



City and County of San Francisco
Master Report

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place.
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

File Number: 120650	File Type: Communication	Status: Filed
Enacted:	Effective:	
Version: 1	In Control: Board of Supervisors	
File Name: Petitions and Communications	Date Introduced: 06/19/2012	
Requester:	Cost:	Final Action:
Comment:	Title: Petitions and Communications received from June 5, 2012, through June 11, 2012, for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters, or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on June 19, 2012. 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 will not be redacted. *From Office of the Controller, submitting the FY2012-2013 Public Education Enrichment Fund Annual Report. (1) From Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector, submitting the FYs 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, Payroll Expense Exclusion, Clean Technology Business Report. (2) From Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector, submitting the FY2011, Payroll Expense Exclusion, Stock-Based Compensation Report. (3) From Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector, submitting the FY2011, Payroll Expense Tax Exclusion, Central Market Street & Tenderloin Area Report. (4) From Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector, submitting the FYs 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, Payroll Expense Tax Exclusion, Biotechnology Report. (5) From Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector, submitting the FYs 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, Payroll Expense Tax Credit, Enterprise Zone Report. (6) From Department of Human Resources, submitting the proposed changes in the Administrative Provisions for the Interim Annual Salary Ordinance. File No. 120592. Copy: Each Supervisor, Budget & Finance Committee	

Clerk (7)

From Tes Welborn, submitting support for Financial Services in Formula Retail Law. File No. 120047. (8)

From Office of the Clerk of the Board, the following departments have submitted their 2012 Local Agency Biennial Notice: (9)

Superior Court
Law Library
Film Commission
Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
Finance Corporation
Department of the Environment
Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority

From Office of the Sheriff, submitting request for waiver of Administrative Code Chapter 12B for Rapid Notify, Inc. (10)

From Office of the Sheriff, submitting request for waiver of Administrative Code Chapter 12B for Recology Peninsula Services. (11)

From Office of the Mayor, submitting notice that Mayor Lee will be out of State from June 12, 2012, through June 15, 2012. Supervisor Elsbernd will serve as Acting Mayor. Copy: Each Supervisor, City Attorney (12)

From Capital Planning Committee, regarding the Supplemental Appropriation Requests for the San Francisco General Hospital, Trauma Center Improvement Program, Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Program, and the San Francisco International Airport. File Nos. 120532, 120526, 120533, 120537. Copy: Each Supervisor, Budget and Finance Committee Clerk (13)

From Karla McElroy, regarding City and County FY2012-2014 budget proposal. File No. 120591. Copy: Each Supervisor (14)

From concerned citizens, submitting support for proposed legislation regarding the CPMC hospital. File No. 120549. Copy: Each Supervisor, 3 letters (15)

From concerned citizens, regarding the Beach Chalet Project. Copy: Each Supervisor, 3 letters (16)

From State Fish and Game Commission, regarding proposed regulatory action relating to Blue Cavern State Marine Conservation Area. Copy: Each Supervisor (17)

From concerned citizens, thanking the Board of Supervisors for broadcasting their meetings on the radio. 2 letters (18)

From Office of the Clerk of the Board, the following departments have submitted their reports regarding Sole Source Contracts for FY2011-2012: (19)

Board of Appeals
Office of Assessor/Recorder
Ethics Commission

From concerned citizens, regarding the 8 Washington Street Project. File No. 120270. 3 letters (20)

From Civil Service Commission, submitting notice of a Civil Service Commission action regarding benefits of elected officials and annual salary adjustment for Board of Supervisors' members. Copy: Each Supervisor (21)

From San Francisco Planning Department, submitting appointment for the Western SoMa Citizens Planning Task Force. (22)

From concerned citizen, submitting support to the amendment to reverse Citizen's United. (23)

From Department of Emergency Management, submitting update on the BayWEB public safety communications project. (24)

From Marc Bruno, regarding the North Beach Businesses against Subway Extraction. 3 letters (25)

From Jeffrey Goldfarb, regarding appeal at 601 Dolores Street. File No. 120495. Copy: Each Supervisor, City Attorney (26)

From concerned citizen, regarding proposed California Pacific Medical Center Long Range Development Plan Project. File No. 120362. Copy: Each Supervisor (27)

From concerned citizens, regarding Ross Mirkarimi. 3 letters (28)

From Claudine Venegas, submitting Form SFEC-126 Notification of Contract Approval, Sublease Extension for 1440 Harrison Street. File No. 120585. (29)

From concerned citizens, regarding Bernal Heights mural. 2 letters (30)

From Sue Hestor, regarding Waterfront Infrastructure Financing District No. 2. File No. 120278 (31)

From Roland Salvato, regarding various issues. (32)

From Aaron Goodman, submitting concerns regarding issues of the Ethics Commission Hearing. (33)

From State Fish and Game Commission, regarding

Master Report Continued (120650)

proposed regulatory action relating to kelp bass, barred sand bass and spotted sand bass sport fishing. Copy: Each Supervisor (34)

(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.)

History of Legislative File 120650

Ver	Acting Body	Date	Action	Sent To	Due Date	Result
-----	-------------	------	--------	---------	----------	--------



Issued: Public Education Enrichment Fund: Annual Report FY 2012-13
Reports, Controller

to:

Calvillo, Angela, Nevin, Peggy, BOS-Supervisors, BOS-Legislative Aides, Kawa, Steve, Howard, Kate, Falvey, Christine, Elliott, Jason, Campbell, Severin, Newman, Debra, sfdocs@sfpl.info, gmetcalf@spur.org, CON-Media Contact, ggiubbini@sftc.org, CON-EVERYONE, CON-CCSF Dept Heads, CON-Finance Officers, flemingk@sfusd.edu, armentroutc@sfusd.edu, ingrid@first5sf.org, tfong@first5sf.org, Kloomok, Laurel
06/04/2012 01:46 PM

Sent by:

"Chapin-Rienzo, Shanda" <shanda.chapin-rienzo@sfgov.org>

Hide Details

From: "Reports, Controller" <controller.reports@sfgov.org> Sort List...

To: "Calvillo, Angela" <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>, "Nevin, Peggy" <peggy.nevin@sfgov.org>, BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors.bp2ln@sfgov.microsoftonline.com>, BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislativeaides.bp2ln@sfgov.microsoftonline.com>, "Kawa, Steve" <steve.kawa@sfgov.org>, "Howard, Kate" <kate.howard@sfgov.org>, "Falvey, Christine" <christine.falvey@sfgov.org>, "Elliott, Jason" <jason.elliott@sfgov.org>, "Campbell, Severin" <severin.campbell@sfgov.org>, "Newman, Debra" <debra.newman@sfgov.org>, "sfdocs@sfpl.info" <sfdocs@sfpl.info>, "gmetcalf@spur.org" <gmetcalf@spur.org>, CON-Media Contact <con-mediacontact.bp2ln@sfgov.microsoftonline.com>, "ggiubbini@sftc.org" <ggiubbini@sftc.org>, CON-EVERYONE <con-everyone.bp2ln@sfgov.microsoftonline.com>, CON-CCSF Dept Heads <con-ccsfdeptheads.bp2ln@sfgov.microsoftonline.com>, CON-Finance Officers <confinanceofficers.bp2ln@sfgov.microsoftonline.com>, "flemingk@sfusd.edu" <flemingk@sfusd.edu>, "armentroutc@sfusd.edu" <armentroutc@sfusd.edu>, "ingrid@first5sf.org" <ingrid@first5sf.org>, "tfong@first5sf.org" <tfong@first5sf.org>, "Kloomok, Laurel" <laurel.kloomok@sfgov.org>, Sent by: "Chapin-Rienzo, Shanda" <shanda.chapin-rienzo@sfgov.org>

The Office of the Controller, City Services Auditor, presents the Public Education Enrichment Fund Annual Report for FY 2012-13. This report provides an overview of the Public Education Enrichment Fund legislation and the Controller's review of the Children and Families Commission's and San Francisco Unified School District's expenditure plans, spending to date, and performance measures for FY 2012-13. The report also provides a summary of the Controller's recommendations to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors for approval of the Public Education Enrichment Fund expenditure plans for FY 2012-13.

To view the full report, please visit our website at: <http://co.sfgov.org/webreports/details.aspx?id=1431>

This is a send only email.

For more information please contact Monique Zmuda, Deputy Controller, at (415) 554-7500

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



June 4, 2012

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2012 JUN -4 PM 4:08
AK

Re: Annual Report to the Board of Supervisors
2011 Payroll Expense Tax Exclusion - Clean Technology Business

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

The Tax Administrator, pursuant to the provisions of the San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations Code, herewith submits the annual report of businesses that were approved for the Clean Technology Business Exclusion for the 2011 calendar year.

Schedule A of the report summarizes for the 2011 calendar year the number of businesses approved for the exclusion, the total number of San Francisco employees, the number of eligible employees, and the amount of Clean Technology Business Exclusion claimed for calendar year 2011. Twenty-two (22) businesses were approved for the Clean Technology Business Exclusion, and they excluded \$57,563,544.50 in payroll expense, which represents \$854,860.54 in forgone payroll expense tax for this exclusion. These businesses reported 629 employees that qualified for the exclusion.

Schedule B of the report summarizes the Clean Technology Business Exclusion for calendar years 2009 through 2011. Compared to the calendar year 2010, results indicate an increase of 227 jobs in the clean technology business sector for the calendar year 2011 in San Francisco.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact me at (415) 554-7601.

Very truly yours,

David Augustine
David Augustine
Interim Tax Administrator

cc: José Cisneros
San Francisco Public Library

Attachment

2

**TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT
CLEAN TECHNOLOGY PAYROLL EXPENSE TAX EXCLUSION
CALENDAR YEAR 2011**

Schedule A

Year	Number of Businesses Approved	Total SF Employees	Number of Eligible Employees	Clean Technology Exclusion	Payroll Expense Tax Forgone due to Small Business Exemption	Payroll Expense Tax Forgone due to Clean Technology Exclusion
2011	22	629	629	\$ 57,563,544.50	\$ 8,592.63	\$ 854,860.54

**TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT
CLEAN TECHNOLOGY PAYROLL EXPENSE TAX EXCLUSION
FOR CALENDAR YEARS 2009 THROUGH 2011**

Schedule B

Year	Number of Firms Filing	Total SF Employees	Number of Eligible Employees	Clean Technology Exclusion	Payroll Expense Tax Forgone due to Small Business Exemption	Payroll Expense Tax Forgone due to Clean Technology Exclusion
2009	12	288	288	\$25,396,189.30	\$1,012.50	\$379,930.34
2010	14	402	402	\$50,173,008.00	\$301.07	\$752,294.06
2011	22	629	629	\$57,563,544.50	\$8,592.63	\$854,860.54
Change from 2010 to 2011	8	227	227	\$7,390,536.50	\$8,291.57	\$102,566.48



June 4, 2012

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2012 JUN -4 PM 4:08
AK

Re: Annual Report to the Board of Supervisors
2011 Payroll Expense Tax Exclusion – Stock-Based Compensation

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

The Tax Administrator, pursuant to the provisions of the San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations Code, herewith submits the annual report of businesses that were approved for the Stock-Based Compensation Exclusion from the payroll expense tax for the 2011 calendar year.

Schedule A of the report summarizes for the 2011 calendar year the number of businesses approved for the exclusion and the amount of Stock-Based Compensation Exclusion claimed for calendar year 2011. One (1) business was approved for the Stock-Based Compensation Exclusion, and it excluded a total of \$100,621,719 in payroll expense, which represents \$1,509,325.79 in forgone payroll expense tax.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact me at (415) 554-7601.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive that reads "David Augustine".

David Augustine
Interim Tax Administrator

cc: José Cisneros
San Francisco Public Library

Attachment

3

**TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT
STOCK BASED COMPENSATION PAYROLL EXPENSE TAX EXCLUSION
CALENDAR YEAR 2011**

Schedule A

Year	Number of Businesses Approved	Total SF employees	Stock Based Compensation Exclusion	Payroll Expense Tax Forgone
2011	1	1975	\$100,621,719.00	\$1,509,325.79



June 4, 2012

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2012 JUN -4 PM 4:08
AV

Re: Annual Report to the Board of Supervisors
2011 Payroll Expense Tax Exclusion – Central Market Street & Tenderloin Area

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

The Tax Administrator, pursuant to the provisions of the San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations Code, herewith submits the annual report of businesses that were approved for the Central Market Street & Tenderloin Area Exclusion from the payroll expense tax for the 2011 calendar year.

Schedule A of the report summarizes for the 2011 calendar year the number of businesses approved for the exclusion, the total number of San Francisco employees, the number of eligible employees, and the amount of Central Market Street & Tenderloin Area Exclusion claimed for calendar year 2011. Three (3) firms were approved for the Central Market Street & Tenderloin Area Exclusion, and they excluded a total of \$2,737,617.53 in payroll expense, which represents \$41,064.26 in forgone payroll expense tax.

This is the first year this particular exclusion has been in effect and therefore no comparative data is provided.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact me at (415) 554-7601.

Very truly yours,

David Augustine
David Augustine
Interim Tax Administrator

cc: José Cisneros
San Francisco Public Library

Attachment

4

**TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT
CENTRAL MARKET STREET & TENDERLOIN AREA PAYROLL EXPENSE TAX EXCLUSION
CALENDAR YEAR 2011**

Schedule A

Year	Number of Businesses Approved	Total SF Employees	Number of Eligible Employees	Central Market Exclusion	Payroll Expense Tax Forgone
2011	3	228	140	\$ 2,737,617.53	\$ 41,064.26



June 4, 2012

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2012 JUN -4 PM 4:08

Re: Annual Report to the Board of Supervisors
2011 Payroll Expense Tax Exclusion - Biotechnology

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

The Tax Administrator, pursuant to the provisions of the San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations Code, herewith submits the annual report of businesses that were approved for the Biotechnology Exclusion from the payroll expense tax for the 2011 calendar year.

Schedule A of the report summarizes for the 2011 calendar year the number of businesses approved for the exclusion, the total number of San Francisco employees, the number of eligible employees, and the amount of Biotechnology Exclusion claimed for calendar year 2011. Twenty-seven (27) businesses were approved for the Biotechnology Exclusion, and they excluded a total of \$91,459,189.84 in payroll expense, which represents \$1,363,728.28 in forgone payroll expense tax for this exclusion. These businesses reported 704 employees that qualified for the exclusion.

Schedule B of the report summarizes the Biotechnology Exclusion for calendar years 2009 through 2011 with amounts updated. Compared to the preceding calendar year 2010, results indicate a decrease of 89 jobs in the biotechnology business sector for the calendar year 2011 in San Francisco.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact me at (415) 554-7601.

Very truly yours,

David Augustine
David Augustine
Interim Tax Administrator

cc: José Cisneros
San Francisco Public Library

Attachment

5

**TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT
BIOTECHNOLOGY PAYROLL EXPENSE TAX EXCLUSION
CALENDAR YEAR 2011**

Schedule A

Year	Number of Businesses Approved	Total SF Employees	Number of Eligible Employees	Biotechnology Exclusion	Payroll Expense Tax Forgone due to Small Business Exemption	Payroll Expense Tax Forgone due to Biotechnology Exclusion
2011	27	704	704	\$91,459,189.84	\$8,159.56	\$1,363,728.28

**TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT
BIOTECHNOLOGY PAYROLL EXPENSE TAX EXCLUSION
FOR CALENDAR YEARS 2009 THROUGH 2011**

Schedule B

Year	Number of Businesses Approved	Total SF Employees	Number of Eligible Employees	Biotechnology Exclusion	Payroll Expense Tax Forgone due to Small Business Exemption	Payroll Expense Tax Forgone due to Biotechnology Exclusion
2009	11	565	565	\$59,790,369.41	\$3,373.42	\$893,482.13
2010	22	793	793	\$75,469,827.00	\$8,278.85	\$1,123,768.56
2011	27	704	704	\$91,459,189.84	\$8,159.56	\$1,363,728.28
Change from 2010 to 2011	5	-89	-89	\$15,989,362.84	-\$119.28	\$239,959.72

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



José Cisneros, Treasurer

June 4, 2012

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

Re: Annual Report
2011 Payroll Expense Tax Credit – Enterprise Zone

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2012 JUN -4 PM 4:08
AIC

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

The Tax Administrator, pursuant to the provisions of the San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations Code, herewith submits the annual report of businesses that received tax credits for the 2011 calendar year. This year the report covers the Enterprise Zone Tax Credit only.

Schedule A of the report summarizes for the 2011 calendar year the number of businesses approved for the Enterprise Zone Tax Credit, the total number of San Francisco employees, the number of eligible employees, and the amount of tax credit claimed. Ninety-four (94) businesses were approved for the Enterprise Zone Tax Credit in the amount of \$297,144.18. These businesses reported 406 employees that qualified for this tax credit.

Schedule B of the report compares the Enterprise Zone Tax Credits for tax years 2009 through 2011.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact me at (415) 554-7601.

Very truly yours,

David Augustine

David Augustine
Interim Tax Administrator

cc: José Cisneros
San Francisco Public Library

Attachments

(6)

**TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT
PAYROLL EXPENSE - ENTERPRISE ZONE TAX CREDIT
CALENDAR YEAR 2011**

Schedule A

Year	Number of Businesses Approved	Total SF Employees	Number of Eligible Employees	Total Enterprise Zone Tax Credit
2011	94	8,309	406	\$297,144.18

**TAX COLLECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT
PAYROLL EXPENSE - ENTERPRISE ZONE TAX CREDIT
CALENDAR YEARS 2009 THROUGH 2011**

Schedule B

Year	Number of Businesses Approved	Total SF Employees	Number of Eligible Employees	Total Enterprise Zone Tax Credit
2009*	33	2,722	92	\$57,081.29
2010*	63	7,119	287	\$219,849.07
2011	94	8,309	406	\$297,144.18
Change from 2010 to 2011	31	1,190	119	\$77,295.11

* - amended

City and County of San Francisco

Edwin M. Lee
Mayor



BOS-11, B/F clerk, COB, ~~to~~ cpage
Department of Human Resources

Micki Callahan
Human Resources Director

File # 120592

May 30, 2012

Ms. Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, California 94102

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

In accordance with the provisions of the San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 3, Section 3.10, the Department of Human Resources prepared and submitted the Administrative Provisions of the Interim Annual Salary Ordinance (ASO) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2013. Below are the proposed changes:

2) Section 2. Compensation Provisions.

Section 2.1 was updated to include the Health Service System's stipend amounts for PUC employees assigned to Hetch Hetchy, and Recreation and Park employees permanently assigned to Camp Mather for FY 2012-13.

This sentence was added to clarify the effective dates of the stipend amounts. "These rates are effective July 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012 only, and may change as of January 1, 2013."

Please contact Gilda Cassanego, Senior Personnel Analyst, at 557-4859 if you have any questions or concerns.


Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Micki Callahan".

Micki Callahan
Human Resources Director

cc: Harvey Rose, Budget Analyst
Kate Howard, Mayor's Office
Ben Rosenfield, Controller

7



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Victor Young/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: ASO - FY 2012-2013 - Admin Provisions for Interim ASO - Letter re: Proposed Changes in Admin Provisions

From: "Cassanego, Gilda" <gilda.cassanego@sfgov.org>
To: "Calvillo, Angela" <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: "Callahan, Micki" <micki.callahan@sfgov.org>, "Rosenfield, Ben" <ben.rosenfield@sfgov.org>, "Howard, Kate" <kate.howard@sfgov.org>, "Sandler, Risa" <risa.sandler@sfgov.org>, "Yamasaki, Ted" <ted.yamasaki@sfgov.org>, "Ko, Kerry" <kerry.ko@sfgov.org>, "Palileo, Lucy" <lucy.j.palileo@sfgov.org>, "Bobila, Marites" <marites.bobila@sfgov.org>, "Rose, Harvey" <harvey.rose@sfgov.org>
Date: 06/04/2012 03:52 PM
Subject: ASO - FY 2012-2013 - Admin Provisions for Interim ASO - Letter re: Proposed Changes in Admin Provisions


Attached is a letter that summarizes the proposed changes in the Administrative Provisions for the Interim Annual Salary Ordinance (ASO).

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Gilda Cassanego
Sr. Personnel Analyst
Department of Human Resources
(415) 557-4859



Interim ASO - Letter to Angela Calvillo - Clerk of BOS - Changes in Admin Provisions 5-30-2012.pdf



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Alisa Miller/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 120047: Tell Supervisors to support including Financial Services in Formula Retail

From: tesw@aol.com
To: angela.calvillo@sfgov.org
Date: 06/04/2012 03:22 PM
Subject: Tell Supervisors to support including Financial Services in Formula Retail

Dear Supervisors:

Please support including Financial Services in San Francisco's Formula Retail Law!

Give neighborhoods a chance to approve new big businesses moving into their area.

The few neighborhoods that have a chain ban have already endorsed this ammendment.

Thanks!
Tes Welborn

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

**2012 Local Agency Biennial Notice
Conflict of Interest Code Review Report**

2012 JUN -5 PM 5:00

PN

Name of Agency: San Francisco Superior Court
Mailing Address: 400 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA 94102
Contact Person: T. Michael Yuen Office Phone No: 415-551-5727
E-mail: myuen@sftc.org Fax No: 415-551-5701

This agency has reviewed its conflict-of-interest code and has determined that:

- An amendment is required. The following amendments are necessary:**
(Check all that apply.)

- Include new positions (including consultants) that must be designated.
- Delete positions that manage public investments from the list of designated positions.
 - Revise disclosure categories.
 - Revise the titles of existing positions.
 - Delete titles of positions that have been abolished.
 - Other (describe) _____

- Code is currently under review by the code-reviewing body.**

- No amendment is required.**

The agency's code accurately designates all positions that make or participate in the making of governmental decisions; the disclosure categories assigned to those positions accurately require the disclosure of all investments, business positions, interests in real property, and sources of income that may foreseeably be affected materially by the decisions made by those holding the designated positions; and the code includes all other provisions required by Government Code Section 87302.



Signature of Chief Executive Officer



Date


Complete this notice regardless of how recently your code was approved or amended.

Please return this notice no later than **Aug. 1, 2012**, via e-mail (PDF), inter-office mail, or fax to:

Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
ATTN: Peggy Nevin
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Fax: 554-5163
E-mail: peggy.nevin@sfgov.org

(9)

epage
AS



2012 Local Agency Biennial Notice Conflict of Interest Code Review Report

Name of Agency: SAN FRANCISCO LAW LIBRARY
Mailing Address: 401 VAN NESS AVENUE, ROOM 400 SF
Contact Person: MARCIA BELL Office Phone No: 554-6824
E-mail: marcia.bell@sfgov.org Fax No: 554-6194

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2012 JUN -4 PM 12:58
N

This agency has reviewed its conflict-of-interest code and has determined that:

An amendment is required. The following amendments are necessary:
(Check all that apply.)

- Include new positions (including consultants) that must be designated.
- Delete positions that manage public investments from the list of designated positions.
- Revise disclosure categories.
- Revise the titles of existing positions.
- Delete titles of positions that have been abolished.
- Other (describe) _____

Code is currently under review by the code-reviewing body.

No amendment is required.

The agency's code accurately designates all positions that make or participate in the making of governmental decisions; the disclosure categories assigned to those positions accurately require the disclosure of all investments, business positions, interests in real property, and sources of income that may foreseeably be affected materially by the decisions made by those holding the designated positions; and the code includes all other provisions required by Government Code Section 87302.

Signature of Chief Executive Officer

June 4, 2012


Date

Complete this notice regardless of how recently your code was approved or amended.

Please return this notice no later than **Aug. 1, 2012**, via e-mail (PDF), inter-office mail, or fax to:

Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
ATTN: Peggy Nevin
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Fax: 554-5163
E-mail: peggy.nevin@sfgov.org

*epage v
qashan*



2012 Local Agency Biennial Notice Conflict of Interest Code Review Report

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2012 JUN -5 PM 12:01

Name of Agency: San Francisco Film Commission
Mailing Address: City Hall, Room 473, San Francisco, CA 94102
Contact Person: Susannah Robbins Office Phone No: 415-554-6241
E-mail: Susannah.robbs@sfgov.org Fax No: 4115-554-6503
This agency has reviewed its conflict-of-interest code and has determined that:


An amendment is required. The following amendments are necessary:
(Check all that apply.)

- Include new positions (including consultants) that must be designated.
- Delete positions that manage public investments from the list of designated positions.
- Revise disclosure categories.
- Revise the titles of existing positions.
- Delete titles of positions that have been abolished.
- Other (describe) _____

Code is currently under review by the code-reviewing body.

No amendment is required.

The agency's code accurately designates all positions that make or participate in the making of governmental decisions; the disclosure categories assigned to those positions accurately require the disclosure of all investments, business positions, interests in real property, and sources of income that may foreseeably be affected materially by the decisions made by those holding the designated positions; and the code includes all other provisions required by Government Code Section 87302.



Signature of Chief Executive Officer

Jun 1, 2012

Date

Complete this notice regardless of how recently your code was approved or amended.

Please return this notice no later than **Aug. 1, 2012**, via e-mail (PDF), inter-office mail, or fax to:

Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
ATTN: Peggy Nevin
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Fax: 554-5163
E-mail: peggy.nevin@sfgov.org

Spaue ✓
AS ✓

2012 Local Agency Biennial Notice
Conflict of Interest Code Review Report

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2012 JUN -5 PM 1:58
TRJ

Name of Agency: Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
Mailing Address: 25 Van Ness Ave., Ste. 320, San Francisco, CA 94102
Contact Person: Delene Wolf Office Phone No: 415-252-4650
E-mail: delene.wolf@sfgov.org Fax No: 415-252-4699

This agency has reviewed its conflict-of-interest code and has determined that:

An amendment is required. The following amendments are necessary:


(Check all that apply.)

- Include new positions (including consultants) that must be designated.
- Delete positions that manage public investments from the list of designated positions.
- Revise disclosure categories.
- Revise the titles of existing positions.
- Delete titles of positions that have been abolished.
- Other (describe) _____

Code is currently under review by the code-reviewing body.

No amendment is required.

The agency's code accurately designates all positions that make or participate in the making of governmental decisions; the disclosure categories assigned to those positions accurately require the disclosure of all investments, business positions, interests in real property, and sources of income that may foreseeably be affected materially by the decisions made by those holding the designated positions; and the code includes all other provisions required by Government Code Section 87302.



Signature of Chief Executive Officer

6/5/12


Date

Complete this notice regardless of how recently your code was approved or amended.

Please return this notice no later than **Aug. 1, 2012**, via e-mail (PDF), inter-office mail, or fax to:

Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
ATTN: Peggy Nevin
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Fax: 554-5163
E-mail: peggy.nevin@sfgov.org

CPA
ASV



2012 Local Agency Biennial Notice Conflict of Interest Code Review Report

Name of Agency: Finance Corporation
 Mailing Address: 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hill, Rm 336
 Contact Person: Angela Whittaker Office Phone No: 415-554-6643
 E-mail: Angela.Whittaker@sfgov.org Fax No: _____

RECEIVED
 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
 SAN FRANCISCO
 2012 JUN - 8 PM 12:13

This agency has reviewed its conflict-of-interest code and has determined that:

An amendment is required. The following amendments are necessary:
 (Check all that apply.)

- Include new positions (including consultants) that must be designated.
- Delete positions that manage public investments from the list of designated positions.
- Revise disclosure categories.
- Revise the titles of existing positions.
- Delete titles of positions that have been abolished.
- Other (describe) _____

Code is currently under review by the code-reviewing body.

No amendment is required.

The agency's code accurately designates all positions that make or participate in the making of governmental decisions; the disclosure categories assigned to those positions accurately require the disclosure of all investments, business positions, interests in real property, and sources of income that may foreseeably be affected materially by the decisions made by those holding the designated positions; and the code includes all other provisions required by Government Code Section 87302.

Signature of Chief Executive Officer

6/8/12
 Date

Complete this notice regardless of how recently your code was approved or amended.

Please return this notice no later than **Aug. 1, 2012**, via e-mail (PDF), inter-office mail, or fax to:

Clerk of the Board
 Board of Supervisors
 ATTN: Peggy Nevin
 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
 San Francisco, CA 94102
 Fax: 554-5163
 E-mail: peggy.nevin@sfgov.org

page 1
AS

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2012 JUN -8 AM 10:16

BY PN

**2012 Local Agency Biennial Notice
Conflict of Interest Code Review Report**

Name of Agency: Department of the Environment _____

Mailing Address: 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 _____

Contact Person: David Assmann _____ Office Phone No: (415) 355-3702 _____

E-mail: David.Assmann@sfgov.org _____ Fax No: (415) 554-6393 _____

This agency has reviewed its conflict-of-interest code and has determined that:

An amendment is required. The following amendments are necessary:
(Check all that apply.)

X Include new positions (including consultants) that must be designated. *Please add 0923
Manager II – disclosure category 2*

- Delete positions that manage public investments from the list of designated positions.
- Revise disclosure categories.
- Revise the titles of existing positions.
- Delete titles of positions that have been abolished.
- Other (describe) _____

Code is currently under review by the code-reviewing body.

No amendment is required.

The agency's code accurately designates all positions that make or participate in the making of governmental decisions; the disclosure categories assigned to those positions accurately require the disclosure of all investments, business positions, interests in real property, and sources of income that may foreseeably be affected materially by the decisions made by those holding the designated positions; and the code includes all other provisions required by Government Code Section 87302.

David Assmann
Signature of Chief Executive Officer

June 8, 2012
Date

Complete this notice regardless of how recently your code was approved or amended.

Please find attached the requested notice for the Department of the Environment. Please note that we are recommending the addition of the 0923 classification to Disclosure Category 2. Let me know if you have any questions.

David Assmann
Deputy Director
SF Environment
(415) 355-3702
(415) 254-7245 (cell)
11 Grove Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

*Gravel
AS ✓*

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2012 JUN -8 PM 2:09

BY PW

**2012 Local Agency Biennial Notice
Conflict of Interest Code Review Report**

Name of Agency: GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY
Mailing Address: 501 STANYAN ST., S.F. CA 94117
Contact Person: DAN MAUER Office Phone No: 581-2542
E-mail: dan.mauer@sfgov.org Fax No: 581-2540

This agency has reviewed its conflict-of-interest code and has determined that:


An amendment is required. The following amendments are necessary:
(Check all that apply.)

- Include new positions (including consultants) that must be designated.
- Delete positions that manage public investments from the list of designated positions.
- Revise disclosure categories.
- Revise the titles of existing positions.
- Delete titles of positions that have been abolished.
- Other (describe) _____

Code is currently under review by the code-reviewing body.

~~XXXX~~ **No amendment is required.**

The agency's code accurately designates all positions that make or participate in the making of governmental decisions; the disclosure categories assigned to those positions accurately require the disclosure of all investments, business positions, interests in real property, and sources of income that may foreseeably be affected materially by the decisions made by those holding the designated positions; and the code includes all other provisions required by Government Code Section 87302.



Signature of Chief Executive Officer
DAN MAUER, COMMISSION SECRETARY

6-8-12

Date

Complete this notice regardless of how recently your code was approved or amended.

Please return this notice no later than **Aug. 1, 2012**, via e-mail (PDF), inter-office mail, or fax to:

Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
ATTN: Peggy Nevin
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Fax: 554-5163
E-mail: peggy.nevin@sfgov.org

City and County of San Francisco

OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF



Vicki Hennessy
Interim Sheriff

(415) 554-7225

June 07, 2012

To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

From: Vicki Hennessy 
Interim Sheriff


Re: Waiver Request – Rapid Notify, Inc.

Pursuant to the San Francisco Administrative code Chapters 12B & 14B attached is a copy the Waiver Request Form (HRC Form 201) sent to the Human Right Commission on 6/7/12.

The Sheriff's Department is requesting a waiver from Administrative Code Chapters 12B and 12C requirement for Rapid Notify, Inc.

This is a one year subscription fee which allows access to Rapid Notify a proprietary emergency telecommunication system for San Mateo County. The System is fully automated and pre-programmed with all residential and business telephone numbers in that county. This will allow the Sheriff to initiate automated emergency telephone calls, to residents and business of San Mateo County, with emergency information (prisoner escapes, etc.) related to the San Francisco County Jails, located in San Bruno.

If you have any questions about this request, please contact Mylan Luong at (415) 554-7236. Thanks you for your consideration of this matter.

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2012 JUN - 6 AM 9:10
BY 

10



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

S.F. ADMINISTRATIVE CODE CHAPTERS 12B and 14B WAIVER REQUEST FORM (HRC Form 201)

FOR HRC USE ONLY
Request Number: _____

➤ **Section 1. Department Information**

Department Head Signature: *Wicki O. Hennessy*
 Name of Department: Sheriff
 Department Address: 1 Dr Carton B. Goodlett Place, Rm#456, San Francisco, CA
 Contact Person: Mylan Luong
 Phone Number: 554-7236 Fax Number: 554-7050

➤ **Section 2. Contractor Information**

Contractor Name: Rapid Notify, Inc. Contact Person:
 Contractor Address: 26041 Cape Dr., Suite 220, Laguna Niguel, CA 92677
 Vendor Number (if known): 76003 Contact Phone No.:

➤ **Section 3. Transaction Information**

Date Waiver Request Submitted: 06/07/12 Type of Contract:
 Contract Start Date: 7/1/12 End Date: 6/30/13 Dollar Amount of Contract: \$12075

➤ **Section 4. Administrative Code Chapter to be Waived (please check all that apply)**

- Chapter 12B
- Chapter 14B *Note: Employment and LBE subcontracting requirements may still be in force even when a 14B waiver (type A or B) is granted.*

➤ **Section 5. Waiver Type (Letter of Justification *must* be attached, see Check List on back of page.)**


- A. Sole Source
- B. Emergency (pursuant to Administrative Code §6.60 or 21.15)
- C. Public Entity
- D. No Potential Contractors Comply – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: 05/20/11
- E. Government Bulk Purchasing Arrangement – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on:
- F. Sham/Shell Entity – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on:
- G. Local Business Enterprise (LBE) (for contracts in excess of \$5 million; see Admin. Code §14B.7.1.3)
- H. Subcontracting Goals

HRC ACTION	
12B Waiver Granted: _____	14B Waiver Granted: _____
12B Waiver Denied: _____	14B Waiver Denied: _____
Reason for Action: _____	
HRC Staff: _____	Date: _____
HRC Staff: _____	Date: _____
HRC Director: _____	Date: _____

DEPARTMENT ACTION – This section must be completed and returned to HRC for waiver types D, E & F.	
Date Waiver Granted: _____	Contract Dollar Amount: _____

City and County of San Francisco

OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF



Vicki Hennessy
Interim Sheriff

(415) 554-7225

Date: 6/7/12

To: Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

From: Vicki Hennessy *VH*
Sheriff - *Interim*

Subject: Request for Waiver of applicable San Francisco Administrative Code Requirements for Garbage Collection Services for the San Francisco County Jails in San Bruno, CA to Be Provided by Recology Peninsula Services, Vendor #16179 in the amount of \$120,000 for the Term July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013.

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2012 JUN -6 AM 9:10
BY *RL*

The San Francisco Sheriff's Department (SFSD) requests your approval of the above referenced sole source request for the reasons set forth in this memo.

The San Bruno, CA Municipal Code Section 10.20.050 provides that San Bruno, CA City Council "may provide for the issuance of an exclusive permanent contract for the collection of garbage and rubbish with the city in the manner and upon the terms set forth in this chapter." Please refer to the language attached to this memo.

San Bruno Garbage Company is the company contracted by the City of San Bruno for garbage collection under the provisions of San Bruno's municipal Code.

Please call Mylan Luong at 415-554-7236 with any questions you may have regarding this request.

11



**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION**

**S.F. ADMINISTRATIVE CODE CHAPTERS 12B and 14B
WAIVER REQUEST FORM
(HRC Form 201)**

FOR HRC USE ONLY
Request Number: _____

➤ **Section 1. Department Information**

Department Head Signature: *Debi L. Hennerty*
 Name of Department: ^{Interim} Sheriff
 Department Address: 1 Dr Carton B. Goodlett Place, Rm#456, San Francisco, CA
 Contact Person: Mylan Luong
 Phone Number: 554-7236 Fax Number: 554-7050

➤ **Section 2. Contractor Information**

Contractor Name: Recology Peninsula Services Contact Person: _____
 Contractor Address: 101 Tanforan Avenue, San Bruno, CA 94066
 Vendor Number (if known): 16179 Contact Phone No.: _____

➤ **Section 3. Transaction Information**

Date Waiver Request Submitted: 6/07/12 Type of Contract: _____
 Contract Start Date: 7/1/12 End Date: 6/30/13 Dollar Amount of Contract: \$120,000

➤ **Section 4. Administrative Code Chapter to be Waived (please check all that apply)**

- Chapter 12B
- Chapter 14B *Note:* Employment and LBE subcontracting requirements may still be in force even when a 14B waiver (type A or B) is granted.


➤ **Section 5. Waiver Type (Letter of Justification *must* be attached, see Check List on back of page.)**

- A. Sole Source
- B. Emergency (pursuant to Administrative Code §6.60 or 21.15)
- C. Public Entity
- D. No Potential Contractors Comply – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: 5/20/11
- E. Government Bulk Purchasing Arrangement – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: _____
- F. Sham/Shell Entity – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: _____
- G. Local Business Enterprise (LBE) (for contracts in excess of \$5 million; see Admin. Code §14B.7.1.3)
- H. Subcontracting Goals

HRC ACTION	
12B Waiver Granted: _____	14B Waiver Granted: _____
12B Waiver Denied: _____	14B Waiver Denied: _____
Reason for Action: _____	
HRC Staff: _____	Date: _____
HRC Staff: _____	Date: _____
HRC Director: _____	Date: _____

DEPARTMENT ACTION – This section must be completed and returned to HRC for waiver types D, E & F.
 Date Waiver Granted: _____ Contract Dollar Amount: _____

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



BOS 11
C. P. Adams
Deputy City Attorney
EDWIN M. LEE
MAYOR

June 11, 2012

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2012 JUN 11 AM 9:15
BY *pac*

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Pursuant to Charter Section 3.100, I hereby designate Supervisor Sean Elsbernd as Acting-Mayor from the time I leave the State of California on Tuesday, June 12 at 9:45am until I return on Friday, June 15 at 10:00pm.

In the event I am delayed, I designate Supervisor Elsbernd to continue to be the Acting-Mayor until my return to California.

Sincerely,

[Handwritten Signature]
Edwin M. Lee
Mayor

cc: Mr. Dennis Herrera, City Attorney



Capital Planning Committee

BOS-11
B+F clerk, cpage

Naomi M. Kelly, City Administrator, Chair

MEMORANDUM

June 5, 2012

To: Supervisor David Chiu, Board President

From: Naomi Kelly, City Administrator and Capital Planning Committee Chair

Copy: Members of the Board of Supervisors
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Capital Planning Committee

Regarding: Authorizations to Issue and Related Supplemental Appropriation Requests for General Obligation (G.O.) Bonds (\$265,185,000) for the San Francisco General Hospital and Trauma Center Improvement Program, G.O. Bonds (\$40,410,000) for the Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Program and Revenue Bonds (\$502,200,000) for the San Francisco International Airport.

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2012 JUN - 6 AM 10:12

In accordance with Section 3.21 of the Administrative Code, on June 4, 2012, the Capital Planning Committee (CPC) reviewed three authorizations of debt issuance and related supplemental appropriation requests.

1. Board File Numbers 120532 and 120526

Authorization to Issue up to \$265,185,000 in G.O. Bonds and Approval of Related Supplemental Appropriation Request for the San Francisco General Hospital and Trauma Center Improvement Program

Recommendation:

Recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the supplemental appropriation.

Comments:

The CPC recommends approval of these items by a vote of 11-0.

Committee members or representatives in favor include: Ken Bukowski, Office of the City Administrator; Ed Reiskin, SFMTA; Douglas Legg, Public Works; John Rahaim, Planning Department; John Martin, San Francisco International Airport; Judson True, Board President's Office; Nadia Sesay, Controller's Office; Ed Harrington, SFPUC; Dawn Kamalanathan, Recreation and Parks Department; Elaine Forbes, Port of San Francisco; and Kate Howard, Mayor's Budget Director.

13

**2. Board File Numbers 120533
and 120527**

**Authorization to Issue up to \$40,410,000 in G.O. Bonds
and Approval of Related Supplemental Appropriation
Request for the Earthquake Safety and Emergency
Response Program**

Recommendation:

Recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the supplemental appropriation.

Comments:

The CPC recommends approval of these items by a vote of 11-0.

Committee members or representatives in favor include: Ken Bukowski, Office of the City Administrator; Ed Reiskin, SFMTA; Douglas Legg, Public Works; John Rahaim, Planning Department; John Martin, San Francisco International Airport; Judson True, Board President's Office; Nadia Sesay, Controller's Office; Ed Harrington, SFPUC; Dawn Kamalanathan, Recreation and Parks Department; Elaine Forbes, Port of San Francisco; and Kate Howard, Mayor's Budget Director.

3. Board File Number TBD:

**Authorization to Issue up to \$502,200,000 in Revenue
Bonds Approval of Related Supplemental
Appropriation Request for the San Francisco
International Airport**

Recommendation:

Recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the supplemental appropriation.

Comments:

The CPC recommends approval of these items by a vote of 11-0.

Committee members or representatives in favor include: Ken Bukowski, Office of the City Administrator; Ed Reiskin, SFMTA; Douglas Legg, Public Works; John Rahaim, Planning Department; John Martin, San Francisco International Airport; Judson True, Board President's Office; Nadia Sesay, Controller's Office; Ed Harrington, SFPUC; Dawn Kamalanathan, Recreation and Parks Department; Elaine Forbes, Port of San Francisco; and Kate Howard, Mayor's Budget Director.



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Victor Young/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 120591: City of San Francisco's 2012-14 Budget

From: kmcelroy@onemain.com
To: "SF Board of Sup." <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>,
Cc: NERT <dianariver@aol.com>, NERT <kg6cev@yahoo.com>
Date: 06/07/2012 10:11 AM
Subject: City of San Francisco's 2012-14 Budget

June 7, 2012

Dear Board President and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I understand that again this year the Budget & Finance Committee is facing huge necessary "proposed" budget cuts. When the Committee presents their Fiscal Year (FY) 2012-14 budget proposal to the full Board of Supervisors for consideration, I trust you will NOT consider cutting any amount from the proposed San Francisco Fire Department's (SFFD) - Neighborhood Emergency Response Team (NERT) budget allocation. As you already know, NERT is a City funded program that trains citizens/civilians to respond during any and all emergency situations.

NERT is quite possibly the best allocation of taxpayer dollars via the city coffers! Therefore, cutting anything from the already lean SFFD - NERT proposed budget isn't cost-effective. Any change would likely end the NERT program as we know it, making everyone less safe in a disaster. NERT's lend a trained hand to help others because they received basic, advanced as well as, re-training via San Francisco's first responders. NERT's are more than 16,000 strong and have been trained to "act in the face of danger". You never know when that moment we'll occur and NERT boots on SF district/neighborhood ground will be mobilized to save lives and assist with city-wide communications via Ham Radio Operators.

As both a member and supporter of NERT, I urge you not to consider any SFFD budget changes that will directly or indirectly affect SFFD or NERT budgets.

As illustrated above, San Francisco needs civilians/citizens who are prepared to take care of themselves and assist others after a disaster. NERT is the only program in our city that offers free, hands-on disaster preparedness training. Most importantly, it's taught by professional first responders from the SFFD. Our SFFD instructors are outstanding teachers who live by what they teach us. It is their knowledge and training that helps keep us safe as volunteer disaster responders.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Karla McElroy,
NERT Volunteer
1487 - 47th Avenue
SF, CA 94122-2908



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 120549: APPEAL OF CPMC EIR (please support)

From: "Evy Pearce" <evy@bottomline.comcastbiz.net>
To: <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>,
Date: 06/08/2012 02:44 PM
Subject: APPEAL OF CPMC EIR (please support)

As a resident in the vicinity of the proposed building of a new CPMC hospital, I am concerned there will be a negative

Impact on our neighborhood.

We are already experiencing much too much traffic, noise and exhaust pollution.

Additionally, the wind tunnel on Franklin Street makes it very unpleasant to cross the street at Pine, Sutter, Post or Geary.

One takes their life in their hands while crossing Van Ness Ave at any cross street, and the wind is extreme at any crossing.

Bicycles are often on the sidewalks now. There, no doubt, will be more bicycles taking to the sidewalks once construction starts.

In my opinion, CPMC could not have picked a worse site to build a hospital on. I find it hard to believe there is not another

site where there would be much less congestion.

You would be doing the citizens of San Francisco a great favor by voting against this project at this location.

Sincerely,

Evy Pearce, 1777 Pine St, #402, San Francisco, CA 94109. 415-441-7302



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 120549: APPEAL OF CPMC EIR please support!

From: Patricia Lovelock <patricialovelock@sbcglobal.net>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org,
Date: 06/08/2012 12:10 AM
Subject: APPEAL OF CPMC EIR please support!

I am writing to support the appeal of the CPMC EIR. As a resident in the area of the proposed Cathedral Hill campus I am extremely concerned about the massive impacts that apparently cannot and will not be mitigated. Issues such as transportation, air quality and noise need to be reconsidered and if they cannot be successfully mitigated changes to the project must be made. Our neighborhood health and safety and our access to transportation should be of utmost importance.

Our neighborhood has waited a long time for the BRT transit improvements on Van Ness and Geary. We have put up with slow and unreliable buses that are often so crowded we cannot even board. CPMC's impacts will cause the hoped for improvements to be nullified. The hundreds of vehicles carrying staff, patients, families and deliveries will cause additional congestion to streets such as the arterials of Franklin, Gough, Pine and Bush, Van Ness and Polk Street. The Van Ness BRT with no left turn access from Mission to Broadway will further increase traffic on these streets. We currently have periods of gridlock in this area and commonly see unsafe driving maneuvers. I often see emergency vehicles unable to move through traffic due to cars unable or unwilling to yield. I have seen an ambulance on a Saturday afternoon need to travel upon the sidewalk to bypass stopped cars. LOS as the main way to measure traffic impact is inadequate to capture the true nature of impacts in this traffic-dense residential neighborhood. The addition of two enlarged ERs and their ambulance traffic is also of great concern.

The SFDPH has mapped out the areas of high vehicle-pedestrian injuries in San Francisco. The area surrounding the Cathedral Hill site is one of these high intensity areas. The Tenderloin, Van Ness from Market to Union and nearby sections of Polk, Pine, Sutter, Post, Franklin, Bush and Gough are all parts of high-injury density corridors needing pedestrian safety improvements. The EIR neglects to consider the plan's additional negative impacts on these already identified hazardous areas. No mitigations are considered for impacted streets west of Van Ness.

Increase in hazardous air quality is of special concern in our neighborhood due to the already very high levels of contaminants resulting from Van Ness and the surrounding arterials. Daily I have to clean vehicle emission particles from plants on my deck. Our neighborhood may have one of the city's greatest concentrations of residences for seniors and the disabled. Within blocks of the Cathedral site there are more than a dozen such complexes, some very large. Additional pollution during both construction and build-out will be of great harm to these "sensitive receptors".

The SFDPH has also mapped areas of unhealthy traffic noise. Again, the area of the Cathedral site already suffers from these noxious impacts. The density of the project and its traffic and operations will add heavily to this problem. We will also have to endure added numbers of emergency vehicle sirens, car honking and de

I am certainly not against the building of earthquake-safe hospitals but I do believe the plan as set forth in the current LRDP and EIR needs much further consideration. It includes a large number of significant negative impacts, many poorly analyzed and mitigated, in a densely populated residential (zoned residential) area. We have already had to endure some of these same impacts from the current Pacific campus and the terrible CPMC maintenance of the vacant hotel site. We want to see a LRDP and EIR with real and substantial mitigations and a development agreement that fairly addresses ALL neighborhood areas negatively impacted, that greatly improves health care access for even the least fortunate and that fairly compensates the city for this very detrimental "spot zoning". Please support the appeal of the CPMC EIR.

Sincerely,

Patricia Lovelock 1777 Pine St. Apt. 401
San Francisco CA 94109
(415) 440-4909

Bt-11
epg

File 120549

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2012 JUN -7 AM 9:52

AZ

June 5, 2012

To: Board of Supervisors

City and County of San Francisco

From: OWL-SF

The Older Women's League of San Francisco focuses on issues unique to women as they age. We advocate for improved access to high-quality and affordable healthcare for the women of SF. We also advocate for quality of life issues, including a safe, livable, city for women throughout the city and from every socioeconomic bracket. We educate ourselves and our peers about issues affecting older women, and we VOTE!

We oppose the CPMC Developmental Plan to build a mega-hospital on Van Ness and to downsize St. Luke's Hospital. OWL recommends that the plans for the rebuild be delayed until 2013 when the Healthcare Master Plan goes into effect and guides official decisions regarding health care needs and consistency for the entire City. If the plan must go forward, we recommend that CPMC be responsive to community needs and build 2 full service hospitals rather than one large hospital,

Please see that Sutter Health rebuilds CPMC "the right way." We demand the following:

- 1) CPMC must provide charitable care (including shortfalls in Medi-Cal and Healthy San Francisco) equal to the average level of care provided by similar SF hospitals for a minimum of 20 years.
- 2) CPMC must charge fair prices and provide some price protection to insurers so that residents insured by different policies (including those covering current and retired City employees and their families) have access to CPMC services.
- 3) CPMC must build and operate St. Luke's as an acute care hospital of at least 180 beds with a full complement of services for a minimum of 20 years, without the right to close down or substantially reduce services unless consent of the City and input from community stakeholders is obtained.
- 4) St. Luke's must have robust Centers of Excellence, including Senior Health and Community Health, adding substantial value to existing services.
- 5) CPMC must restore and maintain adequate skilled nursing facility beds spread among 3 campuses. The 110 beds currently agreed upon are inadequate.
- 6) CPMC must provide psychiatric services at St. Luke's and the Cathedral Hill Hospital, including acute, sub-acute and outpatient services.
- 7) The City must have input in Community Healthcare Programs in order to address changing circumstances, community needs and evolving medical practices.

- 8) SF has adopted a policy of maintaining a relationship between jobs and housing. In the current plan, housing is mostly addressed through a Down Payment Loan Plan, which provides no net gain in housing for the City. There should be new affordable housing to provide a net increase in housing for the increased workforce.
- 9) The current plan commits CPMC to giving only 40 local residents jobs per year for 5 years. CPMC must commit to more local hires and contribute to workforce development required to achieve local hiring goals.
- 10) Nurses should be guaranteed a fair and neutral vote on whether or not the union will be carried over into the new hospital
- 11) Transportation issues are not adequately addressed considering the size of the 555 bed hospital proposed for Cathedral Hill. Seniors are particularly dependent on public transportation. Solutions must be found regarding safety issues, impacts on seniors, people with disabilities, and people with mobility issues.

Thank you for considering our opinions and our needs in the upcoming vote.

Melanie Grossman

Melanie Grossman, Ph.D., L.C.S.W.

Chair, Political Advocacy Committee

Older Women's League, San Francisco

Date: 06/10/2012 02:14 PM
Subject: Beach Chalet Soccer Fields -- please support the Win-win Alternative!

PLEASE DO NOT LET OUR OCEAN ARE IN GOLDEN GATE BECOME A MOCKERY OF OUR TOWN. 60 FT. LIGHTS? ASTRO TURF? 55 TREES TO BE ELIMINATED? NOT IN MY LIFETIME AS LONG AS I HAVE A SAY IN THE MATTER.

SUZANNE SANDIDGE
2395 - 47TH AVE
SF, CA 94116

From: Charlotte Hennessy <charlottehennessy@att.net>
To:
Cc: david.chiu@sfgov.org, david.compos@sfgov.org, Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org, Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org, board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org, Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org
Date: 06/10/2012 04:49 PM
Subject: Beach Chalet Soccer Fields -- please support the Win-win Alternative!

Dear Supervisors:

Please don't let the destruction of the west end of Golden Gate Park happen!

The proposed soccer field will destroy wildlife habitat and patterns, will disrupt the neighbors' peace and quiet with the way it's proposed (60' lights, 365 days a year until 10 o'clock at night), and will destroy the beauty and serenity that is enjoyed by everyone who visits that end of the park. It would be a huge mistake to let this go through as proposed. The alternative would be the best solution. I won't repeat what you already know about it, but it seems that reason would dictate that this is the the path to take.

Thank you for all you do.

Sincerely,

Charlotte Hennessy



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Beach Chalet emails

From: Hunter Wallof <huntermgatherer8@yahoo.com>
To: John.Avalos@sfgov.org, David.Campos@sfgov.org, David.Chiu@sfgov.org,
Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org, Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org,
Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org, Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org, Jane.Kim@sfgov.org, Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org,
Christina.Olague@sfgov.org,
Date: 06/10/2012 07:40 AM
Subject: Beach Chalet Soccer Fields -- please support the Win-win Alternative!

Dear Keepers of The Park; My family loves the Park, at least those parts we can afford to visit; and we are as Hunter&Willow

From: "Janet Hohbach" <obgya@sbcglobal.net>
To: <John.Avalos@sfgov.org>, <David.Campos@sfgov.org>, <David.Chiu@sfgov.org>,
<Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org>, <Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org>, <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>,
<Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org>, <Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org>, <Jane.Kim@sfgov.org>,
<Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org>,
Date: 06/10/2012 09:23 AM
Subject: Beach Chalet Soccer Fields -- please support the Win-win Alternative!

Dear Supervisors- My family and I are very opposed to the artificial turf soccer field idea in GGP that has been proposed by a private company. Both our kids play and enjoy their soccer teams in the city but I would not dream of sacrificing part of our beautiful park for one sport or group. We love the area behind the Beach chalet and a group of us were at the Park Chalet recently enjoying the wild space adjacent to it. All the kids were climbing trees, running around the existing fields and playing hide and seek. Ungroomed wild areas in the city are important for our kids to see and explore. We own a home in the Inner Sunset and bought in this neighborhood because open space is very important to us.

The artificial lighting at night is also concerning to me. The negative impact on marine animals and birds is an issue and one we will not be sure of until the damage is done. I know SF Parks need money but can you imagine New Yorkers letting a private company destroy part of Central Park for the benefit of one group?

Please listen to the people that live here and love and support this city. There are other options. My kids play on the huge fields at West Sunset(Wawona) and the ones by Saint Ignatius. Let us improve the fields we have before destroying something we will not be able to bring back.

Thank you for your consideration.

Janet Hohbach
1443 8th Avenue

From: "Suzanne" <ssvmmer1@comcast.net>
To: <John.Avalos@sfgov.org>, <David.Campos@sfgov.org>, <David.Chiu@sfgov.org>,
<Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org>, <Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org>, <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>,
<Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org>, <Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org>, <Jane.Kim@sfgov.org>,
<Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org>, <Christina.Olague@sfgov.org>,



Beach Chalet Soccer Fields -- please support the Win-win Alternative!

Charlotte Hennessy to:

06/10/2012 04:49 PM

Cc: david.chiu, david.compos, Carmen.Chu, Malia.Cohen,
board.of.supervisors, Sean.Elsbernd

Dear Supervisors:

Please don't let the destruction of the west end of Golden Gate Park happen!

The proposed soccer field will destroy wildlife habitat and patterns, will disrupt the neighbors' peace and quiet with the way it's proposed (60' lights, 365 days a year until 10 o'clock at night), and will destroy the beauty and serenity that is enjoyed by everyone who visits that end of the park. It would be a huge mistake to let this go through as proposed. The alternative would be the best solution. I won't repeat what you already know about it, but it seems that reason would dictate that this is the the path to take.

Thank you for all you do.

Sincerely,

Charlotte Hennessy

BOS-11 cpage

Commissioners
Daniel W. Richards, President
Upland
Michael Sutton, Vice President
Monterey
Jim Kellogg, Member
Discovery Bay
Richard Rogers, Member
Santa Barbara
Jack Baylis, Member
Los Angeles

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor

Fish and Game Commission



Sonke Mastrup, Executive Director
1416 Ninth Street, Room 1320
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-4899
(916) 653-5040 Fax
www.fgc.ca.gov

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2012 JUN -7 PM 2:48
R

June 6, 2012

TO ALL INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES:

This is to provide you with a copy of the notice of proposed regulatory action relative to Section 632, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to Blue Cavern State Marine Conservation Area, which will be published in the California Regulatory Notice Register on June 8, 2012.

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

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

Sincerely,

Sherrie Fonbuena
Associate Governmental Program Analyst

Attachment

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

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Fish and Game Commission (Commission), pursuant to the authority vested by sections 200, 202, 203.1, 205(c), 219, 220, 240, 1590, 1591, 2860, 2861, and 6750 of the Fish and Game Code and sections 36725(a) and 36725(e) of the Public Resources Code, and to implement, interpret or make specific sections 200, 202, 203.1, 205(c), 219, 220, 240, 1580, 1583, 2861, 5521, 6653, 8420(e), and 8500 of the Fish and Game Code and sections 36700(e), 36710(e), 36725(a), and 36725(e) of the Public Resources Code, proposes to amend Section 632, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to Blue Cavern State Marine Conservation Area.

Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

The existing regulation provides area boundaries, take restrictions, and anchoring and mooring restrictions within the Blue Cavern State Marine Conservation Area (SMCA). For public health, safety, and general welfare, the proposed regulation re-opens Blue Cavern SMCA to anchoring and mooring, except within the Catalina Marine Science Center Marine Life Refuge (Refuge). The proposed regulation clarifies that the authority of the director of the Refuge to allow anchoring, mooring or scientific take extends only within the Refuge, not the entire SMCA.

Anchoring and mooring are restricted in the Refuge to protect ongoing scientific studies and the integrity of study sites. The director of the Refuge can authorize anchoring and mooring or take of marine life for scientific purposes, under the conditions prescribed in a scientific collecting permit issued by the Department of Fish and Game (Sections 10655 and 10502.8, Fish and Game Code). These provisions were unintentionally applied to the entire Blue Cavern SMCA in rulemaking file 2011-1101-04SR. During the Marine Life Protection Act planning phase, the South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) developed Marine Protected Area (MPA) proposals for the South Coast Study Region. Based on a review of MPA planning records, and confirmed through follow-up discussions with SCRSG members, no documentation specifies intent to expand the no-anchoring and mooring provision or the authority of the director of the Refuge to allow anchoring, mooring or scientific take beyond the existing Refuge.

Blue Cavern SMCA is commonly used by experienced and inexperienced divers. Under the current regulation, the live-boating technique is now the only option for dive vessels. This technique involves deploying divers from a vessel into the water while keeping the motor running to remain within sight and easy access of the divers. Because the vessel may need to move constantly, the location of deployed divers can be very difficult for other vessel operators on site to determine, especially with multiple vessels in the same area.

A regulation change is needed to protect the public health, safety, and general welfare while preserving the intended purpose of the SMCA designation. This proposed regulation allows anchoring and mooring within the Blue Cavern SMCA except within the Refuge and clarifies that the authority the Refuge director to allow anchoring, mooring, or take of marine life for scientific purposes applies only within the Refuge. All other existing take restrictions remain in effect throughout the SMCA. The proposed regulation makes permanent the emergency regulation that expires on October 30, 2012.

The proposed regulation will provide benefits to public health and safety by minimizing risk for divers in the Blue Cavern SMCA. Minor benefits to air quality may be realized in the

implementation of the proposed regulation; however, the Commission does not anticipate any significant benefits to the environment.

The proposed regulation is neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations. No other entity has authority to promulgate regulations concerning these activities within Commission-established State marine conservation areas.

NOTICE IS ALSO GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held at the Crown Plaza Ventura Beach Hotel, 450 E. Harbor Blvd., Ventura, California, on Wednesday, August 8, 2012 at 8:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard. Written comments may be submitted to the address given below, or by fax at (916) 653-5040, or by e-mail to FGC@fgc.ca.gov. Written comments mailed, faxed or e-mailed to the Commission office, must be received before 5:00 p.m. on August 3, 2012. All comments must be received no later August 8, 2012, at the hearing in Ventura, CA. If you would like copies of any modifications to this proposal, please include your name and mailing address.

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

Availability of Modified Text

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

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

Impact of Regulatory Action

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

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

The proposed action will not have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states. The proposed regulation pertains only to the Blue Cavern State Marine Conservation Area offshore of Catalina Island in Los Angeles County.

- (b) Impact on the Creation or Elimination of Jobs within the State, the Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses, or the Expansion of Businesses in California; Benefits of the Regulation to the Health and Welfare of California Residents, Worker Safety, and the State's Environment:

The agency is not aware of any impacts the proposed action would have on creation, expansion, or elimination of jobs or businesses in California.

The Commission anticipates benefits to the health and welfare of California residents by minimizing risks to divers in the Blue Cavern SMCA, while preserving the intended purpose of the Blue Cavern SMCA.

The Commission does not anticipate any non-monetary benefits to worker safety.

Existing regulation benefits the environment by protecting habitat and biodiversity in the Blue Cavern SMCA. Minor benefits to air quality may be realized in the implementation of the proposed regulation; however, the Commission does not anticipate any significant benefits to the environment.

- (c) Cost Impacts on a Representative Private Person or Business:

The Commission is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.

- (d) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State:

Some unknown level of cost savings will be realized by not having to invest as much time in enforcement of potentially dangerous regulations.

- (e) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies:

Some unknown level of cost savings will be realized by not having to invest as much time in enforcement of potentially dangerous regulations.

- (f) Programs Mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts: None.

- (g) Costs Imposed on any Local Agency or School District that is Required to be Reimbursed Under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4, Government Code: None.

- (h) Effect on Housing Costs: None.

Effect on Small Business

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

Consideration of Alternatives

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

FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

Sonke Mastrup
Executive Director

Dated: May 29, 2012



Thank you for the radio.
emersondell

to:

board.of.supervisors

06/05/2012 02:39 PM

Hide Details

From: "emersondell" <emersondellrose@gmail.com>

To: <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>,

Please respond to "emersondell" <emersondellrose@gmail.com>

I am listening to your meetings on my radio.
Its sounds great!

Emerson

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4GLTE smartphone.

(18)

Ms. Gloria Lird
1650 Jones Street # 3
San Fran, Ca. 94109-2727

The Board of Supervisors

Dear honorable San Francisco Supervisors,

Thank you!

You have just saved me \$74.30 a month. I just drop my basic cable. I don't need it anymore. I can hear the Supervisors meeting on the radio.

Thank you again.

I am on a fixed income and I can use \$74 dollars for food and Muni.

Once again thank you,

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2012 JUN - 6 PM 3: 34

June 19 – Communications Page

From Clerk of the Board, the following departments have submitted their reports regarding Sole Source Contracts for FY 2011-2012:

Board of Appeals
Office of Assessor/Recorder
Ethics Commission



RE: Sole Source Contracts and Annual Reports - Response Required

Goldstein, Cynthia

to:

Board of Supervisors

06/07/2012 08:48 AM

Hide Details

From: "Goldstein, Cynthia" <cynthia.goldstein@sfgov.org>

To: Board of Supervisors <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>,

This message is sent pursuant to Admin. Code Chapter 67.24(e) to notify you that the Board of Appeals did not enter into any sole source contracts during fiscal year 2011-2012.

Cynthia G. Goldstein
Executive Director
San Francisco Board of Appeals
1650 Mission Street, Suite 304
San Francisco, CA 94103
phone: 415-575-6881
fax: 415-575-6885
www.sfgov.org

as requested: ASR sole source contracts in FY11-12

Kimberlee Kimura to: Board of Supervisors

06/07/2012 12:48 PM

Cc: Angela D'Anna, Feliciano Payumo

ASR did not enter into any new sole source contracts in FY11-12. ASR's pre-existing sole source contracts are the following:

Term	Vendor	Amount	One time / Annual?	Reason
2008-2014	ATPac	\$115,346.48	Annual	specialized software
2011-2012	Easy Access	\$94,230.00	Annual	specialized software
2011-2012	Easy Access	\$197,428.50	One time	specialized software

Please let me know if you have any other questions, Kimberlee

*Kimberlee Kimura, Deputy Director * Office of the Assessor-Recorder * City & County of San Francisco * 1 Carlton B. Goodlett Pl * City Hall, Room 190 * San Francisco, CA 94102-4698 * tel: (415) 554-7911 * email: kimberlee.kimura@sfgov.org*

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
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: June 6, 2012
To: Department Heads & Persons Responsible for
Sole Source Contracts & Annual Reports
From: Clerk of the Board
Subject: Sole Source Contracts for Fiscal Year 2011-2012
Please respond by July 9, 2012

SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS

Sunshine Ordinance Section 67.24(e) requires that at the end of each fiscal year each City Department provide the Board of Supervisors with a list of all sole source contracts entered into during the past fiscal year. Please list all existing sole source contracts, adding those entered into during Fiscal Year 2011-2012. Please report if your department **did not** enter into any sole source contracts during the past fiscal year. The list shall be made available for inspection and copying. In addition, Sunshine Ordinance Section 67.29-2 encourages departments to post this information on their websites. Submit sole source contract information by:

Inter-departmental mail: Clerk of the Board, Board of Supervisors, Room 244 City Hall
OREmail: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org.

Below is a suggested format for transmitting the information.

The Ethics Commission did not enter into any new sole source contracts during FY 11-12.

Existing Sole Source Contracts:

Term	Vendor	Amount	Reason
10/31/10-9/30/13	Westcoast Online Information Systems, Inc., dba Netfile	\$262,500	Electronic filing system for FPPC and local ethics forms.

ANNUAL REPORTS

Charter Section 4.103 provides that each board and commission of the City and County shall be required by ordinance to prepare an annual report describing its activities, and shall file such report with the Mayor and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors. Administrative Code Section 8.16, in turn, requires other official published documents relating to the functions of the official, board, commission or department, or affairs under their control, to file two copies of the report or document with the San Francisco Public Library within 10 days from the date of publication. Department Heads: Please make certain your boards and commissions comply with this requirement.

If you have questions regarding your obligations of these requirements, please contact the Deputy City Attorney advising your department.

SUE C. HESTOR
Attorney at Law
870 Market Street, Suite 1128 • San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 362-2778 • FAX (415) 362-8048

File # 120270
upage

hestor@earthlink.net
(415) 846-1021

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2012 JUN - 6 PM 2:23

June 5, 2012

Supervisor Carmen Chu
Chair, Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Sub-committee
City Hall
San Francisco CA 94102

Dear President Chiu:

Friends of Golden Gateway (FOGG) challenges the ability of the Budget and Finance Sub-Committee to conduct any hearing on matters related to the 8 Washington Street/Seawall Lot 351 project at the Committee meeting on June 6, 2012 because documents related to the matters being considered for approval were not timely posted and available on the Board website. Full documents on a major PERMANENT transfer of Port property, and full documents setting out the financial transactions related to that transfer and development on Port property were NOT posted, and to this date are NOT available on the Board website. Many critical documents are also not available on the Port website.

The items before the **Budget and Finance Sub-committee** are -

- ✓ **Item 7 - 120270** - Approval of Public Trust Exchange; Agreement to Sell Portion of Seawall Lot 351 in Exchange for Portion of Block 168-Lot 58, Block 171-Lot 69 and Block 201-Lot 12; Approval of Lease and Maintenance Agreement
- Item 8 - 120278** - Amending Resolution of Intention to Form Waterfront Infrastructure Financing District

The agenda and supporting documents for the June 6, 2012 were available on the Board website on Friday, June 1, 2012. Major critical documents for this hearing were NOT provided anywhere on the Board site - directly or via a link. Following the order listed on "agenda packet contents list" for file **120270** they are:

- Purchase and Sale Agreement** - at page 61 (just cover page provided)
- May 24, 2012 Memo to Port Commission - at page 59 (just cover page provided)
- March 23, 2012 Memo to Port Commission - at page 60 (just cover page provided)
- Lease No L-5110 w/Waterfront Partners** - at page 58 (just cover page provided) [L-15110]
- Maintenance Agreement for Open Space** - at page 57 (just cover page provided)
- February 19, 2009 (Memo to Port Commission) - at page 43 (just cover page provided)

20

It is my understanding that additional material may have been provided by Port staff as recently as yesterday. I have not seen any such information.

The statement "the complete document can be found in the file" is insufficient for the public and Supervisors to review and prepare for a June 6 hearing, given that agenda was posted on Friday, June 1, and particularly given that the Port financial documents were also not provided prior to the May 29, 2012 Port hearing.

The only Port hearing on the financial documents for this project was on Tuesday, May 29, 2012, immediately after a 3-day holiday. The agenda for that meeting was posted after 5pm on Thursday, May 24. The Supporting Documents on the Port website for that meeting did NOT include any of the following documents which the Commission approved at its Tuesday, May 29 meeting:

Disposition and Development Agreement
Lease L-15110 for term of 66 years
Purchase and Sale Agreement
Maintenance Agreement
Trust Exchange Agreement

None of the above documents were available on the Port website when the May 29 agenda was posted, which agenda noted that the documents were available for public inspection at the Port Commission Secretary's Office "during normal office hours." Again, that agenda was posted after 5pm on Thursday, May 24. Because of the holiday weekend, the Commission Secretary (among others) was not in her Port office on Friday, May 25. In response to my inquiry when the agenda was posted, the Secretary told me that Phil Williamson of Port staff would be working for a few hours on Friday morning and could provide any missing documents. I made such a request and did receive a set of the above listed documents around noon on Friday. I have no idea whether other members of the public were given the same information about contacting Mr. Williamson and were able to get those documents. As of today, none of the above-listed documents are available on the Port website.


The **Disposition and Development Agreement** sets out the framework for the Infrastructure Finance District actions proposed in file **120278**, item 8 on the June 6, 2012 Budget and Finance Sub-Committee agenda. This includes amending Infrastructure Financing District No. 2 at the Port of San Francisco and allocating City General Funds to the Port of San Francisco for the proposed project. Again the underlying document - the DDA - is not available on either the Board website or the Port website. As a separate matter, file 120278 was listed on NO Board Committee calendar prior to appearing on June 6. This is clearly a matter requiring that it appear on a calendar for 30 days prior to action.

Given the magnitude and permanence of the decisions the Board is being asked to make, both the public and members of the Board should have all five Port documents available to them. A note that documents are available in the Board file is insufficient, particularly when they were also NOT provided for the Port Commission hearing. The EIR for this project - which is much longer than any of the financial documents - is available on line at the Planning website. The CEQA findings, which are also

extensive, are available on line. Failure to provide the full set of documents on-line at least 72 hours before the only Board hearing on these financial documents does not allow for informed public comment in the manner contemplated by Board rules or Public Meetings law requirements.

FOGG requests that the above matters be taken off the Wednesday, June 6 Budget and Finance Sub-Committee agenda, that the full set of the 5 Port documents be provided on-line ALONG WITH ANY MODIFICATIONS PROPOSED BY THE PORT for a minimum of 72 hours and that a Board Committee hearing be conducted after the time they are available.

Respectfully submitted,



Sue C. Hestor

For Friends of Golden Gateway

cc: David Chiu, Board President
Supervisor John Avalos, Vice-Chair Budget and Finance Sub-Committee
Supervisor Jane Kim, Member Budget and Finance Sub-Committee
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Cheryl Adams, Deputy City Attorney
Louise Renne
Brad Paul
Lee Radner, FOGG



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Alisa Miller/BOS/SFGOV, Victor Young/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Files 120720-120272: 8 Washington concessions

From: stephanie greenburg <stephgreenburg@gmail.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org,
Date: 06/07/2012 12:01 PM
Subject: 8 Washington concessions

Dear BOS,

I would like to comment on the upcoming vote for 8 Washington, and concessions asked by Jane Kim. While I am not so concerned about the parking spaces (actually, if any were available to the public it could be beneficial for visitors to the Ferry Bldg and other destinations near it, including the future Exploratorium and Teatro Zinzanni, as well as AT&T Park (and future Warriors arena?). I am highly interested in the proposed concession to provide funds for streetscape improvements within 1-mile of the development. I think this is a no-brainer.

I should say, I am in support of 8 Washington. It is one block from the troubled Broadway Corridor which is lined with nightclubs, strip clubs, run-down SROs and VERY new low-income housing, to be joined by more. This project brings much needed diversity and money to the area, and it will be a boon for the North Beach business community along this major tourist thoroughfare. Let's not forget how important our tourist thoroughfares are, with all the money they bring in for the City.

The troubled Broadway Corridor, from The Embarcadero to Columbus, falls within this 1-mile radius, as does the Grant Ave business corridor and Washington Square Park (just at 1 mile). In addition, the Kearny and Vallejo Steps are within this radius. All of these locations is in desperate need of better lighting and streetscape improvements. In fact, the Kearny Steps were slated for greenery and better lighting a decade ago, but the project was scrapped due to lack of funding, can we finally fulfill this project? Please? You can see these steps from downtown, they are an eye-sore and are unsafe after dark. Could funds be diverted to add signage and lighting to Broadway, the dark Vallejo Steps and Washington Square Park to improve safety? I can't remember the last time we saw any streetscape improvements on Grant Ave. In fact, while many streetscape/beautification and safety improvements have been accomplished or proposed across the City, North Beach has largely been ignored and has received little, if any funding. In fact, this highly visible and trafficked area is not part of the Clean Streets Program, how can this be? Is this really the impression we want tourists to take home?

I would hope the many needs of North Beach would be addressed by these concessions, as opposed to funds being diverted to the more geographically obvious areas of FiDi and Embarcadero. We really could use some help and these funds would be of great assistance to our community.

Thank you for your time and efforts.

Best regards,

Stephanie Greenburg (Central CPAB)

--

Steph



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Alisa Miller/BOS/SFGOV, Victor Young/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Files 120270-120272: 8 Washington concessions

From: Roger W <roger1003@yahoo.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org,
Date: 06/07/2012 01:19 PM
Subject: Fwd: 8 Washington concessions

Dear BOS,

8 Washington should pay to help improve the troubled Broadway Corridor, from The Embarcadero to Columbus, falls within this 1-mile radius, as does the Grant Ave business corridor and Washington Square Park (just at 1 mile).


In addition, the Kearny and Vallejo Steps are within this radius. All of these locations is in desperate need of better lighting and streetscape improvements. In fact, the Kearny Steps were slated for greenery and better lighting a decade ago, but the project was scrapped due to lack of funding, can we finally fulfill this project? Please? You can see these steps from downtown, they are an eye-sore and are unsafe after dark. Could funds be diverted to add signage and lighting to Broadway, the dark Vallejo Steps and Washington Square Park to improve safety? I can't remember the last time we saw any streetscape improvements on Grant Ave. In fact, while many streetscape/beautification and safety improvements have been accomplished or proposed across the City, North Beach has largely been ignored and has received little, if any funding.

Or, ask central station to do their job!

Hope you are having a good day and thank you again.

Sincerely,

Roger Weinman
District Coordinator of Telegraph Hill
SFFD Neighborhood Emergency Response Team
San Francisco, CA
Mobile: 415-378-6637
HAM: KJ6ETJ
<http://www.sf-fire.org/index.aspx?page=875>



To:
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: CSC Action for 5-21-12

From: "Henriquez, Lizzette" <lizzette.henriquez@sfgov.org>
To: "Lee, Edwin (Mayor)" <edwin.lee@sfgov.org>, "Chiu, David" <david.chiu@sfgov.org>, "Avalos, John" <john.avalos@sfgov.org>, "Campos, David" <david.campos@sfgov.org>, "Chu, Carmen" <carmen.chu@sfgov.org>, "Cohen, Malia" <malia.cohen@sfgov.org>, "Elsbernd, Sean" <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>, "Farrell, Mark" <mark.farrell@sfgov.org>, "Kim, Jane" <jane.kim@sfgov.org>, "Mar, Eric" <eric.l.mar@sfgov.org>, "Olague, Christina" <christina.olague@sfgov.org>, "Wiener, Scott" <scott.wiener@sfgov.org>, "Adachi, Jeff" <jeff.adachi@sfgov.org>, "Cisneros, Jose" <jose.cisneros@sfgov.org>, "Gascon, George" <george.gascon@sfgov.org>, "Hennessy, Vicki" <vicki.hennessy@sfgov.org>, Cityattorney <cityattorney@sfgov.org>, "Ting, Phil" <phil.ting@sfgov.org>, "Huish, Jay" <jay.huish@sfgov.org>, "Callahan, Micki" <micki.callahan@sfgov.org>, "Calvillo, Angela" <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>, "Dodd, Catherine" <catherine.dodd@sfgov.org>, "Czerwin, Cindy" <cindy.czerwin@sfgov.org>, "Lum, Loretta" <loretta.lum@sfgov.org>, "Ponder, Steve" <steve.ponder@sfgov.org>, "Rosenfield, Ben" <ben.rosenfield@sfgov.org>, "Smothers, James" <james.smothers@sfgov.org>, "Howard, Kate" <kate.howard@sfgov.org>
Cc: "Sanchez, Anita" <anita.sanchez@sfgov.org>
Date: 05/25/2012 09:11 AM
Subject: CSC Action for 5-21-12

Lizzette Henriquez



Civil Service Commission 5-21-12 Notice of Action for Elected Officials.pdf



5-21-12 Notice of Certification Action for Elected Officials.pdf



CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

EDWIN M. LEE
MAYOR

May 23, 2012

**NOTICE OF CERTIFICATION OF BENEFITS
OF ELECTED OFFICIALS (INCLUDING MEMBERS OF THE BOARD
OF SUPERVISORS) FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012-13 OF THE CITY AND
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO IN ACCORDANCE WITH
CHARTER SECTION A8.409-1**

E. DENNIS NORMANDY
PRESIDENT

KATE FAVETTI
VICE PRESIDENT

SCOTT R. HELDFOND
COMMISSIONER

MARY Y. JUNG
COMMISSIONER

ANITA SANCHEZ
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Charter Section A8.409-1 requires the Civil Service Commission to annually set the benefits of elected officials, to take effect July 1 of each year. Benefits of elected officials may equal but may not exceed those benefits provided to any classification of miscellaneous officers and employees as of July 1 of each year. Benefits-setting by the Commission affects all elected officials, including Members of the Board of Supervisors.

In accordance with Charter Section A8.409-1, at its meeting of May 21, 2012, the Civil Service Commission acted to certify the benefits of elected officials (including Member, of the Board of Supervisors) for Fiscal Year 2012-13 at the same level of benefits as those provided to Municipal Executives' Association (MEA) covered employees in effect on July 1, 2012.

Therefore, each elected official (including Member, Board of Supervisors) receives a fringe benefit package at the same level of benefits as those of MEA covered employees as in effect on July 1, 2012 for Fiscal Year 2012-13. This certification of benefits of elected officials (including Member, Board of Supervisors) for Fiscal Year 2012-13 is forwarded to all appropriate personnel for inclusion and implementation in the Fiscal Year 2012-13 Budget.

Sincerely,

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

ANITA SANCHEZ
Executive Officer

- c: The Honorable Edwin Lee, Mayor
The Honorable David Chiu, President, Board of Supervisors
The Honorable John Avalos, Member, Board of Supervisors
The Honorable David Campos, Member, Board of Supervisors
The Honorable Carmen Chu, Member, Board of Supervisors
The Honorable Malia Cohen, Member, Board of Supervisors

The Honorable Sean Elsbernd, Member, Board of Supervisors
The Honorable Mark Farrell, Member, Board of Supervisors
The Honorable Jane Kim, Member, Board of Supervisors
The Honorable Eric Mar, Member, Board of Supervisors
The Honorable Christina Olague, Member, Board of Supervisors
The Honorable Scott Wiener, Member, Board of Supervisors
The Honorable Jeff Adachi, Public Defender
The Honorable Jose Cisneros, Treasurer
The Honorable George Gascón, District Attorney
The Honorable Vicki Hennessy, Interim Sheriff
The Honorable Dennis Herrera, City Attorney
The Honorable Phil Ting, Assessor-Recorder
Jay Huish, Executive Director, Employees' Retirement System
Micki Callahan, Human Resources Director
Angela Calvillo, Clerk, Board of Supervisors
Catherine Dodd, Health Service System
Risa Sandler, Budget and Revenue Manager, Controller's Office
Loretta Lum, PPSD
Steve Ponder, Manager, Compensation Unit, DHR
Ben Rosenfield, Controller
James Smothers, Director, PPSD
Kate Howard, Mayor's Budget Director
Commission File



CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

EDWIN M. LEE
MAYOR

May 23, 2012

NOTICE OF ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT (4TH YEAR OF 5-YEAR CYCLE) OF SALARY OF MEMBER, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN ACCORDANCE WITH CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION ACTION OF MAY 4, 2009 AND CHARTER SECTION 2.100 FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012-13

E. DENNIS NORMANDY
PRESIDENT

KATE FAVETTI
VICE PRESIDENT

SCOTT R. HELDFOND
COMMISSIONER

MARY Y. JUNG
COMMISSIONER

ANITA SANCHEZ
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

At its meeting of May 21, 2012, the Civil Service Commission had for its consideration the above matter.

Charter Section 2.100 - Composition and Salary directs that the Civil Service Commission shall set the Supervisors' salary once every five years. At its meeting of May 4, 2009, the Civil Service Commission acted to set the salary for the full-time position of Member, Board of Supervisors at \$98,660 annually for a five (5) year cycle, effective July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2014. In addition to setting the salary, the Commission action of May 4, 2009 included "to increase the salary for each fiscal year, effective July 1, 2010 based on the CPI-U change of the prior calendar year reported in January of each year and not to exceed 5%." The Commission also acted that the salary will not decrease in the event the CPI-U falls below zero. Fiscal Year 2012-13 is the 4th year of the 5-year cycle.

The annual CPI-U (Consumer Price Index – All Urban Consumers) issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics comparing the CPI-U change in December 2011 to the previous CPI-U in December 2010 is a **2.9% increase** in the CPI-U.


It was the decision of the Commission to: Accept the report; Due to a **2.9% CPI-U change**, salaries of the members of the Board of Supervisors is increased **2.9%** in accordance with Charter Section 2.100 and Commission Action of May 4, 2009 for Fiscal Year 2012-13. Therefore, for the fourth (4th) year of the five (5) year cycle for members of the Board of Supervisors, the salaries are increased **2.9%** effective July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013 as listed in the chart below.

FY 2012-13 Salary Member, Board of Supervisors (covering the period July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013)		
Certified Salary FY 2011-12	2.9% Increase Based on CPI-U Change	Salary (after 2.9% increase) FY 2012-13
\$102,743	\$2,980	\$105,723

The notice of salary adjustment is forwarded to all appropriate personnel for inclusion and implementation in the Fiscal Year 2012-13 Budget.

Sincerely,

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION


ANITA SANCHEZ FOR
Executive Officer

- c: The Honorable Edwin Lee, Mayor
- The Honorable David Chiu, President, Board of Supervisors
- The Honorable John Avalos, Member, Board of Supervisors
- The Honorable David Campos, Member, Board of Supervisors
- The Honorable Carmen Chu, Member, Board of Supervisors
- The Honorable Malia Cohen, Member, Board of Supervisors
- The Honorable Sean Elsbernd, Member, Board of Supervisors
- The Honorable Mark Farrell, Member, Board of Supervisors
- The Honorable Jane Kim, Member, Board of Supervisors
- The Honorable Eric Mar, Member, Board of Supervisors
- The Honorable Christina Olague, Member, Board of Supervisors
- The Honorable Scott Wiener, Member, Board of Supervisors
- The Honorable Jeff Adachi, Public Defender
- The Honorable Jose Cisneros, Treasurer
- The Honorable George Gascón, District Attorney
- The Honorable Vicki Hennessey, Interim Sheriff
- The Honorable Dennis Herrera, City Attorney
- The Honorable Phil Ting, Assessor-Recorder
- Jay Huish, Executive Director, Employees' Retirement System
- Micki Callahan, Human Resources Director
- Angela Calvillo, Clerk, Board of Supervisors
- Catherine Dodd, Health Service System
- Risa Sandler, Budget and Revenue Manager, Controller's Office
- Loretta Lum, PPSD
- Steve Ponder, Manager, Compensation Unit, DHR
- Ben Rosenfield, Controller
- James Smothers, Director, PPSD
- Kate Howard, Mayor's Budget Director
- Commission File
- Board of Supervisor's Salary File
- Chron




SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2012 JUN -5 PM 3:12

DATE: June 1, 2012
TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
FROM: John Raha 
Planning Director
RE: Planning Department Appointment
Western SoMa Citizens Planning Task Force

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

This memo is to designate Corey Teague as the Planning Department staff representative for the Western SoMa Citizens Planning Task Force. This appointment is meant to replace that of Paul Lord, the current Planning Department representative. This appointment will take effect on June 4, 2012.

The Western SoMa Citizens Planning Task Force was established to advise the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission on zoning and area plans for the Western SoMa neighborhood. Per the Task Force by-laws adopted on October 26, 2005 and revised March 2007:

The Western SoMa Citizens Planning Task Force consists of 26 members: 20 members appointed by the Board of Supervisors; three appointed by the District 6 Supervisor; one appointed by the Planning Director (emphasis added); one appointed by the Director of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority; and one appointed by the Director of the Department of Public Health.

Based on these by-laws, please accept this memo as my appointment to the Task Force. Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns at 415-558-6411.

Thank you.

cc: Jim Meko, Chair, Western SoMa Citizens Planning Task Force
Corey Teague, Planner, SF Planning Department
Paul Lord, Senior Planner, SF Planning Department
Jose Campos, Director of Citywide Planning, SF Planning Department
Julian Banales, Southeast Team Leader, SF Planning Department



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: "resolutions Week" regarding Amendment to reverse Citizens United

From: "Carol-O" <imtreble@snakebite.com>
To: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org,
Date: 06/11/2012 06:02 AM
Subject: "resolutions Week" regarding Amendment to reverse Citizens United

Dear SF Board of Supervisors;


Has the city of San Francisco joined in what is being called "Resolutions Week" where local governments are asked to adopt formal resolutions calling for a Constitutional amendment to overturn what Citizens United put in place? SF was not mentioned in the articles I read on this issue so I wanted to be sure that SF stays in the forefront of progressive, human first, government. Here is a link to the story:

<http://www.policymic.com/articles/9483/end-citizens-united-supreme-court-urged-to-stop-corporate-financing-of-u-s-elections> As I am certain you are aware this is one of the most, probably the most, important issue in politics today. Please act to support the amendment and if you've already taken action thank you :)

Carol-O

"Rise like lions after slumber - In unvanquishable number
Shake your chains to earth like dew - Which in sleep had fallen on you
Ye are many, they are few. "

Percy Bysshe Shelley



To:
 Cc:
 Bcc:
 Subject:

From: "Alden, Amiee" <amiee.alden@sfgov.org>
 To: "Elliott, Jason" <jason.elliott@sfgov.org>, "Avalos, John" <john.avalos@sfgov.org>, "Campos, David" <david.campos@sfgov.org>, "Chiu, David" <david.chiu@sfgov.org>, "Chu, Carmen" <carmen.chu@sfgov.org>, "Cohen, Malia" <malia.cohen@sfgov.org>, "Elsbernd, Sean" <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>, "Farrell, Mark" <mark.farrell@sfgov.org>, "Kim, Jane" <jane.kim@sfgov.org>, "Mar, Eric" <eric.l.mar@sfgov.org>, "Olague, Christina" <christina.olague@sfgov.org>, "Wiener, Scott" <scott.wiener@sfgov.org>
 Cc: "Jones, Jermain" <jermain.jones@sfgov.org>, "Kronenberg, Anne" <anne.kronenberg@sfgov.org>, "Fraser, Barry" <barry.fraser@sfgov.org>, "Geddes, Michelle" <michelle.geddes@sfgov.org>, "Blackstone, Cammy" <cammy.blackstone@sfgov.org>, "Bruss, Andrea" <andrea.bruss@sfgov.org>, "Calvillo, Angela" <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>, "Chung Hagen, Sheila" <sheila.chung.hagen@sfgov.org>, "Durazo, Chris" <chris.durazo@sfgov.org>, "Gillett, Gillian" <gillian.gillett@sfgov.org>, "Hamilton, Megan" <megan.hamilton@sfgov.org>, "Henderson, Dominica" <dominica.henderson@sfgov.org>, "Hsieh, Frances" <frances.hsieh@sfgov.org>, "Kelly, Margaux" <margaux.kelly@sfgov.org>, "Lim, Victor" <victor.lim@sfgov.org>, "Mormino, Matthias" <matthias.mormino@sfgov.org>, "Pagoulatos, Nickolas" <nickolas.pagoulatos@sfgov.org>, "Rauschuber, Catherine" <catherine.rauschuber@sfgov.org>, "Redondiez, Raquel" <raquel.redondiez@sfgov.org>, "Ronen, Hillary" <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>, "Scanlon, Olivia" <olivia.scanlon@sfgov.org>, "Stefani, Catherine" <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>, "Tang, Katy" <katy.tang@sfgov.org>, "Taylor, Adam" <adam.taylor@sfgov.org>, "True, Judson" <judson.true@sfgov.org>, "Veneracion, April" <april.veneracion@sfgov.org>, "Volberding, Alexander" <alexander.volberding@sfgov.org>
 Date: 05/16/2012 03:46 PM
 Subject:

Attached please find an update from DEM Executive Director Anne Kronenberg on recent Congressional and federal agency activities related to the BayWEB public safety communications project.

Amiee Alden
 Executive Assistant for Policy and Legislation
 Department of Emergency Management
 1011 Turk Street
 San Francisco, CA 94102
 Phone: (415) 558-3803
 Cell: (415) 519-1707
 Email: amiee.alden@sfgov.org
 Website: www.sfdem.org



Cover - NTIA and BTOP.pdf



Edwin M. Lee
Mayor

Department of Emergency Management
1011 Turk Street, San Francisco, CA 94102

Division of Emergency Communications
Phone: (415) 558-3800 Fax: (415) 558-3843

Division of Emergency Services
Phone: (415) 487-5000 Fax: (415) 487-5043



Anne Kronenberg
Executive Director

MEMORANDUM

To: Mayor Edwin Lee
Members of the Board of Supervisors

From: Anne Kronenberg

Date: May 16, 2012

RE: **BayWEB Project Timeline Extended to Conform With New Federal Legislation**

The Board of Supervisors approved legislation in February 2012 to allow Motorola, the project vendor for the Bay Area Wireless Enhanced Broadband (BayWEB) project, to install equipment in San Francisco. Shortly after the Board's action, Congress passed sweeping legislation¹ allocating new communications spectrum to public safety, and calling for the creation of a nationwide public safety communications network. This new legislation provides both the spectrum and the federal regulatory oversight agency, FirstNet that will be necessary to build out a robust public safety communications system nationwide. The federal government has asked the seven public safety broadband projects nationwide that are funded by federal stimulus dollars, including our own BayWEB project, to slow down the implementation of their networks until new federal FirstNet agency can be established and national standards can be set.

The Broadband Technology Opportunity Program (BTOP) grant funding for BayWEB and the new FirstNet agency are both administered by the National Telecommunications and Information Agency (NTIA). NTIA sent the attached letter to the BayWEB vendor and grant recipient Motorola last week, issuing a "partial suspension" of the BTOP grant until FirstNet is appointed and they have the opportunity to set standards. NTIA will allow Motorola to continue preparing sites for installation of equipment, but will not allow actual purchase of equipment like antennas during the suspension. FirstNet will create national standards that ensure that all of the public safety networks nationwide can communicate. Because NTIA's new directive will delay completion of projects like BayWEB, NTIA is working with the U.S. Office of Management and Budget to secure an extension of the August 2013 deadline by which all BTOP projects were to be completed.

Bay Area public safety agencies and Motorola are committed to completing BayWEB, and have been working closely with NTIA to ensure that our project maintains momentum and federal support. While the recent action by Congress has extended the implementation timeline for BayWEB, the final result will be a stronger project that is part of a robust public safety communications network for the entire nation. Please don't hesitate to contact me if I can provide any additional information.

Attachments

¹ The Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012



To:
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: North Beach Businesses against Subway Extraction

From: Marc Bruno <marcabruno@yahoo.com>
To: "carmen.chu@sfgov.org" <carmen.chu@sfgov.org>, "sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org" <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>, "Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org" <Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org>, "john.avalos@sfgov.org" <john.avalos@sfgov.org>, "david.campos@sfgov.org" <david.campos@sfgov.org>, "David.Chiu@sfgov.org" <David.Chiu@sfgov.org>, "Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org" <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, "Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org" <Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org>, "Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org" <Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org>, "Jane.Kim@sfgov.org" <Jane.Kim@sfgov.org>, "Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org" <Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org>, "angela.calvillo@sfgov.org" <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>, "Christina.Olague@sfgov.org" <Christina.Olague@sfgov.org>,
Cc: "marcabruno@yahoo.com" <marcabruno@yahoo.com>
Date: 06/10/2012 09:49 PM
Subject: Fw: North Beach Businesses against Subway Extraction

North Beach Businesses against Subway Extraction

06-09-2012

Dear Supervisor,

I have been asked by the North Beach businesses opposed to the above referenced Central Subway Extraction Project to forward this to each of you immediately. Please let me know that you have received it.

Attachments 1 and 2 represent the two-page North Beach Business Association letter in opposition to the project. Attachment 3, initially signed by 91 businesses, and now signed by an additional six since Friday, is our request to Representative Nancy Pelosi to restrict or deny further funding to this extraction project until such time that our voice is heard by City officials.

This email and related attachments, a petition signed by 97 business owners, represent an overwhelming opposition by neighborhood businesses to this proposed extraction-- a project which neither local businesses nor residents were informed of until Tuesday, May 22, less

than one month before the proposed start date.

An additional petition, beginning next week and being circulated at the North Beach Festival, will be forwarded to you upon the collection of 500 signatures by local residents. All of them will be strongly opposed to this extraction project in North Beach.

Yours sincerely,

Marc Bruno
415-434-1528

North Beach Businesses and Community Leaders

25

*against Central Subway Extraction Plan
15 Nobles Alley, No. 3
San Francisco, CA 94133*

Representative Nancy Pelosi
8th District, California
Minority Leader of the House
235 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515-0508
Attention: Robert Edmonson, Legislative Director
robert.edmonson@mail.house.gov

June 7, 2012

Dear Representative Pelosi,

Per my conversation with Robert Edmonson, your Legislative Director, I am forwarding a letter from the North Beach Business Association (NBBA) requesting review and delay of the MTA's proposed extraction of the Central Subway drilling equipment at or near the corner of Columbus Avenue and Union Street in North Beach.

Over 100 businesses are represented by this organization, the neighborhood's sole business association.

In addition, 91 business owners within a four block area of the proposed extraction site have signed a petition requesting that these activities be postponed until all reasonable alternatives for the extraction have been reviewed.

We are hopeful that this review be offered in a public forum, properly noticed and open to all those likely to be affected by the project. Three of those proposed alternatives-- all of them part of the department's original EIS-- are described in the attached NBBA letter.

Your immediate attention to this matter is appreciated. I personally know how much you love this neighborhood, the Italian community's "cittadina," and I recall fondly your support for us many years ago when I joined you and three other diners at the Italian Consulate to help raise funds for the Bocce Ball courts at Aquatic Park. The firm I then worked for, Melvin Belli, is long since gone-- but the need to come together as hyphenated Americans who know what it means to depend on neighborhood and community is no less acute today than it was then.

Local businesses are as essential to North Beach as the church of Sts. Peter and Paul, the beauty of Washington Square and (of course) the Bocce Ball courts. Without these local businesses, many people in our neighborhood would drive many blocks away to buy necessities, others who live here would lose their jobs and still others-- the owners themselves-- would find better and more inviting places to invest their time and money. Please help us preserve the delicate balance these businesses need to thrive in North Beach.

Sincerely,

Marc Bruno



NBBA 06.06.12 re Central Subway P.1.jpg



NBBA 06.06.12 re Central Subway P.2.jpg



Representative Nancy Pelosi.doc



2

Representative Nancy Pelosi
8th District, California
Minority Leader of the House
235 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0508
Attention: Robert Edmonson, Legislative Director

Co-Presidents

Brandy Marts
Shell Thomas

Vice President

Kathleen Dooley

Treasurer

Rebekah Shapiro

Secretary

Roark O'Neill

Directors

Robert Carlson

Janet Clyde

Dan Macchiarini

Al Ribaya

June 6, 2012

Dear Representative Pelosi,

Our organization, the North Beach Business Association, is writing in support of the letter from the North Beach Business and Community Leaders Against the Central Subway Extraction Plan. We represent many businesses in the neighborhood commercial corridor. We want to make it clear that we are not opposed to the Central Subway project; we are opposed to the proposed plan to extract the massive equipment in the heart of our neighborhood when there are other, less destructive methods to achieve this goal.

When former mayors Willie Brown and Gavin Newsom and Nathaniel Ford discussed the Central Subway, all parties stated that a number of options were available in the EIS for the removal of the tunneling equipment : backing the machine out and removing it at the point of entry, leaving it underground until the next phase of the Subway – adding a station in North Beach and at Fisherman's Wharf was financed, or removing the equipment at the MUNI Yard at Northpoint Street.

You can imagine, after absolutely no public outreach to our neighborhood was done, when MTA gave a presentation at our May NBBA meeting and announced they would begin digging up the 2 major arteries in North Beach in less than one month, we were shocked and outraged.

The commercial area of North Beach is comprised completely of small, independent businesses. The proposed 2 year extraction project will be a devastating blow to the North Beach economy and few businesses have the financial resources to weather such a blow. We are anticipating that many shops will be forced to permanently close their doors if the extraction project goes through as planned.



Representative Nancy Pelosi

June 7, 2012

Page two

As we are sure you are aware, North Beach is an internationally known destination for visitors in San Francisco. We are beginning the busiest time of the year in our neighborhood and normally would welcome many thousands of visitors and locals to enjoy the ambience of our shops, cafes and our beautiful Washington Square Park. If this plan proceeds as scheduled, the noise, dirt and dust will devastate our local economy. Who will be able to sit outside of our cafes or in Washington Square Park when the streets will be torn up for 2 years and traffic will be diverted from the major streets that access our neighborhood? The devastation will also be going on as at the same time as the America's Cup will be bringing additional visitors to North Beach.

We join with our neighbors and friends in pleading with you to insist that the MTA revisit the extraction options and approve one that will not destroy the economy of North Beach.

Sincerely,

Brandy Marts
Co-President

***North Beach Businesses and Community Leaders
against Central Subway Extraction Plan
15 Nobles Alley, No. 3
San Francisco, CA 94133***

Representative Nancy Pelosi
8th District, California
Minority Leader of the House
235 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515-0508
Attention: Robert Edmonson, Legislative Director
robert.edmonson@mail.house.gov

June 3, 2012

Dear Representative Pelosi,

We write you concerning the proposed extraction of Central Subway drilling equipment and related activities that are scheduled to begin this month, June 2012, here in North Beach, in the vicinity of Columbus Avenue and Union Street. These related activities include utility relocation (AT&T, fire hydrant and water lines, sewer relocation) and retrieval shaft construction-- all of which involves at least two years of extraordinarily disruptive street construction, using excavators, dump trucks, backhoes and other heavy equipment.

The interference with traffic on major arteries will be intolerable to businesses, residents and tourists. The expected dirt, dust and noise, and the replacement of street and sidewalk surfaces with metal plates, will be dangerous to pedestrians and bicyclists and a hindrance to anyone wishing to visit North Beach.

Time is of the essence in halting the widespread, disruptive impact of the Central Subway extraction project along the major corridors running through North Beach, disruption that will result in severe economic damage to businesses throughout the neighborhood---a major tourist destination.

We respectfully request your office to intercede to halt any action, pertaining to the Central Subway Drilling Extraction Project, proposed to begin in the heart of North Beach. (This letter is not intended as a statement on the Central Subway itself, rather on the issue of extraction of the drilling equipment in North Beach.)

As you are aware, this Extraction Project cannot proceed without authorization of federal funding. We ask that this funding be denied or withdrawn, or, at minimum that this stage of the project, including related activities scheduled to begin this month in North Beach, be put on hold until such time that the following conditions are met, as required by federal, state and local law, to wit:

1. Alternative Proposals and Locations. Alternative proposals and locations for extraction of the drilling equipment (including utility relocation and retrieval shaft construction) should be examined in public forums properly noticed to all North Beach businesses and residents likely to be affected by the extraction project. *This has not been done.*

2. Washington Square Park. The Park is one of the most heavily used in San Francisco, in an area with the lowest per capita open space of any neighborhood. In addition, Washington Square is the only Park in San Francisco designated a Historic Landmark, and, as such, any and all activity directly or indirectly related to Central Subway street construction within 100 feet of the Park should be fully vetted by the North Beach community. *This has not been done.*

3. Written Record. A written record must be established and made available including the responses from properly noticed businesses and residents most likely to be affected by the extraction project, including proposed utility relocation and retrieval shaft construction, scheduled to begin June, 2012, and such record must be included in the otherwise deficient EIS/EIR. *This has not been done.*

4. Reasonable Notice to Affected Businesses and Residents. Should the extraction plan move forward in North Beach, timely written notice must be given businesses and residents likely to be affected by the project, including utility relocation and retrieval shaft construction, and this timely notice should continue at reasonable intervals for the duration of the project. *This has not been done nor promised.*

According to the City, the drilling machines to be extracted in North Beach will not reach the proposed extraction point earlier than August, 2016. In light of this, there is no reason to begin the preparation for such extraction or any related activities in North Beach prior to August 1, 2014.

For these reasons, we, the undersigned, respectfully request that your office without delay, prevail on the City of San Francisco to undertake no Central Subway drilling extraction construction activities, including but not limited to utility relocation and retrieval shaft construction in and around Columbus Avenue between Green and Filbert Streets, as presently proposed to begin this June, 2012.

Very truly yours,

Marc Bruno
415-434-1528

City Attny, epage

June 5, 2012

David Cincotta, Esq.
Jeffer Mangels Butler & Mitchell, LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111

VIA EMAIL at DCincotta@jmbm.com

Project

Re: Children's Day School, 601 Dolores Street, San Francisco, CA

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2012 JUN -6 PM 2:47
cc

Dear David:

I appreciated the opportunity to speak with you today regarding the currently bifurcated hearing on the various appeals to Children's Day School's use permit and variance for 601 Dolores Street property in San Francisco. In our phone conversation, we both agreed that, in the interest of providing sufficient time for the Parties to discuss a mutually agreeable solution to their differences, we would request and support a continuance of the currently scheduled June 19th hearing on the appeal of the categorical exemption determination. We also agreed it was not in either party's interest that either party file its evidentiary documents in support of or in opposition to the categorical exemption issued by the clerk's June 11 requested date. As I mentioned, if we were required to file the reports we have had prepared, those will become public records and, therefore, can be used by anyone in opposition to your client's project.

Based on the foregoing, we collectively agreed that we would: (1) request that Supervisor Weiner obtain or at least support a continuance of the June 19th hearing to a date no sooner than the date currently set for the CUP appeal and perhaps longer if additional negotiating time appeared warranted; and (2) neither party would argue that the other party was required to file any documents either in support of or in opposition to the categorical exemption on the June 11 requested date. The result of this agreement is that we agree that documents filed after that date would still become part of the record of proceedings, could be considered by the Board of Supervisors in the appeal(s), and could become part of the administrative record should a writ of mandate be filed in the same manner as any other document that would have been presented to the Board of Supervisors prior to their decision.

By signing this letter below, you confirm that you agree with the foregoing.

Sincerely,

RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP

Jeffrey A. Goldfarb

I agree with the foregoing.

David Cincotta, Esq.

BOS-11

file 120362

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

Comments

① I am interested in the motion 18588 for the proposed California Pacific Medical Center Long Range Development Plan Project coz many people will be benefited by these plan especially the elders.

Now a days many people get sick they need a good hospital to take good care of them.

all the rest of the motion are okay and favorable
I doubt the 120362 ② Construct and maintain off site improvements on the north side of Cedar Street between Van Ness Ave and Polk St. It might affect the ~~Senior~~ Housing^{at} 990 Polk St. Wre we live.

Residents of 990 Polk Street
Apt 512 SPCA-94109

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2012 JUN -7 PM 2:41

Pz

(27)



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Fw: Stop the Witchhunt - Justice for Ross Mirkarimi

From: Jennifer Nicoletto <mail@change.org>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org,
Date: 06/07/2012 12:10 AM
Subject: Stop the Witchhunt - Justice for Ross Mirkarimi

Greetings,

I just signed the following petition addressed to: SF Mayor Lee (Mayor Ed Lee).

Mayor Edwin Lee, Stop the witch hunt against Ross Mirkarimi. Let justice run its course.

Do not deprive San Francisco of a leading progressive voice and long-serving public servant. Ross has suffered enough for his transgressions. End his public humiliation, let him be reunited with his family.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Nicoletto
SF, California

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at <http://www.change.org/petitions/san-francisco-mayor-edwin-lee-stop-the-witchhunt-justice-for-ross-mirkarimi-and-his-family>. To respond, [click here](#)



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Stop the Witchhunt - Justice for Ross Mirkarimi

From: niky missagh <mail@change.org>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org,
Date: 06/08/2012 08:23 PM
Subject: Stop the Witchhunt - Justice for Ross Mirkarimi

Greetings,

I just signed the following petition addressed to: SF Mayor Lee (Mayor Ed Lee).

Mayor Edwin Lee, Stop the witch hunt against Ross Mirkarimi. Let justice run its course. Do not deprive

San Francisco of a leading progressive voice and long-serving public servant. Ross has suffered enough for

his transgressions. End his public humiliation, let him be reunited with his family.

Sincerely,

niky missagh
san jose , California

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at <http://www.change.org>.

[org/petitions/san-francisco-mayor-edwin-lee-stop-the-witchhunt-justice-for-ross-mirkarimi-and-his-family](http://www.change.org/petitions/san-francisco-mayor-edwin-lee-stop-the-witchhunt-justice-for-ross-mirkarimi-and-his-family).

To respond, [click here](#)

From: mahrokh missagh <mail@change.org>
To: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org,
Date: 06/08/2012 08:26 PM
Subject: Stop the Witchhunt - Justice for Ross Mirkarimi

Greetings,

I just signed the following petition addressed to: SF Mayor Lee (Mayor Ed Lee).

Mayor Edwin Lee, Stop the witch hunt against Ross Mirkarimi. Let justice run its course. Do not deprive San Francisco of a leading progressive voice and long-serving public servant. Ross has suffered enough for his transgressions. End his public humiliation, let him be reunited with his family.

Sincerely,

mahrokh missagh
san jose, California

Note: this email was sent as part of a petition started on Change.org, viewable at [http://www.change.org](http://www.change.org/petitions/san-francisco-mayor-edwin-lee-stop-the-witchhunt-justice-for-ross-mirkarimi-and-his-family).

[org/petitions/san-francisco-mayor-edwin-lee-stop-the-witchhunt-justice-for-ross-mirkarimi-and-his-family](http://www.change.org/petitions/san-francisco-mayor-edwin-lee-stop-the-witchhunt-justice-for-ross-mirkarimi-and-his-family). To respond, [click here](#)



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Alisa Miller/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: File 120585: Exercise of option term under Sublease for 1440 Harrison St.

From: Claudine Venegas/ADMSVC/SFGOV
To: Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV,
Date: 06/08/2012 02:49 PM
Subject: Exercise of option term under Sublease for 1440 Harrison St.

Sirs/Madams,

We recently filed a Resolution for the above captioned matter.

The landlord's attorney forwarded the additional information (below) to attach to Form SFEC-126.

Thank you.
Claudine

Claudine O. Venegas
Senior Real Property Officer
Real Estate Division
25 Van Ness Ave., #400
San Francisco, CA 94102
415-554-9872 direct
415-552-9216 fax



Attachment to Form SFEC-126.pdf

ATTACHMENT TO FORM SFEC-126
NOTIFICATION OF CONTRACT APPROVAL
Sublease Extension for 1440 Harrison Street, San Francisco
for Human Services Agency

1) Contractor Harrison Assets, LLC is a California limited liability company. Since Harrison Assets, LLC is not a corporation, it has no board of directors;

2) Harrison Assets, LLC is managed by Ronaldo Cianciarulo, who is the chief executive officer, chief financial officer, and chief operating officer;

3) Baker Hamilton Properties, LLC is the 100% owner of Harrison Assets, LLC. Ronaldo Cianciarulo owns a 20 percent interest or more in Baker Hamilton Properties, LLC. There is no other person who owns a 20% interest or more in Baker Hamilton Properties, LLC, other than Ronaldo Cianciarulo;

4) There is no subcontractor; and

5) There is no political committee sponsored or controlled by Harrison Assets, LLC, Baker Hamilton Properties, LLC, or Ronaldo Cianciarulo.



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Bernal Library Mural -again?

From: "Nancy and Richard" <evertays@earthlink.net>
To: <libraryusers2004@yahoo.com>,
Cc: <mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org>, <juan.torres@sfgov.org>, <tom.decaigny@sfgov.org>,
<board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>, "David Campos" <David.Campos@sfgov.org>
Date: 06/10/2012 04:19 PM
Subject: Bernal Library Mural -again?

I am in receipt of an anonymous person's flyer (libraryusers2004@yahoo.com) distributed in Bernal Heights today as the scaffolding is already on the Bernal Library and the long awaited completion of the restoration of the library building begins Monday. Unlike their anon flyer I have signed my name.

It would be a rant to try and correct the ridiculous number of outright untruths and exaggerations in their flyer so I will not. David Campos has not only been attending but helping lead for many years a healing process and community meetings over it. He can assure you of this fact. So can I. The anon flyer asks us in the community to write you all and to include them, so I will.

No painted wall mural stands FOREVER. They are pursuing a fight for the sake of a fight. Evidence today there resurfaces a list of untruths and divisive comments that utterly neglect the majority of the very community that came together over these issues.

Calling the new art 'gentrification' and 'sanitized' and invoking Victor Jara's name in the flyer headline reflect the untrue charges which only reopen a rift between Latin, minority and White. White San Franciscans have labored decades to heal that rift and so too on this very mural issue. The people behind warming up this old cadaver issue feed on the long dead issue in ignorance. They even cite the sister of Arch Williams -one of 23 painters names signed to the mural as wanting to challenge the legality of repainting the mural in a new way that respects the WPA building...

*The first idea to create this mural was that of a white librarian (to defeat graffiti).

*Arch Williams was not Latino.

*The Latin man Acala who thankfully helped white Arch Williams finish the mural said Arch was not a good illustrator. Acala is a journalist today in Sacramento.

*Of a panel of mural artists assembled to offer opinions regarding the quality of execution on the old mural - not one could defend it on that point. This was pursued as part of the extensive process of developing a new mural which incorporates many many features of the old mural!

*Of the 26 surnames signed to the mural -only 8 are Latino. Children and Acala were brought in to help Arch finish after 3 years of ridiculously poor progress.

*A well known new book "Street Art San Francisco: Mission Muralismo" pictures 500 murals in SF yet completely omits the Bernal Library mural -this, even though the author is a Bernal resident! The book has a forward by Carlos Sanata. Only possible reasons are that the mural is not an example of Latin muralismo or that it is of such poor quality. The author will not criticize the work yet its absence speaks for itself.

Richard Everett
Bernal Heights



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Do not destroy the Bernal Heights mural!

From: Laura Camp <lauracamp@sbcglobal.net>
To: "mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org" <mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org>, "tom.decaigny@sgfov.org" <tom.decaigny@sgfov.org>, "juan.torres@sfgov.org" <juan.torres@sfgov.org>, "board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org" <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>, "david.campos@sfgov.org" <david.campos@sfgov.org>, "librarusers2004@yahoo.com" <librarusers2004@yahoo.com>,
Date: 06/09/2012 07:19 PM
Subject: Do not destroy the Bernal Heights mural!

I am a native San Franciscan! I am a 50 year old African American woman with two teenagers. I have lived in Bernal Heights for years. I have a MBA and follow SF politics. Does it make sense to spend funds in this economic environment to destroy art and history?

I found out today about the plans to destroy this landmark while I was on my way to Good Life with my teenager. My teenage daughter was appalled that SF politicians seem to be as crooked as WDC politicians.

Please stop the destruction of this beautiful mural so that I don't have to become an activist!

I have a hard time convincing my kids about the virtues of voting and the motives of politicians when this type of crap goes on. I am keeping the faith anyway.

Regards,
Laura Camp

Sent from my iPad

SUE C. HESTOR
Attorney at Law
870 Market Street, Suite 1128 • San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 362-2778 • FAX (415) 362-8048

File 120278

cp page

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2012 JUN -6 PM 2:22

hestor@earthlink.net
(415) 846-1021

June 5, 2012

Supervisor Carmen Chu
Chair, Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Sub-committee
City Hall
San Francisco CA 94102

Dear President Chiu:

Friends of Golden Gateway (FOGG) challenges the ability of the Budget and Finance Sub-Committee to conduct any hearing on matters related to the 8 Washington Street/Seawall Lot 351 project at the Committee meeting on June 6, 2012 because documents related to the matters being considered for approval were not timely posted and available on the Board website. Full documents on a major PERMANENT transfer of Port property, and full documents setting out the financial transactions related to that transfer and development on Port property were NOT posted, and to this date are NOT available on the Board website. Many critical documents are also not available on the Port website.

The items before the **Budget and Finance Sub-committee** are -

Item 7 - 120270 - Approval of Public Trust Exchange; Agreement to Sell Portion of Seawall Lot 351 in Exchange for Portion of Block 168-Lot 58, Block 171-Lot 69 and Block 201-Lot 12; Approval of Lease and Maintenance Agreement

✓ **Item 8 - 120278** - Amending Resolution of Intention to Form Waterfront Infrastructure Financing District

The agenda and supporting documents for the June 6, 2012 were available on the Board website on Friday, June 1, 2012. Major critical documents for this hearing were NOT provided anywhere on the Board site - directly or via a link. Following the order listed on "agenda packet contents list" for file **120270** they are:

Purchase and Sale Agreement - at page 61 (just cover page provided)
May 24, 2012 Memo to Port Commission - at page 59 (just cover page provided)
March 23, 2012 Memo to Port Commission - at page 60 (just cover page provided)
Lease No L-5110 w/Waterfront Partners - at page 58 (just cover page provided) [L-15110]
Maintenance Agreement for Open Space - at page 57 (just cover page provided)
February 19, 2009 (Memo to Port Commission) - at page 43 (just cover page provided)

It is my understanding that additional material may have been provided by Port staff as recently as yesterday. I have not seen any such information.

The statement "the complete document can be found in the file" is insufficient for the public and Supervisors to review and prepare for a June 6 hearing, given that agenda was posted on Friday, June 1, and particularly given that the Port financial documents were also not provided prior to the May 29, 2012 Port hearing.

The only Port hearing on the financial documents for this project was on Tuesday, May 29, 2012, immediately after a 3-day holiday. The agenda for that meeting was posted after 5pm on Thursday, May 24. The Supporting Documents on the Port website for that meeting did NOT include any of the following documents which the Commission approved at its Tuesday, May 29 meeting:

Disposition and Development Agreement
Lease L-15110 for term of 66 years
Purchase and Sale Agreement
Maintenance Agreement
Trust Exchange Agreement

None of the above documents were available on the Port website when the May 29 agenda was posted, which agenda noted that the documents were available for public inspection at the Port Commission Secretary's Office "during normal office hours." Again, that agenda was posted after 5pm on Thursday, May 24. Because of the holiday weekend, the Commission Secretary (among others) was not in her Port office on Friday, May 25. In response to my inquiry when the agenda was posted, the Secretary told me that Phil Williamson of Port staff would be working for a few hours on Friday morning and could provide any missing documents. I made such a request and did receive a set of the above listed documents around noon on Friday. I have no idea whether other members of the public were given the same information about contacting Mr. Williamson and were able to get those documents. As of today, none of the above-listed documents are available on the Port website.


The **Disposition and Development Agreement** sets out the framework for the Infrastructure Finance District actions proposed in file **120278**, item 8 on the June 6, 2012 Budget and Finance Sub-Committee agenda. This includes amending Infrastructure Financing District No. 2 at the Port of San Francisco and allocating City General Funds to the Port of San Francisco for the proposed project. Again the underlying document - the DDA - is not available on either the Board website or the Port website. As a separate matter, file **120278** was listed on NO Board Committee calendar prior to appearing on June 6. This is clearly a matter requiring that it appear on a calendar for 30 days prior to action.

Given the magnitude and permanence of the decisions the Board is being asked to make, both the public and members of the Board should have all five Port documents available to them. A note that documents are available in the Board file is insufficient, particularly when they were also NOT provided for the Port Commission hearing. The EIR for this project - which is much longer than any of the financial documents - is available on line at the Planning website. The CEQA findings, which are also

extensive, are available on line. Failure to provide the full set of documents on-line at least 72 hours before the only Board hearing on these financial documents does not allow for informed public comment in the manner contemplated by Board rules or Public Meetings law requirements.

FOGG requests that the above matters be taken off the Wednesday, June 6 Budget and Finance Sub-Committee agenda, that the full set of the 5 Port documents be provided on-line ALONG WITH ANY MODIFICATIONS PROPOSED BY THE PORT for a minimum of 72 hours and that a Board Committee hearing be conducted after the time they are available.

Respectfully submitted,



Sue C. Hestor
For Friends of Golden Gateway

cc: David Chiu, Board President
Supervisor John Avalos, Vice-Chair Budget and Finance Sub-Committee
Supervisor Jane Kim, Member Budget and Finance Sub-Committee
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Cheryl Adams, Deputy City Attorney
Louise Renne
Brad Paul
Lee Radner, FOGG



What about that \$1.7 Million for Coit Tower??

Roland Salvato

to:

Mayor (Ed) Lee

06/07/2012 11:43 AM

Cc:

"Supervisor (Mark) Farrell", "Supervisor (Jane) Kim", Board of Supervisors, "Supervisor (Eric) Mar", "Supervisor (John) Avalos", "Supervisor (David) Campos", "Supervisor (Malia) Cohen", "Supervisor (David) Chiu", "Supervisor (Christina) Olague", "Supervisor (Carmen) Chu", "Supervisor (Sean) Elsbernd", "Supervisor (Scott) Wiener", Recreation and Parks Department

Hide Details

From: Roland Salvato <rolandsalvato@hotmail.com> Sort List...

To: "Mayor (Ed) Lee" <mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org>,

Cc: "Supervisor (Mark) Farrell" <mark.farrell@sfgov.org>, "Supervisor (Jane) Kim" <jane.kim@sfgov.org>, Board of Supervisors <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>, "Supervisor (Eric) Mar" <eric.l.mar@sfgov.org>, "Supervisor (John) Avalos" <john.avalos@sfgov.org>, "Supervisor (David) Campos" <david.campos@sfgov.org>, "Supervisor (Malia) Cohen" <malia.cohen@sfgov.org>, "Supervisor (David) Chiu" <david.chiu@sfgov.org>, "Supervisor (Christina) Olague" <christina.olague@sfgov.org>, "Supervisor (Carmen) Chu" <carmen.chu@sfgov.org>, "Supervisor (Sean) Elsbernd" <sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org>, "Supervisor (Scott) Wiener" <scott.wiener@sfgov.org>, Recreation and Parks Department <rpdinfo@sfgov.org>

Mayor Lee,

You were opposed to Prop B, and you announced a 1.7 million dollar injection of tax money into Coit Tower just prior to the election.

What will become of this money?

I am scratching my head about your reasons for this announcement, at that time. Was it ethical or legal? Are you still in favor of dedicating that money?

Please respond to indicate you've received this email.
Supervisors, please weigh in on this item.

Thanks.

32

It's better to have a permanent income than to be fascinating.

-- Oscar Wilde in *The Model Millionaire*

If you can't have a permanent income, at least be fascinating.

-- Roland Salvato in the kitchen



To: BOS Constituent Mail Distribution, Linda Wong/BOS/SFGOV,
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: SFBOS Rules Committee - Item 6 + 7 Ethic's Commission Hearing - Amendments to City's Campaign Law's

From: Aaron Goodman <amgodman@yahoo.com>
To: Jane.Kim@sfgov.org, Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org, David.Campos@sfgov.org,
Cc: board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
Date: 06/07/2012 12:05 PM
Subject: SFBOS Rules Committee - Item 6 + 7 Ethic's Commission Hearing - Amendments to City's Campaign Law's

June 7, 2012

SFBOS Rules Committee

As I will be unable to attend I want to submit my concerns regarding the issues of the Ethic's Commission Hearing and

On September 27, 2011, the (SOTF) found Supervisors David Chiu, Scott Wiener, Malia Cohen and Eric Mar in violation of Sunshine meeting laws. All four Supervisors were found guilty and the matter was referred to the District Attorney's office. The Supervisors were found guilty of withholding pertained to the Parkmerced development.

To date the Ethics commission has done NOTHING to seriously deal with the issue of the approval process for a large reversal of the prior approval nor steps by the District Attorney's office has been made since the city has been sued on

There was no investigation on the lobbyists efforts to get that project approved, the emails and text messages by lobby deal. All during the hearings at multiple stages of the Parkmerced project Lobbyists for Stellar management, Fortress Ir hall, and the system to get as many people to those hearings as possible when many seniors, and tenants who could n agenda item was pushed later into the evening, or limited severley in speaking time during public comment while allowi project glorified presentations that did nothing to investigate the concerns raised by many opposed to the project.

Lobbyists strolled the halls going into supervisors offices WITHOUT any labels or visual notation on there person that d projects. I would ask if any of the SFBOS especially David Chiu were not lobbied repeatedly by Stellar Management, Fc Apartments Association group members, along with SPUR and SFHAC both whom have lobbied on behalf of Parkmerc contributions by the Architect Craig Hartman (SOM) and others to specific campaigns.

When during one hearing it was noted that only ONE person could speak for a particular organization per the rules, it w of the project not stating that they were "members" or employees of SFHAC or SPUR in the hearings.

This alters the course of hearings and presents to commissioners a false resemblance of project approval. When many proposed project.

Related to Item 6;

I want to personally thank Supervisor Campos for obtaining the Harvey Rose report and strongly urge that Rules Commr some of its points.

As noted prior I have concerns with Ethics inaction on issues of regulating lobbyists, on failure to deal with money laund include actual voters in considering what the public's best interests and needs are.

The fact that many Developers and connected organizations such as SPUR and SFHAC are lobbying City Hall for permits. This is a double standard that hurts citizens, and permits account for nearly nine out of ten City Hall lobbying efforts. Contribution can still fundraise for the officials who will decide on their contracts, unlike Los Angeles.

It is improper that lobbyists are allowed to contribute in San Francisco, but not in Los Angeles. This is a direct conflict of interest. Related to Item 7 (Wiener), speak directly to the proposed amendments:

Tenants and neighborhood groups where I am active never knew these proposals were being considered and were never consulted. The changes proposed in the reporting schedule means that it will be harder for citizens to learn about who is funding these boards such as the Planning Commission and SF BOS Land-Use have been stacked recently to favor development. I am concerned that these proposals, like ending the cumulative contribution ban, have been in force with no problem. It appears that provisions open up new loopholes in how money is being transferred between committees. Which is a concern that often can lead to some supervisors being placed in roles that do not always indicate any knowledge or experience in the area. The Rose Report also looks at the difference between LA and SF when it comes to enforcing the rules and provides insight into enforcement.

Per the Rose report, it would be important to consider the following issues in relation to strengthening the Ethics Commission:

- Explicitly prohibiting any political contributions from registered lobbyists.
- Increasing the frequency with which candidates must report contributions and including the primary and general elections as compared to four such reports required.
- Increasing personal contribution limits to possibly offset the influence of unregulated contributions.
- Reducing the Ethics Commission reporting requirement threshold from \$5,000 per candidate or measure.
- Reducing the amount of time for which extensions of credit to a campaign are allowed.
- Establishing a lower threshold for reporting of independent expenditures on behalf of a candidate, from the current \$5,000 in San Francisco.

Please accept these comments due to my inability to attend the hearing and raise specific issues to the Parkmerced project.

Sincerely,

Aaron Goodman

BOS-11. cpage

Commissioners
Daniel W. Richards, President
Upland
Michael Sutton, Vice President
Monterey
Jim Kellogg, Member
Discovery Bay
Richard Rogers, Member
Santa Barbara
Jack Baylis, Member
Los Angeles

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor

Sonke Mastrup, Executive Director
1416 Ninth Street, Room 1320
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-4899
(916) 653-5040 Fax
www.fgc.ca.gov

Fish and Game Commission



June 6, 2012

TO ALL INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES:

This is to provide you with a copy of the notice of proposed regulatory action relative to Sections 27.65 and 28.30, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to kelp bass, barred sand bass and spotted sand bass sport fishing, which will be published in the California Regulatory Notice Register on June 8, 2012.

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

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

Sincerely,

Sherrie Fonbuena
Associate Governmental Program Analyst

Attachment

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

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Fish and Game Commission (Commission), pursuant to the authority vested by sections 200, 202, 205, 219, and 220 of the Fish and Game Code and to implement, interpret or make specific sections 200, 202, 203.1, 205, 207, 210, 215, 219, 220, 240, 5508, and 5509 of said Code, proposes to amend sections 27.65 and 28.30, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to kelp bass, barred sand bass and spotted sand bass.

Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

Under current regulations, Section 27.65(b)(1), Title 14, CCR, specifies a minimum fillet length for kelp bass, barred sand bass, spotted sand bass, and ocean whitefish. Section 28.30 specifies a minimum size (total length and alternate length) and bag limit for kelp bass, barred sand bass, and spotted sand bass.

The three proposed regulatory options are intended to work together to favor population increases of the three bass species by reducing take. The options include an increase in the minimum size limit for all three species (with a corresponding increase in fillet length and alternate length), a reduction in the bag limit for all three species, and a spawning season closure for barred sand bass only. Each proposed option includes a range of sub-options yielding different reductions in catch depending on the species. The following summarizes the options for regulatory change in Title 14, Sections 27.65(b)(1) and 28.30:

Option 1: The proposed regulation would increase the minimum size limit for bass to either 13, 14, or 15 inches total length. An increase in the minimum size limit to 13, 14, or 15 inches will require a corresponding increase in the fillet length size to 7, 7.5, or 8 inches, respectively and a corresponding increase in the alternate length size to 9.25, 10, or 10.75 inches, respectively. Ocean whitefish fillets would retain the 6.5 inches minimum length and require the entire skin be attached.

Option 2: Current regulations specify a limit of 10 fish (bass) in any combination of species. The proposed regulation would retain the 10 fish upper limit in aggregate stipulation, but provide for a reduction in the individual species limit within the range of 10 to 0.

Option 3: Current regulations do not specify any seasonal closure of barred sand bass fishing. The proposed regulation would close barred sand bass fishing from 1 week to 3 months during the spawning season (June 1-August 31).

The benefits of the proposed regulations are sustainable management of the bass resources to protect bass populations while continuing to provide recreational fishing opportunities.

The proposed regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing State regulations. No other State agency has the authority to promulgate sport fishing regulations.

NOTICE IS GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held at the Crown Plaza Ventura Beach Hotel, 450 E. Harbor Blvd., Ventura, California, on Wednesday, August 8, 2012 at 8:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard.

NOTICE IS ALSO GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held at the Radisson Hotel-LAX, 6225 West Century Blvd., Los Angeles, California, on Wednesday, November 7, 2012, at 8:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard. Written comments may be submitted to the address given below, or by fax at (916) 653-5040, or by e-mail to FGC@fgc.ca.gov. Written comments mailed, faxed or e-mailed to the Commission office, must be received before 5:00 p.m. on November 2, 2012. All comments must be received no later than November 7, 2012 at the hearing in Los Angeles, CA. If you would like copies of any modifications to this proposal, please include your name and mailing address.

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

Availability of Modified Text

If the regulations adopted by the Commission differ from but are sufficiently related to the action proposed, they will be available to the public for at least 15 days prior to the date of adoption. Circumstances beyond the control of the Commission (e.g., timing of Federal regulation adoption, timing of resource data collection, timelines do not allow, etc.) or changes made to be responsive to public recommendation and comments during the regulatory process may preclude full compliance with the 15-day comment period, and the Commission will exercise its powers under Section 202 of the Fish and Game Code. Regulations adopted pursuant to this section are not subject to the time periods for adoption, amendment or repeal of regulations prescribed in Sections 11343.4, 11346.4 and 11346.8 of the Government Code. Any person interested may obtain a copy of said regulations prior to the date of adoption by contacting the agency representative named herein.

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

Impact of Regulatory Action

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

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

The proposed action will not have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting businesses, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states.

Some impacts to southern California businesses catering to bass fishing may be realized; however, these impacts are not expected to be significant or statewide. The bass fishery is only a southern California fishery, and businesses from other states do not compete with southern California businesses for this resource.

(b) Impact on the Creation or Elimination of Jobs Within the State, the Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses, or the Expansion of Businesses in California; Benefits of the Regulation to the Health and Welfare of California Residents, Worker Safety, and the State's Environment.

An increase in the minimum size limit (Option 1) will result in fewer bass taken, but it is unlikely to result in the creation or elimination of jobs or businesses. The minimum size increase is not expected to reduce the number of anglers aboard CPFVs and rental boats to the same extent that a reduction in the bag limit would because the opportunity to catch larger fish still exists.

Due to some of the recreational fishing community having support for a reduction in the bag limit (Option 2), it is unknown whether a moderate reduction in the bag limit would deter a significant portion of anglers from fishing. However, a severe reduction in the bag limit (e.g., zero take) would most likely result in the loss of jobs and the elimination of several businesses associated with the industry (see economic impact analysis report).

A barred sand bass season closure (Option 3) could also result in the loss of jobs or businesses, depending on actual customer interest (fishing for barred sand bass versus other species) and revenue lost due to potential impacts to sport fishing landings. Under a partial season closure, it seems likely that landings would choose to continue their regular schedule and fish for other species, resulting in no loss of jobs or businesses. However, under a full season closure, a significant reduction in fishing trips would most likely result in the loss of jobs and the elimination of several businesses associated with the industry (see economic impact analysis report).

For all three options, fewer fish being taken home would result in some lost income to CPFV crew members due to filleting fewer fish.

Despite the possibility of a short-term adverse impact to businesses, the long-term intent of all the proposed actions is to increase sustainability of the bass fisheries and, subsequently, the long-term viability of these same businesses.

The Commission anticipates benefits to the health and welfare of California residents. Currently there are health advisories recommending limited consumption of kelp bass and barred sand bass from certain areas within southern California due to contaminants (see economic impact analysis report). Limiting take of these fishes through the proposed regulations will help residents comply with these health advisories.

The Commission does not anticipate any non-monetary benefits to worker safety.

The Commission anticipates benefits to the environment by the sustainable management of California's bass resources.

(c) Cost Impacts on a Representative Private Person or Business:

The agency is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.

(d) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State: None.

(e) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies: None.

(f) Programs mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts: None.

(g) Costs Imposed on Any Local Agency or School District that is Required to be Reimbursed Under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4, Government Code: None.

(h) Effect on Housing Costs: None.

Effect on Small Business

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

Consideration of Alternatives

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

FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

Sonke Mastrup
Executive Director

Dated: May 29, 2012