off valves (ASV) in populated areas that cross earthquake faults. In addition, PG&E will enhance its Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system to provide operators additional information, tools, and training to allow for early detection and quick response to pipeline rupture events. PG&E will also conduct a study to evaluate potential SCADA expansion and improvement.

Pipeline Records Integration Program – This program consists of two work efforts: (1) collecting and verifying all pipeline strength tests and pipeline features data necessary to calculate the maximum allowable operating pressure (MAOP) of all gas transmission pipelines and associated components, and (2) transition away from relying on traditional paper records by consolidating data into integrated, core data management systems and building materials traceability for gas transmission pipeline components from receipt, through installation, to retirement from service.

Interim Safety Enhancement Measures – PG&E's Implementation Plan includes the following interim safety enhancement measures: (1) validate the MAOP for all gas transmission pipelines in the system, (2) interim pressure reductions and (3) increased leak surveys and patrols.

This filing does not address distribution (gas lines handling reduced pressure) rates or the commodity costs of gas. Rates for PG&E's gas distribution services, and the rates PG&E charges for natural gas itself, are set in separate CPUC proceedings.

Will rates increase as a result of this filing?

Yes, if the CPUC approves PG&E's request, a typical residential customer using 37 therms per month would see an average monthly gas bill increase of \$1.93, from \$45.23 to \$47.16. A typical small business customer

using 287 therms per month would see an average monthly gas bill increase of \$14.95, from \$279.80 to \$294.75. Individual customers' bills may differ

A table illustrating the impact of the requested \$247.3 million increase in gas revenue for 2012, on each customer class, was included in a bill insert mailed directly to customers beginning earlier this month.

In addition to the \$247.3 PG&E is seeking for 2012, PG&E also requests Implementation Plan revenue requirements for 2013 and 2014 of \$220.8 million and \$300.6 million, respectively. This money will be used to implement the work scope indicated in the Implementation Plan related to pipeline modernization, valve automation, pipeline records integration, and interim safety enhancement measures, all in a safe and reliable manner.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

To request a copy of the filing and exhibits or for more details, call PG&E at 1-800-743-5000.

For TDD/TTY (speech-hearing impaired), call 1-800-652-4712.

Para más detalles llame al 1-800-660-6789 • 詳情請致電 1-800-893-9555

You may request a copy of the filing and exhibits by writing to:

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
Gas Transmission Pipeline Safety Enhancement Plan
P.O. Box 7442, San Francisco, CA 94120.

THE CPUC PROCESS

The CPUC's Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) will review this filing.

The DRA is an independent arm of the CPUC, created by the Legislature to represent the interests of all utility customers throughout the state and obtain the lowest possible rate for service consistent with reliable and safe service levels. The DRA has a multi-disciplinary staff with expertise in economics, finance, accounting and engineering. The DRA's views do not necessarily reflect those of the CPUC. Other parties of record may also participate.

The CPUC *may* hold evidentiary hearings where parties of record present their proposals in testimony and are subject to cross-examination before an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ). These hearings are open to the public, but only those who are parties of record may present evidence or cross-examine witnesses during evidentiary hearings. Members of the public may attend, but not participate in, these hearings.

After considering all proposals and evidence presented during the hearing process, the ALJ will issue a draft decision. When the CPUC acts on this filing, it may adopt all or part of PG&E's request, amend or modify it, or deny the filing. The CPUC's final decision may be different from PG&E's filing.

If you would like to learn how you can participate in this proceeding or if you have comments or questions, you may contact the CPUC's Public Advisor as follows:

Public Advisor's Office
505 Van Ness Avenue
Room 2103
San Francisco, CA 94102

1-415-703-2074 or 1-866-849-8390 (toll free)
TTY 1-415-703-5282 or TTY 1-866-836-7825 (toll free)
E-mail to public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov

If you are writing a letter to the Public Advisor's Office, please include the number of the filing (R.11-02-019) to which you are referring. All comments will be circulated to the Commissioners, the assigned Administrative Law Judge and the Energy Division staff.

A copy of PG&E's Gas Transmission Pipeline Safety Enhancement Plan and exhibits are also available for review at the California Public Utilities Commission, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, Monday–Friday, 8 a.m.–noon, and on the CPUC's website at <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/puc/>.

SENIOR COUNSEL:
C. D. MICHEL

SPECIAL COUNSEL:
JOSHUA R. DALE
W. LEE SMITH

ASSOCIATE COUNSEL:
SEAN A. BRADY
SCOTT M. FRANKLIN
HILLARY J. GREEN
THOMAS E. MACIEJEWSKI
CLINT B. MONFORT
JOSEPH A. SILVOSO, III
TAMARA M. RIDER
LOS ANGELES, CA

Writer's Direct Contact:
(562) 216-4441
cmichel@michelandassociates.com

MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
Attorneys at Law

BOS-11 - via email
File 110901
Public Safety
OF COUNSEL:
DON B. KATES
SAN FRANCISCO, CA
RUTH P. HARING
LOS ANGELES, CA
GLENN S. MCROBERTS
SAN DIEGO, CA
AFFILIATE COUNSEL:
JOHN F. MACHTINGER
JEFFREY M. COHON
LOS ANGELES, CA
DAVID T. HARDY
TUCSON, AZ

September 13, 2011

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
CITY AND COUNTY SAN FRANCISCO
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
VIA OVERNIGHT MAIL

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 SEP 14 PM 4:15
PN

**Re: BOS File No. 110901: Police Code - Safe Storage and Enhanced-Lethality
Ammunition Findings – OPPOSITION**

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

We write on behalf of our clients the California Rifle and Pistol Association Foundation ("CRPAF"), in opposition to proposed ordinance, File No. 110901 [Police Code - Safe Storage and Enhanced-Lethality Ammunition Findings], which is currently scheduled to be heard by the Public Safety Committee on Thursday, September 15, 2011, and to lodge materials relevant to the Committee's consideration.

Although CRPAF intends to provide additional materials for the Board of Supervisors' (BOS) consideration should this ordinance be voted out of committee and referred for consideration by the BOS, we have enclosed copies of the following books at this time for the Committee's consideration which address the effectiveness of firearms use in self-defense.

Bob Irwin, THE REALITY OF ARMED SELF DEFENSE: SURVIVING THE ATTACK AND THE AFTERMATH (2010).

John R. Lott, Jr., MORE GUNS, LESS CRIME: UNDERSTANDING CRIME AND GUN CONTROL (3d ed., 2010).

We urge the committee to review these resources and hope they are helpful in its consideration of File No. 110901.

Sincerely,
MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

C. D. Michel

CDM/ca
Enc.


JOHN R. LOTT, JR.

THIRD EDITION


**UNDERSTANDING CRIME
AND GUN CONTROL LAWS**

"Lott turns conventional wisdom
concerning violent crime and
handguns on its head."

—*Chicago Tribune*



THE REALITY OF ARMED SELF DEFENSE



BY JIMMYE L. BROWN

File no. 110935
COPES - BOS - 11 -

Frank Hung
2273 Chestnut St.
S.F. CA 94123

September 12, 2011

TO: ALL Members of Board
of Supervisors

Ms. Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
Rm. 224 City Hall,
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
S.F. CA94102

RE: Case #2010.0420CETZ- Edward Inn.

Dear Board of Supervisors and Social workers

Before I begin, I must emphasize that I am in no way anti- TAY and my comment is not meant to upset or hurt any one's feeling.

Referring to wordings used in previous notice by planning department, which I quote " ...it is housing scheme for the transitional- age youth (TAY) who are out-off foster home or homeless youth.. .The TAY will **require supervision, enforcement of house rules, under imposed quiet hours..**"

With so many social workers speaking on behalf of the TAY and pleading in favor of this housing project in the 1st hearing, all things are pointing to the fact that this will be a **halfway house or correction home** for juvenile delinquent, kick-out from foster homes or a **homeless shelter** for homeless youth.

I challenge the Planning Department on

(a)"**Wrongful / Falsified Application and Contravention of Planning Regulation**" of having a halfway house , correction home and /or homeless shelter within 300 ?m radius from bars, pubs night-club and alcoholic drinking establishment. In exhibit C, only one bar/restaurant is mentioned in the vicinity of the project site. In fact there are 5# of bars, pubs, night-club and alcoholic drinking establishment right next to it as follows:

- 1) Sports Bar directly across the street @ corner of Scott/ Lombard ,
- 2) Night-club and bar 2 doors next to sports bar in Scott.
- 3) Bin38, a drinking and dinning opposite to #2,
- 4) Delany- bar in Chestnut,
- 5) A16- bar and alcoholic drinking establishment,
- 6) Monaghan- bar in Pierce , and
- 7) Liquor store@ corner of Scott/ Divisadero.

You would not like to have a sex joint, Strip club in residential area or next to a school. It is a contravention of planning regulation and ~~the~~ safety measure of the city code.

(b) Falsification: Disguised the application of halfway house, correction home or homeless shelter under the category of "group housing" which is defined by the department as: rooming house, boarding house, guest house, club house, fraternity & sorority house, monastery.. medical or education institution. Since it was mentioned in exhibit A, that the TAY are out of school and the fraternity & sorority housing is not for them.

In no way is a jail house, halfway house, correction home or homeless shelter would fit into definition of "Group Housing"

(c) Fabrication: As mentioned in (a) above, there are 5 bars, pubs and alike instead of just one bar mentioned in the exhibit c. The similar housing scheme @864 Ellis Street is a deception & wrong example, because it is located and surround by auto-repair shops, car rental, storage buildings. There aren't any pubs, bars, night-club around that might arouse bad behavior or perturbation of TAY

Already the crime rate, street fighting and police calls, public disturbance, noise nuisance, street urination have tripled recently in the Scott and Chestnut Street. There are too many young, beautiful & sexy ladies patrons that frequent bars & pub after 11pm in Scott and Chestnut Street. Under such environment, bars, pubs & night-club and girls, the TAY from the halfway house, correction home, youth homeless shelter would be too easily arouse to bad behavior, violence, perturbation and / or sexual assault.

I urgent the Board of Supervisor would stop this project on above mentioned reason/ ground .

The TAY deserved better treatment to start a new life, and the planning commission should find a better location for halfway house, correction home, shelter home for homeless youth away from all these distraction, bars, pubs, night-club...

Thank you .

Frank Hung



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Re : UAL - EEOC San Francisco District Office - Unfair Treatments to Injured UAL - SFO based Personnels

From: jr rubang <col-jr@sbcglobal.net>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Cc: co-jr@sbcglobal.net, joaquin.torres@sfgov.org
Date: 09/13/2011 03:41 PM
Subject: Re : UAL - EEOC San Francisco District Office - Unfair Treatments to Injured UAL - SFO based Personnels

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I e-mailed your offices some time a week and a half ago right before the Labor Day Holiday.

I will be attending the Airport Commissioners Public Hearing on Tuesday at 9AM at Room 400 at City Hall : our views us the Injured Workers of SFO.

We the Workers we take pride to what we do at SFO and to the City we represent. We need protections from

We are also inviting available Mayors Office staffs. Please hear us. Thank you.

Best,

JR RUBANG Cell 707-631-6065 / col-jr@sbcglobal.net
Shop Mechanic Fax 707-421-1052
United Air Lines
San Francisco Int'l Airport
San Francisco, CA 94128 UAL Employee File No. 093175

2770 Baytree Drive
Fairfield, CA 94533



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110899: Vote YES on "False Advertising by Limited Services Pregnancy Centers"

From: Arlene Reed <radiablo@sbcglobal.net>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/14/2011 09:31 PM
Subject: Vote YES on "False Advertising by Limited Services Pregnancy Centers"

Dear Supervisor:

Please vote YES on the "False Advertising by Limited Services Pregnancy Centers" ordinance introduced by Supervisor Malia Cohen on August 2, 2011. The item is scheduled for a committee vote on September 26, 2011.

Ralph and Arlene Reed



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110899: False Advertising by Limited Services Pregnancy Centers? No

The Clerk's Office has received 152 form emails like the one below.

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 09/16/2011 04:11 PM -----

From: peter sommer <pete.sommer@sbcglobal.net>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/14/2011 05:30 PM
Subject: False Advertising by Limited Services Pregnancy Centers? No

Dear Supervisor:

Please vote **no** on the so-called "False Advertising by Limited Services Pregnancy Centers" ordinance introduced by Supervisor Malia Cohen on August 2, 2011. The item is scheduled for a committee vote on September 26, 2011.

The ordinance is unnecessary, improperly limits the constitutional free speech rights of pregnancy care centers in San Francisco, and is redundant of state laws.

The targeting of First Resort by this ordinance and the City Attorney is based on a national campaign by NARAL to undermine a woman's right to choose the kind of support and counsel she would like to receive.

First Resort is a non-profit pregnancy counseling and licensed medical clinic providing free services for 27 years.

Their *trained counselors, registered nurses and qualified OB/GYNs* are committed to helping women make healthy, well-informed choices consistent with their own core values and beliefs. First Resort's communications with potential clients are not misleading; they are clear, honest and appropriate.

As a supporter of First Resort, I know they recognize a woman's legal right and personal freedom to choose abortion, and the heart of their approach is to always treat women with truthfulness, dignity and respect, whichever choice they make.

Vote NO on this unnecessary legislation.

Sincerely,

Peter & Maria Sommer



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110899: Letter in favor of Last Resort

From: Timothy Conlan <timconlanop@gmail.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/14/2011 05:28 PM
Subject: Letter in favor of Last Resort

Dear Supervisors,

Don't be misled by a slick campaign with big money to obstruct a reputable local organization such as Last Resort with a long history of service. First Resort's communications with potential clients are not misleading; they are clear, honest and appropriate as they have testified and proven. You could expose yourself to suits against their rights and be shown to be a knee jerk group.

First Resort is a non-profit pregnancy counseling and licensed medical clinic providing free services for 27 years. Their trained counselors, registered nurses and OB/GYNs are committed to helping women make healthy, well-informed choices consistent with their own core values and beliefs.

Please vote no on the so-called "False Advertising by Limited Services Pregnancy Centers" ordinance introduced by Supervisor Malia Cohen on August 2, 2011. The item is scheduled for a committee vote on September 26, 2011.

The ordinance is unnecessary, improperly limits the constitutional free speech rights of pregnancy care centers in San Francisco, and is redundant of state laws.

The targeting of First Resort by this ordinance and the City Attorney is based on a national campaign by NARAL to undermine a woman's right to choose the kind of support and counsel she would like to receive.

As a supporter of First Resort, I know they recognize a woman's legal right and personal freedom to choose abortion, and the heart of their approach is to always treat women with truthfulness, dignity and respect, whichever choice they make.

Vote NO on this unnecessary legislation.

Sincerely,

Father Timothy Conlan, OP
2506 Pine St.
San Francisco, CA 94115



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110899: Crisis Pregnancy Centers

From: Terence J Cooney <terencejcooney@aol.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/15/2011 12:12 PM
Subject: Crisis Pregnancy Centers

Dear Sir/Ms.:

A year ago my family and I had the great pleasure of spending time in your friendly, lovely and easy to travel city, and, indeed, our visit was so enjoyable that we often look for excuses to justify return trips (e.g. family events, college for our son, etc.).

However, recently I learned that your Board of Supervisors is considering legislation, promoted by abortion supporters, that would place great burdens on Crisis Pregnancy Centers, even though courts in Maryland and New York have found that such legislation violates our Constitutional Right to Free Speech.

Given the unsuccessful history of this legislative approach, I can only assume that the decision to pursue such a course is based on a determination to financially intimidate the providers of such services by forcing them into a David and Goliath contest with the City in which they must legally defend their long standing operations.

I do not reside in San Francisco, so I cannot exercise a vote to reflect my views, but I can vote with my money. I can assure you that my family and I will not return to San Francisco if this course is pursued, and I will make every effort to persuade relatives and friends, and others that respect our constitutional right to Free Speech to follow a similar course.

Yours truly,

Terence J. Cooney



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110899: Legislation

The Clerk's Office has received 27 form emails like the one below.

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 09/19/2011 06:35 PM -----

From: "Jim & Betty Boso" <jbboso@gmail.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 09/19/2011 10:03 AM
Subject: Legislation

Dear Supervisor:

Please vote **no** on the so-called "False Advertising by Limited Services Pregnancy Centers" ordinance introduced by Supervisor Malia Cohen on August 2, 2011. The item is scheduled for a committee vote on September 26, 2011.

The ordinance is unnecessary, improperly limits the constitutional free speech rights of pregnancy care centers in San Francisco, and is redundant of state laws.

The targeting of First Resort by this ordinance and the City Attorney is based on a national campaign by NARAL to undermine a woman's right to choose the kind of support and counsel she would like to receive.

First Resort is a non-profit pregnancy counseling and licensed medical clinic providing free services for 27 years. Their trained counselors, registered nurses and OB/GYNs are committed to helping women make healthy, well-informed choices consistent with their own core values and beliefs. First Resort's communications with potential clients are not misleading; they are clear, honest and appropriate.

As a supporter of First Resort, I know they recognize a woman's legal right and personal freedom to choose abortion, and the heart of their approach is to always treat women with truthfulness, dignity and respect, whichever choice they make.

Vote NO on this unnecessary legislation.

Sincerely,

James H Boso M.D. and Elizabeth Boso



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc: Deborah Barone/BOS/SFGOV,
Subject: Debt Policy of the City and County of San Francisco

Debt Policy of the City and County of San Francisco

Nadia Sesay to: Angela Calvillo, Carmen Chu, Jose Cisneros, Ben
Rosenfield, Rick Wilson, Harvey Rose

09/15/2011 04:25 PM

David Chiu, Debra Newman, Jason Elliott, Mark Blake, Kenneth Roux, Anthony
Cc: Ababon, Angela Whittaker, Rick Caldeira, Jander Lacerda, Katy Tang, "True,
Judson"

September 15, 2011

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Carmen Chu, Chair, Budget and Finance Committee
José Cisneros, Treasurer
Ben Rosenfield, Controller
Rick Wilson, Budget Director
Harvey Rose, Budget and Legislative Analyst to the Board

Re: Debt Policy of the City and County of San Francisco

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Attached please find a copy of the Debt Policy of the City and County of San Francisco, established by the Controller's Office of Public Finance. This document summarizes our Office's existing debt policies and formally establishes them for all future debt. From time to time, the Controller's Office of Public Finance may deviate from policies herein and will highlight such situations at the time.

If you have any questions or are interested in additional information, please contact me at Nadia.Sesay@sfgov.org or (415) 554-5956.

Sincerely,

Nadia Sesay
Director, Controller's Office of Public Finance

cc: Supervisor David Chiu
Debra Newman, Budget and Legislative Analyst Office
Jason Elliot, Mayor's Office
Mark Blake, City Attorney's Office
Kenneth Roux, City Attorney's Office



CCSF Debt Policy.09-2011.pdf

Nadia Sesay
Director, Office of Public Finance
City & County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 336
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5956
(415) 554-4864 Fax
nadia.sesay@sfgov.org