Petitions and Communications received from November 1, 2011, through November 7, 2011, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on November 15, 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 James Chaffee, regarding a false arrest lawsuit. (1)

From Office of Civic Engagement & Immigrant Affairs, regarding the FY2010-2011 Language Access Ordinance Summary Compliance Report. (2)

From concerned citizens, regarding saving the Sharp Park Wetlands. File No. 110966, Copy: Budget and Finance Committee Clerk, 9 letters (3)

From concerned citizens, regarding Occupy San Francisco. File No. 111164, 4 letters (4)

From Delta Stewardship Council, submitting notice that the draft Environmental Impact Report for the Delta Plan is available for public review and comment. (5)

From State Department of Transportation, submitting report regarding the illegal discharge (or threatened illegal discharge) of hazardous waste, which could cause substantial injury to the public health or safety. Copy: Each Supervisor (6)

From Joseph Demko, submitting support for continued funding of the Neighborhood Emergency Response Training (NERT) program. Copy: Each Supervisor (7)

From Public Utilities Commission, regarding PG&E's compliance with all the provisions of Administrative Code Chapter 11.44 and the PG&E's Franchise. Copy: Each Supervisor (8)

From Lloyd Schloegel, regarding the Environmental Impact Report for the Transit Center District Plan. (9)

From Samuel Nigro, regarding public nudity in restaurants and public seating areas. File No. 110967, Copy: Each Supervisor (10)

From concerned citizens, regarding saving the Sharp Park Wetlands. File No. 110966, Copy: Budget and Finance Committee Clerk, 5 letters (11)

From Department of Public Health, submitting the Laguna Honda Hospital and Rehabilitation Center's Compliance Quarterly Report, regarding the reversal of the

admission policy priorities that took place February 22, 2005. Copy: GAO Committee Clerk (12)

From Department of Human Resources, submitting the FY2010-2011 Annual Sexual Harassment Report. Copy: GAO Committee Clerk (13)

From concerned citizens, submitting support for bird safe buildings. File No. 110785, 3 letters (14)

From Office of Citizen Complaints, submitting the 2011 Third Quarter Statistical Report. (15)

*(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.)

Chaffee -- What is at Stake -- False Arrest Suit -- Chaffee v. David Chiu
James Chaffee
to:
board.of.supervisors, Carmen.Chu, David Campos, David Chiu, Eric L. Mar, Jane Kim, John.Avalos, Malia Cohen, Mark Farrell, Ross.Mirkarimi, Scott Wiener, Sean.Elsbernd
10/31/2011 11:34 AM
Hide Details
From: "James Chaffee" <chaffeej@pacbell.net> Sort List...

To: <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>, <Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org>, "David Campos" <David.Campos@sfgov.org>, "David Chiu" <David.Chiu@sfgov.org>, "Eric L. Mar" <Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org>, "Jane Kim" <Jane.Kim@sfgov.org>, <John.Avalos@sfgov.org>, "Malia Cohen" <Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org>, "Mark Farrell" <Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org>, <Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org>, "Scott Wiener" <Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org>, <Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org>

Dear Friends,

As many of you have heard I was arrested and removed from a Board of Supervisors meeting and I am suing David Chiu and the Sheriff's office, and whoever else might be responsible for false arrest. Of course it would mean nothing if it was about me. This provides the platform to expose the scandal of privatization that this city has become and that they are trying to shut me up about.

The Branch Library Improvement Program is now complete enough that the City can no longer claim that the answer to all of the broken promises lies in the future. It is just another example of the fact that the glittering promises of the public-private partnership was just another "pig in a poke" one more time.

David Chiu said at a recent Board of Supervisors meeting that he envied those Supervisors who had library branch openings in their districts. After all that has happened and all that he knows, to David Chiu what matters is that he wants to play the hero and everything else gets swept under the rug. David Chiu is the personification of the moral collapse of our society.

David Chiu's statement is the quintessential of example of not only the sordid underside of incumbency but that basic corruption of political system that is more capitalist than it is democratic. There is no democracy if the corporate interests can purchase immunity from accountability with just a few pennies out of the public assets that they looted.

1

After I was arrested back on October 13 it was clear that the supervisors were shocked to see me again the following week. They assumed, I suppose, that I would hang myself in my cell and I would be just another example of the futility of attempting to fight the interests that can throw money around City Hall, armed only with the truth.

Well it is not going to be that simple. I have filed suit for false arrest. That suit has been "Removed" to Federal Court. I am probably the only litigant there ever was who got the City Attorney's Motion to Dismiss the suit, before I got notice of the case assignment. It should be remanded back again, but no one can predict what a Federal Judge will do.

The best way to show that the False Arrest suit is valid is to show that they know what I have been saying about the abuse of privatization contained in the corruption of the Branch Library Improvement Program is true. In order for there to be democracy there have to be protections for the public-spirited citizen, the whistleblower, the citizen watchdog and even the notorious Gadfly (which I suppose I have become by now.)

The reason this False Arrest is so significant is because I have played the game on the establishment's terms. I have taken scrupulous care over several decades now to always present myself properly, never allow myself to be provoked. Extraordinary efforts have been put forth to do so, and I have never done anything that would mar my reputation. I have been a chair of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force and protected open government and democratic values with numerous lawsuits and administrative complaints over the years.

I assume I don't have to remind my readers of what John F. Kennedy said. If David Chiu and his ilk can get away with arresting me and removing me from a Board of Supervisors meeting they are saying that attempting to use the tools of democracy means nothing. That can't be true. We can't let it be true.

(Just in the off chance that a teenager may be reading this, John F. Kennedy said, "Those who make peaceful revolution impossible, make violent revolution inevitable." Even the conservative New York Times columnist Nicholas Kristof (NYTimes, Oct. 27) said that a case can be made that Occupy Wall Street "highlights the need to restore basic capitalist principles like accountability." The fact is accountability is a democratic principle not a capitalist principle.)

James Chaffee

To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Annual Language Access Ordinance Compliance Plans

From: Adrienne Pon/ADMSVC/SFGOV
To: Phil Ting/ASRREC/SFGOV@SFGOV, Treasurer Cisneros/TTX/SFGOV@SFGOV, Michael Hennessey/SFSD/SFGOV@SFGOV, Wendy Still/ADPROB/SFGOV@SFGOV, john.martin@flysfo.com, George Gascon/DA/SFGOV@SFGOV, John Arntz/ELECTIONS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Vivian Day/DBI/SFGOV@SFGOV, Amy Brown/ADMSVC/SFGOV@SFGOV, Anne Kronenberg/DEM/SFGOV@SFGOV, Melanie.Nutter@sfgov.microsoftonline.com, Joanne Hayes-White/SFFD/SFGOV@SFGOV, Greg Suhr/SFPD/SFGOV@SFGOV, Trent Rhorer/DHS/CCSF@CCSF, William Siffermann/JUV/SFGOV@SFGOV, Jennifer Entine Matz/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, John Rahaim/CTYPLN/SFGOV@SFGOV, Jeff Adachi/PUBDEF/SFGOV@SFGOV, Barbara Garcia/DPH/SFGOV@SFGOV, lherrera@sfpl.info, ed.harrington@sfgov.org, Mohammed.Nuru@sfdpw.org, Delene Wolf/RENT/SFGOV@SFGOV, Phil Ginsburg/RPD/SFGOV@SFGOV, Ed.Reiskin@sfgov.org, Tanya Peterson <tanyap@sfzoo.org>
Cc: Mayor Edwin Lee/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, David Chiu/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Steve Kawa/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Amy Brown/ADMSVC/SFGOV@SFGOV
Date: 11/01/2011 06:20 PM
Subject: Annual Language Access Ordinance Compliance Plans

LAO FY2011-12 Reporting (zipped) Folder.zip

Dear Colleagues,

Thank you for your leadership in ensuring that all city residents, regardless of their ability to speak English, have access to timely and critical information.

As you know, San Francisco's Language Access Ordinance requires all Tier 1 Departments to comply with the full extent of the law and to file annual Compliance Plans by December 31, 2011 of each year. We are happy to report that all 26 Tier 1 Departments are currently in compliance and taking the law seriously. This is especially important given the national increase in LEP residents, lawsuits, federal compliance review, and emergency situations affecting public safety.

For this year's filing (FY2010-11 ended June 30, 2011), please have your department LAO Liaison complete the attached reporting form and return this with your approval signature no later than 11:59:59 PST on December 31, 2011 as required by law.

Please let us know if you have any questions or need assistance. Isis Fernandez Sykes, OCEIA's Legal and Legislative Analyst, is the LAO Compliance Coordinator and can be reached at 415.554.7036 (isis.fernandez.sykes@sfgov.org).

Always,

Adrienne

Adrienne Pon
Executive Director
Office of Civic Engagement & Immigrant Affairs
City & County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 368
San Francisco, CA 94102
Telephone: (415) 554.7029 (ask for Whitney Chiao, Executive Assistant)
(415) 554.7028 (direct)
Facsimile: (415) 554.4849

2

To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Victor Young/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110966: Sharp Park Legislation

From: Suzy Chersky <happysmurf@netzero.net>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 11/01/2011 09:12 PM
Subject: Sharp Park Legislation
Sent by: National Parks Conservation Association <takeaction@npca.org>

Nov 1, 2011

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support current legislation to repurpose the failing Sharp Park Golf Course into a better public park in partnership with the National Park Service. Repurposing the Pacifica-based, but San Francisco-owned golf course, which is also located within the boundary of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, will best protect endangered species, provide more recreational activities and public access, provide flood control for adjacent neighborhoods, and is the least expensive option for San Francisco.

Sharp Park Golf Course loses up to hundreds of thousands of dollars each year, continues to kill endangered species, and prevents other golf courses in San Francisco from receiving adequate maintenance. We can do better. Indeed, repurposing Sharp Park will allow San Francisco to redirect resources to improve the five other courses it manages, which are currently suffering from neglect.

The National Park Service has stated that they will conduct the long-term planning and conversion of the golf course to a new public park with restored wildlife habitat and trail-based recreation. Please help build a better public park at Sharp Park that everyone can enjoy by supporting the legislation.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Ms. Suzy Chersky
18030 Brookhurst St PMB 410
Fountain Valley, CA 92708-6756

3

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

From: sandra castaneda <magick_tools@yahoo.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 10/31/2011 11:35 AM
Subject: Restore Sharp Park into a National Park
Sent by: Sandra Castaneda <magick_tools=yahoo.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.

sandra castaneda
Burlingame, 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, Victor Young/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110966: Support Sharp Park Legislation

From: Hiroko Jones <hnomichi@sbcglobal.net>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 11/06/2011 06:51 PM
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.

Hiroko Jones
440 Davis Ct. 2220
San Francisco, CA 94111

To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Victor Young/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110966 Sharp Park

From: Ron Avila <ronavila@hotmail.com>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 11/03/2011 05:41 PM
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.

Ron Avila
2024 Mission #411
San Francisco, CA 94110-1245

From: jade kiran <jadeinsf@gmail.com>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 11/03/2011 07:47 PM
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.

jade kiran
750 gonzalez
san francisco, CA 94132-2202

From: Eric Zakin <zippyzakin1964@gmail.com>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 11/03/2011 11:15 PM
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.

Eric Zakin
4145 George Ave #1
San Mateo, CA 94403

From: Peter Brastow <pcb123@natureinthecity.org>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org
Cc: AvalosStaff <AvalosStaff@sfgov.org>
Date: 11/04/2011 07:48 AM
Subject: Sharp Park legislation

Dear San Francisco elected officials,

Please see attached our letter of support for Supervisor Avalos' legislation on Sharp Park. Thanks for your work conserving the City's natural heritage and indigenous biodiversity.

Regards,

Peter Brastow
Founding Director, **Nature in the City**
PO Box 170088
San Francisco CA 94117
415-845-0087
pcb123@natureinthecity.org

BECOME A MEMBER!

SIGN UP for our
EMAIL NEWSLETTER
http://www.natureinthecity.org
http://urbannature.org
http://sfwma.org

Need Local *NATIVE PLANT* Landscaping?
Call **HABITAT CITY** at 415.722.1092

or go to **www.habitatcity.org**. Sharp Park support letter nov.pdf

From:	Joe Mason <joemason@myway.com>
To:	Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date:	11/04/2011 10:17 PM
Subject:	Sharp Park Legislation
Sent by:	National Parks Conservation Association <takeaction@npca.org>

Nov 5, 2011

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Repurposing the Pacifica-based, but San Francisco-owned golf course, which is also located within the boundary of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, will best protect endangered species, provide more recreational activities and public access, provide flood control for adjacent neighborhoods, and is the least expensive option for San Francisco.

Sharp Park Golf Course loses up to hundreds of thousands of dollars each year, continues to kill endangered species, and prevents other golf courses in San Francisco from receiving adequate maintenance. We can do better. Indeed, repurposing Sharp Park will allow San Francisco to redirect resources to improve the five other courses it manages, which are currently suffering from neglect.

The National Park Service has stated that they will conduct the long-term planning and conversion of the golf course to a new public

park with restored wildlife habitat and trail-based recreation. Please help build a better public park at Sharp Park that everyone can enjoy by supporting the legislation.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Mr. Joe Mason
12033 Califa St
Valley Village, CA 91607-1201

From: Dawn Ferro <dferro59@gmail.com>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 11/05/2011 12:46 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.

Dawn Ferro
1061 Church Street
San Francisco,, CA 94114-3414

From: Mandy Beltz <rocknroll1379@yahoo.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 11/06/2011 11:46 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.

Mandy Beltz

Richmond, TX, TX
USA

To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Gail Johnson/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 111164: SF Plans to 'yes/no' support Occupy Protests?

From: "Neil Signo, A+ Network+" <neil_signo@yahoo.com>
To: "Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org" <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, "cgroom@co.sanmateo.ca.us" <cgroom@co.sanmateo.ca.us>, Rose Gibson <RoseJG@co.sanmateo.ca.us>
Cc: "Viewer.comments@ktvu.com" <Viewer.comments@ktvu.com>, "ccd@fostercity.org" <ccd@fostercity.org>, "mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org" <mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org>
Date: 11/01/2011 08:22 AM
Subject: SF Plans to 'yes/no' support Occupy Protests?

SF Mayor, SFO Board of Supervisors & San Mateo Board;
cc:\\Bay Area News TV;
In the news this morning of SFO Board's plans to support or not support the City Occupy protests? Iam making the requests below, that 'accomodation' for the lower than 99%, hoping to defuse, a 'give-take-compromise'.

I am requesting the SFO to San Mateo Boards to make mandatory, the use of "HELP WANTED" store front signs for jobs that are below $25,000/year compensation, no limit on pay and use of 'help wanted' signs if the establishment is on a Bus Transit Route street corner. And advertising in the local city public library bulletin board. That would include the no college jobs, that fact remains complaints of Bachelor Degree can work the job, ask for higher pay for the same skills, to 'unreplaceable attitude'.

The request to make the "Help Wanted" store front sign mandatory should help defuse some 'resident's fustrations' for part-time, full-time workers, disabled to persons past the age of 60.

To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: LOSS OF REVENUE-OCCUPATION IDIOTICY

From: rhettgio@aol.com
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 11/01/2011 11:43 AM
Subject: LOSS OF REVENUE-OCCUPATION IDIOTICY

ATTN: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

I see that the news is reporting that you are having a meeting today as to the "ILLEGAL" OCCUPATION ENCAMPMENT ON PUBLIC PROPERTY IN S.F.

I hope that before this meeting you go back and read your pledged "oath" of office which states your commitment to implement decisions based within the confines of the LAW. The same LAW, we all must be subject to equally.

Yes, there is corruption everywhere, even on Wall Street. The answer to corruption is implementation of OUR LAWS, prosecute ALL the guilty, all parties involved, including politicians and SOLVE THE PROBLEM! The answer is NOT unlimited protesting with illegal encampments on public grounds. Legitmate concerns have been taken over by socialist, marxist, communist activists which include Union Leaders sending out their blinded sheep to do their bidding. "Collapse the system". Collapse it to what? Do you realize that a , called for " Collapse" of the system, WILL ENDANGER EVERYONE! That a collapse of the system will STOP ALL COMMERCE! A LOSS OF ALL PENSIONS, ECT. CURRENTLY INVESTED IN THE STOCK MARKET! What are you thinking to condone such TREASON.....They DO NOT REPRESENT 99% OF THE POPULATION-------They are not even ONE PERCENT OF THE POPULATION! WAKE UP!!!!

The businesses surrounding the ILLEGAL ENCAMPMENT OCCUPATION PROTESTERS are DOOMED! The majority of consumers will AVOID THIS AREA. Those business WILL FAIL----and the city of San Francisco will be held responsible for this NONSENSE. REAL working people will LOOSE THEIR JOBS AND BUSINESSES! SAN FRANCISCO WILL LOOSE EVEN MORE REVENUE. I personally, WILL NOT SUPPORT ANY BUSINESS WITHIN THE CITY THAT SUPPORT AND ENCOURAGE THE UNLAWFUL 24/7 ENCAMPMENT "OCCUPATION"
OF THAT CITY. The LAW is the LAW and must be applied to everyone EQUALLY-----that is not the case for the"occupiers". The City of San Francisco (as well as all other "occupied" cities) WILL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE AND ACCOUTABLE FOR ALL THE LOSS OF BUSINESS, JOBS, POLICE AND CITY OVERTIME, LOST REVENUE OF PLANNED FUNCTIONS, HOTEL RENTALS, COLLEGE STUDENT ENROLLMENT, ETC....ETC....ETC....!

Our family visits SF monthly---we had planned an overnight trip for 19 family members----WE HAVE CANCELLED THAT. Our yearly Chistmas shopping trip WILL NOT HAPPEN-we will go to Vacaville instead!

The Board of Supervisors have the responsibility to ensure that EVERYONE IS FAIRLY REPRESENTED UNDER THE RULE OF LAW. If you choose NOT TO FOLLOW THE RULE OF LAW, EQUALY, EVERYONE WILL BE EFFECTED. Surly, you must realize that if EVERYONE disobeyed the law----there would be mass chaos. You can not have a productive city / population if illegal encampments of various "groups" are allowed ---- who would want to do business there ?; who would want to travel there? Let me answer that for you.....NO ONE!!!

Represent all of the people, not some "fringe" groups that want to distroy this country, using innocent, well intended individuals and legitimate concerns as their "vehicle" to do so. STOP THIS NONSENSE; FOLLOW THE LAW; DO YOUR JOB!

A note to the man who is running for mayor? (dark hair with glasses at the occupy illegal encampments last week) Watching you "pandering" to the media and occupiers at the illegal encampments last week was dispicable and oh-so-obviously SELF-SERVING. You are what is wrong with this great Country.....its all about me, me and me. How can I "use" this situation to MY ADVANTAGE, WITH NO CONSIDERATION TO ANYONE ELSE! I hope you FAIL in your bid for office; you are of no service to anyone!

Pamela Cinquini
Chico, CA

File 111604
BOS 11, page



Troy Lettre's

1936

I REMEMBER IT WELL

Marc Troy's interview

V-J DAY-1945

A HUNDRED THOUSAND PEOPLE CRAMED SAN FRANCISCO'S MARKET STREET TO CELEBRATE THE END OF WORLD WAR II..WE DANCED IN THE STREETS FROM THE FERRY BLDG. TO 8TH STREET. THE JUBILATION WENT FROM CONTROLLED GAYETY THE FIRST DAY INTO A SECOND AND THIRD DAY OF VIOLENCE,RAPE,DESTRUCTION TO NEARLY EVERY STORE ON MARKET STREET.PART OF THE CITY WAS OUT OF CONTROL AND IT TOOK THE S.F.FIRE DEPARTMENT ON THE THIRD DAY TO HOSE DOWN THE STREETS FOR 12 BLOCKS TO DISPERSE THE HOOLIGANS THAT NEVER SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES.....TODAY,OAKLANDS MAYOR QUAN AND S.F'S MAYOR LEE FOLLOWING THE NOVEMBER ELECTIONS SHOULD CALL ON THE FIRE DEPARTMENT TO HOSE DOWN THE AREAS WHICH HAVE BEEN

TAKEN OVER BY THE TENT PEOPLE ON BOTH SIDES OF THE BAY.....PARTS OF OUR CITY SHOULD NOT BE CAPTURED BY FORCES WHO DO NOT RESPECT THE LAWS OF OUR CITIES.....

GIVE THE TENT PEOPLE NOTICE TO REMOVE ALL PERSONAL AFFECTS BY A CERTAIN DATE,THEN CALL UPON THE FIRE DEPARTMENT TO HOSE DOWN THE AREAS WITH SPRAY WATER,NOT THE FORCE WATER THAT CAN INJURE THE OCCUPIERS.....

THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS THEN CAN GO IN AND CONFISCATE ANY AND ALL FOREIGN MATERIALS WHICH BLOCK CITY PROPERTIES,TENTS,ETC.

THE MEDIA HAS A RESPONSIBILITY NOT TO ENCOURAGE THESE DEMONSTRATORS WHICH HAS BEEN SO EVIDENT THE PAST FEW WEEKS..THE MEDIA IS RESPONSIBLE FOR MUCH OF THESE DEMONSTRATORS ACTIONS..IT IS TIME FOR THE MEDIA TO DISCONTINUE ITS DOUBLE EDGE BLADED COVERAGE OF THE CURRENT CLASS STRUGGLE,WHICH CAN INDEED LEAD TO MORE SERIOUS DEMONSTRATIONS IN THE SO CALLED "FREEDOM OF SPEECH"AXIOM.....



...w of la... ...way with ...n... ...t nighters fi ...mi Ravetti ...g, gold gown ...ss/model La ...Sporting a gor ...snapless gown. Hers is a trul

magnifique!...

The opera/concert was a success! The ne artist of substance!...

Following the performance, 460 of the b stretch limousines, while Larry Castle in his delivered socialite Susan Buffett through the Broadway for the **Blockbuster II Party** o Getty mansion, but also in John and Dede Ro Wildt's sumptuous homes....

While **The Flying Dutchmen Vale** eep the traffic clear in the three block are ...ousands of white, sparkling, tree lights and ...arious jazz bands and musicians, the guests champagne flowing, caviar and delectables ga

Blockbuster II was the climax to a memo festivities of the week, this reporter joined ab **Orleans' Preservation Hall Jazz Band** a music festival....

With Percy and Willie Humphrey's dynar

Clerk of the Board Customer Satisfaction Form
Board of Supervisors to: Madeleine Licavoli 10/28/2011 04:37 PM

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 10/28/2011 04:38 PM -----

From: <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
To: <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
Date: 10/27/2011 09:23 AM
Subject: Clerk of the Board Customer Satisfaction Form

To:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Email:Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
DIVISION_AGENCY:COB
TREATED_YOU:Strongly_Agree
VOICEMAIL:Strongly_Agree
EMAIL_RESPONSE:Strongly_Agree
QUESTIONS:Strongly_Agree
ACCURATE_INFORMATION:Strongly_Agree
BEHAVED_ETHICALLY:Strongly_Agree
ANSWER_RESPONSE:Strongly_Agree
COMFORT_LEVEL:Outstanding
ADDITIONAL_COMMENTS:Thank you Supervisors: Avalos Campos Kim Chu Marr for standing in solidarity with 1,000 occupiers!
NUMBER:
MAILING_ADDRESS:
CONTACT_EMAIL:jmalcomson@yahoo.com

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF A DRAFT PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE DELTA PLAN

The Delta Stewardship Council, an independent state agency, is issuing this notice to advise the public that a Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (DPEIR) for the Delta Plan has been prepared and is now available for public review and comment for 60 days, from November 4, 2011 through (and including) January 3, 2012. This notice is provided pursuant to noticing requirements found in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Sec. 21092), and the State CEQA Guidelines (Guidelines Sec. 15087).

SUMMARY

In November 2009, the California Legislature enacted SBX7 1. It requires the Delta Stewardship Council to develop, adopt, and implement by January 1, 2012 the Delta Plan, a legally enforceable, comprehensive, long-term management plan for the Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta and the Suisun Marsh (Delta) that achieves the coequal goals (Water Code section 85300(a)). "Coequal goals means the two goals of providing a more reliable water supply for California and protecting, restoring and enhancing the Delta ecosystem. The coequal goals shall be achieved in a manner that protects and enhances the unique cultural, recreational, natural resource and agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place" (Water Code section 85054). Achieving the coequal goals is a primary and fundamental purpose of the Delta Plan. **A draft Delta Plan to meet the requirements of SBX7 1 has been prepared and is the proposed project being evaluated in the DPEIR.**

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PROJECT AREA

The draft Delta Plan generally covers five topic areas and goals: increased water supply reliability, restoration of the Delta ecosystem, improved water quality, reduced risks of flooding in the Delta, and protection and enhancement of the Delta as an evolving place. Through the Delta Plan, however, the Council does not propose or contemplate constructing, owning, or operating any facilities related to these five topic areas. Rather, the Delta Plan sets forth regulatory policies, and recommendations, that seek to influence the actions, activities and projects of cities, counties, and State, federal, regional and local agencies toward meeting the goals in the five topic areas. Examples of the types of actions/activities the Delta Plan seeks to influence include, but are not limited to: new or expanded water storage reservoirs; wetlands and riparian restoration; invasive species management; water flow patterns in the Delta; water, wastewater, stormwater and agricultural runoff water treatment; levee modification and construction; floodplain expansion; new/improved active and passive recreation opportunities in the Delta.

The focus of the Delta Plan is on the Delta and Suisun Marsh, although the Delta Plan could have influence beyond the Delta. The Delta area is generally located west of Sacramento and east of the San Francisco Bay area within the network of waterways formed primarily by the confluence of the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers. Activities the Delta Plan could influence in the Delta and Suisun Marsh could include, for example, levee improvements, wetlands restoration and recreation projects, among others. Accomplishing the coequal goals across the five topic areas the Delta Plan covers, however, could involve physical actions (should other agencies undertake them) in areas outside the Delta, including the Delta Watershed to the north of the Delta and other areas that currently rely on water exported from the Delta. These areas include, for example, portions of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys and southern California. Activities the Delta Plan could influence in those areas could include, for example, groundwater storage enhancements, new/expanded reservoirs and treatment plants, among others. See attached map.

DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY

Copies of the Draft Delta Plan Program EIR are available online at the Delta Stewardship Council's Web site: http://www.deltacouncil.ca.gov. You can obtain a CD-ROM copy of the DPEIR by sending an e-mail with the subject line "Request for CD-ROM Copy of DPEIR" to eircomments@deltacouncil.ca.gov, or by calling 916-445-0144. A copy of the DPEIR and any documents incorporated by reference are also available for viewing at the Delta Stewardship Council offices located at 980 9th Street, Suite 1500, Sacramento, CA 95814. Lastly, a copy of the DPEIR is available in the main branch of each County library in counties that possibly could be affected by the Delta Plan; addresses for these libraries can be found at http://www.deltacouncil.ca.gov.

PROVIDING COMMENTS ON THE DPEIR; PUBLIC MEETINGS

Written comments on the Draft Delta Plan Program EIR should be provided to the Delta Stewardship Council on or before January 3, 2012. Written comments on the Draft Delta Plan Program EIR should be sent to: "EIR Comments", Delta Stewardship Council, 980 Ninth Street, Suite 1500, Sacramento, CA 95814.

Comments on the DPEIR may also be submitted electronically through the Delta Stewardship Council's web site at http://www.deltacouncil.ca.gov, or via e-mail with the subject line "Draft EIR" to eircomments@deltacouncil.ca.gov. Comments may also be provided orally or in writing at public Council meetings on the following dates:

5

- Thursday, November 17, 2011
  1:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. (Council will take oral public comment)
  Sheraton Grand Hotel, 1230 J Street, Sacramento, CA

- Thursday, December 15, 2011
  1:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. (Council will take oral public comment)
  California State Capitol, Room 447, Sacramento, CA

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Terry Macaulay, Interim Chief Deputy Executive Officer, Delta Stewardship Council, 980 9th Street, Suite 1500 , Sacramento, CA 95814 (telephone: 916-445-0144 or 916-445-5511).

ANTICIPATED SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROJECT: Through the Delta Plan, the Council does not propose construction, operation or maintenance of any facilities. Rather, the Council seeks to influence other agencies to take certain actions. The degree to which that influence results in physical changes to the environment is uncertain, and depends upon what specific actions those other agencies propose. The DPEIR takes a conservative approach, however, in concluding that activities/projects other agencies could implement that the Delta Plan could influence may have significant environmental impacts to resources in the following areas: water resources, biological resources, flood management, land use and planning, agriculture and forestry resources, visual resources, air quality, cultural resources, geology and soils, paleontological resources, mineral resources, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, recreation, transportation, utilities, climate change and greenhouse gas emissions.



NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF A DRAFT PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE DELTA PLAN
SCH #2010122028

BOS-11
cpage

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
111 GRAND AVENUE
P. O. BOX 23660
OAKLAND, CA 94623-0660
PHONE (510) 286-4506
FAX (510) 286-4482
TTY 711

Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!

October 24, 2011

Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Sir or Madam:

The attached report is submitted pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25180.7.

The report documents information regarding the illegal discharge (or threatened illegal discharge) of hazardous waste, which could cause substantial injury to the public health or safety.

The report is submitted on behalf of all designated employees of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

Sincerely,

Kim C. Le

KIM C. LE
District Office Chief
Office of Maintenance Services

Attachment

6

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PROPOSITION 65 REPORTING FORM

AGENCY: Caltrans Office of Maintenance Services 111 Grand Avenue, 6th Floor Oakland, CA 94612	REPORT DATE: October 21, 2011 REPORTED BY: L. Horan TELEPHONE: (510) 286-4492 TIME: 5:25 A.M.
DATE OF INCIDENT: October 19, 2011	ROUTE: 101 POST MILE: 3.65
COUNTY OF INCIDENT: San Francisco	ADDRESS: W/B 80 @ SB 101
OWNER: Unknown	
DESCRIPTION CAUSE OF ACCIDENT: Accident involving a big rig that caught on fire	
RESPONSIBLE PARTY NAME: Unknown	TELEPHONE:
IDENTIFICATION OF DISCHARGE WASTE: Diesel Fuel	

CHEMICAL NAME COMMON NAME:	PHYSICAL STATE:	VOLUME:
Diesel Fuel	Liquid	80 gallons

ENVIRONMENT AFFECTED:		LOCALE:	
Roadway	☒	Residential	☐
Sewer or Storm Drain	☐	Commercial	☐
Bay/Ocean	☐	Other Area	☐
Air	☐	Public Property	☒
Other	☒ Caltrans dirt lot below roadway	Private Property	☐

DESCRIPTION OF EXTENT OF CONTAMINATION: Overturned big rig leaking 80 gallons of diesel	
NUMBER OF PERSONS REPORTEDLY INJURED: One	MEDICAL TREATMENT RECEIVED Yes ☒ No ☐
OTHER PERTINENT INFORMATION: Service Request# 680488, OES Log# 11-6240	

BOS-11
cpage

JOSEPH N. DEMKO
3436 Broderick Street
San Francisco, CA 94123
(415) 440-3781

November 1, 2011

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

RE: NERT Program

Dear Honorable Board of Supervisors:

I am an attorney who practices in San Francisco and lives in the city. I recently had the opportunity to participate in the Neighborhood Emergency Response Training (NERT) program over two days put on by the San Francisco Fire Department.

I want to express to you how worthwhile I believe the program is, and how well-run and organized it is. I would strongly urge you, in the future, to support the program.

As an attorney, I am required to take a Mandatory Continuing Legal Education (MCLE) credit. The instructors who taught the NERT program, which I attended at Fisherman's Wharf on October 20th and 27th, 2011 were as good, if not better, than most of the instructors I encounter while attending MCLE seminars. The program was very informative, worthwhile, and I would encourage you that when it comes time for preparation for the budgets for the city and/or fire department that you continue to support this worthwhile program. Thank you.

Very Truly Yours,

Joseph N. Demko

JND:jw

K:JND/Personal Letters/Board of Supervisors 11-1-11

7

B5-11
C03

San Francisco
Water Power Sewer
Services of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

1155 Market Street, 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
T 415.554.0725
F 415.554.3280
TTY 415.554.3488

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 NOV -2 PM 3:24
BY AK

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

November 1, 2011

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

In accordance with San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 11.44 (b), the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC or Department) is filing a report with the Board of Supervisors analyzing whether Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) is complying with all provisions of this Chapter and PG&E's Franchise, except those items addressed by the Controller's Report.

To the SFPUC's knowledge, there has been no change in ownership of PG&E's Franchise. The Department has not received any complaints about the Franchise from third-party users. Except as stated below, PG&E is in compliance with the terms and conditions of the Franchise.

Over the last two years, SFPUC had a number of disputes with PG&E concerning PG&E's responsibility under Section 7(d) of the Franchise. This section requires PG&E to remove or relocate its facilities without expense to the City where relocation is made necessary by any lawful change in grade, alignment or width of any street, or by any work to be performed under the governmental authority of the City. With several City projects, PG&E has been unwilling to pay the costs of relocating their facilities that conflict with projects undertaken by the City. These projects include: (i) the construction of SFPUC's new office building at 525 Golden Gate Avenue; (ii) the construction of the Chinese Recreation Center at 1199 Mason Street; (iii) the construction of the City's Central Subway, Union Square Station and; (iv) the construction of the new North Beach Library/Joe DiMaggio Park at 701 Lombard Street.

For the aforementioned projects, the City has paid PG&E, under protest, approximately $500,000 through PG&E's Electric Service Contract process to keep these projects on schedule. Delays in these projects have contributed to additional costs to SFPUC, and in time and labor to work out these disputes.

In addition to the disputes with PG&E on projects, associated with costs of relocating its facilities, other complaints include PG&E's non-responsiveness to Notice-of-Intent to construct and inaccurate information regarding the location of its facilities, which have caused City construction projects to delay, demobilize and incur costs. More concerning, inaccurate location information can present a health and safety threat to workers and the general public.

The SFPUC will continue to focus on enhancing its outreach to other City organizations to identify all issues of non-compliance with PG&E and the Franchise, with the objective of mitigating unnecessary costs to the City and ensuring PG&E is complying with its obligations under the Franchise.

Sincerely,

Camron Samii
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Manager, Administration & Budget, Power Enterprise

c: Honorable Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Barbara Hale, Assistant General Manager, Power Enterprise
Tonia Lediju, Director of Audits

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

TO
SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING COMMISSION

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Lloyd W. Schloegel
General Delivery
SAN FRANCISCO,
CALIFORNIA 94142

November 3, 2011

Regarding SAN FRANCISCO TRANSIT CENTER DISTRICT PLAN, EIR, which includes a 61 story tower at 425 MISSION STREET AT FIRST STREET. 2007.0558E and 2008.0789E; NOV 3, 2011 Agenda.

STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION:

In Europe transit centers are built to low heights of four to ten stories. So if there is any national conflict there, it will affect a decongested low built area. This was the thinking before the second World War. This is not what the Italians have been planning for the city of San Francisco, which has seismic sensitivities. Italian designers of the downtown plan are planning to construct six or more buildings at the transit center which would allow a 500 foot, a 700 foot, and a 1,000 foot height. A typical height per floor is eleven feet. This is a reckless and irresponsible plan and is totally unnecessary. Many office buildings in this area are under utilized now. There is a second 60 story building, an office tower, now completed across the street.

9

Statement in Opposition to TRANSIT CENTER DISTRICT PLAN
2007.0558E, 61 Story Tower, NOVEMBER 3, 2011

In this ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT the population of SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY is projected to increase by twenty percent to about 934,000 people from the YEAR 2005 to 2030. The population of SAN FRANCISCO is currently estimated to be less than 250,000. The SPONSOR for this PLAN is the SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT.

TOTAL EMPLOYMENT in SAN FRANCISCO is projected to increase by fifty PERCENT between 2005 and 2030 to a total of 793,000 jobs, AN INCREASE of 241,000 jobs. PAGE 188.

The ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is incompetent. Population AND job growth the STATISTICS are grossly UNREALISTIC. AND the PROPOSED BUILDINGS ARE not NECESSARY. The RATIONALE that is offered by the EIR for this building project is to ACCOMMODATE projected job growth for the next twenty-five YEARS.

The ORIGINAL PLAN FOR A NINE STORY TRANSIT center building here WAS better. I HAVE seen such a nine STORY building in California which WAS a NUISANCE FOR WAITING PASSENGERS. The old TRANSIT center building which HAS been demolished WAS eight STORIES high.

There is no city in the world that HAS SUCH A TALL building AT the TRANSIT center. This is very BAD PLANNING. SHANGHAI, China, and Japan both allowed buildings in excess of twenty STORIES AT the TRANSIT Center. SHANGHAI is over-built. SAN FRANCISCO is becoming over-built in the downtown AREA.

Lloyd Schloegel

BOS-11

File 110967

SAMUEL A. NIGRO, M.D., INC.
CHILD, ADOLESCENT AND FAMILY PSYCHIATRY
216-932-3970
Preferred mailing:
2517 Guilford Road
Cleveland Heights, OH 44118
www.DocNigro.com

Parkland Center
Suite 102
3733 Parkeast Drive
Beachwood, Ohio 44121

Family & Professional Counseling
Suite 775
14701 Detroit Avenue
Lakewood, Ohio 44107

10-26-11

To the governments of SanFrancisco and California

Dear Government Leaders:

Re: NAKEDNESS IN PUBLIC

It is my understanding that the City of San Francisco has laws which allow public nakedness and that a recent law was proposed requiring those NAKED to have a towel to sit on when and wherever they gather. That is an insult to their freedom to be as animal-like as possible. In fact, I think naked in public people should be prohibited by law from using any apparel or utensils or facilities. And above all, a law should be passed requiring them to walk or remain on all fours at all times.

Those naked in public must be supported in their rejection and independence of humanbeingness and personhood which clothes so define. My proposals help those naked in public to blend in with the other subhuman animals even more so! They would not even need towels to sit on either but would justifiably be required to just lay on the floor and to squat on all fours at all times (like other animals do when on the ground, chairs or tables as the case may be).

Requiring ON ALL FOURS AT ALL TIMES while naked would also render their animality to be much more realistic than half-baked efforts of standing erect like humans (which detracts greatly from their subhumanness efforts). Also, naked people should be **prohibited by law FROM USING UTENSILS** for any reason including those used for eating and cleaning self. In addition, urination, defecation, menstruation, and copulation should be in public while naked because not to do so detracts from their desired open animality! Public nakedness laws must require **full animality** otherwise they are frauds of a sort. Court authorized exemptions can be provided on an individual, as needed, basis.

I trust this will proceed with all promptness!

Sincerely,

Samuel A. Nigro, M.D.

CC Newspaper mailing list
Medical Mailing list
Governor, California
General Assembly, California
Interested others

10

Nov 1, 2011

File 110966
cpage

Office of the Clerk of the Board
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 NOV -3 PM 4:

To Whom It May Concern:

I am submitting this letter today to make clear my support of 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.

I may not be a resident of San Francisco, but I am a resident of the Bay Area, and frequently spend my dollars and time at its parks, beaches, and local businesses. It is just as important to me that Sharp Park is restored. The legislation makes sense for the environment, for San Francisco taxpayers, for fuller public enjoyment of Sharp Park, and for all residents of the Bay Area relying so heavily on your city's recreation and parks. I hope you'll support this important legislation.

Regards,

Susan Cossins

Mr. & Mrs. Robert Cossins
459 Marin Dr.
Burlingame, CA 94010-2724

Cc: Supervisors John Avalos, David Campos, Carmen Chu, David Chiu, Malia Cohen, Sean Elsbernd, Mark Farrell, Jane Kim, Eric Mar, Ross Mirkarimi, Scott Wiener

11

Dr. David Schneider
OPTOMETRIST
(510) 848-6733 • ds6956@earthlink.net

1736 HEARST AVENUE • BERKELEY, CA 94703

121-1-22

File 110966
BOS-11
cpage

DEM SF BoS —

I URGE you TO APPROVE

Sup. AVALOS' ordinance calling for

repurposing of the SHARP PARK GOLF

course TO A NEW PUBLIC PARK w/

more public ACCESS in partnership

w the GGNRA.

THANKS —

DAVID SCHNEIDER, OD

To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Victor Young/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 110996: Sharp Park Legislation

From: Yseult Biwer <pbprodu@aol.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 11/03/2011 12:40 AM
Subject: Sharp Park Legislation
Sent by: National Parks Conservation Association <takeaction@npca.org>

Nov 3, 2011

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Please support current legislation to repurpose the failing Sharp Park Golf Course into a better public park in partnership with the National Park Service. Repurposing the Pacifica-based, but San Francisco-owned golf course, which is also located within the boundary of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, will best protect endangered species, provide more recreational activities and public access, provide flood control for adjacent neighborhoods, and is the least expensive option for San Francisco.

Sharp Park Golf Course loses up to hundreds of thousands of dollars each year, continues to kill endangered species, and prevents other golf courses in San Francisco from receiving adequate maintenance. We can do better. Indeed, repurposing Sharp Park will allow San Francisco to redirect resources to improve the five other courses it manages, which are currently suffering from neglect.

The National Park Service has stated that they will conduct the long-term planning and conversion of the golf course to a new public park with restored wildlife habitat and trail-based recreation. Please help build a better public park at Sharp Park that everyone can enjoy by supporting the legislation.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Yseult Biwer
23143 Canzonet St
Woodland Hills, CA 91367-6104

To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Victor Young/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 100996: Support Sharp Park Legislation

From: Birgit Hermann <bhermannsf@aol.com>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 11/02/2011 08:13 PM
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.

Birgit Hermann
627 Page Street #7
San Francisco, CA 94117

To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 100996: Please Save The Sharp Park Wetlands

From: Alan Levesque <yemahoma5@yahoo.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 11/02/2011 08:32 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.

Alan Levesque

McKinleyville, CA 95519
US

GAO
Clerk
COB → 1 page

City and County of San Francisco
Department of Public Health

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

Edwin M. Lee
Mayor

November 1, 2011

Honorable David Chiu
President, Board of Supervisors

Honorable David Campos
Member, Board of Supervisors

Honorable Mark Farrell
Member, Board of Supervisors

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

Re: Resolution #050396

Dear Supervisors Chiu, Campos and Farrell:

In response to Resolution #050396, I am enclosing the Laguna Honda Hospital and Rehabilitation Center's 2011 3rd Quarter Report showing compliance with the reversal of the Admission Policy priorities that was implemented on February 22, 2005.

On February 17, 2005, Mayor Newsom directed the DPH Director to allow Laguna Honda Executive Staff to reverse the Admission Policy priorities back to the pre-March 2004 priorities. The policy was changed effective February 22, 2005. Since that time, you will see the percentage of patients coming to Laguna Honda from San Francisco General Hospital has ranged from 57-63%. The annual percentage and current year rates are as follows:

2003: 54%	2007: 58%	January to Sept 2011: 59%
2004: 73%	2008: 57%	
2005: 63%	2009: 60%	
2006: 59%	2010: 59%	

The age distribution shows an increased trend of residents over 50 years of age. In 2004, 83% of residents at Laguna Honda were over 50 years of age, compared to 88% of the residents in this category for January to September 2011.

I am available to answer any questions you may have. I can be reached at 759-2363 or via email at mivic.hirose@sfdph.org.

Sincerely,

Mivic Hirose
Executive Administrator

12

Attachments:

A. Sources of New SNF Admissions to Laguna Honda
   - A-1 July – Sept 2011
   - A-2 2010
   - A-3 2009
   - A-4 2008
   - A-5 2007
   - A-6 2006
   - A-7 2005
   - A-8 2004
   - A-9 2003

B. Laguna Honda Distribution of Residents by Race
   - B-1 9/30/11 and 9/30/10 Snapshot
   - B-2 9/30/09 and 9/30/08 Snapshot
   - B-3 9/30/07 and 9/30/06 Snapshot
   - B-4 9/30/05 and 9/30/04 Snapshot
   - B-5 9/30/03 and 9/30/02 Snapshot
   - B-6 9/30/01 Snapshot

C. Laguna Honda Gender Distribution
   Deciles of Age by percent from 2001 through January to September 2011

D. Laguna Honda Age Distribution
   By Calendar Year from 2001 through January to September 2011

cc: Honorable Sean Elsbernd, Member, Board of Supervisors
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Barbara A. Garcia, Director of Health

SOURCES OF NEW ADMISSIONS TO LAGUNA HONDA HOSPITAL *
JANUARY 2011 – SEPTEMBER 2011

		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		
Source of Admission	Jan	SFGH	Feb	SFGH	Mar	SFGH	Apr	SFGH	May	SFGH	June	SFGH	July	SFGH	Aug	SFGH	Sep	SFGH	Oct	SFGH	Nov	SFGH	Dec	SFGH	Total	%
Board and Care					2				1		1				1		2								7	3%
Cal Pac Acute	3										2				1		1								7	3%
Cal Pac SNF									1				2												3	1%
Chinese Hospital Acute							1		1						1										3	1%
Chinese Hospital SNF																									0	0%
Home	8		3		1		4				5		3		3		4								31	11%
Home Health																									0	0%
Kaiser Acute																									0	0%
Kaiser SNF																									0	0%
Mt. Zion Acute	1		1		1		1				3						1								8	3%
Other Misc	3		1		1		1		1		1				4		2								14	5%
Other SNF	1								1				1												3	1%
Seton Acute																									0	0%
SFGH Acute	23	49%	12	46%	17	65%	13	57%	16	53%	15	43%	10	43%	17	61%	21	58%		0%		0%		0%	144	53%
SFGH SNF	2	4%	1	4%	2	8%	2	9%	4	13%	4	11%	2	9%		0%		0%		0%		0%		0%	17	6%
St. Francis Acute	1		2						1		1		1		1		2								9	3%
St. Francis SNF																									0	0%
St. Luke's Acute	1		1		1				2								1								6	2%
St. Luke's SNF	1		2										1												4	1%
St. Mary's Acute	1		3								1														5	2%
St. Mary's SNF																									0	0%
Seton Acute																									0	0%
Seton SNF																									0	0%
UC Med Acute	2				1		1		1		2		3				2								12	4%
UC Med SNF									1																1	0%
VA Hospital Acute																									0	0%
VA Hospital SNF																									0	0%
TOTAL	47	53%	26	50%	26	73%	23	65%	30	67%	35	54%	23	52%	28	61%	36	58%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	274	100%

*Effective 12/8/2010, all Laguna Honda Hospital residents were relocated to the new building and the total licensed bed capacity is 780 (15 for General Acute Care and 765 for SNF).

ATTACHMENT A-1

SOURCES OF NEW ADMISSIONS TO LAGUNA HONDA HOSPITAL*
JANUARY 2010 – DECEMBER 2010

		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		
Source of Admission	Jan	SFGH	Feb	SFGH	Mar	SFGH	Apr	SFGH	May	SFGH	June	SFGH	July	SFGH	Aug	SFGH	Sept	SFGH	Oct	SFGH	Nov	SFGH	Dec	SFGH	Total	%
Board and Care	1		2		2								1		2				1				1		10	3%
Cal Pac Acute															2		1								3	1%
Cal Pac SNF											2														2	1%
Chinese Hospital Acute					1								1												2	1%
Chinese Hospital SNF																									0	0%
Home	3		1		1		3		1		4		4		2		2		2		6		2		31	10%
Home Health																									0	0%
Kaiser Acute									1										1						2	1%
Kaiser SNF																									0	0%
Mt. Zion Acute	2						2								2		1				2				9	3%
Other Misc	1				3		1		1		4				2						1		4		17	5%
Other SNF	1		2		2								1						1						7	2%
Seton Acute																									0	0%
SFGH Acute	16	52%	15	52%	13	43%	15	45%	12	60%	16	59%	13	43%	14	41%	18	75%	14	56%	8	36%	11	55%	165	51%
SFGH SNF	4	13%	2	7%	1	3%	4	12%	1	5%	1	4%	3	10%	5	15%		0%	2	8%	2	9%		0%	25	8%
St. Francis Acute	1		3		1		1						2		2		2		2		1				15	5%
St. Francis SNF																									0	0%
St. Luke's Acute							1		2				2		2										7	2%
St. Luke's SNF			1				2		1																4	1%
St. Mary's Acute	1				1								1		1				1						5	2%
St. Mary's SNF																									0	0%
Seton Acute																									0	0%
Seton SNF																									0	0%
UC Med Acute	1		3		5		4		1				2						1		2		2		21	6%
UC Med SNF																									0	0%
VA Hospital Acute																									0	0%
VA Hospital SNF																									0	0%
TOTAL	31	**65%**	29	**59%**	30	**47%**	33	**58%**	20	**65%**	27	**63%**	30	**53%**	34	**56%**	24	**75%**	25	**64%**	22	**45%**	20	**55%**	325	100%

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

ATTACHMENT A-2

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

		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%			
Source of Admission	Jan	SFGH	Feb	SFGH	Mar	SFGH	Apr	SFGH	May	SFGH	June	SFGH	July	SFGH	Aug	SFGH	Sept	SFGH	Oct	SFGH	Nov	SFGH	Dec	Total	%
Board and Care													2		1									3	1%
Cal Pac Acute	1		2		2		2				2		1		1								1	12	4%
Cal Pac SNF							1										1		1					3	1%
Chinese Hospital Acute																								0	0%
Chinese Hospital SNF																								0	0%
Home	1		1				3		2		1		3				2		2		2		2	19	7%
Home Health																								0	0%
Kaiser Acute													1											1	0%
Kaiser SNF																								0	0%
Mt. Zion Acute							1		1		1				1		2							6	2%
Other Misc					1				1						2				2		2			8	3%
Other SNF					1		1		3		3		3		1				2				1	15	5%
Seton Acute							1						1											2	1%
SFGH Acute	8	53%	17	74%	11	55%	12	38%	10	42%	16	47%	15	50%	17	63%	12	67%	5	33%	17	65%	12	152	53%
SFGH SNF	2	13%	1	4%		0%	2	6%	4	17%	5	15%		0%		0%	1	6%	1	7%	2	8%	3	21	7%
St. Francis Acute			1				4		1		1		1		1				1		1			11	4%
St. Francis SNF																								0	0%
St. Luke's Acute	1						1				1		1		1				1				2	8	3%
St. Luke's SNF									1															1	0%
St. Mary's Acute	1		1				1																	3	1%
St. Mary's SNF					1																			1	0%
Seton Acute																								0	0%
Seton SNF																								0	0%
UC Med Acute	1				4		3		1		4		2		2						2			19	7%
UC Med SNF																								0	0%
VA Hospital Acute																								0	0%
VA Hospital SNF																								0	0%
TOTAL	15	67%	23	78%	20	55%	32	44%	24	58%	34	62%	30	50%	27	63%	18	72%	15	40%	26	73%	21	285	100%

*Due to budgetary and construction related issues, LHH is decreasing admissions effective 1/1/2008. General SNF Admissions are being denied while Hospice, Rehab and AIDS/HIV are still being admitted based upon bed availability.
** Data re-run March 2011

ATTACHMENT A-3

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

		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%			
Source of Admission	Jan	SFGH	Feb	SFGH	Mar	SFGH	Apr	SFGH	May	SFGH	Jun	SFGH	Jul	SFGH	Aug	SFGH	Sep	SFGH	Oct	SFGH	Nov	SFGH	Dec	Total	%
Board and Care			1		1				1		1										1			5	2%
Cal Pac Acute	1						3						1		1		1		1		1		1	10	4%
Cal Pac SNF																							1	1	0%
Chinese Hospital Acute			1				1						1											3	1%
Chinese Hospital SNF																								0	0%
Home	1		3		1		1		1		2		3		3		1		1		2		1	20	8%
Home Health																								0	0%
Kaiser Acute							1																	1	0%
Kaiser SNF																								0	0%
Mt. Zion Acute																								0	0%
Other Misc									2						1						1			4	2%
Other SNF															2		2		1		1			6	3%
Seton Acute																								0	0%
SFGH Acute	7	58%	12	60%	8	53%	18	60%	18	64%	10	45%	8	53%	13	57%	10	53%	13	68%	7	47%	10	134	57%
SFGH SNF		0%		0%		0%		0%		0%		0%		0%		0%		0%		0%		0%		0	0%
St. Francis Acute	2		1		3		1		1		1		2		1		1		1					14	6%
St. Francis SNF																								0	0%
St. Luke's Acute			1		1		1								1									4	2%
St. Luke's SNF																	1							1	0%
St. Mary's Acute					1				1		2						1				1		1	7	3%
St. Mary's SNF																								0	0%
Seton Acute																								0	0%
Seton SNF																								0	0%
UC Med Acute	1		1				4		4		6				1		2		2		1		3	25	11%
UC Med SNF																								0	0%
VA Hospital Acute																							1	1	0%
VA Hospital SNF																								0	0%
TOTAL	12	**58%**	20	**60%**	15	**53%**	30	**60%**	28	**64%**	22	**45%**	15	**53%**	23	**57%**	19	**53%**	19	**68%**	15	**47%**	18	236	100%

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

ATTACHMENT A-4

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

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

*Excluding internal transfers

ATTACHMENT A-5

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

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

*Excluding internal transfers

ATTACHMENT A-6

SOURCES OF NEW SNF ADMISSIONS TO LAGUNA HONDA HOSPITAL*
JANUARY 2005 – DECEMBER 2005

		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%
Source of Admission	Jan	SFGH	Feb	SFGH	Mar	SFGH	Apr	SFGH	May	SFGH	Jun	SFGH	Jul	SFGH	Aug	SFGH	Sep	SFGH	Oct	SFGH	Nov	SFGH	Dec	SFGH	Total	%
Board and Care			1						1		1												2		5	1%
Cal Pac Acute	1		1				1				4						2		7		2		6		24	4%
Cal Pac SNF															1				1				1		3	1%
Chinese Hospital Acute			1		1				1				1		1		3				2				10	2%
Chinese Hospital SNF																									0	0%
Home	3		3		5		8		5		7		7		5		5		4		7		6		65	11%
Home Health																									0	0%
Kaiser Acute													1								1				2	0%
Mt. Zion Acute																							1		1	
Other	1		2		2		1		1		1		2						2				2		14	2%
Out of County**									1		3				3		1								8	1%
R.K. Davies Acute																									0	0%
R.K. Davies SNF																									0	0%
SFGH Acute	38	79%	34	68%	38	68%	27	60%	26	57%	33	60%	24	55%	29	63%	31	62%	27	60%	26	54%	22	47%	355	61%
SFGH SNF	2	4%	1	2%	2	4%		0%	1	2%	2	4%	2	5%		0%		0%		0%	1	2%			11	2%
St. Francis Acute			2		1		4		1		4		4		2		3		1		4		3		29	5%
St. Francis SNF					1				1																2	0%
St. Luke's Acute	1		1		1		1		1				1								2				8	1%
St. Luke's SNF			1																		1				2	0%
St. Mary's Acute							1		1						1		2								5	1%
St. Mary's SNF															1										1	0%
Seton Acute					1												1								2	0%
Seton SNF							1																		1	0%
UC Med Acute	2		3		2		1		5				2		2		2		3		2		4		28	5%
UC Med SNF																									0	0%
VA Hospital Acute					2				1						1										4	1%
VA Hospital SNF																									0	0%
TOTAL	48	**83%**	50	**70%**	56	**71%**	45	**60%**	46	**59%**	55	**64%**	44	**59%**	46	**63%**	50	**62%**	45	**60%**	48	**56%**	47	**47%**	580	100%

*Excluding internal transfers

SOURCES OF NEW SNF ADMISSIONS TO LAGUNA HONDA HOSPITAL*
JANUARY 2004 – DECEMBER 2004

Source of Admission	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	%
Board and Care					1	1	1						3	0%
Cal Pac Acute		4		2	3	3	1		2	2	1	2	20	3%
Cal Pac SNF												1	1	0%
Chinese Hospital Acute						1	1	1	2	1			6	1%
Chinese Hospital SNF													0	0%
Home	4	7	3	7	8	1	2	6	6	2	5	3	54	9%
Home Health													0	0%
Kaiser Acute	1				1			2		1			5	1%
Other	1	2			1	5	3	3	1				16	3%
Out of County**										1			1	0%
R.K. Davies Acute													0	0%
R.K. Davies SNF													0	0%
SFGH Acute	40	36	64	37	24	35	33	34	31	41	39	42	456	73%
SFGH SNF							1					1	2	0%
St. Francis Acute		1		5	1	1	2	2	1				13	2%
St. Francis SNF						1		1					2	0%
St. Luke's Acute		1				1	2		1	2			7	1%
St. Luke's SNF			1	1									2	0%
St. Mary's Acute	1		3		1	3	5	1	1			2	17	3%
St. Mary's SNF													0	0%
Seton Acute						1		1				1	3	0%
Seton SNF													0	0%
UC Med Acute		5	1		1	2	1		1	3	1		15	2%
UC Med SNF													0	0%
VA Hospital Acute						2							2	0%
VA Hospital SNF													0	0%
TOTAL	47	56	72	52	41	57	52	51	46	53	46	52	625	100%

* Excluding internal transfers
** Out-of-county count begins in October 2004

ATTACHMENT A-8

SOURCES OF NEW SNF ADMISSIONS TO LAGUNA HONDA HOSPITAL*
JANUARY 2003 – DECEMBER 2003

Source of Admission	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	%
Board and Care		3	2	1	2	2				1			11	2%
Cal Pac Acute		2	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	1	3	3	21	4%
Cal Pac SNF	5	3	1	3			2	2		1			17	3%
Chinese Hospital Acute	1			3							2		6	1%
Chinese Hospital SNF			1										1	0%
Home	4	6	6	9	5	10	1	5	5	6	1	5	63	11%
Home Health										1			1	0%
Kaiser Acute		1	1				1	1					4	1%
Other		1	2	3	4			4	1	3	1	2	21	4%
R.K. Davies Acute													0	0%
R.K. Davies SNF													0	0%
SFGH Acute	27	19	29	20	32	20	20	23	24	23	24	29	290	52%
SFGH SNF	3	2	4	2		1				1			13	2%
St. Francis Acute	1	1	1			3	4	2			1	2	15	3%
St. Francis SNF	2	2	2			2	3			3	1	2	17	3%
St. Luke's Acute		1	1	2	2	1	1	1		1	3		13	2%
St. Luke's SNF	1		2		1		2			1	1	1	9	2%
St. Mary's Acute		4	4	2	1	1	1	2		2	2		19	3%
St. Mary's SNF		1	1										2	0%
Seton Acute					1		2	1		1			5	1%
Seton SNF	1												1	0%
UC Med Acute	1	1	1	1	3	5	2	2	3	3	4	2	28	5%
UC Med SNF													0	0%
VA Hospital Acute							1						1	0%
VA Hospital SNF					1			1					2	0%
TOTAL	46	47	60	47	54	46	42	47	34	48	43	46	560	100%

* Excluding admissions from Unit M7

Laguna Honda Hospital Distribution of Residents by Race as of 9/30/2011
(n = 756)



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



ATTACHMENT B-1

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



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



ATTACHMENT B-2

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



Laguna Honda Hospital Distribution of Residents by Race as of 9/30/2006
(n = 1033)



Laguna Honda Hospital Distribution of Residents by Race as of 9/30/2005
(n = 1076)



Laguna Honda Hospital Distribution of Residents by Race as of 9/30/2004
(n = 1068)



Laguna Honda Hospital Distribution of Residents by Race as of 9/30/2003
(n = 1086)



Laguna Honda Hospital Distribution of Residents by Race as of 9/30/2002
(n = 1078)



ATTACHMENT B-5


Laguna Honda Hospital Distribution of Residents by Race as of 9/30/2001
(n = 1090)
Asian, 21%
African American / Black, 25%
Hispanic, 10%
Other, 2%
Non-Hispanic / White, 41%

Laguna Honda Hospital
Gender Distribution of Residents
2001 – First 9 Months of 2011



ATTACHMENT C

Laguna Honda Hospital
Age Distribution of Residents
2001 – First 9 months of 2011



	<30	30–39	40–49	50–59	60–69	70–79	80–89	90–99	>99
Calendar 2001	1.1%	3.8%	10.6%	14.6%	16.3%	19.4%	22.4%	10.9%	0.8%
Calendar 2002	1.3%	3.6%	9.7%	14.8%	16.7%	19.6%	22.1%	11.2%	1.0%
Calendar 2003	0.6%	3.7%	8.9%	16.3%	18.1%	19.4%	22.2%	10.1%	0.8%
Calendar 2004	1.2%	4.4%	12.2%	18.1%	17.5%	17.0%	19.9%	8.7%	0.9%
Calendar 2005	1.4%	3.6%	10.4%	19.0%	18.2%	17.8%	20.9%	8.7%	0.0%
Calendar 2006	1.4%	2.6%	9.5%	19.2%	19.0%	17.8%	20.3%	9.0%	1.1%
Calendar 2007	1.4%	2.4%	8.9%	17.9%	20.2%	17.4%	21.5%	9.0%	1.3%
Calendar 2008	1.5%	3.0%	8.5%	18.0%	19.1%	16.8%	20.2%	9.3%	1.5%
Calendar 2009	1.5%	2.1%	6.9%	18.4%	21.6%	19.1%	20.2%	9.3%	0.9%
Calendar 2010	0.9%	2.2%	8.5%	17.8%	22.2%	19.0%	19.2%	9.1%	1.1%
First 9 months of 2011	0.9%	3.6%	7.5%	18.7%	22.6%	19.6%	17.6%	6.6%	2.9%

ATTACHMENT D

To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Annual Sexual Harassment Report 2010-2011

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 11/07/2011 11:36 AM -----

From: Martha Cervantes/DHR/SFGOV
To: Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Theresa.Sparks@sfgov.microsoftonline.com, Emily.Murase@sfgov.microsoftonline.com
Date: 11/04/2011 04:11 PM
Subject: Annual Sexual Harassment Report 2010-2011

Hello,

Attached you will find the Annual Report on Sexual Harassment Complaints filed in the fiscal year 2010/2011.

Annual Sexual Harassment Report 2010-2011.pdf

Please feel free to contact our office if you have any questions.

Thank You,

Martha Cervantes
Equal Employment Opportunity Division
City and County of San Francisco
Department of Human Resources
1 South Van Ness Ave. 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 557-4812
(415) 557-4803 (fax)
Martha.Cervantes@sfgov.org

City and County of San Francisco

Edwin M. Lee
Mayor

Department of Human Resources

Micki Callahan
Human Resources Director

MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Micki Callahan, Human Resources Director

DATE: November 4, 2011

SUBJECT: Annual Report on Sexual Harassment Complaints filed in Fiscal Year 2010/2011

I. Annual Report on Sexual Harassment Complaints

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

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

In accordance with the San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 16.9-25(e)(2), enclosed is the "Annual Report on Sexual Harassment Complaints." Attachment A identifies "internal" complaints filed with individual City and County of San Francisco Departments and the Department of Human Resources, Equal Employment Opportunity Division (DHR EEO). Attachment B identifies "external" complaints filed with the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH). For Fiscal Year 2010/2011, a total of 15 complaints (9 internal and 6 external) alleging sexual harassment were filed.

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

Enclosure

cc: Dennis Herrera, City Attorney

ANNUAL REPORT ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT COMPLAINTS
INTERNAL COMPLAINTS[1]

Fiscal Year 2010/2011 (July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011)

DEPARTMENT	TOTAL FILED	STATUS				
		Pending	Settled	Insufficient Evidence	Sustained	Not Investigated
Administrative Services	1					1
Assessor-Recorder	1				1	
Child Support Services	1			1		
Human Resources	1					1
Medical Examiner	1					1
Police	2			1		1
Public Works	1			1		
Treasure/Tax Collector	1				1	
TOTAL COMPLAINTS	9			3	2	4

Definitions:

- *"Settled":* complaint was resolved;
- *"Insufficient Evidence":* complaint was investigated and there was insufficient evidence to establish sexual harassment;
- *"Sustained":* complaint investigated and there was sufficient evidence that sexual harassment occurred; and
- *"Not Investigated":* Adm./Med. Ex./Police complaints were not investigated because they did not meet EEO jurisdiction and DHR complaint was untimely.

[1] Complaints filed with individual Departments and the Department of Human Resources, Equal Employment Opportunity Division (DHR EEO).

ATTACHMENT A

ANNUAL REPORT ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT COMPLAINTS:
EXTERNAL COMPLAINTS[2]

Fiscal Year 20010/2011 (July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011)

DEPARTMENT	TOTAL FILED	STATUS				
		Pending	Settled	Insufficient Evidence	Sustained	Not Investigated
Emergency Communications	2					2
Medical Examiner	1	1				
Public Works	1	1				
Recreation & Parks	1	1				
Treasure/Tax Collector	1	1				
TOTAL COMPLAINTS	6	4				2

Definitions:

- *"Settled":* complaint was resolved;
- *"Insufficient Evidence":* complaint was investigated and there was insufficient evidence to establish sexual harassment;
- *"Sustained":* complaint investigated and there was sufficient evidence that sexual harassment occurred; and
- *"Not Investigated":* complaint was not investigated because the DFEH issued notice of right to sue.

[2] Complaints filed externally with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) or the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC).

Support Bird-Safe Building Standards

Patricia Goldberg to: Board.of.Supervisors 11/04/2011 08:49 PM

Sent by: Defenders of Wildlife <ecommunications@defenders.org>

Please respond to Patricia Goldberg

Nov 4, 2011

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Francisco resident and a supporter of Defenders of Wildlife, 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,

Ms. Patricia Goldberg
1622 21st Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122-3334
(415) 665-2980

14

Support Bird-Safe Building Standards

Dirk Obudzinski to: Board.of.Supervisors 11/05/2011 11:51 PM

Sent by: Defenders of Wildlife <ecommunications@defenders.org>

Please respond to Dirk Obudzinski

Nov 6, 2011

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Francisco resident and a supporter of Defenders of Wildlife, 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. Dirk Obudzinski
1231 6th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122-2501

Support Bird-Safe Building Standards

Rose Reisfield to: Board.of.Supervisors 11/07/2011 09:25 AM

Sent by: Defenders of Wildlife <ecommunications@defenders.org>

Please respond to Rose Reisfield

Nov 7, 2011

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a San Francisco resident and a supporter of Defenders of Wildlife, 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,

Miss Rose Reisfield
369 Center blvd.
Fairfax, CA 94930

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

To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Fw: OCC's Third Quarter Statistical report

From: Pamela Thompson/OCC/SFGOV
To: Matthew Goudeau/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV
Date: 11/01/2011 05:47 PM
Subject: OCC's Third Quarter Statistical report

Attached, please find OCC's Third Quarter Statistical report. A hardcopy will be forthcoming in interoffice mail. I was informed that an electronic copy was suffiecient along with a hard copy. If you need more copies, please let me know.

OCC_3Q11.pdf

Thanks,

Pamela Thompson
Executive Assistant
Police-Office of Citizen Complaints
25 Van Ness Avenue #700
San Francisco, CA 94102
415-241-7721
www.sfgov.org/occ

15