10/7

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO **OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER**

C: Supv. Elsbernd

MEMORANDUM

1

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2008 SEP 16 AM 10: 44
BY

TO: Honorable Supervisor Sean Elsbernd
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Monique Zmuda, Deputy Controller

DATE: September 16, 2008

SUBJECT: FY 2009-10 Debt Service Requirements Inquiry

This memo responds to Supervisor Elsbernd's request for our office to provide:
1) a preliminary outlook for the City's Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10 debt service requirements, in the event that the $887.4M San Francisco General Hospital general obligation bond authorization is passed by San Francisco voters in November 2008, and
2) a schedule showing the date that current general obligation bonds will be retired, affecting the tax rate.

As stated in the ballot handbook, the Controller estimated the change to the tax rate should the proposed General Obligation Bond of $887.4 million be authorized and sold. Under current assumptions, the approximate costs will be as follows:

- In fiscal year 2009-2010, following issuance of the first series of bonds, and the year with the lowest tax rate, the estimated annual costs of debt service would be $3.4 million and result in a property tax rate of $0.00251 per $100 ($2.51 per $100,000) of assessed valuation.

- In fiscal year 2013-2014, following issuance of the last series of bonds, and the year with the highest tax rate, the estimated annual costs of debt service would be $78.5 million and result in a property tax rate of $0.05032 per $100 ($50.32 per $100,000) of assessed valuation.

- The best estimate of the average tax rate for these bonds from fiscal year 2009-2010 through 2033-2034 is $0.0337 per $100 ($33.70 per $100,000) of assessed valuation.

- Based on these estimates, the highest estimated annual property tax cost for the owner of a home with an assessed value of $400,000 would be approximately $197.77.

- Landlords would be allowed to pass through 50% of the annual property tax cost of the proposed bond to tenants as permitted in the City Administrative Code. Based on these estimates, the highest estimated annual cost for a tenant in a unit with an assessed value of approximately $131,000 would be $32.96.

1

These estimates are based on projections only, which are not binding upon the City. Projections and estimates may vary due to the timing of bond sales, the amount of bonds sold at each sale, and actual assessed valuation over the term of repayment of the bonds. Hence, the actual tax rate and the years in which such rates are applicable may vary from those estimated above. The City's current debt management policy is to issue new general obligation bonds only as old ones are retired, keeping the property tax impact from general obligation bonds approximately the same over time.

Attachment 1 provides an update of the City and County of San Francisco Debt Service Requirements – General Obligation Bonds and the retirement date of each bond. In addition, Attachment 2 provides a Statement of Principle and Interest paid for the current FY 08-09, indicating that $142M of debt principal will be repaid this fiscal year. This reduction will also have a positive impact on the next year's property rate calculation.

As a final note, the actual FY 2009-10 property tax rate may be higher or lower than the rate for FY 2008-09, depending on a number of factors, including:

- Amount of new bond issuances prior to the determination of the 2009-10 rate
- Interest rate obtained on new bond issuances.
- Value of bonds re-funded (if any) prior to the determination of the 2009-10 rate
- Actual growth in the City and County of San Francisco assessed valuation
- Amount of debt and principle retired over the current amount paid.

Attachment 1

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
General Obligation Bonds (as of September 1, 2008)

Description of Issue (Date of Authorization)	Series	Issued	Outstanding	Date Retired	Authorized & Unissued
Golden Gate Park Improvements (6/2/92)	2001A	17,060,000	2,310,000	2011	
Seismic Safety Loan Program (11/3/92)	2007A	9,695,228	9,357,731	2027	$305,304,772 [1]
Steinhart Aquarium Improvement (11/7/95)	2005F	29,245,000	26,140,000	2025	
Affordable Housing Bonds (11/5/96)	2001C	17,000,000	1,510,000	2010	
	2001D	23,000,000	6,420,000	2014	
Educational Facilities - Unified School District (6/3/97)	2003B	29,480,000	23,760,000	2023	
Zoo Facilities Bonds (6/3/97)	2002A	6,210,000	4,775,000	2022	
	2005H	7,505,000	6,705,000	2025	
Laguna Honda Hospital (11/2/99)	2005A	110,000,000	103,785,000	2021	
	2005I	69,000,000	67,220,000	2030	
Neighborhood Recreation and Park (3/7/00)	2001B	14,060,000	1,905,000	2011	
	2003A	20,960,000	16,895,000	2023	
	2004A	68,800,000	59,175,000	2024	
California Academy of Sciences Improvement (3/7/00)	2004B	8,075,000	6,945,000	2024	
	2005E	79,370,000	70,950,000	2025	
Branch Library Facilities Improvement (11/7/00)	2001E	17,665,000	1,575,000	2010	
	2002B	23,135,000	17,790,000	2022	
	2005G	34,000,000	30,400,000	2025	
	2008A	31,065,000	31,065,000	2028	
Clean & Safe Neighborhood Parks (2/5/08)	2008B	42,520,000	42,520,000	2028	142,480,000
SUB TOTALS		**$657,845,228**	**$531,202,731**		**447,784,772**
General Obligation Refunding Bonds Series 2002-R1 issued 4/23/02		$118,945,000	$70,640,000	2013	
General Obligation Refunding Bonds Series 2004-R1 issued 6/16/04		$21,930,000	$3,795,000	2014	
General Obligation Refunding Bonds Series 2006-R1 issued 10/31/06		$90,690,000	$86,440,000	2020	
General Obligation Refunding Bonds Series 2006-R2 issued 12/18/06		$66,565,000	$57,960,000	2019	
General Obligation Refunding Bonds Series 2008-R1 issued 5/29/08		$232,075,000	$232,075,000	2021	
General Obligation Refunding Bonds Series 2008-R2 issued 5/29/08		$39,320,000	$39,320,000	2018	
General Obligation Refunding Bonds Series 2008-R3 issued 7/30/08		$118,130,000	$118,130,000	2030	
TOTALS		**$1,345,500,228**	**$1,139,562,731**		**$447,784,772**

[1] Of the $35,000,000 authorized by the Board of Supervisors in February 2007, $9,695,228 has been drawn upon to date pursuant to the Credit Agreement described under "General Obligation Bonds Authorized but Unissued."

Source: Office of Public Finance, City and County of San Francisco.

Attachment 2

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Statement of Bond Redemption and Interest
General Obligation
Fiscal Year 2008-2009

Bond Description	Principal	Interest	Total
GENERAL CITY			
1992 Golden Gate Park Improvements, Series 2001A	$ 740,000	$ 92,400	$ 832,400
1994 UMB Program - Seismic Safety, Series 2007A	296,743	514,971	811,714
1994 UMB Program - Seismic Safety, Series 2007A 4ht draw (Estimate)	709,307	123,333	832,640
1994 UMB Program - Seismic Safety, Series 2007A 5th draw (Estimate)	26,039	25,400	51,439
1995 Steinhart Aquarium Improvement, Series 2005F	1,065,000	1,219,663	2,284,663
1996 Affordable Housing, Series 2001C	740,000	61,170	801,170
1996 Affordable Housing, Series 2001D	910,000	426,088	1,336,088
1997 San Francisco Unified School District, Series 2003B	1,225,000	901,100	2,126,100
1997 Zoo Facilities, Series 2002A	270,000	180,333	450,333
1997 Zoo Facilities, Series 2005H	275,000	312,850	587,850
1999 Laguna Honda Hospital, Series 2005A	6,465,000	5,067,538	11,532,538
1999 Laguna Honda Hospital, Series 2005B,C,D	-	6,965,515	6,965,515
1999 Laguna Honda Hospital, Series 2005I	1,855,000	3,043,131	4,898,131
2000 Branch Library Facilities Improvement, Series 2001E	770,000	63,000	833,000
2000 Branch Library Facilities Improvement, Series 2002B	1,005,000	671,906	1,676,906
2000 Branch Library Facilities Improvement, Series 2005G	1,240,000	1,418,506	2,658,506
2000 Branch Library Facilities Improvement, Series 2008A	915,000	1,459,013	2,374,013
2000 California Academy of Sciences, Series 2004B	305,000	312,838	617,838
2000 California Academy of Sciences, Series 2005E	2,890,000	3,310,531	6,200,531
2000 Neighborhood Recreation and Park Facilities Improvement, 2001B	610,000	76,200	686,200
2000 Neighborhood Recreation and Park Facilities Improvement, 2003A	875,000	640,676	1,515,676
2000 Neighborhood Recreation and Park Facilities Improvement, 2004A	2,590,000	2,665,219	5,255,219
2007 Neighborhood Recreation and Park Facilities Improvement, 2008A (Estimate)	1,080,000	2,357,093	3,437,093
2002 General Obligation Bond Refunding, Series 2002 R1	18,350,000	3,128,313	21,478,313
2004 General Obligation Bond Refunding, Series 2004 R1	-	151,800	151,800
2004 General Obligation Bond Refunding, Series 2006 R1	5,045,000	3,842,900	8,887,900
2004 General Obligation Bond Refunding, Series 2006 R2	10,535,000	2,221,823	12,756,823
2004 General Obligation Bond Refunding, Series 2008 R1	44,595,000	10,769,188	55,364,188
2004 General Obligation Bond Refunding, Series 2008 R2	2,595,000	2,024,381	4,619,381
SUB-TOTAL GENERAL CITY	$ 107,977,089	$ 54,046,879	$ 162,023,968
OUTSIDE CITY ANNUAL BUDGET			
SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT (SFCCD)			
2001 Community College District, Series 2002	$ 1,085,000	$ 1,649,156	$ 2,734,156
2001 Community College District, Series 2004	4,340,000	4,552,825	8,892,825
2001 Community College District, Series 2006	1,110,000	2,135,788	3,245,788
2005 Community College District, Series 2006	2,125,000	4,041,446	6,166,446
2005 Community College District, Series 2007	2,600,000	7,857,065	10,457,065
2005 Community College District, Series 2008 (Estimate)	385,000	802,533	1,187,533
SUB-TOTAL SF COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT	$ 11,645,000	$ 21,038,813	$ 32,683,813
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (SFUSD)			
2003 Unified School District, Series 2004	$ 2,290,000	$ 2,044,163	$ 4,334,163
2003 Unified School District, Series 2005	4,720,000	5,577,944	10,297,944
2003 Unified School District, Series 2006	3,245,000	3,912,994	7,157,994
2006 Unified School District, Series 2007	3,355,000	4,127,775	7,482,775
2006 Unified School District, Series 2008 (Estimate)	2,950,000	6,350,000	9,300,000
SUB-TOTAL SF UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	$ 16,560,000	$ 22,012,876	$ 38,572,876
BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT (BART)			
2004 BART Earthquake Safety Bonds	$ 252,300	$ 545,203	$ 797,503
2008 BART Earthquake Safety Bonds	5,942,100	5,582,957	11,525,057
	$ 6,194,400	$ 6,128,160	$ 12,322,560
SUB-TOTAL SFCCD, SFUSD AND BART	$ 34,399,400	$ 49,179,849	$ 83,579,249
TOTAL GENERAL OBLIGATION - GENERAL CITY, SFCCD, SFUSD AND BART	$ 142,376,489	$ 103,226,728	$ 245,603,217

O= GAO Clerk

2007-08 Civil Grand Jury Report – Mayor's Office of Housing

HOMELESS HAVE HOMES, BUT THEY RE STILL ON THE STREET

California Penal Code Sections 933.05(a) and (b) requires the responding party to report for each recommendation of the Civil Grand Jury ***one*** *of the following actions:*

1. **Recommendation Implemented** - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action	2. **Will Be Implemented in the Future** - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation	3. **Requires Further Analysis** - Explanation - Timeframe (Not to exceed six months from date of publication of grand jury report)	4. **Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable** - Explanation

For each recommendation below, indicate which action you have taken or plan to take and provide the required information.

Recommendation	Responses Required From:	Response: 1, 2, 3, or 4
2. The City should order that comprehensive cost/benefit analysis be performed on current supportive housing programs to include: (A) costs of the supportive programs for various homeless populations compared to the cost avoidance through reduced use of emergency services, hospitals, jails, etc., and (B) comparative analysis of specific programs and supportive housing models to assess reasons that the cost of providing supportive housing differs substantially between different programs that seem equally successful in outcome.	Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Human Services Agency, Department of Public Health, Mayor's Office of Housing, Mayor's Office of Community Development, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency.	3. The Citywide Loan Committee currently requires cost comparisons for capital funding. MOH will work with DPH and HSA to determine if a more comprehensive analysis involving service and operating comparison can be incorporated to assess 2B. MOH's timeframe will be based on the research that DPH and HSA are currently undertaking.
4. The City should develop performance criteria for its supportive housing programs that emphasize inputs (e.g., intake criteria, building operating costs, and capital construction costs or master lease payments) and outcomes (in particular, housing retention rates, reduction in use of emergency services and increase in client incomes).	Human Services Agency, Department of Public Health, Mayor's Office of Housing, Mayor's Office of Community Development, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, Department of Children, Youth and their Families	2. The Citywide Loan Committee currently requires cost comparisons for capital projects that analyzes and makes decisions based on operating and capital funding. DPH and HSA already measure outcomes and MOH will work with those agencies to incorporate these criteria into our long-range planning (6 months)
5. The City should require non-profits and city agencies to benchmark their performance against each other, against the private sector and against non-profits which operate without significant government funding.	Human Services Agency, Department of Public Health, Mayor's Office of Housing, Mayor's Office of Community Development, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, Department of Children, Youth and their Families	1. MOH currently does measure operating and capital costs from sponsor to sponsor. To our knowledge there are not any local private companies that that provide comparable services without government funding.
6. City Department and Agencies should base decisions about renewing or terminating supportive housing contracts solely on the outcomes of the enhanced performance measures.	Human Services Agency, Department of Public Health, Mayor's Office of Housing, Mayor's Office of Community Development, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency,	4. MOH does not award service contracts directly for supportive housing. MOH works with DPH and HSA to support their approach to

9/8/2008

10/7

2007-08 Civil Grand Jury Report – Mayor's Office of Housing

HOMELESS HAVE HOMES, BUT THEY RE STILL ON THE STREET

California Penal Code Sections 933.05(a) and (b) requires the responding party to report for each recommendation of the Civil Grand Jury ***one*** *of the following actions:*

1. **Recommendation Implemented** - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action	2. **Will Be Implemented in the Future** - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation	3. **Requires Further Analysis** - Explanation - Timeframe (Not to exceed six months from date of publication of grand jury report)	4. **Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable** - Explanation

For each recommendation below, indicate which action you have taken or plan to take and provide the required information.

Recommendation	Responses Required From:	Response: 1, 2, 3, or 4
	Department of Children, Youth and their Families, Department on the Status of Women	accountability on services.
7. City Departments and Agencies should simplify reporting requirements for non-profit service providers and develop a computerized tracking system to help monitor homeless housing clients, in line with the recommendations of the controller's April 2008 Care Not Cash audit.	Department of Telecommunications and Information Systems, Office of the Controller, Human Services Agency, Department of Public Health, Mayor's Office of Housing, Mayor's Office of Community Development, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, Department of Children, Youth and their Families	4. MOH does not directly contract with service providers for supportive housing.
8. The city should create a computerized tracking system with an individual identification number of each homeless housing client, which would be linked with a medical case management system now in use by the Department of Public Health.	Department of Telecommunications and Information Systems, Office of the Controller, Human Services Agency, Department of Public Health, Mayor's Office of Housing, Mayor's Office of Community Development, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, Department of Children, Youth and their Families	4. MOH does not case manage or directly track homeless individuals. MOH supports tracking models that DPH and HSA employ.

081137 10/7

3

Lloyd W. SCHLOEGEL

BOARD of Supervisors
City of SAN FRANCISCO
SAN FRANCISCO. CALIF.

September 16, 2008

Testimony for BOARD of Supervisors HEARING on Appeal of FINAL Supplemented ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT for the PROPOSED CENTRAL SUBWAY SYSTEM PROJECT. OPPOSING VIEW.
081137, ITEM 20, BOARD AGENDA Sep 16, 2008

The proposed Central Subway System would connect FOURTH AND KING STREETS AND approximately UNION Street North of Chinatown. Several alternative Routes are proposed. The Stockton street section would go through the Solid Rock structure under the Stockton Street tunnel and would weaken this system. The FOURTH STREET underground section surfaces at about HARRISON STREET. The proposal to dig an underground tunnel on this Route is dangerous in a geological sense, expensive and unnecessary.

An alternative proposal for this project would follow the Trolley Car line on the Embarcadero out to about Pacific or Broadway avenues North of Chinatown. The passengers would then take a bus to go into the city or to Chinatown. If the passengers must make a bus connection here, the expected savings in travel time may be lost.

Letter to Board of Supervisors Regarding FSEIR
for Central Subway System in San Francisco.
September 16, 2008

The problem of moving people to this area can be more easily solved by introducing a new Muni TRANSIT ROUTE utilizing the existing trolley line on the Embarcadero and the circular bus Route from the Embarcadero. This does not involve the expensive and destructive digging of channels.

Two-car trains on the Embarcadero line would solve most of the problem for carrying a large volume of passengers.

The estimated travel time by Bus from about FOURTH AND TOWNSEND Street to BROADWAY, North of Chinatown, is about 11.8 minutes now, according to the EIR, page 5-15. This time requirement would increase to 17.0 minutes by the year 2030. The underground travel times over this Route would be about five to seven minutes.

It is possible that seventy percent of the passengers would only want to travel between Market Street and Union Street North of Chinatown, about fourteen blocks.

This entire costly boondoggle is for the purpose of saving ten minutes of travel time on the existing surface bus system. It also disturbs two good streets that are presently well served by five or more City Bus LINES.

THE SEIR is not adequate because it fails to discuss this alternative which seems to be the most favored, the least expensive, the most feasible, and the easiest to put into operation.
I find the proposal for an underground system to be unnecessary and detrimental to the long-term interests of the City. I urge you to drop this idea.

L. Hoag
September 16, 2008

10/7

4

City and County of San Francisco

Office of the Controller – City Services Auditor

AIRPORT COMMISSION:

Compliance Audit of AirTran Airways, Inc.

September 17, 2008

4

CONTROLLER'S OFFICE
CITY SERVICES AUDITOR

The City Services Auditor was created within the Controller's Office through an amendment to the City Charter that was approved by voters in November 2003. Under Appendix F to the City Charter, the City Services Auditor has broad authority for:

- Reporting on the level and effectiveness of San Francisco's public services and benchmarking the city to other public agencies and jurisdictions.
- Conducting financial and performance audits of city departments, contractors, and functions to assess efficiency and effectiveness of processes and services.
- Operating a whistleblower hotline and website and investigating reports of waste, fraud, and abuse of city resources.
- Ensuring the financial integrity and improving the overall performance and efficiency of city government.

The audits unit conducts financial audits, attestation engagements, and performance audits. Financial audits address the financial integrity of both city departments and contractors and provide reasonable assurance about whether financial statements are presented fairly in all material aspects in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles. Attestation engagements examine, review, or perform procedures on a broad range of subjects such as internal controls; compliance with requirements of specified laws, regulations, rules, contracts, or grants; and the reliability of performance measures. Performance audits focus primarily on assessment of city services and processes, providing recommendations to improve department operations.

We conduct our audits in accordance with the Government Auditing Standards published by the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO). These standards require:

- Independence of audit staff and the audit organization.
- Objectivity of the auditors performing the work.
- Competent staff, including continuing professional education.
- Quality control procedures to provide reasonable assurance of compliance with the auditing standards.

Audit Team: Elisa Sullivan, Audit Manager
Edwin De Jesus, Associate Auditor

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

Ben Rosenfield
Controller

Monique Zmuda
Deputy Controller

September 17, 2008

San Francisco Airport Commission
P.O. Box 8097
San Francisco International Airport
San Francisco, CA 94128-8097

President and Members:

The Controller's Office, City Services Auditor, presents its report concerning the compliance audit of AirTran Airways, Inc. (AirTran). AirTran has an airline operating permit from the Airport Commission of the City and County of San Francisco to use the landing facilities at the San Francisco International Airport for its air transportation business.

Reporting Period: July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2007

Landing Fees Paid: $897,817

Results:

AirTran reported 2,136 revenue aircraft landings, and paid $897,817 in landing fees to the Airport. However, it did not comply with certain provisions of its permit by not keeping complete records of its Airport operations (for a period of five years after the termination of its permit) and by reporting its aircraft departures instead of its aircraft arrivals. Further, although we found that AirTran reported 13 more aircraft landings to the Airport than the total landings reflected in its monthly summary of daily aircraft landings, we were not able to verify the reason for the over reported landings due to the lack of detailed records.

AirTran's response and the Airport's response are attached to this report. The Controller's Office, City Services Auditor, will work with the Airport to follow up on the status of the recommendations made in this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert J. Tarsia

Robert Tarsia
Deputy Audit Director

cc: Mayor
Board of Supervisors
Civil Grand Jury
Budget Analyst
Public Library

INTRODUCTION

Audit Authority

The Office of the Controller (Controller) has authority under the San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 10, Article 1, Section 10.6-2 to audit, at regular intervals, all leases of city-owned real property where rent of $100,000 or more a year is to be paid to the City. In addition, the City Charter provides the Controller, City Services Auditor (CSA), with broad authority to conduct audits. We conducted this audit under that authority and pursuant to an audit plan agreed to by the Controller and the Airport.

Background

AirTran Airways, Inc. (AirTran) has an airline operating permit from the Airport Commission (Commission) of the City and County of San Francisco to use the landing facilities at the San Francisco International Airport (SFO) for AirTran's air transportation business. The permit, which commenced on November 1, 2003, requires AirTran to submit to the Airport Department (Airport) a monthly report showing AirTran's actual revenue aircraft landings by aircraft type and other landing data necessary to calculate the landing fees. The Airport charges AirTran a landing fee based on the maximum landing weight of its revenue aircraft landings at SFO. These landings are those for which AirTran has received or made a monetary fee or charge. For every 1,000 pounds of aircraft landed, the Commission sets a fee that it may change annually. During our audit period, the Airport's fee per 1,000 pounds was $3.214 for fiscal year 2004-05, $3.213 for fiscal year 2005-06, and $3.336 for fiscal year 2006-07.

Scope and Methodology

The purpose of this audit was to determine if AirTran complied with the reporting and payment provisions of its operating permit. Our audit period was from July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2007.

To conduct the audit, we examined the applicable terms of AirTran's permit, and the adequacy of its procedures for recording, summarizing, and reporting revenue aircraft landings. We tested whether AirTran accurately reported its revenue aircraft landings and the maximum landing weights of its aircraft landed at SFO. We also determined whether AirTran had any outstanding payments due to the Airport for the audit period.

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

AUDIT RESULTS

AirTran Did Not Comply With Certain Provisions of Its Operating Permit

From July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2007, AirTran reported 2,136 revenue aircraft landings and paid $897,817 in landing fees to the Airport. The exhibit below shows AirTran's total reported revenue aircraft landings and the associated landing fees.

EXHIBIT **Number of Reported Landings and Landing Fees Paid July 1, 2004, Through June 30, 2007**

Period/Aircraft Type	Landing Weight (in lbs)	# of Landings	Total Landing Weight (in lbs)	Rate per 1,000 lbs	Landing Fees Due
July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005					
717-200	102,000	1	102,000	3.214	$ 328
737NG	128,000	478	61,184,000	3.214	196,645
A-320	142,000	135	19,170,000	3.214	61,612
July 1, 2005, through June 30, 2006					
737NG	128,000	678	86,784,000	3.213	278,837
July 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007					
737NG	128,000	844	108,032,000	3:336	360,395
Total		**2,136**	**275,272,000**		**$897,817**

Source: Airport reports on landing fees and aircraft landings.

AirTran did not comply with certain provisions of its operating permit by not keeping complete records of its operations at the Airport. In particular, AirTran was unable to provide us its Operational Performance Summary reports that it used to prepare the Monthly Air Traffic Activity Reports (MATARs) submitted to the Airport during the audit period. In addition, AirTran could not provide documentation of the cancelled flights, which AirTran's station manager said could possibly explain the difference in the reported aircraft landings and the landings on its monthly summary report. AirTran's operating permit requires it to maintain records pertaining to its operations at the Airport for a period of five years after the termination of its permit. According to AirTran's station manager, AirTran keeps records in its system for only 90 days. She further stated that this is in compliance with the Federal Aviation Administration's regulations.

AirTran Made Minor Errors in Reporting Aircraft Landings

When we compared the MATARs submitted to the Airport to AirTran's monthly summary reports, we found that AirTran reported 13 more aircraft landings to the Airport than it had on its monthly summary reports. According to AirTran's station manager, when preparing the MATARs, AirTran used a report of aircraft departures instead of aircraft landings. However, AirTran's operating permit requires it to report revenue aircraft arrivals, upon which its landing fees are based. AirTran's Station Manager further stated that AirTran does not keep aircraft at the Airport and that for every departure there must be a landing. However, we believe the monthly departure report may not be an accurate record of AirTran's aircraft landings, because it could include non-revenue landings. As a result of the lack of detailed records, we are unable to verify and document the cause of the discrepancies.

Recommendations

The Airport should take the following actions:

1. Require AirTran to keep all records pertaining to its operations for five years after the termination of its permit, and in particular those records that will support the information reported on its MATARs.

2. Advise AirTran to prepare its MATARs using aircraft landing reports instead of departure reports, and to document its non-revenue landings, if any.

ATTACHMENT: AIRPORT RESPONSE

San Francisco International Airport

P.O. Box 8097
San Francisco, CA 94128
Tel 650.821.5000
Fax 650.821.5005
www.flysfo.com

August 26, 2008

Mr. Robert Tarsia
Deputy Audit Director
City Hall, Room 476
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Subject: AirTran Airways, Inc.

Dear Robert:

The Airport agrees on the audit findings and will implement the recommendations per the attached audit response and recommendation form.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at (650) 821-4533.

Sincerely,

Teresa Rivor
Senior Property Manager
Aviation Management

Attachment

Recommendation	Responsible Agency	Response
1. The Airport should require AirTran to keep all records pertaining to its operations for five years after the termination of its permit.	Aviation Management	Agree. Upon formal distribution of report to tenant, staff will prepare letter requiring tenant to comply with operating permit.
2. The Airport should advise AirTran to prepare its MATARs using aircraft landing reports instead of departure reports, and to document its non-revenue landings, if any.	Aviation Management	Agree. Upon formal distribution of report to tenant, staff will prepare letter requiring tenant to copy with Operating Permit.

ATTACHMENT: AIRTRAN RESPONSE

Comments provided via email.

1. AirTran does have copies of all MATARs since AirTran began service to SFO. However, the MATAR does not have a section for the documentation of tail numbers. A list of our fleet tail numbers for our 737 aircraft is available from our system SOC in Orlando.
2. AirTran will prepare the MATAR using landing reports; however, I must mention that AirTran does not house any aircraft here at SFO, thus for every departure there is a landing.
3. Current AirTran Station Management has implemented an Excel spreadsheet to document tail numbers and landings, where the SFO MATAR does not.

Danielle Thomas
AirTran Station Manager

10/7

5

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2008 SEP 17 AM 11:03
BY

September 8, 2008

Dear Mayor, Members of the City Council and Members of the SFMTA Board,

I take M-line inbound from Beverly & 19th Ave to Downtown every day. I take M-line outbound from _____ to _____ every _____

I **oppose** the Transportation Effectiveness Project (TEP)'s proposal (M-line's last stop will be at San Francisco State University) because

It causes me more time to wait

I suggest that M continues its current route
I would like the #26 bus to be reinstated
its old route as soon as possible.

Please listen to the M-line riders' concerns. We need your help to stop shortening the M-line. Thank you very much for your attention.

Yours sincerely

(FENG AI TAN)

Address: [redacted]

5

09-15-08

(of board of Supervisors / council)

Dear Mayor, Members of the City and Members of the SFMTA Broad.

I am the resident in Ocean View District I am living on Chester avenue the across street is 19th ave I have been living in this area over eight years. when I first moved to here the transportation was very good. I always took M to go to work and if missed the M or the M was out of service I had Bus # 26 to take or when the M was slow on Saturday I also went to the 19th & junipero serra stop to catch bus # 26 to go to baboa Bart station to take Bart to go to work. That was the most efftive ride. It saved time and used only monthly fast pass. When I arrived home if the M was left I always took bus 26 from Geneva San Jose stop. It just took me 10 to 12 minutes to arrive home. Occasionally the M lines stopped over the Broad Street and Plymouth ST and it returned back to SF state. We had to get off there. I just walked 1 block to San Jose Ave and caught the bus #26 then I could still connect to Bart. For the other direction too, when we took M from West Portal if M dumped us at SF state and the M needed return to downtown I still could jump on bus # 26 to arrive home. On the both direction Bus #26 was very helpful and convenience.

However from the past three years the Muni stopped the bus #26 running in our neighborhoods. M street car was running late Almost every day that we had problems waiting for M to arrive even longer we didn't even have a alterative bus to take by the time we were waiting for the M to come it said "out of service " It made us very frustrated we all got stuck because there was no other options for us. I was force to either to go to SF State to catch bus 28 or 28 limited (because the 28 limited wont stop on the junipero serra stop that is another issues) to go Daly City Bart station to pay more money to get Bart ticket to go downtown or if I didn't have enough time I had to catch taxi at Bart station and that is the only place I can catch taxi without waiting very long. The other ways I used a lot When I did these, I almost had a heart attacked I ran very quickly from Chester St to St Charles St passed the ramp from brotherhood way and alemany St to go to the Daly City Bart. I was late for work so many times already. I complained so many times either by calling 311 or I even talked to the MUNI supervisor William Mary, nothing had been changed and now even MUNI wanted to replace J from M it will even create more trouble for us. I totally disagreed with TEP proposal and I want the Bus 26 to be back to SF State as soon as possible. We can not wait any more

and 19TH Ave Bus Stop →

We want the Bus # 26 to be back to S F State via Brotherdood now.

Do you really have some one who can actually go out to see to find out how frustrated we are at now? To investigating these matters thoroughly? To discovered all these kind of problems that we are encountering now? We are totally isolated and we had talked to MUNI Staffs at OMI meeting on 05-29-08 Thursday night TEP meeting. We had 300

people to expresses our concerns. MUNI ignored our true voices It is very disappointed to know that MUNI is going to eliminate bus # 26 in their TEP proposal. We are located in a very busy area, the exit of brotherhood way and 280 free way but no other alterative buses to take, Can you believe It? If you were one of us, how do you feel and how do you think?

When I see the bus 26 just waiting in Baboa Bart station for returning back to Downtown. Why doesn't Muni prolong a few more stops to SF State like before that save us a lot of troubles and problems. We have Seniors, Working people, Students form SF State, Students to Phelan Campus, By cycle riders as well,(no bicycles are allowed on any street cars) we all need **# 26 bus to be reinstated back to SF State Terminal AS SOON AS POSSIBLE** Thank you!

"No change on M Please Reinstate bus # 26 as soon as possible"

Sincerely your

Jessica Luong

Also if an emergence occur, we need to go Downtown or some where else after 1:00 AM morning we still need to go SF State to catch Owl # bus 91. Does MUNI has a closer stop for our neighborhoods ? A lot of us do not drive and we all need transportation. Thank you

(Dept from Chester To work potrero and 16 TH Street)

San Francisco Mayors Office
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

6 10/7

September 15, 2008

To who it may concern,

I have lived in San Francisco for 19 years and I have depended on MUNI to get me to my jobs during that time. At first it was by using the 38 Geary, then I moved, and used the 24 Divisadero and 38 Geary, and now I have used the 19 Polk and the N Juda for the last ten years. In all that time my experience with MUNI has been tolerable, never great, never good, just tolerable.

MUNI is unreliable, the trains and buses are dirty, it's employees are mostly rude and indifferent, it's response to customers concerns is practically nonexistent.

Granted there are a few MUNI employees that are quiet good, there is one train operator on the N Juda who announces every up coming stop, and is polite to every passenger, though from my experience this is very atypical. Having to deal with the other 95% of MUNI employees who are rude, sarcastic and indifferent is what I will more often than not remember about MUNI.

Today around 4:00 p.m. there was a problem on the N Juda line between 19th Avenue and Hillway, when I boarded a motor coach (#6273) that was stopped at Irving and 2nd Avenue heading inbound the driver (#1355) was asked by nearly every passenger, where she was going. This drivers response to nearly every passenger was "I don't know". I should have been surprised, but really wasn't, it was so typical of what I'd come to expect from MUNI – *The driver of the MUNI bus didn't even know where she was going!*

Before MUNI starts asking for any fair increases they really need to work at improving their service; here are three simple things MUNI can work at improving system wide:

1. Customer service training for all drivers and station agents, they should know the routes and provide information to the passengers without sarcasm or rudeness.

2. Clean the trains and buses, the floors are grimy and filthy and the walls and ceilings are covered with graffiti.

3. Announce all stops for trains and buses, and the buses should pull all the way to the curb to let passengers board and disembark.

I have little expectations that MUNI can or will improve at any of the above, but I thought I'd at least share the experiences I've had with MUNI and its employees while I have lived in San Francisco.

Sincerely,

R.J. Thorsen

6

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

7

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 15, 2008

To: Members of the Board of Supervisors

From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board Madeleine Licavoli

Subject: Form 700

This is to inform you that the following individuals have submitted a Form 700 Statement of Economic Interests to my office.

- David Noyola, Legislative Assistant to Supervisor Peskin
- David Owen, Legislative Assistant to Supervisor Peskin

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2008 SEP 16 AM 10: 38
BY

BOARD of SUPERVISORS

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

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 17, 2008

To: Members of the Board of Supervisors

From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Subject: Form 700

This is to inform you that the following individuals have submitted a Form 700 Statement of Economic Interests to my office:

- Luke Klipp, Legislative Assistant to Supervisor Sandoval

10/7

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

8

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 15, 2008

To: Members of the Board of Supervisors

From: for Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board Madeleine Licavoli

Subject: Conflict of Interest Code Review

The Political Reform Act requires every local government agency to review its conflict-of-interest code biennially. Each agency must submit to the Board of Supervisors, a notice indicating whether or not an amendment is necessary by October 1, 2008.

This is to inform you that the following City departments and agencies have submitted their conflict-of-interest code notice to my office:

- Citizen's Counsel Obligation Board Oversight Committee
- Department of Children, Youth and Their Families
- Department of Environment
- Department of Public Works
- Department of Technology
- Fine Arts Museum
- Fire Department
- Health Service System
- Landmark Preservation Advisory Board
- Law Library
- Office District Attorney
- Office of Assessor-Recorder
- Office of Economic and Workforce Development
- Office of the City Administrator/General Services Agency
- Police Department
- Public Library
- Public Utilities Commission
- Taxi Commission

c: Andrew Shen, Deputy City Attorney

8

BOARD of SUPERVISORS

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

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 16, 2008

To: Members of the Board of Supervisors

From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Subject: Conflict of Interest Code Review

The Political Reform Act requires every local government agency to review its conflict of interest code biennially. Each agency must submit to the Board of Supervisors a notice indicating whether or not an amendment is necessary by October 1, 2008.

This is to inform you that the following City departments and agencies have submitted their conflict of interest code notice to my office:

- San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

10/7

9

DEAR BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.

I'M WRITING TO URGE YOU TO CONTINUE TO SUPPORT AND IMPLEMENT COMMUNITY CHOICE ENERGY AGGREGATION. THIS WILL ~~&~~ CREATE THE LARGEST URBAN SOLAR FACILITY IN THE WORLD RIGHT HERE IN S.F. PLEASE ~~TAKE LEADERSHIP~~ TO ENSURE CCA HAS ADEQUATE RESOURCES AND HAS PROFESSIONAL, INDEPENDENT OVERSIGHT.

THANK YOU

Kathy Bardon

23 Letters

9

San Francisco
ATTN: Board of Supervisors

I'm writing to urge you to continue to support and implement to support and implement Community Choice Energy Aggregation. This will create the largest urban solar facility in the world right here in San Francisco. Please take leadership to ensure CCA has adequate resources and has professional, independent oversight.

Thank you
Sita Shapiro

Kathleen Aguilera

Kathleen Aguilera > Solar Power Now!

We want solar power Now!!

Amy Powell, San Fracisco, CA

Dear Supervisors

I'd love to all solar panels on public rooftops - please support community choice energy.

Thank you!

Ryan Bell

Dear Board of Supervisors,
I support Solar Energy
Marcus Ronald

I support Community

Choice Energy

Carol

Dear Board of Supervisor,

I'm writing to urge you to continue to support and implement Community choice & Energy Aggregation. This will create the largest urban & solar facility in the world right here in San Francisco. Please take leadership to ensure CCA has adequate resources and has professional, independent oversight.

Thank You

Mein O'Sleppel

Dear Governor & Board of Supervisors

I support solar energy. It is more expensive than fossil fuels.

Dr. Martin Green

Dear Board of Directors,

I'm writing to support Community Choice Energy Aggregation. Please take leadership to ensure CCA has adequate resources for the project.

Thanks,

Luz E. Rodriguez

Please Continue to support the Community Choice Energy Aggregation. We can lead ~~the~~ not only the country but the world right here in San Francisco.

Darren Lees

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I support clean environmental choices. If we think about it, in full detail, it makes the most sense for ourselves, community, children and future. Please understand that our current energy choices are destructive and will drastically impact our future generations. Please invest in cleaner energy practices.

Thank you!

Julia Zukerman

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to encourage you to continue to support and implement Community Choice Energy Aggregation. This will create the largest urban solar facility in the world right here in San Francisco. Please take leadership to ensure CCA with adequate resources and with professional, independent oversight.

Thanks so much! Anne Szczynski

Dear Boardperson

Please support Community choice Energy.

Jane Williams

DEAR BOARD of SUPERVISORS:

I SUPPORT COMMUNITY CHOICE ENERGY AGGREGATION.

THANK YOU
BRIAN CARROSCIO

Dear Supervisors,

I support Community Choice Energy.

Sincerely,

8/3/08

To: Board of Supervisors

From: Dennis Ivans

Please consider implementing the Community Choice Energy Aggregation Program.

Dennis Ivans

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to say you to continue to support and implement Community Choice Energy Aggregation. This will create the largest urban solar facility in the world might here in San Francisco.

Please take leadership to assure CCA has adequate resources and has professional, independent oversight.

Thanks so much.

MALGORZATA WARNICKA

Dear Board of Supervisors

I support giving energy, and all efforts to keep the full effects of Global Warming from transforming our planet into a downward extinction

Robert Villee

DEAR BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, I'M WRITING TO URGE YOU TO CONTINUE TO SUPPORT & IMPLEMENT COMMUNITY CHOICE ENERGY AGGREGATION.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I support Community Choice Energy.

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to continue to support & implement Comm. Choice Energy Aggregation.

~~The~~ San Francisco needs to continue to be a progressive example for the state & nation & lead the way towards green energy.

Thanks.

Allie Ganzon.

Dear Supervisors:
I am pro-solar. This state + S.F. need to move in that direction Now!!

Dave McDonnell

081133
cc: BOS

10/7

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2008 SEP 17 PM 1:12

10

From Judy West

Sept 15, 2008

To the Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

Re: Appeal of Planning Commission August 7, 2008 Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Project, Planning Case No. 2004.0160E; and adoption of Environmental Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations – Motion Nos 17659 & 17661, respectively. BOS Files 081133 – 081136

I would like this letter to provide additional Basis for the Appeals of the Certification of the Final EIR for the Eastern Neighborhoods, made by the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods and the South of Market Action Committee.

The EIR as prepared by the City staff was not adequate in assessing the environmental impacts of zoning changes to existing property in the M-1 zoning districts.

1) **There was no review of the Liquefaction Hazard Zones** as required by the California Seismic Hazard Mapping Act (Calif. Public Resource Code Section 2690-2699.6).

The Initial Scoping Study for the EIR released Dec 17, 2005 determined that this issue would not be discussed in the EIR because "seismic hazards of subsequent development would be alleviated through the DBI requirement for a geotechnical report and implementation of the Building Code" (page 49).

However, the proposed rezoning makes it more difficult for property owners to perform seismic retrofits to existing property, than the existing zoning, and the environmental impacts to private property and historic resources were not discussed. Much of the affected area was developed a century ago, with deteriorated buildings, in known Seismic Hazard Areas, proposed to no longer allow uses, which would trigger seismic upgrades to existing structures in the existing codes.

2) **There was no review of the actual, existing land uses in the affected project area** (in particular the location of existing residential uses in industrial zoning districts), as compared to the proposed land use changes. The proposed zoning was compared to existing zoning, but not to existing conditions. The proposed zoning will create widespread, non-conforming uses, but there was never an analysis of where or to what extent the proposed non-conforming uses would be.

Recent court rulings have confirmed that the Baseline must be premised on actual conditions and not simply compared against current zoning. Note:
Woodward Park Homeowners Assoc v. City of Fresno (5 Dist. 2007) 149 CalApp.4th 892
St. Vincent's Schoff for Boys v. City of San Rafael (1 Dist. 2008) 161 Cal.App.4th 989

Respectfully submitted,

Judy West
Environmental Assessor

10

From Judy West

Sept 15, 2008

To the Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

Re: Appeal of Planning Commission August 7, 2008 Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Project, Planning Case No. 2004.0160E; and adoption of Environmental Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations – Motion Nos 17659 & 17661, respectively.
BOS Files 081133 – 081136

File #081133

I would like this letter to provide additional Basis for the Appeals of the Certification of the Final EIR for the Eastern Neighborhoods, made by the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods and the South of Market Action Committee.

The EIR as prepared by the City staff was not adequate in assessing the environmental impacts of zoning changes to existing property in the M-1 zoning districts.

1) **There was no review of the Liquefaction Hazard Zones** as required by the California Seismic Hazard Mapping Act (Calif. Public Resource Code Section 2690-2699.6).

The Initial Scoping Study for the EIR released Dec 17, 2005 determined that this issue would not be discussed in the EIR because "seismic hazards of subsequent development would be alleviated through the DBI requirement for a geotechnical report and implementation of the Building Code" (page 49).

However, the proposed rezoning makes it more difficult for property owners to perform seismic retrofits to existing property, than the existing zoning, and the environmental impacts to private property and historic resources were not discussed. Much of the affected area was developed a century ago, with deteriorated buildings, in known Seismic Hazard Areas, proposed to no longer allow uses, which would trigger seismic upgrades to existing structures in the existing codes.

2) **There was no review of the actual, existing land uses in the affected project area** (in particular the location of existing residential uses in industrial zoning districts), as compared to the proposed land use changes. The proposed zoning was compared to existing zoning, but not to existing conditions. The proposed zoning will create widespread, non-conforming uses, but there was never an analysis of where or to what extent the proposed non-conforming uses would be.

Recent court rulings have confirmed that the Baseline must be premised on actual conditions and not simply compared against current zoning. Note:
Woodward Park Homeowners Assoc v. City of Fresno (5 Dist. 2007) 149 CalApp.4th 892
St. Vincent's Scholl for Boys v. City of San Rafael (1 Dist. 2008) 161 Cal.App.4th 989

Respectfully submitted,

Judy West
Environmental Assessor

10/7

11

"SFBG Online"

09/17/2008 11:10 AM

To "SFBG Online"

cc

bcc Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV

Subject This week at SFBG: A planning primer for the supes

SFBG
SAN FRANCISCO BAY GUARDIAN ONLINE

A planning primer for the supes

Everyone in town ought to be fighting a developer giveaway that brings the city nothing

Guardian Editorial

EDITORIAL The Eastern Neighborhoods Plan, which comes before the Board of Supervisors this month, is more than a set of rezoning and fee proposals. It's a blueprint for how San Francisco sees its future as a city. When the supervisors are done with it, the plan will either preserve and expand the city's affordable housing stock and protect blue-collar jobs, or it will usher in a vastly expanded land rush for developers who will wipe out small businesses that employ local residents and build tens of thousands of high-end condos for rich single people who work in Silicon Valley.

The stakes couldn't be higher — and not just for the Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market, and Dogpatch districts, but for the entire city. Because if the supervisors can't get this right, the pattern will be set for development that will profoundly change the demographics (and politics) of this city.

Click here for full editorial.

Ms. Norma Soto

Sept. 12, 2008

10/7

(12)

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I am writing today to ask to make animal welfare at the San Francisco Zoo a top priority at your hearings. Please carefully evaluate the practices of the zoo.

I urgently ask that you replace current zoo management with other management who are progressive and who are dedicated to transforming the SF zoo into a rescue and rehabilitation of animals.

Board of Directors, If you can change the SF zoo to be more of a rehabilitation and rescue for the animals, then why dont you?

I trust you will see the urgency in this matter.

thank you. Respectfully,

Norma Soto (12)

Page

File 080818 Sept. 13, 2008
Each Supvs

Dear Sir:

Please hold hearings to carefully evaluate the purpose and practices of the SF Zoo.

Make Animal Welfare concerns a top priority in their evaluation

Put pressure on replacing existing Zoo management with more progressive professionals who are dedicated to transforming the zoo into one that puts the animal needs first. And redefine the Zoo's Mission to focus on rescue and rehabilitation of animals, and not on exploitation and entertainment.

Thank you.

George & Myra Hurst

Riverside-Illinois
60546

10/7

13

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP

LAWYERS

ANCHORAGE BELLEVUE LOS ANGELES NEW YORK PORTLAND SAN FRANCISCO SEATTLE SHANGHAI WASHINGTON, D.C.

JUDITH DROZ KEYES
DIRECT (415)
jkeyes@

SUITE 800
505 MONTGOMERY STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-6533

TEL (415) 276-6500
FAX (415) 276-6599
www.dwt.com

September 16, 2008

Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
1 Carlton B Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I am a resident of San Francisco, a practicing attorney in San Francisco, the daughter of an enlisted man who served honorably in the United States Navy in World War II, and the widow of an officer in the United States Navy who served honorably in Vietnam and who died there because the swift boat he captained was not equipped to withstand enemy fire. The way our city, and our country, treat our men and women in the military, and treat our veterans when they no longer serve in that capacity, is an issue of special importance to me.

I write in support of the appointment of Stephen Noetzel to a position on the San Francisco Veterans Affairs Commission.

We need a commissioner who understand the special challenges and needs of the majority of today's veterans, that is, veterans of Korea and Vietnam, the Gulf War, and Afghanistan and Iraq. We need a commissioner who will work to address these challenges and needs, both for the benefit of the veterans – who deserve nothing less – and for the benefit of our community, which also deserves better than the what we have had. We need Stephen Noetzel.

Stephen Noetzel will bring to the Commission passion and energy, broad experience with, and contacts in, our community, and a deep understanding of the problems our veterans face and ideas for solutions to those problems. We need his leadership.

I urge the nomination of Stephen Noetzel.

Very truly yours,

Judith Droz Keyes

13

10/7

Amy Hart/ADMSVC/SFGOV
09/17/2008 01:19 PM

To Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV
cc tom.ammiano@sfgov.org
bcc
Subject Re: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY

14

Clerk of the Board,

The Office of the Chief Medical Examiner has no direct involvement with the deployment of Police Officers in the City or the processing of suspects.

We continue to be diligent in the processing of sudden, unexpected and violent deaths and laboratory studies in support of Law Enforcement and Legal entities in the City.

Amy P. Hart, M.D
Chief Medical Examiner
Office of the Chief Medical Examiner
850 Bryant Street, North Terrace
San Francisco, California 94103
(415) 553-1799
Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV



Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
09/15/2008 02:58 PM

To Amy.Hart@sfgov.org
cc tom.ammiano@sfgov.org
Subject BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY

For any questions, call the sponsoring supervisor

TO: Amy P Hart
Chief Medical Examiner

FROM: Clerk of the Board
DATE: 9/15/2008
REFERENCE: 20080909-067
FILE NO.

Due Date: 10/12/2008

This is an inquiry from a member of the Board of Supervisors made at the Board

deployed within 60 days of a efficacy test of existing systems. We are now very long overdue. When exactly will the system be installed and what area exactly will it cover?

To the Office of the District Attorney and the SFPD, please explain the disturbing lack of suspects, arrests, and thus successful prosecutions with respect to violence in the Mission.

To the City Attorney, I have been supportive of the gang injunction because it seemed to hold the potential to reduce violence in the Mission. This has not happened yet. Please explain how the injunction has positively impacted the plague of violence in the Mission, and what its future prospects are.

Over the next week, I will be working with the Controller's Office, our Budget Analyst, violence prevention advocates in the community, and the law enforcement to secure any and all necessary funding to ensure that City government and its community partners are appropriately equipped to address the ongoing violence in the Mission.

Additionally, I will be looking for
. money for neighborhood Rec Centers to be open at night
. for more access to vans used by CBOs to provide safe passage out of harm's way to the youth of the Mission
. and a progress report on what drastic and needed changes have been made, since the audit I commissioned, to the City's previously lackluster Workforce development programs, and how workforce development will be retooling its efforts to train the Mission's young people for jobs.

This City has a 6.2 billion dollar budget, and the matter securing money to address violence in the Mission is one of priorities, not of available funds.
There are a wide array of things the City currently spends money on which, under the circumstances, should obviously be prioritized as less urgent than the dedication of any and all resources to confronting the tide of violence in the Mission.

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

Your response to this inquiry is requested by 10/12/2008



Jennifer
Johnston/DHR/SFGOV
09/17/2008 02:41 PM

To Zach Tuller/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV
cc Tom Ammiano/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
bcc
Subject Re: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY, Reference #20080909-030

15

Dear Zach:

I am responding to Supervisor Ammiano's request for information regarding police staffing in the Mission District and other crime prevention efforts by the Mayor's Office, the City Attorney's Office, the District Attorney's Office and other various City stakeholders. While I do not believe that Supervisor Ammiano's inquiries are applicable to the Department of Human Resources, we certainly remain available to assist in any way we can.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Johnston
Chief of Policy
Department of Human Resources
City and County of San Francisco
Phone: 415.557.4932
Fax: 415.557.4919

Jennifer Johnston/DHR/SFGOV

Micki Callahan/DHR/SFGOV

Board of Supervisors
----- Original Message -----

From: Board of Supervisors
Sent: 09/15/2008 02:58 PM PDT
To: Micki Callahan
Cc: Tom Ammiano
Subject: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY

For any questions, call the sponsoring supervisor

TO: Micki Callahan
Human Resources

FROM: Clerk of the Board
DATE: 9/15/2008

REFERENCE: 20080909-030
FILE NO.

Due Date: 10/12/2008

This is an inquiry from a member of the Board of Supervisors made at the Board meeting on 9/9/2008.

Supervisor Ammiano requests the following information:

Inquiring to the District Attorney, City Attorney, Mayor's Office, and All City Departments.

I had a very constructive meeting yesterday with Chief and her Command Staff, together with the Mission Community Response network. We discussed how the SFPD and the CBOs would need to coordinate and share information in the future. My office will continue to facilitate this dialogue until an appropriate level of coordination has become institutionalized the norm amongst all sides of the violence prevention community, community and law enforcement.

In the last few days, we have heard from an alarming number of constituents that the extra officers deployed to patrol the Mission have been on Mission Street, posted in front of locales like the "Foreign Cinema", and Valencia Street bars where little gang violence is known to occur.

Perceptions like these do not help the department's image or efforts to build the prerequisite trust with the community necessary in order to prevent violence and pursue investigations to a fruitful conclusion. Whats more, many officers were assumed to be newer recruits, if for no other reason than who they decided to stop, question, and search. This judgement may have been made in error, but I would like to know who, demographically speaking, from the department has been deployed.

In less turbulent times, Mission station, which has the highest volume of calls of any precinct in the City, has had a staff of 160 officers. Now it has only between 105-110 at any given time. This level of staffing is plainly inadequate. Some precincts without doubt require more staffing than others. We need 50-60 more officers now. There is uniform agreement amongst my constituents that a redeployment of the SFPD's forces to the Mission must happen, and must be sustained for the foreseeable future.

I will not tolerate an abandonment of the Mission after a few days or weeks of what

may be relative calm. The current levels of staffing simply do not insure an acceptable level of safety in the Mission. What sort of redeployment does the Chief envision going forward?

The original promise from the Mayor's office with regard to the installation of a Shotspotter gunfire detection system in the Mission was that one would be deployed within 60 days of a efficacy test of existing systems. We are now very long overdue. When exactly will the system be installed and what area exactly will it cover?

To the Office of the District Attorney and the SFPD, please explain the disturbing lack of suspects, arrests, and thus successful prosecutions with respect to violence in the Mission.

To the City Attorney, I have been supportive of the gang injunction because it seemed to hold the potential to reduce violence in the Mission. This has not happened yet. Please explain how the injunction has positively impacted the plague of violence in the Mission, and what its future prospects are.

Over the next week, I will be working with the Controller's Office, our Budget Analyst, violence prevention advocates in the community, and the law enforcement to secure any and all necessary funding to ensure that City government and its community partners are appropriately equipped to address the ongoing violence in the Mission.

Additionally, I will be looking for
. money for neighborhood Rec Centers to be open at night
. for more access to vans used by CBOs to provide safe passage out of harm's way to the youth of the Mission
. and a progress report on what drastic and needed changes have been made, since the audit I commissioned, to the City's previously lackluster Workforce development programs, and how workforce development will be retooling its efforts to train the Mission's young people for jobs.

This City has a 6.2 billion dollar budget, and the matter securing money to address violence in the Mission is one of priorities, not of available funds.
There are a wide array of things the City currently spends money on which, under the circumstances, should obviously be prioritized as less urgent than the dedication of any and all resources to confronting the tide of violence in the Mission.

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

Your response to this inquiry is requested by 10/12/2008

10/7

"Short, Carla"
<Carla.Short@sfdpw.org>
09/16/2008 07:00 AM

To Board of Supervisors <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
bcc
Subject REFERENCE: 20080722-002

16

TO: Clerk of the Board

FROM Liz Lerma
Public Works

DATE: 9/15/2008
REFERENCE: 20080722-002
FILE NO.

Although the planting site does not meet current guidelines, which is why it was not scheduled for replacement originally, the tree at 2717 Pine Street will be replanted.

****
Carla Short
Urban Forester
Department of Public Works
Bureau of Urban Forestry
415.641.2674

10/7

Da 9-11 **Truth Campaign** To End 61 Years of Mass Murder and Plunder for Fascist Gain by Shock and Shame.
Sept. 16, 2008, Abuse News #3822 by **John Jenkel**, write-in candidate for president, 800-500-7083, 9-11bountyhunter@

17

Congress: Stop raising more public blood debt

for mass murder and plunder in optional unconstitutional wars of congressional choice, and declare

Cease fire in Jihad.

Today, September 16, 2008, at 3:00 P.M., after seven years of evading the issue of United States mass murder in optional unconstitutional wars, a California Superior Court of constitutional law located at the Empire Annex, 3055 Cleveland Avenue in Santa Rosa, California, will consider a public good petition by **John Jenkel**, *'da 9-11* Bounty Hunter, for a writ of mandate that compels the Secretary of State to disqualify 22 candidates from running for federal office under Section 3 of the 14th Amendment in light of their giving aid and comfort to domestic enemies who profit from human misery in undeclared wars of congressional choice, not necessity.

over

Ending 61 years of 72 Hoover Institute-advised, congressionally authorized, and CIA-produced unconstitutional wars of congressional choice, NEVER necessity.

If the names of national candidates **Joseph Biden, John McCain,** or **Barack Obama,** or California candidates for Congress **Howard Berman, Wally Berger, Mary Bono, Ken Calvert, John Doolittle, David Drier, Elton Gallegly, Duncan Hunter, Darrell Issa, Jerry Lewis, Howard McKeon, Gary Miller, George Radanovich, Danna Roharabacher, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward Royce, Adam Schiff, Brad Sherman,** or **Henry Waxman** appear on any California ballots, the 2008 California General election results will be voidable by any California court of constitutional law.

As members of Congress, these candidates treasonously favor continuing the mass murder of Californians who serve in the common defense of the union of states. They volunteer in good faith to support and defend the Constitution without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, but are ordered under an impostor commander-in-chief to "shoot to kill" every man, woman, or child on Iraqi streets between 6 pm and 6 am, and are justifiably subject to be killed by Jihadists and Iraqi freedom fighters.

The trillion dollar per year funding of this horror by Congress has resulted in severe cutbacks of state services for we, the deceived and intimidated People of the State of California who empower the court and to whom California Superior Court Judge **Gary Nadler** owes allegiance. ANY mental reservation about, or evasion of, his Honor's honoring Petitioner's request, or evasion of issuing this significant writ, puts judicial officer Nadler is a treasonous light and ripe for a death sentence under California Penal Code Section 37.

When two thirds of each House of Congress declares a cease fire in Jihad and repeals strike-first **Public Law 107-243** that establishes foreign policy for United States blood baths on foreign soil, Petitioner will drop his case.

CM-110

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address):
Jill Bowers, Deputy Attorney General, State Bar No. 186196
California Department of Justice
1300 I Street, Sacramento, CA, 95814

TELEPHONE NO.: (916) 323-1948 FAX NO. (Optional): (916) 324-5567
E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): jill.bowers@doj.ca.gov
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Secretary of State Debra Bowen

FOR COURT USE ONLY

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF Sonoma
STREET ADDRESS: 600 Administration Drive
MAILING ADDRESS:
CITY AND ZIP CODE: Santa Rosa, CA 95403
BRANCH NAME: Hall of Justice

PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: John Jenkel
DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: Secretary of State Debra Bowen

CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT

(Check one): ☑ UNLIMITED CASE (Amount demanded exceeds $25,000) ☐ LIMITED CASE (Amount demanded is $25,000 or less)

CASE NUMBER: SCV-242315

A **CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE** is scheduled as follows:
Date: September 16, 2008 Time: 3:00 P.M. Dept.: Div.: Room: 20
Address of court *(if different from the address above)*:
Empire Annex, 3035 Cleveland Avenue, Suite 200, Santa Rosa, CA 95403

INSTRUCTIONS: All applicable boxes must be checked, and the specified information must be provided.

1. **Party or parties** *(answer one)*:
   a. ☑ This statement is submitted by party *(name)*: Secretary of State Debra Bowen
   b. ☐ This statement is submitted **jointly** by parties *(names)*:

2. **Complaint and cross-complaint** *(to be answered by plaintiffs and cross-complainants only)*
   a. The complaint was filed on *(date)*: February 8, 2008
   b. ☐ The cross-complaint, if any, was filed on *(date)*:

3. **Service** *(to be answered by plaintiffs and cross-complainants only)*
   a. ☐ All parties named in the complaint and cross-complaint have been served, or have appeared, or have been dismissed
   b. ☐ The following parties named in the complaint or cross-complaint
      (1) ☐ have not been served *(specify names and explain why not)*:
      (2) ☐ have been served but have not appeared and have not been dismissed *(specify names)*:
      (3) ☐ have had a default entered against them *(specify names)*:
   c. ☐ The following additional parties may be added *(specify names, nature of involvement in case, and the date by which they may be served)*:

4. **Description of case**
   a. Type of case in ☑ complaint ☐ cross-complaint *(describe, including causes of action)*:
   Petitioner seeks to "disqualify" Presidential candidates Barack Obama and John McCain, Vice Presidential candidate Joseph Biden, and 19 California congressional candidates from federal office

Form Adopted for Mandatory Use
Judicial Council of California
CM-110 [Rev. January 1, 2007]

CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT

Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.720–3.730
www.courtinfo.ca.gov

American LegalNet, Inc
www.FormsWorkflow.com

10/7

FU #080913
c. Bos

Lisa Pagan/MAYOR/SFGOV
09/15/2008 04:45 PM

To <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
bcc
Subject Fw: Opposition to Broadway Entertainment Corridor Community Benefit District (CBD)

RE: Written testimony for public hearing on Broadway Community Benefit District on 9-16-08 Item #18

18

Lisa Pagan
Project Manager
Office of Economic
and Workforce Development
(415) 554-6936 ph
(415) 554-6018 fax
----- Forwarded by Lisa Pagan/MAYOR/SFGOV on 09/15/2008 04:45 PM -----

"Broadway Corridor"
m>
09/15/2008 02:13 PM

To Lisa.Pagan@sfgov.org
cc
Subject Opposition to Broadway Entertainment Corridor Community Benefit District (CBD)

Broadway Corridor Group
Opposition to New Added Assessment Taxes

September 15, 2008

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
c/o Ms. Lisa Pagan
Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development City of San Francisco

Re: **Opposition to Broadway Entertainment Corridor Community Benefit District (CBD)**

Dear Ms. Pagan:

This letter is to correct a letter from New City/Marco Li Mandri on 9/8/08, which is as usual incorrect in many ways. First of all, Francesca Valdez is not mentioned. Ms. Valdez is not only a property owner, but also the owner of Broadway Studios for 18 years. She was insulted by Mr. Mandri during the meeting that "*...her opinion is the same as Karl's Pleskot known opposition ...*", so Ms. Valdez had to defend herself and said, *"I have my own brain..."* and opposed this CBD. Secondly, on 3rd page "*...the majority of supporting property owners did not attend the meeting due to the fact that they had signed a petition in support and cast heir ballots in favor of the district formation process ...*" We believe that our opposition group has twenty-five (25) members of whom then (10) did not receive original ballots.. We could not reach twelve (12) property owners. Then on 3rd page "*...Everyone present voted in support of the shorter district*

18

...., which is not true at all. Only Marco's group and T.J. Bianchi (Impark) would favor shorter term, but also it was mentioned that all CBD has to be redone because the present one is not adequate.

Our opposition group strongly believe that this undemocratically CBD was proposed and created only by five (5) large property owners whose tenancy are six (6) adult entertainment clubs within the two blocks of Broadway, which is also a boundary of this CBD district. The planning and final decision for the proposed CBD was done behind closed doors for a year and a half before notifying the majority of property owners and businesses whose future would be seriously and negatively fiscally affected. This CBD process from the conception to the final stage was undemocratically solicited because majority of property owners had received **NO** notification from the CBD self-governing body of any of their ongoing meetings until August 20, 2008. CBD organizers had been repeatedly requested to invite all property owners and businesses, but it was always ignored. We are opposed to participating in this newly created CBD and to be forced to pay assessments for it.

The new CBD district has 42 properties within two (2) blocks on Broadway and has tenancy: nine (9) Adult Entertainment Clubs ("Heaven" is operating without any license); six (6) adult stores; six (6) locations have Entertainment license; five (5) restaurants; three (3) parking lots; three (3) office /condominium buildings; most of properties have residency on 2nd and 3rd floors.

To our knowledge San Francisco has eighteen (18) Adult Entertainment Club and nine (9, one without any license) of them are located on two (2) blocks on Broadway, North Beach between Montgomery Street and Kearny Street.

This undemocratically formed CBD would be controlled and dominated by a few large property owners with their adult entertainment tenancy and would have great affect and serious negative fiscal impact on each of us.

Thank you for your support.

Karl B. Pleskot
Broadway Corridor Group
Opposition to New Added Assessment Taxes

10/7

"Kimo Crossman" <kimo@[redacted]>
09/17/2008 06:55 PM

To "'Board of Supervisors'" <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, <Frank.Darby@sfgov.org>
cc "'Angela Calvillo'" <Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org>, "'Nilka Julio'" <Nilka.Julio@sfgov.org>, "'Madeleine Licavoli'" <Madeleine.Licavoli@sfgov.org>, "'Linda Wong'"
bcc
Subject OVERDUE?: Immediate Disclosure Request written advice on complying with SO 67.14C recording/posting digital audio

I don't believe I have received a response to this request

19

thanks

From: Kimo Crossman [mailto:kimo@[redacted]
Sent: Sunday, September 14, 2008 12:10 PM
To: 'Board of Supervisors'; 'Frank.Darby@sfgov.org'
Cc: 'Angela Calvillo'; 'Nilka Julio'; 'Madeleine Licavoli'
Subject: Immediate Disclosure Request written advice on complying with SO 67.14C recording/posting digital audio

Immediate Disclosure Request

Dear COB:

Please provide all emails not exchanged with me which pertain to the SOTF complaint I have filed about recording and posting digital audio as required under 67.14c. This includes all legal discussions with city attorney since this is waived under 67.21 i and 67.24, telephone slips, calendar entries and notes taken from any meetings.

Please provide information on a daily incremental basis



Frank Darby/BOS/SFGOV
09/18/2008 02:24 PM

To "Kimo Crossman" <kimo@[redacted]
cc Angela Calvillo/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, SOTF/SOTF/SFGOV@SFGOV
bcc
Subject Response to: OVERDUE?: IDR written advice on complying with SO 67.14C recording/posting digital audio

Mr. Crossman,

This e-mail is in response to you e-mail alleging that the response to your IDR is overdue. Please be advised that we responded to IDR on Tuesday, September 16, 2008 on behalf of the Office of the Clerk of the Board, SOTF and myself. For your convenience I am resubmitting our e-mailed response to your request. (*See below*)

Frank Darby, Jr.
Records & Information Manager
Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Satisfaction form by clicking the link below.
http://www.sfgov.org/site/bdsupvrs_form.asp?id=18548

"Kimo Crossman" <kimo@[redacted]>

"Kimo Crossman" <kimo@[redacted]
09/17/2008 06:55 PM

To "'Board of Supervisors'" <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, <Frank.Darby@sfgov.org>
cc "'Angela Calvillo'" <Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org>, "'Nilka Julio'" <Nilka.Julio@sfgov.org>, "'Madeleine Licavoli'" <Madeleine.Licavoli@sfgov.org>, "'Linda Wong'" <linda.wong@sfgov.org>
Subject OVERDUE?: Immediate Disclosure Request written advice on complying with SO 67.14C recording/posting digital audio

I don't believe I have received a response to this request

thanks

Frank Darby/BOS/SFGOV
09/16/2008 10:44 AM

To "Kimo Crossman" <kimo@[redacted]
Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Angela



cc Calvillo/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, SOTF/SOTF/SFGOV@SFGOV

Subject Response to: IDR written advice on complying with SO 67.14C recording/posting digital audio

Mr. Crossman,

This e-mail is in response to your request to me the Office of the Clerk of the Board and the SOTF for copies of e-mails, telephone slips, calendar entries and meeting notes that were not exchanged with you regarding complaint number #08042_Kimo Crossman vs. DTIS, SFGTV, Media Services, City Administrator, Clerk of the Board, SOTF Administrator. Attached below is DCA Llorente's Instructional letter to the Task Force.

08042_Instructional.doc

We have no additional records responsive to your request.

Frank Darby, Jr.
Records & Information Manager
Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Satisfaction form by clicking the link below.
http://www.sfgov.org/site/bdsupvrs_form.asp?id=18548

"Kimo Crossman" <kimo@[illegible]

"Kimo Crossman" <kimo@[illegible]

09/14/2008 12:09 PM

To "'Board of Supervisors'" <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, <Frank.Darby@sfgov.org>

cc "'Angela Calvillo'" <Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org>, "'Nilka Julio'" <Nilka.Julio@sfgov.org>, "'Madeleine Licavoli'" <Madeleine.Licavoli@sfgov.org>

Subject Immediate Disclosure Request written advice on complying with SO 67.14C recording/posting digital audio

Immediate Disclosure Request

Dear COB:

Please provide all emails not exchanged with me which pertain to the SOTF complaint I have filed about recording and posting digital audio as required under 67.14c. This includes all legal discussions with city attorney since this is waived under 67.21 i and 67.24, telephone slips, calendar entries and notes taken from any meetings.

Please provide information on a daily incremental basis



Frank Darby/BOS/SFGOV
09/16/2008 10:44 AM

To "Kimo Crossman" <kimo@v
cc Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Angela Calvillo/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, SOTF/SOTF/SFGOV@SFGOV
bcc
Subject Response to: IDR written advice on complying with SO 67.14C recording/posting digital audio

Mr. Crossman,

This e-mail is in response to your request to me the Office of the Clerk of the Board and the SOTF for copies of e-mails, telephone slips, calendar entries and meeting notes that were not exchanged with you regarding complaint number #08042_Kimo Crossman vs. DTIS, SFGTV, Media Services, City Administrator, Clerk of the Board, SOTF Administrator. Attached below is DCA Llorente's Instructional letter to the Task Force.

08042_Instructional.doc

We have no additional records responsive to your request.

Frank Darby, Jr.
Records & Information Manager
Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Satisfaction form by clicking the link below.
http://www.sfgov.org/site/bdsupvrs_form.asp?id=18548

"Kimo Crossman" <kimo@v

"Kimo Crossman"
<kimo@
09/14/2008 12:09 PM

To "'Board of Supervisors'" <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, <Frank.Darby@sfgov.org>
cc "'Angela Calvillo'" <Angela.Calvillo@sfgov.org>, "'Nilka Julio'" <Nilka.Julio@sfgov.org>, "'Madeleine Licavoli'" <Madeleine.Licavoli@sfgov.org>
Subject Immediate Disclosure Request written advice on complying with SO 67.14C recording/posting digital audio

Immediate Disclosure Request

Dear COB:

Please provide all emails not exchanged with me which pertain to the SOTF complaint I have filed about recording and posting digital audio as required under 67.14c. This includes all legal discussions with city attorney since this is waived under 67.21 i and 67.24, telephone slips,

calendar entries and notes taken from any meetings.

Please provide information on a daily incremental basis

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY

ERNEST H. LLORENTE
Deputy City Attorney

DIRECT DIAL: (415) 554-4236
E-MAIL: ernest.llorente@sfgov.org

MEMORANDUM

September 12, 20008

KIMO CROSSMAN v. SFGTV, MEDIA SERVICES, CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND FRANK DARBY, SOTF ADMINISTRATOR (08042)

COMPLAINT

THE COMPLAINANT ALLEGES THE FOLLOWING FACTS:

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed an ordinance that expanded section 67.14 of the Administrative Code/Sunshine Ordinance that provided for digital form of audio or video recordings of policy body meetings. After the Task Force meetings of 6/10/08 and 7/22/08, Kimo Crossman requested the digital recordings of those meetings. The Task Force administrator advised Kimo Crossman that digital recordings of those meetings are not available because the Mayor did not fund the staff positions to make digital recording machines operational.

COMPLAINANT FILES COMPLAINT

On August 1, 2008, Kimo Crossman filed a complaint against the SFGTV, Media Services, the Sunshine Task Force ADministrator and the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors. alleging violation Section 67.14 of the Sunshine Ordinance as amended by the BOS. At the complaint committee hearing on 9/9/08, Kimo Crossman added the Board of Supervisors to his complaint.

RESPONDENT AGENCIES APPEARS BEFORE THE COMPLAINT COMMITTEE

On September 9, 2008, representatives from SFGTV, Media Services, Clerk of the BOS and the Task Force administrator appeared before the Complaint Committee and stated that solely due to the non funding of the staff positions necessary to implement the digital sound recording system the system is not implemented.

APPLICABLE STATUTORY SECTIONS:

1. Sunshine Ordinance, San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.1 addresses Findings and Purpose.

2. Sunshine Ordinance, San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.14 deals with tape recording.

3. Sunshine Ordinance, San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.21 addresses general requests for public documents including records in electronic format.

5. Sunshine Ordinance, San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.21-1 addresses the policy regarding the use and purchase of computer systems.

6 Sunshine Ordinance, San Francisco Administrative Code Section. 67.26 deals with withholding kept to a minimum.

7. Sunshine Ordinance, San Francisco Administrative Code Section. 67.27 deals with justification for withholding.

8. Sunshine Ordinance, San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.29-2 deals with Internet Access/World Wide Web Minimum Standards.

9. California Public Records Act, Government Code Section 6253.9 deal with information in an electronic format.

10. California Public Records Act, Government Code Section 6253 deals with public records open to inspection; agency duties and time limits. California Public Records Act, Government Code Section 6255 deals with justification for withholding of records.

11. California Constitution, Article I, Section 3 addresses Assembly, petition, open meetings.

APPLICABLE CASE LAW:

none

ISSUES TO BE DETERMINED

1. FACTUAL ISSUES

A. Uncontested Facts:

The parties agree to the following facts:

- Crossman submitted Public Records Requests to SOTF Administrator Darby for a digital recording of the 6/10/08 and 7/22/08 Task Force Meetings
- Administrator Darby responded in a timely fashion and stated that digital recordings of the meetings are not available because the City does not have an appropriation to fund staff who could implement the digital recording machines.

B. Contested facts/ Facts in dispute:

The Task Force must determine what facts are true.

i. Relevant facts in dispute:

Whether City departments are violating Section 67.14 of the Sunshine Ordinance for its failure to implement the digital recording of policy body meetings because of lack of funding for the implementation of the digital recording system.

. **QUESTIONS THAT MIGHT ASSIST IN DETERMINING FACTS:**

a.) none.

3. LEGAL ISSUES/ LEGAL DETERMINATIONS:

- **Were sections of the Sunshine Ordinance (Section 67.21), Brown Act, and/or Public Records Act were violated?**
- **Was there an exception to the Sunshine Ordinance, under State, Federal, or case law?**

CONCLUSION

THE TASK FORCE FINDS THE FOLLOWING FACTS:

THE TASK FORCE FINDS THAT THE ALLEGED VIOLATIONS TO BE **TRUE OR NOT TRUE.**

Memorandum

ATTACHED STATUTORY SECTIONS FROM CHAPTER 67 OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE (THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE) UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED

Section 67.1 addresses Findings and Purpose

The Board of Supervisors and the People of the City and County of San Francisco find and declare:

(a) Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public.

(b) Elected officials, commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. The people do not cede to these entities the right to decide what the people should know about the operations of local government.

(c) Although California has a long tradition of laws designed to protect the public's access to the workings of government, every generation of governmental leaders includes officials who feel more comfortable conducting public business away from the scrutiny of those who elect and employ them. New approaches to government constantly offer public officials additional ways to hide the making of public policy from the public. As government evolves, so must the laws designed to ensure that the process remains visible.

(d) The right of the people to know what their government and those acting on behalf of their government are doing is fundamental to democracy, and with very few exceptions, that right supersedes any other policy interest government officials may use to prevent public access to information. Only in rare and unusual circumstances does the public benefit from allowing the business of government to be conducted in secret, and those circumstances should be carefully and narrowly defined to prevent public officials from abusing their authority.

(e) Public officials who attempt to conduct the public's business in secret should be held accountable for their actions. Only a strong Open Government and Sunshine Ordinance, enforced by a strong Sunshine Ordinance Task Force can protect the public's interest in open government.

(f) The people of San Francisco enact these amendments to assure that the people of the City remain in control of the government they have created.

(g) Private entities and individuals and employees and officials of the City and County of San Francisco have rights to privacy that must be respected. However, when a person or entity is

before a policy body or passive meeting body, that person, and the public, has the right to an open and public process.

Section 67.21 addresses general requests for public documents.

This section provides:

a.) Every person having custody of any public record or public information, as defined herein, ... shall, at normal times and during normal and reasonable hours of operation, without unreasonable delay, and without requiring an appointment, permit the public record, or any segregable portion of a record, to be inspected and examined by any person and shall furnish one copy thereof upon payment of a reasonable copying charge, not to exceed the lesser of the actual cost or ten cents per page.

b.) A custodian of a public record shall as soon as possible and within ten days following receipt of a request for inspection or copy of a public record, comply with such request. Such request may be delivered to the office of the custodian by the requester orally or in writing by fax, postal delivery, or e-mail. If the custodian believes the record or information requested is not a public record or is exempt, the custodian shall justify withholding any record by demonstrating, in writing as soon as possible and within ten days following receipt of a request, that the record in question is exempt under express provisions of this ordinance.

c.) A custodian of a public record shall assist a requester in identifying the existence, form, and nature of any records or information maintained by, available to, or in the custody of the custodian, whether or not the contents of those records are exempt from disclosure and shall, when requested to do so, provide in writing within seven days following receipt of a request, a statement as to the existence, quantity, form and nature of records relating to a particular subject or questions with enough specificity to enable a requester to identify records in order to make a request under (b). A custodian of any public record, when not in possession of the record requested, shall assist a requester in directing a request to the proper office or staff person.

...

k.) Release of documentary public information, whether for inspection of the original or by providing a copy, shall be governed by the California Public Records Act Government Code Section 6250 et seq.) in particulars not addressed by this ordinance and in accordance with the enhanced disclosure requirement provided in this ordinance.

l.) Inspection and copying of documentary public information stored in electronic form shall be made available to the person requesting the information in any form requested which is available to or easily generated by the department, its officers or employees, including disk, tape, printout or monitor at a charge no greater than the cost of the media on which it is duplicated. Inspection of documentary public information on a computer monitor need not be allowed where the information sought is necessarily and inseparably intertwined with information not subject to disclosure under this ordinance. Nothing in this section shall require a department t program or reprogram a computer to respond to a request for information or to

release information where the release of that information would violate a licensing agreement or copyright law.

Section 67.21-1 addresses the City's policy regarding the use and purchase of computer systems.

This section provides:

a) It is the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to utilize computer technology in order to reduce the cost of public records management, including the costs of collecting, maintaining, and disclosing records subject to disclosure to member of the public under this section. To the extent that it is technologically and economically feasible, department that use computer systems to collect and store public records shall program and design the systems to ensure convenient, efficient, and economical public access to records and shall make public records easily accessible over public networks such as the Internet.

b) Department purchasing new computer systems shall attempt to reach the following goals as a means to achieve lower costs to the public in connection with the public disclosure of records;

1) Implementing a system in which exempt information is segregated or filed separately from otherwise disclosable information.

2) Implementing a system that permits reproduction of electronic copies of records in a format that is generally recognized as an industry standard format.

3) Implementing a system that permits making records available through the largest non-profit, non-proprietary public computer network, consistent with the requirement for security of information.

Section 67.26 provides:

No record shall be withheld from disclosure in its entirety unless all information contained in it is exempt from disclosure under express provisions of the California Public Records Act or of some other statute.

Information that is exempt from disclosure shall be masked, deleted or otherwise segregated in order that the nonexempt portion of a requested record may be released, and keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the appropriate justification for withholding required by section 67.27 of this article. This work shall be done personally by the attorney or other staff member conducting the exemption review. The work of responding to a public-records request and preparing documents for disclosure shall be considered part of the regular work duties of any city employee, and no fee shall be charged to the requester to cover the personnel costs of responding to a records request.

Section 67.27 provides:

Any withholding of information shall be justified in writing, as follows:

a.) A withholding under a specific permissive exemption in the California Public Records Act, or elsewhere, which permissive exemption is not forbidden to be asserted by this ordinance, shall cite that authority.

b.) A withholding on the basis that disclosure is prohibited by law shall cite the specific statutory authority in the Public Records Act of elsewhere.

c.) A withholding on the basis that disclosure would incur civil or criminal liability shall cite any specific statutory or case law, or any other public agency's litigation experience, supporting that position.

d.) When a record being requested contains information, most of which is exempt from disclosure under the California Public Records Act and this Article, the custodian shall inform the requester of the nature and extent of the nonexempt information and suggest alternative sources for the information requested, if available.

Section 67.29-2 provides:

Internet Access/World Wide Web Minimum Standards.

Each department of the City and County of San Francisco shall maintain on at World Wide Web site, or on a comparable, readily accessible location on the Internet, information that it is required to make publicly available. Each department is encouraged t make publicly available through its World Wide Web site, as much information and as many documents as possible concerning its activities. At a minimum, within six months after enactment of this provision, each department shall post on its World Wide Web site all meeting notices required under this ordinance, agendas and the minutes of all previous meetings of its policy bodies for the last three years. Notices and agendas shall be posted no later than the time that the department otherwise distributes this information to the public, allowing reasonable time for posting. Minutes of meetings shall be posted as soon as possible, but in any event within 48 hours after they have been approved. Each department shall make reasonable efforts to ensure

that its World Wide Web site is regularly reviewed for timeliness, and updated on at least a weekly basis. The City and County shall also make available on its World Wide Web site, or on a comparable, readily accessible location on the Internet, a current copy of the City Charter and all City Codes.

The California Constitution as Amended by Proposition 59 in 2004 provides for openness in government.

Article I Section 3 provides:

a) The people have the right to instruct their representative, petition government for redress of grievances, and assemble freely to consult for the common good.

b)(1) The people have the right of access to information concerning the conduct of the people's business, and therefore, the meetings of public bodies and the writings of public officials and agencies shall be open to public scrutiny.

2) A statute, court rule, or other authority, including those in effect on the effective date of this subdivision that limits the right of access shall be adopted with findings demonstrating the interest protect by the limitation and the need for protecting that interest.

3) Nothing in this subdivision supersedes or modifies the right of privacy guaranteed by Section 1 or affects the construction of any statute, court rule, or other authority to the extent that it protects that right to privacy, including any statutory procedures governing discovery or disclosure of information concerning the official performance or professional qualifications of a peace officer.

4) Nothing in this subdivision supersedes or modifies any provision of this Constitution, including the guarantees that person may not be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or denied equal protection of the laws, as provided by Section 7.

5) This subdivision does not repeal or nullify, expressly or by implication, any constitutional or statutory exception to the right of access to public records or meetings or public bodies that is in effect on the effective date of this subdivision, including, but not limited to, any statute protecting the confidentiality of law enforcement and prosecution records.

6) Nothing in this subdivision repeals, nullifies, supersedes, or modifies protections for the confidentiality of proceedings and records of the Legislature, the Members of the Legislature, and its employees, committee, and caucuses provided by Section 7 of Article IV, state law, or

legislative rules adopted in furtherance of those provisions: nor does it affect the scope of permitted discovery in judicial or administrative proceedings regarding deliberations of the Legislature, the Members of the Legislature, and its employees, committees, and caucuses.

The California Public Records Act is located in the state Government Code Sections 6250 et seq. All statutory references, unless stated otherwise, are to the Government Code.

Section 6253 provides.

a) Public records are open to inspection at all times during the office hours of the state or local agency and every person has a right to inspect any public record, except as hereafter provided. Any reasonably segregable portion of a record shall be available for inspection by any person requesting the records after deletion of the portions that are exempted by law.

b) Except with respect to public records exempt from disclosure by express provisions of law, each state or local agency, upon a request for a copy of records that reasonably describes an identifiable record or records, shall make the records promptly available to any person upon payment of fees covering direct costs of duplication, or a statutory fee if applicable. Upon request, an exact copy shall be provided unless impracticable to do so.

c) Each agency, upon a request for a copy of records, shall within 10 days from receipt of the request, determine whether the request, in whole or in part, seeks copies of disclosable public records in the possession of the agency and shall promptly notify the person making the request of the determination and the reasons therefore....

Section 6253.9 provides:

a) Unless otherwise prohibited by law, any agency that has information that constitutes an identifiable public record not exempt from disclosure pursuant to this chapter that is in an electronic format shall make that information available in an electronic format when requested by any person and, when applicable, shall comply with the following:

(1) The agency shall make the information available in any electronic format in which it holds the information.

(2) Each agency shall provide a copy of an electronic record in the format requested if the requested format is one that has been used by the agency to create copies for its own use or

for provision to other agencies. The cost of duplication shall be limited to the direct cost of producing a copy of a record in any electronic format.

b) Notwithstanding paragraph (2) of subdivision (a), the requester shall bear the cost of producing a copy of the record, including the cost to construct a record, and the cost of programming and computer services necessary to produce a copy of the record when either of the following applies:

(1) In order to comply with the provisions of subdivision a.), the public agency would be required to produce a copy of an electronic record and the record is one that is produced only at otherwise regularly scheduled intervals.

(2) The request would require data compilation, extraction, or programming to produce the record.

c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to require the public agency to reconstruct a record in an electronic format if the agency no longer has the record available in an electronic format.

d) If the request is for information in other than electronic format, and the information also is in electronic format, the agency may inform the requester that the information is available in electronic format.

e. Nothing in this section shall be construed to permit an agency to make information available only in electronic format.

f) Nothing in this section shall be construed to require the public agency to release an electronic record in the electronic form in which it is held by the agency if its release would jeopardize or compromise the security or integrity of the original record or of any proprietary software in which it is maintained.

g) Nothing in this section shall e construed to permit public access to records held by any agency to which access is otherwise restricted by statute.

Section 6255 provides:

a) The agency shall justify withholding any record by demonstrating that the record in question is exempt under express provisions of this chapter or that on the facts of the particular case the public interest served by not disclosing the record clearly outweighs the public interest served by disclosure of the record.

b) A response to a written request for inspection or copies of public records that includes a determination that the request is denied, in whole or in part, shall be in writing.

10/7

20

"James Chaffee"
<chaffeej@ [redacted]
09/17/2008 04:11 PM

To <bruce@ [redacted] <deetje@ [redacted]
<frandacosta@ [redacted] <grossman356@ [redacted]
<home@prosf.org>, <joelynn114@ [redacted]
cc
bcc
Subject Chaffee -- Sunshine Appointment to be Heard Tomorrow, Violation of Ordinance Threatened

Dear Friends,

The Rules Committee of the Board of Supervisors at 10:00 a.m. Thursday morning, tomorrow, will hold a hearing on the appointment of seat 7 of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. The applicants are David Pilpel and Doyle Johnson.

Seat seven is the consumer advocacy seat. (Of course, as an agency advocate, Mr. Pilpel ought not to even apply, but then there does not seem to be a seat designated for agency advocacy.)

The item is continued from August 7, and the announcement states that the applicant must be someone who "is physically handicapped and who has demonstrated interest in citizen access and participation in local government."

I just realized this is wrong. I hope someone can go to the meeting. If we look at the actual text of the Sunshine Ordinance there are already four seats for those who must have demonstrated interest in citizen access and participation in local government and there are two seats for consumer advocacy. This means that one of the seats 8 through 11 must be "physically handicapped." To do otherwise leaves "consumer advocacy" under represented. It should be obvious that "interested in" might mean people on all sides of the issue of participation, whereas "advocacy" means a partisan willing to advocate for the consumer, a quite different matter as to both perspective and skill. If either applicant who is qualified for interest in citizen access and participation in local government gets it, there will be five seats in that category, and only one in "consumer advocacy," an obvious violation of the ordinance.

James Chaffee

20

10/7

SF Environment

GAVIN NEWSOM
Mayor

JARED BLUMENFELD
Director

21

MEMORANDUM

TO: Supervisor Tom Ammiano
FROM: Jared Blumenfeld
DATE: September 16, 2008
RE: Inquiry 20080909-046

The Department of the Environment does not operate any recreational centers or other public facilities in the Mission District, nor does it operate any vehicle pools.

The Department supports workforce development, particularly in the area of the emerging green economy. In past years, the Deparment's Environmental Justice Grant Program has offered funding to a range of training programs, including solar installation, using state funds restricted for use in the Bayview/Hunters Point and Potrero Hill communities.

Department of the Environment, City and County of San Francisco
Telephone: (415) 554-6390 • Fax: (415) 554-6393 • 11 Grove Street, San Francisco, CA 94102
Email: Environment@ci.sf.ca.us • www.sfenvironment.com

21

22 10/7

"Lee, Frank W"
<Frank.W.Lee@sfdpw.org>
09/16/2008 11:18 AM

To Board of Supervisors <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc "Ammiano, Tom" <Tom.Ammiano@sfgov.org>, "Rodis, Nathan" <Nathan.Rodis@sfdpw.org>
bcc
Subject FW: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - DUE NOTICE #20080805-002

Dear Board of Supervisors:

Director Ed Reiskin and Deputy Director of Operations Mohammed Nuru met with Supervisor Ammiano and answered this inquiry.

Sincerely,
Frank W. Lee
Executive Assistant to the Director
Department of Public Works
Tel: (415) 554-6993
Fax: (415) 522-7727

-----Original Message-----
From: Reiskin, Ed
Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2008 11:15 AM
To: Lee, Frank W
Cc: Rodis, Nathan
Subject: RE: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - DUE NOTICE

Yes. Mohammed and I met with him.

-----Original Message-----
From: Lee, Frank W <Frank.W.Lee@sfdpw.org>
Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2008 11:01 AM
To: Reiskin, Ed <Ed.Reiskin@sfdpw.org>
Cc: Rodis, Nathan <Nathan.Rodis@sfdpw.org>
Subject: FW: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - DUE NOTICE

Ed:

On 8/8, you mentioned that you will be scheduling a meeting with Supe. Ammiano to discuss this. Have you met with Ammiano? If yes, I will close this out.

Frank

-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors
Sent: Monday, September 15, 2008 2:59 PM
To: Reiskin, Ed

Cc: Ammiano, Tom
Subject: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - DUE NOTICE

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - DUE NOTICE
If you have already responded, please disregard this notice.
For any questions, call (415) 554-7708.

TO: Edward Reiskin
Public Works

FROM: Clerk of the Board
DATE: 9/15/2008
REFERENCE: 20080805-002
FILE NO.

Due Date: 9/7/2008
Reminder Sent: 9/15/2008

The inquiry referenced above from Supervisor Ammiano was made at the Board meeting on 8/5/2008 and a response was requested by the due date shown above.

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

For your convenience, the original inquiry is repeated below.

> The City recently conducted an audit concerning the amount and geographical distribution of trash on our streets. It is evident that the Mission has a disproportionately high number of streets with names appearing in this audit. I appreciate very much that the Director made a point of stopping by my office to discuss the audit's findings, and I look forward to working with him on the DPW's proposed solutions to addressing litter abatement going forward. In the meantime, I would like to know what strategies to this end are currently being pondered by the administration. Additionally, my office has received upwards of 100 phone calls decrying the removal of garbage cans from areas where they are sorely needed. Does the DPW continue to believe that less trash receptacles will lead to litter on the street?

10/7

URBAN COUNTIES CAUCUS

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

September 16, 2008 p.m.

23

Budget Not Baked – Sausage not Cooked

"Three months late and this is all we get?" Those are the words Governor Schwarzenegger used at a press conference moments ago to talk about his disappointment with the Budget the Legislature passed early this morning. "This budget just kicks the can down the alley and adopts fake reforms."

The Governor made plain his intention to veto the Bill when it reaches his desk. It is not clear what will happen to the rest of the package, but we suspect it will not fare well. Further, the Governor indicated that if the Legislature overrides his veto, he "will veto all their bills." When questioned by a reporter over whether he really meant "all", he clarified that he will carefully review every bill to see whether it will have a negative impact on the State's finances or is a "job killer." We suspect that at least measures authored by the sixty-one Assembly Members and twenty-nine Senators who voted for the budget bill are at a considerable degree of risk.

While the Governor's words were carefully chosen and delivered in measured style today, his facial expressions, body language and voice did little to hide the degree of irritation he is experiencing over the situation. He told the press that he "promised the people I would try to fix the broken system. But the Budget they passed this morning makes our problems even worse."

The Governor acknowledged at least one of the Legislature's assumed motives in passing the collection of bills that comprise this year's spending plan. "We have gone through hard times these last three months and people are getting hurt." However, he is concerned that if the Legislature overrides his veto, "we will need either a huge tax increase or big cuts to education next year."

So at some point over the next few days the Governor will put his reasons for vetoing the Budget on paper and his staff will deliver it along with the unsigned budget bill (**AB 1781**) to the Chief Clerk of the Assembly. That will trigger the reconvening of the 2007-08 Legislature, which adjourned early this morning. The four legislative leaders have already responded to inquiries from reporters on the likelihood of the Legislature overriding a gubernatorial veto.

> Senator Cogdill: "I believe that as a Legislature we'll override the veto."
> Speaker Bass: "If we bring 120 legislators up here to override a veto, I'm pretty confident we're not going to have difficulty doing that and we would do it in rapid fire,"
> Assembly Member Villines: "not getting your way is no reason to veto the state budget."
> And Senator Perata upon adjournment: "We will be asking you to come back" for an override session if the governor vetoes the spending plan.

According to legislative records, the last time the Legislature overrode budget-related vetoes was thirty-nine years ago, when Jerry Brown was in the corner office. The old adage that those with weak stomachs should not watch the making of either law or sausage is apropos. We are watching history in the making here and it is not pretty.

URBAN COUNTIES CAUCUS

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

September 22, 2008

Legislature Finalizes Anti-Climatic Budget

"I don't see that much of a signing ceremony, because there's nothing to really celebrate that much. We have, as I said, great -- we accomplished great things but there are certain things that were not accomplished. But we will be having a signing, I think maybe on Monday. Maybe." Those were Governor Schwarzenegger's comments Friday afternoon shortly before the Legislature convened to bless two measures needed to get his signature on a 2008-09 Budget.

The Governor called the bills "an improvement" over the package they sent to him last Tuesday morning, but observed that it still fails to solve California's structural financial problems. We would note that is an understatement, since the Legislature's own budget staff already acknowledges that the package contains a reserve of only $826 million and a "projected out-year shortfall" of about $1.5 billion. These assumptions bank on all of the revenue estimates as well as anticipated expenditures holding firm. However, August revenues were down and property taxes are likely to perform poorly, barring some miraculous improvement in the housing market. The assumptions also presume that the tax accelerations included in the budget deal will hold up to scrutiny and perform as expected.

So what was so wrong with the package that Legislators passed on Tuesday that required them to reconvene and approve two additional bills? The Governor was not satisfied with the "budget reform" the Legislature had adopted (SCA13) and he also was not keen on the income tax acceleration bill (SB 36XXX). So Legislators returned to Sacramento for sessions that only lasted about half an hour and included no debate. The mood was dour, but Members should not have to return again to override gubernatorial vetoes. They approved two measures, **SCA 30** (Ashburn) and **SB 28X** (Budget and Fiscal Review Committee) that gave them a ticket back to their districts, hopefully until December.

Since SCA 13 had already been chaptered by the Secretary of State, SCA 30 makes changes to that measure which restrict the Legislature's ability to transfer funds out of the Budget Stabilization Fund (BSF). Funds could only be removed from the BSF when General Fund revenues are inadequate to support the spending levels of the prior year, adjusted for inflation and population. These are in addition to the provisions of SCA 13, which increase the size of the BSF from the current five percent to 12.5 percent, limit the Governor's ability to suspend transfers into the BSF, and capture the "April Surprise" revenues, which are those dollars not needed to meet the Proposition 98 guarantee and are five percent above the estimates for that year. Both SCAs will be on a "future" special election ballot, likely some time next spring.

SB 28X required some special maneuvering to enable its passage. The bill it was replacing, SB 36XXX, was approved in the third extraordinary session as a majority vote bill, but the Legislature closed down the third extraordinary session last Tuesday morning before adjourning. So the Governor issued a proclamation expanding the purposes of the first extraordinary session on health to also include fiscal issues. The Governor has indicated he will veto SB 36XXX, and there are insufficient Republican votes to override a veto. So SB 28X had to be passed in the special session (because it could only muster a majority vote) so it could become effective within 90 days of the end of the special session, which was adjourned Friday evening. The measure accelerates quarterly estimated tax payments, eliminates "safe harbor" for taxpayers who earn over $1 million, imposes new penalties for understatement of corporate taxes, and makes other tax-related changes. So add these measures to the explanation of the budget package that we provided on September 16 and you have the aggregate deal. The Governor is expected to use his blue pencil to reduce total spending by a few hundred million more and we will report on those actions as they occur.

SEP-15-2008 03:21P FROM:PGE TO:14155545163 P.1

10/7

24

FACSIMILE cover sheet

Count 7

Date: September 15, 2008 From: David G. Eselius

To: City and County of San Francisco Supervisors, California

Total Pages: 16 pages plus cover sheet

Regarding: *"Behind Mexico's Wave of Beheadings"* is Congressional "illegal drug" legislation and American consumption of "illegal drugs"

Compassion is essential

SEP-15-2008 03:21P FROM:DGE TO:14155545163 P.2

David G. Eselius

Date: Monday, September 15, 2008

To: Senator John McCain (Republican - AZ)
Senator Barack Obama (Democrat - IL)

cc: Salinas City Council, California
City and County of San Francisco Supervisors, California
Barbara Boxer, U.S. Senator, California
Nancy Pelosi, U.S. House Speaker, California
Senator Hillary Clinton, New York
Democratic National Committee (DNC)
Republican National Committee (RNC)
Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger
Sam Farr, Member of Congress, 17th District California
Abel Maldonado, California Senator, 15th District
Monterey County Supervisors, members
Santa Cruz County Supervisors, members
Watsonville Council & Public Record
Capitola Council & Public Record
Scotts Valley Council & Public Record
Santa Cruz Sentinel & Media

Subj.: *"Behind Mexico's Wave of Beheadings"* is Congressional "illegal drug" legislation and American consumption of "illegal drugs"

Dear Honorable Presidential Candidates,

The attached *"Behind Mexico's Wave of Beheadings"* is a graphic reporting of atrocities caused by American consumption of "illegal drugs." Vicious narco turf battles result from America drug user's money flowing into Mexico. Beheadings *"have been the latest act of terror in the relentless turf war over Mexico's billion dollar smuggling routes... During August alone, gangsters hacked off 30 craniums across the country -- adding to the total of almost 200 beheadings in 2008 so far... Decapitations were almost unheard of here before 2006... The cycle of beheadings intensified throughout 2007 until every gangster in Mexico seemed to have an executioner's ax in his arsenal."*

For political reasons, Congress maintains the nation's 1970s laws that regulate "illegal drugs." The manor in which current drug laws a applied and the "War on Drugs" are the main enablers of "illegal drug" consumption within America. Resulting is that America is the largest consumer of "illegal drugs." Therefore, America is the largest perpetrator

of the global "illegal drug" economy, violence, and societal corruption (which would include political corruption).

- Sales of "illegal drugs" within America are now, along with welfare, social services, healthcare, and "low income" housing, the largest sustaining economy within inner urban Black and Latino communities.
- Over the long-term, American-Latino "illegal drug" importation into America via Mexico is the largest source to the world of trillions of dollars of revenue pass-through to international drug cartels and money laundering.
- The Mexican "illegal drug" flow is also the largest source of gang violence within the White, Black, and Latino communities.
- By passively eliminating "illegal drug" activity within poor and uneducated communities, there would be less illegal wealth within poor and rich communities. Former drug dealers would have do honest work for a living, or remain on government welfare and healthcare.
- Rather than criminalizing drug use, reform of existing legislation to accommodate social and medical determination of potential harm caused by "legal-drugs of potential abuse," will result in decreases in global and American violence.
- A new U.S. government multi-billion dollar tax base is to be established when the U.S. government regulates and taxes legal-drugs of potential abuse, by recognized evaluation methods of social and medical "Matrix of Harm."
- There is to be no political or law enforcement "control" of the American social and medical "Matrix of Harm" evaluations for legal-drugs of potential abuse.
- The "Matrix of Harm" would direct the drug Re-Scheduling within the Controlled Substance Act (CSA) of 1970.
- Passively eliminating "illegal drug" criminal regulation to favor legal-drugs of potential abuse would disrupt a covert many-trillion dollar illegal drug economy, which has extensive ties to American and global graft, corruption, and murder.

Since the 1970s Nixon era and the continued emergence of the American anti-establishment "drug culture," American consumption of "illegal drugs" has increased social acceptance of drug use and the high consumption of drugs of potential abuse.

More substantial than "change," a reform of Congressional "illegal drug" legislation is necessary.

American law enforcement never had a chance of winning the "War on Drugs." For some time, American and global criminals have been in firm control of "illegal drug" activity. The only result from continued funding the "War on Drugs" is more funding of the "War on Drugs."

Some American politicians who ignore the harm of existing "illegal drug" laws are also ignoring the operations of expansive American and international drug cartels.

Salinas California

Salinas' killings by drug gangs are already the deadliest since 2004, when police reported 20 homicides for the entire year. The city has seen scores of other shootings.

Salinas does not have enough "illegal drug" demand to merit 20 homicides this year. The problem confuting the Salinas City Council is that they are located 25 miles north of Soledad Prison (a large California maximum-security prison). Salinas's residents provide some of the prison guard and staff workforce. Salinas also has a resident population of "family" members who remain in the area to provide "family" support to prison inmates. Comingling of prison population interests within the Salinas population does occur.

Criminal gangs within the prison, whose leadership is doing time in Soledad Prison, also control California importation, domestic production, distribution, and sales of "illegal drugs" along the West Coast and elsewhere. Criminals both in and out of jail control this huge "illegal drug" economy.

Interconnected gang leaderships form affiliates both inside and outside various prison walls. Prison gang's structures are large powerful covert American crime syndicates. Because the prison drug-gang leadership has proven their trust and merit, they have also earned the right for the ultimate say in whom and how a person is to be murdered.

It happens that too many gang members resettle in Salinas (near Soledad Prison). Therefore, Salinas' narco turf battles break out now and then.

Obviously, these Salinas gang members (with their "families") have time to kill while they are living off social welfare in government supplied "low-income housing." The conflicts caused by living near a maximum-security prison are the cause of the 20 Salinas murders this year.

In order for the Salinas City Council to reduce city homicides, the Council will have to stop the Soledad prison gangs from issuing kill-orders to their Salinas crews.

Short of having their city residents talk to the police and then be killed like a rat, there is little more that the Salinas City Council can do. Remember the Mexican drug-gang notes after the beheadings that say things like *"See. Hear. Shut up. If you want to stay alive."* Black and White communities might not understand such messages, but the large American Latino community most certainly understands the message – "disrespect" drug gangs, you, and your family will die.

San Francisco, California

When it comes to political support of a large number of illegal immigrants and support for a huge amount of illegal drug consumption, California should first come to mind.

Frisco city and county is known for "medical marijuana" high usage and is an illegal immigrant "sanctuary city." The Frisco County/City Supervisors have yet to find an illegal immigrant they would not give sanctuary to, nor have they found a pot that could

not be smoked. The police force is politically influenced to support powerful political needs.

San Francisco County/City Board of Supervisors' management of "illegal drugs" that are imported from Mexico is much the same as Los Angeles County Supervisors and Los Angeles City Council "illegal drug" management. Both cities are "sanctuary cities" and "medical marijuana" supporters. Los Angeles is informally known as the "Gang Capital of the Nation."

In 2007, the San Francisco recorded 98 homicides, the highest number in more than a decade. In the first half of 2008, Los Angeles reports 198 homicides - which corresponds to a rate of 9.6 (per 100,000 population) -- a major decrease from 1993, when the all time homicide rate of over 21.1 (per 100,000 population) was reported for the year.

As "sanctuary cities" and "medical marijuana" political activity has played out over the years, the covert results is that the "illegal drug" economy grew. Politicians became more dependent upon support from the California illegal Latin American immigrants and poor Black communities. The Democrats are known for support of welfare, "low-income housing," and healthcare projects. Government support and jobs replaced the need for non-government jobs. Political directions within America were more toward socialism (or communism). The "illegal drug" economy grew from its 1970s beginnings to today's problems.

As false representatives of the middle class, California's left-progressive Democrats embraced growing the appearance and size of low-income and poverty groups. The government funding and demographics of the poor gave the Democrats a political advantage. The California expanding workforce is modeled after 1840s Marxist economy, organized labor, and self-political interests. American capitalism was undermined.

Within the sanctuary of "sanctuary cities" and "medical marijuana" cities, federal agencies remain obstructed from identifying and deporting illegal immigrants who are involved in drug activity. Within the population of Latin American legal and illegal immigrants (and others), there is a growing core of American "illegal drug" cartels and drug-gangs. (Some criminal gangs have stationed their crews in Salinas, to provide for the needs Soledad Prison inmates.)

Because of politics, "sanctuary cities" and "medical marijuana" cities -- like San Francisco and Los Angeles -- harbored "illegal drug" cartel members who grew the multi national trillion-dollar "illegal drug" economy. American drug consumers and American "War on Drugs" funds enabled global illegal drug economy profits.

From within the urban sanctuaries, drug gangs grew, and attacked the American soft regions, overwhelming American common good. Over time, drug crime and corruption imbedded itself thought out America society.

American political legislation has grown the national and international "illegal drug" economy.

Consult *"National Drug Threat Assessment 2007,"* National Drug Intelligence Center, U.S. Department of Justice, for official intelligence analysis of "illegal drug" activity within America.

California Prison Guard Union

California, because of legislated penal code requirements, has a huge and growing prison population. Governor Schwarzenegger is attempting to turn a few problems around by reducing the prison population. Some part of the prison population is incarcerated for non-violent "illegal drug" offensives.

The California Correctional Peace Officers Association (CCPOA) union is upset with proposed changes to prison planning for two reasons: reducing prison load would reduce the number of employed guards (30,000-member union) and prison pay levels may remain flat due to California's $15 to $18 billion long-term budget deficit.

To defend their position as the most powerful government union special interest, the prison guard union (CCPOA) gave California Legislation President Pro for Perata $602,000 to help defeat Governor Schwarzenegger voter district redistricting measure (Proposition 11, Redistricting, November 2008). Currently, gerrymandered California voter districts keep legislative special interests in alignment, which is necessary to reelect special interest leadership.

> *"Backers of November's political redistricting measure took the state prison guards union (CCPOA) to task Wednesday for giving State Senate President Pro Tem Don Perata $602,000 to help defeat the measure."*
>
> "Redistricting measure backers blast prison guards, Perata"
> By Josh Richman
> Oakland Tribune, 08/27/2008

The prison guards union (CCPOA) is an example of California government unions gaming the Sacramento political coterie to get what they want – which is more money, greater job security, one hundred percent paid healthcare benefits, and earlier retirement with full benefits. In exchange, the unions turn out the votes for the election.

California Voter District Redistricting

"Under current law, California legislators draw their own political districts. Allowing politicians to draw their own districts is a serious conflict of interest that harms voter's common good... California politicians draw districts that serve their interests, not those of our communities." (League of Women Voters of California, web site: "important background points")

"State Democratic Party leaders use it (drawing legislative district lines) to retain their margin in Sacramento, and both they and their Republican counterparts use it to plot the courses and careers of individual candidates. Raise enough money for us, they tell would-be politicians, and we'll draw an Assembly district for you now and perhaps a Senate district that you can slide into when your term expires. Cross us, and we'll draw a district that will never elect you."

"Voters are supposed to choose their representatives, but in California, political parties select their voters. That kind of power is destructive and inherently anti-democratic. It must end, and Proposition 11 will help end it."

"California needs redistricting reform"
LA Times, Opinion, September 12, 2008

Typical within California, we have too many politically bound county supervisors and city councils. Respectable city councils consider the Los Angeles City Council to be a cake burner.

"The Los Angeles City Council is the governing body... is composed of fifteen members elected from single-member districts for four-year terms ... Each council member receives an annual salary of $149,159, a figure that makes them the highest-paid city council members in the country. Each council member is entitled to a $1 million annual discretionary fund, which can be used to fund whatever project they want. Each member is granted funds to operate offices in both the City Hall and in the councilmanic districts. Each council member on average has a staff of about 20 people. The members also have the use of a city automobile."

Wikipedia: Los Angeles City Council

Within a four-year term of office, fifteen Los Angeles City Council members each have a $600,000 salary, discretionary access to $4 million, an automobile, and a staff of 20 people. If Los Angeles City voting districts are gerrymandered, and have a full time staff of 20 people, and discretionary access to $4 million per four-year election cycle -- a Los Angles City Council member can stay in office for more than twenty-years.

Apparently, the 1978 Peoples' Proposition 13 has not hampered the spending habits of the Los Angles City Council. The 2008-2009 City Budget is about $7 billion. In the 2004-2005 City Budget, it was $5.39 billion.

It would appear that the Los Angeles City Council could have many doors open to possible untoward politics.

Sisyphus was compelled to roll a huge rock up a steep hill, but before he could reach the top of the hill, the rock would always roll back down again, forcing him to begin again. The maddening nature of the Greek Gods' punishment for Sisyphus was due to his overweening pride, self-confidence, superciliousness, and arrogant belief in his own

cleverness. Governor Schwarzenegger working with the state legislatures to pass a California balanced budget is like working with Sisyphus.

The left progressive-Democrats have developed the greater capability of remaining self-sustaining without involving constitutes' common good.

Who needs compliant voters when you are the political-syndicate that is the government?

The California legislatures are the Gods of political funding to whom all other elected officials and government employees bow. I do not believe California politicians are motivated to change "illegal drug" problems within California.

On June 6, 1978, California's fiscal downfall was established with the passage of Proposition 13 (a.k.a., People's Initiative to Limit Property Taxation). The 1978 People's Initiative redistributed wealth and power from local control to that of a centralized state legislature control. Resulting is that to obtain benefit from political coterie funding, politicians who remain in office follow the biding of the grand Sacramento political coterie leadership. California politics is thought of as "grassroots politics." I sometimes think that we have a kleptocratic government (see Wikipedia: Kleptocracy)

After 1978, government and California grew more to suit the needs of politicians. Coincidently, because of a covert 1840s Marxist movement's objectives, the left progressive-Democrat legislatures have overwhelmed the unsuspecting (but not necessarily virtuous) California Republicans. Being "politically left" is now the most powerful special interest in California, and appears as a large following within Congress.

California gerrymandering of voter districts for political job security (and possibly for rewards) remains instrumental in retaining centralized political leadership status quo.

Societal and Medical (not Criminal) Drug Management

The 1967 successful musical Hair brought hope with the opening song "Aquarius." The memorable line "This is the dawning of the Age of Aquarius" was never able to get past President Nixon.

Current legislative definitions of "illegal drugs" are based upon established 1970s President Nixon and Congressional legislation.

> "Also during this time, Nixon commissioned the National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse -- known as the Shafer Commission after its chairman, Raymond P. Shafer -- to study marijuana abuse in the United States. During his presentation (March 22, 1972) of the commission's findings to Congress, Shafer recommended the decriminalization of marijuana in small amounts, saying, *'[T]he criminal law is too harsh a tool to apply to personal possession even in the effort to discourage use. It implies an overwhelming indictment of the behavior which we believe is not appropriate. The actual and*

potential harm of use of the drug is not great enough to justify intrusion by the criminal law into private behavior, a step which our society takes only 'with the greatest reluctance.' Nixon buried this commission's findings and ... (maintained marijuana as a 'Schedule I' within) ... the Controlled Substances Act (CSA of 1970)."

Wikipedia: Controlled Substances Act

The Shaffer Commission recommended decriminalization of simple possession, finding:

> *[T]he criminal law is too harsh a tool to apply to personal possession even in the effort to discourage use. It implies an overwhelming indictment of the behavior which we believe is not appropriate. The actual and potential harm of use of the drug is not great enough to justify intrusion by the criminal law into private behavior, a step which our society takes only 'with the greatest reluctance.*

The Commission found that the constitutionality of marijuana prohibition was suspect, and that the executive and legislative branches had a responsibility to obey the Constitution, even in the absence of a court ruling to do so:

> *While the judiciary is the governmental institution most directly concerned with the protection of individual liberties, all policy-makers have a responsibility to consider our constitutional heritage when framing public policy. Regardless of whether or not the courts would overturn a prohibition of possession of marihuana for personal use in the home, we are necessarily influenced by the high place traditionally occupied by the value of privacy in our constitutional scheme.*

The Commission also recommended that the distinctions between licit and illicit drugs be dropped, finding that *"the use of drugs for pleasure or other non-medical purposes is not inherently irresponsible; alcohol is widely used as an acceptable part of social activities"*

Wikipedia: National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse

While Nixon buried former Governor Shafer and his Commission, the anti-establishment social activist went on with smoking pot and doing drugs. After 40-years, "illegal drug" demand is a systemic problem within America and globally. Politicians pushed the American people down the enhanced dreary road of "illegal drugs."

The United States' Controlled Substances Act (CSA) of 1970 and the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961 (as 1972 Protocol amended) are the basis of drug control within America and international treaties. The CSA qualifies drugs by "Scheduling": i.e., drug approvals add, remove, and transfer among the five Schedules (I through V) within the CSA.

Schedule I drugs are most restrictive and Schedule V drugs least restrictive. Tobacco, beer, wine, and spirits are explicitly exempt from CSA Scheduling.

As witnessed by almost 200 beheadings in Mexico this year, the U.S. maintains a very large "illegal drug" global supply chain to satisfy American "illegal drug" users. The left progressive-Democrat politicians benefit from existing "illegal drug" legislation because the restrictions highlight social inequities and drug use that was prevalent during the Vietnam War era.

The Democrat presidential November 2008 election was crafted to resurface the images and conflicts of John F. Kennedy and Ted Kennedy involvement with the Vietnam War era (1959 - April 30, 1975). The Kennedy-Camelot era was to be reborn within the 2009 to 2013 administration. The anti-establishment drug culture was part of that Vietnam War era, therefore some Democrats maintain "illegal drug" legislation for today's political-conflict needs.

To date, we have spent $2.5 trillion on the "War on Drugs" and perhaps more than $3.5 trillion on laundered money shipped to international drug cartels. Over time, American consumption of "illegal drugs" has increased, violence has increased, and politicians have no interest in eliminating the covert criminal drug economy, or saving the American economy multi-trillions of dollars. To reform the "illegal drug" ongoing 40-year old multi-trillion-dollar drug economy would be politically embarrassing for too many politicians.

"This is the U.S. on drugs"
Only cops and crooks have benefited from $2.5 trillion spent fighting trafficking.
By David W. Fleming and James P. Gray
July 5, 2008, Opinion, Los Angeles Times

The United States' so-called war on drugs brings to mind the old saying that if you find yourself trapped in a deep hole, stop digging. Yet, last week, the Senate approved an aid package to combat drug trafficking in Mexico and Central America, with a record $400 million going to Mexico and $65 million to Central America.

The United States has been spending $69 billion a year worldwide for the last 40 years, for a total of $2.5 trillion, on drug prohibition -- with little to show for it. ***Is anyone actually benefiting from this war?*** *Six groups come to mind.*

The ***first groups*** *are the drug lords in nations such as Colombia, Afghanistan, and Mexico, as well as those in the United States. They are making billions of dollars every year -- tax-free.*

The ***second groups*** *are the street gangs that infest many of our cities and neighborhoods, whose main source of income is the sale of illegal drugs.*

__Third__ are those people in government who are paid well to fight the first two groups. Their powers and bureaucratic fiefdoms grow larger with each tax dollar spent to fund this massive program that has been proved not to work.

__Fourth__ are the politicians who get elected and reelected by talking tough -- not smart, just tough -- about drugs and crime. But the tougher we get in prosecuting nonviolent drug crimes, the softer we get in the prosecution of everything else because of the limited resources to fund the criminal justice system.

The __fifth groups__ are people who make money from increased crime. They include those who build prisons and those who staff them. The prison guards union is one of the strongest lobbying groups in California today, and its ranks continue to grow.

And __last__ are the terrorist groups worldwide that are principally financed by the sale of illegal drugs.

__Who are the losers in this war?__ Literally everyone else, especially our children.

Today, there are more drugs on our streets at cheaper prices than ever before. There are more than 1.2 million people behind bars in the U.S., and a large percentage of them for nonviolent drug usage. Under our failed drug policy, it is easier for young people to obtain illegal drugs than a six-pack of beer. Why? Because the sellers of illegal drugs don't ask kids for IDs. As soon as we outlaw a substance, we abandon our ability to regulate and control the marketing of that substance.

After we came to our senses and repealed alcohol prohibition, homicides dropped by 60% and continued to decline until World War II. Today's murder rates would likely again plummet if we ended drug prohibition.

__So what is the answer?__ Start by removing criminal penalties for marijuana, just as we did for alcohol. If we were to do this, according to state budget figures, California alone would save more than $1 billion annually, which we now spend in a futile effort to eradicate marijuana use and to jail nonviolent users. Is it any wonder that marijuana has become the largest cash crop in California?

We could generate billions of dollars by taxing the stuff, just as we do with tobacco and alcohol.

We should also reclassify most Schedule I drugs (drugs that the federal government alleges have no medicinal value, including marijuana and heroin) as Schedule II drugs (which require a prescription), with the government regulating their production, overseeing their potency, controlling their distribution and allowing licensed professionals (physicians, psychiatrists, psychologists, etc.) to

prescribe them. This course of action would acknowledge that medical issues, such as drug addiction, are best left under the supervision of medical doctors instead of police officers.

The mission of the criminal justice system *should always be to protect us from one another and not from ourselves. That means that drug users who drive a motor vehicle or commit other crimes while under the influence of these drugs would continue to be held criminally responsible for their actions, with strict penalties. But that said, the system should not be used to protect us from ourselves.*

Ending drug prohibition, taxing and regulating drugs and spending tax dollars to treat addiction and dependency are the approaches that many of the world's industrialized countries are taking. Those approaches are ones that work.

David W. Fleming, a lawyer, is the chair of the Los Angeles County Business Federation and immediate past chair of the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce. James P. Gray is a judge of the Orange County Superior Court

Technically, it is not hard to passively transition from the ruin of criminal "illegal drugs" to regulation of legal-drugs of potential misuse. Thus, "*Ending drug prohibition, taxing and regulating drugs and spending tax dollars to treat addiction and dependency are the approaches that many of the world's industrialized countries are taking. Those approaches are ones that work.*"

"*The mission of the criminal justice system should always be to protect us from one another and not from ourselves. That means that drug users who drive a motor vehicle or commit other crimes while under the influence of these drugs would continue to be held criminally responsible for their actions, with strict penalties. But that said, the system should not be used to protect us from ourselves.*"

There is a need for a U.S. drug risk-assessment of harm to assess the harm resulting from a drug's potential misuse. The United Kingdom (UK) Advisory Council on the Misuse of Drugs (ACMD) has developed a drug risk-assessment 'Matrix of Harm.'

There are three (3) main factors that together determine the harm associated with any drug of potential abuse: the physical harm to the individual user caused by the drug; the tendency of the drug to induce dependence; and the effect of drug use on families, communities, and society

A drug's impact risk-assessment 'Matrix of Harm has within three (3) main categories and three (3) sub-factors, together they determine the harm that is associated with any drug of potential abuse.

What is the Matrix scope and who does the evaluation? The methodology used within the Matrix assessment technique offers a systematic framework and process that could be

used by national and international regulatory bodies to assess the harm of current and future drugs of abuse. (For additional information, see study *"Development of a rational scale to assess the harm of drugs of potential misuse,"* By: David Nutt, Leslie A King, William Saulsbury, and Colin Blakemore, Lancet 2007; 369: 1047–53)

The development of the proposed American drug "Matrix of Harm," by an independent qualified group of technicians, is necessary because much of the current assessments of "illegal drugs" are conflicting with drug use reality. The "Matrix of Harm" was developed within a peer-reviewed United Kingdom study.

If tobacco, beer, wine, and spirits were to be included within a reformed CSA Scheduling, and based upon the British drug "Matrix of Harm," most people would be surprised to find that drug harm (in descending order of harm) below **alcohol** is -- ketamine, benzodiazepines, **amphetamine**, **tobacco**, buprenorphine, **cannabis**, solvents, 4-MTA, **LSD**, **methylphenidate**, **anabolic steroids**, **GHB**, **ecstasy** (MDMA), alkyl nitrites, and khat.

The assessment matrix design includes nine parameters of risk, created by dividing each of the three major categories of harm into three subgroups. The "Matrix of Harm" review-experts had experience in one of the many areas of addiction, ranging from chemistry, pharmacology, and forensic science, through psychiatry and other medical specialties, including epidemiology, as well as the legal and police services.

Some may dispute the rankings of the proposed British drug "Matrix of Harm" of drugs of potential abuse. Most likely, some rankings will adjust slightly over time resulting from further independent review by an empowered team of qualified medical, social, and criminal behaviorist. However, the main body of the Matrix will most likely remain as is for some time to come.

If America politicians were to no longer cling to the 1970s criminal "illegal drug" approach to drugs of potential abuse, those who would have the most to loose would be -- drug lords, street gangs, bureaucratic fiefdoms of crime fighters, politicians, prisons (and those who staff them), and terrorist/rebellion groups.

Passively transitioning from criminal control of "illegal drugs" to a societal and medical control of legal-drugs of potential abuse would result in gains by literally everyone else globally, and within America, especially our children.

In order to passively transition from criminal control of "illegal drugs," to a societal and medical control of any legal-drug of potential abuse, requires only reform of Re-Scheduling within the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) of 1970. Drug evaluation reform is to be based upon conclusions derived from evaluating physical harm, dependence, and social harms of drugs of potential abuse.

"Illegal Drug" Perspective Summary

Since the unstudied Scheduling within the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) of 1970, there has occurred a grinding destruction of people, societies, and economies. It is time for American politicians to wake up and act to a higher order of fiduciary responsibility.

The mission of the criminal justice system should always be to protect us from one another and not from ourselves.

Medical issues, such as drug addiction, are best left under the supervision of medical doctors instead of police officers or some untoward politician.

The Shafer Commission also recommended (1972) that the distinctions between licit and illicit drugs be dropped, finding that *"the use of drugs for pleasure or other non-medical purposes is not inherently irresponsible; alcohol is widely used as an acceptable part of social activities"*

The global violence resulting from American consumption of "illegal drugs" is a simple concept to visualize – just keep in mind Mexican *"gangsters hacked off 30 craniums across the country -- adding to the total of almost 200 beheadings in 2008 so far."*

American taxpayers have spent many trillions of dollars (perhaps greatly exceeding $6 trillion over the long-term) on the war on drugs and exporting drug to be money laundered within foreign countries.

The cost to America for political "illegal drugs" would most likely exceed home asset values currently held by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac mortgage giants. Combined, the newly nationalized Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are responsible for more than half of all mortgage lending, or about $6 trillion.

For years, Congress has transitioned from capitalism to a socialist (or communist) oriented Marxist-governance. During this time, there has been only minor interest in reforming the Vietnam War era's "illegal drug" legislation (i.e., the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) of 1970).

Congressional special-interest intentions currently represent the needs of the illegal-drug economy within their voting district. Most non-drug-gang voting districts view "illegal drugs" as NIMBY (not in my back yard). The facts are that "illegal drug" use and crime is everywhere within America, and is present in very large quantities.

Congress is to recognize and correct systemic problems that develop where cities and communities ignore federal law and create there own political fiefdoms of "medical marijuana" and illegal immigrant "sanctuary cities."

Government regulation of "legal-drugs of potential abuse" provides opportunities for appropriate taxation, drug-education, and distribution of popular and currently in use of drugs of potential abuse. Therefore, proper social and medical assistance for people who abuse drugs becomes more effective.

The federal government is to regulate the production, distribution, sale, and taxing of legal-drugs of potential abuse. Global criminal drug gangs' lost revenue is recaptured as federal/state tax revenue and legal capitalist profits. The taxes would help offset welfare, social services, healthcare, education, and "low-income" housing for the poor. Alternatively, the tax revenue could be applied to reduce the federal debt.

The "illegal drug" economy was institutionalized over 40-years. Generating legal jobs for some poor communities involves basic social transformations within the community. Increased community funding would be of little help in transformations of morality values and peer pressures. The necessary moral assistance includes communities regaining their values of God, family, duty, and county.

Congress, as their own special interest, has failed America miserably by clinging to projections of Vietnam War era social radicalism. Continued support of Nixon-Congresses' "illegal drug" legislation has developed an untreated multi-trillion-dollar American drug habit. This "illegal drug" habit results in global crime, societal decay, and economic decay within America.

Turning Congress to support legal-drugs of potential abuse, as a societal and medical concern (and a very much lesser criminal matter), is to be part of the coming salivation of the America economy and society within the 21st Century.

"Compassion is not religious business, it is human business, it is not luxury, it is essential for our own peace and mental stability, it is essential for human survival."

- Dalai Lama

Sincerely,

David G. Eselius – An open letter

Attachment: *"Behind Mexico's Wave of Beheadings"*

Monday, Sep. 08, 2008
"Behind Mexico's Wave of Beheadings"
By Ioan Grillo / Mexico City

There's a peaceful aura about the lifeless faces lined up on the video, death having drained the tension from their cheeks, their eyes wide shut above thick moustaches, and square jaws. But as the shot pans out, the horror of their end is revealed: The dead men's heads have been roughly hacked away from their torsos, which the camera finds hanging upside down across the room on meat hooks, their blood draining away onto white floor tiles. "This is your responsibility for not respecting the deals you have made with us," reads a hand-written note in Spanish by the decapitated heads.

The sickening footage was posted on YouTube after 12 headless bodies were dumped on two ranches in Mexico's southeastern Yucatan peninsula last week. Police identified the victims as local drug dealers, saying five were decapitated while alive, but that the rest had been dismembered after first being strangled or beaten to death. A police sweep netted three suspects allegedly arrested while carrying bloodied axes and machetes. The suspects were alleged to have been members of the ultra-violent drug gang the Zetas, indicating the atrocities may have been the latest act of terror in the relentless turf war over Mexico's billion dollar smuggling routes. Police also claimed the killings may have had a ritual dimension, after searching the suspects' houses and finding shrines to "The Holy Death," a grim reaper figure venerated by many Mexican criminals.

The biggest mass beheading in recent history caused widespread revulsion in Mexico, but little surprise. Decapitations have become as commonplace in the increasingly vicious narco turf battles as stabbings are in London. During August alone, gangsters hacked off 30 craniums across the country -- adding to the total of almost 200 beheadings in 2008 so far. Heads have been stuck on crosses, shoved into iceboxes, and left in car trunks along with snakes.

"The gangsters use these bloody tactics to try and win a psychological war against their enemy and sow terror in the population," said Luis Astorga, author of several books on the cartels. "But neither side is winning, and the violence just spirals without end as the gangs keep raising their bets and killing in more spectacular ways."

Decapitations were almost unheard of here before 2006. The first case related to the drug wars occurred in April of that year, when thugs left the craniums of two policemen in the seaside resort Acapulco, apparently in revenge for the shooting of four traffickers in a prolonged gun battle. The following September, thugs in ski masks rolled five severed heads onto a dance floor in the mountainous state of Michoacan. The cycle of beheadings intensified throughout 2007 until every gangster in Mexico seemed to have an executioner's ax in his arsenal.

Most heads are left with notes such as one that read: "See. Hear. Shut up. If you want to stay alive." Others have been videotaped and posted on the Internet. One 2007 film on

YouTube showed a man in a ski mask slicing off the head of an alleged Zeta tied to a chair in his underwear. YouTube quickly removed the video, just as it took down last week's film of the beheaded bodies. But the site handles millions of videos, making them difficult to control.

Public Safety Secretary Genaro Garcia Luna claims that the inspiration for the terror tactic had been al-Qaeda in Iraq. "This began after there was an image that al-Qaeda sent out to the world via the Internet showing the execution of a prisoner in Iraq," he told a news conference after the 2007 video.

There may also be more local influences at work: Following some early beheadings, Mexican police arrested former members of Guatemala's elite Kaibil military unit, which had carried out bloody atrocities against rebel villages during the nation's four-decade civil war. "We have testimonies of the Kaibiles hacking off the heads of living people with knives to terrorize communities," said Guatemalan Rep. Otilia Lux de Coti, who served in the nation's Truth Commission following the 1996 peace accord. "Many continue to be dangerous killers after they leave the military." The Kaibiles are alleged to work with Mexico's Zetas, many who were themselves defectors from elite military units. Beheadings are also a favored tactic of Central America's bloody Mara Salvatrucha gangs, who have been enlisted as muscle by the Mexican mafias.

Archeologist Ernesto Vargas says the tactic could even reflect the pre-Columbian use of beheadings, a common tactic of the Mayan people who dominated southern Mexico and Guatemala before the Spanish conquest. "The Mayans cut off the heads of prisoners as a symbol of complete domination over their enemies," Vargas said. One of the biggest pre-Hispanic sites of severed skulls was found in the Mayan ruins of Chichen Itza, close to the site of last week's massacre, he points out.

Whatever its roots, there appears no end in sight to the current wave of decapitations. Astorga fears that even worse atrocities lie ahead. "Who knows what perverse methods these assassins might use to get one up over their rivals," he said. "Many are military killers but without the army command to hold them back. Their only limits are what they can imagine or what they can find in the most violent Hollywood movies."

10/7

On behalf of
BERT
PEPLIES

[redacted]
San Francisco, California 94109
Telephone: 415 [redacted]
Email: steve@r[redacted]

25

September 19, 2008

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
San Francisco, CA 94102
Attn: Communications

Re: Homicide Investigation of BERT PEPLIES, August 31, 2007

To Whom This May Concern:

Robert (Bert) Peplies, a member of our family, was a victim in a double homicide (or alleged murder/suicide) that occurred on August 31, 2007, more than one year ago, in Ingleside Heights. To date, no one in our family has received any information as to even when we can expect to receive the relevant autopsy and police reports. The autopsy report for the second victim, Linda Almanza, was released in January 2008.

We have cooperated fully with Inspector Karen Lynch. Ms. Lynch assured us that a "Rush" was placed on finalizing Bert's autopsy due to the apparent brutality of the crime. At the time, she predicted it could take up to four months to receive the complete report.

On Thursday, September 13, 2007, during Barbara Peplies' visit to San Francisco, Barbara (Bert's sister) and Diane Rigda (married to Bert's stepbrother and resident of San Francisco) met with Inspector Lynch at the police station at 850 Bryant Street, to collect Bert's possessions found on his person at the time of death. When Barbara offered Bert's diary to Inspector Lynch, on that day, Ms. Lynch responded that she did not need any further information and that they already knew what had happened (she did not elaborate, saying "I have already said too much"). Ms. Lynch never even inquired why Barbara thought this diary could contain relevant evidence. At that time, based on Ms. Lynch's confidence, we assumed Bert's reports would be ready very soon.

We are not familiar with murder investigations as this is the first time such a tragedy has happened to anyone in our family. We relied on what we were told by Ms. Lynch and the San Francisco Medical Examiner's office but what we were told one year ago has not come to pass. We still are struggling without closure in Bert's death.

25

"Stiffed" by John Geluardi in the September 10, 2008 SF Weekly mentions our situation and, in particular, highlights our family's frustration with the stalling and lack of information about obtaining Bert's reports. On Wednesday, September 10, 2008, the day "Stiffed" was published, Inspector Karen Lynch telephoned Barbara Peplies and left an angry voicemail message claiming that the aforementioned article is "all lies."

We felt unnecessarily intimidated and thought her tone was uncalled for. We are not criminals; our family member is dead and we do not know anything definite about the circumstances of his death. We simply want all the information to which we are entitled and in a timely fashion. Our family is, of course, upset and shocked by Bert's death but this poor treatment by the authorities with whom we have tried to cooperate and to be patient, has angered and upset us anew.

As law-abiding, tax-paying voters we are concerned about poor customer service and a sloppy investigation. We are concerned that someone may have gotten away with murder. We do not deserve to be treated as we have and certainly do not need to be exposed to the unprofessional behavior of Ms. Lynch. Instead an occasional courtesy call, informing us of any progress or even lack thereof, would have been and will be so much appreciated.

Consider appointing a liaison officer to assist victim's families in information gathering. We are entitled to a police report, crime scene report and autopsy report (including toxicology and DNA analysis) regarding Bert Peplies' death on August 31, 2007. We do not care about statistics or politics. We are not disputing the conclusions of the police or wish in any way to be antagonistic; we simply want the proof so that we can move on.

Please immediately provide details as to when we can reasonably expect to receive this information and, as soon as they are available, the reports to all signatories of this letter.

Sincerely,

Barbara Peplies
[redacted]
Alcoa, TN 37701

Mark Peplies
1 [redacted]
Johnson City, TN 37601

Steve Dowd and Diane Rigda
[redacted]
San Francisco, CA 94109

Bob Peplies, Sr. and Anne Brading
[redacted]
Johnson City, TN 37604

cc: Police Commission
cc: Chief of Police Heather J. Fong
cc: Mayor Gavin Newsom
cc: Lieutenant Michael Stasko (in charge of Homicide Division)
cc: Chief of San Francisco Medical Examiner's Office, Stephen Gelman

10/7

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

OFFICE OF THE TREASURER

José Cisneros
TREASURER

PAULINE MARX
Chief Assistant Treasurer

Newlin Rankin
Chief Investment Officer

September 15, 2008

The Honorable Gavin Newsom
Mayor of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, Ca 94102-0917

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, Ca 94102-0917

26

Ladies and Gentlemen:

This correspondence and its attachments show the investment activity (for fiscal year to date) of the portfolios under Treasurer's management.

Portfolio Statistics from July 1, 2008 to August 31, 2008:

	Pooled	All
Interest Received	$14,335,747	$14,335,747
Total Net Earnings	$13,962,956	$14,240,234
Earned Income Yield	2.675%	2.697%
Average Age of Portfolio	335 Days	332 Days

Total cost of the securities on hand as of August 31, 2008 was $3,061,929,439 with a market value of $3,059,696,352 plus fixed assets accrued interests of $9,506,278. The earned income yield for the month of August 2008 is 2.696%.

In accordance with provisions of California State Government Code Section 53646, we are forwarding herewith computer printouts detailing the City's investment portfolio as of August 31, 2008. These investments are in compliance with California Code and our statement of investment policy, and provide sufficient liquidity to meet expenditure requirements for the next six months.

Very truly yours,

José Cisneros
Treasurer
Enc.
cc: Harvey Rose, Budget Analyst (w/Enc.)
Ben Rosenfield, Controller (w/Enc.)
Controller – Internal Audit Division -YTD-All Funds, YTD-Pooled Funds
Oversight Committee: R. Sullivan, Dr. Don Q. Griffin, J. Grazioli, S. MacDonald, P. Marx
Transportation Authority – David Murray, San Francisco Public Library – 2 copies
Office Copy

C I T Y / C O U N T Y O F S A N F R A N C I S C O
M R . N E W L I N R A N K I N 4 1 5 - 5 5 4 - 4 4 8 7

P O R T F O L I O S T A T I S T I C S
7/01/08 THROUGH 8/31/08

RUN: 09/04/08 12:11:52

ALL FUNDS

	GOV'T SECURITIES ASSETS	GOV'T SECURITIES LIABILITIES	TIME DEPOSITS ASSETS	TIME DEPOSITS LIABILITIES	TOTAL
TOTAL INCOME RECEIVED IN THIS PERIOD:	14,171,480.40	.00	164,266.89	N/A	14,335,747.29
TOTAL NET EARNINGS THIS PERIOD:	14,061,801.20	.00	178,432.65	N/A	14,240,233.85
AVERAGE DAILY PORTFOLIO BALANCE:	3,075,974,616.30	.00	32,296,774.19	N/A	3,108,271,390.49
EARNED INCOME YIELD THIS PERIOD:	2.691	.000	3.252	N/A	2.697
END OF PERIOD PORTFOLIO BALANCE:	3,021,729,438.86	.00	40,200,000.00	N/A	3,061,929,438.86
CURRENT AMORTIZED BOOK VALUE:	3,020,654,899.48	.00	40,200,000.00	N/A	3,060,854,899.48
WEIGHTED AVERAGE YIELD AT END OF PERIOD:	2.653	.000	3.209	N/A	2.660
WEIGHTED AVERAGE DAYS TO MATURITY:	331.67	.00	154.44	N/A	N/A
WEIGHTED AVERAGE DAYS TO CALL:	331.67	.00	154.44	N/A	N/A
NET PORTFOLIO YIELD, 365-DAY BASIS:					2.697

(FS/ERNFS)

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487

PORTFOLIO STATISTICS
7/01/08 THROUGH 8/31/08

RUN: 09/04/08 12:11:51

FUND: 100 POOLED FUNDS

	GOV'T SECURITIES ASSETS	GOV'T SECURITIES LIABILITIES	TIME DEPOSITS ASSETS	TIME DEPOSITS LIABILITIES	TOTAL
TOTAL INCOME RECEIVED IN THIS PERIOD:	14,171,480.40	.00	164,266.89	N/A	14,335,747.29
TOTAL NET EARNINGS THIS PERIOD:	13,784,523.43	.00	178,432.65	N/A	13,962,956.08
AVERAGE DAILY PORTFOLIO BALANCE:	3,040,974,616.30	.00	32,296,774.19	N/A	3,073,271,390.49
EARNED INCOME YIELD THIS PERIOD:	2.669	.000	3.252	N/A	2.675
END OF PERIOD PORTFOLIO BALANCE:	2,986,729,438.86	.00	40,200,000.00	N/A	3,026,929,438.86
CURRENT AMORTIZED BOOK VALUE:	2,985,654,899.48	.00	40,200,000.00	N/A	3,025,854,899.48
WEIGHTED AVERAGE YIELD AT END OF PERIOD:	2.629	.000	3.209	N/A	2.637
WEIGHTED AVERAGE DAYS TO MATURITY:	334.69	.00	154.44	N/A	N/A
WEIGHTED AVERAGE DAYS TO CALL:	334.69	.00	154.44	N/A	N/A
NET PORTFOLIO YIELD, 365-DAY BASIS:					2.675

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487

PORTFOLIO STATISTICS
7/01/08 THROUGH 8/31/08

FUND: 9702 SFUSD TRANS 07-08

	GOV'T SECURITIES ASSETS	GOV'T SECURITIES LIABILITIES	TIME DEPOSITS ASSETS	TIME DEPOSITS LIABILITIES	TOTAL
TOTAL INCOME RECEIVED IN THIS PERIOD:	.00	.00	.00	N/A	.00
TOTAL NET EARNINGS THIS PERIOD:	277,277.77	.00	.00	N/A	277,277.77
AVERAGE DAILY PORTFOLIO BALANCE:	35,000,000.00	.00	.00	N/A	35,000,000.00
EARNED INCOME YIELD THIS PERIOD:	4.664	.000	.000	N/A	4.664
END OF PERIOD PORTFOLIO BALANCE:	35,000,000.00	.00	.00	N/A	35,000,000.00
CURRENT AMORTIZED BOOK VALUE:	35,000,000.00	.00	.00	N/A	35,000,000.00
WEIGHTED AVERAGE YIELD AT END OF PERIOD:	4.664	.000	.000	N/A	4.664
WEIGHTED AVERAGE DAYS TO MATURITY:	74.00	.00	.00	N/A	N/A
WEIGHTED AVERAGE DAYS TO CALL:	74.00	.00	.00	N/A	N/A
NET PORTFOLIO YIELD, 365-DAY BASIS:					4.664

1

(SIRPT)

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487
INVESTMENT INVENTORY
INVESTMENTS OUTSTANDING AS OF 8/31/08
MAJOR SORT KEY IS ICC#
SETTLEMENT DATE BASIS

PAGE: 1
RUN: 09/04/08 11:41:01

SUMMARY DESCRIPTION		CUPN RATE	TRDNG YIELD	BOOK PRICE	PAR VALUE SHARES	BOOK VALUE
(Inv Type) 11 TREASURY BILLS	3.24%(C)	1.875	1.891	99.176	100,000,000.00	99,175,694.44
(Inv Type) 12 TREASURY NOTES	17.62%(C)	3.050	2.504	100.635	536,100,000.00	539,503,314.36
(Inv Type) 22 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	1.81%(C)	4.337	3.872	100.795	55,000,000.00	55,437,000.00
(Inv Type) 23 FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSN.	1.09%(C)	4.300	3.605	101.086	33,150,000.00	33,510,009.00
(Inv Type) 28 FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	.84%(C)	3.120	3.120	100.000	25,700,000.00	25,700,000.00
(Inv Type) 30 FHLMC Bonds	2.64%(C)	4.351	4.099	101.076	79,950,000.00	80,810,000.00
(Inv Type) 31 FHLB FLOATER QTR ACT-360	17.95%(C)	2.617	2.633	99.996	549,500,000.00	549,476,468.00
(Inv Type) 33 FFCB FLOATER QTR ACT-360	1.63%(C)	2.520	2.520	100.000	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00
(Inv Type) 41 FNMA DISCOUNT NOTES	4.84%(C)	2.430	2.457	98.897	150,000,000.00	148,345,125.00
(Inv Type) 43 FEDERAL HOME LOAN DISC NOTES	8.90%(C)	2.270	2.291	99.097	275,000,000.00	272,517,652.77
(Inv Type) 44 FMC DISCOUNT NOTES	4.28%(C)	2.138	2.160	98.989	132,428,000.00	131,089,401.69
(Inv Type) 81 COMMERCIAL PAPER DISC	20.52%(C)	2.643	2.672	98.932	635,000,000.00	628,216,995.82
(Inv Type) 82 COMMERCIAL PAPER INT BEARING	4.83%(C)	2.913	5.907	98.632	150,000,000.00	147,947,777.78
(Inv Type) 91 NEGOTIABLE C.D.'S	8.49%(C)	2.956	2.956	100.000	260,000,000.00	260,000,000.00
(Inv Type) 1010 PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT	.17%(C)	2.787	2.787	100.000	5,200,000.00	5,200,000.00
(Inv Type) 1011 PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT MONTHLY	1.14%(C)	3.221	3.221	100.000	35,000,000.00	35,000,000.00
	REPORT TOTALS					
	ASSETS FIXED	2.762	2.802	99.671	3,072,028,000.00	3,061,929,438.86

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487
INVESTMENT INVENTORY
INVESTMENTS OUTSTANDING AS OF 8/31/08
MAJOR SORT KEY IS ICC#
SETTLEMENT DATE BASIS

pool

SUMMARY DESCRIPTION		CUPN RATE	TRDNG YIELD	BOOK PRICE	PAR VALUE SHARES	BOOK VALUE
(Inv Type) 11 TREASURY BILLS	3.28%(C)	1.875	1.891	99.176	100,000,000.00	99,175,694.44
(Inv Type) 12 TREASURY NOTES	17.82%(C)	3.050	2.504	100.635	536,100,000.00	539,503,314.36
(Inv Type) 22 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	1.83%(C)	4.337	3.872	100.795	55,000,000.00	55,437,000.00
(Inv Type) 23 FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSN.	1.11%(C)	4.300	3.605	101.086	33,150,000.00	33,510,009.00
(Inv Type) 28 FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	.85%(C)	3.120	3.120	100.000	25,700,000.00	25,700,000.00
(Inv Type) 30 FHLMC Bonds	2.67%(C)	4.351	4.099	101.076	79,950,000.00	80,810,000.00
(Inv Type) 31 FHLB FLOATER QTR ACT-360	18.15%(C)	2.617	2.633	99.996	549,500,000.00	549,476,468.00
(Inv Type) 33 FFCB FLOATER QTR ACT-360	1.65%(C)	2.520	2.520	100.000	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00
(Inv Type) 41 FNMA DISCOUNT NOTES	4.90%(C)	2.430	2.457	98.897	150,000,000.00	148,345,125.00
(Inv Type) 43 FEDERAL HOME LOAN DISC NOTES	9.00%(C)	2.270	2.291	99.097	275,000,000.00	272,517,652.77
(Inv Type) 44 FMC DISCOUNT NOTES	4.33%(C)	2.138	2.160	98.989	132,428,000.00	131,089,401.69
(Inv Type) 81 COMMERCIAL PAPER DISC	20.75%(C)	2.643	2.672	98.932	635,000,000.00	628,216,995.82
(Inv Type) 82 COMMERCIAL PAPER INT BEARING	4.89%(C)	2.913	5.907	98.632	150,000,000.00	147,947,777.78
(Inv Type) 91 NEGOTIABLE C.D.'S	7.43%(C)	2.700	2.700	100.000	225,000,000.00	225,000,000.00
(Inv Type) 1010 PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT	.17%(C)	2.787	2.787	100.000	5,200,000.00	5,200,000.00
(Inv Type) 1011 PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT MONTHLY	1.16%(C)	3.221	3.221	100.000	35,000,000.00	35,000,000.00
REPORT TOTALS		2.741	2.781	99.667	3,037,028,000.00	3,026,929,438.86
ASSETS FIXED						

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487

INVESTMENT MATURITY DISTRIBUTION
AS OF 08/31/08

RUN: 09/04/08 11:41:07

ALL FUNDS

CALL/MATURITY	DATE RANGE	NO OF INV	COST	%	CUM %
1 TO 2 MONTHS	09/01/08-10/31/08	26	913,004,482.95	29.8	29.8
2 TO 3 MONTHS	11/01/08-11/30/08	8	278,439,363.89	9.1	38.9
3 TO 4 MONTHS	12/01/08-12/31/08	14	348,734,456.06	11.4	50.3
4 TO 5 MONTHS	01/01/09-01/31/09	13	393,054,511.05	12.8	63.1
5 TO 6 MONTHS	02/01/09-02/28/09	1	49,345,125.00	1.6	64.7
6 TO 12 MONTHS	03/01/09-08/31/09	8	158,217,995.64	5.2	69.9
12 TO 18 MONTHS	09/01/09-02/28/10	13	564,035,177.76	18.4	88.3
18 TO 24 MONTHS	03/01/10-08/31/10	1	25,700,000.00	.8	89.2
24 TO 36 MONTHS	09/01/10-08/31/11	0		.0	89.2
36 TO 48 MONTHS	09/01/11-08/31/12	0		.0	89.2
48 TO 60 MONTHS	09/01/12-08/31/13	8	331,398,326.51	10.8	100.0
60 TO 72 MONTHS	09/01/13-08/31/14	0		.0	100.0
72 TO 84 MONTHS	09/01/14-08/31/15	0		.0	100.0
84 TO 120 MONTHS	09/01/15-08/31/18	0		.0	100.0
120 TO *** MONTHS	09/01/18-	0		.0	100.0
GRAND TOTALS		92	3,061,929,438.86		

Total number of funds represented: 2

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487

(SIRPT) INVESTMENT INVENTORY

INVESTMENTS OUTSTANDING AS OF 8/31/08
MAJOR SORT KEY IS ICC#
SETTLEMENT DATE BASIS

INVSMT NO.	DESCRIPTION	CUSIP	FUND NO.	MATURITY (TICKER)	PURCHASE DATE	SAF/ PURP	CUPN RATE	TRDNG YIELD	BOOK PRICE	PAR VALUE SHARES	BOOK VALUE
A 42041	T BILL	912795H95	100	12/04/08	07/02/08	000	2.000	2.017	99.139	50,000,000.00	49,569,444.44
A 42064	T BILL	912795J93	100	01/29/09	08/20/08	000	1.750	1.764	99.213	50,000,000.00	49,606,250.00
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 11 TREASURY BILLS				3.24%(C)			1.875	1.891	99.176	100,000,000.00	99,175,694.44
A 41876	T NOTE	912828FT2	100	09/30/08	10/31/07	000	4.625	3.981	100.570	2,000,000.00	2,011,406.25
A 41877	T NOTE	912828FT2	100	09/30/08	10/31/07	000	4.625	3.976	100.574	2,000,000.00	2,011,484.38
A 41878	T NOTE	912828FT2	100	09/30/08	10/31/07	000	4.625	3.981	100.570	2,000,000.00	2,011,406.25
A 41879	T NOTE	912828FT2	100	09/30/08	10/31/07	000	4.625	3.976	100.574	2,000,000.00	2,011,484.38
A 41697	T NOTE (98)	912828BT6	100	12/15/08	07/23/07	000	3.375	4.860	98.016	5,000,000.00	4,900,781.25
A 41698	T NOTE (98)	912828BT6	100	12/15/08	07/23/07	000	3.375	4.866	98.008	10,000,000.00	9,800,781.25
A 41699	T NOTE (98)	912828BT6	100	12/15/08	07/23/07	000	3.375	4.907	97.953	5,000,000.00	4,897,656.25
A 41700	T NOTE (98)	912828BT6	100	12/15/08	07/23/07	000	3.375	4.901	97.961	5,000,000.00	4,898,046.88
A 41738	T NOTE (98.11)	912828BT6	100	12/15/08	08/08/07	000	3.375	4.668	98.320	8,000,000.00	7,865,625.00
A 41740	T NOTE	912828BT6	100	12/15/08	08/07/07	000	3.375	4.583	98.426	5,000,000.00	4,921,289.06
A 41662	T. NOTE (99.19)	912828GB0	100	12/31/08	06/08/07	000	4.750	5.038	99.570	20,000,000.00	19,914,062.50
A 42003	T NOTE	912828GL8	100	03/31/09	04/09/08	000	4.500	1.682	102.825	50,000,000.00	51,412,749.77
A 42013	T NOTE	912828GL8	100	03/31/09	04/09/08	000	4.500	1.682	102.825	50,000,000.00	51,412,749.77
A 41870	T NOTE	912828FE5	100	05/15/09	10/26/07	000	4.875	3.797	101.609	5,000,000.00	5,080,468.75
A 41841	T NOTE	912828GT1	100	05/31/09	10/16/07	000	4.875	4.250	100.965	10,000,000.00	10,096,484.38
A 41862	T NOTE	912828GY0	100	07/31/09	10/23/07	000	4.625	3.864	101.285	5,100,000.00	5,165,542.97
A 41993	T NOTE	912828HS2	100	02/28/10	03/31/08	000	2.000	1.677	100.605	50,000,000.00	50,302,734.38
A 41994	T NOTE	912828HS2	100	02/28/10	03/31/08	000	2.000	1.677	100.605	50,000,000.00	50,302,734.38
A 41995	T NOTE	912828HV5	100	03/31/13	04/01/08	000	2.500	2.458	100.202	50,000,000.00	50,101,071.55
A 41996	T NOTE	912828HV5	100	03/31/13	04/01/08	000	2.500	2.458	100.202	50,000,000.00	50,101,071.55
A 41997	T NOTE	912828HV5	100	03/31/13	04/01/08	000	2.500	2.458	100.202	25,000,000.00	25,050,535.78
A 41998	T NOTE	912828HV5	100	03/31/13	04/01/08	000	2.500	2.462	100.187	50,000,000.00	50,093,259.05
A 41999	T NOTE	912828HV5	100	03/31/13	04/01/08	000	2.500	2.462	100.187	50,000,000.00	50,093,259.05
A 42012	T NOTE	912828HV5	100	03/31/13	04/01/08	000	2.500	2.462	100.187	25,000,000.00	25,046,629.53
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 12 TREASURY NOTES				17.62%(C)			3.050	2.504	100.635	536,100,000.00	539,503,314.36
A 41988	FEDERAL HOME LN BKS	3133XMWP2	100	11/13/09	03/18/08	000	4.500	3.531	101.538	25,000,000.00	25,384,500.00
A 41950	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	3133XP4T8	100	01/28/13	01/31/08	000	4.200	4.161	100.175	30,000,000.00	30,052,500.00
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 22 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK				1.81%(C)			4.337	3.872	100.795	55,000,000.00	55,437,000.00
A 42033	FEDERAL NATL MTG ASSN	31398AKU5	100	12/24/09	05/08/08	000	4.300	3.605	101.086	33,150,000.00	33,510,009.00
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 23 FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSN				1.09%(C)			4.300	3.605	101.086	33,150,000.00	33,510,009.00
A 41986	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	31331YYL8	100	03/18/10	03/18/08	000	3.120	3.120	100.000	25,700,000.00	25,700,000.00

C I T Y / C O U N T Y O F S A N F R A N C I S C O
M R . N E W L I N R A N K I N 4 1 5 - 5 5 4 - 4 4 8 7
I N V E S T M E N T I N V E N T O R Y
INVESTMENTS OUTSTANDING AS OF 8/31/08
MAJOR SORT KEY IS ICC#
SETTLEMENT DATE BASIS

INVSMT NO.	DESCRIPTION	CUSIP	FUND NO.	MATURITY (TICKER)	PURCHASE DATE	SAF/ PURP	CUPN RATE	TRDNG YIELD	BOOK PRICE	PAR VALUE SHARES	BOOK VALUE
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 28 FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK				.84%(C)							
							3.120	3.120	100.000	25,700,000.00	25,700,000.00
A 42045	F H L M C	3128X7N91	100	07/14/09	07/14/08	000	3.250	3.250	100.000	29,950,000.00	29,950,000.00
A 41973	FEDERAL HOME LN MTG CORP	3128X6VZ6	100	12/19/12	02/15/08	000	5.000	4.598	101.720	50,000,000.00	50,860,000.00
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 30 FHLMC Bonds				2.64%(C)							
							4.351	4.099	101.076	79,950,000.00	80,810,000.00
A 42016	F H L B FLOATER	3133XNXA2	100	01/08/09	04/18/08	000	2.589	2.679	99.955	50,000,000.00	49,977,500.00
A 42018	F H L B FLOATER	3133XNYB9	100	01/14/09	04/21/08	000	2.588	2.678	99.955	50,000,000.00	49,977,358.00
A 42019	F H L B FLOATER	3133XNYB9	100	01/14/09	04/21/08	000	2.588	2.678	99.955	30,000,000.00	29,986,410.00
A 42020	FHLB FLOATER QTR	3133XPAY0	100	01/28/09	01/25/08	000	2.625	2.625	100.000	15,000,000.00	15,000,000.00
A 42021	FHLB FLOATER QTR	3133XPAY0	100	01/28/09	01/25/08	000	2.625	2.625	100.000	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00
A 41915	F H L B FLOATER	3133XNF61	100	11/23/09	12/07/07	000	2.626	2.651	99.969	50,000,000.00	49,984,700.00
A 41916	F H L B FLOATER	3133XNF61	100	11/23/09	12/07/07	000	2.626	2.651	99.969	50,000,000.00	49,984,700.00
A 41924	F H L B FLOATER	3133XNF61	100	11/23/09	12/28/07	000	2.626	2.586	100.050	50,000,000.00	50,024,900.00
A 41937	F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT	3133XNF61	100	11/23/09	01/09/08	000	2.626	2.610	100.020	50,000,000.00	50,010,000.00
A 41938	F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT	3133XNF61	100	11/23/09	01/09/08	000	2.626	2.610	100.020	50,000,000.00	50,010,000.00
A 41939	F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT	3133XNF61	100	11/23/09	01/09/08	000	2.626	2.610	100.020	4,500,000.00	4,500,900.00
A 41940	F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT	3133XNF61	100	11/23/09	01/09/08	000	2.626	2.610	100.020	50,000,000.00	50,010,000.00
A 41941	F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT	3133XNF61	100	11/23/09	01/09/08	000	2.626	2.610	100.020	50,000,000.00	50,010,000.00
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 31 FHLB FLOATER QTR ACT-360				17.95%(C)							
							2.617	2.633	99.996	549,500,000.00	549,476,468.00
A 42065	FFCB FLOATER QTR	31331Y6X3	100	10/26/09	08/26/08	000	2.520	2.520	100.000	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 33 FFCB FLOATER QTR ACT-360				1.63%(C)							
							2.520	2.520	100.000	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00
A 42036	F N M A	313588N92	100	11/10/08	06/03/08	000	2.250	2.273	99.000	50,000,000.00	49,500,000.00
A 42037	F N M A	313588N92	100	11/10/08	06/03/08	000	2.250	2.273	99.000	50,000,000.00	49,500,000.00
A 42061	F N M A	313589BV4	100	02/13/09	08/28/08	000	2.790	2.827	98.690	50,000,000.00	49,345,125.00
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 41 FNMA DISCOUNT NOTES				4.84%(C)							
							2.430	2.457	98.897	150,000,000.00	148,345,125.00
A 42009	F H L B	313384J34	100	10/03/08	04/08/08	000	2.130	2.153	98.947	50,000,000.00	49,473,416.67
A 42010	F H L B	313384J34	100	10/03/08	04/08/08	000	2.130	2.153	98.947	50,000,000.00	49,473,416.67
A 42011	F H L B	313384J34	100	10/03/08	04/08/08	000	2.130	2.153	98.947	25,000,000.00	24,736,708.33
A 42043	F H L B DISCOUNT	313384K24	100	10/10/08	07/11/08	000	2.360	2.374	99.403	50,000,000.00	49,701,722.22
A 42053	F H L B DISCOUNT	313384K24	100	10/10/08	07/11/08	000	2.360	2.374	99.403	50,000,000.00	49,701,722.22
A 42042	F H L B DISCOUNT	313396U35	100	12/22/08	07/07/08	000	2.440	2.468	98.861	50,000,000.00	49,430,666.66
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 43 FEDERAL HOME LOAN DISC NOTES				8.90%(C)							
							2.270	2.291	99.097	275,000,000.00	272,517,652.77

INVSMT NO.	DESCRIPTION	CUSIP	FUND NO.	MATURITY (TICKER)	PURCHASE DATE	SAF/ PURP	CUPN RATE	TRDNG YIELD	BOOK PRICE	PAR VALUE SHARES	BOOK VALUE
A 42007	F M C	313396H71	100	09/29/08	04/11/08	000	2.070	2.091	99.017	32,428,000.00	32,109,151.69
A 42008	F M C	313396H71	100	09/29/08	04/11/08	000	2.070	2.091	99.017	50,000,000.00	49,508,375.00
A 42038	FREDDIE DISCOUNT	313396Q30	100	11/20/08	06/04/08	000	2.250	2.274	98.944	50,000,000.00	49,471,875.00
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 44 FMC DISCOUNT NOTES				4.28%(C)			2.138	2.160	98.989	132,428,000.00	131,089,401.69
A 41989	BANK OF AMERICA C P	0660P0J20	100	09/02/08	03/26/08	000	2.490	2.518	98.893	50,000,000.00	49,446,666.66
A 41990	BANK OF AMERICA C P	0660P0J20	100	09/02/08	03/26/08	000	2.490	2.518	98.893	20,000,000.00	19,778,666.67
A 41992	BANK OF AMERICA C P	0660P0J20	100	09/02/08	03/25/08	000	2.470	2.498	98.895	20,000,000.00	19,779,072.22
A 42002	NESTLE CORP C P	64105GJ21	100	09/02/08	04/07/08	000	1.790	1.803	99.264	25,000,000.00	24,816,027.78
A 42056	WELLS FARGO C P	9497F0JG8	100	09/16/08	07/31/08	000	2.340	2.347	99.695	50,000,000.00	49,847,250.00
A 42017	BANK OF SCOTLAND C P	06478GKE3	100	10/14/08	04/16/08	000	2.760	2.799	98.612	25,000,000.00	24,653,083.33
A 42047	WELLS FARGO C P	9497F0KE1	100	10/14/08	07/21/08	000	2.340	2.353	99.448	50,000,000.00	49,723,750.00
A 42029	ING C P	4497W0KT4	100	10/27/08	05/01/08	000	2.760	2.798	98.628	25,000,000.00	24,656,916.67
A 42032	NESTLE C P	64105GKU7	100	10/28/08	05/05/08	000	2.020	2.040	99.012	40,000,000.00	39,604,977.78
A 42062	WELLS FARGO C P	9497F0LR1	100	11/25/08	08/28/08	000	2.680	2.698	99.337	20,000,000.00	19,867,488.89
A 42039	AIG C P	00137EM93	100	12/09/08	06/26/08	000	3.000	3.042	98.617	50,000,000.00	49,308,333.33
A 42040	AIG C P	00137EM93	100	12/09/08	06/26/08	000	3.000	3.042	98.617	50,000,000.00	49,308,333.33
A 42063	WELLS FARGO C P	9497F0M90	100	12/09/08	08/28/08	000	2.680	2.701	99.233	20,000,000.00	19,846,644.44
A 42048	ING C P	4497W0MP0	100	12/23/08	07/22/08	000	2.890	2.926	98.764	50,000,000.00	49,381,861.11
A 42049	ING C P	4497W0MP0	100	12/23/08	07/22/08	000	2.890	2.926	98.764	25,000,000.00	24,690,930.56
A 42054	Commerzbank CP	20260AN63	100	01/06/09	07/30/08	000	2.890	2.928	98.716	40,000,000.00	39,486,222.22
A 42058	BANK OF SCOTLAND C P	06478GN67	100	01/06/09	08/05/08	000	2.980	3.018	98.725	50,000,000.00	49,362,611.11
A 42052	TOYOTA C P	89233GNL6	100	01/20/09	07/25/08	000	2.750	2.788	98.633	25,000,000.00	24,658,159.72
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 81 COMMERCIAL PAPER DISC				20.52%(C)			2.643	2.672	98.932	635,000,000.00	628,216,995.82
A 42024	INTL LEASE FINANCE C P	45974MJW9	100	09/30/08	04/23/08	000	2.940	5.958	98.693	50,000,000.00	49,346,666.67
A 42022	BAN OF AMERICA C P	0660P0KE0	100	10/14/08	04/28/08	000	2.800	5.675	98.686	50,000,000.00	49,342,777.78
A 42023	INTL LEASE FINANCE C P	45974MKQ0	100	10/24/08	04/29/08	000	3.000	6.090	98.517	50,000,000.00	49,258,333.33
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 82 COMMERCIAL PAPER INT BEARING				4.83%(C)			2.913	5.907	98.632	150,000,000.00	147,947,777.78
A 41975	JP MORGAN N C D	48123PRY3	100	09/04/08	03/04/08	000	2.800	2.800	100.000	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00
A 41976	JP MORGAN N C D	48123PRY3	100	09/04/08	03/04/08	000	2.800	2.800	100.000	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00
A 41977	JP MORGAN N C D	48123PRY3	100	09/04/08	03/04/08	000	2.800	2.800	100.000	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00
A 42025	CHASE N C D	16144RGN7	100	11/10/08	04/30/08	000	2.500	2.500	100.000	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00
A 42026	CHASE N C D	16144RGN7	100	11/10/08	04/30/08	000	2.500	2.500	100.000	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00
A 41869	BANK OF AMERICA NCD	06050G2C3	9702	11/13/08	10/25/07	000	4.600	4.600	100.000	35,000,000.00	35,000,000.00
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 91 NEGOTIABLE C.D.'S				8.49%(C)			2.956	2.956	100.000	260,000,000.00	260,000,000.00

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487

(SIRPT) INVESTMENT INVENTORY

RUN: 09/04/08 11:41:01

INVESTMENTS OUTSTANDING AS OF 8/31/08
MAJOR SORT KEY IS ICC#
SETTLEMENT DATE BASIS

	INVSMT NO.	DESCRIPTION	CUSIP	FUND NO.	MATURITY (TICKER)	PURCHASE DATE	SAF/ PURP	CUPN RATE	TRDNG YIELD	BOOK PRICE	PAR VALUE SHARES	BOOK VALUE
A	41892	MISSION AREA CREDIT UN		100	11/03/08	11/02/07	000	3.500	3.500	100.000	100,000.00	100,000.00
A	42044	MISSION NATIONAL BANK PU		100	07/16/09	07/16/08	000	3.900	3.900	100.000	100,000.00	100,000.00
A	42055	FIRST NATIONAL BANK CD		100	07/31/09	07/31/08	000	2.750	2.750	100.000	5,000,000.00	5,000,000.00
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 1010 PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT .17%(C)								2.787	2.787	100.000	5,200,000.00	5,200,000.00
A	41925	CITIBANK PTD		100	01/02/09	01/03/08	000	3.750	3.750	100.000	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00
A	42059	PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT MONT		100	01/06/09	08/04/08	000	2.800	2.800	100.000	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00
A	42060	PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT MONT		100	01/06/09	08/01/08	000	2.800	2.800	100.000	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00
A	41948	FIRST NATL BANK INT MONT		100	01/18/09	01/19/08	000	3.850	3.850	100.000	5,000,000.00	5,000,000.00
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 1011 PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT MONTHLY 1.14%(C)								3.221	3.221	100.000	35,000,000.00	35,000,000.00
REPORT TOTALS ASSETS FIXED								2.762	2.802	99.671	3,072,028,000.00	3,061,929,438.86

(SIRPT)

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487
INVESTMENT INVENTORY
INVESTMENTS OUTSTANDING AS OF 8/31/08
MAJOR SORT KEY IS BANK
SETTLEMENT DATE BASIS

RUN: 09/04/08 11:41:01

INVSMT NO.	DESCRIPTION	CUSIP	FUND NO.	MATURITY (TICKER)	PURCHASE DATE	SAF/ PURP	CUPN RATE	TRDNG YIELD	BOOK PRICE	PAR VALUE SHARES	BOOK VALUE
A 41892	MISSION AREA CREDIT UN		100	11/03/08	11/02/07	000	3.500	3.500	100.000	100,000.00	100,000.00
A 42044	MISSION NATIONAL BANK PU		100	07/16/09	07/16/08	000	3.900	3.900	100.000	100,000.00	100,000.00
A 42055	FIRST NATIONAL BANK CD		100	07/31/09	07/31/08	000	2.750	2.750	100.000	5,000,000.00	5,000,000.00
SUBTOTAL (Bank) 19 BANK OF NEW YORK				100.00%(C)			2.787	2.787	100.000	5,200,000.00	5,200,000.00
				REPORT TOTALS							
				ASSETS		FIXED	2.787	2.787	100.000	5,200,000.00	5,200,000.00

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487

(EIS / ERNEIS)

EARNED INCOME SUMMARY
08/01/08 THROUGH 08/31/08
SORT KEYS ARE FUND ICC#

RUN: 09/04/08 11:41:05

FUND: 100 POOLED FUNDS

INV NO.	PURCHASE DATE	COUPON RATE	DESCRIPTION	TICKER / MATURITY DATE	SHARES / SCHEDULED PAR VALUE	SCHEDULED BOOK VALUE	YIELD/ 365	DATE SOLD/MAT	INCOME RECEIVED THIS PER	TOTAL/NET EARNINGS
42041	07/02/08	2.0000	T BILL	12/04/08	50,000,000.00	49,569,444.44	2.045			86,111.12
42064	08/20/08	1.7500	T BILL	01/29/09	50,000,000.00	49,606,250.00	1.788			29,166.67
SUBTOTAL (ICC#) 11 TREASURY BILLS		3.24%(C)		123 DAYS	100,000,000.00	99,175,694.44	1.974		.00	115,277.79
41662	06/08/07	4.7500	T. NOTE (99.19)	12/31/08	20,000,000.00	19,914,062.50	5.007			84,684.62
41697	07/23/07	3.3750	T NOTE (98)	12/15/08	5,000,000.00	4,900,781.25	4.880			20,312.18
41698	07/23/07	3.3750	T NOTE (98)	12/15/08	10,000,000.00	9,800,781.25	4.886			40,671.75
41699	07/23/07	3.3750	T NOTE (98)	12/15/08	5,000,000.00	4,897,656.25	4.929			20,501.75
41700	07/23/07	3.3750	T NOTE (98)	12/15/08	5,000,000.00	4,898,046.88	4.923			20,478.05
41738	08/08/07	3.3750	T NOTE (98.11)	12/15/08	8,000,000.00	7,865,625.00	4.683			31,284.25
41740	08/07/07	3.3750	T NOTE	12/15/08	5,000,000.00	4,921,289.06	4.597			19,212.46
41830	10/12/07	3.2500	T NOTE	08/15/08	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	4.436	MATURED	258,203.12	16,850.14
41841	10/16/07	4.8750	T NOTE	05/31/09	10,000,000.00	10,096,484.38	4.227			36,247.10
41862	10/23/07	4.6250	T NOTE	07/31/09	5,100,000.00	5,165,542.97	3.813			16,729.52
41867	10/25/07	4.8750	T NOTE	08/31/08	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	4.039	MATURED	178,125.00	33,411.46
41870	10/26/07	4.8750	T NOTE	05/15/09	5,000,000.00	5,080,468.75	3.739			16,133.76
41876	10/31/07	4.6250	T NOTE	09/30/08	2,000,000.00	2,011,406.25	3.968			6,779.20
41877	10/31/07	4.6250	T NOTE	09/30/08	2,000,000.00	2,011,484.38	3.964			6,771.97
41878	10/31/07	4.6250	T NOTE	09/30/08	2,000,000.00	2,011,406.25	3.968			6,779.20
41879	10/31/07	4.6250	T NOTE	09/30/08	2,000,000.00	2,011,484.38	3.964			6,771.97
41993	03/31/08	2.0000	T NOTE	02/28/10	50,000,000.00	50,302,734.38	1.656		415,760.87	70,858.19
41994	03/31/08	2.0000	T NOTE	02/28/10	50,000,000.00	50,302,734.38	1.656		415,760.87	70,858.19
41995	04/01/08	2.5000	T NOTE	03/31/13	50,000,000.00	50,101,071.55	2.449			104,215.49
41996	04/01/08	2.5000	T NOTE	03/31/13	50,000,000.00	50,101,071.55	2.449			104,215.49
41997	04/01/08	2.5000	T NOTE	03/31/13	25,000,000.00	25,050,535.78	2.449			52,107.75
41998	04/01/08	2.5000	T NOTE	03/31/13	50,000,000.00	50,093,259.05	2.453			104,348.19
41999	04/01/08	2.5000	T NOTE	03/31/13	50,000,000.00	50,093,259.05	2.453			104,348.19
42003	04/09/08	4.5000	T NOTE	03/31/09	50,000,000.00	51,412,749.77	1.657			72,371.30
42012	04/01/08	2.5000	T NOTE	03/31/13	25,000,000.00	25,046,629.53	2.453			52,174.11
42013	04/09/08	4.5000	T NOTE	03/31/09	50,000,000.00	51,412,749.77	1.657			72,371.30
SUBTOTAL (ICC#) 12 TREASURY NOTES		17.62%(C)		941 DAYS	536,100,000.00	539,503,314.36	2.533		1,267,849.86	1,191,487.58
41935	01/07/08	5.1250	F H L B INTEREST EARNING	08/08/08	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	3.767	MATURED	871,268.00	36,415.76
41936	01/07/08	5.1250	F H L B INTEREST EARN	08/21/08	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	3.758	MATURED	844,356.00	103,868.25
41950	01/31/08	4.2000	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	01/28/13	30,000,000.00	30,052,500.00	4.079			104,107.73
41988	03/18/08	4.5000	FEDERAL HOME LN BKS	11/13/09	25,000,000.00	25,384,500.00	3.435			74,048.35
SUBTOTAL (ICC#) 22 FEDERAL HOME LOA		1.81%(C)		1074 DAYS	55,000,000.00	55,437,000.00	3.774		1,715,624.00	318,440.09
42033	05/08/08	4.3000	FEDERAL NATL MTG ASSN	12/24/09	33,150,000.00	33,510,009.00	3.515			100,030.73

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487

(EIS / ERNEIS)

EARNED INCOME SUMMARY
08/01/08 THROUGH 08/31/08
SORT KEYS ARE FUND ICC#
FUND: 100 POOLED FUNDS

INV NO.	PURCHASE DATE	COUPON RATE	DESCRIPTION	TICKER / MATURITY DATE	SHARES / SCHEDULED PAR VALUE	SCHEDULED BOOK VALUE	YIELD/ 365	DATE SOLD/MAT	INCOME RECEIVED THIS PER	TOTAL/NET EARNINGS
SUBTOTAL (ICC#)			23 FEDERAL NATIONAL 1.09%(C)	480 DAYS	33,150,000.00	33,510,009.00	3.515		.00	100,030.73
41986	03/18/08	3.1200	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	03/18/10	25,700,000.00	25,700,000.00	3.061			66,820.00
SUBTOTAL (ICC#)			28 FEDERAL FARM CRE .84%(C)	564 DAYS	25,700,000.00	25,700,000.00	3.061		.00	66,820.00
41973	02/15/08	5.0000	FEDERAL HOME LN MTG CORP	12/19/12	50,000,000.00	50,860,000.00	4.474			193,262.67
42045	07/14/08	3.2500	F H L M C	07/14/09	29,950,000.00	29,950,000.00	3.189			81,114.58
SUBTOTAL (ICC#)			30 FHLMC Bonds 2.64%(C)	1106 DAYS	79,950,000.00	80,810,000.00	3.998		.00	274,377.25
41915	12/07/07	2.6260	F H L B FLOATER	11/23/09	50,000,000.00	49,984,700.00	2.554		313,438.50	108,439.19
41916	12/07/07	2.6260	F H L B FLOATER	11/23/09	50,000,000.00	49,984,700.00	2.554		313,438.50	108,439.19
41924	12/28/07	2.6260	F H L B FLOATER	11/23/09	50,000,000.00	50,024,900.00	2.511		313,438.50	106,668.63
41937	01/09/08	2.6260	F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT	11/23/09	50,000,000.00	50,010,000.00	2.527		313,438.50	107,324.47
41938	01/09/08	2.6260	F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT	11/23/09	50,000,000.00	50,010,000.00	2.527		313,438.50	107,324.47
41939	01/09/08	2.6260	F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT	11/23/09	4,500,000.00	4,500,900.00	2.527		28,209.47	9,659.21
41940	01/09/08	2.6260	F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT	11/23/09	50,000,000.00	50,010,000.00	2.527		313,438.50	107,324.47
41941	01/09/08	2.6260	F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT	11/23/09	50,000,000.00	50,010,000.00	2.527		313,438.50	107,324.47
42016	04/18/08	2.5890	F H L B FLOATER	01/08/09	50,000,000.00	49,977,500.00	2.688			114,102.91
42018	04/21/08	2.5880	F H L B FLOATER	01/14/09	50,000,000.00	49,977,358.00	2.687			114,046.81
42019	04/21/08	2.5880	F H L B FLOATER	01/14/09	30,000,000.00	29,986,410.00	2.687			68,428.65
42020	01/25/08	2.6250	FHLB FLOATER QTR	01/28/09	15,000,000.00	15,000,000.00	2.661			33,906.25
42021	01/25/08	2.6250	FHLB FLOATER QTR	01/28/09	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	2.661			113,020.84
SUBTOTAL (ICC#)			31 FHLB FLOATER QTR 17.95%(C)	339 DAYS	549,500,000.00	549,476,468.00	2.584		2,222,278.97	1,206,009.56
42065	08/26/08	2.5200	FFCB FLOATER QTR	10/26/09	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	2.555			21,000.00
SUBTOTAL (ICC#)			33 FFCB FLOATER QTR 1.63%(C)	421 DAYS	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	2.555		.00	21,000.00
42036	06/03/08	2.2500	F N M A	11/10/08	50,000,000.00	49,500,000.00	2.304			96,875.00
42037	06/03/08	2.2500	F N M A	11/10/08	50,000,000.00	49,500,000.00	2.304			96,875.00
42061	08/28/08	2.7900	F N M A	02/13/09	50,000,000.00	49,345,125.00	2.866			15,500.00
SUBTOTAL (ICC#)			41 FNMA DISCOUNT NO 4.84%(C)	102 DAYS	150,000,000.00	148,345,125.00	2.338		.00	209,250.00
42009	04/08/08	2.1300	F H L B	10/03/08	50,000,000.00	49,473,416.67	2.183			91,708.33
42010	04/08/08	2.1300	F H L B	10/03/08	50,000,000.00	49,473,416.67	2.183			91,708.33
42011	04/08/08	2.1300	F H L B	10/03/08	25,000,000.00	24,736,708.33	2.183			45,854.17
42042	07/07/08	2.4400	F H L B DISCOUNT	12/22/08	50,000,000.00	49,430,666.66	2.502			105,055.56

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487

(EIS / ERNEIS)

EARNED INCOME SUMMARY
08/01/08 THROUGH 08/31/08
SORT KEYS ARE FUND ICC#
FUND: 100 POOLED FUNDS

INV NO.	PURCHASE DATE	COUPON RATE	DESCRIPTION	TICKER / MATURITY DATE	SHARES / SCHEDULED PAR VALUE	SCHEDULED BOOK VALUE	YIELD/ 365	DATE SOLD/MAT	INCOME RECEIVED THIS PER	TOTAL/NET EARNINGS
42043	07/11/08	2.3600	F H L B DISCOUNT	10/10/08	50,000,000.00	49,701,722.22	2.407			101,611.12
42053	07/11/08	2.3600	F H L B DISCOUNT	10/10/08	50,000,000.00	49,701,722.22	2.407			101,611.12
SUBTOTAL (ICC#) 43 FEDERAL HOME LOA 8.90%(C)				50 DAYS	275,000,000.00	272,517,652.77	2.322		.00	537,548.63
41755	08/27/07	4.6900	FREDDIE MAC	08/18/08	16,000,000.00	15,255,853.33	4.987	MATURED	744,146.67	35,435.56
42007	04/11/08	2.0700	F M C	09/29/08	32,428,000.00	32,109,151.69	2.120			57,802.91
42008	04/11/08	2.0700	F M C	09/29/08	50,000,000.00	49,508,375.00	2.120			89,125.00
42038	06/04/08	2.2500	FREDDIE DISCOUNT	11/20/08	50,000,000.00	49,471,875.00	2.306			96,875.00
SUBTOTAL (ICC#) 44 FMC DISCOUNT NOT 4.28%(C)				48 DAYS	132,428,000.00	131,089,401.69	2.358		744,146.67	279,238.47
41989	03/26/08	2.4900	BANK OF AMERICA C P	09/02/08	50,000,000.00	49,446,666.66	2.553			107,208.34
41990	03/26/08	2.4900	BANK OF AMERICA C P	09/02/08	20,000,000.00	19,778,666.67	2.553			42,883.34
41992	03/25/08	2.4700	BANK OF AMERICA C P	09/02/08	20,000,000.00	19,779,072.22	2.532			42,538.89
42000	04/01/08	2.5600	ING C P	08/19/08	50,000,000.00	49,502,222.22	2.622	MATURED	497,777.78	64,000.00
42001	04/01/08	2.5600	ING C P	08/05/08	50,000,000.00	49,552,000.00	2.619	MATURED	448,000.00	14,222.22
42002	04/07/08	1.7900	NESTLE CORP C P	09/02/08	25,000,000.00	24,816,027.78	1.828			38,534.72
42017	04/16/08	2.7600	BANK OF SCOTLAND C P	10/14/08	25,000,000.00	24,653,083.33	2.838			59,416.66
42029	05/01/08	2.7600	ING C P	10/27/08	25,000,000.00	24,656,916.67	2.837			59,416.67
42032	05/05/08	2.0200	NESTLE C P	10/28/08	40,000,000.00	39,604,977.78	2.068			69,577.78
42039	06/26/08	3.0000	AIG C P	12/09/08	50,000,000.00	49,308,333.33	3.084			129,166.67
42040	06/26/08	3.0000	AIG C P	12/09/08	50,000,000.00	49,308,333.33	3.084			129,166.67
42047	07/21/08	2.3400	WELLS FARGO C P	10/14/08	50,000,000.00	49,723,750.00	2.386			100,750.00
42048	07/22/08	2.8900	ING C P	12/23/08	50,000,000.00	49,381,861.11	2.967			124,430.55
42049	07/22/08	2.8900	ING C P	12/23/08	25,000,000.00	24,690,930.56	2.967			62,215.28
42052	07/25/08	2.7500	TOYOTA C P	01/20/09	25,000,000.00	24,658,159.72	2.827			59,201.38
42054	07/30/08	2.8900	Commerzbank CP	01/06/09	40,000,000.00	39,486,222.22	2.968			99,544.45
42056	07/31/08	2.3400	WELLS FARGO C P	09/16/08	50,000,000.00	49,847,250.00	2.380			100,750.00
42058	08/05/08	2.9800	BANK OF SCOTLAND C P	01/06/09	50,000,000.00	49,362,611.11	3.060			111,750.00
42062	08/28/08	2.6800	WELLS FARGO C P	11/25/08	20,000,000.00	19,867,488.89	2.735			5,955.56
42063	08/28/08	2.6800	WELLS FARGO C P	12/09/08	20,000,000.00	19,846,644.44	2.738			5,955.56
SUBTOTAL (ICC#) 81 COMMERCIAL PAPER 20.52%(C)				71 DAYS	635,000,000.00	628,216,995.82	2.699		945,777.78	1,426,684.74
42022	04/28/08	2.8000	BAN OF AMERICA C P	10/14/08	50,000,000.00	49,342,777.78	2.877			120,555.56
42023	04/29/08	3.0000	INTL LEASE FINANCE C P	10/24/08	50,000,000.00	49,258,333.33	3.087			129,166.66
42024	04/23/08	2.9400	INTL LEASE FINANCE C P	09/30/08	50,000,000.00	49,346,666.67	3.020			126,583.34
SUBTOTAL (ICC#) 82 COMMERCIAL PAPER 4.83%(C)				42 DAYS	150,000,000.00	147,947,777.78	2.995		.00	376,305.56
41968	02/27/08	2.9000	J P MORGAN N C D	08/27/08	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	2.940	MATURED	366,527.78	52,361.11
41975	03/04/08	2.8000	JP MORGAN N C D	09/04/08	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	2.839			120,555.56
41976	03/04/08	2.8000	JP MORGAN N C D	09/04/08	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	2.839			120,555.56

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487

(EIS / ERNEIS) EARNED INCOME SUMMARY

08/01/08 THROUGH 08/31/08

SORT KEYS ARE FUND ICC#

RUN: 09/04/08 11:41:05

FUND: 100 POOLED FUNDS

INV NO.	PURCHASE DATE	COUPON RATE	DESCRIPTION	TICKER / MATURITY DATE	SHARES / SCHEDULED PAR VALUE	SCHEDULED BOOK VALUE	YIELD/ 365	DATE SOLD/MAT	INCOME RECEIVED THIS PER	TOTAL/NET EARNINGS
41977	03/04/08	2.8000	JP MORGAN N C D	09/04/08	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	2.839			120,555.56
42025	04/30/08	2.5000	CHASE N C D	11/10/08	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	2.535			53,819.45
42026	04/30/08	2.5000	CHASE N C D	11/10/08	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	2.535			107,638.89
42031	05/20/08	2.3000	WELLS FARGO N C D	08/19/08	40,000,000.00	40,000,000.00	2.332	MATURED	232,555.56	46,000.00
SUBTOTAL (ICC#) 91 NEGOTIABLE C.D.'		7.35%(C)		26 DAYS	225,000,000.00	225,000,000.00	2.718		599,083.34	621,486.13
41892	11/02/07	3.5000	MISSION AREA CREDIT UN	11/03/08	100,000.00	100,000.00	3.549			301.39
42044	07/16/08	3.9000	MISSION NATIONAL BANK PU	07/16/09	100,000.00	100,000.00	3.954			335.84
42055	07/31/08	2.7500	FIRST NATIONAL BANK CD	07/31/09	5,000,000.00	5,000,000.00	2.788			11,840.28
SUBTOTAL (ICC#) 1010 PUBLIC TIME DE		.17%(C)		328 DAYS	5,200,000.00	5,200,000.00	2.825		.00	12,477.51
41925	01/03/08	3.7500	CITIBANK PTD	01/02/09	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	3.802		32,291.67	32,291.67
41948	01/19/08	3.8500	FIRST NATL BANK INT MONT	01/18/09	5,000,000.00	5,000,000.00	3.903		16,576.39	16,576.39
42050	07/25/08	2.1800	CITIBANK PTD	08/01/08	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	N.D.	MATURED	4,238.89	
42059	08/04/08	2.8000	PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT MONT	01/06/09	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	2.839		21,000.00	21,777.78
42060	08/01/08	2.8000	PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT MONT	01/06/09	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	2.839		23,333.33	24,111.11
SUBTOTAL (ICC#) 1011 PUBLIC TIME DE		1.14%(C)		128 DAYS	35,000,000.00	35,000,000.00	3.278		97,440.28	94,756.95
SUBTOTAL (FUND) 100 POOLED FUNDS		- ASSETS		332 DAYS	3037028000.00	3026929438.86			7,592,200.90	6,851,190.99
SUBTOTAL (FUND) 100 POOLED FUNDS		- NET			3037028000.00	3026929438.86			7,592,200.90	6,851,190.99

FUND STATISTICS	ASSETS	LIABILITIES
AVERAGE DAILY INVESTMENT BALANCE	:3,017,294,579.03	
EARNED INTEREST YIELD THIS PERIOD	: 2.673	.000
WEIGHTED AVG YIELD AT END OF PERIOD	: 2.640	.000
TOTAL INTEREST EARNED FOR FUTURE RECEIPT:	17,820,064.37	

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487

(EIS / ERNEIS)

EARNED INCOME SUMMARY
08/01/08 THROUGH 08/31/08
SORT KEYS ARE FUND ICC#

FUND: 9702 SFUSD TRANS 07-08

INV NO.	PURCHASE DATE	COUPON RATE	DESCRIPTION	TICKER / MATURITY DATE	SHARES / SCHEDULED PAR VALUE	SCHEDULED BOOK VALUE	YIELD/ 365	DATE SOLD/MAT	INCOME RECEIVED THIS PER	TOTAL/NET EARNINGS
41869	10/25/07	4.6000	BANK OF AMERICA NCD	11/13/08	35,000,000.00	35,000,000.00	4.664			138,638.89
SUBTOTAL (ICC#)		91	NEGOTIABLE C.D.' 1.14%(C)	74 DAYS	35,000,000.00	35,000,000.00	4.664		.00	138,638.89
SUBTOTAL (FUND)		9702	SFUSD TRANS 07-08- ASSETS	74 DAYS	35,000,000.00	35,000,000.00			.00	138,638.89
SUBTOTAL (FUND)		9702	SFUSD TRANS 07-08- NET		35,000,000.00	35,000,000.00			.00	138,638.89

FUND STATISTICS	ASSETS	LIABILITIES
AVERAGE DAILY INVESTMENT BALANCE :	35,000,000.00	
EARNED INTEREST YIELD THIS PERIOD :	4.664	.000
WEIGHTED AVG YIELD AT END OF PERIOD :	4.664	.000
TOTAL INTEREST EARNED FOR FUTURE RECEIPT:	1,395,333.33	

GRAND TOTAL	100.00%(C)	329 DAYS	3072028000.00	3061929438.86	2.696		7,592,200.90	6,989,829.88

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487
INVESTMENT INVENTORY WITH MARKET VALUE

RUN: 09/04/08 11:41:03

(RPTMKT)

INVESTMENTS OUTSTANDING AS OF 08/31/08
MAJOR SORT KEY IS ICC#

INVEST NUMBER	DESCRIPTION PURCHASE MATURITY DATE	CUSIP	BANK BROK	FUND SAFE	CPN RATE YTM TR	PAR/SHARES BOOK	MARKET VALUE MARKET PRICE	CURR ACCR INT PRICE SOURCE	UNREALIZED GAIN UNREALIZED LOSS
A 42041 T	BILL	912795H95	19	100	2.0000	50,000,000.00	49,785,807.29	169,444.45	46,918.40
	07/02/08 12/04/08		56	000	2.0174	49,569,444.44	99.57161458333	SUNGARD	
A 42064 T	BILL	912795J93	19	100	1.7500	50,000,000.00	49,645,353.62	29,166.67	9,936.95
	08/20/08 01/29/09		52	000	1.7639	49,606,250.00	99.29070723684	SUNGARD	
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 11 TREASURY BILLS			3.25%(M)		1.8750	100,000,000.00	99,431,160.91	198,611.12	56,855.35
					1.8906	99,175,694.44	99.43116100000		
A 41876 T	NOTE	912828FT2	19	100	4.6250	2,000,000.00	2,004,375.00	38,920.77	
	10/31/07 09/30/08		87	000	3.9807	2,011,406.25	100.2187500000	SUNGARD	-7,031.25
A 41877 T	NOTE	912828FT2	19	100	4.6250	2,000,000.00	2,004,375.00	38,920.77	
	10/31/07 09/30/08		43	000	3.9764	2,011,484.38	100.2187500000	SUNGARD	-7,109.38
A 41878 T	NOTE	912828FT2	19	100	4.6250	2,000,000.00	2,004,375.00	38,920.77	
	10/31/07 09/30/08		45	000	3.9807	2,011,406.25	100.2187500000	SUNGARD	-7,031.25
A 41879 T	NOTE	912828FT2	19	100	4.6250	2,000,000.00	2,004,375.00	38,920.77	
	10/31/07 09/30/08		89	000	3.9764	2,011,484.38	100.2187500000	SUNGARD	-7,109.38
A 41697 T	NOTE (98)	912828BT6	19	100	3.3750	5,000,000.00	5,021,875.00	35,963.11	121,093.75
	07/23/07 12/15/08		45	000	4.8598	4,900,781.25	100.4375000000	SUNGARD	
A 41698 T	NOTE (98)	912828BT6	19	100	3.3750	10,000,000.00	10,043,750.00	71,926.23	242,968.75
	07/23/07 12/15/08		40	000	4.8657	9,800,781.25	100.4375000000	SUNGARD	
A 41699 T	NOTE (98)	912828BT6	19	100	3.3750	5,000,000.00	5,021,875.00	35,963.11	124,218.75
	07/23/07 12/15/08		43	000	4.9072	4,897,656.25	100.4375000000	SUNGARD	
A 41700 T	NOTE (98)	912828BT6	19	100	3.3750	5,000,000.00	5,021,875.00	35,963.11	123,828.12
	07/23/07 12/15/08		89	000	4.9013	4,898,046.88	100.4375000000	SUNGARD	
A 41738 T	NOTE (98.11)	912828BT6	19	100	3.3750	8,000,000.00	8,035,000.00	57,540.98	169,375.00
	08/08/07 12/15/08		45	000	4.6679	7,865,625.00	100.4375000000	SUNGARD	
A 41740 T	NOTE	912828BT6	19	100	3.3750	5,000,000.00	5,021,875.00	35,963.11	100,585.94
	08/07/07 12/15/08		87	000	4.5833	4,921,289.06	100.4375000000	SUNGARD	
A 41662 T.	NOTE (99.19)	912828GB0	19	100	4.7500	20,000,000.00	20,187,500.00	162,635.87	273,437.50
	06/08/07 12/31/08		40	000	5.0376	19,914,062.50	100.9375000000	SUNGARD	
A 42003 T	NOTE	912828GL8	19	100	4.5000	50,000,000.00	50,703,125.00	946,721.31	
	04/09/08 03/31/09		47	000	1.6817	51,412,749.77	101.4062500000	SUNGARD	-654,296.90
A 42013 T	NOTE	912828GL8	19	100	4.5000	50,000,000.00	50,703,125.00	946,721.31	
	04/09/08 03/31/09		47	000	1.6817	51,412,749.77	101.4062500000	SUNGARD	-654,296.90
A 41870 T	NOTE	912828FE5	19	100	4.8750	5,000,000.00	5,095,312.50	72,197.69	14,843.75
	10/26/07 05/15/09		40	000	3.7975	5,080,468.75	101.9062500000	SUNGARD	
A 41841 T	NOTE	912828GT1	19	100	4.8750	10,000,000.00	10,203,125.00	123,872.95	106,640.62
	10/16/07 05/31/09		40	000	4.2504	10,096,484.38	102.0312500000	SUNGARD	
A 41862 T	NOTE	912828GY0	19	100	4.6250	5,100,000.00	5,209,968.75	20,510.87	44,425.78
	10/23/07 07/31/09		40	000	3.8643	5,165,542.97	102.1562500000	SUNGARD	
A 41993 T	NOTE	912828HS2	19	100	2.0000	50,000,000.00	49,843,750.00	2,762.43	
	03/31/08 02/28/10		47	000	1.6772	50,302,734.38	99.68750000000	SUNGARD	-458,984.38
A 41994 T	NOTE	912828HS2	19	100	2.0000	50,000,000.00	49,843,750.00	2,762.43	
	03/31/08 02/28/10		47	000	1.6772	50,302,734.38	99.68750000000	SUNGARD	-458,984.38
A 41995 T	NOTE	912828HV5	19	100	2.5000	50,000,000.00	48,937,500.00	525,956.28	
	04/01/08 03/31/13		89	000	2.4582	50,101,071.55	97.87500000000	SUNGARD	-1,160,156.25

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487
INVESTMENT INVENTORY WITH MARKET VALUE

INVESTMENTS OUTSTANDING AS OF 08/31/08
MAJOR SORT KEY IS ICC#

	INVEST NUMBER	DESCRIPTION / PURCHASE MATURITY DATE	CUSIP	BANK BROK	FUND SAFE	CPN RATE YTM TR	PAR/SHARES BOOK	MARKET VALUE MARKET PRICE	CURR ACCR INT PRICE SOURCE	UNREALIZED GAIN UNREALIZED LOSS
A	41996 T NOTE		912828HV5	19	100	2.5000	50,000,000.00	48,937,500.00	525,956.28	
		04/01/08 03/31/13		89	000	2.4582	50,101,071.55	97.87500000000	SUNGARD	-1,160,156.25
A	41997 T NOTE		912828HV5	19	100	2.5000	25,000,000.00	24,468,750.00	262,978.14	
		04/01/08 03/31/13		89	000	2.4582	25,050,535.78	97.87500000000	SUNGARD	-580,078.13
A	41998 T NOTE		912828HV5	19	100	2.5000	50,000,000.00	48,937,500.00	525,956.28	
		04/01/08 03/31/13		76	000	2.4616	50,093,259.05	97.87500000000	SUNGARD	-1,152,343.75
A	41999 T NOTE		912828HV5	19	100	2.5000	50,000,000.00	48,937,500.00	525,956.28	
		04/01/08 03/31/13		76	000	2.4616	50,093,259.05	97.87500000000	SUNGARD	-1,152,343.75
A	42012 T NOTE		912828HV5	19	100	2.5000	25,000,000.00	24,468,750.00	262,978.14	
		04/01/08 03/31/13		76	000	2.4616	25,046,629.53	97.87500000000	SUNGARD	-576,171.88
	SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 12 TREASURY NOTES		17.41%(M)			3.0500	536,100,000.00	532,660,906.25	5,336,968.99	1,321,417.96
						2.5046	539,503,314.36	99.35849800000		-8,036,093.83
A	41988 FEDERAL HOME LN BKS		3133XMWP2	19	100	4.5000	25,000,000.00	25,070,312.50	337,500.00	
		03/18/08 11/13/09		76	000	3.5312	25,384,500.00	100.2812500000	SUNGARD	-314,187.50
A	41950 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS		3133XP4T8	19	100	4.2000	30,000,000.00	29,953,125.00	115,500.00	
		01/31/08 01/28/13		47	000	4.1607	30,052,500.00	99.84375000000	SUNGARD	-99,375.00
	SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 22 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK		1.80%(M)			4.3374	55,000,000.00	55,023,437.50	453,000.00	.00
						3.8725	55,437,000.00	100.0426140000		-413,562.50
A	42033 FEDERAL NATL MTG ASSN		31398AKU5	19	100	4.3000	33,150,000.00	33,274,312.50	265,292.08	
		05/08/08 12/24/09		47	000	3.6047	33,510,009.00	100.3750000000	SUNGARD	-235,696.50
	SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 23 FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGA		1.09%(M)			4.3000	33,150,000.00	33,274,312.50	265,292.08	.00
						3.6047	33,510,009.00	100.3750000000		-235,696.50
A	41986 FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK		31331YYL8	19	100	3.1200	25,700,000.00	25,691,968.75	363,055.33	
		03/18/08 03/18/10		47	000	3.1200	25,700,000.00	99.96875000000	SUNGARD	-8,031.25
	SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 28 FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BAN		.84%(M)			3.1200	25,700,000.00	25,691,968.75	363,055.33	.00
						3.1200	25,700,000.00	99.96875000000		-8,031.25
A	42045 F H L M C		3128X7N91	19	100	3.2500	29,950,000.00	29,950,000.00	127,079.51	0.00
		07/14/08 07/14/09		53	000	3.2500	29,950,000.00	100.0000000000	SUNGARD	
A	41973 FEDERAL HOME LN MTG CORP BONDS		3128X6VZ6	19	100	5.0000	50,000,000.00	50,281,250.00	500,000.00	
		02/15/08 12/19/12		87	000	4.5985	50,860,000.00	100.5625000000	SUNGARD	-578,750.00
	SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 30 FHLMC Bonds		2.62%(M)			4.3514	79,950,000.00	80,231,250.00	627,079.51	.00
						4.0987	80,810,000.00	100.3517820000		-578,750.00
A	42016 F H L B FLOATER		3133XNXA2	19	100	2.5890	50,000,000.00	49,968,750.00	197,770.83	
		04/18/08 01/08/09		47	000	2.6788	49,977,500.00	99.93750000000	SUNGARD	-8,750.00

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487
INVESTMENT INVENTORY WITH MARKET VALUE

RUN: 09/04/08 11:41:03

(RPTMKT)

INVESTMENTS OUTSTANDING AS OF 08/31/08
MAJOR SORT KEY IS ICC#

INVEST NUMBER	DESCRIPTION PURCHASE MATURITY DATE	CUSIP	BANK BROK	FUND SAFE	CPN RATE YTM TR	PAR/SHARES BOOK	MARKET VALUE MARKET PRICE	CURR ACCR INT PRICE SOURCE	UNREALIZED GAIN UNREALIZED LOSS
A	42018 F H L B FLOATER 04/21/08 01/14/09	3133XNYB9	19	100	2.5880	50,000,000.00	49,968,750.00	176,127.78	
			47	000	2.6784	49,977,358.00	99.93750000000	SUNGARD	-8,608.00
A	42019 F H L B FLOATER 04/21/08 01/14/09	3133XNYB9	19	100	2.5880	30,000,000.00	29,981,250.00	105,676.67	
			47	000	2.6784	29,986,410.00	99.93750000000	SUNGARD	-5,160.00
A	42020 FHLB FLOATER QTR 01/25/08 01/28/09	3133XPAY0	19	100	2.6250	15,000,000.00	14,990,625.00	38,281.25	
			87	000	2.6250	15,000,000.00	99.93750000000	SUNGARD	-9,375.00
A	42021 FHLB FLOATER QTR 01/25/08 01/28/09	3133XPAY0	19	100	2.6250	50,000,000.00	49,968,750.00	127,604.17	
			87	000	2.6250	50,000,000.00	99.93750000000	SUNGARD	-31,250.00
A	41915 F H L B FLOATER 12/07/07 11/23/09	3133XNF61	19	100	2.6260	50,000,000.00	49,890,625.00	32,825.00	
			47	000	2.6508	49,984,700.00	99.78125000000	SUNGARD	-94,075.00
A	41916 F H L B FLOATER 12/07/07 11/23/09	3133XNF61	19	100	2.6260	50,000,000.00	49,890,625.00	32,825.00	
			47	000	2.6508	49,984,700.00	99.78125000000	SUNGARD	-94,075.00
A	41924 F H L B FLOATER 12/28/07 11/23/09	3133XNF61	19	100	2.6260	50,000,000.00	49,890,625.00	32,825.00	
			47	000	2.5855	50,024,900.00	99.78125000000	SUNGARD	-134,275.00
A	41937 F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT 360 01/09/08 11/23/09	3133XNF61	19	100	2.6260	50,000,000.00	49,890,625.00	32,825.00	
			47	000	2.6097	50,010,000.00	99.78125000000	SUNGARD	-119,375.00
A	41938 F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT 360 01/09/08 11/23/09	3133XNF61	19	100	2.6260	50,000,000.00	49,890,625.00	32,825.00	
			47	000	2.6097	50,010,000.00	99.78125000000	SUNGARD	-119,375.00
A	41939 F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT 360 01/09/08 11/23/09	3133XNF61	19	100	2.6260	4,500,000.00	4,490,156.25	2,954.25	
			47	000	2.6097	4,500,900.00	99.78125000000	SUNGARD	-10,743.75
A	41940 F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT 360 01/09/08 11/23/09	3133XNF61	19	100	2.6260	50,000,000.00	49,890,625.00	32,825.00	
			47	000	2.6097	50,010,000.00	99.78125000000	SUNGARD	-119,375.00
A	41941 F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT 360 01/09/08 11/23/09	3133XNF61	19	100	2.6260	50,000,000.00	49,890,625.00	32,825.00	
			47	000	2.6097	50,010,000.00	99.78125000000	SUNGARD	-119,375.00
	SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 31 FHLB FLOATER QTR ACT-36 17.93%(M)				2.6170	549,500,000.00	548,602,656.25	878,189.95	.00
					2.6331	549,476,468.00	99.83669800000		-873,811.75
A	42065 FFCB FLOATER QTR 08/26/08 10/26/09	31331Y6X3	19	100	2.5200	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	21,000.00	0.00
			54	000	2.5200	50,000,000.00	100.0000000000	SUNGARD	
	SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 33 FFCB FLOATER QTR ACT-36 1.63%(M)				2.5200	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	21,000.00	.00
					2.5200	50,000,000.00	100.0000000000		
A	42036 F N M A 06/03/08 11/10/08	313588N92	19	100	2.2500	50,000,000.00	49,760,000.00	281,250.00	
			47	000	2.2727	49,500,000.00	99.52000000000	UPRICE	-21,250.00
A	42037 F N M A 06/03/08 11/10/08	313588N92	19	100	2.2500	50,000,000.00	49,760,000.00	281,250.00	
			47	000	2.2727	49,500,000.00	99.52000000000	UPRICE	-21,250.00
A	42061 F N M A 08/28/08 02/13/09	313589BV4	19	100	2.7900	50,000,000.00	49,370,000.00	15,500.00	9,375.00
			54	000	2.8270	49,345,125.00	98.74000000000	UPRICE	
	SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 41 FNMA DISCOUNT NOTES 4.87%(M)				2.4296	150,000,000.00	148,890,000.00	578,000.00	9,375.00
					2.4571	148,345,125.00	99.26000000000		-42,500.00
A	42009 F H L B 04/08/08 10/03/08	313384J34	19	100	2.1300	50,000,000.00	49,898,666.67	431,916.66	
			95	000	2.1527	49,473,416.67	99.79733333333	SUNGARD	-6,666.66

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487
INVESTMENT INVENTORY WITH MARKET VALUE

(RPTMKT)

RUN: 09/04/08 11:41:03

INVESTMENTS OUTSTANDING AS OF 08/31/08
MAJOR SORT KEY IS ICC#

	INVEST NUMBER	DESCRIPTION / PURCHASE MATURITY DATE	CUSIP	BANK BROK	FUND SAFE	CPN RATE YTM TR	PAR/SHARES BOOK	MARKET VALUE MARKET PRICE	CURR ACCR INT PRICE SOURCE	UNREALIZED GAIN UNREALIZED LOSS
A	42010	F H L B 04/08/08 10/03/08	313384J34	19	100	2.1300	50,000,000.00	49,898,666.67	431,916.66	
				95	000	2.1527	49,473,416.67	99.79733333333	SUNGARD	-6,666.66
A	42011	F H L B 04/08/08 10/03/08	313384J34	19	100	2.1300	25,000,000.00	24,949,333.33	215,958.34	
				95	000	2.1527	24,736,708.33	99.79733333333	SUNGARD	-3,333.34
A	42043	F H L B DISCOUNT 07/11/08 10/10/08	313384K24	19	100	2.3600	50,000,000.00	49,876,500.00	170,444.45	4,333.33
				40	000	2.3742	49,701,722.22	99.75300000000	SUNGARD	
A	42053	F H L B DISCOUNT 07/11/08 10/10/08	313384K24	19	100	2.3600	50,000,000.00	49,876,500.00	170,444.45	4,333.33
				40	000	2.3742	49,701,722.22	99.75300000000	SUNGARD	
A	42042	F H L B DISCOUNT 07/07/08 12/22/08	313396U35	19	100	2.4400	50,000,000.00	49,600,222.22	189,777.78	
				53	000	2.4681	49,430,666.66	99.20044444444	SUNGARD	-20,222.22
	SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 43 FEDERAL HOME LOAN DISC		8.96%(M)			2.2701	275,000,000.00	274,099,888.89	1,610,458.34	8,666.66
						2.2907	272,517,652.77	99.67268700000		-36,888.88
A	42007	F M C 04/11/08 09/29/08	313396H71	19	100	2.0700	32,428,000.00	32,370,494.35	266,639.23	
				40	000	2.0906	32,109,151.69	99.82266666667	SUNGARD	-5,296.57
A	42008	F M C 04/11/08 09/29/08	313396H71	19	100	2.0700	50,000,000.00	49,911,333.33	411,125.00	
				40	000	2.0906	49,508,375.00	99.82266666667	SUNGARD	-8,166.67
A	42038	FREDDIE DISCOUNT 06/04/08 11/20/08	313396Q30	19	100	2.2500	50,000,000.00	49,734,444.44	278,125.00	
				40	000	2.2740	49,471,875.00	99.46888888889	SUNGARD	-15,555.56
	SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 44 FMC DISCOUNT NOTES		4.31%(M)			2.1379	132,428,000.00	132,016,272.12	955,889.23	.00
						2.1598	131,089,401.69	99.68909300000		-29,018.80
A	41989	BANK OF AMERICA C P 03/26/08 09/02/08	0660P0J20	19	100	2.4900	50,000,000.00	49,996,638.89	549,875.01	97.22
				40	000	2.5179	49,446,666.66	99.99327777778	SUNGARD	
A	41990	BANK OF AMERICA C P 03/26/08 09/02/08	0660P0J20	19	100	2.4900	20,000,000.00	19,998,655.56	219,950.00	38.89
				40	000	2.5179	19,778,666.67	99.99327777778	SUNGARD	
A	41992	BANK OF AMERICA C P 03/25/08 09/02/08	0660P0J20	19	100	2.4700	20,000,000.00	19,998,655.56	219,555.56	27.78
				40	000	2.4976	19,779,072.22	99.99327777778	SUNGARD	
A	42002	NESTLE CORP C P 04/07/08 09/02/08	64105GJ21	19	100	1.7900	25,000,000.00	24,998,319.44	182,729.16	
				87	000	1.8033	24,816,027.78	99.99327777778	SUNGARD	-437.50
A	42056	WELLS FARGO C P 07/31/08 09/16/08	9497F0JG8	19	100	2.3400	50,000,000.00	49,949,583.33	104,000.00	
				41	000	2.3472	49,847,250.00	99.89916666667	SUNGARD	-1,666.67
A	42017	BANK OF SCOTLAND C P 04/16/08 10/14/08	06478GKE3	19	100	2.7600	25,000,000.00	24,927,736.11	264,500.00	10,152.78
				87	000	2.7988	24,653,083.33	99.71094444444	SUNGARD	
A	42047	WELLS FARGO C P 07/21/08 10/14/08	9497F0KE1	19	100	2.3400	50,000,000.00	49,855,472.22	136,500.00	
				41	000	2.3530	49,723,750.00	99.71094444444	SUNGARD	-4,777.78
A	42029	ING C P 05/01/08 10/27/08	4497W0KT4	19	100	2.7600	25,000,000.00	24,905,888.89	235,750.00	13,222.22
				49	000	2.7984	24,656,916.67	99.62355555556	SUNGARD	
A	42032	NESTLE C P 05/05/08 10/28/08	64105GKU7	19	100	2.0200	40,000,000.00	39,846,733.33	267,088.89	
				53	000	2.0401	39,604,977.78	99.61683333333	SUNGARD	-25,333.34
A	42062	WELLS FARGO C P 08/28/08 11/25/08	9497F0LR1	19	100	2.6800	20,000,000.00	19,872,500.00	5,955.56	
				41	000	2.6979	19,867,488.89	99.36250000000	SUNGARD	-944.45
A	42039	AIG C P 06/26/08 12/09/08	00137EM93	19	100	3.0000	50,000,000.00	49,608,125.00	279,166.67	20,625.00
				51	000	3.0421	49,308,333.33	99.21625000000	SUNGARD	

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487
INVESTMENT INVENTORY WITH MARKET VALUE

(RPTMKT)

INVESTMENTS OUTSTANDING AS OF 08/31/08
MAJOR SORT KEY IS ICC#

INVEST NUMBER	DESCRIPTION / PURCHASE MATURITY DATE	CUSIP	BANK BROK	FUND SAFE	CPN RATE YTM TR	PAR/SHARES BOOK	MARKET VALUE MARKET PRICE	CURR ACCR INT PRICE SOURCE	UNREALIZED GAIN UNREALIZED LOSS
A 42040	AIG C P	00137EM93	19	100	3.0000	50,000,000.00	49,608,125.00	279,166.67	20,625.00
	06/26/08 12/09/08		51	000	3.0421	49,308,333.33	99.21625000000	SUNGARD	
A 42063	WELLS FARGO C P	9497F0M90	19	100	2.6800	20,000,000.00	19,843,250.00	5,955.56	
	08/28/08 12/09/08		41	000	2.7007	19,846,644.44	99.21625000000	SUNGARD	-9,350.00
A 42048	ING C P	4497W0MP0	19	100	2.8900	50,000,000.00	49,552,708.33	164,569.44	6,277.78
	07/22/08 12/23/08		49	000	2.9262	49,381,861.11	99.10541666667	SUNGARD	
A 42049	ING C P	4497W0MP0	19	100	2.8900	25,000,000.00	24,776,354.17	82,284.72	3,138.89
	07/22/08 12/23/08		49	000	2.9262	24,690,930.56	99.10541666667	SUNGARD	
A 42054	Commerzbank CP	20260AN63	19	100	2.8900	40,000,000.00	39,578,077.78	105,966.67	
	07/30/08 01/06/09		76	000	2.9276	39,486,222.22	98.94519444444	SUNGARD	-14,111.11
A 42058	BANK OF SCOTLAND C P	06478GN67	19	100	2.9800	50,000,000.00	49,472,597.22	111,750.00	
	08/05/08 01/06/09		87	000	3.0185	49,362,611.11	98.94519444444	SUNGARD	-1,763.89
A 42052	TOYOTA C P	89233GNL6	19	100	2.7500	25,000,000.00	24,707,229.17	72,569.44	
	07/25/08 01/20/09		55	000	2.7881	24,658,159.72	98.82891666667	SUNGARD	-23,499.99
	SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 81 COMMERCIAL PAPER DISC 20.64%(M)				2.6426	635,000,000.00	631,496,650.00	3,287,333.35	74,205.56
					2.6719	628,216,995.82	99.44829100000		-81,884.73
A 42024	INTL LEASE FINANCE C P	45974MJW9	19	100	2.9400	50,000,000.00	49,346,666.67*	534,916.67	0.00
	04/23/08 09/30/08		87	000	5.9578	49,346,666.67	98.69333334000	BOOK	
A 42022	BAN OF AMERICA C P	0660POKE0	19	100	2.8000	50,000,000.00	49,342,777.78*	490,000.00	0.00
	04/28/08 10/14/08		40	000	5.6746	49,342,777.78	98.68555556000	BOOK	
A 42023	INTL LEASE FINANCE C P	45974MKQ0	19	100	3.0000	50,000,000.00	49,258,333.33*	520,833.33	0.00
	04/29/08 10/24/08		87	000	6.0903	49,258,333.33	98.51666666000	BOOK	
	SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 82 COMMERCIAL PAPER INT BE 4.84%(M)				2.9133	150,000,000.00	147,947,777.78	1,545,750.00	.00
					5.9075	147,947,777.78	98.63185200000		
A 41975	JP MORGAN N C D	48123PRY3	19	100	2.8000	50,000,000.00	50,001,133.90	703,888.89	1,133.90
	03/04/08 09/04/08		76	000	2.8000	50,000,000.00	100.0022677994	SUNGARD	
A 41976	JP MORGAN N C D	48123PRY3	19	100	2.8000	50,000,000.00	50,001,133.90	703,888.89	1,133.90
	03/04/08 09/04/08		76	000	2.8000	50,000,000.00	100.0022677994	SUNGARD	
A 41977	JP MORGAN N C D	48123PRY3	19	100	2.8000	50,000,000.00	50,001,133.90	703,888.89	1,133.90
	03/04/08 09/04/08		76	000	2.8000	50,000,000.00	100.0022677994	SUNGARD	
A 42025	CHASE N C D	16144RGN7	19	100	2.5000	25,000,000.00	24,995,983.80	215,277.78	
	04/30/08 11/10/08		76	000	2.5000	25,000,000.00	99.98393518355	SUNGARD	-4,016.20
A 42026	CHASE N C D	16144RGN7	19	100	2.5000	50,000,000.00	49,991,967.59	430,555.56	
	04/30/08 11/10/08		76	000	2.5000	50,000,000.00	99.98393518355	SUNGARD	-8,032.41
A 41869	BANK OF AMERICA NCD	06050G2C3	19	9702	4.6000	35,000,000.00	35,138,717.68	1,395,333.33	138,717.68
	10/25/07 11/13/08		40	000	4.6000	35,000,000.00	100.3963362376	SUNGARD	
	SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 91 NEGOTIABLE C.D.'S 8.50%(M)				2.9558	260,000,000.00	260,130,070.77	4,152,833.34	142,119.38
					2.9558	260,000,000.00	100.0500270000		-12,048.61

* MARKET = BOOK LESS PURCHASE INTEREST

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487

(RPTMKT) INVESTMENT INVENTORY WITH MARKET VALUE

RUN: 09/04/08 11:41:03

INVESTMENTS OUTSTANDING AS OF 08/31/08
MAJOR SORT KEY IS ICC#

	INVEST NUMBER	DESCRIPTION / PURCHASE MATURITY DATE	CUSIP	BANK BROK	FUND SAFE	CPN RATE YTM TR	PAR/SHARES BOOK	MARKET VALUE MARKET PRICE	CURR ACCR INT PRICE SOURCE	UNREALIZED GAIN UNREALIZED LOSS
A	41892	MISSION AREA CREDIT UN		19	100	3.5000	100,000.00	100,000.00	612.50	
		11/02/07 11/03/08		62	000	3.5000	100,000.00	100.0000000000	USERPR	0.00
A	42044	MISSION NATIONAL BANK PUBLI		19	100	3.9000	100,000.00	100,000.00	509.17	
		07/16/08 07/16/09		60	000	3.9000	100,000.00	100.0000000000	USERPR	0.00
A	42055	FIRST NATIONAL BANK CD		19	100	2.7500	5,000,000.00	5,000,000.00	12,222.22	
		07/31/08 07/31/09		63	000	2.7500	5,000,000.00	100.0000000000	USERPR	0.00
	SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 1010 PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT		.17%(M)			2.7865	5,200,000.00	5,200,000.00	13,343.89	
						2.7865	5,200,000.00	100.0000000000		.00
A	41925	CITIBANK PTD		19	100	3.7500	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	1,041.67	
		01/03/08 01/02/09		48	000	3.7500	10,000,000.00	100.0000000000	USERPR	0.00
A	42059	PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT MONTHLY		19	100	2.8000	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	777.78	
		08/04/08 01/06/09		93	000	2.8000	10,000,000.00	100.0000000000	USERPR	0.00
A	42060	PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT MONTHLY		19	100	2.8000	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	777.78	
		08/01/08 01/06/09		93	000	2.8000	10,000,000.00	100.0000000000	USERPR	0.00
A	41948	FIRST NATL BANK INT MONTHLY		19	100	3.8500	5,000,000.00	5,000,000.00	534.72	
		01/19/08 01/18/09		63	000	3.8500	5,000,000.00	100.0000000000	USERPR	0.00
	SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 1011 PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT M		1.14%(M)			3.2214	35,000,000.00	35,000,000.00	3,131.95	
						3.2214	35,000,000.00	100.0000000000		.00
	GRAND TOTAL					2.7623	3072028000.00	3059696351.72	20,289,937.08	1,612,639.91
						2.8017	3061929438.86	99.59858300000		-10,348,286.85

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487

* ACTIVE TRANSACTIONS *

DETAIL TRANSACTION REPORT - FIXED INCOME
08/01/08 TO 08/31/08
SETTLEMENT DATE BASIS
FUND: 100 POOLED FUNDS

INV # / USER	DESCRIPTION/POOL# / MEMO	BANK / CASH	BROK / DATE	MATURITY /ENTRY	TRADE/ SETTLE	TXN TYP	COUPON YIELD	PAR VALUE ORIGINAL FACE	BOOK VALUE PREM / (DISC)	(INTEREST) AMORT/(ACCRET)	(GAIN)/LOSS SETTLEMENT
41755	FREDDIE MAC	19	43	08/18/08	08/18/08	MAT	4.690	-16,000,000.00	-15,255,853.33	-744,146.67	
tom				08/29/08	08/18/08		4.919				16,000,000.00
41830	T NOTE	19		08/15/08	08/15/08	AMRT	3.250		95,703.12		
tom				08/29/08	08/15/08		4.415			-95,703.12	
			40		08/15/08	MAT	3.250	-10,000,000.00	-10,000,000.00	-162,500.00	
tom				08/29/08	08/15/08		4.415				10,162,500.00
41867	T NOTE	19		08/31/08	08/31/08	AMRT	4.875		-65,625.00		
tom				08/29/08	08/31/08		4.074			65,625.00	
			40		08/31/08	MAT	4.875	-10,000,000.00	-10,000,000.00	-243,750.00	
tom				08/29/08	08/31/08		4.074				10,243,750.00
41915	F H L B FLOATER	19		11/23/09	08/23/08	INTR	2.453			-313,438.50	
		08/23/08		08/27/08	08/23/08		2.474				313,438.50
tom											
41916	F H L B FLOATER	19		11/23/09	08/23/08	INTR	2.453			-313,438.50	
		08/23/08		08/27/08	08/23/08		2.474				313,438.50
tom											
41924	F H L B FLOATER	19		11/23/09	08/23/08	INTR	2.453			-313,438.50	
		08/23/08		08/27/08	08/23/08		2.419				313,438.50
tom											
41935	F H L B INTEREST EARNI	19		08/08/08	08/08/08	AMRT	5.125		-409,982.00		
tom				08/29/08	08/08/08		3.692			409,982.00	
			47		08/08/08	MAT	5.125	-50,000,000.00	-50,000,000.00	-1,281,250.00	
tom				08/29/08	08/08/08		3.692				51,281,250.00
41936	F H L B INTEREST EARN	19		08/21/08	08/21/08	AMRT	5.125		-436,894.00		
tom				08/29/08	08/21/08		3.685			436,894.00	
			47		08/21/08	MAT	5.125	-50,000,000.00	-50,000,000.00	-1,281,250.00	
tom				08/29/08	08/21/08		3.685				51,281,250.00
41937	F H L B FLOATER QTR AC	19		11/23/09	08/23/08	INTR	2.453			-313,438.50	
		08/23/08		08/27/08	08/23/08		2.439				313,438.50
tom											
41938	F H L B FLOATER QTR AC	19		11/23/09	08/23/08	INTR	2.453			-313,438.50	
		08/23/08		08/27/08	08/23/08		2.439				313,438.50
tom											
41939	F H L B FLOATER QTR AC	19		11/23/09	08/23/08	INTR	2.453			-28,209.47	
		08/23/08		08/27/08	08/23/08		2.439				28,209.47
tom											
41940	F H L B FLOATER QTR AC	19		11/23/09	08/23/08	INTR	2.453			-313,438.50	
		08/23/08		08/27/08	08/23/08		2.439				313,438.50
tom											
41941	F H L B FLOATER QTR AC	19		11/23/09	08/23/08	INTR	2.453			-313,438.50	
		08/23/08		08/27/08	08/23/08		2.439				313,438.50
tom											
41968	J P MORGAN N C D	19	76	08/27/08	08/27/08	MAT	2.900	-25,000,000.00	-25,000,000.00	-366,527.78	
tom				08/29/08	08/27/08		2.900				25,366,527.78
41993	T NOTE	19		02/28/10	08/31/08	INTR	2.000		-84,239.13	-415,760.87	
		08/31/08		08/29/08	08/31/08		1.677				500,000.00
tom											
41994	T NOTE	19		02/28/10	08/31/08	INTR	2.000		-84,239.13	-415,760.87	
		08/31/08		08/29/08	08/31/08		1.677				500,000.00
tom											
42000	ING C P	19	49	08/19/08	08/19/08	MAT	2.560	-50,000,000.00	-49,502,222.22	-497,777.78	
tom				08/29/08	08/19/08		2.586				50,000,000.00
42001	ING C P	19	49	08/05/08	08/05/08	MAT	2.560	-50,000,000.00	-49,552,000.00	-448,000.00	
tom				08/29/08	08/05/08		2.583				50,000,000.00

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487

* ACTIVE TRANSACTIONS *

DETAIL TRANSACTION REPORT - FIXED INCOME
08/01/08 TO 08/31/08
SETTLEMENT DATE BASIS
FUND: 100 POOLED FUNDS

INV # / USER	DESCRIPTION/POOL# / MEMO	BANK CASH	BROK DATE	MATURITY /ENTRY	TRADE/ SETTLE	TXN TYP	COUPON YIELD	PAR VALUE ORIGINAL FACE	BOOK VALUE PREM / (DISC)	(INTEREST) AMORT/(ACCRET)	(GAIN)/LOSS SETTLEMENT
42031	WELLS FARGO N C D	19	41	08/19/08	08/19/08	MAT	2.300	-40,000,000.00	-40,000,000.00	-232,555.56	
tom				08/29/08	08/19/08		2.300				40,232,555.56
42058	BANK OF SCOTLAND C P	19	87	01/06/09	08/05/08	PURC	2.980	50,000,000.00	49,362,611.11		
tom				08/25/08	08/05/08		3.018		-637,388.89		-49,362,611.11
42061	F N M A	19	54	02/13/09	08/27/08	PURC	2.790	50,000,000.00	49,345,125.00		
tom				08/28/08	08/28/08		2.827		-654,875.00		-49,345,125.00
42062	WELLS FARGO C P	19	41	11/25/08	08/27/08	PURC	2.680	20,000,000.00	19,867,488.89		
tom				08/28/08	08/28/08		2.698		-132,511.11		-19,867,488.89
42063	WELLS FARGO C P	19	41	12/09/08	08/27/08	PURC	2.680	20,000,000.00	19,846,644.44		
tom				08/28/08	08/28/08		2.701		-153,355.56		-19,846,644.44
42064	T BILL	19	52	01/29/09	08/20/08	PURC	1.750	50,000,000.00	49,606,250.00		
tom				08/28/08	08/20/08		1.764		-393,750.00		-49,606,250.00
42065	FFCB FLOATER QTR	19	54	10/26/09	08/19/08	PURC	2.520	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00		
tom				08/28/08	08/26/08		2.520				-50,000,000.00

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487
DETAIL TRANSACTION REPORT - FIXED INCOME
08/01/08 TO 08/31/08
REPORT GRAND TOTALS
ASSETS

* ACTIVE TRANSACTIONS *

TYPE/ TXN#	PAR WEIGHTED YIELD	PAR VALUE	ORIGINAL FACE VALUE	BOOK VALUE	PREMIUM/ (DISCOUNT)	AMORTIZATION/ (ACCRETION)	(INTEREST)	(GAIN)/ LOSS	SETTLEMENT
									-238,028,119.44
PURC (6)	2.560	240,000,000.00		238,028,119.44	-1,971,880.56				
INTR (10)	2.277			-168,478.26			-3,053,800.71		
MAT (9)	3.174	-301000000.00		-299310075.55			-5,257,757.79		302,877,908.89
AMRT (3)	3.723			-912,501.00		912,501.00			
ACR (1)	4.415			95,703.12		-95,703.12			

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487

* ACTIVE TRANSACTIONS *

DETAIL TRANSACTION REPORT - FIXED INCOME
08/01/08 TO 08/31/08
SETTLEMENT DATE BASIS
FUND: 100 POOLED FUNDS

INV # / USER	DESCRIPTION/POOL# / MEMO	BANK CASH	BROK DATE	MATURITY /ENTRY	TRADE/ SETTLE	TXN TYP	COUPON YIELD	PAR VALUE ORIGINAL FACE	BOOK VALUE PREM / (DISC)	(INTEREST) AMORT/(ACCRET)	(GAIN)/LOSS SETTLEMENT
41925	CITIBANK PTD	19		01/02/09	08/31/08	INTR	3.750			-32,291.67	
tom		08/31/08		08/29/08	08/31/08		3.750				32,291.67
41948	FIRST NATL BANK INT MO	19		01/18/09	08/31/08	INTR	3.850			-16,576.39	
tom		08/31/08		08/29/08	08/31/08		3.850				16,576.39
42050	CITIBANK PTD	19	93	08/01/08	08/01/08	MAT	2.180	-10,000,000.00	-10,000,000.00	-4,238.89	
tom				08/29/08	08/01/08		2.180				10,004,238.89
42059	PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT MO	19	93	01/06/09	08/04/08	PURC	2.800	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00		
tom				08/27/08	08/04/08		2.800				-10,000,000.00
					08/31/08	INTR	2.800			-21,000.00	
tom		08/31/08		08/29/08	08/31/08		2.800				21,000.00
42060	PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT MO	19	93	01/06/09	08/01/08	PURC	2.800	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00		
tom				08/27/08	08/01/08		2.800				-10,000,000.00
					08/31/08	INTR	2.800			-23,333.33	
tom		08/31/08		08/29/08	08/31/08		2.800				23,333.33

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487

* ACTIVE TRANSACTIONS *

DETAIL TRANSACTION REPORT - FIXED INCOME
08/01/08 TO 08/31/08
REPORT GRAND TOTALS
ASSETS

TYPE/ TXN#	PAR WEIGHTED YIELD	PAR VALUE	ORIGINAL FACE VALUE	BOOK VALUE	PREMIUM/ (DISCOUNT)	AMORTIZATION/ (ACCRETION)	(INTEREST)	(GAIN)/ LOSS	SETTLEMENT
PURC (2)	2.800	20,000,000.00		20,000,000.00					-20,000,000.00
INTR (4)	3.221						-93,201.39		
MAT (1)	2.180	-10,000,000.00		-10,000,000.00			-4,238.89		10,004,238.89

10/7

Capital Planning Committee

Edwin M. Lee, City Administrator, Chair

MEMORANDUM

27

September 15, 2008

To: Supervisor Aaron Peskin, Board President

From: Edwin M. Lee, City Administrator & Capital Planning Committee Chair

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

Regarding: Recommendations on (1) the Supplemental Appropriation ($40,520,000) for the First Issuance of the 2008 Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond, and (2) the Supplemental Appropriation ($130,462.77) for the Port of San Francisco's Pier 43.5 Promenade Project

In accordance with Section 3.21 of the Administrative Code, on September 15, 2008 the Capital Planning Committee (CPC) reviewed materials from the Recreation and Parks Department and the Port of San Francisco relating to the supplemental appropriation of the balance of funds from the first issuance for the 2008 Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond. The CPC also reviewed materials from the Port of San Francisco regarding the supplemental appropriation for the Pier 43.5 Promenade project. The CPC's recommendations on these items are set forth below.

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2008 SEP 22 AM 10:50

1. **Board File Number TBD:** **Supplemental Appropriation ($40,520,000) for First Issuance of the 2008 Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond**

   Recommendation: Recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the supplemental appropriation.

   Comments: The projects and associated funding are the same as presented to the CPC on July 14, 2008 for the review and approval of the first bond issuance. The CPC recommended the supplemental appropriation by a vote of 9-0.

2. **Board File Number TBD:** **Supplemental Appropriation ($130,462.77) for the Port of San Francisco's Per 43.5 Promenade Project**

   Recommendation: Recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the supplemental appropriation.

   Comments: The Port of San Francisco is requesting to re-appropriate old revenue bond funds from closed projects to help fund the design phase of the Pier 43.5 Promenade project. The Committee recommended authorizing the supplemental appropriation by a vote of 9-0.

27

10/7

28

September 18, 2008

San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117

Honorable Commissioners,

My name is James Keys and I serve on the City and County of San Francisco's Mental Health Board and I also serve as the Secretary of the Executive Board.

I am presenting this letter to you to bring attention to the need for specific improvements at Gene Friend Recreational Center located at 270 6th Street. As we all know this city is 46.7 square miles and there is little open space available for residents to enjoy. The South of Market area has two lovely parks, Victoria Manolo Draves and Gene Friend Recreational Center. While our city faces budgetary problems the "fallout" first affects the poor, those who live near poverty level and our open spaces.

As a resident of San Francisco I would request of this commission to bring about a change at Gene Friend Recreational Center that would bolster the community, improve the rec center and bring a safe haven for children living in the SoMa area.

Gene Friend Recreational Center is in need of renovation. By creating a new and improved Community Center safety would improve and give not only the staff, yet the entire community "peace of mind" that their children and themselves would have some measure of prevention regarding some violence.

Yet renovation will take time and what is needed now is increased programming at the rec center that is geared towards the entire community, including the poor, the elderly, all children, youth and families. The rec center has some programming that is staffed by United Playaz, a group awarded by the San Francisco Mental Health Board that is making an enormous difference at Gene Friend Recreational Center. Yet United Playaz and the present staff can not continue this without your intervention.

Please accept the resolution presented by United Playaz, adopt this in its entirety and move the resolution to the City and County of San Francisco's Board of Supervisors. In this manner you will make a difference in the lives of the men, women and children living around Gene Friend and also help to curb violence while improving the value of property in the area.

Thank you,

James Keys
Secretary
City and County of San Francisco
Mental Health Board

cc: Mayor Newsom, Board of Supervsiors, Helynna Brook, Carolyn Caldwell

28

10/7

Office of the Mayor
City & County of San Francisco

Gavin Newsom

29

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2008 SEP 19 PM 4:55
BY

September 16, 2008

Ms. Angela Calvillo
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94109

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

Pursuant to Charter Section 3.100, I hereby designate Supervisor Michela Alioto-Pier as Acting-Mayor from the time I leave the state of California at 8:05AM on Monday, September 22, 2008 until 11:59PM Monday, September 22, 2008.

I hereby designate Supervisor Sean Elsbernd as Acting-Mayor from 12:00AM on Tuesday, September 23, 2008 until 11:59PM Wednesday, September 24, 2008.

I hereby designate Supervisor Carmen Chu as Acting-Mayor from 12:00AM on Thursday, September 25, 2008 until 11:59PM Thursday, September 25, 2008.

I hereby designate Supervisor Bevan Dufty as Acting-Mayor from 12:00AM on Friday, September 26, 2008 until 2:15PM on Friday, September 26, 2008. In the event I am delayed, I designate Supervisor Dufty to continue to be the Acting-Mayor until my return to California.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

cc: Mr. Dennis Herrera, City Attorney

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

29

10/7

City and County of San Francisco

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2008 SEP 18 PM 4:06
BY

Phone: (415) 554-6920
Fax: (415) 554-6944
TDD: (415) 554-6900
www.sfgov.org/dpw

Department of Public Works
Office of the Director
City Hall, Room 348
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4645

Gavin Newsom, Mayor
Edward D. Reiskin, Director

30

September 17, 2008

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

RE: ***2007-08 List of Sole Source Contracts***

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

In accordance with the City's Sunshine Ordinance (Administrative Code Chapter 67), I am enclosing a list of the sole source contracts awarded by the Department of Public works for the fiscal year 2007-08.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contract Robert Carlson of my staff at 554-4831.

Sincerely,

Edward D. Reiskin
Director

Attachment: As noted

Cc: Greg Wagner, Mayor's Budget Office
Robert Carlson, OFFMA

DPW REPORTING OF SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007 – 2008

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

REPORTING OF SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007 – 2008 IN ACCORDANCE WITH SUNSHINE ORDINANCE REQUIREMENTS

TERM:		VENDOR:	AMOUNT:	REASON:
START	*END*			
3/17/2008	3/17/2010	Chinatown Community Development Center	$100,000	The Bureau of Engineering awarded a sole source contract to provide community outreach services and schematic plans for the Chinatown Alleyway Renovation Program.
5/29/2008	6/30/2009	Hostbridge Technology, Inc.	$9,600	The General Administration Bureau, through the Computer Services Division, awarded a purchase order to a sole source vendor that provides technical support for proprietary software to support a web interface with the City's FAMIS system to exchange data with the department Requisition and Tracking System (RAS).

City and County of San Francisco
Department of Building Inspection

Gavin Newsom, Mayor
Vivian L. Day, C.B.O., Acting-Director

Ru # 080924

31

September 8, 2008

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

Subject: Response to City Grand Jury Recommendations

This letter is in response to the Civil Grand Jury report titled "Fits and Starts: The Response of San Francisco Government to Past Civil Grand Jury Recommendations", dated June 2008, item 4. Item 4 states: "The Office of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should follow up with the Department of Building Inspection to make certain that questions of seismic safety are addressed at all designated City operation centers."

The Department of Building Inspection (DBI) has met with representatives from the Department of Emergency Management, Department of Public Works, Department of Real Estate, and others regarding the seismic safety and operability of City Department Operations Centers (DOC). This core group has become the lead group to implement Strategic Goal 10: Improve the functional and operational capabilities of Department Operating Centers of the San Francisco All-Hazards Strategic Plan.

At this time, we are in the process of determining the seismic safety and operability of the buildings where existing DOC's are located.

If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Raymond Lui, S.E.
Deputy Director for Plan Review Services

Cc: Mike Fernandez, Mayor's Office of Public Policy and Finance
Vivian L. Day, Acting-Director
Neal Taniguchi, Manager for Administration and Finance

Angela Calvillo/BOS/SFGOV
09/22/2008 11:42 AM

To Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV
cc
bcc
Subject Fw: Letter

C Pages?

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

Complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Satisfaction form by clicking the link below.
http://www.sfgov.org/site/bdsupvrs_form.asp?id=18548

----- Forwarded by Angela Calvillo/BOS/SFGOV on 09/22/2008 10:32 AM -----

Sylvia N. Thai/DBI/SFGOV
09/22/2008 10:20 AM

To Mike Fernandez/MAYOR/SFGOV@SFGOV, Angela Calvillo/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV
cc Raymond R Lui/DBI/SFGOV@SFGOV
Subject Re: Letter

Response item 4.pdf

Thanks

Sylvia Thai
415-558-6139
Raymond R Lui/DBI/SFGOV



Raymond R Lui/DBI/SFGOV
09/22/2008 10:07 AM

To "Sylvia Thai" <sylvia.thai@sfgov.org>
cc
Subject Letter

Sylvia, please forward a copy of the letter to the Board of Supervisors that I had you send a couple of weeks ago asap. Thanks.

Ray Lui

10/7

32

"James Chaffee"
<chaffeej@ [redacted]
09/20/2008 06:40 PM

To <sotf@sfgov.org>, <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
bcc
Subject Chaffee -- Sunshine Complaint Against Abuses by Board of Supervisors

From: James Chaffee
Date: September 20, 2008
Subject: Sunshine Complaint Against Board of Supervisors' Abuses of Public Comment Requirements

There is a complaint before the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force that is of crucial importance.

As usual, the powerful political forces are gathering to set a precedent against public comment and the nature of the complaint is being seriously undercut and given short shrift at every juncture. The complaint is No. 4 on the Agenda for the Task Force meeting of September 23, 2008, and the named respondent is Supervisor Jake McGoldrick. The complainant is Tomas Picarello. I don't know Mr. Picarello and I don't know anyone who knows him. He has provided no details or advocacy for his position and the Sunshine Task Force Administrator and the City Attorney representative provide nothing but a response from McGoldrick and a blizzard of documents without any explanation of their relevance totaling 212 pages. I wonder if Mr. Picarello is a made up name to make it easier to attack Sunshine. I have decided that I might as well jump into the breach and provide some advocacy for this issue. I would encourage anyone to jump in who can.

Here is the link for your convenience. http://www.sfgov.org/site/sunshine_page.asp?id=88993

The issue fundamentally is that City Attorney through the agency of the Board of Supervisors has decided that a public body should be able to provide public comment once, at one meeting, and then never again no matter how many times the issue is subsequently heard. The most egregious example and the one that I will focus on is the consideration of the Annual Salary Ordinance. I have attached, as a pdf, the one page of the agenda of the Budget and Finance Committee from June 26, 2008 which shows the crux of the violation. As you will see, it describes an agenda item, Item No. 11, at that meeting, File No. 080604. This agenda item was first considered by the Budget and Finance Committee on May 21, 2008. At that meeting there is no indication that public comment was taken and all speakers noted were City officials. It was heard again on May 22, 2008, and public comment was taken.

Thereafter, it was heard again on May 28, May 29, and June 26, and at each meeting it was announced on the agenda that the required public comment was heard and closed on May 22, and no further public comment would be allowed. This is in the face of the fact that the committee heard extensive comment from City official on each of those occasions.

It should be overwhelmingly obvious that this violates the spirit of Sunshine. If City officials are feeding the Supervisors, our elected representatives, a bunch of falsehoods, there is no way that interested citizens can contradict that testimony and bring the truth, not to mention other perspectives, to the attention of the Budget and Finance Committee.

What about the technical requirements of the Sunshine Ordinance? Everyone reading this by now should know it by heart. The ordinance says, at Sec. 67.15(a), "Every agenda for regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address a policy body on items of interest to the public . . ."

Of course, this is utterly indefensible. Every agenda means every agenda. Is the City Attorney really claiming that a meeting on May 22, and a meeting on June 26 are the same meeting? My goodness, the stock market could have crashed in the interim and citizens having been placed in a new situation, not to mention having heard new claims from City officials, may have a different point to make.

I probably don't have to give any vivid illustrations of how destructive and dangerous this is for the public's right monitor public process. What his means is that at any juncture that City Hall officials see fit, the public can be frozen out of the process and whenever serious discussions are held, it can always be said, the public spoke last month -- how about last quarter, last year? This is a devastating blow to Sunshine principles and based on what we have seen so far, the City Attorney is going to push it through a "friendly" Sunshine Task Force.

As a little bit of an end note, it should be noticed that as curious as it sounds, the record was further obliterated by the fact that when the Annual Salary Ordinance was passed it became Ordinance Nos. 141-08, and 143-08, which were based on file Nos. 080726, 081041. I could not find either of these file numbers on the Budget and Finance Agenda, so if a public review was ever conducted the agenda item discussed above, File No. 080604, would not show up. And that agenda item never became an ordinance – very curious.

Sunshine-SupesAgendaIssue 205.pdf

11. 080604 **[Proposed Annual Salary Ordinance for Selected Departments, Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2009 and for the Municipal Transportation Agency, Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2010]**

Proposed Annual Salary Ordinance enumerating positions in the Annual Budget and Appropriation Ordinance for Selected Departments of the City and County of San Francisco for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2009 and for the Municipal Transportation Agency for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2010. (Mayor)

(Fiscal Impact.)

5/1/08, RECEIVED AND ASSIGNED to Budget and Finance Committee.

5/21/08, CONTINUED. Heard in Committee. Speakers: Victor Pacheco, Interim Director, Board of Appeals; Harvey Rose, Budget Analyst; Hared Blumenfeld, Director, Dept of the Environment; Monique Zmuda, Deputy Controller; Monique Moyer, Executive Director, San Francisco Port; Elene Wolf, Director, Rent Board; Debra Newman, Budget Analyst's Office; Ben Rosenfield, Controller; John Martin, Director, San Francisco International Airport.

Continued to May 22, 2008.

5/22/08, CONTINUED. Heard in Committee. Speakers: Clare Murphy, Director, Retirement; Harvey Rose, Budget Analyst; Monique Zmuda; Ed Harrington, General Manager, PUC; Nani Coloretti, Mayor's Budget Director; Carmen Kelly, PUC; Nathaniel Ford, Executive Director Municipal Transportation Agency; Jordanna Thigpen, Acting Director, Taxi Commission; Ben Rosenfield, Controller; Monique Zmuda, Deputy Controller; David Pilpel; Susan King; Robin Chair; Michael Sevill, Local 21;Rich Eisen; Rosu Hagen; Andy Thornly; Dave Snider; Shirley Graff; Crystal Java, Liz Portman; male speaker; Bob Planthold; male speaker; Cheryl Brinkman; Minish Chapman.

Continued to May 28, 2008.

5/28/08, CONTINUED. Heard in Committee. Speakers: Harvey Rose, Budget Analyst; Ben Rosenfield, Controller; David; Monique Zmuda, Deputy Controller; Tina Olsen, SF Port; Delene Wolf, Director, Rent Board; John Martin, Director, SF International Airport; Ken Bruce, Budget Analyst's Office; Nani Coloretti, Mayor's Budget Director; Mr. Picitello.

Continued to May 29, 2008.

5/29/08, CONTINUED. Heard in Committee. Speakers: Clare Murphy, Executive Director, Retirement; Ed Harrington, General Manager, PUC; Harvey Rose, Budget Analyst; Marcia Bell, Law Library; female speaker; Jordanna Thigpen, Acting Director, Taxi Commission; Ben Rosenfield, Controller; Monique Zmuda, Deputy Controller; Nani Coloretti, Mayor's Budget Director; Nathaniel Ford, Executive Director, MTA.

Continued to June 26, 2008.

The public comment legally required under California Government Code Section 54954.3 and San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.15(a) prior to adoption of File Nos. 080603 and 080604 was provided and completed on May 22, 2008.

ADJOURNMENT

IMPORTANT INFORMATION

NOTE: Persons unable to attend the meeting may submit to the City, by the time the proceedings begin, written comments regarding the agenda items above. These comments will be made a part of the official public record and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Any written comments should be sent to: Committee Clerk of the Budget and Finance Committee, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102 by 5:00 p.m. on the day prior to the hearing. Comments which cannot be delivered to the committee clerk by that time may be taken directly to the hearing at the location above

LEGISLATION UNDER THE 30-DAY RULE

10/7

33

"Vaing, Jonathan" <Jonathan.Vaing@sfdpw.org>

09/19/2008 02:38 PM

To Board of Supervisors <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>

cc Board of Supervisors <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, "Brown, Vallie" <Vallie.Brown@sfgov.org>, "Galbreath, Rick" <Rick.Galbreath@sfgov.org>, "Galli, Phil"

bcc

Subject RE: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - #20080708-003

Here's the status of removing graffiti from the following private property locations:

546 Haight SR# 800750 -Lower Level Graffiti Abated-Second Notice for Top Level 8-22-08)
146 Webster SR# 826087 -Notice Posted-Graffiti Abated 9-4-08)
799 Haight SR# 828530 -Notice Posted-Graffiti Abated 8-20-08)
1115 Fell SR# 840219 -Nothing Found 8-12-08)
2001 Grove SR# 816642 -Notice Posted-Graffiti Abated 8-19-08)
600 Stanyan SR# 817272 -Notice Posted-Graffiti Abated 9-9-08)
670 Stanyan SR# 818258 -Notice Posted-Graffiti Abated 8-18-08)
1762 Waller SR# 817273 -Notice Posted-Graffiti Abated 8-12-08)
1756 Waller SR# 828823 -Inspected -Graffiti Abated 8-06-08)
1734 Waller SR# 816879 -Second Notice sent 9-9-08)
583 Haight SR# 823754 -Abated 8-12-08)
1101 Oak SR# 824328 -Second Notice 8-22-08)
537 Shrader SR# 816174 -Notice Posted-Graffiti Abated 8-12-08)
701 Shrader SR# 776128 -Inspected Nothing Found 8-7-08)
759 Shrader SR# 793138 -Graffiti Abated 8-12-08)
1708 Waller SR# 812409 -Graffiti Abated 8-12-08)
903 Stanyan SR# 827360 -Graffiti aBATED 8-12-08)
364 Divisadero SR#827361 -Graffiti Abated 8-13-08)

Jonathan C. Vaing
DPW Graffiti Abatement Unit
Operation Supervisor
415-695-2181

-----Original Message-----
From: Lee, Frank W
Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2008 11:09 AM
To: Vaing, Jonathan
Cc: Hines, Timothy; Rodis, Nathan
Subject: FW: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - SECOND PAST DUE NOTICE #20080708-003

Jonathan:

Please respond directly to the Board of Supervisors and copy Supe. Mirkarimi. Please use the reference number in your reply title, and copy Nathan Rodis and me because we are tracking these requests.

Thanks,
Frank

-----Original Message-----
From: Board of Supervisors
Sent: Monday, September 15, 2008 2:59 PM
To: Reiskin, Ed
Subject: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - SECOND PAST DUE NOTICE

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - SECOND PAST DUE NOTICE
If you have already responded, please disregard this notice.
For any questions, call (415) 554-7708.

TO: Edward Reiskin
Public Works

FROM: Clerk of the Board
DATE: 9/15/2008
REFERENCE: 20080708-003
FILE NO.

Due Date:	8/8/2008:
Reminder Sent:	8/8/2008
Past Due Notice Sent:	9/15/2008

The inquiry referenced above from Supervisor Mirkarimi was made at the Board meeting on 7/8/2008 and a response was requested by the due date shown above.

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

For your convenience, the original inquiry is repeated below.

Requesting that the Department of Public Works report on the status of removing graffiti from the following private property locations:
546 Haight
146 Webster
799 Haight
1115 Fell
2001 Grove
600 Stanyan

80/7

34

"Vaing, Jonathan"
<Jonathan.Vaing@sfdpw.org
>
09/19/2008 03:32 PM

To Board of Supervisors <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>

cc Board of Supervisors <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, "Brown, Vallie" <Vallie.Brown@sfgov.org>, "Galbreath, Rick" <Rick.Galbreath@sfgov.org>, "Galli, Phil"

bcc

Subject RE: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - DUE NOTICE #20080805-003

Here's the status of removing graffiti at the following private property locations:

295 Buchanan	SR# 797269	-NOTICE Posted-Graffiti on Wall is Abated-Second Notice sent 8-25-08 regarding sticker on window)
409 & 1101 Oak	SR# 824328	-Second Notice 8-22-08)
546 Haight	SR# 800750	-Notice Posted-Lower Level Graffiti is Abated-Second Notice sent for Top side Level Graffiti)
146 Webster	SR# 826087	-Notice Posted- Graffiti Abated 9-4-08)
799 Haight	SR# 827347	-Graffiti Abated 8-15-08)
2001 Grove	SR# 816642	-Notice Posted-Graffiti Abated 8-19-08)
583 Haight	SR# 823754	-Graffiti Abated 8-12-08)
537 Shrader	SR# 816174	-Graffiti Abated 8-12-08)
701 Shrader	SR# 776128	-Nothing Found-Inspected 8-06-08)
1708 Waller	SR# 812409	-Graffiti Abated 8-12-08)
903 Stanyan	SR# 827360	-Graffiti Abated 8-12-08)
364 Divisadero	SR# 827361	-Graffiti Abated 8-13-08)

Jonathan Vaing
DPW Graffiti Abatement Unit
Operation Supervisor
415-695-2181

-----Original Message-----
From: Lee, Frank W
Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2008 11:03 AM
To: Vaing, Jonathan
Cc: Hines, Timothy; Rodis, Nathan
Subject: FW: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - DUE NOTICE #20080805-003

Jonathan:

Please respond directly to the Board of Supervisors and copy Supe. Mirkarimi. Please use the reference number in your reply title, and copy Nathan Rodis and me because we are tracking these requests.

Thanks,

10/7

35

Giannina Miranda/ELECTIONS/SFGOV

09/19/2008 03:03 PM

To Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV
cc Tom Ammiano/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV
bcc
Subject RE: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY - Reference #20080909-062

Hello,

Please find attached our Department's response to the Board of Supervisors Inquiry, Reference Number 20080909-062.

091908 RE BOS Inquiry Ref No. 20080909-062.pdf

Thank You,

Giannina Miranda
Executive Assistant
Department of Elections
City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 48
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-4397
(415) 554-7344 fax

DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS
City and County of San Francisco
www.sfgov.org/elections

John Arntz
Director

Memorandum

To: **Honorable Tom Ammiano, Member, Board of Supervisors**

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

From: **John Arntz, Director of Elections**

Date: **September 19, 2008**

RE: **Board of Supervisors Inquiry, Reference # 20080909-062**

The Department of Elections is unable to respond with material relevant to this inquiry.

Voice (415) 554-4375
Fax (415) 554-7344

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 48
San Francisco CA 94102-4634

Vote-By-Mail Fax(415) 554-4372
TTY (415) 554-4386

36 10/7

"Roiz, Teresa"
<TRoiz@sfwater.org>
09/22/2008 09:24 AM

To "Board of Supervisors" <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc "Patricio, Lorelei" <LPatricio@sfwater.org>
bcc
Subject Declaration of Emergency Memo to Board of Supervisors

Attached is a copy of the Declaration of Emergency Memo to the Board of Supervisors on the Replacement of Kirkwood Generator Stator Core.

Thank you.

Teresa Roiz
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Office of the Assistant General Manager - Water
1155 Market Street, 11th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
Phone: (415) 934-5726
Fax: (415) 934-5751
email: troiz@sfwater.org

Decla of Emerg to BOS_Kirkwood.pdf

SFPUC
WATER
WASTEWATER
POWER

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL MANAGER
1155 Market St., 11th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103 • Tel. (415) 554-1600 • Fax (415) 554-3161 • TTY (415) 554.3488

September 17, 2008

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco

The Honorable Ben Rosenfield
Controller, City and County of San Francisco

SUBJECT: Declaration of Emergency – Replacement of Kirkwood Generator Stator Core

Gentlepersons:

In accordance with Chapter 6, Article IV, Section 6.60(D) of the Administrative Code of the City and County of San Francisco, I am declaring an emergency on behalf of the Public Utilities Commission.

The Kirkwood Powerhouse (KPH) was constructed in 1967. Generator units KPH1 and KPH2 were in service shortly thereafter. The life span of a generator winding is 30 years. HHWP issued contract HH910 to rewind KPH1 and KPH2 (replace the stator windings only). Upon removal of the stator windings the stator core was inspected. Due to the inconsistencies in the stator core configuration of KPH1, the new windings could not be installed with proper wedging or side packing (the stator core in KPH2 is useable). To have KPH1 available to generate for spring runoff, the stator core must be replaced prior to installing the windings. Without the core being replaced, the rewind on KPH1 cannot be completed. If KPH1 is not rewound and available for spring runoff, there may be a reduction in generation revenues of up to $3,500,000 (median year, varies by water year type).

It is in the best interest of the City to issue emergency contracts to replace the existing microwave system. Work to be performed is beyond the capabilities of City forces. The estimated total cost of the project is $2,200,000.

I am therefore declaring the existence of an emergency. I trust that this meets with your concurrence and approval.

Very truly yours,

Edward Harrington
General Manager
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

cc: A. Caen F.X. Crowley F. Vietor M. Carlin T. Rydstrom

10/7

37

<Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
09/19/2008 03:50 PM

To <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
bcc
Subject Clerk of the Board Customer Satisfaction Form

Submitted on: 9/19/2008 3:50:27 PM

Additional_Comments: September 19, 2008

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I recently received the notification obligating San Francisco Employers to provide mass transit commuter benefits to their employees. Thank God I don't have 20 employees. I have just slightly less than 20 employees.

San Francisco must really be trying their best to run small businesses out of the city. I have made it through the mandatory 9 days paid sick time. My company policy for the last 21 years had been 5 days paid sick time. Now I must provide additional paid sick time and let the employees roll it over year after year. What an accounting nightmare. I have always provided medical and dental insurance, which I pay for as a benefit to my employees. However as the economy gets worse it will be very difficult to pay for all of the San Francisco and state social programs that I am required to provide. What happened to a fair wage for a fair days work? I am a 5th generation Californian. I grew up with people whose parents came to this country with 20 dollars in their pocket. Nobody gave them a hand out. They worked! They followed the American Dream. They worked, saved their money and provided for their families. Nobody said it was easy. We did not expect handouts. This certainly is not the system we have today. Today we say come to California - illegally is OK because we will provide all kinds of free programs for you (our businesses will pay for them) and "safe zones" where no one can ask you for your documentation. You will get discounted college tuition. You will get free medical care at our hospitals. This is a big favorite of mine. My mother who paid her own way and paid for her own medical insurance was turned away after waiting all day for a doctor ordered x-ray. She waited and waited while numerous undocumented people with no insurance and no money to pay for medical care were taken ahead of her. My mother was turned away..and she DIED the next day!!!!!! Enough is enough!!!

How dare you tell me that businesses similar to mine MUST provide transportation in order for their employees to get to work? I'm sorry but if you can't get yourself to work on your own you are irresponsible and lazy.

San Francisco is again driving businesses away. (I remember when all of the shipping business was forced out and moved across the Bay.) We started our business in San Francisco in 1986. We have provided jobs for many people. We have paid for their medical, dental, vision and 401k programs. Some of my employees have been with me for 20 years. I am sickened to think that

37

businesses such as mine would be forced to shut down. You would be responsible for all of my employees being out of work.

We are turning into a socialist city. If you keep taxing businesses at this rate we will turn into a country like Russia. Why should those of us who work hard for a living keep going? Why should we work any harder if the government is just going to take it away from us and give it to someone who is lazy and doesn't want to get up at 6am everyday like I do? I truly understand that there are those people who need assistance. Assistance is the key word. Unfortunately there is a large element of lazy people who feel entitled for people like me to take care of them. What do you plan to do when all of us hard working people give up? Who will you tax then? Everybody will loose.

Please stop forcing the small business owner to pay for EVERYTHING. If someone wants assistance they should have to do something in exchange. If you need food stamps, OK help clean the street, DO SOMETHING - DO ANYTHING - BUT CONTRIBUTE SOMETHING!!!

As the 1976 movie "Network" so perfectly put it - "I'm as made as hell and I'm not going to take this anymore". I really don't think businesses can take much more.

Regards,
Jonette Burton
The Bath + Beyond

Name: Jonette Burton

Number: [redacted]

Mailing Address: The Bath + Beyond
[redacted]t.
San Francisco, CA 94107

Email: jonisb@ [redacted]

User Data

Client IP (REMOTE_ADDR) : 67.112.31.2
Client IP via Proxy (HTTP_X_FORWARDED_FOR) :

10/7

frandacosta@[redacted]
09/21/2008 03:43 PM

To "Da Costa, Francisco" <frandacosta@[redacted]
cc
bcc Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
Subject Twenty thousands units down the pipeline

40

--

Check this out:

http://www.franciscodacosta.com/articles/blossoms092.html

Francisco Da Costa

40

10/7

41



SUN
<sunfreedom76@[redacted]
>

09/20/2008 04:57 PM

To gavin.newsom@sfgov.org, board_of_supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us, editor@sfbaytimes.com, c.laird@ebar.com

cc sfbarea@yahoogroups.com, nakity@yahoogroups.com, savefreedom@yahoogroups.com, franhattan <franhattan@yahoogroups.com>,

bcc

Subject Testimony about Nude Political Demonstration, 20 Sept. 2008, in Castro district.

To all it may concern:

I participated in a nude political demonstration for freedom and peace, called a "Freedom Walk", on the afternoon of Saturday, 20 September 2008, in the Castro gayborhood of San Francisco.

This demo was sponsored by the FKK organizatiuon (led by George Davis); and endorsed by Senior Unlimited Nudes (SUN) of SF (currently led by Tortuga Bi Liberty). It was videotaped by a third organization.

Several men gathered around 2 or 2:30 PM on 18th street near Castro. Several of us disrobed, and walked nude along 18th street, toward the Mission district. After a short distance, a police car intercepted us. The SFPD ordered us to "cover up".
Most of us quickly did so.

My friend George Davis had a long discussion with the driver of the SFPD car, probably a Sergeant; and, eventually, George got dressed also. Then the officer emerged from his car, and conducted a polite conversation with several of us; most of which was video-taped.
At all times, his tone was cordial and respectful.

So far as I know, there was NO rudeness or other misbehavior by any officer at this incident; nor by any demonstrator.

I understand that Mr. Davis MAY file a complaint against the police officers, and/or the SF Police Department. Since he is an honest and truthful person, I don't expect him to allege that any rudeness or violence occurred.

Presumably his complaint, IF any, would concern the lawfulness (or not) of SFPD's actions here -- in that SFPD interrupted a completely lawful nude political demonstration, and ordered the demonstrators to "cover up"; and thereby violated the civil rights and civil liberties of the demonstrators, and also the general public's right to receive political ideas conveyed by such a demonstration.

SUN similarly asserts violation of such civil rights and civil liberties;

but chooses to refrain from filing any complaints concerning SFPD suppression of this demonstration on 20 September 2008.
SUN chooses, metaphorically, to "turn the other cheek".

I affirm that the foregoing statement is true,
to the best of my knowledge and belief;
so help me, Aphrodite.

For freedom until death,

Tortuga Bi LIBERTY,
Senior Unlimited Nudes
l [redacted]
San Francisco, CA 94142-6937

.....

PS-- What is the email address of
the SF Police Department?
Since I don't have that address,
I'm sending this testimony
to the Mayor
and the Board of Supervisors.
I ask them (or anyone) to forward it to
SFPD and to
any agencies, officials, etc.,
who might be concerned.

.....
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/SaveFreedom
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/nakity/
SUN, POB 426937, SF, CA 94142-6937
Freedom until death!

10/7

(42)

ahimsa sumchai
<asumchai@[redacted]>

09/19/2008 01:08 PM

To Norma J F Harrison <r[redacted]>, <communityfirstcoalition@y[redacted]>, <home@[redacted]>, board_of_supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us>,

cc

bcc

Subject RE: Capitalism sucks big time .....We have a shortage in America of primary care or family type doctors

This is only part of the problem...doctors who provide expensive interventions like cardiologists, otolaryngologists and dermatologists have more marketing potential than primary care doctors who rely on seeing a large volume of patients to bolster their incomes and practice revenues. This is why the time alloted for patients has dwindled to a global average of 5 minutes according to the British Royal College of Surgeons.

Ahimsa Porter Sumchai, M.D. NSCA-CPT

> From: normaha@[redacted]
> To: ;
> Subject: Capitalism sucks big time .....We have a shortage in America of primary care or family type doctors
> Date: Fri, 19 Sep 2008 02:27:13 -0700
>
>
http://google-sina.com/2008/03/21/new-york-times-examines-migration-of-top-medical-students-to-dermatology-plastic-surgery/
> The New York Times on Wednesday examined a "migration" of "top tier"
> medical students from "branches of health care that manage major
> diseases toward specialties that improve the life of patients," such
> as dermatology and plastic surgery, and that improve the "lives of
> physicians, with better pay, more autonomy and more-controllable
> hours."
>
> According to the Times, dermatology and plastic surgery are "among the
> most competitive" residency programs. Dermatology, plastic surgery and
> otolaryngology had the highest median medical board scores and the
> largest percentage of medical honor society members among 18
> specialties, according to a report by the Association of American
> Medical Colleges and the National Resident Matching Program.
>
> Internists in 2007 worked an average of 50 hours weekly, compared with
> about 40 hours weekly for dermatologists, according to an annual
> survey by the magazine Medical Economics. A recent survey conducted by
> the Medical Group Management Association found that internists have
> average annual incomes of $191,525, compared with $390,274 for
> dermatologists. In addition, dermatology "offers more independence

> from the bureaucracy of managed care because patients pay up front for
> cosmetic procedures not covered by health insurance," the Times
> reports.
>
> "Medical school professors and administrators say such discrepancies
> are dissuading some top students at American medical schools from
> entering fields, like family medicine, that manage the most prevalent
> serious illnesses," according to the Times. Such students are "being
> replaced in part by graduates of foreign medical schools, some of whom
> return to their home countries to practice," the Times reports.
>
> Joel Feiner, a cardiology professor and associate dean for clinical
> education at the Emory University School of Medicine, said, "We have a
> shortage in America of primary care or family type doctors," adding,
> "We do need dermatologists, but I am more worried about the really
> sick people, and dermatologists aren't taking care of them" (Singer,
> New York Times, 3/19).
>

Norma J F Harrison
<normaha@[redacted]
09/19/2008 03:07 PM

To: ahimsa sumchai <asumchai@[redacted]
communityfirstcoalition@[redacted]
home@[redacted] [redacted] l_of_supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us,
cc:
bcc:
Subject: Re: Capitalism sucks big time .....We have a shortage in America of primary care or family type doctors

Hi, Ahimsa, regards and thanks for the comment.
My message though was meant to illustrate 1. that capitalism drives everyone into profit-making; people go to get training for positions where they can make money, not service, not stuff we need and like, but money;
that is, IF they can afford to take the time and spend the money to get training.
2. the training to GET qualified to do any of that profit making - for us on the ground, now, not about those tiny few who own everything, trained or not -
that training is wholly out of reach for MANY people: too costly, too much time away from other obligations; too far away - too costly just to get there; too costly to get the books or other required tools....
3. and ultimately the training is about fitting in someplace to serve a brutal system: Capitalism is not a victimless crime. These jobs are most often about serving irrelevant work; insurance, banking, investments, real estate, teaching - teaching being a commodity that deals in the commodities reading, writing, calculating, history, science, art, all of which belong in integrated living, not as segregated activities - segregated by age and by activity. Usually they're done in oppressive environments, as well - hours at the job site too long, compensation too little, benefits under attack or altogether gone so unsafe working conditions.

Capitalism is the great alienator stealing our natural activities, turning them into commodities to be bought and sold - our labor being most susceptible to our Owners' control.

That was MY point.

That capitalism creates inadequate doctoring is an illustration. And capitalism, seeking ownership of this feature we used to provide us all - yes, not as high-tech/skilled as today's, but ours, nevertheless - capitalism barely permits alternative health care.

Norma

----- Original Message ---- From: ahimsa sumchai asumchai@hotmail.com To: Norma J F Harrison <normaha@pacbell.net>; communityfirstcoalition@yahoogroups.com; home@prosf.org; board_of_supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us; synapse@ucsf.edu; jdiaz@sfchronicle.com; letters@sfexaminer.com; tredmond@sfbg.com; letters@sfweekly.com; letters@sfdaily.net Sent: Friday, September 19, 2008 1:08:54 PM
Subject: RE: Capitalism sucks big time .....We have a shortage in America of primary care or family type doctors
This is only part of the problem...doctors who provide expensive interventions like cardiologists, otolaryngologists and dermatologists have more marketing potential than primary care doctors who rely on

10/7

(43)

Paul Nisbett
<pnisbett@j [redacted]
09/19/2008 11:13 AM

To "board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org" <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>, "gavin.newsom@sfgov.org" <gavin.newsom@sfgov.org>
cc <cwnevius@chronicle.com>
bcc
Subject Supermarket Closing = More Do Nothing City Government

Hello City Government,

I was disapointed to learn in C.W. Nevius' column, my local grocery store CALA on Nob Hill is being closed due to developer pressure.

I'm just wondering when the do nothing government of this city is going to actually address problems of the people who live and work in the city ? For the last 16 years ,the city government has been entirely focused on what is good for the special interest political groups that create the most noise . It's great we are trying to house the homeless but god forbid local working people, or the homeless for that matter, are able to go to the grocery store and buy food.

Apparently the Board of Supervisors and the mayor think everybody makes the 140 grand a year, that they do -courtesy of our taxes, and can afford to eat out in restaurants three meals a day. Well that's very good for the Golden Gate Restaurant Association ,isn't it?

The problem with supermarkets disappearing is very simple to solve. Say 'No' to developers and create special zoning for existing supermarket sites . That way if CALA wants to sell they can sell but only to another supermarket or grocery outlet. This is a profitable business that you are allowing to cave in to greed. Teh amyors spokesman on the mattter : "You should be grateful that we still have stores like Whole Foods - known locally as 'Whole Paycheck' -that are only a little more expensive than suburban grocery stores."

It's pathetic when it is easier for an average person to conduct their day to day business in the suburbs than in the heart of a major city. I sold my car because of city government persecution of drivers in this city . I don't have a huge problem with that in that I actually like getting around by bike . Now, your policies are telling people if they want to buy groceries ,they have to drive to the suburbs. Yeah. Transit First. Big talk - No action.

This is the problem woith so called "progressive" politics. The people involved are completly out of touch with normal people who have normal jobs.

Newsom should be a welcome addition to the state capitol. As you are not that different , maybe you should take Chris Daley along as your running mate.

-Paul Nisbett

10/7

<pjstark@[redacted]

09/18/2008 09:17 AM

To <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>

cc

bcc

Subject Public input for Board of Supervisors

44

Submitted on: 9/18/2008 9:17:39 AM

name: Paul Stark

phone: [redacted]

comments: The recently enacted regulation regarding disposition and storage of household garbage receptacles is a reasonable, logical, and important way to prevent litter and unsanitary conditions from trashing our city. Do not allow this regulation to be diluted by a sham waiver process.

The current regulation does seem directed to appearance more than litter prevention, but it is an important step to prevent trash and garbage from filling our streets and public areas.

I would be very disappointed to see it's positive effects diluted in any way by any lenient waiver process.

I have lived in the Sunset for 56 years and owned a home on the Great Highway for 36 years. The wind here and elsewhere on the west side, frequently lifts the lids of garbage and trashcans that are stored outside. This often topples them and the contents spill out onto the street. The trash ends up on the streets, in the Golden Gate Recreational Area, and the Zoo.

Poor container design is also a factor. A more secure lid could prevent this. Also, if householders were instructed to position the can with the lid hinge facing into the prevailing wind, this would help mitigate the litter. Particularly on collection day, when the can really needs be outside. The open lid acts like a sail that almost insures the can will topple.

Even if they don't fall over, much of the contents blow out and DPW street cleaning gets to clean it up, when they can afford to. This is most serious in the San Francisco's west side, and at higher elevations.

Sincerely,
Paul Stark
San Francisco

<tankzgma@ ———
09/18/2008 10:16 AM

To <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
bcc
Subject Public input for Board of Supervisors

Submitted on: 9/18/2008 10:16:36 AM

name: judy peterson

phone:

comments: On the problem of trash cans needing to be put away,why can't there be a heavy vinyl cover to put over the cans for people who don't have a shed or garage to put cans in. it seems like a better idea than citing people or spending money to find out who should get an exemption. I'm sure there are companys out there that could make these covers for a reasonable cost, and they could be made in a neutral color that would acceptable to all.

User Data

Client IP (REMOTE_ADDR) : 68.118.54.26
Client IP via Proxy (HTTP_X_FORWARDED_FOR) :

10/7

45



<montana1616@[redacted]m>
09/16/2008 02:22 PM

To <boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
bcc
Subject re: re: re:

YOUR LATEST DICTATORIAL RULING CALLING FOR THE WALGREEN CHAIN
TO STOP SELLING CIGARETTES IS THE LATEST FIASCO, I DO NOT LIKE SMOKING,
CIGARETTES AND THE LIKE ANYMORE THAN YOU DO, BUT YOU ARE TAKING A MAJOR
SOURCE OF INCOME FROM THE STORE. BESIDES, THIS COUNTRY IS STILL ABOUT
CHOICE, THE PEOPLE DO NOT HAVE TO BUY FROM WALGREENS, THEY CAN BUY
FROM SAFEWAY OR COSTCO.

ANOTHER GRIPE IS THE COST OF PARKING IN THE CITY, YOU ARE MAKING
IT AWFULLY HARD FOR THE CITIZENS OF S.F. TO LIVE IN THE CITY, ESPECIALLY
WHEN EVERY YEAR YOU RAISE THE FEES FOR EVERYTHING, LIKE THE ZOO,
MUSEUMS, ETC. ITS NO WONDER THE MIDDLE CLASS IS MOVING OUT.

<montana1616@ [redacted]
m>

09/17/2008 03:08 PM

To <boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
bcc
Subject unenforceable laws

STOP MAKING UNENFORCEABLE LAWS, FOR INSTANCE:
1-POOP LAW (DOG POOP)
2-BOOM BOX NOISE
3-NO SMOKING AT BUS STOPS
4-YOU'VE ELIMINATED THE PLASTIC BAG, BUT NOW THE STORES HAVE
TO USE PAPER, THEREBY CUTTING UP TREES TO GET THEM, THAT DOES
NOT MAKE SENSE.
5-THE POLICE HAVE MORE IMPORTANT THINGS TO DO LIKE SOLVING THE MURDERS THAT ARE OCCURING ON A DAILY BASIS.

<montana1616@[redacted]m>

09/17/2008 03:01 PM

To <boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org>

cc

bcc

Subject GENERAL SUBJECTS

I AM TOTALLY DISGUSTED WITH THE BUNCH OF YOU, AS A NATIVE SAN FRANCISCAN, YOU HAVE DISGRACED THIS ONCE PROUD CITY INTO A TOTALLY WACKED OUT LEFTIST ORGANIZATION. THE ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION SITUATION IS THE WORSE, BECAUSE OF YOUR
STANCE, 3 OF OUR CITIZENS WERE MURDERED AND NOW A WIFE AND MOTHER LEFT WITH NO ONE. I HOPE SHE SUES THE CITY AND BIG.

Janette Barroca
<jbb3252@[redacted]
09/21/2008 12:52 PM
Please respond to
jbb3252@[redacted]

To Alter Nathan Bader <alternathanbader@[redacted]
cc Charlie Rose <charlierose@pbs.org>, Ken Garcia Examiner <kgarcia@examiner.com>, Board of Supervisors <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
bcc
Subject Who Am I ????

--- On **Tue, 9/16/08, Manuel Barroca** <***manuelbarroca@***[redacted]

SUBJECT: WHO AM I ??

Who Am I?
I am under 45 years old,
I love the outdoors,
I hunt,
I am a Republican reformer,
I have taken on the Republican Party establishment,
I have many children,
I have a spot on the national ticket as
vice president with less than two years
in the governor's office.

Did you guess?

I am Teddy Roosevelt in 1900.

<comeyeshua2@[redacted]>

09/18/2008 09:49 PM

To <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>

cc

bcc

Subject Public input for Board of Supervisors

Submitted on: 9/18/2008 9:49:21 PM

name: Sue Bee

phone:

comments: NO, NO,homosexuality is wrong and immoral.....
I vote NOCALL GOVERNOR SCHWARZENEGGER'S OFFICE POLL AND MAKE YOUR VOICE HEARD.
The Number to call is : 1-916-445-2841Takes less than 30 seconds. It is just a recording: Press 1 for English. Press 2 to voice an opinion Press 1 for AB 25 67 - Harvey Milk Day Press 2 is a NO vote. Please vote now!Please pass this on to as many people as possible!Harvey Milk was a homosexual activist and San Francisco Board

---

User Data

Client IP (REMOTE_ADDR) : 66.173.148.121
Client IP via Proxy (HTTP_X_FORWARDED_FOR) :

10/7

46

Michealle_King@fws.gov
09/17/2008 07:36 AM

To Al_Donner@fws.gov, Arnold_Roessler@fws.gov
cc
bcc Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
Subject Critical Habitat Proposed for California Red-Legged Frog, Comment Period Open Through Nov. 17, 2008

On Sept. 16, 2008 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service published in the *Federal Register* a proposed rule to designate 1.8 million acres of critical habitat for the federally protected California red-legged frog. A 60-day public comment period is now open, and the public is encouraged to comment on the proposal during the comment period, which ends Nov. 17, 2008. Also, note that requests for public hearings on the proposal must be submitted by Oct. 31, 2008.

This entirely new proposal is the result of a rigorous scientific review, using improved criteria. The proposal calls for 49 units in 28 California counties. It was developed by Service biologists at the direction of Service Director Dale Hall, after he concluded that there may have been inappropriate influence by former personnel on a 2006 critical habitat rule for the frog.

For the full proposal, go either to **http://edocket.access.gpo.gov/2008/pdf/E8-20473.pdf** or to **http://www.fws.gov/sacramento/** to view the *Federal Register* notice, news release and maps of the proposed units. Comments must be submitted through the Federal eRulemaking Portal: **http://www.regulations.gov** or by mail or hand to the address in the *Federal Register* notice.

United States Department of the Interior -- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office – 2800 Cottage Way, W-2605 – Sacramento, CA 95825
Telephone: 916-414-6600 On the web: **http://www.fws.gov/sacramento**

10/7

47

"AlvinJohnson"
<alv.johnson@ [redacted]
09/18/2008 02:10 PM

To info@barackobama.com
cc "David Plouffe, BarackObama.com" <info@barackobama.com>, BOS <BOS@sfgov.org>, "Gavin.Newsom" <Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org>
bcc
Subject Lies to Nowhere - Debate

Dear David,

Its good to hear and to know that Obama is fighting back and is ready and willing to engage McCain in a debate to set the record straight. I too, am trying to set the record straight against "lies to nowhere" being issued by the Gavin Newsom administration, of the City and County of San Francisco. I have suffered race, gender and ADA discrimination at the hands of the Newsom administration on the same level as the disastrous Bush administration. This administration (Newsom) continues to obstruct justice and due process. They attack their employees, and lately has sought to imprison them if they speak out about the corruption going on in SF city government. I have sought whistle blower protection to no avail, as it has only made me a clearer target for retaliation by the San Francisco City Attorney's Office. I have had my health benefits totally cut-off despite the mayor (Gavin Newsom) touting a Universal Health plan for all citizens of the city of San Francisco, and have been forced into an early (50 years old) retirement by the City of San Francisco, despite following procedures for appealing this retaliatory cut-off of health benefits. The city of San Francisco, to this day refuses to hear complaints against their systemic racial discrimination in civil service. They will not honor subpoenas for their staff to appear, instead they resign the staff, making them of limits to superior court. They (City & County of SF) refuse to provide access to or to make available public records that will demonstrate a pattern of abuse within their civil service system.

My career as a communications network professional has been derailed by a malicious administration under the control of a vindictive city attorney's office. What Obama is taking on in McCain, I have to deal with on a daily basis with a corrupt city government that refuses to hear complaints against city government practices that are professionally detrimental and unethical. Fake commissions and hearings are conducted to silence the brave who speak up against wrong doing by city administrators. Real life imitating real life.



I have requested to debate the Mayor (Gavin Newsom) and/or his staff, to set the record straight on technology and employment compensation abuses, as well as misuse of public safety funds (Emergency Response Fee/9-1-1) and the "lies to nowhere" being announced by his administration (DHR Director), utilizing as a forum for this debate, the Willie Brown Jr. (former SF mayor when I was hired w/SF) Institute on Policy and Public Service.

If you have any clout with Mayor Gavin Newsom or his San Francisco administration of attorney's, could you please encourage them to consider the request to set the record straight on the racial and employment compensation abuses of his administration in a debate. The issues involve retirement abuses, health benefits abuses, worker's compensation abuses, employment (equal pay) compensation abuses, public safety funding abuses, technology professional career abuses.

Sincerely,
Alvin Johnson

---------- Original message from "David Plouffe, BarackObama.com" <info@barackobama.com>: ----------

alvin --

The McCain campaign has finally admitted that this election is about change.

Their new ad uses what news organizations are calling "naked lies" to reinvent two politicians whose records embody the same culture of corruption and far-right policies we've seen from the Bush administration.

The biggest whopper in the ad (that's still being repeated day after day by McCain and Palin on the campaign trail) is that Governor Palin stopped the infamous "Bridge to Nowhere" -- in fact, she supported it, and even hired a lobbyist in Washington to get more pork-barrel projects like it.

If the McCain-Palin campaign wants to have a debate about who is prepared to bring the change we need, we're more than ready.

So we just launched a new ad to set the record straight on McCain and Palin. **Watch our response ad and make a donation of $5 or more to help us keep it on the air.**