

Petitions and Communications received from December 9, 2008 through December 29, 2008 for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on January 6, 2009. File 090003, Part 2.

From Richard Skaff, urging removal of the SF Department of Building Inspection policy titled "Dimensional Tolerances for New and Existing Construction". (63)

From Jim Meko, thanking Supervisor Duffy for introducing the Youth and Family Zone legislation, which asked that the Board amend the boundaries of the Youth and Family Zone to confine it to the Eastern Neighborhoods and allow the Western SoMa process a chance to complete its work. (64)

From Office of the Controller, submitting report from the Office of Economic Analysis regarding resolution to establish the "Tourism Improvement District" in San Francisco. File 081517 (65)

From Communities in Harmony Advocating for Learning and Kids, submitting newsletter concerning funding for the youth ideas program. (66)

From Department of Public Works, regarding removing graffiti from various locations in District 5. (Reference No. 20081021-001) (67)

From Department of Public Works, regarding removing graffiti from various locations in District 5. (Reference No. 20081209-001) (68)

From Department of Public Works, regarding removing graffiti from various locations in District 5. (Reference No. 20081209-003) (69)

From Department of Public Works, regarding removing graffiti from various locations in District 5. (Reference No. 20081216-001) (70)

From Department of Public Works, regarding removing graffiti from various locations in District 5. (Reference No. 20081209-02) (71)

From Department of Public Works, regarding removing graffiti from various locations in District 5. (Reference No. 20081216-003) (72)

From Law Offices of Stephen Williams, requesting the appeal of proposed project at 1864-1868 Green Street is withdrawn. File 081486, Copy: Each Supervisor, Clerk (73)

From Francisco Da Costa, regarding the \$1.9 billion to revamp the Hetch Hetchy Water System. (74)

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to various budget cuts in city funded programs. 13 letters (75)

From Francisco Da Costa, regarding the agreement between the Lennar Corporation and the City and County of San Francisco. 2 letters (76)

From concerned citizens, urging a no vote on any combustion turbine peaker projects, and call for a 2009 Energy Action Plan to close the existing Mirant power plant by 2010. 3 letters (77)

From Joan Wood, commenting on the North Beach Community Court. (78)

From Romano Gatto, regarding the December 8, 2008 NAACP & Team Gatto Boxing club press conference. (79)

From Pam & Terry Elliott, submitting opposition to the proposed project at 2655 Scott Street. File 081432, Copy: Supervisors Peskin, Maxwell, Campos (80)

From Office of the Treasurer, submitting investment activity (for fiscal year to date) of the portfolios under the Treasurer's management. Copy: Each Supervisor, Clerk of the Board (81)

From Andrea O'Leary, urging all public parks and businesses to comply with the law by removing their garbage bins out of public sight. (82)

From Bill Sargeant, requesting something be done to suppress all the pilfering and rummaging through the blue recycling cans. (83)

From Monty Morris, regarding the dumping of phone books in front of apartment buildings. (84)

From State of California Fish and Game Commission, submitting notice of proposed changes in regulations. Copy: Each Supervisor (85)

From Timothy Harding, commenting that he will not visit San Francisco anymore due to its' status as a "Sanctuary City." (86)

From the Pugliese Family, thanking the Board for the tribute in memory of Susan Pugliese. (87)

From Mike McKinley, commenting on the disorganization on the opening day of the new Academy of Sciences. (88)

From Elise Pundt, commenting on the passage of Proposition 8. (89)

From SF Public Utilities Commission, submitting list and maps of all developed and underdeveloped land under the SF Public Utilities Commission's jurisdiction within the City and County of San Francisco. (Reference No. 20081125-001) (90)

From SF Public Utilities Commission, submitting request for release of reserved funds (\$136,622,239) for the Water System Improvement Program. (91)

From Tina Seastrom, regarding evaluating the purpose and practices at the San Francisco Zoo. (92)

From Ahimsa Sumchai, submitting correspondence regarding "demand for materials and communications: SOFT representative and BOS Peskin and Maxwell 10/9/07." (93)

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV

12/19/2008 10:05 AM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: Department of Building Inspection Dimensional
Tolerance Policy

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 Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 12/19/2008 10:10 AM -----



"Richard"

12/18/2008 05:25 PM

To "????????????P?????????"

cc "Gavin Newsom" <Gavin.Newsom@sfgov.org>, <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>, <susan.mizner@sfgov.org>, <louis.verdugo@doj.ca.gov>, "Thorman, David" <David.Thorman@dgs.ca.gov>, "Conrad, Richard" <Richard.Conrad@dgs.ca.gov>, <janet.l.blizard@usdoj.gov>

Subject Department of Building Inspection Dimensional Tolerance
Policy

12/18/08

Vivian L. Day, Acting Director
Department of Building Inspection
City and County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, 6th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

Ms. Day,

I am writing to ask that you take the action to immediately remove the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection policy titled "***Dimensional Tolerances for New and Existing Construction***".

Although the Department's policy may not be as extreme in its interpretations as the "**Reasonable Construction Tolerances for Disable Access Construction**" policy created by the Orange Empire Chapter of ICC policy (see attached), it is my opinion that many of the assumptions within your Department's policy are similarly problematic in that I believe they directly conflict with California Building Code, Title 24 and its intent, to

63

assure accessibility within the built environment. In 2002, the Attorney General informed the Orange Empire Chapter that their policy was in conflict with California Building Code and regulations(see attached letter). In your Department's tolerance policy, the items listed as "t" through "bb" clearly state that there are no "reference" available to support such tolerances yet the policy supports their use.

During my tenure with the City of San Francisco, when this policy was being discussed at a number of public meetings held by Building Department staff, I clearly stated my opinion, the same opinion that I have today. It is my opinion that the Department of Building Inspection's Construction Tolerance policy is an "underground regulation" and illegal. I felt then as now, that this policy is in violation of state building code and state regulations protecting the rights of persons with disabilities.

Additionally, I am very concerned that the policy was updated by your staff in January, 2008. Was the process used to update the policy carried out in a public forum with input sought from the disability community including the Mayor's Office on Disability and the Mayor's Disability Council? Was the policy and its most recent update reviewed and agreed to by the California Department of Justice, the State Architect's Office and/or the California Building Standards Commission?

I look forward to your timely response.

Richard Skaff



San Francisco Construction Tolerance Policy-September 16-1998-Updated-01-01-08.pdf



California Attorney General Letters re Orange Empire ICC Construction Tolerance Policy.pdf



Construction Tolerances - Orange Empire Chapter of ICBO-Ron Mincer.pdf



Jim Meko

12/15/2008 07:16 AM

To Aaron Peskin <Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org>, Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org, David.Campos@sfgov.org, Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org, Chris Daly
cc Board of Supervisors <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, Jon Lau <jon.lau@sfgov.org>

bcc

Subject: Western SoMa explains itself

Dear Supervisors,

I want to thank Supervisor Dufty for introducing the amendment to the Youth and Family Zone legislation that I requested and apologize for any confusion caused by assertions that the timing was wrong. Supervisor Dufty was only responding to an email I sent to all of you last month (reprinted below) which asked that you "kindly amend the boundaries of the Youth and Family Zone to confine it to the Eastern Neighborhoods and allow the Western SoMa process a chance to complete its work." Because Supervisor Dufty withdrew the amendment, we'll have to work with the next Board to clean up any inconsistencies you've created in these overlapping Special Use Districts.

Please don't forget that literally hundreds of SoMa residents have been participating in our process. They've rolled up their sleeves, learned the intricacies of the planning process, devoted countless hours to meetings and actually helped to write our own Community Plan. A great deal of time was devoted to ensuring that family-friendly policies were included.

~~While the Plan undergoes environmental review, we're in the midst of a discussion of what we~~ call "boom-proof zoning." The idea is to avoid the negative consequences that result when development patterns overwhelm neighborhood character and to ensure that the kind of development allowed mitigates those consequences. I can't imagine a subject of greater importance to SoMa's youth and families. John Elberling and Marc Salomon are leading the discussion. Skot Kuiper has brought the SoMa arts community into the discussion. Henry Karnilowitz represents small businesses, Sue Hagen Contreras advocates for parks and open space, Anthony Faber is there for preservation interests and Tom Radulovich brings a transportation perspective to the conversation. SPUR, HAC and the RBA are at the table with us too. SOMCAN and ENACT are nowhere to be found.

There is nothing else like the Western SoMa process. It is a true community-based process and has generated an unbelievable amount of buy-in. After sitting through Eastern Neighborhoods, I'm sure you can see the merit in such an approach. Please show some consideration for the countless hours of volunteer time and initiative that have gone into our efforts.

Jim Meko, chair

Western SoMa Citizens Planning Task Force

64

From: Jim Meko <jim.meko@comcast.net>

Date: November 24, 2008 8:02:52 AM PST

To: Aaron Peskin <Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org>, Michela Alioto-Pier <Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org>, Tom Ammiano <Tom.Ammiano@sfgov.org>, Carmen Chu <Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org>, Chris Daly <Chris.Daly@sfgov.org>, Bevan Dufty <Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org>, Sean Elsbernd <Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org>, Sophie Maxwell <Sophie.Maxwell@sfgov.org>, Jake McGoldrick <Jake.McGoldrick@sfgov.org>, Ross Mirkarimi <Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org>, Gerardo Sandoval <Gerardo.Sandoval@sfgov.org>

Subject: Y&FZ: we have a problem

Supervisors,

In the rush to enact a meaningful response to the request for a Youth and Family Zone in the 6th Street area, someone got a little sloppy ... geographically. The boundaries of the Y&FZ spill over into the Western SoMa Special Use District in two areas. The eastern incursion, along Folsom and Clementina between 4th and 5th Streets, doesn't significantly affect our Plan but the annexation of the western side of Seventh Street, which includes portions of the Folsom Street Neighborhood Commercial District and the Langton Residential Enclave District, creates serious consequences.

There has been no community process to justify reclassifying these Western SoMa blocks. Hundreds of neighbors have been faithfully participating in the Western SoMa process and are totally unaware of what this Youth and Family Zone is all about. 7th and Folsom Streets includes some of the most significant height and density bonuses built into our Plan and will be the source for a critical portion of our public benefits package. Along Langton Street, "youth and family" is not necessarily the most appropriate focus for two of the gayest blocks in San Francisco.

You are engaged in approving the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan. Western SoMa is not part of the Eastern Neighborhoods process. It is an independent, thriving, community-driven process that has another year and a half to go before our proposal comes before the Board of Supervisors. Would you kindly amend the boundaries of the Youth and Family Zone to confine it to the Eastern Neighborhoods and allow the Western SoMa process a chance to complete its work.

Jim Meko, chair

Western SoMa Citizens Planning Task Force

etc.



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

*File 081517
C:page, Annette*

**Ben Rosenfield
Controller
Monique Zmuda
Deputy Controller**

December 16, 2008

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
Room 244, City Hall

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2008 DEC 16 PM 12:27
PR

Re: Office of Economic Analysis Impact Report for File Number 081517

Dear Madam Clerk and Members of the Board:

The Office of Economic Analysis is pleased to present you with its economic impact report on file number 081517, "Resolution to Establish the San Francisco Tourism Improvement District: Economic Impact Report." If you have any questions about this report, please contact me at (415) 554-5369.

Best Regards,

Kurt Fuchs
Senior Economist

65

City and County of San Francisco

Office of the Controller - Office of Economic Analysis

Resolution to Establish Tourism Improvement District in San Francisco: Economic Impact Report

File No. 081517



December 15, 2008



City and County of San Francisco

Office of the Controller - Office of Economic Analysis

Resolution to Establish a Tourism Improvement District in San Francisco:
Economic Impact Report

December 15, 2008

Main Conclusions

The proposed resolution would establish the San Francisco Tourism Improvement District (TID), whose purpose would be twofold:

1. To fund San Francisco Convention and Visitor's Bureau (SFCVB) marketing budget, providing the SFCVB a stable funding source, while increasing the marketing budget above recent year's budget allocations; and
2. Fund needed Moscone Convention Center capital improvement projects which have been deferred, as well as to fund predevelopment activities for a planned expansion of the Convention Center.

The TID proposes to assess each tourist hotel in San Francisco a percentage of gross revenue from tourist rooms, similar to how the City's hotel tax is assessed. The assessment will initially range from 1.0% to 1.5% of the hotel room rate, depending on the hotel's location and benefits received through the TID.

The proposed TID assessment revenues will substantially increase SFCVB funding above current levels - funding for SFCVB marketing and sales programs will double to about \$18 million per year, while funding for the Moscone Convention Center capital improvement plan will nearly triple to about \$9 million per year. The TID revenues will replace the City General Fund contributions to the SFCVB (currently a portion of hotel tax collections), freeing up the SFCVB allocation for other City services.

The increased marketing and Moscone capital improvement budget of \$27 million per year with the TID is anticipated to increase the number of hotel rooms booked through the SFCVB for both convention/business and leisure travel, resulting in increased economic activity and hotel tax collections. The TID revenues will provide a stable funding source for a long-term marketing plan and upgraded facilities that will help San Francisco maintain and grow its market position as a top tourist and convention destination.

However, the TID assessment will increase the effective hotel room rate for all hotels citywide by 1% to 1.5% initially (the TID assessment rate). As effective room rates increase, a decline in demand (hotel occupancy) could be expected.

Therefore the economic impact factors are:

1. Increased demand for hotel rooms due to increased marketing budget and Moscone upgrades, weighed against
2. Potential loss in hotel bookings due to higher hotel room costs.

With the increased marketing budget and capital program, SFCVB projects a 16% rise in hotel room spending, or an additional \$49 million annually as a result of its efforts to attract additional convention, self-contained, and leisure travelers, generating an additional \$6.9 million in hotel taxes.

Depending on market conditions, the TID assessment could be absorbed by the hotel guest (in a strong market), the hotel owner (in a weaker market), or some combination of the two. If the market weakened such that hotels had to lower room rates to make up for the increased TID assessment, the hoteliers would essentially be paying the fee by lowering the base daily rate to a cost-neutral level.

Although the City's hotel market has been strong, the OEA estimated the impact of the TID assessment assuming it resulted in a decline in hotel spending, taking into account an estimate of the elasticity of demand. Based on a published study which concluded that for each 1% increase in room assessments or taxes, a 0.44 percent decline in occupancy could be expected. The OEA estimated that a decline in hotel occupancy due to the average TID assessment would result in about \$9.7 million less hotel spending per year, and would lower TOT collections by \$1.4 million.





The incremental increase in SFCVB-attributed hotel spending is estimated at about \$49 million per year, or about 5 times the potential loss of \$9.7 million, for a net increase of about \$39.5 million in annual hotel spending. The net increase in spending is projected to generate about \$5.5 million annually in net additional TOT collections.

The OEA concludes that investing in marketing and short-and long-term improvements to the Moscone Convention Center will outweigh any potential loss.

Highlights

- Travel and tourism are major components of San Francisco's economy, generating \$8 billion in annual economic activity. Convention-related expenditures account for more than \$2 billion, per SFCVB figures.
- The proposed TID assessment revenues will replace the City General Fund contributions to the SFCVB, nearly doubling funding currently available to the SFCVB for marketing and sales programs geared to tourist hotels. In addition the TID funds will nearly triple the current funding for the Moscone Convention Center 5-year capital improvement plan.
- The TID proposes to assess each tourist hotel in San Francisco a percentage of gross revenue from tourist rooms, similar to how the TOT is assessed. The assessment will initially range from 1.0% to 1.5% of the hotel room rate, depending on the hotel's location. For purposes of the assessment district, two zones were established with different assessment rates depending on the hotel location and benefits received.
- The increased marketing and capital improvement budget is anticipated to increase the number of hotel rooms booked through the SFCVB, resulting in increased economic activity and hotel tax collections.
- With the increased marketing budget and capital program, SFCVB projects a 16% increase in hotel room spending (\$49 million annually) as a result of its efforts to attract additional convention, self-contained, and leisure travelers. Total SFCVB-related hotel spending is estimated to increase to \$351 million per year, with an increased \$27 million SFCVB budget.
- Taking into account the sensitivity of hotel demand to increases in hotel taxes and assessments, the OEA estimated a 0.5% decline in the hotel occupancy rate due to the TID assessment, resulting in about \$9.7 million less hotel spending per year, and would lower TOT collections by \$1.4 million.
- The incremental increase in SFCVB-attributed hotel spending is estimated at about \$49 million per year, or about 5 times the potential loss (\$9.7 million) from increased assessments, for a net increase of about \$39.5 million in hotel spending per year.
- The net increase in spending is projected to generate about \$5.5 million annually in net additional TOT collections.
- Investing in marketing and short-and long-term improvements to the Moscone Convention Center will outweigh any potential loss.

ECONOMIC SCORECARD

	Highly Negative Impact	Moderately Negative Impact	Neutral Impact	Moderately Positive Impact	Highly Positive Impact
City Economy					
Employment					
Hotel Guests					
Hotel Owners					

INTRODUCTION

Summary of Proposed Tourism Improvement District (TID)

The proposed resolution would establish the San Francisco Tourism Improvement District (TID), whose purpose would be twofold:

1. To fund San Francisco Convention and Visitor's Bureau (SFCVB) marketing budget, providing the SFCVB a stable funding source (removed from the uncertainties and fluctuations of the City's budget process), while increasing the marketing budget above recent year's budget allocations; and
2. Fund needed Moscone Convention Center capital improvement projects which have been deferred, as well as to fund predevelopment activities for a planned expansion of the Moscone Convention Center.

Currently, the SFCVB is funded through a portion of the City's transient occupancy tax (TOT), as well as private contributions.¹ Annually during the City's budget process, the allocation of TOT revenue to the SFCVB is set, with the resulting amount appropriated to the SFCVB. In the past, this allocation has fluctuated, depending on other City budget priorities. One of the purposes of the TID, in addition to increasing funding, is to provide a reliable funding source to enable long-term planning and program implementation. The proposed TID assessment would replace City funding of the SFCVB, freeing up the SFCVB's TOT allocation for other purposes.

The TID proposes to assess each tourist hotel in San Francisco a percentage of gross revenue from tourist rooms, similar to how the TOT is assessed. The assessment will initially range from 1.0% to 1.5% of the hotel room rate, depending on the hotel's location, and will be paid by the hotel guest. For purposes of the assessment district, two zones were established with different assessment rates depending on the benefits received:

¹ In fiscal year 2007-08, the SFCVB was allocated about 3.8% of the TOT collections, or about \$8.7 million. This is 10% higher than the previous fiscal allocation of 3.9% of the TOT which yielded about \$7.7 million to the SFCVB. In the 2008-09 budget, the SFCVB was allocated about 3.2% of the TOT collections, or a projected \$7.8 million, about 10% lower than the 2007-08 allocation. In addition to TOT funds, SFVCB also is supported by member contributions and donations, totaling about \$6.5 million per year.

1. Zone 1 includes tourist hotels located in the vicinity of the convention facilities and downtown tourist attractions. Due to their proximity to these facilities and attractions, the Zone 1 properties are projected to benefit more directly from increased SFCVB marketing efforts and Moscone upgrades. Accordingly, the Zone 1 hotels would be assessed at the higher 1.5% rate.²
2. Zone 2 includes tourist hotels located further away from convention facilities and core tourist attractions, resulting in less direct benefits than those properties in Zone 1, and are therefore assessed the lower 1.0% rate.

Figure 1 shows the boundaries of the two zones. As indicated, Zone 2 includes all tourist hotels located west of Van Ness and South Van Ness Avenues, and south of 16th Street. Zone 1 includes the remainder of the City, primarily in the Union Square, Yerba Buena, and downtown submarkets.


In total, approximately 91% of the City's tourist hotel rooms are located in Zone 1, while the remaining 9% are located within Zone 2, according to TID implementation documents.³

² See <http://www.sfcvb.org/media/downloads/members/tid.pdf?button=Full+TID+Management+Plan> for the TID Management Plan which provides a detailed description of the TID.

³ The number of hotels in Zone 1 comprise about 68% of the total tourist hotel properties in San Francisco, while the remaining 32% of hotels are located in Zone 2.

FIGURE 1

Map of TID Hotel Benefit Zones: Dots Indicate Individual Hotels



Source: San Francisco Convention and Visitor's Bureau

Summary of TID Management Plan

The TID assessment will be allocated to fund both SFCVB marketing efforts and Moscone capital improvements. The proposed TID assessment revenues will substantially increase funding for SFCVB marketing and sales programs focused on tourist hotels, and will replace the City General Fund contributions to the SFCVB. In addition, the TID funds will nearly triple the current funding for the Moscone Convention Center 5-year capital improvement plan.⁴

The TID revenues will fund hotel-specific marketing and promotions programs by the SFCVB for the benefit of tourist hotels. TID revenues will also fund Moscone Convention center improvements, including capital improvements to existing facilities and predevelopment planning for a possible expansion of the convention center.

The table below summarizes the TID assessment allocation, by zone, and the estimated annual budget, by component.

TABLE 1		SFCVB Tourism Improvement District (TID) Assessment Allocation and Estimated Budget		
SFCVB Budget Component	Assessment Allocation (3)		Estimated Budget	
	Zone 1	Zone 2		
Marketing, Promotions, Operations (1)	1.00%	0.75%	\$ 18,000,000	
Moscone Capital Improvements (2)	0.50%	0.25%	\$ 9,000,000	
Total	1.50%	1.00%	\$ 27,000,000	
Notes:				
1. Includes CVB marketing and promotions activities for the benefit of tourist hotels. This assessment will be in place for 15 years. Currently the City provides approximately \$9.0 million to the CVB for its marketing efforts, with another \$6.5 million coming from member partners. The CVB anticipates reduced revenue from its member partners once the TID is operational, resulting in a net increase of about \$7.5 million from current funding. Source: SFCVB.				
2. Moscone capital improvements includes renovations and upgrades, deferred maintenance, and design and planning efforts for a planned expansion. This assessment will be in place for 5 years. The City currently funds approximately \$2.4 million for Moscone improvements, resulting in a funding increase of about \$6.6 million per year with the TID.				
3. The total allocation for years 1-5 of the TID is 1.5% for Zone 1 and 1.0% for Zone 2. In years 6-15, this amount will be decreased by the Moscone component, or an assessment of 1.0% in Zone 1 and 0.75% in Zone 2.				

The TID assessment funding Moscone capital improvements will be in place 5 years, while the SFCVB

⁴ In addition to the TID funds dedicated to Moscone capital improvements, the City will issue certificates of participation (COPs) to raise an additional \$45 million for Moscone capital improvements.

marketing and promotions component will be in place for 15 years, resulting in a reduced assessment starting in year 6.

As indicated in the above table, the TID is anticipated to generate \$27 million in funding in the first year, with \$18 million per year for SFCVB marketing activities, and \$9 million per year for convention facility upgrades and expansion planning. This represents an increase over existing funding of about \$7.5 million for SFCVB marketing and \$6.6 million for Moscone improvements.

The total dollar amount of the assessment is expected to fluctuate annually based on the total annual gross revenue from tourist hotel rooms, which will depend on market conditions.

The increased marketing and capital improvement budget is anticipated to increase the number of hotel rooms booked through the SFCVB for both convention and business travel and leisure travel, resulting in increased economic activity and hotel tax collections. The TID funding will provide a stable source of funds for a long-term marketing plan and upgraded facilities that will help San Francisco maintain and grow its market position as a top tourist and convention destination.

However, the TID assessment will increase the effective hotel room rate for all hotels citywide by 1% to 1.5% initially (the TID assessment rate). As effective room rates increase, a decline in demand (hotel occupancy) could be expected. The next section assesses these economic impact factors and estimates the net economic impact of the proposed TID.

ECONOMIC IMPACT FACTORS

Introduction

Travel and tourism are major components of San Francisco's economy, generating \$8 billion in annual economic activity. Convention-related expenditures account for more than \$2 billion, per SFCVB figures.⁵

The proposed TID assessment revenues will replace the City General Fund contributions to the SFCVB, nearly doubling funding currently available to the SFCVB for marketing and sales programs geared to tourist hotels. In addition the TID funds will nearly triple the current funding for the Moscone Convention Center 5-year capital improvement plan.

The TID revenues will provide a stable funding source for a long-term marketing plan and upgraded facilities that will help San Francisco maintain and grow its market position as a top tourist and convention destination, resulting in increased economic activity and hotel tax collections.

However, because the TID assessment is tied to hotel room rates, the effective hotel room rate for all hotels citywide will increase by the TID assessment rate, or 1% to 1.5%. As effective room rates increase, a decline in occupancy could be expected.

Therefore the economic impact factors are:

1. Increased demand for hotel rooms due to increased marketing budget and Moscone upgrades, weighed against
2. Potential loss in hotel bookings due to higher hotel room costs.

⁵ Source: San Francisco Convention and Visitor Bureau, "Visitor Industry Economic Impact Estimates, 2007."

ECONOMIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Estimated Impact of TID Expenditures on Hotel Revenues

The TID Management Plan includes estimates of both the existing and projected hotel expenditures directly attributed to SFCVB marketing efforts and utilization of the City's convention facilities.

The SFCVB estimates that in 2006, hotel room spending attributed to SFCVB efforts totaled about \$300 million, or about 22% of the \$1.4 billion in total citywide taxable hotel spending that year. About 66% of this hotel spending is attributed to events booked at Moscone Center, 30% is attributed to self-contained meetings, and 4% was derived from leisure traveler hotel spending.

TABLE 2 Estimated CVB-Attributed Accommodation Spending – Existing and Projected

SFCVB Sector	Estimated Current Hotel Spending (1)	Estimated Increase in Hotel Spending (2)	Percent Increase
Moscone Convention Center (3)	\$ 199,272,000	\$ 28,467,000	14.3%
Self Contained Meetings (4)	\$ 91,356,000	\$ 9,136,000	10.0%
Leisure Travel (5)	\$ 11,628,000	\$ 11,628,000	100.0%
Total SFCVB-Attributed Hotel Spending	\$ 302,256,000	\$ 49,231,000	16.3%

Total Citywide Hotel Spending (6)	\$ 1,363,234,232
% of Hotel Spending Attributed to SFCVB	22%

Notes:

1. Based on 2006 estimates of hotel spending attributed to SFCVB efforts. These projections and estimates were developed by SFCVB and are based on several studies conducted on behalf of the SFCVB, including Dean Runyan Associates, Destination Analysts, and PriceWaterhouseCoopers.
2. Estimated marginal increase in hotel spending directly attributed to increased SFCVB marketing efforts and Moscone upgrades funded through the TID. Source: SFCVB.
3. Existing spending based on 70% Moscone occupancy level, equating to approximately 825,000 hotel room nights (the 5-year average annual number of room-nights booked through the SFCVB by conventioners attending Moscone conventions and events.) Projected increase in hotel spending is based on an increase in Moscone occupancy to 80%, equating to a total of about 940,000 room-nights, or an increase of 120,000 room-nights per year. As a point of reference, this figure is lower than the 990,000 room-nights occupied in 2008 by conventioners.
4. Self contained meetings refers to groups that do not meet in Moscone Center. Existing spending based on 600,000 hotel room nights occupied by these groups. Projected spending is based on a 10% increase booked room-nights by these groups, or an increase of 60,000 room-nights above current levels.
5. Existing spending based on SFCVB estimates per review of web traffic to SFCVB site. SFCVB estimates that leisure travel spending will double as a result of its TID-funded marketing efforts.
6. Based on 2006 taxable hotel spending, per actual transient occupancy tax collections.

With the increased marketing budget and capital program, SFCVB projects a 16% increase in hotel room spending (\$49 million annually) as a result of its efforts to attract additional convention, self-contained, and leisure travelers, as indicated in Table 2 above. Total SFCVB-related hotel spending is estimated to increase to \$351 million per year, with an increased \$27 million SFCVB budget.

Impact of Increased Effective Hotel Room Rate on Hotel Demand

Because the TID assessment will be added to the guest's room charge, the effective room rate for all hotels citywide will increase by the TID assessment rate, or 1% to 1.5%⁶. As effective room rates increase, a decline in hotel room demand (as expressed by occupancy rates) could be expected.

To estimate the impact of a price increase on demand (occupancy), the OEA analyzed historic hotel room rates and occupancy levels. This information provides insight into the price-sensitivity of the City's hotel market and gives an indication of the elasticity of demand for hotel rooms in San Francisco.⁷

As indicated in Table 3 below, Average Daily Rates (ADR) increased a total of 23% during the past 9 years, while the occupancy rate declined by only 0.9% during the same time period, demonstrating relatively strong market demand. The number of occupied annual room nights more accurately reflects real occupancy rate changes, as it takes into account additions to the City's hotel room inventory. As indicated, although the occupancy rate declined slightly between 1999 and 2007, the number of occupied rooms actually *increased* by 0.8%.

As demonstrated in the below table, ADR has increased by an average of 2.4% per year with no commensurate decrease in occupancy, demonstrating the market's ability to absorb higher costs, indicative of strong demand.

⁶ When factoring in the existing 14% hotel tax, the total effective room rate (including taxes, assessments and the base room rate) will increase by 0.9% to 1.3%.

⁷ Elasticity is a measure of the sensitivity of quantity demanded to changes in price. In other words, it is the percentage change in quantity demanded (in this case, occupancy rate) resulting from a percentage change in price (in this case, hotel room rate). A commodity that is elastic means demand is sensitive to pricing, while an inelastic commodity is not as sensitive to price changes.

TABLE 3

Historic San Francisco Hotel Market Performance

Year	Occupancy Rate	Occupied Roomnights (2)	Average Daily Rate
2007	78.1%	9,507,953	\$186
2006	75.7%	9,226,755	\$168
2005	75.9%	9,217,155	\$154
2004	73.3%	8,782,504	\$145
2003	67.6%	8,101,473	\$141
2002	64.8%	7,764,952	\$146
2001	67.8%	8,127,436	\$166
2000	82.3%	9,858,972	\$169
1999	78.8%	9,436,573	\$151
Total Change	-0.9%	0.8%	23.4%
Annual % Change	-0.1%	0.1%	2.4%

Notes:

1. Source: PKF Consulting and San Francisco Controller's Office.
2. Calculated based on the average annual occupancy rate multiplied by the City's hotel room inventory. The room inventory comprised about 33,000 rooms until 2005, when new construction increased the inventory to 33,300. Inventory increased again in 2006 to 33,375 rooms. In 2008, with the opening of the Intercontinental, room inventory increased to the current 33,925 rooms.

The above table suggests that demand for San Francisco hotel rooms is relatively strong, with room rate increases having a nominal effect on occupancy.

Although the market has been strong, suggesting that increases in the effective room rate with the inclusion of the TID assessment will not reduce room-night demand significantly, the hotel market is cyclical and can be expected to change.

Over time, the City's hotel market will adjust to the new TID assessment since it will be applied to all hotels in the market. Depending on market conditions, the TID assessment could be absorbed by the hotel guest (in a strong market), the hotel owner (in a weaker market), or a combination of the two. If the market weakened such that hotels had to lower room rates to make up for the increased TID assessment, the hoteliers would essentially be paying the fee by lowering the base daily rate to a cost-neutral level.

The following table provides an illustrative example of this point by calculating the total room cost (including ADR, TOT, and TID assessment) under several scenarios.

The first column calculates the total room cost per night assuming the 2007 ADR of \$186 and the current transient occupancy tax (TOT) of 14%, resulting in a total room cost of \$212 per night. This reflects the actual average effective room cost under existing conditions.

The second column shows the same calculation but adds the proposed 1.5% TID assessment, for a total room cost of about \$215 per night. This example assumes a relatively strong market, with the hotel guest paying the assessment, and the hotel owner maintaining ADR at the pre-TID assessment rate.

The third column illustrates a scenario in which hotel owners would have to lower the ADR to maintain the pre-TID total room cost of \$212. This scenario reflects weaker market conditions and assumes that the market is unwilling to adjust to the TID assessment, meaning the most it will pay for a room (including taxes and assessments) is \$212 per night. In this illustrative example, the hotel owners would lower the ADR from \$186 to \$183.50, (about 1.3%) so that total room cost is maintained at the pre-TID level.

TABLE 4	Illustrative Example of TID Assessment Impact on Total Room Cost and ADR		
	Existing Conditions (no TID)	Proposed TID	
		Stronger Market Scenario	Weaker Market Scenario
Average Daily Rate	\$ 186.00	\$ 186.00	\$ 183.59
TOT @ 14%	\$ 26.04	\$ 26.04	\$ 25.70
TID @ 1.5%	\$ -	\$ 2.79	\$ 2.75
Total Room Cost (including taxes and assessments)	\$ 212.04	\$ 214.83	\$ 212.04

As indicated, in the weaker market scenario, the lower ADR would also result in a 1.3% decline in TOT collections. The net effect is a reduction in hotel spending commensurate with the 1.3% increase in effective total room costs.

Although the market has been strong, the OEA estimated the impact of the TID assessment assuming it resulted in a decline in hotel spending, taking into account an estimate of the elasticity of demand. A study published by the Cornell

University School of Hotel Administration⁸ concluded an average elasticity of demand for hotel rooms was -0.44, meaning that for each 1% increase in room assessments, a 0.44 percent decrease in occupancy could be expected.

TABLE 5

Potential Decline in Annual Hotel Spending and TOT Collections Due to Increased Hotel Cost with TID Assessment (Years 1-5)

Total Taxable Hotel Spending (pre-TID) (1)			\$ 1,519,550,000
Proposed Average TID Assessment (3)	1.46%		
x Demand Elasticity (4)	-0.44		
= Percentage Decrease in Occupancy	-0.64%		
x Hotel Occupancy (pre-TID) (2)	78.1%	78.1%	
= Absolute Decrease in Occupancy (5)		-0.50%	
Hotel Occupancy with TID (6)		77.5%	
Total Taxable Hotel Spending (with TID) (7)			\$ 1,509,810,000
Potential Decline in Taxable Hotel Spending			\$ (9,740,000)
Potential Decline in TOT Collections	14.00%		\$ (1,363,600)

Notes:

1. Based on calendar year 2007 actual TOT collections. Source: San Francisco Controller's Office.
2. Average 2007 hotel occupancy per PKF.
3. Estimated weighted average TID assessment rate. Weighted based on # of rooms in each zone (91% x 1.5% + 9% x 1.0% = 1.46%)
4. This analysis assumes demand elasticity of -0.44, based on a national study published in the Cornell Hotel & Restaurant Administration Quarterly. That analysis concluded, on average, for each 1% increase in hotel tax or assessment (which amounts to a 1% increase in ADR), a 0.44% decline in occupancy could be expected.
5. Based on the 78.1% pre-TID occupancy rate, a 0.64% decrease in occupancy equates to about a 0.5% absolute decline in occupancy (78.1% x 0.64% = 0.5%).
6. Hotel occupancy with TID (78.1% - 0.50% = 77.5%)
7. Calculated based on 2007 hotel spending applied to adjusted occupancy rate.

As indicated in the above table, a decline in hotel occupancy of -0.5% due to the weighted average TID assessment would result in about \$9.7 million less hotel spending per year, and would lower TOT collections by \$1.4 million, assuming \$1.5 billion in annual taxable hotel spending.

⁸ Source: "Cornell Hotel & Restaurant Administration Quarterly," October 1992, page 84.

Net Impact Summary

The following table summarizes the estimated change in hotel spending and hotel tax collections associated with the TID.

TABLE 6		Net Impact Summary	
	Annual Incremental Hotel Spending	Annual Incremental TOT	
Incremental CVB-Attributed Hotel Spending (1)	\$ 49,231,000	\$ 6,892,340	
Estimated Decrease in Hotel Spending (2)	\$ (9,740,000)	\$ (1,363,600)	
Net Impact	\$ 39,491,000	\$ 5,528,740	

Notes:

1. See Table 2.
2. See Table 5.

Investing in marketing and short-and long-term improvements to the Moscone Convention Center will outweigh any potential loss.

As indicated, the incremental increase in SFCVB-attributed hotel spending is estimated at about \$49 million per year, generating an additional \$6.9 million in hotel taxes. The estimated decrease in hotel spending associated with the higher TID assessment is estimated at about \$9.7 million per year, for a net increase of about \$39.5 million in hotel spending. This net increase in spending is projected to generate about \$5.5 million annually in net TOT collections, as indicated in the above table.

STAFF CONTACTS

Kurt Fuchs, Senior Economist (kurt.fuchs@sfgov.org) (415) 554-5369

Ted Egan, Chief Economist (ted.egan@sfgov.org) (415) 554-5268

Todd Feiler, City Hall Fellow (todd.feiler@sfgov.org) (415) 554-5159

The authors thank Leonard Hoops with the San Francisco Convention and Visitor's Bureau for his assistance in the preparation of this report. All errors, omissions, and conclusions are solely those of the Office of Economic Analysis.

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2008 DEC 23 AM 8:09

BY SW

Youth Funding Youth Ideas



Do you have a brilliant idea, but lack funding and support?

Y.F.Y.I Funds Youth Led Projects up to \$10,000

Funding Cycle Deadline: January 1st, 2009 At 8:00 p.m.

Youth Funding Youth Ideas (YFYI) Mission:

YFYI is a youth-led program that seeks to foster young San Franciscans with the opportunities to expand on their leadership goals by funding their project ideas. We bring the tools and support; you bring the ideas.

For information, please contact us at:

CHALK Office

965 Mission Street, Suite 520

San Francisco, CA 94103

415-977-6949

415-755-2245 Fax

YFYIinfo@chalk.org

www.chalk.org/yfyi

YFYI is a program of Communities in Harmony Advocating for Learning and Kids (CHALK)

66

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Content</u>
I.	Minimum Eligibility Requirements
II.	YFYI Terms & Definitions
III.	Frequently Asked Questions
IV.	Project Contact Information
V.	Demographic Information
VI.	Summary Answers Section
VII.	Itemized Budget Form
VIII.	Budget Narrative Form
IX.	Additional Information

SECTION I.: MINIMUM ELEGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

To be eligible for a YFYI grant:

- Project must be located in San Francisco and services must be provided to residents of the city and county of San Francisco.
- The project must be completely youth led but needs an adult ally for emergency purposes.
- Project must be led by youth between the ages of 13 and 17 (**note* there must be project leader(s) under the age of 18 throughout the contracted length of the project**).
- The project must have a non-profit organization to act as a fiscal sponsor to monitor all financial transactions.
- ALL sections of the YFYI application, which require answers or information, must be completed.
- Youth ages 13-17 **MUST** develop project idea and complete application
- Project travel expenses (ie. Trips, hotel, airfare, etc.) must be under 20% of overall budget costs (**note*excludes local transportation**)

YFYI will also consider the following:

- Participation of civic institution(s)
- Institutional change
- Community participation
- Community change
- Service learning
- Number of volunteers
- Beneficiaries of project
- Reasonable and well thought out budget

Upon receiving grant money from YFYI, it is required that:

- Youth and adults involved in project keep direct communication with YFYI
- Youth and adults will meet with YFYI whenever necessary
- Youth and adults will provide YFYI with all receipts to account for money spent
- Youth and adults participate in all YFYI events

**IF REQUIREMENTS ARE NOT MET, AFTER RECEIVING A GRANT,
YFYI IS ENTITLED TO TAKE BACK MONEY FROM ANY PROJECT,
INCLUDING MONEY THAT HAS BEEN SPENT**

PLEASE PRINT IN BLACK OR BLUE INK

If handwriting is not legible, applications will not be considered.

SECTION II: YFYI TERMS & DEFINITIONS

*These definitions are specific to YFYI and are not necessarily generally used definitions. Providing YFYI's definitions of these terms is being done so that applicants are clear on language used by YFYI youth and adult staff.

1. **Youth:** Someone between the ages of 13 and 17.
2. **Youth Leader:** Someone between the ages of 13 and 17 who is directly involved in the development and daily leadership of the project and writing of the proposal.
3. **Adult Ally:** Someone 18 years old or older who is involved in the project only to provide support and guidance to youth of the same project.
4. **Beneficiaries:** People who will benefit from the project other than the youth leading the project.
5. **Fiscal Sponsor:** A non-profit organization or institution that is responsible for handling financial transactions for the project.
6. **Volunteers:** Youth or adults who are not receiving pay, and who will help support the project.
7. **Stipend:** A type of payment often provided for services or completion of a project. Stipends are fixed by date (example: paid on 15th of each month) and amount (example: \$200 per month).
8. **Itemized Budget:** An organized list that breaks down the expenses item by item.
9. **Budget Narrative:** A written explanation for each budget item, including, its purpose, calculation, etc.
10. **Demographics:** A collection of information including age, gender, postal code, ethnicity, etc. Used by YFYI to gain an understanding of whom the project is serving.
11. **Time-line:** A breakdown of project steps, events, and accompanying estimated dates.
12. **Civic Institution(s):** Local places offering services to the public, including schools, churches, community centers and clubs.
13. **Institutional Change:** Making long term changes in regards to the way in which things are done, run or completed; such as policies, laws or practices.
14. **Program Officer:** A YFYI youth staff that participates in interviews, grant making, monitoring, communication and support of specific projects.
15. **Youth Evaluator:** A YFYI youth staff that participates in interviews, grant making, record keeping and analyzing of specific projects to determine growth and success.
16. **Proposal:** YFYI grant application (this form).

SECTION III: FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

1. Question: If we need assistance in completing the application, what should we do?
You may call our office at (415) 977-6949 between the hours of 12pm-8pm Monday through Friday and arrange a meeting with one of the YFYI members for help.

2. Question: If you're eighteen can you apply for a grant?
YFYI can only give grants to youth between the ages of 13 and 17. However, 18 year olds may still be involved in the projects as long as the projects are fundamentally led by youth between the required ages of 13-17.

3. Question: If I live outside of San Francisco can I apply for a grant?
Our program is meant to serve the youth of San Francisco, and we cannot give grants to projects whose youth leaders live outside of San Francisco. Projects must also be serving the San Francisco community and being run and located within San Francisco.

4. Question: When is the deadline for applying for funding?
YFYI has three funding cycles. The applications are due on October 1st, January 1st and April 1st, at 8pm. Deadlines are set up so that YFYI has sufficient time to review proposals, interview applicants and make a funding decision.

5. Question: How long does it take a grantee to receive grant?
After an application is submitted, program officers will contact the applicants and arrange an interview. The program officer and evaluator assigned to the project will decide if the project is to be presented for funding or if the project needs further assistance prior to being considered for funding. If a project is presented at an YFYI funding meeting, the applicants would be notified on whether or not their proposal will be funded. This process takes no more than two months, starting from the application deadline date by which the application was submitted.

6. Question: What types of projects are you interested in funding?
We look for projects that will benefit San Francisco youth. We will also consider the following: participation of civic institutions, institutional change, community participation, community change, service learning, number of volunteers, beneficiaries of project, reasonable and well thought out budget, and application completion. We fund in the following categories: Arts, Education, Entrepreneurships, Environment, Health, Juvenile Justice, Recreation, Violence Prevention, and Youth Employment.

7. Question: How do you get prepared for an interview?
Make sure you know your project well and be prepared to answer questions about the project.

8. Question: Can we fax or email applications?
Yes, you can fax us at (415) 755-2247 or email your application to YFYI at YFYIinfo@chalk.org, but make sure you contact YFYI staff first at (415)-977-6949.

9. Question: How do you decide whether or not to fund a proposal?
1. All YFYI staff review every proposal and leave comments or questions for the assigned program officer and evaluator of the project to ask the applicants in the interview;
2. An interview is conducted by a program officer and an evaluator who will determine if the project is ready to be presented at the funding meeting or if the project needs further assistance before being considered for funding;
3. YFYI will focus on projects that show sustainable change (that a project will grow), civic engagement (having volunteers, community participants, and making change in the community), and having beneficiaries (people who will benefit from the project even if they are not directly involved in it).

SECTION IV: CONTACT INFORMATION

Primary Youth Leader (13-17)

Name:	
Date of Birth:	
Zip Code:	
Ethnicity:	
Languages Spoken:	
Gender:	
Email:	
Contact Number:	
Community Organization:	
School:	
Grade:	

Secondary Youth Leader (13-17)

Name:	
Date of Birth:	
Zip Code:	
Ethnicity:	
Languages Spoken:	
Gender:	
Email:	
Contact Number:	
Community Organization:	
School:	
Grade:	

Third Youth Leader (13-17)

Name:	
Date of Birth:	
Zip Code:	
Ethnicity:	
Languages Spoken:	
Gender:	
Email:	
Contact Number:	
Community Organization:	
School:	
Grade:	

Adult Ally (18+)

Name:	
Are you a parent?:	
Zip Code:	
Ethnicity:	
Languages Spoken:	
Gender:	
Email:	
Contact Number:	
Community Organization:	

If more room is needed to add more participants, please feel free to attach another page.

Section V: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Projected Demographic Information

YFYI uses this form to gain an understanding of how many youth your project is serving. **Please fill in with numbers only. Do not circle or check off.**

Total number of participants to be served by your project (include people involved in the project as well as those who will be affected by it –beneficiaries):

1) AGES	Projected Number of Participants to be Served by Age Group		
	0-5		
	6-13		
	14-17		
	Caregivers/Parents over 17		

2) GENDER	Projected Number of Participants to be Served by Gender		
	Male		
	Female		
	Transgender		

3) ETHNICITY	Projected Number of Participants to be Served by Ethnicity		
	Asian - including Filipino		
	Black/African-American		
	Latino		
	Native American/Native Alaskan		
	Pacific Islander		
	White		
	Multiethnic		

4) OTHER DEMOGRAPHICS	Projected Number of Participants to be Served by Category		
	Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual		
	Youth with Special Needs		
	Homeless/Transitional Housing		
	Limited English-Speaking		

5) ZIP CODES	Projected Number of Participants to be Served by ZIP Code							
	94102		94111		94122		94133	
	94103		94112		94123		94134	
	94104		94114		94124			
	94105		94115		94127			
	94107		94116		94129			
	94108		94117		94130			
	94109		94118		94131			
	94110		94121		94132			

* Projected Demographic Information Sheet taken from Cover Sheet A- Part II from DCYF

SECTION VI: SUMMARY ANSWERS

Project Name: _____

Duration of Project:

Please Circle One: _____ Six months Nine months Twelve Months

Who is your fiscal sponsor? _____

1) Briefly describe your projects goals and activities along with how your project will benefit your community.

2) What steps will you take to complete your project? When will you begin your project?

3) Who is currently involved in this project? What are these people, if any, responsible for?

4) Does your project have volunteers? YES _____ NO _____ HOW MANY? _____

What are the tasks of the volunteers?

5) How will your project benefit and/or affect the youth?

How many people will help you with this project? _____

6) How will your project affect the community?

7) Where will this project be held? Location? (Example: Recreation Center, School, Community Based Organization, etc.)

If there is an address please let us know:

Name (if any) of location: _____

District or neighborhood: _____


Address: _____

Phone number: _____

Time appropriate to call: _____

Contact person (of location): _____

8) What district(s) or area(s) will your project target and why?



9) What has been done to ensure the success of your project so far?

10) Have you done any fundraising for your project? YES _____ NO _____

If you HAVE NOT fundraised do you plan to do so? Explain.

If you HAVE fundraised, what has been done? Explain.

11) Why is this project important to you?

12) Is there anything else you would like us to know regarding your project?

SECTION VII: ITEMIZED BUDGET FORM

IT IS CRITICAL THAT YOU FILL THIS OUT CORRECTLY. IF YOU DO NOT KNOW HOW TO PROPERLY COMPLETE THIS FORM OR HAVE QUESTIONS, PLEASE CALL YFYI AT 415.977.6949.

A Personnel				
	<u>Position/Title</u>	<u>Budget Calculation</u>		<u>Total</u>
		<u>Pay per hour</u>	<u># of hours worked</u>	
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
Subtotal Personnel				

B Program Materials And Supplies			
	<u>Items</u>	<u>Show Calculations</u>	<u>Total</u>
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
Total Programs Materials and Supplies			

C Other Program Expenses			
	<u>Items</u>	<u>Show Calculations</u>	<u>Total</u>
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
Total Other Program Expenses			

Total Overall Expenses

SECTION VIII: BUDGET NARRATIVE FORM

THIS FORM IS A BREAKDOWN OF YOUR BUDGET IN WORDS. EACH SECTION MUST INCLUDE EVERY ITEM LISTED ON THE BUDGET FORM ABOVE WITH A DETAILED EXPLANATION FOR EACH ITEM AND WHY IT IS NEEDED.

Personnel

Program Materials & Supplies

Other Program Expenses

SECTION SIX: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Questions or Comments:

How did you hear about YFYI?

Please write down the specific answer if you received this application at school, a community based organization or elsewhere.

Please Check One

CHALK Outreach Worker (the youth in the orange uniforms)	
YFYI Staff	
YouthLine Phone Line	
YFYI Website	
Card	
Poster	
Flyer	
Friend:	
Family:	
School:	
Community Based Organization:	
Other:	

**Please return application to the address
below:**

**Youth Funding Youth Ideas (YFYI)
965 Mission Street, Suite 520
San Francisco, CA 94103**

**Or you can fax it to (415) 755-2247
To ask questions, call (415) 977-6949**

中文申請表請在網上提取,網址:

www.chalk.org/yfyi 或者請電415-977-6949

Aplicaciones en Español están disponibles en el
Internet: www.chalk.org/yfyi o puede llamarnos al
415-977-6949.

**Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV**
12/18/2008 03:11 PM

To Lolita Espinosa/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Rana
Calonsag/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Alistair
Gibson/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV

cc

bcc

Subject **Fw: Response to Board of Supervisors Inquiry**
#20081021-001

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 12/18/2008 03:16 PM -----

Ted Egan/CON/SFGOV
12/17/2008 04:06 PM

To Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

cc Maura Lane/CON/SFGOV@SFGOV

Subject **Response to Board of Supervisors Inquiry #20081021-001**

Ted Egan
Chief Economist, Office of Economic Analysis
Controller's Office, City and County of San Francisco
City Hall Room 306
(415) 554-5268
<http://www.sfgov.org/controller/oea>

Confidentiality Notice: The contents of this email, all related responses and any files and/or attachments transmitted with it are CONFIDENTIAL and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. This email may contain legally privileged information and may not be disclosed, copied or distributed to anyone without authorization from the email's originator. It is strictly prohibited for unaddressed individuals or entities to take any action based on information contained in this email. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete all copies from your system .



Ref No 20081021-001 AEITC_final.pdf

67

**Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV**

12/18/2008 03:41 PM

To Lolita Espinosa/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Rana
Calonsag/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Alistair
Gibson/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY #20081209-001

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 Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 12/18/2008 03:46 PM -----



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

12/18/2008 01:01 PM

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

cc "Black, Sue" <SBlack@sfgov.org>, Board of Supervisors
<Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, "Brown, Vallie"
<Vallie.Brown@sfgov.org>, "Galbreath, Rick"
<Rick.Galbreath@sfgov.org>, "Galli, Phil"
<Phil.Galli@sfdpw.org>, "Lee, Frank W"
<Frank.W.Lee@sfdpw.org>, "Nuru, Mohammed"
<Mohammed.Nuru@sfdpw.org>, "Pollock, Jeremy"
<Jeremy.Pollock@sfgov.org>, "Reiskin, Ed"
<Ed.Reiskin@sfdpw.org>, "Rodis, Nathan"
<Nathan.Rodis@sfdpw.org>

Subject RE: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY #20081209-001

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

Garbage Cans:

Northwest corner of Grove and Webster SR# 870594 (Abated 12-17-08)
Northwest corner of Haight and Fillmore SR# 870596 (Abated 12-17-08)

Mailboxes:

Cole and Fulton SR# 870598 (Abated 12-17-08)
(Street DO NOT cross)
Linden and Oak
Northwest corner of Haight and Fillmore SR# 870601 (Abated 12-17-08)

Jonathan C. Vaing
SF-DPW Graffiti Unit
Operation Act. Supervisor II
Office: 415-695-2181
Fax: 415-641-2640
Jonathan.Vaing@sfdpw.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Lee, Frank W
Sent: Tuesday, December 16, 2008 4:21 PM
To: Vaing, Jonathan

Cc: Hines, Timothy; Nuru, Mohammed; Rodis, Nathan

68

Subject: FW: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY #20081209-001

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: Wednesday, December 10, 2008 2:04 PM
To: Reiskin, Ed
Subject: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY
For any questions, call the sponsoring supervisor

TO: Edward Reiskin
Public Works

FROM: Clerk of the Board
DATE: 12/10/2008
REFERENCE: 20081209-001
FILE NO.

Due Date: 1/9/2009

This is an inquiry from a member of the Board of Supervisors made at the Board meeting on 12/8/2008.

Supervisor Mirkarimi requests the following information:

Requesting that the Department of Public Works report on the status of removing graffiti from the following locations:
Garbage Cans
Northwest corner of Grove and Webster
Northwest corner of Haight and Fillmore
Mailboxes
Cole and Fulton
Linden and Oak
Northwest corner of Haight and Fillmore

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 1/9/2009

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV

12/18/2008 03:38 PM

To Lolita Espinosa/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Rana
Calonsag/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Alistair
Gibson/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY #20081209-003

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 Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 12/18/2008 03:42 PM -----



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

>

12/18/2008 12:38 PM

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

cc "Black, Sue" <SBlack@sfgov.org>, Board of Supervisors
<Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, "Brown, Vallie"
<Vallie.Brown@sfgov.org>, "Galbreath, Rick"
<Rick.Galbreath@sfgov.org>, "Galli, Phil"
<Phil.Galli@sfdpw.org>, "Lee, Frank W"
<Frank.W.Lee@sfdpw.org>, "Nuru, Mohammed"
<Mohammed.Nuru@sfdpw.org>, "Pollock, Jeremy"
<Jeremy.Pollock@sfgov.org>, "Reiskin, Ed"
<Ed.Reiskin@sfdpw.org>, "Rodis, Nathan"
<Nathan.Rodis@sfdpw.org>

Subject RE: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY #20081209-003

Here's the status of removing graffiti from utility poles at the following locations:

Wood:

Southeast corner of Steiner and Herman	SR# 870577 (Abated 12-17-08)
429 Oak	SR# 870078 (Abated 12-17-08)
Southwest corner of Oak and Laguna	SR# 870599 (Abated 12-17-08)

Metal Pole:

Northwest corner of Fillmore and Haight,	SR# 870581 (Abated 12-17-08)
Southwest corner of Clayton and Haight	SR# 870586 (Abated 12-17-08)
Northeast corner of Page and Scott	SR# 870588 (Abated 12-17-08)
Divisadero near O'Farrell	SR# 870591 (Abated 12-17-08)

Jonathan C. Vaing
SF-DPW Graffiti Unit
Operation Act. Supervisor II
Office: 415-695-2181
Fax: 415-641-2640
Jonathan.Vaing@sfdpw.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Lee, Frank W

Sent: Tuesday, December 16, 2008 4:24 PM

69

To: Vaing, Jonathan
Cc: Nuru, Mohammed; Hines, Timothy; Rodis, Nathan
Subject: FW: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY #20081209-003

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: Wednesday, December 10, 2008 2:04 PM
To: Reiskin, Ed
Subject: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY
For any questions, call the sponsoring supervisor

TO: Edward Reiskin
Public Works

FROM: Clerk of the Board
DATE: 12/10/2008
REFERENCE: 20081209-003
FILE NO.

Due Date: 1/9/2009

This is an inquiry from a member of the Board of Supervisors made at the Board meeting on 12/8/2008.

Supervisor Mirkarimi requests the following information:

Requesting that the Department of Public report on the status of removing graffiti from utility poles at the following locations:

Wood:

Southeast corner of Steiner and Herman
429 Oak

Southwest corner of Oak and Laguna

Metal Pole:

Northwest corner of Fillmore and Haight, near bus shelter

Southwest corner of Clayton and Haight

Northeast corner of Page and Scott

Divisadero near O'Farrell

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 1/9/2009

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV

12/22/2008 01:53 PM

To Lolita Espinosa/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Rana
Calonsag/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Alistair
Gibson/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY #20081216-001

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 Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 12/22/2008 01:58 PM -----



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

>

12/20/2008 10:32 AM

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

cc "Black, Sue" <SBlack@sfgov.org>, Board of Supervisors
<Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, "Brown, Vallie"
<Vallie.Brown@sfgov.org>, "Galbreath, Rick"
<Rick.Galbreath@sfgov.org>, "Galli, Phil"
<Phil.Galli@sfdpw.org>, "Lee, Frank W"
<Frank.W.Lee@sfdpw.org>, "Nuru, Mohammed"
<Mohammed.Nuru@sfdpw.org>, "Pollock, Jeremy"
<Jeremy.Pollock@sfgov.org>, "Reiskin, Ed"
<Ed.Reiskin@sfdpw.org>, "Rodis, Nathan"
<Nathan.Rodis@sfdpw.org>

Subject RE: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY #20081216-001

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

Phone Switch Boxes:

Northwest corner of O'Farrell and Ellis	(STREET DO NOT CROSS)
Northwest corner of Turk and Webster	SR# 871594 (Abated 12-19-08)
Northeast corner of Scott and Waller	SR# 871595 (Abated 12-19-08)
Northwest corner of Hayes and Webster	SR# 871596 (Abated 12-19-08)

Garbage Cans:

Southeast corner of Geary and Webster	SR# 871597 (Abated 12-19-08)
Northeast corner of McAllister and Webster	SR# 871598 (Abated 12-19-08)
Northwest corner of Buchanan and Haight	SR# 871599 (Abated 12-19-08)
Northwest corner of Fulton and Broderick	SR# 871600 (Abated 12-19-08)

Fire Hydrant:

Southeast corner of Haight and Webster	SR# 871602 (Abated 12-19-08)
----------------------------------------	------------------------------

Jonathan C. Vaing
SF-DPW Graffiti Unit
Operation Act. Supervisor II
Office: 415-695-2181
Fax: 415-641-2640
Jonathan.Vaing@sfdpw.org

70

-----Original Message-----

From: Lee, Frank W
Sent: Wednesday, December 17, 2008 3:27 PM
To: Vaing, Jonathan
Cc: Hines, Timothy; Nuru, Mohammed; Rodis, Nathan
Subject: FW: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY #20081216-001

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: Wednesday, December 17, 2008 11:51 AM
To: Reiskin, Ed
Subject: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY
For any questions, call the sponsoring supervisor

TO: Edward Reiskin
Public Works

FROM: Clerk of the Board
DATE: 12/17/2008
REFERENCE: 20081216-001
FILE NO.

Due Date: 1/16/2009

This is an inquiry from a member of the Board of Supervisors made at the Board meeting on 12/16/2008.

Supervisor Mirkarimi requests the following information:

Requesting that the Department of Public Works report on the status of removing graffiti at the following locations:

Phone Switch Boxes

Northwest corner of O'Farrell and Ellis

Northwest corner of Turk and Webster

Northeast corner of Scott and Waller

Northwest corner of Hayes and Webster

Garbage Cans

Southeast corner of Geary and Webster

Northeast corner of McAllister and Webster

Northwest corner of Buchanan and Haight

Northwest corner of Fulton and Broderick

Fire Hydrant

Southeast corner of Haight and Webster

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 1/16/2009

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV

12/22/2008 01:55 PM

To Lolita Espinosa/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Alistair
Gibson/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Rana
Calonsag/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY #20081209-002

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 Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 12/22/2008 02:00 PM -----



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

>

12/20/2008 12:06 PM

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

cc "Black, Sue" <SBlack@sfgov.org>, "Brown, Vallie"
<Vallie.Brown@sfgov.org>, "Galbreath, Rick"
<Rick.Galbreath@sfgov.org>, "Galli, Phil"
<Phil.Galli@sfdpw.org>, "Lee, Frank W"
<Frank.W.Lee@sfdpw.org>, "Nuru, Mohammed"
<Mohammed.Nuru@sfdpw.org>, "Pollock, Jeremy"
<Jeremy.Pollock@sfgov.org>, "Reiskin, Ed"
<Ed.Reiskin@sfdpw.org>, "Rodis, Nathan"
<Nathan.Rodis@sfdpw.org>

Subject RE: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY #20081209-002

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

Status	SR#
1226 9th Avenue	870572
Notice Posted /due 1-24-08	
509 Oak- nothing found, correct address 527-29 Oak St.	870575
Notice Posted /due 1-19-08	
607 Irving, back of building on 6th Avenue /601-619 Irving	870576
Notice Posted /due 1-24-08	
600 Stanyan	
841608 Second Notice /due 1-26-08	
688 Stanyan	
870590 Notice Posted /due 1-19-08	
668 Stanyan	
870593 Nothing found 12-17-08	
650 Stanyan	
870595 Nothing found 12-18-08	
1432 Haight	
864867 Notice Posted /due 1-19-08	
1501 Haight	
870602 Notice Posted /due 1-19-08	
546 Haight same building	866661
Notice Posted /due 1-19-08	
542 Haight same building	866661
Notice Posted /due 1-19-08	

71

588 Haight
870611 Notice Posted /due 1-19-08
295 Buchanan
870615 Nothing found 12-18-08
300 Buchanan
870616 Nothing found 12-18-08
602 Haight

870618 Nothing found 12-18-08
923 Divisadero
870619 Nothing found 12-18-08
857 Divisadero
867222 Notice Posted /due 1-19-08
808 Divisadero
867325 Notice Posted /due 1-19-08
876 Haight
866031 Notice Posted /due 1-12-08
99 Webster
870632 Notice Posted /due 1-19-08
1667 Haight
843259 Notice Posted /due 1-12-08
1684 Haight
870635 Notice Posted /due 1-19-08
1648 Haight
870637 Notice Posted /due 1-19-08
1668 Haight
870641 Notice Posted /due 1-19-08

Jonathan C. Vaing
SF-DPW Graffiti Unit
Operation Act. Supervisor II
Office: 415-695-2181
Fax: 415-641-2640
Jonathan.Vaing@sfdpw.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Lee, Frank W
Sent: Tuesday, December 16, 2008 4:18 PM
To: Vaing, Jonathan
Cc: Nuru, Mohammed; Hines, Timothy; Rodis, Nathan
Subject: FW: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY #20081209-002

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: Wednesday, December 10, 2008 2:04 PM
To: Reiskin, Ed
Subject: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY
For any questions, call the sponsoring supervisor

TO: Edward Reiskin
Public Works

FROM: Clerk of the Board
DATE: 12/10/2008
REFERENCE: 20081209-002
FILE NO.

Due Date: 1/9/2009

This is an inquiry from a member of the Board of Supervisors made at the Board meeting on 12/8/2008.

Supervisor Mirkarimi requests the following information:

Requesting that the Department of Public Works report on the status of removing graffiti at the following private property locations:

1226 9th Avenue
509 Oak
607 Irving, back of building on 6th Avenue
600 Stanyan
688 Stanyan
668 Stanyan
650 Stanyan

1432 Haight
1501 Haight
546 Haight
542 Haight
588 Haight
295 Buchanan
300 Buchanan
602 Haight
923 Divisadero
857 Divisadero
808 Divisadero
876 Haight
99 Webster
1667 Haight
1684 Haight
1648 Haight
1668 Haight

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 1/9/2009

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV

12/22/2008 01:53 PM

To Lolita Espinosa/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Rana
Calonsag/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Alistair
Gibson/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY #20081216-003

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 Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 12/22/2008 01:57 PM -----



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

>

12/20/2008 09:50 AM

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

cc "Black, Sue" <SBlack@sfgov.org>, Board of Supervisors
<Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>, "Brown, Vallie"
<Vallie.Brown@sfgov.org>, "Galbreath, Rick"
<Rick.Galbreath@sfgov.org>, "Galli, Phil"
<Phil.Galli@sfdpw.org>, "Lee, Frank W"
<Frank.W.Lee@sfdpw.org>, "Nuru, Mohammed"
<Mohammed.Nuru@sfdpw.org>, "Pollock, Jeremy"
<Jeremy.Pollock@sfgov.org>, "Reiskin, Ed"
<Ed.Reiskin@sfdpw.org>, "Rodis, Nathan"
<Nathan.Rodis@sfdpw.org>

Subject RE: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY #20081216-003

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

Metal Poles:

Northeast corner of McAllister and Webster SR# 871571 (Abated
12-19-08)
Northeast corner of Waller and Fillmore SR# 871572 (Abated
12-19-08)

Wood Poles:

Southwest corner of Waller and Webster SR# 871573 (Abated
12-19-08)
Southwest corner of Oak and Webster SR# 871574 (Abated
12-19-08)

Bus Shelters:

Southwest corner of Sutter and Laguna SR# 871576 (Request sent
to 311 for Clear Channel 12-20-08)
Fillmore and Haight, all four corners-graffiti and dirty SR# 870617
(Request sent to 311 for Clear Channel 12-17-08)
Northeast corner of Fillmore and Hermann SR# 871578 (Request sent
to 311 for Clear Channel 12-20-08)

Mailboxes:

Northwest corner of Octavia and Haight SR# 871581 (Abated
12-19-08)
Southwest corner of Oak and Webster SR# 871582 (Abated
12-19-08)

72

Emergency Boxes:
Northwest corner of Turk and Pierce
12-19-08)
Southwest corner of Turk and Fillmore
12-19-08)

SR# 871583 (Abated

SR# 871584 (Abated

Jonathan C. Vaing
SF-DPW Graffiti Unit 1`
Operation Act. Supervisor II
Office: 415-695-2181
Fax: 415-641-2640
Jonathan.Vaing@sfdpw.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Lee, Frank W
Sent: Wednesday, December 17, 2008 3:31 PM
To: Vaing, Jonathan
Cc: Nuru, Mohammed; Hines, Timothy; Rodis, Nathan
Subject: FW: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY #20081216-003

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: Wednesday, December 17, 2008 11:51 AM
To: Reiskin, Ed
Subject: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY
For any questions, call the sponsoring supervisor

TO: Edward Reiskin
Public Works

FROM: Clerk of the Board
DATE: 12/17/2008
REFERENCE: 20081216-003
FILE NO.

Due Date: 1/16/2009

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

Board meeting on 12/16/2008.

Supervisor Mirkarimi requests the following information:

Requesting that the Department of Public Works report on the status of removing graffiti at the following locations:

Metal Poles

~~Northeast corner of McAllister and Webster~~

Northeast corner of Waller and Fillmore

Wood Poles

Southwest corner of Waller and Webster

Southwest corner of Oak and Webster

Bus Shelters

Southwest corner of Sutter and Laguna

Fillmore and Haight, all four corners-graffiti and dirty

Northeast corner of Fillmore and Hermann

Mailboxes

Northwest corner of Octavia and Haight

Southwest corner of Oak and Webster

Emergency Boxes

Northwest corner of Turk and Pierce

Southwest corner of Turk and Fillmore

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 1/16/2009

12/08/2008 14:15 4157758047

LAW OFFICES

File # 081486

PAGE 02

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2008 DEC -8 PM 1:45
SW

C: BOS
C: AC, JgDR
C: page

BY



LAW OFFICES OF
STEPHEN M. WILLIAMS

1934 Divisadero Street | San Francisco, CA 94115 | TEL: 415.292.3656 | FAX: 415.776.8047 | smw@stevewilliamsllaw.com

December 5, 2008

via facsimile and mail

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall—Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-5184

RE: Appeal of Determination of Categorical Exemption from Environmental Review
1864-1868 Green Street—Hearing Date December 16, 2008
Withdrawal of Appeal

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

This Office represents the appellants in the above-noted matter which is currently scheduled to be heard by the Board of Supervisors on December 16, 2008.

I am writing to request that the appeal in this matter be withdrawn from consideration. The parties have reached a private settlement which has resolved the dispute.

Thank you for your attention to this matter, if you require any further information or assistance please do not hesitate to contact at any time.

VERY TRULY YOURS,

STEPHEN M. WILLIAMS

CC: Ben S. B. Lee
David Cincotta, Esq.
Stelly Hardue, Planner

73

<http://www.indybay.org/newsitems/2008/12/20/18555808.php>

San Francisco | Health, Housing, and Public Services

\$1.9 Billion to revamp Hetch Hetchy in the hands of inept, inexperienced - SFPUC cronies.

by Francisco Da Costa

Saturday Dec. 20th, 2008 10:33 AM

Mayor Gavin Newsom with much fun fare signed on the documents that would permit San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to waste millions on the recent \$1.9 billion - first phase - to revamp the Hetch Hetchy - infrastructure. When Richard Sklar left the SFPU Commission - a void was created. More so with Dennis Normandy leaving the SF Public Utilities Commission - too. The sitting Commissioners - all take their orders from Caligula - that is Mayor Gavin Newsom.

Susan Leal the ultimate liar and queen of disorganization has left her scent all over San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. She goes laughing to the Bank - having fleeced the City and County of San Francisco - and taken thousands of dollars - in a deal that little has been written about. Her salary before she was fired - \$350,000.

Four women all very close to Susan Leal - presented their cases in front of the San Francisco Planning Department - and took the SF Planning Commission - dumb as they are - for a wild ride.

The Mayor got rid of Susan Leal for personal reasons.

But after getting rid of Susan Leal - he found out the that he had opened a can of worms. Susan Leal was ~~determined to destroy the Hetch Hetchy - Clean Water Program. Susan was determined to do it her way~~ - and use her inner circle of women friends - to accomplish this mission.

These were the same women that accompanied Susan Leal to Paris and even Morocco - on junkets that cost - thousands - and all to fulfill the fantasy at tax payers - expense.

So, these women when they came before the SF Planning Commission and returned to their seats smiling after their drab presentation - are happy that they are there to fulfill the rotten legacy that Susan Leal has left behind.

Susan Leal has destroyed the careers of many innocent decent women and men.

Even today many SFPUC employees are not happy. So, how does one imagine - this large amount of money \$1.9 Billion will be spent - when most of the folks in charge are pussyfooting about - with little or no experience?

One presenter failed to observe that our present population is closer to 900,000 in San Francisco.

And it is this number that should be used - close term to factor the consumption of clean drinking water. And we need to see the actual empirical data - when some one who is a novice, proclaims - that we in San Francisco use less water - compared to our neighbors.

Our neighbors use recycled water - and right now we are learning from them how to best use recycled water.

74

We have over 1000 miles of clean water drinking pipes that are more than seventy five years old in San Francisco. Most of these pipes are leaking - millions of gallons seep and pollute the water shed. Not a mention about this fact. The SF Planners - not one of them asked for empirical data - on our leaking Clean Water Pipes. More Sewage pipes too - that are over 75 years old.

Another presenter takes pride more in her title than the actual program - and has a French accent. She has always been very close to Susan Leal - shares similar taste - and for the longest time has been pussyfooting around. She controls the program and will waste millions - without blinking an eye.

At one time Hetch Hetchy had four main pipes that brought water to San Francisco. Now - this has been reduced to three. Some band-aid rehab is being done - at certain sections - and this will come to haunt the SFPUC in the long run.

The woman addressing the Environmental Concerns - made hundreds of general statements.

Well, if the SF Planners are not savvy and did not care to consult - engineers they could not fathom the difficulties linked to the Hetch Hetchy Clean Water Program. This woman hoodwinked the SF Planning Commission. These vermin make a lot of money - wasting SF tax payers money.

The fourth woman - bragged about changes made and how recycled water would be used in San Francisco. We should have had a plan ten years ago.

We supply millions of gallons of Hetch Hetchy water to the Presidio of San Francisco. We must stop supplying the Presidio with our precious water. The Presidio has a Water Treatment Plant and they can figure out - how to supply their customers.

And, if we must - the rate per gallons should be upped - we must learn to respect the Hetch Hetchy water.

Most readers are not aware that San Francisco politicians used their clout in Congress to steal the land and the Sacred Water that belongs to the First People - that made their abode and still do around Hetch Hetchy.

Most readers do not know that this water is naturally very pristine and naturally filtered to the highest standard.

It is only when Hetch Hetchy water is mixed with water taken from the other rivers that - the water must be treated. Over eighty percent of the water that comes to San Francisco is from the Hetch Hetchy.

Yet, the bastards will never, ever once mention the First People. Especially, the ones that prefer their life style that lacks a moral compass and is devoid of any spirituality.

The SFPUC has over 2.4 million customers. Many of our customers live outside San Francisco naturally - and so we must ask - some valid questions.

Why are there so much swimming pools in some areas where we supply Hetch Hetchy water - and can the owners of the swimming pools switch to recycled water?

~~Are we monitoring companies like IBM and Star Bucks that waste millions of gallons of water?~~

When are we going to put low flow toilets at City Hall? Flush and you witness a water fall!

There are other pertinent questions I could ask but why humble the fools - that are NOT educated on issues and most of them can not see beyond their noses.

For the longest time ever we have NOT paid attention to our ground water and our water shed in and around San Francisco.

We must remember this land was stolen from the Ohlone and they are best informed about the land, water, air, sky and what ever - critical factors linked to Mother Earth.

The strangers that stole the land - abused the land - and polluted the resources.

It is always interesting to watch White Folks talk about the Environment, Cultural Resources, deals with the politicians and policies. Some talk about conservation and fail to address the millions of gallons wasted - every single day in San Francisco.

And then there is the Waste Water that impacts Clean Water - but the stupid women - all of them - so called experts - did not go there. Of course they have no clue about the relationship between Clean Water and Waster Water - that is used side by side and in very close proximity.

In San Francisco the population will remain stable and one of the reasons is the present Economic Crisis.

The present Economic Crisis - is going to grow worse and will impact the Hetch Hetchy Infrastructure Programs. More - if a Big Earth Quake strikes - which it will soon - the program will be set back - five years or so.

Then we have the issues of payment and mandatory use of dual plumbing one for clean water and the other for half- treated or recycled water. This is expensive and has to be addressed in detail. San Francisco developers will shell out - and pass the added rent to the renters.

For years we few spoke about Impact Fees - when I mentioned that to the SF Planning - they did not know what I was talking about? What is it that the SF Planning understands - except to cater to the biggest developers?

It was a joke seeing the SF Planning Commissioners - make a fuss over a general non binding letter - that was written in confounded language.

Some one failed to mention the word - "demand" - and they wasted a full half an hour - debating. Then came to a consensus of sorts - that the letter was not binding and was meant to push the Clean Water Hetch Hetchy Infrastructure Program ahead:

<http://www.sfwater.org>

Mr. Harrington needs to fire a lot of the garbage that Susan Leal has planted - all over the place at SF Public Utilities Commission.

Very few San Franciscans attend the SF Planning Meeting and the SF Public Utilities Commission meetings - because the nonsense deliberated is more about politics than the good of the constituents that pay for their sewage and the Clean Drinking water.

The over \$4.4 Billion dollars must be spent with Accountability and full Transparency - bond money

created to revamp the Hetch Hetchy system.

We must have people in the know - and the only qualification should NOT be life style preferences and a lot of pussyfooting around and wasting - tax payer money.

Our present Economic Crisis - is here to stay for a long time - five to seven years. this is no joke. As thousands lose their jobs - we can help San Franciscans - work on these projects. The SF Union must step up - they have failed San Franciscans. Especially Local 22 - they talk the talk but cannot walk the walk.

Again and again at the National, State , and local level - the tax payer is forced to bail out for the misdeeds linked to very poor planning and wasteful spending.

The last time around - a Bond Measure was passed and a Blank Check was given to the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission.

Caligula is happy anytime he gets the chance to do his Spin and Media - circus impressions.

There is no one to guard the hen house - and the SFPUC vixens are having a field day - spewing hot air and hoodwinking the public at large.

Francisco Da Costa
Director
Environmental Justice Advocacy

<http://www.muwekma.org>

<http://www.hunterspointshipyard.com>

<http://www.hunterspointnavalshipyard.com>

<http://www.cbre.com>

<http://www.sfgov.org>

<http://www.sfwater.org>

<http://www.sfwater.org>

© 2000–2008 San Francisco Bay Area Independent Media Center. Unless otherwise stated by the author, all content is free for non-commercial reuse, reprint, and rebroadcast, on the net and elsewhere. Opinions are those of the contributors and are not necessarily endorsed by the SF Bay Area IMC. [Disclaimer](#) | [Privacy](#) | [Contact](#)



Robert Garcia

m>

12/10/2008 09:43 PM

Please respond to

To Jake.McGoldrick@sfgov.org, Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org,
David.Campos@sfgov.org, Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org,
Chris.Daly@sfgov.org, Sophie.Maxwell@sfgov.org,
cc SBAC@sfgov.org

bcc

Subject Small Business Assistant Center is vital - please read

Good Evening,

I'd like to introduce myself. My name is Robert Garcia and I'm a minority-owned small business owner. I own a company that shows outdoor movies in cities across the Bay Area including San Jose, Hollister, Union City, Fremont and Atherton.

I came across the SBAC when I wanted to partner with the City/County of San Francisco. Similar to the work we do with other cities, we show movies to the local community as a way to provide great free community activities. We also work with the local government officials to drive traffic into local businesses by allowing local merchants to give away free tickets to enter the (free) movie. Regardless if the movie-goer buys something or not, it's a proven method to drive people into businesses they might not normally venture into.

When I made my initial call to find out who could help me, I was literally transferred to four different departments (Redevelopment Agency, Parks & Rec, City Hall and 311) before I was finally transferred to SBAC. I spoke to Ms. Martha Yanez. I explained my issues to Ms. Yanez and told her how I wanted to partner with the City/County of San Francisco. Not only did Ms. Yanez know who to contact, but she also said she would follow up with me.

To my surprise, Ms. Yanez was not a typical government employee who would "pass the buck" or give me "lip service" to get me to stop bothering them. Ms. Yanez was polite, friendly and got me in touch with the correct person the first time.

I can go on and on about what a great job Ms. Yanez did. I think the SBAC provides a great service and this is one department that should not be cut from the budget. In fact, cutting the SBAC from the budget will not only be a disservice to me, but it will be a disservice to all of the current and future small business owners of the City/County of San Francisco.

In closing, I would like to reiterate my support for the SBAC. I know these are tough times and cuts need to be made, but perhaps you can spare this department from the chopping blocks because it provides a vital service to small business owners such as myself and many others.

Best regards,

Robert Garcia
Owner
Movies a Go-Go



"Kelly Jo Delatorre"

12/24/2008 10:32 AM

To Jake.McGoldrick@sfgov.org, Bevan.Duffy@sfgov.org,
Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org, David.Campos@sfgov.org,
Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org, Sophie.Maxwell@sfgov.org,
cc Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, SBAC@sfgov.org

bcc

Subject Please fight for the Small Business Assistance Center

Hello,

My name is Kelly DeLaTorre. I am a new business conductor here in SF. The small business center, I believe, is of vital importance for all entrepreneurs not just newbies like myself. They were able to help me with aspects of my business that I had not even considered yet. In this struggling economy we need every bit of this assistance we can get, and if this small organization is done away with I think that can only lead to less proficient business conduction throughout the entire city. Please I'm joining in the plight to persuade you to save the Small Business Assistance Center, San Francisco needs it.

Sincerely,

Kelly J. DeLaTorre



"Susan King"
<ski
rg>

12/16/2008 12:13 PM

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

cc

bcc

Subject: Quan Yin

To all S.F. City Supervisors,

I feel that is extremely important that we keep the funding for Quan Yin Health Services. These complimentary services for HIV+/AIDS are not just complimentary, but, necessary to the on-going health and welfare of this community. I understand the gravity of the fiscal shortfalls, but, I am also well aware of fiscal waste in the administrative staffing, monies being spent on needless consultations and on endless discussions and negotiations on ball parks that will not yield the revenues or employment opportunities being touted in the media. I have lived here all of my life and have kept up on city politics since high school (I am 50 yrs.old). I have heard it all and have seen the outcomes. I know there is a way to save these services.

I know that we cannot save all the social services. I know that there has to be a balance in the budget cuts and that no one is going to be completely satisfied with the decisions, but, if there is a way to save Quan Yin, I feel that we have to do all it takes so that this community has every chance at a **long, healthy and prosperous life.**

These are my personal feelings. This does not reflect the thoughts or opinions of Holy Family Day Home.

Sincerely,
Susan King

Susan King

Social Services Manager
Holy Family Day Home
299 Dolores Street
San Francisco, Ca. 94103
Phone: (415) 861-5361 x 210
Fax: (415) 861-8926



David Magidson

12/09/2008 12:28 PM

To Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org, Chris.Daly@sfgov.org,
Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org, Sean.Elsbernd@sfgov.org,
Carmen.Chu@sfgov.org, Sophie.Maxwell@sfgov.org,

cc

bcc

Subject saving.cable.access

Hi,

My name is David Magidson, I live on 8th Ave in The Sunset.

I wanted to chime in on funding channel 29. I have a children's show on Saturday morning (Boswick the Clown Show). I'm a fan of cable access because it has allowed me to reach more children than I ever could performing live. Channel 29 has also allowed me access to equipment that would be very difficult to afford.

I have a dream of making children's programming, public access has allowed me to do just that.

I know budgets are tight, hopefully this program will not be completely cut.

Thanks so much,

David Magidson

75

Wellness Center
ABRAHAM LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL
2162 24th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94116
Tel: 415-242-2574
Fax: 415-242-2592
Email: lincoln@sfallness.org
Web: www.sfallness.org


RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

December 17, 2008

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

2008 DEC 22 AM 11:47

BY _____



RE: In Support of the Vietnamese Youth Development Center's Family Support Program

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing this letter in regards to the budget cut facing the Vietnamese Youth Development Center's (VYDC) Family Support program. VYDC is a case management program aimed toward supporting youth on probation and their families. My name is Jen Kenny-Baum and I am a Wellness Coordinator at Abraham Lincoln High School in the City and County of San Francisco. I was notified that the VYDC's Family Support program will be eliminated from the Juvenile Probation Department funding due to the fiscal budget cut starting this following February 2009. This would mean that youth-on-probation will no longer have access to a Case Manager who could work with them personally to support them through the tough process of probation (custody visits, connection to services, counseling, adhering to probation restrictions, etc.), working closely with family and community members to increase the chances of youth being successfully reintegrated back into the community.

VYDC has been dedicated to working with the Tenderloin community and other underserved communities in the city of San Francisco for almost 30 years, offering a variety of beneficial prevention and intervention services to enhance youth productivity and success. Specifically, the Family Support program has played a vital role in this City in terms of helping probation youth successfully complete their probation period and reduced the rate of recidivism in juvenile crime. They also provide language assistance and advocacy for Southeast Asian families, especially those that are monolingual, through counseling, career and educational planning, and much more.

I have witnessed the support this agency provides personally. At Abraham Lincoln High School there are a number of monolingual families who are looking for support to help navigate the educational system and to help act as a cultural guide in ensuring their children succeed. In addition, I have seen the dedication and care of the staff that work with youth in truly ensuring they meet their needs.

I believe that cutting out this program will definitely affect our community. Youth will lose valuable community allies and support. Southeast Asian families will definitely have hard times adapting to the new life due to the lack of the city support. This program is also a great resource in preventing violence within the neighborhood and schools. Therefore, I truly would like the Board of Supervisors to reconsider the JPD decision for eliminating this crucial community program.

Sincerely,


Jen Kenny-Baum, MSW, PPSC



Partnering to support student health and well-being.

San Francisco Department
of Public Health

San Francisco Department of
Children, Youth and Their Families

San Francisco Unified
School District

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV

12/15/2008 04:34 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: Public input for 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

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 12/15/2008 04:39 PM -----



12/11/2008 06:02 PM

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

cc

Subject Public input for Board of Supervisors

Submitted on: 12/11/2008 6:02:59 PM

name: Patricia

phone:

comments: Dear Supervisor Maxwell,

~~Writing you out of deep concern for the effect of your proposed budget cuts.~~
Public Health & Human Services covers all of us in San Francisco---from the affluent to the most vulnerable, and in times of economic crisis we need this safety net more than ever. We need a full assessment of the City's management to discover where the waste is, and cut first the programs that do not affect people's lives. Vital human and community-based services are not optional. Please-Please No Cuts on Public Healthcare's Backs!

Thank you
Happy Holidays
Patricia

User Data

Client IP (REMOTE_ADDR) : 71.146.209.33
Client IP via Proxy (HTTP_X_FORWARDED_FOR) :



12/11/2008 11:44 PM

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

cc

bcc

Subject Public input for Board of Supervisors

Submitted on: 12/11/2008 11:44:53 PM

name: Lizzie Duemig

phone:

comments: I've been a public school teacher for the past 8 years. After being run out of SF schools, I took a job outside of SF last year, only to lose my job in the spring due to the state budget cuts, as I was low man on the totem pole. I tried to turn a very difficult situation into a new direction and in that process I found a new passion. I've been working for the past 9 months to get into the SFPD. I didn't apply to any other police agencies as I live in the city and this is where I want to work. You cut the budget to delay the cadet classes scheduled for the fall of 2008...which left us in stiff competition to get into the next academy classes. I've passed every rigorous test and trial and my hiring meeting was set for this Wednesday...the day after the lovely new budget slashing proposal. Seriously, think about what I just said--I was a teacher and now I'm trying to be a cop. I guess the need for those services don't seem to be the priority for the law-makers and city managers. I am quite intelligent and understand the difficult economic situation, but don't you think you need to weigh the costs of WHAT you are cutting and not just how much money that amounts too? You might want to take a minute and look at the big picture so some of us good-intentioned, hardworking citizens stop getting screwed over. Don't you think that if you have new potential recruits, such as myself, that you might want to actually HIRE them and allow an academy class to go through, as you should know full-well that you are going to have almost a third of the department up for retirement in the next few years. Plus, anyone who thinks in any type of rational mindset understands that as the economy continues to worsen, crime is going to increase. Who truly thinks it's a good idea to now have LESS cops on the street?! This seems to be RIDICULOUS planning on the part of the city administration. I sincerely hope you vote down the proposal to cut funding for the police academy cadet classes.

User Data

Client IP (REMOTE_ADDR) : 71.146.137.59

Client IP via Proxy (HTTP_X_FORWARDED_FOR) :



<michael.
12/15/2008 12:20 PM

To <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
bcc
Subject Public input for Board of Supervisors

Submitted on: 12/15/2008 12:20:06 PM

name: Michael Pare

comments: I know that budget cuts are requiring some lay-offs in the Parks & Rec centers around the city. However, there is one person -- Veronica -- who works at the Moscone Rec center who is outstanding, and I would hope you could show appreciation for her great work. She makes the Rec center wonderful, by offering great classes for my son Anthony (2yrs) and his friends. We all love Veronica, who makes that Rec center so inviting and enriching for the kids.

User Data

Client IP (REMOTE_ADDR) : 71.132.149.82
Client IP via Proxy (HTTP_X_FORWARDED_FOR) :

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV

12/15/2008 04:48 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: Public input for 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

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 12/15/2008 04:54 PM -----



<deputysheriff@yahoo.com>

12/13/2008 12:45 PM

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

cc

Subject Public input for Board of Supervisors

Submitted on: 12/13/2008 12:45:58 PM

name: Deputy Sheriff

phone:

comments: With all of the talks of budget cuts and potentially cutting our pay, I'd like to remind the city that the Deputy Sheriffs have taken numerous pay cuts and "give backs" through the years.

The following suggestions have been made on a number of occasions but it has fallen off deaf ears with the Sheriff's administration.

If we kept the inmates locked up to meet the minimum title 15 standard, we could reduce our staffing by 20% with a hiring freeze. Cutting employees will increase overtime due to the minimum staffing requirements. There is no reason to let the inmates out of their cells almost all day everyday. We meet title 15 standards by Monday afternoon.

Every other county has a minimum amount of time that inmates are allowed out of their housing area for showering, recreation time, etc.

There are a number of inmates that have hundreds to thousands of dollars on their personal accounts. Why not charge these inmates for the services that the city provides ie; medical care, forms etc?

The administration of the Sheriff's Department is always keen to cut back from staff, however, inmates don't ever feel the brunt of the budget cuts. Is there any way that the Board of Supervisors can have legislation passed ordering the Sheriff to follow Title 15 to the letter of the Penal Code vs. giving them well over their rights?

Please look into this and make fair cuts that affect everyone not just the one's that work hard for a living and obey the law.

Deputy Sheriff



"Don Falk"

12/11/2008 02:56 PM

To <Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org>
cc <Chris.Daly@sfgov.org>, <Jake.McGoldrick@sfgov.org>,
<Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org>,
<Bevan.Dufty@sfgov.org>, <David.Campos@sfgov.org>,
bcc

Subject Letter of Support -- Office of Economic and Workforce
Development

Dear Supervisor Peskin,

I am writing to urge you to preserve the Office of Economic and Workforce Development's funding for neighborhood economic development programs. While Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation is primarily a housing developer, we have recently become much more involved in economic development in the Tenderloin. Given an emerging consensus that the area is in desperate need of additional goods and services, TNDC has invested significant time and effort in trying to attract a grocery store to our new building at the corner of Taylor and Eddy. We have also been an important stakeholder in the Tenderloin Community Benefit District and a key partner in the OEWD-funded Tenderloin Economic Development Project, one of our senior staff serving on its Board of Directors.

We have benefited from OEWD's grant budget, which helped us retain a professional commercial broker to assist with grocery store attraction. We also worked intensively with OEWD staff to promote the Tenderloin to grocery stores, in conjunction with our efforts. We look forward to a continuing partnership with OEWD in order to realize our joint goal.

Furthermore, we understand the City is very interested in seeing the revitalization of Taylor Street, and, as a property owner there and a partner in the Tenderloin Economic Development Project – whose goal is to help engineer that revitalization on Taylor Street – we are particularly enthusiastic about the \$50,000 commitment TEDP has from OEWD. If the budget cuts go through, we will have to forego this funding and likely not see the Taylor Street efforts implemented.

TNDC stands firm in its belief that economic development is more important than ever in the Tenderloin. Staffing and funding from OEWD are crucial elements of that effort. Please preserve their funding.

Sincerely,

Donald S. Falk
Executive Director

Cc: Board of Supervisors

Donald S. Falk
Executive Director
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation
201 Eddy Street, San Francisco, CA 94102

T: 415.358.3923 M: 415.264.7949

dfalk@tndc.org



Letter of support for OEWD Dec 2008.pdf



Tomiquia Moss

12/15/2008 04:36 PM

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

cc

bcc

Subject Do Cut the Communities you want to Serve the MOEWD

Hello Supervisors:

I am the President of the North of the Market/Tenderloin Community Benefit District and I want to strongly urge you to not cut funding to the Neighborhood and Business Development component of MOEWD. In the midst of the most horrifying budget cuts this city has seen, we have to think creatively about the cuts that the city is forced to make. To cut funding to small businesses and CBD's are not the way to generate cost savings. The NOM/TL CBD has leveraged well over 200 jobs in two years for Tenderloin residents through our work with community partners. Generating revenue from the private sector i.e. property owners has been of incredible value to the Tenderloin community. The Tenderloin Economic Development Project is another resource that has served as a revenue generator for the neighborhood by facilitating opportunities for small businesses to bring job opportunities into the neighborhood. I recognize that the Board of Supervisors have to make really difficult decisions about funding priorities but I hope that you recognize that by cutting funding to the Neighborhood and Business Development function at MOEWD you are in fact costing the city and its neighborhoods access to employment and revenue that people are in dire need of in San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Tomiquia Moss

President

North of Market/ Tenderloin Community Benefit District

Send e-mail faster without improving your typing skills. [Get your Hotmail® account.](#)



"W. K. Yung"

<

>

12/20/2008 09:23 PM

To Jake.McGoldrick@sfgov.org, Bevan.Duffy@sfgov.org,
Michela.Alioto-Pier@sfgov.org, David.Campos@sfgov.org,
Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org, Sophie.Maxwell@sfgov.org,
cc Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, SBAC@sfgov.org

bcc

Subject Support for Small Business Assistance Center

They have been very helpful last time I visited. During this tough economic period, many small business need help to survive, the most direct source of information is the small business assistance center, without their help I could spend years to browse through the sneaky links from all the governments website to get all the informations that I need. Without direct assist, it might lead to more and more business failure which might ends up less tax going to government. Please re-consider the decision of closing Small Business Assistance Center.

Thank you

Sup
C: Peskin
C: Maxwell
o- cpay
GAO
COMM
clerk

Dear Aaron Peskin,

I am the small business owner of San Francisco Meats & Delicatessen at 1330 Ocean Avenue in the Ingleside District of San Francisco. I am a fourth generation San Franciscan born and raised in the Excelsior District, and I have seen our side of the city change dramatically for the better over these past few years. If it weren't for programs like the Neighborhood Marketplace Initiative, OARC (Ocean Ave Revitalization Center), and EAG (Excelsior Action Group) our neighborhoods would be forgotten and riddled with commercial vacancies, crime, vandalism, and more negative issues. Without these city funded programs, our neighborhood would deteriorate over night. All the good these groups have done would be wiped away, and each corridor would be a ghost town for residents and businesses alike. Street decorations, group planning, street fairs, and other positive community gatherings would never happen. Small businesses like ours would be forced to close, because the neighborhood is either too run down or too dangerous to shop in. Why does West Portal and over get all the love? Why do our politicians and government officials forget about us on this side of the city? Why don't we get any positive press in the media? Why are the only media reports about this side of the city always presented negatively? WHY? Because people like you are trying to do away with the one positive thing the entire neighborhood can support!

Without the fine help of these generous people, Ocean Ave would not have 3 new stores, including mine. Without their planning, our streets wouldn't be decorated for the holidays, and we wouldn't seem to feel as safe at night or in the day. We would have no place to air our grievances, and no place to go for help with city ordinances as I did before establishing my store. I wouldn't have been able to directly meet with a city planner to ensure my idea could become a reality. I would love to hear where you live in our city, and I would love hear where you purvey your goods on a daily basis. I challenge you to walk down the street and support us local shops, because if you did you would get the reason why I am so passionate about keeping these vital institutions within the fabric of the entire community. These local activists often go above and beyond their plain duties, and really embody what civil work is all about. I feel politicians like yourself are truly out of touch with SF society if you are trying to eliminate these programs. I can promise you I will not let you do this. I will do everything in my power to keep you from **destroying** my city! If I have go house to house and get signatures I will. Our community will join me in the fight, because WE LIVE HERE, and WE DEMAND to have a voice and a choice as to what goes on in our streets. If you have any questions, comments, or a response, please contact me ASAP.

Thank You,

Joseph P. Shasky III



Owner- San Francisco Meats & Delicatessen

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2008 DEC 12 PM 4:30
BY SJD

"On Ocean Ave. the Ocean Ave. Revitalization Collaborative has been working for 2 yrs. to establish a CBD. With the proposed cuts, our Workplace Initiative, funded staff members as well as the funding to prepare a required CBD proposal, would be cut. This is really frustrating and unfair to neighborhoods like Ocean Ave.

CBDs are a long-term strategy to support and improve neighborhood retail districts. They will be worth ~~the~~ the investment. This effort takes time; please support our work and keep the funding in place."

Dan Weaver
Resident and Community
organizer.

<http://www.indybay.org/newsitems/2008/12/18/18555552.php>

San Francisco | Health, Housing, and Public Services

Prop G sell outs gather to hoodwink the Bayview Hunters Point Community and face static!

by Francisco Da Costa

~~Thursday Dec-18th, 2008 9:08 PM~~

The sell outs from the Bayview Hunters Point Community gathered at 1800 Oakdale - on December 18, 2008 - to hoodwink the community with fake promises. At the meeting - the majority of the folks gathered were pissed off at the organizers and leading the pack James Bryant and Veronica Hunnicut. There were others trying to spew hot air. The community gathered are fed up. Tensions were high in the air. The same sell outs - just to do not get it - they still think that Lennar will take them to the Promise Land. Poor, dumb, idiotic - fools.

Lennar is a liar that tried to fool the community with Proposition G. To date Lennar cannot deliver and the Proposition passed in June, 2008 - is going no where.

Six months later on December 18, 2008 - Eleanor Williams, Jackie Phillips, Mike Casey, James Mccray, Veronica Hunnicutt, and Angelo King - all sell outs - think they can get the community to buy their lies.

A Memorandum signed by the above dubious characters - none of whom have any credibility with the Bayview Hunters Point Community that counts - gathered some folks to sell them some rotten goods. A meeting was held at 1800 Oakdale - and there was utter confusion.

The Core Community Benefits Agreement (CCBA) is going no where. Lennar has no money. Its Stocks and Shares are worthless.

Lennar declared Bankruptcy after promising to build 10,000 homes at Mare Island. Now, Mare Island is on the auction block.

Proposition F stood for Fairness. Proposition F that opposed Proposition G - mandated fifty percent affordable housing. The rest being market value. We demanded Quality of Life Issues.

It was a shame to see - so call pathetic fools none of them educated on issues - trying to convince that community that the community stood to benefit from Lennar. No one in their right mind - believes the lies told the puppets of Lennar.

Well, Lennar has no money and in today's dire economic stressed times - Lennar is looking for money - and cannot find anyone worth its salt - to trust Lennar.

The land Lennar wants to build homes is toxic and prone to liquefaction. Much of it radiological in nature.

The faith based Tabernacle Group does not have one single Memorandum signed with Lenanr that is legal and worth the salt.

The San Francisco Labor Council (SFLC), the San Francisco Organizing Project (SFOP), San Francisco ACORN - each dubious in nature - have never once sat with the community at large - and won their confidence.

76

The Citizens Advisory Committee to the Hunters Point Parcel A - all hand picked by Mayor Gavin Newsom - are sell outs. And judging from the reception Veronica Hunnicut got today - she and the others should feel ashamed of themselves.

ACORN is an organization that the Bayview Hunters Point community does not trust. On the National level - ACORN has failed. Time will tell.

The San Francisco Organizing Project is a joke. Its present organization is split and it does not have the respect of the Bayview Hunters Point community.

The Memorandum circulated called for the sell outs that worked on Proposition G to gather to discuss next steps.

When concrete questions were asked about the plans - the few speakers - spoke of the current economic crisis - but asked the people gathered to have faith in Lennar - that is a Rogue Company.

Some speakers assured that Lennar will come forth with the money - and if they just stick around - all will be well.

Most of the speakers favoring Proposition G - have no idea that Lennar is now called by a new name and has reorganized itself - since signing the Core Community Benefits Agreement (CCBA). Lennar is now called Hunters Point Shipyard Corporation - Limited Partnership.

Lennar has defaulted on the Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA) linked to Parcel A.

Lennar promised rental units on Parcel A and amended the DDA and threw out the rental units.

\$30 million set aside as community benefits have disappeared - no one can give any account for that money.

The Tabernacle Group a group of rogue pastors - claim they represent the community but are there to rake in the money and fill their own pockets.

Arc Ecology was there with Saul Bloom aka David Saleman - using every opportunity to sell out the community. He has several conflict of interests.

The meeting was held to supposedly inform the people - have a dialog - but there was confusion and the air was filled with anger. These fools - all of them Black always selling out the community.

The Samoans are out, so are the Latinos, the Asians, the Native American, the decent Whites and the decent Blacks. The few sell outs think they are at liberty to speak for the community - who gave them the permission?

Now there is talk the Core Community Based Agreement - will be negotiated through the Citizens Advisory Committee - linked to the Hunter Point - Parcel A. Is chair Veronica Hunnicut.

The Bayview Hunters Point - Project Area Committee under Angelo King.

~~Angelo King and Veronica Hunnicut - are sell outs and do not have the better interests of the Bayview Hunters Point community.~~

The meeting called by the organizers from ACORN, SFOP, SFLC, and others - cannot address - Affordable Housing and Workforce Development - linked to Hunters Point and Candlestick Point.

These jerks talk the talk - but cannot walk the walk.

Here are some photographs of the meeting and others to inform you:

<http://www.flickr.com/photos/franciscodacosta/sets/72157611335896155/show/>

Francisco Da Costa
Director
Environmental Justice Advocacy

<http://www.muwekma.org>

<http://www.hunterspointnavalshipyard.com>

<http://www.cbre.com>

<http://www.flickr.com/photos/franciscodacosta/sets/72157611335896155/show/>

<http://www.flickr.com/photos/franciscodaco...>

© 2000–2008 San Francisco Bay Area Independent Media Center. Unless otherwise stated by the author, all content is free for non-commercial reuse, reprint, and rebroadcast, on the net and elsewhere. Opinions are those of the contributors and are not necessarily endorsed by the SF Bay Area IMC. [Disclaimer](#) | [Privacy](#) | [Contact](#)



"Francisco Da Costa"

12/09/2008 09:55 AM

To "Francisco Da Costa" ·

cc

bcc Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV

Subject Lennar and its dubious \$ 2 billion fake agreement with Caligula.

Lennar and its dubious \$2 billion deal with Caligula - ready to set this City and County of San Francisco on fire:

<http://www.indybay.org/newsitems/2008/12/09/18554101.php?printable=true>

Francisco Da Costa

76



Adrienne Hickman

12/11/2008 02:56 PM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
bcc
Subject

Dear Supervisor Elsberend,

Please vote 'NO' on any combustion turbine peaker project, and call for a 2009 Energy Action Plan to close the existing Mirant power plant by 2010, relying only on renewable energy, efficiency, and the Transbay Cable.

Thank You!
Adrienne Hickman

77



"Deanna"

12/11/2008 04:45 PM

Please respond to

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

cc

bcc

Subject no power plants in SF

Dear Supervisor,

Please vote 'NO' on any combustion turbine peaker project, and call for a 2009 Energy Action Plan to close the existing Mirant power plant by 2010, relying only on renewable energy, efficiency, and the Transbay Cable.

Thank You!



Janet McCaffrey

12/11/2008 04:51 PM

Please respond to

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

cc

bcc

Subject renewable energy

Dear Supervisor,

Please vote 'NO' on any combustion turbine peaker project, and call for a 2009 Energy Action Plan to close the existing Mirant power plant by 2010, relying only on renewable energy, efficiency, and the Transbay Cable.

Thank You!

Janet McCaffrey

**Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV**

12/24/2008 12:05 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: Supervisor Maxwell's clean energy ordinance

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 Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 12/24/2008 12:10 PM -----



Michael Allen Hunter

12/23/2008 08:39 PM

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

cc

Subject Supervisor Maxwell's clean energy ordinance

Dear Supervisor,

Please strongly support an amended version of Supervisor Maxwell's clean energy ordinance which will mandate that the City close the Mirant Power Plant by 2012, and run San Francisco on 100% clean electricity within three decades.

Thank You,

~~Michael Hunter, PhD., Stanford University~~

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
12/19/2008 09:45 AM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Fw: Community Court

----- Forwarded by Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 12/19/2008 09:49 AM -----



Joan Joaquin-Wood

12/18/2008 06:43 PM

Please respond to
Joan Joaquin-Wood

To "Bd.of Supes S.F." <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc

Subject Community Court

Hello Board Members! I keep reading that most of you, especially Chris Daly, are opposed to the Mayor's plan for a Community Court. Why do I never read about the existence of the Community Court I have participated in for the last couple of years? There are a dozen of these in different districts and we meet monthly. The North Beach Community Court hears 4 to 7 misdemeanor quality of life and other minor crimes then, and adjudicates them with fines, Community Service, or occasionally acquittals. If they stay "clean" for a year afterward, the record is erased. Perhaps it is the absence of jail time that makes our Courts unattractive to the Mayor, as I can hardly believe he doesn't know about us. The program is administered by a private firm "Arbitration Services" through the District Attorney's office and we judges are volunteers who live in the neighborhood of the crime. We would like more referrals but a police report, as opposed to a citation, is required before we see them, and police don't like paperwork too much. Jackson Gee is the D.A.'s point person. Joan Woods

Joan Wood

78



12/09/2008 11:52 PM

To

cc

org,

bcc Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV

Subject Dec. 8th NAACP & Team Gatto Boxing club Press
Conference & offensive behavior by Redwood City Police
Official

Police Chief Cobarruviaz,

After I attended the NAACP meeting with President of the NAACP Reverend Amos Brown and the Board of the NAACP, I came home and answered an email to Dan Smith, and emailed you as well. Later that evening I read the flier that Dan Smith was handing out to my children, youth, and people that I train AND their parents. I was appalled. I am insisting that I be contacted immediately with an explanation to the intention of your officer and your department, and to their behavior/handling at our press conference yesterday.

Prior to our press conference, I had NUMEROUS telephone conversations with Assistant District Attorney Steve Wagstaffe about having police officials present at this press conference to SUPPORT the youth that have been wrongfully and criminally used, abused, and harmed by ~~Redwood City's Gladiator's Boxing Gym~~. These children and their parents PAID monthly dues (mostly in cash, and without EVER having received receipts from Eloy for ANY monies paid to him), were paying for nothing more than to be admitted entrance into Ramirez's dirty, disease filled, unkept and poorly maintained old, non heated warehouse that he called a gym. I trained ALL of these children, youth, and people Chief! I trained well over 50 people, ALL non profit.

Eloy Ramirez has already been proven to have participated in illegal, unethical, and criminal behavior. Dan Noyes has him on tape admitting all of this and more. Journalist Nathaniel Johnson also has Eloy recorded admitting that he himself had been participating in illegal activities in amateur boxing for nearly 30 years, AND signed up and took his young fighters to participate in these unethical and illegal activities and shows as well.

While President of the NAACP Rev. Amos Brown and his Vice President spoke many of us noticed a man handing out papers to people, clearly shaking his head, making faces, and obviously disagreeing with much of what the Reverend said. People also noticed that when I spoke this man acted in the same manner. The children and youth of my team and their parents were offended and upset by this man who attempted to discuss, debate, and "educate" them on what a good man Eloy Ramirez was.

As these young people began to get upset, angry and frightened by this man, I asked him who he was. He introduced himself as Dan Smith. He said that he ran the PAL program, and he handed me a paper which I promptly stuck in my pocket without reading. ~~He then stated to me that Eloy Ramirez was a good man who helped youth get off of the streets with boxing.~~ Astounded by the

79

audacity and clear stupidity and ignorance of this foolish man, I pointed to the LARGE crowd of young people standing right behind me. I told him to "look at the faces of ALL of these young people. See them all? These are only perhaps a quarter of the children and youth that I train. Eloy Ramirez kicked out and displaced ALL of these kids AND all the others not present!" I asked Dan Smith IF he could then explain that? Officer Dan Smith then told me that there were just differences of opinions. Appalled, disgusted, and wondering how corrupt Dan Smith must be and what HE does with his youth, I told Dan that, "These issues have NOTHING to do with opinion. THEY are legal matters. Eloy like Dan, myself, or ANY person OR coach, are REQUIRED to follow the law. PERIOD.

Dan remained with my team the entire time of the press conference for the most part, handing out papers. At some point when a reporter asked since Eloy's retaliation happened suddenly and without warning, where did I have that I could train my team. I mentioned to him that we as of yet did not have a building space, but were determined and committed to our team, each other, and our goals, and even at times trained in a driveway in the East part of Redwood City. Shortly after hearing this Dan once again approached me and told me and my co-trainer Robert Salinas that he had a "little room for a few more kids at his PAL, and that HE could take a few of MY kids. Hiding my disgust, I mentioned that these little kids had brothers in their teens. Dan told me that he didn't take any kids over 17.

My first question to you Chief Cobarruviaz is, who told Dan Smith that my young fighters were property that could be given to HIM? What made Dan Smith even entertain the preposterous idea that he was good enough of (IF even someone with ANY knowledge, skill or ability or experience in boxing whatsoever) a "boxing trainer" to work with ANY of MY youth? Or what on earth would give him reason to assume that ANY of my youth OR their parents wanted anything to do with him?!? WE are Team Gatto. WE are some of the most skilled fighters in this state. MY team of young people's & fighter's superior skills and both unequalled as well as superior conditioning is well known and without dispute. Our reputation as tough fighters and outstanding athletes, precedes us. I AM a 9 Time World Champion. I am one of the best PROFESSIONAL fighters in the world, and as I'm certain that you have heard, I am equally as superior a boxing trainer, as I am a fighter. What on earth Chief, would make Dan Smith think that he could approach me asking for ANY of my fighters, OR even think we or they would want ANYTHING to do with him, his PAL program (which IF he is a trainer, clearly isn't a well taught OR properly run program?) What makes Dan Smith believe that wanting ONLY the small children for his PAL program, but not wanting and refusing to take the teens, older kids, and young adults who are those MOST at risk, in danger, and those who MOST need direction, mentoring, leadership, guidance, acceptance, inclusion and athletics, is making ANY difference in our community??

Lastly, this ridiculous paper that Dan Smith was passing out to ALL of my children, youth, parents, and supporters at our press conference was some sort of poorly written propaganda supporting "contact sports". It is a two sided legal document defending contact sports AND amateur boxing. Why was Dan Smith passing this propaganda out WHILE working ON duty as a Redwood City Police Official in the capacity as an officer? Was this Redwood City Police or San Mateo County endorsed propaganda? Furthermore, what was Dan Smith's intention, and what was the intention of his propaganda that he attempted to give to every person that he could?

Does the Redwood City Police Department make a habit of allowing their officers to follow official police procedures while on duty? Maintaining decorum, respectability, and character? OR your officers on duty free to hand out personal literature, discuss, and attempt to persuade or explain their own personal opinions (no matter how UTTERLY IGNORANT and clearly contradicted by legal proof they are), to minors, young people, their parents, adults and ANYONE at all??

As one could only have hoped (but clearly we were wrong!), that Officer Dan Smith was intelligent enough to see, hear and therefore realize that this large group of youth gathered alongside NAACP President Rev Amos Brown were there to speak out against the corrupt man who took boxing which was helping and saving their lives, away from them, by kicking them out of his gym. These youth AND their parents and their community were there to support these kids and say that boxing was SO important to them, and SUCH an important part of their lives, that when a corrupt gym owner kicked our boxing team out of his gym as retaliation, they were devastated by it. Many have been lost, and all became more distrustful and angry at a world full of those who are "supposed to help them", PAID to help them, but continue to use and betray them.

Furthermore, both Rev Brown and the kids and their parents made clear what a blessing boxing had been in the lives of their children, and what wonderful changes training with ME had made in their lives. These people were cheated out of the trainer that changed their lives- ME, and out of the sport that I was teaching them that they LOVED learning- BOXING. The last line of this ridiculous paper Officer Dan Smith handed to everyone states, "I hope you may see fit to reconsider your obvious dislike of contact sports." One might want to get a tutor to explain to Dan that I AM a PROFESSIONAL WORLD CHAMPION. I hold 9 WORLD TITLES. I have MORE knock outs than ANYONE in history. I have NO problem with contact. My kids who practice BOXING also would not be learning=2 0THIS particular sport IF they had a problem with contact either. Though I'd also clarify that I do NOT make a practice of, or condone senseless contact or unnecessary sparring in boxing, especially for children who do NOT need brain damage!

Officer Dan Smith's attitude, behavior, discussions, and defense of the man who has and is, committing illegal activity and harm against children was inappropriate, unprofessional, and extremely unacceptable. ESPECIALLY when as a representative of YOUR Redwood City Police force, Dan Smith felt it appropriate to discuss all of this with the children, youth, people, AND parents of the victims HARMED wrongfully AND illegally by Eloy Ramirez. The man Dan Smith attempted to defend to them and ALL of us!!!

We have spoken with the President of the NAACP, the Executive Board of the NAACP, and we are angry, disgusted, and offended. I am demanding an IMMEDIATE explanation from Officer Dan Smith, and an IMMEDIATE written apology to myself and my team from Dan Smith and signed by his police chief. This foolish man who defends a child abuser, and a criminal who MAKES money off of illegally using, fighting and harming children and people should NOT be defended by YOUR police officer AT a press conference held by the NAACP and Team Gatto where we are speaking of abuse caused by this man!! He should not be giving ANY opinions or defense of ANYONE while he is on duty PAID by tax payers to remain impartial, and to keep

children and people safe. We did NOT feel safe. Quite the opposite, we felt threatened, harassed, and attempted bullying and intimidation. We want answers, and we want them now! I will expect an immediate response, and without question or comment those IMMEDIATE written apologies by Dan Smith, and signed by his chief. I believe that an investigation into the practices of YOUR PAL Boxing program are in order. If YOUR PAL coach believes Eloy Ramirez is acting properly, and taking children to participate in "private shows" is appropriate, chances are he has similar practices in your OWN PAL. I will be asking for an investigation into Dan Smith's and Redwood City PAL's participation in either illegal, unsanctioned shows, or "private shows". Perhaps that may explain Dan Smith's adamant attempts to defend a man senselessly harming children and people for money and ego! My boxing team, and our community want, expect, and are demanding immediate answers!!

Ramona Gatto
9 Time World Champion
Team Gatto Boxing Club

Robert Salinas
Excitement Crew Boxing Club

Sincerely,

Ramona Gatto
9 Time World Champion
0A
Team Gatto Boxing Club

-----Original Message-----

From: Jeff Ira <Jeff@cgucpa.com>
To: PD Louis Cobarruviaz <LCobarruviaz@redwoodcity.org>; Council-Rosanne Foust <rfoust@redwoodcity.org>; GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>; Council-Diane Howard <DHoward@redwoodcity.org>; Council-Alicia Aguirre <aaguirre@redwoodcity.org>; Council-Ian Bain <ian@ianbain.org>; Council-Jim Hartnett <JHartnett@redwoodcity.org>; Council-Jeff Ira <jira@redwoodcity.org>; Council-Barbara Pierce <BPierce@redwoodcity.org>; badgirl9x@aol.com
Cc: MGR-Peter Ingram <PIngram@redwoodcity.org>; CLK-Silvia Vonderlinden <svonderlinden@redwoodcity.org>; PD Ron Matuszak <RMatuszak@redwoodcity.org>
Sent: Mon, 8 Dec 2008 10:01 am
Subject: RE: Urgent press conference in Redwood City on illegal boxing activity involving children

Thanks,
Jeff

This electronic mail message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosures under applicable law.

If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete the original and any copy of this e-mail and any printout. Thank you.

To also ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service, we inform you that any tax advice contained in this communication (including attachments) was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, by any taxpayer for the purpose of (1) avoiding tax-related penalties under the U.S. Internal Revenue Code, or (2) promoting, marketing, or recommending to another party any tax-related matters addressed herein.

From: PD Louis Cobarruviaz [mailto:LCobarruviaz@redwoodcity.org]
Sent: Monday, December 08, 2008 9:56 AM
To: Council-Rosanne Foust; GRP-City Council; Council-Diane Howard; Council-Alicia Aguirre; Council-Ian Bain; Council-Jim Hartnett; Council-Jeff Ira; Council-Barbara Pierce; badgirl9x@aol.com
Cc: MGR-Peter Ingram; CLK-Silvia Vonderlinden; PD Ron Matuszak
Subject: RE: Urgent press conference in Redwood City on illegal boxing activity involving children

Dear Mayor Foust,
I have passed this information on to PAL Sergeant Jim Stoney and to PAL Officer Dan Smith and have asked them to represent us our department at the press conference. RWC PAL does not condone the activity described by Diane Friedlaender and we will be checking to ensure that the parent of one the PAL fighters has not been involved independent of PAL. I have also asked Captain Matuszak of the Investigations Division to investigate any violations of the Penal Code and or the Welfare and Institutions Code by anyone in our jurisdiction and if appropriate to bring charges against those abusing children in that way.
Thank you,
Lou

*Louis A. Cobarruviaz, Chief of Police
Redwood City Police Department
1301 Maple Street
Redwood City< i>, CA 94063
(650) 780-7122
(650) 780-7149
lcobarruviaz@redwoodcity.org*

From: Friedlaender, Diane [mailto:dianef@stanford.edu]
Sent: Sunday, December 07, 2008 9:40 PM

To: Council-Rosanne Foust; GRP-City Council; Council-Diane Howard; Council-Alicia Aguirre; Council-Ian Bain; Council-Jim Hartnett; Council-Jeff Ira; Council-Barbara Pierce; badgirl9x@aol.com
Cc: MGR-Peter Ingram; PD Louis Cobarruviaz; CLK-Silvia Vonderlinden
Subject: RE: Urgent press conference in Redwood City on illegal boxing activity involving children

Thank you. We trust that there will be some city representation at this press conference.

Diane Friedlaender

From: Council-Rosanne Foust [mailto:rfoust@redwoodcity.org]
Sent: Sunday, December 07, 2008 9:33 PM
To: Friedlaender, Diane; GRP-City Council; Council-Diane Howard; Council-Alicia Aguirre; Council-Ian Bain; Council-Jim Hartnett; Council-Jeff Ira; Council-Barbara Pierce
Cc: MGR-Peter Ingram; PD Louis Cobarruviaz; CLK-Silvia Vonderlinden
Subject: RE: Urgent press confere nce in Redwood City on illegal boxing activity involving children

Dear Diane and Ken:

Thank you for the email. I am not able to attend but am passing it along to both our Police Chief and City Manager.

Best Regards, Rosanne

Rosanne Foust
Mayor
City of Redwood City, California

Voice:

Fax:

Email:

Web:

Street:

Subscribe to receive Redwood City E-News, news releases, or other documents via email!

Click here to register/subscribe (www.redwoodcity.org/egov)

Listen to 350+ music, sports, & news radio stations – including songs for the holidays – FREE while you browse. [Start Listening Now!](#)

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2008 DEC 15 AM 11:33

BY SW

File # 081432
Sup Campos
C. Sup Maxwell, Sup Peskin
Attn
JK
Joy

Mr. and Mrs. William Terry Elliott

Subject: Appeal Regarding
2655 Scott, File No. 081432,
Hearing on Dec. 16, 2008

December 12, 2008

Aaron Peskin, President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, California 94102

Dear Members of the Board,

We live directly across the street from the proposed project at 2655 Scott Street. We object to the proposed extension, as its visibility from the street is not desirable and will only encourage encroachments that are not consistent with the goals of the Cow Hollow Association Guidelines. This building is part of an Architecturally Significant grouping was designed to respect the Scott Street slope and the beauty of Normandy Terrace. Any modifications to this area with historical importance should be scrutinized and kept to a desired minimum.

We are asking that the Board of Supervisors reject the proposal or push it back from the street. A number of members of the planning commission voted for a modification with the front sitting room eliminated.

Thank you for your consideration and your support would be greatly appreciated, as we all want our beautiful city to retain its magnificence created by its unique location on rolling hills.

Sincerely,

Pam Elliott
Terry Elliott
Pam and Terry Elliott

80

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

c: BOS, ac, cpage
OFFICE OF THE TREASURER



RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2008 DEC 18 PM 3:47

BY SW

José Cisneros
TREASURER

PAULINE MARX
Chief Assistant Treasurer

Newlin-Rankin
Chief Investment Officer

December 12, 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

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 November 30, 2008:

	Pooled	All
Interest Received	\$40,191,256	\$41,913,061
Total Net Earnings	\$34,486,357	\$35,090,107
Earned Income Yield	2.838%	2.857%
Average Age of Portfolio	260 Days	260 Days

Total cost of the securities on hand as of November 30, 2008 was \$2,747,660,473 with a market value of \$2,756,794,558 plus fixed assets accrued interests of 2,917,8240. The earned income yield for the month of November 2008 is 2.857%.

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 November 30, 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, T. Rydstrom, P. Marx
Transportation Authority – David Murray, San Francisco Public Library – 2 copies
Office Copy

81

(FS/ERNFS)

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

PORTFOLIO STATISTICS
 7/01/08 THROUGH 11/30/08

ALL FUNDS

PAGE: 1
 RUN: 12/04/08 10:44:20

	----- GOV'T SECURITIES -----		----- TIME DEPOSITS -----		
	ASSETS	LIABILITIES	ASSETS	LIABILITIES	TOTAL
TOTAL INCOME RECEIVED IN THIS PERIOD:	41,436,481.75	.00	476,579.47	N/A	41,913,061.22
TOTAL NET EARNINGS THIS PERIOD:	34,590,234.36	.00	499,872.66	N/A	35,090,107.02
AVERAGE DAILY PORTFOLIO BALANCE:	2,892,957,448.13	.00	36,997,385.62	N/A	2,929,954,833.75
EARNED INCOME YIELD THIS PERIOD:	2.852	.000	3.223	N/A	2.857
END OF PERIOD PORTFOLIO BALANCE:	2,707,460,472.85	.00	40,200,000.00	N/A	2,747,660,472.85
CURRENT AMORTIZED BOOK VALUE:	2,704,988,279.27	.00	40,200,000.00	N/A	2,745,188,279.27
WEIGHTED AVERAGE YIELD AT END OF PERIOD:	2.747	.000	3.203	N/A	2.753
WEIGHTED AVERAGE DAYS TO MATURITY:	260.44	.00	64.34	N/A	N/A
WEIGHTED AVERAGE DAYS TO CALL:	260.44	.00	64.34	N/A	N/A
NET PORTFOLIO YIELD, 365-DAY BASIS:					2.857

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

PORTFOLIO STATISTICS
 7/01/08 THROUGH 11/30/08

FUND: 100 POOLED FUNDS

PAGE: 1
 RUN: 12/04/08 10:44:19

	----- GOV'T SECURITIES -----		----- TIME DEPOSITS -----		TOTAL
	ASSETS	LIABILITIES	ASSETS	LIABILITIES	
TOTAL INCOME RECEIVED IN THIS PERIOD:	39,714,676.19	.00	476,579.47	N/A	40,191,255.66
TOTAL NET EARNINGS THIS PERIOD:	33,986,484.36	.00	499,872.66	N/A	34,486,357.02
AVERAGE DAILY PORTFOLIO BALANCE:	2,862,075,095.18	.00	36,997,385.62	N/A	2,899,072,480.81
EARNED INCOME YIELD THIS PERIOD:	2.833	.000	3.223	N/A	2.838
END OF PERIOD PORTFOLIO BALANCE:	2,707,460,472.85	.00	40,200,000.00	N/A	2,747,660,472.85
CURRENT AMORTIZED BOOK VALUE:	2,704,988,279.27	.00	40,200,000.00	N/A	2,745,188,279.27
WEIGHTED AVERAGE YIELD AT END OF PERIOD:	2.747	.000	3.203	N/A	2.753
WEIGHTED AVERAGE DAYS TO MATURITY:	260.44	.00	64.34	N/A	N/A
WEIGHTED AVERAGE DAYS TO CALL:	260.44	.00	64.34	N/A	N/A
NET PORTFOLIO YIELD, 365-DAY BASIS:					2.838

(PS/ERNFS)

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

PORTFOLIO STATISTICS
 7/01/08 THROUGH 11/30/08

FUND: 9702 SFUSD TRANS 07-08

PAGE: 1
 RUN: 12/04/08 10:44:20

	----- GOV'T SECURITIES -----		----- TIME DEPOSITS -----		
	ASSETS	LIABILITIES	ASSETS	LIABILITIES	TOTAL
TOTAL INCOME RECEIVED IN THIS PERIOD:	1,721,805.56	.00	.00	.00	1,721,805.56
TOTAL NET EARNINGS THIS PERIOD:	603,750.00	.00	.00	.00	603,750.00
AVERAGE DAILY PORTFOLIO BALANCE:	30,882,352.94	.00	.00	.00	30,882,352.94
EARNED INCOME YIELD THIS PERIOD:	4.664	.000	.000	.000	4.664
END OF PERIOD PORTFOLIO BALANCE:	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
CURRENT AMORTIZED BOOK VALUE:	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
WEIGHTED AVERAGE YIELD AT END OF PERIOD:	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
WEIGHTED AVERAGE DAYS TO MATURITY:	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
WEIGHTED AVERAGE DAYS TO CALL:	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
NET PORTFOLIO YIELD, 365-DAY BASIS:					4.664

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

PORTFOLIO STATISTICS
11/01/08 THROUGH 11/30/08
ALL FUNDS

PAGE: 1
RUN: 12/04/08 10:43:55

	GOV'T SECURITIES		TIME DEPOSITS		TOTAL
	ASSETS	LIABILITIES	ASSETS	LIABILITIES	
TOTAL INCOME RECEIVED IN THIS PERIOD:	9,348,594.43	.00	94,310.09	N/A	9,442,904.52
TOTAL NET EARNINGS THIS PERIOD:	6,713,634.99	.00	105,838.91	N/A	6,819,473.90
AVERAGE DAILY PORTFOLIO BALANCE:	2,767,556,349.96	.00	40,200,000.00	N/A	2,807,756,349.96
EARNED INCOME YIELD THIS PERIOD:	2.951	.000	3.203	N/A	2.955
END OF PERIOD PORTFOLIO BALANCE:	2,707,460,472.85	.00	40,200,000.00	N/A	2,747,660,472.85
CURRENT AMORTIZED BOOK VALUE:	2,704,988,279.27	.00	40,200,000.00	N/A	2,745,188,279.27
WEIGHTED AVERAGE YIELD AT END OF PERIOD:	2.811	.000	3.203	N/A	2.816
WEIGHTED AVERAGE DAYS TO MATURITY:	260.44	.00	64.34	N/A	N/A
WEIGHTED AVERAGE DAYS TO CALL:	260.44	.00	64.34	N/A	N/A
NET PORTFOLIO YIELD, 365-DAY BASIS:					2.955

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

PORTFOLIO STATISTICS
11/01/08 THROUGH 11/30/08

PAGE: 1
RUN: 12/04/08 10:43:54

FUND: 100 HOLED FUNDS

	GOV'T SECURITIES		TIME DEPOSITS		TOTAL
	ASSETS	LIABILITIES	ASSETS	LIABILITIES	
TOTAL INCOME RECEIVED IN THIS PERIOD:	7,626,788.87	.00	94,310.09	N/A	7,721,098.96
TOTAL NET EARNINGS THIS PERIOD:	6,659,968.32	.00	105,838.91	N/A	6,765,807.23
AVERAGE DAILY PORTFOLIO BALANCE:	2,753,556,349.96	.00	40,200,000.00	N/A	2,793,756,349.96
EARNED INCOME YIELD THIS PERIOD:	2.943	.000	3.203	N/A	2.946
END OF PERIOD PORTFOLIO BALANCE:	2,707,460,472.85	.00	40,200,000.00	N/A	2,747,660,472.85
CURRENT AMORTIZED BOOK VALUE:	2,704,988,279.27	.00	40,200,000.00	N/A	2,745,188,279.27
WEIGHTED AVERAGE YIELD AT END OF PERIOD:	2.811	.000	3.203	N/A	2.816
WEIGHTED AVERAGE DAYS TO MATURITY:	260.44	.00	64.34	N/A	N/A
WEIGHTED AVERAGE DAYS TO CALL:	260.44	.00	64.34	N/A	N/A
NET PORTFOLIO YIELD, 365-DAY BASIS:					2.946

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

PORTFOLIO STATISTICS
11/01/08 THROUGH 11/30/08

FUND: 9702 SFUSD TRANS 07-08

PAGE: 1
RUN: 12/04/08 10:43:55

	GOV'T SECURITIES		TIME DEPOSITS		TOTAL
	ASSETS	LIABILITIES	ASSETS	LIABILITIES	
TOTAL INCOME RECEIVED IN THIS PERIOD:	1,721,805.56	.00	.00	.00	1,721,805.56
TOTAL NET EARNINGS THIS PERIOD:	53,666.67	.00	.00	.00	53,666.67
AVERAGE DAILY PORTFOLIO BALANCE:	14,000,000.00	.00	.00	.00	14,000,000.00
EARNED INCOME YIELD THIS PERIOD:	4.664	.000	.000	N/A	4.664
END OF PERIOD PORTFOLIO BALANCE:	.00	.00	.00	N/A	.00
CURRENT AMORTIZED BOOK VALUE:	.00	.00	.00	N/A	.00
WEIGHTED AVERAGE YIELD AT END OF PERIOD:	.000	.000	.000	N/A	.000
WEIGHTED AVERAGE DAYS TO MATURITY:	.00	.00	.00	N/A	N/A
WEIGHTED AVERAGE DAYS TO CALL:	.00	.00	.00	N/A	N/A
NET PORTFOLIO YIELD, 365-DAY BASIS:					4.664

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
 M R. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487 AH

INVESTMENT MATURITY DISTRIBUTION
 AS OF 11/30/08
 RUN: 12/04/08 10:30:17
 PAGE: 1

ALL FUNDS

CALL/MATURITY	DATE RANGE	NO OF INV	COST	%	CUM %
1 TO 2 MONTHS	12/01/08-01/31/09	25	836,002,902.70	30.4	30.4
2 TO 3 MONTHS	02/01/09-02/28/09	4	158,153,669.44	5.8	36.2
3 TO 4 MONTHS	03/01/09-03/31/09	8	398,976,663.26	14.5	50.7
4 TO 5 MONTHS	04/01/09-04/30/09	2	69,681,966.67	2.5	53.2
5 TO 6 MONTHS	05/01/09-05/31/09	2	15,176,953.13	.6	53.8
6 TO 12 MONTHS	06/01/09-11/30/09	22	786,916,441.54	28.6	82.4
12 TO 18 MONTHS	12/01/09-05/31/10	5	184,815,477.76	6.7	89.2
18 TO 24 MONTHS	06/01/10-11/30/10	3	108,880,958.00	4.0	93.1
24 TO 36 MONTHS	12/01/10-11/30/11	4	108,142,940.35	3.9	97.1
36 TO 48 MONTHS	12/01/11-11/30/12	0		.0	97.1
48 TO 60 MONTHS	12/01/12-11/30/13	2	80,912,500.00	2.9	100.0
60 TO 72 MONTHS	12/01/13-11/30/14	0		.0	100.0
72 TO 84 MONTHS	12/01/14-11/30/15	0		.0	100.0
84 TO 120 MONTHS	12/01/15-11/30/18	0		.0	100.0
120 TO *** MONTHS	12/01/18-	0		.0	100.0
GRAND TOTALS		77	2,747,660,472.85		

Total number of funds represented: 1

(SHEET)

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
 MR. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487
 INVESTMENT ADVISOR
 INVESTMENTS OUTSTANDING AS OF 11/30/08
 MAJOR SORT KEY IS ICC#
 SETTLEMENT DATE BASIS

PAGE: 1
 RUN: 12/04/08 10:30:13

SUMMARY DESCRIPTION	CUPI	TRDNG	BOOK	PAR	BOOK	
	RATE	YIELD	PRICE	SHARES	VALUE	
(Inv Type) 11 TREASURY BILLS	7.93%(C)	1.369	1.383	99.007	220,000,000.00	217,816,438.89
(Inv Type) 12 TREASURY NOTES	11.87%(C)	3.352	1.976	101.906	320,100,000.00	326,201,871.16
(Inv Type) 22 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK	9.26%(C)	3.665	3.390	100.848	252,250,000.00	254,388,224.37
(Inv Type) 23 FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSN.	1.22%(C)	4.300	3.605	101.086	33,150,000.00	33,510,009.00
(Inv Type) 28 FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	3.08%(C)	2.832	3.035	99.772	84,700,000.00	84,507,215.98
(Inv Type) 30 FHLMC Bonds	3.90%(C)	4.541	3.801	102.016	104,950,000.00	107,065,958.00
(Inv Type) 31 FHLB FLOATER QTR ACT-360	20.00%(C)	2.710	2.746	99.996	549,500,000.00	549,476,468.00
(Inv Type) 33 FFCB FLOATER QTR ACT-360	1.82%(C)	2.020	2.020	100.000	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00
(Inv Type) 35 FHLB FLOATER MONTHLY	.91%(C)	1.351	1.351	100.000	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00
(Inv Type) 36 FHLMC FLOATER MO ACT-360	2.49%(C)	1.394	1.328	100.055	68,500,000.00	68,537,476.35
(Inv Type) 41 FIMA DISCOUNT NOTES	6.47%(C)	2.653	2.685	98.824	180,000,000.00	177,882,808.33
(Inv Type) 42 FARM CREDIT DISCOUNT NOTES	1.70%(C)	2.350	2.362	99.491	47,000,000.00	46,760,691.67
(Inv Type) 43 FEDERAL HOME LOAN DISC NOTES	1.80%(C)	2.440	2.468	98.861	50,000,000.00	49,430,666.66
(Inv Type) 44 FMC DISCOUNT NOTES	6.48%(C)	2.783	2.815	98.890	180,000,000.00	178,001,972.23
(Inv Type) 81 COMMERCIAL PAPER DISC	17.43%(C)	2.961	2.999	98.738	485,000,000.00	478,880,672.21
(Inv Type) 82 COMMERCIAL PAPER INT BEARING	1.27%(C)	3.370	3.370	100.000	35,000,000.00	35,000,000.00
(Inv Type) 91 NEGOTIABLE C.D.'S	.91%(C)	4.280	4.280	100.000	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00
(Inv Type) 1010 PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT	.19%(C)	2.738	2.738	100.000	5,200,000.00	5,200,000.00
(Inv Type) 1011 PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT MONTHLY	1.27%(C)	3.221	3.221	100.000	35,000,000.00	35,000,000.00
REPORT TOTALS		2.868	2.666	99.902	2,750,350,000.00	2,747,660,472.85
ASSETS						
FIXED						

INVSMT NO.	DESCRIPTION	CUSIP	FUND NO.	MATURITY (TICKER)	PURCHASE DATE	SAF/PURP	CURR RATE	TRDNG YIELD	BOOK PRICE	PAR VALUE	SHARES	BOOK VALUE
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	
A 42098	T BILL	912795L58	100	04/23/09	10/31/08	000	.940	.944	99.546	50,000,000.00	49,772,833.34	
A 42099	T BILL	912795L58	100	04/23/09	10/31/08	000	.940	.944	99.546	20,000,000.00	19,909,133.33	
A 42094	T BILL	912795S44	100	10/22/09	10/29/08	000	1.480	1.502	98.528	50,000,000.00	49,264,111.11	
A 42095	T BILL	912795S44	100	10/22/09	10/29/08	000	1.480	1.502	98.528	50,000,000.00	49,264,111.11	
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 11 TREASURY BILLS 7.93%(C) 1.369 1.383 99.007 220,000,000.00 217,816,438.89												

A 41662	T. NOTE (99.19)	912828G80	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	912828G18	100	03/31/09	04/09/08	000	4.500	1.682	102.715	50,000,000.00	51,357,421.90
A 42013	T NOTE	912828G18	100	03/31/09	04/09/08	000	4.500	1.682	102.715	50,000,000.00	51,357,421.90
A 41870	T NOTE	912828F85	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	912828G71	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	912828G70	100	07/31/09	10/23/07	000	4.625	3.674	101.285	5,100,000.00	5,165,542.97
A 41993	T NOTE	912828H52	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	912828H52	100	02/28/10	03/31/08	000	2.000	1.677	100.605	50,000,000.00	50,302,734.38
A 42096	T NOTE	912828J75	100	06/30/10	10/31/08	000	2.875	1.459	103.281	50,000,000.00	51,640,625.00
A 42097	T NOTE	912828J75	100	06/30/10	10/31/08	000	2.875	1.459	103.281	30,000,000.00	30,984,375.00
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 12 TREASURY NOTES 11.87%(C) 3.352 1.976 101.906 320,100,000.00 326,201,871.16											

A 42090	F H L B	3133XSC48	100	10/02/09	10/02/08	000	3.400	3.400	100.000	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00
A 42091	F H L B	3133XSC48	100	10/02/09	10/02/08	000	3.400	3.400	100.000	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00
A 42092	F H L B	3133XSC48	100	10/02/09	10/02/08	000	3.400	3.400	100.000	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00
A 42093	F H L B	3133XSP4	100	10/23/09	10/27/08	000	3.125	3.125	100.000	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00
A 42104	F H L B	3133XPM49	100	12/10/10	11/18/08	000	3.875	2.867	103.638	20,000,000.00	20,727,622.22
A 42106	F N M A	3135NMF81	100	02/07/11	11/20/08	000	5.050	3.375	104.984	27,250,000.00	28,608,102.15
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 9.26%(C) 3.665 3.390 100.848 252,250,000.00 254,388,224.37											

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 1.22%(C) 4.300 3.605 101.086 33,150,000.00 33,510,009.00											
A 41986	FEDERAL PARM CREDIT BANK	3133IYTL8	100	03/18/10	03/18/08	000	3.120	3.120	100.000	25,700,000.00	25,700,000.00
A 42105	F F C B	3133IYUD0	100	02/14/11	11/19/08	000	2.875	3.203	100.054	19,000,000.00	19,010,199.31
A 42102	F F C B	3133IYG46	100	04/21/11	11/10/08	000	2.625	2.900	99.493	40,000,000.00	39,797,016.67
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 28 FEDERAL PARM CREDIT BANK 3.08%(C) 2.832 3.035 99.772 84,700,000.00 84,507,215.98											

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
---------	-----------	-----------	-----	----------	----------	-----	-------	-------	---------	---------------	---------------

INVSMT NO.	DESCRIPTION	CUSIP	FUND NO.	MATURITY (TICKER)	PURCHASE DATE	SAF/P	PERP	CURR RATE	TRDNG YIELD	BOOK PRICE	PAR VALUE	SHARES	BOOK VALUE
A 42103	F H L M C	3137EAA7	100	08/23/10	11/17/08	000	000	5.125	2.884	105.024	25,000,000.00	26,255,958.00	
A 41973	FEDERAL HOME LN MTG CORP 3128X6VZ6		100	12/19/12	02/15/08	000	000	5.000	4.598	101.720	50,000,000.00	50,860,000.00	
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 30 PHMFC Bonds								4.541	3.801	102.016	104,950,000.00	107,065,958.00	
A 42016	F H L B FLOATER	3133XNKA2	100	01/08/09	04/18/08	000	000	4.085	4.267	99.955	50,000,000.00	49,977,500.00	
A 42018	F H L B FLOATER	3133XNKB9	100	01/14/09	04/21/08	000	000	4.615	4.798	99.955	50,000,000.00	49,977,358.00	
A 42019	F H L B FLOATER	3133XNKB9	100	01/14/09	04/21/08	000	000	4.615	4.798	99.955	30,000,000.00	29,986,410.00	
A 42020	PHLB FLOATER QTR	3133XPAY0	100	01/28/09	01/25/08	000	000	3.346	3.346	100.000	15,000,000.00	15,000,000.00	
A 42021	PHLB FLOATER QTR	3133XPAY0	100	01/28/09	01/25/08	000	000	3.346	3.346	100.000	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	
A 41915	F H L B FLOATER	3133XNPF1	100	11/23/09	12/07/07	000	000	1.968	1.999	99.969	50,000,000.00	49,984,700.00	
A 41924	F H L B FLOATER	3133XNPF1	100	11/23/09	12/28/07	000	000	1.968	1.998	100.050	50,000,000.00	50,010,900.00	
A 41937	F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT	3133XNPF1	100	11/23/09	01/09/08	000	000	1.968	1.948	100.020	50,000,000.00	50,010,000.00	
A 41938	F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT	3133XNPF1	100	11/23/09	01/09/08	000	000	1.968	1.948	100.020	4,500,000.00	4,500,900.00	
A 41939	F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT	3133XNPF1	100	11/23/09	01/09/08	000	000	1.968	1.948	100.020	50,000,000.00	50,010,000.00	
A 41940	F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT	3133XNPF1	100	11/23/09	01/09/08	000	000	1.968	1.948	100.020	50,000,000.00	50,010,000.00	
A 41941	F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT	3133XNPF1	100	11/23/09	01/09/08	000	000	1.968	1.948	100.020	50,000,000.00	50,010,000.00	
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 31 PHLB FLOATER QTR ACT-360								2.710	2.746	99.996	549,500,000.00	549,476,468.00	
A 42065	PRCB FLOATER QTR	31331YKX3	100	10/26/09	08/26/08	000	000	2.020	2.020	100.000	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 33 PRCB FLOATER QTR ACT-360								2.020	2.020	100.000	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	
A 42076	F H L B FLOATER MONTHLY	3133XRRZ8	100	12/28/09	09/18/08	000	000	1.351	1.351	100.000	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 35 PHLB FLOATER MONTHLY								1.351	1.351	100.000	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	
A 42100	F H L M FLOATER MONTHLY	3128X7CN2	100	09/21/09	09/22/08	000	000	1.394	1.328	100.055	18,500,000.00	18,510,121.35	
A 42101	F H L M FLOATER MONTHLY	3128X7CN2	100	09/21/09	09/22/08	000	000	1.394	1.328	100.055	50,000,000.00	50,027,355.00	
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 36 PHMFC FLOATER MO ACT-360								1.394	1.328	100.055	68,500,000.00	68,537,476.35	
A 42061	F N M A	313589BV4	100	02/13/09	08/28/08	000	000	2.790	2.827	98.690	50,000,000.00	49,345,125.00	
A 42068	F N M A	313589BV4	100	02/13/09	09/02/08	000	000	2.770	2.805	98.738	30,000,000.00	29,621,433.33	
A 42088	FNMA DISCOUNT NOTES	313589DD2	100	03/17/09	10/15/08	000	000	2.550	2.578	98.916	50,000,000.00	49,458,125.00	
A 42089	FNMA DISCOUNT NOTES	313589DD2	100	03/17/09	10/15/08	000	000	2.550	2.578	98.916	50,000,000.00	49,458,125.00	
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 41 FNMA DISCOUNT NOTES								2.653	2.665	98.824	180,000,000.00	177,882,808.33	
A 42087	FARMER MAC DISCOUNT	313151AF5	100	01/06/09	10/20/08	000	000	2.350	2.362	99.491	47,000,000.00	46,760,691.67	

INVSMT NO.	DESCRIPTION	CUSIP	FUND NO.	MATURITY (TICKER)	PURCHASER DATE	SAV/PRP	CUPN RATE	TRDNG YIELD	BOOK PRICE	PAR VALUE	SHARES	BOOK VALUE
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 42 PARM CREDIT DISCOUNT NOTES 1.70%(C)												
A 42042	F H L B DISCOUNT				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 1.80%(C)												
A 42085	FREDDIE DISCOUNT	313397BR6			100 02/03/09 10/02/08	000	2.950	2.980	98.984	30,000,000.00		29,695,166.66
A 42086	FREDDIE DISCOUNT	313397BR6			100 02/03/09 10/02/08	000	2.950	2.980	98.984	50,000,000.00		49,491,944.45
A 42082	FREDDIE DISCOUNT	313397C22			100 03/13/09 10/03/08	000	2.650	2.682	98.815	50,000,000.00		49,407,430.56
A 42083	FREDDIE DISCOUNT	313397C22			100 03/13/09 10/03/08	000	2.650	2.682	98.815	50,000,000.00		49,407,430.56
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 44 FMC DISCOUNT NOTES 6.48%(C)												
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	94978DM90			100 12/09/08 08/28/08	000	2.680	2.701	99.233	20,000,000.00		19,846,644.44
A 42075	UNION BANK C P	90485JM91			100 12/09/08 09/26/08	000	3.640	3.667	99.252	25,000,000.00		24,812,944.44
A 42048	ING C P	44978DM90			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	44978DM90			100 12/23/08 07/22/08	000	2.890	2.926	98.764	25,000,000.00		24,690,930.56
A 42054	Comerzbank GP	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 42070	BANK OF SCOTLAND C P	06478GN67			100 01/06/09 09/03/08	000	2.915	2.945	98.988	50,000,000.00		49,493,923.61
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
A 42066	BANK OF AMERICA C P	0660P0Q30			100 03/03/09 09/05/08	000	2.955	2.999	98.531	50,000,000.00		49,265,354.17
A 42067	BANK OF AMERICA C P	0660P0Q30			100 03/03/09 09/05/08	000	2.955	2.999	98.531	50,000,000.00		49,265,354.17
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 81 COMMERCIAL PAPER DISC 17.43%(C)												
A 42069	WELLS FARGO C P	94978DVH8			100 12/09/08 09/29/08	000	3.370	3.370	100.000	35,000,000.00		35,000,000.00
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 82 COMMERCIAL PAPER INT BEARING 1.27%(C)												
A 42084	CITIGROUP N C D	1730DIK60			100 01/06/09 10/06/08	000	4.280	4.280	100.000	25,000,000.00		25,000,000.00
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 91 NEGOTIABLE C.D.'S 91%(C)												
A 42044	MISSION NATIONAL BANK FU				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
A 42107	MISSION AREA CREDIT UNTO				100 11/03/09 11/03/08	000	1.000	1.000	100.000	100,000.00		100,000.00

INVSMT NO.	DESCRIPTION	CUSIP	FUND NO.	MATURITY (TICKER)	PURCHASE DATE	SAF/PURP	CCYR RATE	TRDNG YIELD	BOOK PRICE	PAR VALUE	SHARES	BOOK VALUE
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 1010 PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT .19%(C)												
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 1.27%(C)												
REPORT TOTALS												
ASSETS												
FIXED												
2.868 2.666 99.902 2,750,350,000.00 2,747,660,472.85												

(SHEET)

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
 M R. NEWLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487
 INVESTMENT INVENTORRY
 INVESTMENTS OUTSTANDING AS OF 11/30/08
 MAJOR SORT KEY IS BANK
 SETTLEMENT DATE BASIS

PAGE: 1
 RUN: 12/04/08 10:30:13

INVEST NO.	DESCRIPTION	CUSIP	FUND NO.	MATURITY (TICKER)	PURCHASE DATE	SAP/PURP	CUM RATE	TRNG YIELD	BOOK PRICE	PAR VALUE	SHARES	BOOK VALUE			
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	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	5,000,000.00			
A 42107	MISSION AREA CREDIT UNIO		100	11/03/09	11/03/08	000	1.000	1.000	100.000	100,000.00	100,000.00	100,000.00			
SUBTOTAL (Bank) 19 BANK OF NEW YORK											2,738	2,738	100,000	5,200,000.00	5,200,000.00
REPORT TOTALS											2,738	2,738	100,000	5,200,000.00	5,200,000.00
ASSETS											2,738	2,738	100,000	5,200,000.00	5,200,000.00

INVEST NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	PURCHASE MATURITY DATE	CUSIP	BANK BROK	FUND SAVE	CPN RATE	YTM TR	PAR	SHARES	MARKET PRICE	MARKET VALUE	CURR ACCT INT	UNREALIZED GAIN
A 42064 T BILL	08/20/08 01/29/09	912795J93	19	100	1.7500	50,000	000.00	50,000	000.00	50,000,000.00	250,347.22	143,402.78	
A 42098 T BILL	10/31/08 04/23/09	912795L58	52	000	1.7639	49,606	250.00	100,000	000.00	49,938,362.07	40,472.22	125,056.51	
A 42099 T BILL	10/31/08 04/23/09	912795L58	54	000	.9443	49,772	833.34	99,876	243,793	19,975,344.83	16,188.89	50,022.61	
A 42094 T BILL	10/29/08 10/22/09	912795S44	54	000	1.4800	50,000	000.00	49,580	705.28	49,580,705.28	67,833.33	248,760.84	
A 42095 T BILL	10/29/08 10/22/09	912795S44	54	000	1.5021	49,264	111.11	99,163	410,550	49,580,705.28	67,833.33	248,760.84	

SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 11 TREASURY BILLS 7.95%(M) 1.3687 220,000 000.00 219,075,117.46 442,674.99 816,003.58

A 41662 T. NOTE (99.19)	06/08/07 12/31/08	912828GB0	19	100	4.7500	20,000	000.00	20,075,000.00	397,554.35	160,937.50		
A 42003 T NOTE	04/09/08 03/31/09	912828GL8	19	100	4.5000	50,000	000.00	50,703,125.00	383,241.76	-654,296.90		
A 42013 T NOTE	04/09/08 03/31/09	912828GL8	19	100	4.5000	50,000	000.00	50,703,125.00	383,241.76	-654,296.90		
A 41870 T NOTE	10/26/07 05/15/09	912828BES	19	100	4.8750	5,080	468.75	101,968	750,000	10,209,375.00	1,339.29	112,890.62
A 41841 T NOTE	10/16/07 05/31/09	912828GTL	19	100	4.8750	5,080	468.75	101,968	750,000	10,209,375.00	1,339.29	112,890.62
A 41862 T NOTE	10/23/07 07/31/09	912828GY0	19	100	4.6250	5,100	000.00	5,229,093.75	78,838.65	63,550.78		
A 41993 T NOTE	03/31/08 02/28/10	912828HRS2	19	100	2.0000	50,000	000.00	50,828,125.00	254,143.65	525,390.62		
A 41994 T NOTE	03/31/08 02/28/10	912828HRS2	19	100	1.6772	50,302	734.38	101,656	250,000	51,578,125.00	254,143.65	525,390.62
A 42096 T NOTE	10/31/08 06/30/10	912828JCS	19	100	1.4553	51,640	625.00	103,156	250,000	30,946,875.00	360,937.50	250,781.25
A 42097 T NOTE	10/31/08 06/30/10	912828JCS	19	100	1.4553	30,984	375.00	103,156	250,000	30,946,875.00	360,937.50	250,781.25

SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 12 TREASURY NOTES 11.83%(M) 3.3532 320,100 000.00 326,199,406.25 2,725,776.59 2,074,878.89

A 42090 F H L B	10/02/08 10/02/09	3133XSC48	19	100	3.4000	50,000	000.00	50,078,125.00	278,611.11	78,125.00
A 42091 F H L B	10/02/08 10/02/09	3133XSC48	19	100	3.4000	50,000	000.00	50,078,125.00	278,611.11	78,125.00
A 42092 F H L B	10/02/08 10/02/09	3133XSC48	19	100	3.4000	25,000	000.00	25,039,062.50	139,305.56	39,062.50
A 42093 F H L B	10/27/08 10/23/09	3133XSC48	19	100	3.1250	50,000	000.00	50,140,625.00	147,569.44	140,625.00

SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 11.83%(M) 1.9771 326,201 871.16 101,905,469,000 -1,308,593.80

INVEST NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	PURCHASE DATE	MATURITY DATE	CUSIP	BANK BROK	FUND NAME	CEN RATE	YTM TR	PAR/SHARES	BOOK	MARKET PRICE	MARKET VALUE	CORR ACQR	INT UNREALIZED	GAIN	LOSS
A 42104	F H L B	11/18/08	12/10/10	3133XRM49	19	100	3.8750		20,000	000.00	20,506,250.00	355,208.33	SUNGARD	105,850.00		
A 42106	F N M A	11/20/08	02/07/11	31359MR81	19	100	5.0500		27,250	000.00	28,663,593.75	435,772.91	SUNGARD	449,216.25		
A 41950	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	01/31/08	01/28/13	3133XP478	19	100	4.2000		38,608	102.15	105,187,500,000	430,500.00	SUNGARD	50,625.00		
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type)		22 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK		9.244 (M)		3.6623		252,250,000.00	254,608,906.25	2,065,578.46	941,628.75					
A 42033	FEDERAL NATL MTG ASSN	05/08/08	12/24/09	31398AKU5	19	100	4.3000		33,150	000.00	33,212,156.25	621,654.58	SUNGARD	-297,852.75		
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type)		23 FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTG		1.204 (M)		4.3000		33,150,000.00	33,212,156.25	621,654.58	-297,852.75					
A 41986	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	03/18/08	03/18/10	31331YYL8	19	100	3.1200		25,700	000.00	100,031,250,000	162,595.33	SUNGARD	8,031.25		
A 42105	F F C B	11/19/08	02/14/11	31331YDD0	19	100	2.8750		19,000	000.00	19,124,687.50	162,357.64	SUNGARD	258,637.50		
A 42102	F F CB	11/10/08	04/21/11	31331YG46	19	100	2.6250		40,000	000.00	40,025,000.00	116,666.67	SUNGARD	283,400.00		
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type)		28 FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BAN		3.084 (M)		2.8318		84,700,000.00	84,857,718.75	441,619.64	550,068.75					
A 42045	F H L M C	07/14/08	07/14/09	3128XTN91	19	100	3.2500		29,950	000.00	30,024,875.00	370,423.26	SUNGARD	74,875.00		
A 42103	F H L M C	11/17/08	08/23/10	31378AAX7	19	100	5.1250		25,000	000.00	26,242,187.50	348,784.39	SUNGARD	285,187.50		
A 41973	FEDERAL HOME IN MTG CORP BONDS	02/15/08	12/19/12	3128XGVZ6	19	100	5.0000		50,000	000.00	50,062,500.00	1,125,000.00	SUNGARD	-797,500.00		
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type)		30 FHLMC Bonds		3.864 (M)		4.5395		104,950,000.00	106,329,562.50	1,844,207.65	360,062.50					
A 42016	F H L B FLOATER	04/18/08	01/08/09	3133XKKA2	19	100	4.0890		49,977	500.00	100,187,500,000	306,675.00	SUNGARD	116,250.00		
A 42018	F H L B FLOATER	04/21/08	01/14/09	3133XNYB9	19	100	4.6190		50,000	000.00	50,140,625.00	307,933.33	SUNGARD	163,267.00		
A 42019	F H L B FLOATER	04/21/08	01/14/09	3133XNYB9	19	100	4.7984		49,977	358.00	100,281,250,000	184,760.00	SUNGARD	97,965.00		
A 42020	FHLB FLOATER QTR	01/25/08	01/26/09	3133XPAY0	19	100	3.3460		15,000	000.00	15,023,437.50	47,401.67	SUNGARD	23,437.50		

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

(REPORT)
INVESTMENTS OUTSTANDING AS OF 11/30/08
MAJOR SORT KEY IS ICC#

INVEST NUMBER	DESCRIPTION PURCHASE MATURITY DATE	CUSIP	BANK BROK	FUND SAVE	CEN RATE YTM TR	PAR	SHARES BOOK	MARKET VALUE MARKET PRICE	CORR ACCR INT PRICE SOURCE	UNREALIZED GAIN/LOSS
A 42021	PHLB FLOATER QTR 01/25/08 01/28/09	3133XPAY0	19	100	3.3460	50,000	000.00	50,078,125.00	158,005.56	78,125.00
A 41915	F H L B FLOATER 12/07/07 11/23/09	3133XNPF1	19	100	1.9980	50,000	000.00	49,859,375.00	21,866.67	-125,325.00
A 41916	F H L B FLOATER 12/07/07 11/23/09	3133XNPF1	19	100	1.9980	50,000	000.00	49,859,375.00	21,866.67	-125,325.00
A 41924	F H L B FLOATER 12/28/07 11/23/09	3133XNPF1	19	100	1.9980	49,984	700.00	99,718,750,000.00	21,866.67	-165,525.00
A 41937	F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT 360 01/09/08 11/23/09	3133XNPF1	19	100	1.9680	50,000	000.00	49,859,375.00	21,866.67	-150,625.00
A 41938	F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT 360 01/09/08 11/23/09	3133XNPF1	19	100	1.9680	50,000	000.00	49,859,375.00	21,866.67	-150,625.00
A 41939	F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT 360 01/09/08 11/23/09	3133XNPF1	19	100	1.9680	50,000	000.00	49,859,375.00	21,866.67	-150,625.00
A 41940	F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT 360 01/09/08 11/23/09	3133XNPF1	19	100	1.9680	50,000	000.00	49,859,375.00	21,866.67	-150,625.00
A 41941	F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT 360 01/09/08 11/23/09	3133XNPF1	19	100	1.9680	50,000	000.00	49,859,375.00	21,866.67	-150,625.00
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type)	31 PHLB FLOATER QTR ACT-36		19	100	2.7097	549,500	000.00	548,923,281.25	1,159,810.25	479,044.50
A 42065	PFCE FLOATER QTR 08/26/08 10/26/09	31331YFX3	54	000	2.0200	50,000	000.00	549,476,468.00	99,89504700000	-1,032,231.25
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type)	33 PFCE FLOATER QTR ACT-36		54	000	2.0200	50,000	000.00	549,796,875.00	101,000.00	-203,125.00
A 42076	F H L B FLOATER MONTHLY 09/18/08 12/28/09	3133XRR28	19	100	1.3510	25,000	000.00	24,921,875.00	2,814.58	-78,125.00
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type)	35 PHLB FLOATER MONTHLY		19	100	1.3510	25,000	000.00	24,921,875.00	2,814.58	-78,125.00
A 42100	F H L M FLOATER MONTHLY 09/22/08 09/21/09	3128X7CN2	47	000	1.3277	18,530	121.35	99,843,750,000.00	7,162.33	-39,027.60
A 42101	F H L M FLOATER MONTHLY 09/22/08 09/21/09	3128X7CN2	19	100	1.3277	50,000	000.00	49,921,875.00	19,357.64	-105,480.00
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type)	36 PHLMC FLOATER MO ACT-36		47	000	1.3277	68,500	000.00	68,392,968.75	26,519.97	-144,507.60
A 42061	F N M A 08/28/08 02/13/09	313589BV4	19	100	2.7900	50,000	000.00	49,955,000.00	368,125.00	241,750.00

INVEST NUMBER	DESCRIPTION PURCHASE MATURITY DATE	CUSIP	BANK BROK	FUND SAVE	CEN RATE YTM TR	PAR/SHARES BOOK	MARKET PRICE	CURR ACRR INT PRICE SOURCE	UNREALIZED GAIN/LOSS
A 42068	F N M A 09/02/08 02/13/09	313589BIV4	19	100	2.7700	30,000 000.00	29,973,000.00	207,750.00	143,816.67
A 42088	F N M A DISCOUNT NOTES 10/15/08 03/17/09	313589DD2	19	100	2.8054	29,621,433.33	99,910,000,000	166,458.33	255,416.67
A 42089	F N M A DISCOUNT NOTES 10/15/08 03/17/09	313589DD2	19	100	2.5779	49,458,125.00	99,760,000,000	166,458.33	255,416.67
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 41 F N M A DISCOUNT NOTES 6.52%(M)					2.6532	180,000 000.00	179,668,000.00	908,791.66	896,400.01
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 42 FARM CREDIT DISCOUNT NO 1.70%(M)					2.6849	177,882,808.33	99,826,670,000		
A 42087	FARMER MAC DISCOUNT 10/20/08 01/06/09	313151AF5	19	100	2.3500	47,000 000.00	46,983,550.00	128,858.33	94,000.00
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 43 FEDERAL HOME LOAN DISC 1.81%(M)					2.3620	46,760,691.67	99,965,000,000		
A 42042	F H L B DISCOUNT 07/07/08 12/22/08	313396D35	19	100	2.4400	50,000 000.00	49,989,791.67	498,166.67	60,958.34
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 44 FMC DISCOUNT NOTES 6.52%(M)					2.4681	49,430,666.66	99,979,583,333		
A 42085	FREDDIE DISCOUNT 10/02/08 02/03/09	313397BK6	19	100	2.9500	30,000 000.00	29,976,000.00	147,500.00	133,333.34
A 42086	FREDDIE DISCOUNT 10/02/08 02/03/09	313397BK6	19	100	2.9803	29,695,166.66	99,920,000,000	245,833.33	222,222.22
A 42082	FREDDIE DISCOUNT 10/03/08 03/13/09	313397CZ2	19	100	2.9803	49,491,944.45	99,920,000,000	217,152.78	262,083.33
A 42083	FREDDIE DISCOUNT 10/03/08 03/13/09	313397CZ2	19	100	2.6818	49,407,430.56	99,773,333,333	217,152.78	262,083.33
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 44 FMC DISCOUNT NOTES 6.52%(M)					2.4681	49,430,666.66	99,979,583,300		
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 44 FMC DISCOUNT NOTES 6.52%(M)					2.7835	180,000 000.00	179,709,333.34	827,638.89	879,722.22
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 44 FMC DISCOUNT NOTES 6.52%(M)					2.8146	178,001,972.23	99,838,519,000		
A 42039	AIG C P 06/26/08 12/09/08	00137EM93	19	100	3.0000	50,000 000.00	49,983,111.11	658,333.34	16,444.44
A 42040	AIG C P 06/26/08 12/09/08	00137EM93	19	100	3.0000	49,308,333.33	99,966,222,222	658,333.34	16,444.44
A 42063	WELLS FARGO C P 08/28/08 12/09/08	9497FDM90	19	100	3.0421	49,308,333.33	99,966,222,222	141,444.45	5,155.55
A 42075	UNION BANK C P 09/26/08 12/09/08	9048SJM91	19	100	2.7007	20,000 000.00	19,993,244.44	166,833.34	11,777.78
A 42048	ING C P 07/22/08 12/23/08	4497WMDPO	19	100	2.8900	50,000 000.00	49,953,555.56	529,833.33	41,861.12

INVEST NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	PURCHASE MATURITY DATE	CUSIP	BANK BROK	FUND SAVER	CFN RATE	YTM TR	PAR	SHARES BOOK	MARKET PRICE	MARKET VALUE	CURR ACCT	INT UNREALIZED	GAIN LOSS
A 42049	ING C P	07/22/08 12/23/08	4497WOMP0	19	100	2.8900	25.000	000.00	24,976.777.78	264,916.66	20,930.56			
A 42054	Comerzbank CP	07/30/08 01/06/09	20260AN63	19	100	2.9262	24,690	930.56	99.907111111111	398,177.78	54,800.00			
A 42058	BANK OF SCOTLAND C P	08/05/08 01/06/09	06478GN67	19	100	2.9276	39,486	222.22	99.8480000000	488,388.89	73,000.00			
A 42070	BANK OF SCOTLAND C P	09/03/08 01/06/09	06478GN67	19	100	2.9150	49,362	611.11	99.8480000000	360,326.39	69,750.00			
A 42052	TOYOTA C P	07/25/08 01/20/09	89233GNL6	19	100	2.9448	49,493	923.61	99.8480000000	246,354.17	42,708.33			
A 42066	BANK OF AMERICA C P	09/05/08 03/03/09	0660PQ030	19	100	2.9550	50,000	000.00	49.698,444.44	357,062.50	76,027.77			
A 42067	BANK OF AMERICA C P	09/05/08 03/03/09	0660PQ030	19	100	2.9550	50,000	000.00	49.698,444.44	357,062.50	76,027.77			
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 81 COMMERCIAL PAPER DISC 17.56% (M) 2.9608 485,000 000.00 484,012,666.66 4,627,066.69 504,927.76														
A 42069	WELLS FARGO C P	09/29/08 12/09/08	9497PEVH8	19	100	3.3700	35,000	000.00	100.0000000000	206,412.50	0.00			
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 82 COMMERCIAL PAPER INT BR 1.27% (M) 3.3700 35,000 000.00 35,000,000.00 206,412.50 .00														
A 42084	CITICORP N C D	10/06/08 01/06/09	1730DIK60	19	100	4.2800	25,000	000.00	100.2376853586	166,444.44	59,421.34			
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 91 NEGOTIABLE C.D.'S .91% (M) 4.2800 25,000 000.00 100.2376850000 166,444.44 59,421.34														
A 42044	MISSION NATIONAL BANK PUBLI	07/16/08 07/16/09		19	100	3.9000	100	000.00	98.2659722222	671.67	-1,734.03			
A 42055	FIRST NATIONAL BANK CD	07/31/08 07/31/09		19	100	2.7500	5,000	000.00	4.907,569.44	23,298.61	-92,430.56			
A 42107	MISSION AREA CREDIT UNION	11/03/08 11/03/09		19	100	1.0000	100	000.00	97.4256944444	77.78	-2,574.31			
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type) 1010 PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT .19% (M) 2.7385 5,200 000.00 98.1396370000 24,048.06 -96,738.90														
A 41925	CITIBANK PTD	01/03/08 01/02/09		19	100	3.7500	10,000	000.00	99.8266666667	1,031.55	-17,333.33			

* MARKET = BOOK LESS PURCHASE INTEREST

CITY/COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
M R. NEMLIN RANKIN 415-554-4487
INVESTMENT INVENTORY WITH MARKET VALUES

(REPORT)

INVESTMENTS OUTSTANDING AS OF 11/30/08
MAJOR SORT KEY IS ICC#

INVEST NUMBER	DESCRIPTION PURCHASE MATURITY DATE	CUSIP	BANK BROK	FUND SAFE	YTM TR	PAR	SHARES BOOK	MARKET VALUE MARKET PRICE	CURR ACCR INT PRICE SOURCE	UNREALIZED GAIN UNREALIZED LOSS
A 42059	PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT MONTHLY 08/04/08 01/06/09		19	100	2.8000	10,000	000.00	9,980,500.00	-5.44	-19,500.00
A 42060	PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT MONTHLY 08/01/08 01/06/09		19	100	2.8000	10,000	000.00	9,980,500.00	-5.62	-19,500.00
A 41948	FIRST NATL BANK INT MONTHLY 01/19/08 01/18/09		19	100	3.8500	5,000	000.00	4,987,000.00	534.72	-13,000.00
SUBTOTAL (Inv Type)		1011 PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT M	1.274 (M)							
GRAND TOTAL										
					3.2214	35,000	000.00	34,930,666.67	1,555.21	-69,333.33
					3.2214	35,000	000.00	99,801,905,000.00		
					2.8674	275035	000.00	2756794558.24	16,820,639.16	7,717,116.64
					2.6663	274766	0472.85	100,2343180000		-4,028,007.63

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

(EIS / EKBKIS) EARNED INCOME SUMMARY
11/01/08 THROUGH 11/30/08
SORT KEYS ARE FUND ICC# MATD
FUND: 100 POOLED FUNDS
PAGE: 1
RUN: 12/04/08 10:30:16

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
42064	08/20/08	1.7500	T BILL	01/29/09	50,000,000.00	49,506,250.00	1.788			72,916.66
42098	10/31/08	.9400	T BILL	04/23/09	50,000,000.00	49,772,833.34	.957			39,166.66
42099	10/31/08	.9400	T BILL	04/23/09	20,000,000.00	19,909,133.33	.957			15,666.67
42094	10/29/08	1.4800	T BILL	10/22/09	50,000,000.00	49,264,111.11	1.523			61,666.66
42095	10/29/08	1.4800	T BILL	10/22/09	50,000,000.00	49,264,111.11	1.523			61,666.66
SUBTOTAL (ICCF#) 11 TREASURY BILLS				207 DAYS	220,000,000.00	217,816,438.89	1.402		.00	251,083.31
41697	07/23/07	3.3750	T NOTE (98)	12/15/08	5,000,000.00	4,900,781.25	104.253	11/04/08	196,756.94	41,993.38
41698	07/23/07	3.3750	T NOTE (98)	12/15/08	10,000,000.00	9,800,781.25	9.696	11/04/08	318,051.68	7,810.56
41699	07/23/07	3.3750	T NOTE (98)	12/15/08	5,000,000.00	4,897,656.25	104.988	11/04/08	199,881.94	42,262.46
41700	07/23/07	3.3750	T NOTE (98)	12/15/08	5,000,000.00	4,898,046.88	104.896	11/04/08	199,491.30	42,228.81
41738	08/08/07	3.3750	T NOTE (98.11)	12/15/08	8,000,000.00	7,865,625.00	30.501	11/04/08	244,690.03	19,718.49
41740	08/07/07	3.3750	T NOTE	12/15/08	5,000,000.00	4,921,289.06	99.959	11/04/08	176,249.14	40,432.51
41662	06/08/07	4.7500	T. NOTE (99.19)	03/31/09	20,000,000.00	19,914,062.50	5.007			81,952.86
42003	04/09/08	4.5000	T NOTE	03/31/09	50,000,000.00	51,357,421.90	1.683			71,050.07
42013	04/09/08	4.5000	T NOTE	03/31/09	50,000,000.00	51,357,421.90	1.683			71,050.07
41870	10/26/07	4.8750	T NOTE	05/15/09	5,000,000.00	5,080,468.75	3.781			15,788.97
41841	10/16/07	4.8750	T NOTE	05/31/09	10,000,000.00	10,096,484.38	4.228			35,085.17
41862	10/23/07	4.6250	T NOTE	07/31/09	5,100,000.00	5,165,542.97	3.813			16,189.85
41993	03/31/08	2.0000	T NOTE	02/28/10	50,000,000.00	50,302,734.38	1.690			69,880.03
41994	03/31/08	2.0000	T NOTE	02/28/10	50,000,000.00	50,302,734.38	1.690			69,880.03
42096	10/31/08	2.8750	T NOTE	06/30/10	50,000,000.00	51,640,625.00	1.410			59,848.65
42097	10/31/08	2.8750	T NOTE	06/30/10	30,000,000.00	30,984,375.00	1.410			35,909.19
SUBTOTAL (ICCF#) 12 TREASURY NOTES				338 DAYS	320,100,000.00	326,201,871.16	2.659		1,700,746.03	721,081.10
42090	10/02/08	3.4000	F H L B	10/02/09	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	3.447			141,666.67
42091	10/02/08	3.4000	F H L B	10/02/09	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	3.447			141,666.67
42092	10/02/08	3.4000	F H L B	10/02/09	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	3.447			70,833.34
42093	10/27/08	3.1350	F H L B	10/23/09	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	3.168			130,208.33
41988	03/18/08	4.5000	FEDERAL HOME LN BKS	11/13/09	25,000,000.00	25,384,500.00	21.856	11/13/08	562,500.00	182,402.48
42104	11/18/08	3.8750	F H L B	12/10/10	20,000,000.00	20,727,622.22	2.853			21,064.30
42106	11/20/08	5.0500	F H M A	02/07/11	27,250,000.00	28,608,102.15	3.356			28,935.59
41950	01/31/08	4.2000	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS	01/28/13	30,000,000.00	30,052,500.00	4.216			104,136.52
SUBTOTAL (ICCF#) 22 FEDERAL HOME LOA				544 DAYS	252,250,000.00	254,388,224.37	4.256		562,500.00	820,913.90
42033	05/08/08	4.3000	FEDERAL NATL MTG ASSN	12/24/09	33,150,000.00	33,510,009.00	3.654			100,635.78
SUBTOTAL (ICCF#) 23 FEDERAL NATIONAL				389 DAYS	33,150,000.00	33,510,009.00	3.654		.00	100,635.78
41986	03/18/08	3.1200	FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK	03/18/10	25,700,000.00	25,700,000.00	3.163			66,820.00
42105	11/19/08	2.8750	F F C B	02/14/11	19,000,000.00	19,010,199.31	3.228			20,175.77

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

(RIS / ERNEIS)

EARNED INCOME SUMMARY
11/01/08 THROUGH 11/30/08
SORT KEYS ARE FUND ICC# MAT#
FUND: 100 POOLED FUNDS

PAGE: 2
RUN: 12/04/08 10:30:16

INV NO.	PURCHASE DATE	COUPON RATE	DESCRIPTION	TICKER / MATURITY DATE	SHARES / PAR VALUE	SCHEDULED BOOK VALUE	SCHEDULED BOOK VALUE	YIELD / 365	DATE SOLD/MAT	INCOME RECEIVED THIS PER	TOTAL/NET EARNINGS
42102	11/10/08	2.6250 P F CB		04/21/11	40,000,000.00	39,197,016.67		2.941		.00	67,333.41
SUBTOTAL (ICCN#) 28			FEDERAL FARM CRE	735 DAYS	84,700,000.00	84,507,215.98		3.070		.00	154,329.18
42045	07/14/08	3.2500 F H L M C		07/14/09	29,950,000.00	29,950,000.00		3.295			81,114.58
42103	11/17/08	5.1250 F H L M C		08/23/10	25,000,000.00	26,155,958.00		2.882			29,022.04
41973	02/15/08	5.0000 FEDERAL HOME LN WNG CORP		12/19/12	50,000,000.00	50,860,000.00		4.635			193,748.82
SUBTOTAL (ICCN#) 30			PHILMC Bonds	921 DAYS	104,950,000.00	107,065,958.00		3.973		.00	303,885.44
42016	04/18/08	4.0890 F H L B FLOATER		01/08/09	50,000,000.00	49,977,500.00		4.210			172,922.16
42018	04/21/08	4.6190 F H L B FLOATER		01/14/09	50,000,000.00	49,977,358.00		4.747			194,992.89
42019	04/21/08	4.6190 F H L B FLOATER		01/14/09	30,000,000.00	29,886,410.00		4.747			116,996.27
42020	01/25/08	3.3460 PHIB FLOATER QTR		01/28/09	15,000,000.00	15,000,000.00		3.392			41,825.00
42021	01/25/08	3.3460 PHIB FLOATER QTR		01/28/09	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00		3.392			139,416.67
41915	12/07/07	1.9680 F H L B FLOATER		11/23/09	50,000,000.00	49,984,700.00		2.501			102,745.62
41916	12/07/07	1.9680 F H L B FLOATER		11/23/09	50,000,000.00	49,984,700.00		2.501			102,745.62
41924	12/26/07	1.9680 F H L B FLOATER		11/23/09	50,000,000.00	50,024,900.00		2.457			101,032.17
41937	01/09/08	1.9680 F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT		11/23/09	50,000,000.00	50,010,000.00		2.473			101,666.86
41938	01/09/08	1.9680 F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT		11/23/09	50,000,000.00	50,010,000.00		2.473			101,666.86
41939	01/09/08	1.9680 F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT		11/23/09	4,500,000.00	4,500,900.00		2.473			9,150.02
41940	01/09/08	1.9680 F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT		11/23/09	50,000,000.00	50,010,000.00		2.473			101,666.86
41941	01/09/08	1.9680 F H L B FLOATER QTR ACT		11/23/09	50,000,000.00	50,010,000.00		2.473			101,666.86
SUBTOTAL (ICCN#) 31			PHIB FLOATER QTR	248 DAYS	549,500,000.00	549,476,468.00		3.074		2,379,006.96	1,388,493.86
42065	08/26/08	2.0200 PFCEB FLOATER QTR		10/26/09	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00		2.048			84,166.67
SUBTOTAL (ICCN#) 33			PFCEB FLOATER QTR	330 DAYS	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00		2.048		.00	84,166.67
42076	09/18/08	1.3510 F H L B FLOATER MONTHLY		12/28/09	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00		3.020			62,064.55
SUBTOTAL (ICCN#) 35			PHIB FLOATER MON	393 DAYS	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00		3.020		68,027.75	62,064.55
42100	09/22/08	1.3938 F H L M FLOATER MONTHLY		09/21/09	18,500,000.00	18,510,121.35		3.227			49,096.46
42101	09/22/08	1.3938 F H L M FLOATER MONTHLY		09/21/09	50,000,000.00	50,027,355.00		3.227			132,693.09
SUBTOTAL (ICCN#) 36			PHILMC FLOATER MO	295 DAYS	68,500,000.00	68,537,476.35		3.227		245,455.35	181,789.55
42036	06/03/08	2.2500 F N M A		11/10/08	50,000,000.00	49,500,000.00		2.304	MATURED	500,000.00	28,125.00
42037	06/03/08	2.2500 F N M A		11/10/08	50,000,000.00	49,500,000.00		2.304	MATURED	500,000.00	28,125.00
42061	08/28/08	2.7900 F N M A		02/13/09	50,000,000.00	49,345,125.00		2.866			116,250.00
42068	09/02/08	2.7700 F N M A		02/13/09	30,000,000.00	29,621,433.33		2.844			69,250.00
42088	10/15/08	2.5500 PMA DISCOUNT NOTES		03/17/09	50,000,000.00	49,458,125.00		2.614			106,250.00

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

(BIS / EARNINGS)

EARNED INCOME SUMMARY
11/01/08 THROUGH 11/30/08
SORT KEYS ARE FUND ICC# MATD
FUND: 100 POOLED FUNDS
PAGE: 3
RUN: 12/04/08 10:30:16

INV NO.	PURCHASE DATE	COBON RATE	DESCRIPTION	TICKER / MATURITY DATE	SHARES / PAR VALUE	SCHEDULED BOOK VALUE	YIELD / 365	DATE SOLD/MAT	INCOME RECEIVED THIS PER	TOTAL/NET EARNINGS
42089	10/15/08	2.5500	FNMA DISCOUNT NOTES		50,000,000.00	49,458,125.00	2.614			106,250.00
SUBTOTAL (ICCF#) 41 FNMA DISCOUNT NO 6.47%(C)				92 DAYS	180,000,000.00	177,882,808.33	2.662		1,000,000.00	454,250.00
42087	10/20/08	2.3500	FARMER MAC DISCOUNT		47,000,000.00	46,760,691.67	2.395			92,041.66
SUBTOTAL (ICCF#) 42 FARM CREDIT DISC 1.70%(C)				37 DAYS	47,000,000.00	46,760,691.67	2.395			92,041.66
42042	07/07/08	2.4400	F H L B DISCOUNT		50,000,000.00	49,430,666.66	2.502			101,666.67
SUBTOTAL (ICCF#) 43 FEDERAL HOME LOA 1.80%(C)				22 DAYS	50,000,000.00	49,430,666.66	2.502			101,666.67
42038	06/04/08	2.2500	FREDDIE DISCOUNT		50,000,000.00	49,471,875.00	2.306	MATURED	528,125.00	59,375.00
42085	10/02/08	2.9500	FREDDIE DISCOUNT		30,000,000.00	29,595,166.66	3.022			73,750.00
42086	10/02/08	2.9500	FREDDIE DISCOUNT		50,000,000.00	49,491,944.45	3.022			122,916.66
42082	10/03/08	2.6500	FREDDIE DISCOUNT		50,000,000.00	49,407,430.56	2.719			110,416.67
42083	10/03/08	2.6500	FREDDIE DISCOUNT		50,000,000.00	49,407,430.56	2.719			110,416.67
SUBTOTAL (ICCF#) 44 FMC DISCOUNT NOT 6.48%(C)				86 DAYS	180,000,000.00	178,001,972.23	2.772		528,125.00	476,875.00
42062	08/26/08	2.6800	WELLS FARGO C P		20,000,000.00	19,867,488.89	2.735	MATURED	132,511.11	35,733.33
42039	06/26/08	3.0000	AIG C P		50,000,000.00	49,808,333.33	3.084			125,000.00
42040	06/26/08	3.0000	AIG C P		50,000,000.00	49,808,333.33	3.084			125,000.00
42063	08/28/08	2.6800	WELLS FARGO C P		20,000,000.00	19,846,644.44	2.738			44,666.67
42075	09/26/08	3.6400	UNION BANK C P		25,000,000.00	24,812,944.44	3.718			75,833.34
42048	07/22/08	2.8900	ING C P		50,000,000.00	49,881,861.11	2.967			120,416.66
42049	07/22/08	2.8900	ING C P		25,000,000.00	24,590,930.56	2.967			60,208.33
42054	07/30/08	2.8900	Commerzbank CP		40,000,000.00	39,486,222.22	2.968			96,333.33
42058	08/05/08	2.9800	BANK OF SCOTLAND C P		50,000,000.00	49,862,611.11	3.060			124,166.67
42070	09/03/08	2.9150	BANK OF SCOTLAND C P		50,000,000.00	49,493,923.61	2.986			121,458.33
42052	07/25/08	2.7500	TOYOTA C P		25,000,000.00	24,568,159.72	2.827			57,291.67
42066	09/05/08	2.9550	BANK OF AMERICA C P		50,000,000.00	49,865,354.17	3.041			123,125.00
42067	09/05/08	2.9550	BANK OF AMERICA C P		50,000,000.00	49,865,354.17	3.041			123,125.00
SUBTOTAL (ICCF#) 81 COMMERCIAL PAPER 17.43%(C)				38 DAYS	485,000,000.00	478,980,672.21	3.030		132,511.11	1,232,358.33
42069	09/29/08	3.3700	WELLS FARGO C P		35,000,000.00	35,000,000.00	3.417			98,291.67
SUBTOTAL (ICCF#) 82 COMMERCIAL PAPER 1.27%(C)				9 DAYS	35,000,000.00	35,000,000.00	3.417			98,291.67
42025	04/30/08	2.5000	CHASE N C D		25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	2.535	MATURED	336,805.56	15,625.00
42026	04/30/08	2.5000	CHASE N C D		50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	2.535	MATURED	673,611.11	31,250.00
42084	10/06/08	4.2800	CITICORP N C D		25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00	4.339			89,166.66

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

(HIS / EARNINGS)

EARNED INCOME SUMMARY
11/01/08 THROUGH 11/30/08
SORT KEYS ARE FUND ICC# MATD
FUND: 100 POOLED FUNDS

PAGE: 4
RUN: 12/04/08 10:30:16

INV NO.	PURCHASE DATE	COUPON RATE	DESCRIPTION	TICKER / MATURITY DATE	SHARES / PAR VALUE	SCHEDULED BOOK VALUE	SCHEDULED YIELD / SOLID/MAT	DATE RECEIVED THIS PER	INCOME RECEIVED	TOTAL/NET EARNINGS
SUBTOTAL (ICC#) 91 NEGOTIABLE C.D. .91% (C) 37 DAYS 25,000,000.00 25,000,000.00 3.485 1,010,416.67 136,041.66										
41892	11/02/07	3.5000	MISSION AREA CREDIT DN	11/03/08	100,000.00	100,000.00	3.550	MATURED	330.56	19.45
42044	07/16/08	3.9000	MISSION NATIONAL BANK PU	07/16/09	100,000.00	100,000.00	3.954			325.00
42055	07/31/08	2.7500	FIRST NATIONAL BANK CD	07/31/09	5,000,000.00	5,000,000.00	2.788			11,458.33
42107	11/03/08	1.0000	MISSION AREA CREDIT UNTO	11/03/09	100,000.00	100,000.00	1.014			77.78
SUBTOTAL (ICC#) 1010 PUBLIC TIME DE .19% (C) 244 DAYS 5,200,000.00 5,200,000.00 2.780 330.56 11,880.56										
41925	01/03/08	3.7500	CITIBANK PTD	01/02/09	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	3.802			31,260.12
42059	08/04/08	2.8000	PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT MONT	01/06/09	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	2.839			23,338.78
42060	08/01/08	2.8000	PUBLIC TIME DEPOSIT MONT	01/06/09	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	2.839			23,338.96
41948	01/19/08	3.8500	FIRST NATL BANK INT MONT	01/18/09	5,000,000.00	5,000,000.00	3.903			16,041.67
SUBTOTAL (ICC#) 1011 PUBLIC TIME DE 1.27% (C) 37 DAYS 35,000,000.00 35,000,000.00 3.266 93,979.53 93,958.35										
SUBTOTAL (FUND) 100 POOLED FUNDS - ASSETS 257 DAYS 2750350000.00 2747660472.85 7,721,098.96 6,765,807.24										
SUBTOTAL (FUND) 100 POOLED FUNDS - NET 2750350000.00 2747660472.85 7,721,098.96 6,765,807.24										

FUND STATISTICS

ASSETS

LIABILITIES

AVERAGE DAILY INVESTMENT BALANCE : 2,793,756,349.96

EARNED INTEREST YIELD THIS PERIOD : 2.946

WEIGHTED AVG YIELD AT END OF PERIOD : 2.816

TOTAL INTEREST EARNED FOR FUTURE RECEIPT: 14,348,445.58

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

(EIS / EARNETS)

EARNED INCOME SUMMARY

11/01/08 THROUGH 11/30/08
SORT KEYS ARE FUND ICC# MATD
FUND: 9702 SFUSD TRANS 07-08

PAGE: 5
RUN: 12/04/08 10:30:16

INV NO.	PURCHASE DATE	COTTON RATE	DESCRIPTION	TICKER / MATURITY DATE	SHARES / PAR VALUE	SCHEDULED BOOK VALUE	SCHEDULED PAR VALUE	YIELD / 365	DATE SOLD/MAT	INCOME RECEIVED THIS PER	TOTAL/NET EARNINGS
41869	10/25/07	4.6600	BANK OF AMERICA MCD	11/13/08	35,000,000.00	35,000,000.00	35,000,000.00	4.664	MATURED 1,721,805.56	53,666.67	53,666.67
SUBTOTAL (ICC#) 91 NEGOTIABLE C.D.					0 DAYS	.00	.00	4.664	1,721,805.56	53,666.67	53,666.67
SUBTOTAL (FUND) 9702 SFUSD TRANS 07-08 - ASSETS					0 DAYS	.00	.00		1,721,805.56	53,666.67	53,666.67
SUBTOTAL (FUND) 9702 SFUSD TRANS 07-08 - NET						.00	.00		1,721,805.56	53,666.67	53,666.67

FUND STATISTICS

	ASSETS	LIABILITIES
AVERAGE DAILY INVESTMENT BALANCE	: 14,000,000.00	.000
EARNED INTEREST YIELD THIS PERIOD	: 4.664	.000
WEIGHTED AVG YIELD AT END OF PERIOD	: .000	.000
TOTAL INTEREST EARNED FOR FUTURE RECEIPT:		

GRAND TOTAL 100.00%(C) 257 DAYS 2750350000.00 2747660472.85 2.955 9,442,904.52 6,819,473.91

Sup Campos
C: Sup Maxwell, Sup
Peskin,
RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2008 DEC 15 AM 11:32
Joy
copy

File-081432

December 12, 2008

Dear President Peskin and Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Re: Appeal of Exemption from Environmental Review for 2655 Scott Street – File No. 081432

BY _____ SW

We live at 2649 Scott Street which is immediately adjacent to, south, and uphill of the subject property at 2655 Scott. We are the Appellants and our able attorney, Steve Williams, and knowledgeable Architect/Historian, Vincent Marsh, have separately submitted materials in support of our appeal to be heard on December 16, 2008.

We just wish to inform you that the uneven application of the rules and guidelines regarding land use and environmental protection in our city is about to ruin our lives and is extremely disturbing to our wonderful neighborhood. We ourselves recently built a modest partial fourth floor vertical extension that is well set-back to the rear and not visible from the street in front of our existing home. This addition involved extensive discussions with our neighbors, the Cow Hollow Association, and the Planning Department and was approved without objection. Our structure is not designated as "Architecturally Significant."


In marked contrast, the proposed vertical extension at 2655 Scott Street-

- a.) represents a near maximum and highly visible build-out and is uniformly opposed by the neighborhood;
- b) is a designated "Architecturally Significant" structure, along with its immediate "twin" and corner structure to the north at 2601 Vallejo, and ten other historic resources that frame and define Normandie Terrace;
- c) is unanimously opposed by the Board of the Cow Hollow Association;
- d) has been fraught with pre-application irregularities, including the submission of inaccurate documents and failure to comply with the procedures set out in planning and environmental regulations.

We ask that both our regulated citizens and the regulators of San Francisco: ***Simply Follow The Rules To Preserve Our Neighborhoods.*** This basic principle of governance has not obtained in the instant case.

We, therefore, respectfully request that you exercise your supervisory powers to ensure that all residents are provided a level playing field in the exceedingly complex permitting process that appears to favor developers with advantageous access to our city planners. It is time to apply the brakes to run-away development that threatens to destroy all that we cherish about the existing charm, civility, and uniqueness of our fair city. Thank you for your attention to this important matter in the equitable and judicious treatment of our laws.

Very truly yours,



Annabelle and Thomas Yasuda

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
12/15/2008 03:46 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Fw: Stinky trash bins in every park

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 Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV on 12/15/2008 03:51 PM -----



12/14/2008 08:21 PM

To sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org, board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org,
gavin.newsom@sfgov.org
cc jared.blumenfeld@sfgov.org,
Recpark.Commission@sfgov.org, dennis.kern@sfgov.org,
elizabeth.gee@sfgov.org, SPFamilies@aol.com
Subject Stinky trash bins in every park

Hello Sean, Supervisors, Mayor:

I caught the very end of the Board's 12/9 meeting where you were all praising DPW for enforcing **trash bin removal from public view** on Stanyan St.

It was said at least 3 times that DPW has been doing a good job all over the city. **NOT** in my neighborhood, which is also yours Sean (Mt. Davidson - Miraloma Park)... and that includes **NOT in Sunnyside Park and any other park** in SF.

We checked with DPW and was told (I can look up the name for you somewhere in my piles), that public parks and all businesses must comply. RPD **does NOT have exemptions** from housing these bins out of public sight, and if the residents have to, they do too. RPD, too, can be cited.

Only City Hall can make RPD understand that they are NOT an exception and need to do their jobs. Residents have tried to tell them only to be ignored and snorted at that we're wrong.

We want those ugly, stinky, overflowing bins put away.

Thanks,
Andrea O'Leary
for Sunnyside Park Families & Neighbors

82



12/08/2008 04:14 PM

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

cc

bcc

Subject Public input for Board of Supervisors

Submitted on: 12/8/2008 4:14:35 PM

name: Bill Sargeant

comments: Can you suppress the pilfering and rummaging through the blue recycling cans? The brazenness and number of men is increasing in my neighborhood and I don't like it. I put my cans out yesterday afternoon for pickup this morning and they came up right in front of me and started going through the cans. They remove anything of value that would otherwise be reduce our Sunset Scavenger rates. They spill the debris all over the sidewalk and they add an unsavory element to our residential streets. I have called the police and yet it is such a pervasive occurrence that without some sort of coordinated action by the city, per incident police calls are of insignificant value. Please do something.

User Data

Client IP (REMOTE_ADDR) : 76.227.154.173
Client IP via Proxy (HTTP_X_FORWARDED_FOR) :

83



12/15/2008 10:30 AM

To <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
bcc
Subject Public input for Board of Supervisors

Submitted on: 12/15/2008 10:30:05 AM

name: Monty Morris

phone:

comments: It's that time of the year again. Yep, AT & T is in the spirit of its yearly dumping of yellow page books around this City. This will undoubtedly be followed by another exact wave by the West Valley Yellow pages. This year AT & T have outdone themselves by sending not one large "yellow pages" book but also a smaller version. They are encased in a medium gauge advertisement emblazoned oversized white plastic bag. Simply put these books are shunned, hazardous and an eyesore, with any number of competing "yellow pages" manufacturers trashing the city and overburdening the recycling process, especially the workers that have to move very heavy bins full of unwanted NEW yellow pages. I am sure workers comp claims go up every time these books are dumped into city trash cans and recycling bins.

Unfortunately the environmental waste and manufacturing of a product that is desired by less than 15 % of my building's residents is probably normal for the City and one may only forecast more competing Yellow pages (South Bay and North Bay?) and their assumption or "right" or privilege to continue this trashing of the City in the near future. The blight and inconvenience to city residents is very noticeable and disconcerting. I saw 5 or more of these unsolicited "presents" crammed into the portholes of a neighborhood trash can. The real litter went to the ground nearby the can. A day or two earlier they were abandoned by AT & T delivery people on the sidewalk in front of a building whose gate did not leave any room at the entry. Even with a substantial sized open entry it can become a mess, especially if the building does not have a conscientious or able manager. Doorways and sidewalks are strewn with half opened and drifting stacks of yellow pages that may or may not be recycled or used practically.

For the sake of older people that manage properties and have to upkeep them, find a way to have these companies stop dumping these unwanted items. When given a telephone entry system with a sign that most people respect that says, PLEASE CALL THIS EXTENSION (mgr with forwarding to cell phone) FOR DELIVERIES, the delivery people ignore that simple request AND THEN, dump 40 books, actually 80 plus plastic bags in front of the entry system, making that unworkable especially for disabled people. Had the delivery people called, we would have taken 5 to 10 books avoiding the unwanted extras.

Now we're left to take the time to recycle 35, actually 70 book plus plastic. I'm certain AT & T makes an obligation to their advertisers to distribute to "the entire SF or Bay Area." I would appreciate government taking a stand for far greater, as in having the phone book companies call or contact by mail building owners or their representatives to "opt in" to prevent this phenomenal waste. Is there an owner/property contact list accessible from the City government that is available to bulk distributors/mailers/dumpers that would require companies to budget in the responsibility of making a positive "opt in" contact by mail or phone to owners so that some of this waste could

84

be eliminated.

As a reminder, all of these phone book distributors offer a phone number to call if someone would like a phone book by mail. It is certainly a known and better way to get a phone book if someone absolutely "needs" one and can be easily found online, in an old phone book or even by word of mouth.

If the word got out that this kind of dumping by "the phone company" was illegal or better done another way, the City could become cleaner and lessen its trash budget and injury reports and costs and "green" profile.

Thank you

User Data

Client IP (REMOTE_ADDR) : 67.174.223.50
Client IP via Proxy (HTTP_X_FORWARDED_FOR) :

C. BOS, AC, KB

COMMISSIONERS
Richard Rogers, President
Carpinteria
Cindy Gustafson, Vice President
Tahoe City
Jim Kellogg, Member
Concord
Michael Sutton, Member
Monterey
Daniel W. Richards, Member
Upland

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER



Governor

CPA/KK
JOHN CARLSON, JR.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
1416 Ninth Street
Box 944209
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090
(916) 653-4899
(916) 653-5040 Fax
fgc@fgc.ca.gov

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Fish and Game Commission

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2008 DEC 19 AM 11:15
BY *[Signature]*

December 19, 2008

TO ALL AFFECTED AND INTERESTED PARTIES:

This is to provide you with a copy of the notice of proposed regulatory action relative to Section 670.5, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, and relating to animals of California declared to be endangered or threatened, which will be published in the California Regulatory Notice Register on December 19, 2008.

Ms. Esther Burkett, Habitat Conservation Planning Branch, Department of Fish and Game, phone (916) 445-3764 has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations. Documents relating to the proposed action shall be posted on the Fish and Game Commission website at <http://www.fgc.ca.gov> or may be obtained by writing to our office at the above address.

Sincerely,

Sheri Tiemann
Sheri Tiemann
Staff Services Analyst

Attachment

[Handwritten initials]

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

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Fish and Game Commission (Commission), pursuant to the authority vested by sections 2070 and 2075.5 of the Fish and Game Code and to implement, interpret or make specific sections 1755, 2055, 2062, 2067, 2070, 2072.7, 2075.5 and 2077 of said Code, proposes to amend Section 670.5, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to Animals of California Declared to be Endangered or Threatened.

Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

The Department of Fish and Game recommends that the Commission amend Subsection (a)(5) of Section 670.5 of Title 14, CCR, to delete the California Brown Pelican (*Pelecanus occidentalis californicus*) from the list of endangered birds.

In making the recommendation to delist the brown pelican pursuant to CESA, the Department relied most heavily on the following: 1) The breeding population size of the brown pelican in the Channel Islands has increased from 1969 to the present, after the banning of DDT, and now exceeds the five-year mean 3,000 pair standard noted in the recovery plan (current Channel Islands population size for 2006 is roughly 8,500 breeding pairs); 2) Brown pelicans have gradually expanded their nesting sites in the Channel Islands to former breeding sites, and numbers on Santa Barbara Island have increased substantially since 2001; 3) Productivity has increased to 0.7 and now meets or exceeds the five-year mean 0.7 standard noted in the recovery plan for downlisting; 4) Relative to the five-year mean standard for fledged young in the recovery plan, brown pelicans at West Anacapa Island have achieved the 2,700 fledgling standard for delisting 9 times from 1997-2005; 5) In spite of known threats (*i.e.*, oil spills, human disturbance, starvation events, domoic acid poisoning, fish hook/line mortality), the breeding population of brown pelicans in California has increased substantially; and 6) nesting sites are under generally-protective NPS ownership or management. If delisted, the brown pelican will remain a fully protected species under Fish and Game Code section 3511(b)(2).

NOTICE IS ALSO GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held at the East End Complex, 1500 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, California, on February 6, 2009, at 8:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard. It is requested, but not required, that written comments be submitted on or before January 23, 2009, at the address given below, or by fax at (916) 653-5040, or by e-mail to FGC@fgc.ca.gov. Written comments mailed, faxed or e-mailed to the Commission office, must be received before 5:00 p.m. on February 3, 2009. All comments must be received no later than February 6, 2009, at the hearing in Sacramento, CA. If you would like copies of any modifications to this proposal, please include your name and mailing address.

The regulations as proposed in strikeout-underline format, as well as an initial statement of reasons, including environmental considerations and all information upon which the proposal is based (rulemaking file), are on file and available for public review from the agency representative, John Carlson, Jr., Executive Director, Fish and Game Commission, 1416 Ninth Street, Box 944209, Sacramento, California 94244-2090, phone (916) 653-4899. Please direct requests for the above mentioned documents and inquiries concerning the regulatory process to John Carlson, Jr., or Sheri Tiemann at the preceding address or phone number. **Esther Burkett, Department of Fish and Game, phone (916) 445-3764, has been**

finding are in apparent conflict with Section 11346.3, which is activated by the rulemaking component of CESA.

Since the finding portion of CESA is silent to consideration of economic impact, it is possible that subdivision (a) of Section 11346.3 does not exclude the requirement for economic impact analysis. While the Commission does not believe this is the case, an abbreviated analysis of the likely economic impact of the proposed regulation change on businesses and private individuals is provided. The intent of this analysis is to provide disclosure, the basic premise of the APA process. The Commission believes that this analysis fully meets the intent and language of both statutory programs.

Delisting of the brown pelican will remove the subspecies from the provisions of CESA. However, this delisting action is not expected to result in any significant adverse economic effect on small business or significant cost to private persons or entities undertaking activities subject to CEQA because the brown pelican will remain protected under additional provisions as described below.

- (b) Impact on the Creation or Elimination of Jobs within the State, the Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses, or the Expansion of Businesses in California: None.
- (c) Cost Impacts on a Representative Private Person or Business:

The agency is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action. Delisting the brown pelican will not result in any significant cost to private persons or businesses undertaking activities subject to CEQA and may result in a cost savings to such persons and businesses.
- (d) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State: None.
- (e) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies: None.
- (f) Programs Mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts: None.
- (g) Costs Imposed on any Local Agency or School District that is Required to be Reimbursed Under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4: None.
- (h) Effect on Housing Costs: None.

Effect on Small Business

It has been determined that the adoption of these regulations may affect small business.



12/08/2008 08:25 AM

To <Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
bcc
Subject Public input for Board of Supervisors

Submitted on: 12/8/2008 8:25:51 AM

name: Timothy Harding

comments: I have visited San Francisco before as a tourist...I will not do so again due to your status as a "Sanctuary City."

User Data

Client IP (REMOTE_ADDR) : 24.227.123.165
Client IP via Proxy (HTTP_X_FORWARDED_FOR) :

86

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2008 DEC 17 AM 11:55

BY

PK

December, 2008

To the San Francisco Board of
Supervisors,

Our family would like to thank
you very much for the tribute
in memory of Susan Pugliese.
She was born and raised in San
Francisco and truly loved her city.
We appreciate your kind gesture.

The Joseph T. Pugliese Family

87

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
12/10/2008 11:46 AM

To <CFree55@cvip.net>
cc Nancy Altaro/311/SFGOV, Maria Garcia,
bcc
Subject Re: Public input for Board of Supervisors

tly.



12/08/2008 12:02 PM

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

Subject Public input for Board of Supervisors

Submitted on: 12/8/2008 12:02:25 PM

name: Mike McKinley

phone:

comments: (Recently sent to Academy of Sciences - FYI) I recently visited San Francisco with my wife and a friend. We arrived by AmTrak. We were very pleased with the passenger treatment and timeliness of this transportation. We stayed in a very nice downtown hotel, just a block from the city's impressive Government building. The hotel staff was very receptive, attentive and helpful. We traveled from place to place using the City's efficient, timely and organized transit system. On the day after Thanksgiving, as planned, we arrived 30-minutes before the opening of the Academy of Sciences. We were sure a visit would add to our vacation enjoyment. We were wrong! We experienced no friendly, helpful reception. There was no organization, no timeliness, and no more efficiency. There was allot of bureaucratic bungling and thoughtlessness..

9:00 a.m. The Friday after Thanksgiving, we stood in a ticket line approximately 50 yards in length. The Ticket office was manned by only 4 persons, even though there were over 100 people waiting to 'buy' tickets, and more were arriving. We tried the shorter automated ticket purchases line on the sidewalk, but the machines did not allow for discount purchases, i.e. AAA, AARP.

9:50 a.m. We made it to the ticket window, purchased 3 adult tickets. We walked approximately 75-80 yards to what 'appeared' to be the end of the waiting line for ticket holders to enter the building. We then discovered the real end of the line snaked, around and up another 30 yards along a dirt hiking path. (Note: no where along this 130 yard line were there any accessible restrooms. We also noticed, from afar, two entry doors to the building for general public entry, but only one was open to allow people inside.

10:57 a.m. We managed to reach the entry door. We found, after our entry, people packed so tightly together that one had to wait in lines simply to move

88

5 to 10 feet. People were waiting in longer lines just to use the restroom. They were waiting in a line, approximately 35 yards long & 4 or 5 abreast, just to obtain tickets for the Planetarium show scheduled for 2-3 hours later in the day.

11:37 a.m. We were unable to move around to look at anything of interest. We were told "No Refunds" for the tickets. We left the Academy building disgusted. On exit, we noticed the ticket window remained open, selling more useless tickets to hundreds of more people who were unaware of the mayhem inside. We saw that the waiting line to enter the Academy was still as long as it had been 2 hours earlier. These poor people had no idea of what frustration awaited them. Many of these visitors were handicapped individuals, elderly persons with walkers, and families with children of all ages.

It was obvious the Academy had decided to continue making money at the expense of the paying public. A decision had been made to continue stuffing people into an already overcrowded building! Surely there must have been at least one Fire or Health & Safety Code being violated that day. These choices, plain and simple, constituted abuse of the public for the sole purpose of making money. The Management at the Academy of Sciences should be ashamed of the misery and inconvenience they placed on visitors that day.

We have decided never to return to the Academy. We intend to encourage people we know to also refrain. We will send a version of this letter to San Francisco newspapers. We will do the same with our local newspaper. We will send a copy of this letter to your city government's Council members, and we plan on posting our negative experience on travel websites.

You people owe us an apology and a refund:

User Data

Client IP (REMOTE_ADDR) : 129.8.204.68
Client IP via Proxy (HTTP_X_FORWARDED_FOR) :



12/07/2008 01:49 PM

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

cc

bcc

Subject Public input for Board of Supervisors

Submitted on: 12/7/2008 1:49:21 PM

name: Elise Pundt

phone:

comments:

To whom it may concern,

When I was reading the papers the other day, I came across and article talking about Proposition 8. This as I read was to overturn the ruling of the bill that was passed allowing gay marriage in California. I was appalled by such a thing as that. Yes what happened as to say a bill being passed that was not correct and not done in the right fashion is unbelievable. I cannot even comprehend it. I know that there are a lot of people who are yes for gay marriage and those who are not. Everyone has their own opinion, it happens, but to have something like this pass and not make sure it went through the process correctly is unbelievable. There were over 18,000 couples who went and got married because they could. That was fine, but to then realize that gay marriage was incorrect and to tell all those who love each other and had that chance to be like the "normal" people of society could no longer be the happily married couple was inhuman. We are people and have feelings. To treat us like cattle is something completely uncalled for. The government made the mistake and let this happen. Your government allowed this to go on. ~~No one caught it and then when it was after the fact, government~~ took it away. How is that a fair government? How can that be even right, when it hurt so many people that day they woke up and heard that Prop. 8 had been approved. These things were done in an inhuman and cruel way.


I being a member of the gay community could not believe that so many people could and do not have a heart. Even though I am over two thousand miles away, I still felt the pain that every other gay couple did. I felt the light of hope completely disappear that day. Just to let you know though, we will not stop fighting for what we think is right and fair. This will never stop till we get what is fair and that is equality.

Sincerely,
Elise Pundt

User Data

Client IP (REMOTE_ADDR) : 63.164.26.196
Client IP via Proxy (HTTP_X_FORWARDED_FOR) :

89



SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

REAL ESTATE SERVICES
1145 Market St., 7th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103 • Tel. (415) 487-5210 • Fax (415) 487-5200



*C: Lolita
cpage*

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

FROM: Nathan Purkiss, Government Relations Manager
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

CC: Supervisor Alioto-Pier

DATE: December 26, 2008

REFERENCE: 20081125-001

RE: Maps of Public Utilities Commission Property

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2008 DEC 26 PM 4:47
SM

GAVIN NEWSOM
MAYOR

ANN MOLLER CAEN
PRESIDENT

F.X. CROWLEY
VICE PRESIDENT

FRANCESCA VIETOR
COMMISSIONER

JULIET ELLIS
COMMISSIONER

ED HARRINGTON
GENERAL MANAGER

Supervisor Alioto-Pier requested that the PUC compile a list and maps of all developed and undeveloped land under the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's jurisdiction within the City and County of San Francisco. The response was to include maps of (1) developed land and (2) undeveloped land.

Attached is a list of lands under the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's jurisdiction within the City and County of San Francisco, as well as a map of properties that is color-coded with developed and undeveloped land separately designated. Also enclosed are site-specific maps for each undeveloped location.


In summary, the SFPUC maintains approximately 70 parcels for water, power and sewer operations within the City and County of San Francisco. These parcels vary in use and may include sites used to support operations, right-of-way, pump stations, reservoirs and treatment plants to name but a few.

For purposes of this report, developed land includes land that may have no visible infrastructure atop it, but has some function to further operations; for example, these functions may include water and sewer pipelines, pump stations, and staging areas for projects.

We have identified 5 tracts of land that are undeveloped. These tracts include the O'Shaughnessy Blvd. open space, a parcel located at Putnam Street and Crescent Avenue, a 1.4 acre parcel located at 17th Street and Folsom Street, a portion of the Laguna Honda Reservoir, and the Francisco Reservoir property.


Please feel free to contact us for further information or clarification of any of the properties listed or shown on the maps.


90




SFPUC Land to be Declared Surplus
 Putnam St. and Crescent Ave.

Legend

 SFPUC Parcels/Right-of-Way

 SFPUC Fee Owned Property
 Potential Surplus
 Total Area = 0.17 Acres

 Scale 1 : 1,500
 1 Inch = 125 feet


 0 50 100 200 Feet

Date: 10/20/06


The City does not guarantee that the information is accurate or complete. The City provides this information on an "as is" basis and disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to warranties of merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose and non-infringement. The City is not responsible for any damages arising from the use of data. Users should verify the information before making project commitments.

**SFPUC Land to
 be Declared Surplus
 17th St. and Folsom St.**

Legend

 SFPUC Parcels/Right-of-Way


 SFPUC Fee Owned
 Potential Surplus
 Total Area = 1.4 Acres

 **N**
 Scale 1 : 1,500
 1 Inch = 125 feet

 **Feet**
 0 50 100 200


Date: 10/20/06


The City does not guarantee that the information is accurate or complete. The City provides this information on an "as is" basis and disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to warranties of merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose and non-infringement. The City is not responsible for any damages arising from the use of data. Users should verify the information before making project commitments.




SFPUC Lands
Laguna Honda Reservoir

Legend

 SFPUC Lands

 SFPUC Fee Owned Property
 Potential Surplus
 Total Area = 618 Acres

 SFPUC Pipelines

 N
 Scale 1 : 3900
 1 Inch = 325 feet

 Feet
 0 100 200 400 600

Date: 12/26/08


The City does not guarantee that the information is accurate or complete. The City provides this information on an "as is" basis and disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to warranties of merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose and non-infringement. The City is not responsible for any damages arising from the use of data. Users should verify the information before making project commitments.








SFPUC Lands
O'Shaughnessy Blvd.
Open Space


Legend

 SFPUC Parcels/Right-of-Way

 SFPUC Fee Owned Property
 Potential Surplus
 Total Area = 12.25 Acres

 SFPUC Pipelines

 N
 Scale 1 : 6,000
 1 Inch = 500 feet

 0 125 250 500 750 Feet


Date: 12/26/08

The City does not guarantee that the information is accurate or complete. The City provides this information on an "as is" basis and disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to warranties of merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose and non-infringement. The City is not responsible for any damage arising from the use of data. Users should verify the information before making project commitments.


**SFPUC Land to
be Declared Surplus
Francisco St. Reservoir**

Legend

 SFPUC Parcels/Right-of-Way

 SFPUC Fee Owned Property
Potential Surplus
Total Area = 3.4 Acres


 SFPUC Pipelines

 Scale 1 : 1,500
1 Inch = 125 feet

 0 35 70 140 210 Feet

Date: 12/26/08

The City does not guarantee that the information is accurate or complete. The City provides this information on an "as is" basis and disclaims all warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to warranties of merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose and non-infringement. The City is not responsible for any damages arising from the use of data. Users should verify the information before making project commitments.




San Francisco Public Utilities Comm

Name	SFPUC Dept.	Acres
LAKE MERCED PARK	PUC/Water Department	624.46
AMAZON RESERVOIR TRACT	PUC/Hetch Hetchy	56.46
SE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PLANT	PUC/Clean Water Program	50.30
SUNSET RESERVOIR WATER FACILITIES	PUC/Clean Water Program	34.44
UNIVERSITY MOUND RESERVOIR WATER FACILITIES	PUC/Water Department	34.27
LAGUNA HONDA RESERVOIR	PUC/Water Department	18.93
BALBOA PARK RESERVOIR WATER FACILITIES	PUC/Water Department	17.57
O'SHAUGHNESSY BLVD. OPEN SPACE	PUC/Hetch Hetchy	12.25
SUTRO RESERVOIR WATER FACILITIES	PUC/Water Department	11.78
SUMMIT RESERVOIR WATER FACILITIES	PUC/Water Department	9.06
COLLEGE HILL RESERVOIR WATER FACILITIES	PUC/Water Department	7.96
1900 NEWCOMB AVE	PUC/Clean Water Program	7.32
RESERVOIR LANDS	PUC/Water Department	6.83
NORTHPOINT SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT	PUC/Clean Water Program	6.50
VACANT LAND - SHAFTER	PUC/Clean Water Program	6.17
CENTRAL PUMP STATION/MERCED MANOR RESERVOIR	PUC/Water Department	4.92
20" STRIP ALONG E LINE	PUC/Clean Water Program	4.45
STANFORD HEIGHTS RESERVOIR WATER FACILITIES	PUC/Hetch Hetchy	3.69
FRANCISCO ST RESERVOIR WATER FACILITIES	PUC/Clean Water Program	3.36
LOMBARD RESERVOIR WATER FACILITIES	PUC/Water Department	2.60
NORTH PT CROSSTOWN TRANSPORT MAIN	PUC/Clean Water Program	2.47
RICHMOND TRANSPORT	PUC/Clean Water Program	1.84
WATER DEPARTMENT, PARCEL 370	PUC/Water Department	1.77
17TH ST. AND FOLSOM ST.	PUC/Water Department	1.40
BRYANT STREET PIPE YARD	PUC/Water Department	1.40
REIS TRACT LOTS - TUCKER	PUC/Water Department	1.33
WET WATER RETENSION BASIN	PUC/Clean Water Program	1.28
POTRERO HEIGHTS RESERVOIR WATER FACILITIES	PUC/Water Department	0.92
STATE RELINQUISHMENT (1975)	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.91
WILDE AVE RESERVOIR	PUC/Water Department	0.80
PUTNAM ST. AND CRESCENT AVE.	PUC/Water Department	0.70
LAKE HONDA TRACT (NE 7TH AVE)	PUC/Water Department	0.51
HUNTERS POINT RESERVOIR WATER FACILITIES	PUC/Water Department	0.46
REIS TRACT LOTS - ARLETA II	PUC/Water Department	0.46

on Land Holdings in San Francisco

Name	SFPUC Dept.	Acres
ISLAIS CREEK LOTS (AT CRESCENT)	PUC/Water Department	0.45
FOREST HILL TANK	PUC/Water Department	0.44
ISLAIS CREEK LOTS (AT BOYLSTON)	PUC/Water Department	0.44
SEWER R/W (FOR SEWER ACCESS) AT BURNSIDE & BOSWORTH	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.35
REIS TRACT LOTS - ARLETA I	PUC/Water Department	0.35
DRUMM ST PUMP STATION	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.26
SE EFFLUENT SEWER	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.25
SEA CLIFF #2 PUMP STATION	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.21
SEWER RIGHT-OF-WAY AT NAPOLEON	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.18
SEWER R/W (FOR SEWER ACCESS) AT DIAMOND & BOSWORTH	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.15
LAKESHORE PUMPING STATION	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.13
LAMARTINE ST SEWER R/W	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.12
SEWER DRAINAGE (JOOST)	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.11
SEWER R/W (FOR SEWER ACCESS) AT JOOST & BADEN I	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.11
SEWER DRAINAGE (MELROSE & EDNA)	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.11
PARK MERCED SEWAGE PUMP STATION	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.11
SEWER RIGHT-OF-WAY AT DE LONG	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.09
SEWER R/W (FOR SEWER ACCESS) AT JOOST & BADEN II	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.08
HILLCREST AND OCEAN VIEW LOTS	PUC/Water Department	0.08
SLUDGE TREATMENT PLANT	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.06
CRESTLINE PUMP HOUSE	PUC/Water Department	0.06
SEWER RIGHT-OF-WAY AT QUINT	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.06
SEWER RIGHT-OF-WAY AT PALOU	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.06
PUMP STATION	PUC/Water Department	0.06
COLLEGE HILL STATION	PUC/Water Department	0.06
MUNICH STREET PUMP STATION	PUC/Water Department	0.06
SEWAGE PUMP STATION	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.05
4TH ST NORTH SEWAGE PUMPING STATION	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.05
SEA CLIFF #1 SEWAGE PUMP	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.04
SEWER RIGHT OF WAY	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.03
SEWER R/W LOT 16	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.02
SEWER RIGHT-OF-WAY (5" STRIP)	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.02
GRIFFITH ST SEWAGE PUMPING STATION	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.02
SEWER RIGHT-OF-WAY	PUC/Clean Water Program	0.02



SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ong:Joy
c:cpage



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

December 29, 2008

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2008 DEC 29 AM 11:51
BY

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

**Subject: Water System Improvement Program (WSIP)
Release of Reserves Request for \$136,622,239**

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

I would like to request your assistance to calendar a release of reserves request for the Water System Improvement Program (WSIP) project budgets noted below.

As part of the recently approved \$1.9 billion WSIP supplemental appropriation, new funding for projects exceeding \$100 million was placed on Board of Supervisors reserve. At this time, we are requesting release of reserve funding for non-construction related appropriation authorizations. These funds are needed to continue pre-construction activities on the projects not otherwise subject to Board of Supervisors reserve and to pay for associated financing costs required to fund WSIP.

Project	Description of Projects Exceeding \$100 Million	Supplemental Amount Approved	Associated Construction Amount	Release of Reserve Requested
CUW381	Sunol Valley Water Treatment Plant Expansion / Treated Water Reservoir	\$111,831,674	\$106,264,280	\$5,567,394
CUW359	Irvington Tunnel / Alameda Siphons	318,816,588	311,353,678	7,462,910
CUW374	Calaveras Dam Replacement	240,863,657	234,384,782	6,478,875
CUW368	Bay Division Pipeline / Hydraulic Capacity Upgrade	481,929,032	470,088,574	11,840,458
CUW300	Financing Costs / Capitalized Interest	252,646,138	147,373,536	105,272,602
Total		\$1,406,087,089	\$1,269,464,850	\$136,622,239

Regards,

[Signature]
Ed Harrington
General Manager

91



ahimsa sumchai

To <board_of_supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us>,

cc

bcc

Subject: Demand for Materials and Communications: SOTF representative and BOS Peskin and Maxwell 10/9/07

Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai NSCA-CPT

Subject: Demand for Materials and Communications: SOTF representative and BOS Peskin and Maxwell 10/9/07
Date: Wed, 17 Dec 2008 00:53:44 +0000

Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai NSCA-CPT

Fr:
To:
Subject: Demand for Materials and Communications: SOTF representative and BOS Peskin and Maxwell 10/9/07
Date: Tue, 22 Jan 2008 14:19:05 -0800

From:
Sent: Sunday, January 20, 2008 3:26 PM
To:

Subject: Demand for Materials and Communications: SOTF representative and BOS Peskin and Maxwell 10/9/07

To: City Attorney Dennis Herrera
Re: Demand for materials and communications related to the 10/9/07 meeting between SOTF representatives and Supervisor's Peskin and Maxwell and City Attorney Buck Delventhal

93

Dear Mr. Herrera,

I hereby request and demand under the provisions of San Francisco City Charter Article 67 the Sunshine Ordinance and the California Public Records Act, as well as Freedom of the Press mandates of the State and Federal Constitution, all materials and communications related to the 10/9/07 meeting held between representatives of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, Supervisors Maxwell and Peskin and City Attorney Buck Delventhal.

Please also accept notice that the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force has for the third time found merit in its determinations regarding complaints submitted documenting violations of Article 67 by Supervisor Sophie Maxwell in her capacity as member and chair of the BOS Land Use subcommittee. Additionally, accept notice that should Supervisor Maxwell engage in further activities designed to censor, suppress, repress or omit my public comment or opinion as a member of the independent free media I will initiate legal action charging Supervisor Maxwell with harrassment and intimidation.

Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai NSCA-CPT

Date: Fri, 18 Jan 2008 01:22:28 +0000

Subject: [CommunityFirstCoalition] FW: Order of Determination: File #07091_Dr. Ahimsa Porter-Sumchai v. Supervisor Sophie Maxwell

Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai NSCA-CPT

> From: sotf@sfgov.org
> Subject: Order of Determination: File #07091_Dr. Ahimsa Porter-Sumchai v. Supervisor Sophie Maxwell
> To: asumchai@hotmail.com; Sophie.Maxwell@sfgov.org; Jon.Lau@sfgov.org
> Date: Thu, 17 Jan 2008 13:58:01 -0800
>
>
> Attached is the Order of Determination from the Sunshine Ordinance Task
> Force, regarding the above titled complaint.
>
> (See attached file: 07091_Dr Ahimsha Sumchai vs Sup Maxwell.pdf)
>
>
> Administrator
> Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
> 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
> City Hall, Room 244
> San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
> OFC: (415) 554-7724
> FAX: (415) 554-7854
> SOTF@sfgov.org

Shed those extra pounds with MSN and The Biggest Loser!! [Learn more.](#)

[Messages in this topic \(1\)](#) | [Reply \(via web post\)](#) | [Start a new topic](#)
[Messages](#) | [Files](#) | [Photos](#) | [Links](#) | [Database](#) | [Polls](#) | [Members](#) | [Calendar](#)
MARKETPLACE

[Earn your degree in as few as 2 years - Advance your career with an AS, BS, MS degree -](#)

College-Finder.net.

YAHOO! GROUPS

[Change settings via the Web](#) (Yahoo! ID required)

Change settings via email: [Switch delivery to Daily Digest](#) | [Switch format to Traditional](#)

[Visit Your Group](#) | [Yahoo! Groups Terms of Use](#) | [Unsubscribe](#)

[Visit Your Group](#)

Get in Shape

[on Yahoo! Groups](#)

Find a buddy
and lose weight.

Cat Fanatics

[on Yahoo! Groups](#)

Find people who are
crazy about cats.

Improvement Zone

[on Yahoo! Groups](#)

Find groups about
New Year's goals.

Shed those extra pounds with MSN and The Biggest Loser! [Learn more.](#)

Send e-mail anywhere. No map, no compass. [Get your Hotmail® account now.](#)

Send e-mail faster without improving your typing skills. [Get your Hotmail® account.](#)



ahimsa sumchai

To <board_of_supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us>

cc

bcc

Subject PRESS RELEASE: Mirant Peaker Plant: Federal Lawsuit on
Proposed San Francisco Peaker Plant

Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai NSCA-CPT

Subject: PRESS RELEASE: Mirant Peaker Plant: Federal Lawsuit on Proposed San Francisco
Peaker Plant

Date: Fri, 12 Dec 2008 00:59:05 +0000

Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai NSCA-CPT

Subject: PRESS RELEASE: Mirant Peaker Plant: Federal Lawsuit on Proposed San Francisco
Peaker Plant

Date: Fri, 16 Nov 2007 16:22:23 -0800

From: Brightline Defense - Front Desk

Sent: Friday, November 16, 2007 9:10 AM

Subject: RE: PRESS RELEASE: Mirant Peaker Plant: Federal Lawsuit on Proposed San Francisco Peaker
Plant

Hi Dr. Sumchai,

Here's an update on the lawsuit.

On September 24, 2007, we filed our federal suit on behalf of a cross-section of individuals and organizations affected by the City's proposed CT power plant in Southeast San Francisco. In doing so we had 2 objectives: 1) force the City to reach an agreement with Mirant in which Mirant will agree to close the Potrero Power Plant if the CT power plant is built, avoiding the possibility of two power plants in the neighborhood, and 2) require the Bay Area Air Quality Management District to analyze the greenhouse gas impact, both at the ground-level and on the community at large, before the CT power plant is built, in

compliance with the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling in Massachusetts v. EPA.

We have accomplished goal number one, as Mayor Newsom produced the term sheet of such an agreement with Mirant on November 8.

In regard to number two, we're working on it. We're dealing with lawyers from the Department of Justice, the EPA, and the BAAQMD to determine when the new greenhouse gas rules will be promulgated. This is an identical issue, the EPA's delay in setting forth new rules regulating greenhouse gases as criteria pollutants, currently faced by the California Attorney General's office.

Joshua Arce, Executive Director / Staff Attorney
Brightline Defense Project

From: ahimsa sumchai

Sent: Thu 11/15/2007 4:24 PM

To: home@prosf.org; Brightline Defense - Front Desk; editor@sfbayview.com;
communityfirstcoalition@yahoogroups.com; stoppp@our-city.org

Subject: PRESS RELEASE: Mirant Peaker Plant: Federal Lawsuit on Proposed San Francisco Peaker Plant
What is the status of this lawsuit?

Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai NSCA-CPT

Subject: PRESS RELEASE: Mirant Peaker Plant: Federal Lawsuit on Proposed San Francisco Peaker Plant

Date: Tue, 25 Sep 2007 13:54:05 -0700

From: Brightline Defense - Front Desk [mailto:frontdesk@brightlinedefense.org]

Sent: Monday, September 24, 2007 12:23 PM

To: fyi@brightlinedefense.org

Subject: PRESS RELEASE - Today, 9/24 Federal Lawsuit on Proposed San Francisco Peaker Plant

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

SAN FRANCISCO RESIDENTS FILE SUIT TO HALT CONSTRUCTION OF COMBUSTION TURBINE POWER PLANT IN THEIR NEIGHBORHOOD

Federal Lawsuit Seeks Injunction to Stay Air Quality Permits
for Proposed "Peaker" Plant in Southeast San Francisco

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission is scheduled to give final approval for the construction of these this new power plant at its scheduled meeting on Tuesday, September 25th.

San Francisco, California – September 24, 2007 – Brightline Defense Project today filed suit in federal district court to stop the City of San Francisco's proposed combustion turbine power plant from receiving the permits necessary to allow its construction in the city's Potrero neighborhood. The filing parties allege that the

proposed San Francisco Electric Reliability Project, consisting of three combustion turbine "peakers" designed to supply energy in times of excess demand, has not been properly studied by the Environmental Protection Agency and Bay Area Air Quality Management District in light of a recent United States Supreme Court ruling. The lawsuit also claims that the proposed plant — the City's solution to prompt closure of the aging Mirant Power Plant — is an inferior alternative to proposals that would shutter the Mirant plant without the addition of a new fossil fuel-burning power plant to this low-income, mostly minority area.

Named plaintiffs in the suit include potentially affected local residents Lynne Brown, and Regina Hollins, and the community-based organization, the A. Philip Randolph Institute, San Francisco Chapter (APRI).

Today's complaint references the recent Supreme Court decision in the case of Massachusetts v. EPA in requesting that the federal court prevent the issuance of an Authority to Construct permit until the EPA has complied with the highest court's order to reevaluate its decision not to regulate greenhouse gases. In addition, the parties allege confusion on the part of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, the municipal agency behind the turbine plant proposal, and the California Independent System Operator, the organization charged with operating the state's power grid, regarding the assumption that the Mirant plant cannot be shut down without a replacement plant that continues to disproportionately pollute the Potrero and Bayview Hunters Point neighborhoods.

~~"The Public Utilities Commission advocates the combustion turbine plant because it will provide 'less pollution' than the existing Mirant plant,"~~ stated Joshua Arce, Executive Director of Brightline Defense Project, the non-profit legal aid organization that filed suit on behalf of the complainants. "Legally," Arce continued, "the community is entitled to no pollution."

"There are green alternatives to these polluting power plants. The city should promote any alternative, such as conservation or any of the renewable energy options that have recently been discussed, that is not accompanied by further contamination of the community," Arce said.

"I've lived all my life in Potrero, and I too want the power plant closed, but it makes no sense to me to close one dirty power plant with three dirty plants," said Regina Hollins a plaintiff in the case who lives blocks from where the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) plans to site its three combustion turbines. "Too many of my friends and neighbors are sick and suffer from asthma. More pollution is not the answer to closing the Potrero power plant — we want a NO pollution solution," added Ms. Hollins.

~~"APRI joined hundreds of community activists to close down the Hunters Point Power Plant and now we want Potrero closed too. The southeast community of San Francisco is a poor, mostly minority and increasingly non-English speaking community that has long~~

lived under the shadows of polluting smoke stacks. Today, the community stands up to city bureaucrats to say we don't want to live with three more smoke stacks in our neighborhood sending dangerous toxins into the air." said James A. Bryant, president of the A. Philip Randolph Institute. "We want a Green alternative, we want solar not dirty peaker plants to close Potrero," added Mr. Bryant.

Power plant supporters argue that, despite the negative impact of continued pollution in the neighborhood, the Independent System Operator will only accept implementation of the proposed combustion turbines at this particular location if the Mirant plant is to be closed.

Today's lawsuit, however, alleges that the Independent System Operator lacks the authority to insist on a specific location in matters of power plant siting, and that the City's self-initiated drive to build the proposed turbine plant is a short-term fix at the long-term expense of disadvantaged residents who will continue to be exposed to pollutants for the foreseeable future.

For more information, or a copy of the federal complaint, please visit www.brightlinedefense.org (click on "News") or contact Joshua Arce at 415-837-0600 or josh@brightlinedefense.org.

###

Climb to the top of the charts! Play Star Shuffle: the word scramble challenge with star power. Play Now!

Suspicious message? There's an alert for that. [Get your Hotmail® account now.](#)

Life on your PC is safer, easier, and more enjoyable with Windows Vista®. [See how](#)



ahimsa sumchai

12/27/2008 03:07 PM

To <board_of_supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us>

cc

bcc

Subject San Francisco Board of Education Stands with School Children on Lennar Toxic Dust Exposures

Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai NSCA-CPT

From:

To: :

Subject: San Francisco Board of Education Stands with School Children on Lennar Toxic Dust Exposures

Date: Fri, 12 Dec 2008 22:40:11 +0000

Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai NSCA-CPT

From: home@prosf.org

To: home@prosf.org

Subject: SFUSD: San Francisco Board of Education Stands with School Children: THE LIARS CLUB!

Date: Tue, 25 Sep 2007 13:56:26 -0700

From: frandacosta;

Sent: Friday, September 21, 2007 8:12 AM

To: BOS BOS; PROSF; Christian Holmer

Cc: Michael Cohen; Shelly Bradford; Gregg Fortner; Keith Forman; Nathaniel Ford; Heather Fong; Michael Farrah Jr.; Jared Blumenfeld; Jesse Blout; Fred Blackwell; Dan Bernal; Dwayne Jones; Daniel Homsey

Subject: San Francisco Board of Education stands with innocent children from the BVHP.

--

San Francisco Unified School District and the Board of Education stand with innocent children exposed to toxic dust and Asbestos Friables by Lennar BVHP LLC:

<http://www.indybay.org/newsitems/2007/09/21/18448847.php?printable=true>

Francisco Da Costa

<http://www.indybay.org/newsitems/2007/09/21/18448847.php>

San Francisco | Education & Student Activism

Lennar BVHP LLC and the San Francisco School Board's Resolution exposing Lennar

by Francisco Da Costa

Friday Sep 21st, 2007 8:03 AM

The San Francisco School Board has taken the initiative to bring to light the adverse impacts imposed on innocent children and others by Lennar BVHP LLC. Several PUBLIC schools have been impacted by Lennar's BVHP LLC activities on Parcel A and massive grading of Ultramaphic Serpentine Rock. Concerned parents, relatives, and concerned constituents have gone before the San Francisco Unified School Board Meetings and expressed their concern linked to the adverse impacts and children. Be there Tuesday, September 25, 2007 at 4:30 p.m. - 555 Franklin Street to voice your opinion and be heard.

Concerned parents, children, friends and relatives, and decent constituents have gone before the San Francisco Unified School District at 555 Franklin Street and expressed their concerns about the adverse impacts and suffering - imposed by Lennar BVHP LLC as a result of activities, many illegal on Parcel A - at Hunters Point Naval Shipyard.

Lennar BVHP LLC has conducted massive grading of a very toxic and dangerous rock - called Ultramaphic Serpentine Rock. This rock when crushed is very toxic and when released Asbestos Structures into the air and inhaled will cause adverse impacts in the short term and death in the long term.

One single Asbestos Friable inhaled in the human system will cause cancer and slow death. The World Health Organization makes this very clear. So, do enlightened, well informed doctors and scientists well versed with Asbestos Structures.

The San Francisco Health Department has set a cap of 16,000 structures per cubic meter - a standard that does not take into consideration that this - very toxic rock when crushed belongs to a family of Serpentine Rock and precisely named Ultramaphic Serpentine Rock.

This particular rock is found on Parcel A and some surrounding areas on Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. Potrero Hill and there is a vein of it at the Presidio of San Francisco.

The SF Health Department has released reading material that says the air on Parcel is cleaner then most parts of San Francisco and California. Parcel A and the surrounding Area is a Superfund Site.

Hunters Point Naval Shipyard is one of the ten worst toxic sites in this Nation. Dr. Mitch Katz and Dr. Rajiv Bhatia know something thousands of other do not - and if they are totally wrong and have harmed so many - they must go.

The SFHD mandated that Lennar BVHP LLC sign and agree to a legal agreement as stated in

Article 31 of the San Francisco Health Department Code. Lennar BVHP LLC chose to violate the agreement and did not have Dust Monitoring equipment and Asbestos Monitoring equipment in place of the project for 4 months at the start of their Project on Parcel A. This is a very serious crime.

~~During these 4 months massive grading took place and Lennar BVHP LLC did not do anything -~~
four months is a long time and the SFHD bears responsibility for not following up on complaints and other telephone calls made.

I made several telephone calls myself and wrote about the situation on my web site:

<http://www.franciscodacosta.org>

Some of us came before the San Francisco School Board and spoke about this issue. We went before the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA) and voiced our concern. We went before the Land Use Committee and of course the San Francisco Board of Supervisors (BOS).

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors (BOS) had a special hearing and voted 6-5 to side with Lennar BVHP LLC. Aaron Peskin, Sophie Maxwell, Sean Elsbernd, Jake McGoldrick, Michaela Alioto-Pier, and Bevan Dufty sided with Lennar BVHP LLC.

Ross Mirkarimi, Tom Ammiano, Ed Jew, Chris Daly, and Gerardo Sandoval sided with the community and the children that are adversely affected.

Hundreds of children and elders are rushed to hospital every day - suffering from breathing problems, nose bleeds, severe coughing, headaches, and other related ailments linked with breathing.

It is not uncommon to see several Ambulances respond to Bayview Hunters Point in the affected area to rush patients to near by hospitals every day.

Several people have died.

The Coroner Office can reveal the truth if pressured by the authorities that want to get to the bottom of this serious Health and Safety issue that has plagued the constituents living near by - for the last two years - about the time the rogue Lennar BVHP LLC started their dubious operations - large scale massive grading.

Lennar BVHP LLC and Luster Corporation had the responsibility to do the right thing - but failed and failed again after repeated warnings.

This City has Article 31 and a Dust Mitigation that Lennar BVHP LLC ignored.

This City and County of San Francisco has a Precautionary Principle and Lennar BVHP LLC has failed to abide by it. Shame of Lennar BVHP LLC and our SFHD and also our SF BOS.

Recently we conducted private tests on dust swipes taken from some hot spots and mostly from exterior surfaces. We were shocked with the results too many exceedences of in organics and some - radiological in nature.

~~We have empirical data linked to over 100 exceedences of Asbestos Dust - over the cap of 16,000 structures - some readings reaching 55,000 and 60,000 structures per cubic meter.~~

The paradox is when the real heavy grading was done - there were no Dust and Asbestos Monitoring Equipment in place. This is San Francisco and we brag we are Green.

Come on San Francisco - we can do better then that and we can do it - now.

<http://www.indybay.org/newsitems/2007/09/20/18448824.php>

Francisco Da Costa
Director
Environmental Justice Advocacy

<http://www.hunterspointnavalshipyard.com>

© 2000-2007 San Francisco Bay Area Independent Media Center. Unless otherwise stated by the author, all content is free for non-commercial reuse, reprint, and rebroadcast, on the net and elsewhere. Opinions are those of the contributors and are not necessarily endorsed by the SF Bay Area IMC. Disclaimer | Privacy | Contact

--Forwarded Message Attachment--

To: home@prosf.org
Subject: Dr. Sumchai: The LIARS CLUB!

From: ahimsa sumchai [mailto:asumchai@hotmail.com]

Sent: Monday, September 24, 2007 12:20 PM

To: editor@sfbayview.com; asumchai@hotmail.com; asumchai@sfbayview.com; rtomp@sbcglobal.net; frandacosta@sbcglobal.net; marie@greenaction.org; gavin.newsom@sfgov.org; espanolajackson@sbcglobal.net; communityfirstcoalition@yahoogroups.com; publisher@sfbayview.com; m26sf@aol.com; iolmisha@cs.com; zurda@cal.berkeley.edu; board_of_supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us; home@prosf.org; rolandgarret@aol.com; chris.daly@sfgov.org

Subject: The LIARS CLUB!

Please distribute widely!

Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai NSCA-CPT

THE LIARS CLUB

PARTS I and II

"There was clear evidence levels of asbestos exceeded mandatory thresholds at both the fence line and in the community...the exposures did result in some increase risk to the community.... the concentrations of dust could not be interpreted because of their (Lennar Corporations) sampling methods."

Excerpts from letter written by Thomas Sinks, Ph.D California Department of Public Health

"We are heartened by the fact that the CDC and the California Department of Public Health...appear to agree with the San Francisco Department of Public Health...that there was no significant health risk created by the grading activities at the Shipyard." Excerpts from Press release issued by Mayor Newsom's Office of Communcations 9/21/07

In 2002 a Civil Grand Jury report on the Hunters Point Shipyard found "incomplete information, complex toxic testing requirements, failure to study and explain cluster illnesses among nearby long term residents." The CGJ recommended using commonly accepted scientific techniques to document and evaluate any evidence of clustered environmental illnesses among residents of BVHP.

According to a 2004 investigation published by the San Francisco Chronicle, "in Bayview Hunters Point each of these groups - African Americans, Asians, Pacific Islanders and Hispanics face infant mortality rates above what is expected for their race and ethnicity in California. Babies are 2.5 times more likely to die in their first year here than in other areas of San Francisco. A Chronicle analysis of 10 years of state data shows...within yards of each other around the barracks like Alice Griffith Housing Projects, five families have lost a total of eight babies"

. In 2003 the US. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Air an Radiation published a report on Particle Pollution which states,"scientists are evaluating new studies suggesting exposure to high particle levels may be associated with low birth weight in infants, pre-term deliveries and fetal and infant deaths".

As a physician and scientist I am deeply disturbed by Mayor Gavin Newsom and Health Director Mitchell Katz's unethical perpetuation of lies and misinformation to further their medicolegal, financial and political conflict of interest in the dirty development of the Hunters Point Shipyard.

In an unsigned fact sheet widely distributed to the Bayview Hunters Point Community this year, Katz stated "You may have heard there are reasons to worry about your health because of the construction dust generated by the redevelopment of Parcel A of the Hunters Point Shipyard. That is not true. After extensive analysis the Department of Public Health has concluded that the construction work at the Hunters Point Shipyard Parcel A is safe and will not cause long term or serious health problems."

The single greatest failure of the Department of Public Health is its deliberate refusal to investigate the impact of particle pollution on a symptomatic population of children and adults residing immediately adjacent to the Parcel A grading and excavation site.

The mainstream scientific community has long recognized there is no safe level of exposure

to asbestos. As noted by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, "Excessive cancer risks have been demonstrated for all fiber concentrations studied to date. Evaluation of all available human data provides no evidence for a "safe" level of asbestos exposure.

Last week the California Department of Public Health's Site Inspection Assessment, which is funded by the Agency for Toxic Substances Disease Registry, released its report on Parcel A construction activities. ~~ATSDR evaluates the environmental and human components that lead to~~ human exposure.

Authored by Thomas Sinks, Ph.D, the study found the community was placed at "increased risk" by the exposures to levels of asbestos that "exceeded mandatory thresholds both at the fence line and in the community".

On Friday, September 21, 2007 Mayor Gavin Newsom issued a press release that deliberately misinterprets the findings of the study and claims **"the CDC and the California Department of Public Health agree with the San Francisco Department of Public Health that there was no significant health risk created by the grading activities at the shipyard."**

Newsom deliberately misidentifies the study as having been conducted by the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta. The study investigation was conducted by the Site Assessment Section of the California Department of Public Health. I was contacted by the study investigators and forwarded comprehensive air monitoring data I had obtained from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and a litany of emails I have in storage from high ranking members of the Department of Public Health.

In yet another deliberately misleading statement published as a letter in last week's San Francisco Bay Guardian, Mitch Katz, M.D. Director of Health and Rajiv Bhatia, M.D. Director of Occupational and Environmental Health state, "Soil at Parcel A has been tested repeatedly over the past decades, demonstrating no unsafe levels of any artificial hazardous chemicals."

Ten years ago ATSDR conducted a Public Health Assessment of Hunters Point Shipyard and identified that completed and potential pathways of human exposure to contamination sources exist. Those pathways include soils at the shipyards Parcel E landfill and bay fill areas, as well as on-site and off site soils containing PCBs, metals and lead.

Despite assurances that grading is near completion, Lennar corporation continues it's reckless construction activities on Parcel A that have generated a grand total of 66 documented exceedences in asbestos levels mandating work stoppage and four notices of violation by the Department of Public Health including a 48 hour temporary shut down last month for dust emissions witnessed to cross onto Navy property.

Parcel A of the Hunters Point Shipyard was a "dirty transfer" of property from the Federal government to the City and County of San Francisco in 2004. Only two sites on Parcel A were carried through to the Remedial Investigation (RI) stage of the Federal Superfund or CERCLA act. Parcel A never underwent a full cleanup to the final remedy stage as required by CERCLA and was transferred with a litany of residual contaminants from lead and asbestos in buildings to arsenic, metals, motor oil and breakdown products of diesel in soil and groundwater.

PART II

The declaration statement of the Parcel A Record of Decision (ROD) published pursuant to the CERCLA Act on November 16, 1995 states, "Based on an evaluation of analytical data and

other information, the Navy has determined that no remedial action is necessary to ensure the protection of human health and the environment at Parcel A."

The Parcel A ROD documents the soil analysis for metals at one of the two Parcel A RI sites conducted by the Navy. Numerous metals remained in concentrations exceeding their preliminary remediation goals as established by the EPA after the Navy had excavated the soil. Arsenic was detected in 40 of 41 samples, beryllium in 36 of 41 samples, chromium in 19 of 41 samples, manganese in 35 of 41 samples as was nickel.

Parcel A was transferred with deed restrictions notifying the public of lead based paint contamination in buildings. The lead based paint survey was conducted in 1997. According to the Parcel A Finding of Suitability to Transfer or FOST, when the 1997 supplemental lead sampling was complete lead in concentrations exceeding the 221mg/kg EPA clean up goal was detected on Parcel A. Rather than clean it up the BRAC Cleanup Team reviewed all of the data on lead for Parcel A from both the 1993 and the 1997 sampling. The average concentration of lead in soils across Parcel A derived from the 1993 and 1997 sampling was calculated to be 215 mg/kg. Because it fell short of the 221 mg/kg clean up goal it was allowed to remain in the soil. Over the next decade Parcel A buildings were allowed to deteriorate without soil testing at the time of the transfer of the property in 2004. Thus, the Navy could not guarantee that lead based paint had not been released into Parcel A soils exceeding the 221mg/kg clean up requirement at the time of the Parcel A transfer ten years later!

The Parcel A FOST identifies the presence of lead-based paint in buildings on Parcel A and prohibits use of these structures prior to demolition. The City was charged with responsibility for managing all lead-based paint hazards, including soil contamination in compliance with the Residential Lead Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992.

Parcel A buildings with lead based paint are being leased by the Redevelopment Agency to artists and other base tenants despite the risk of lead exposure.

On November 16, 2004 the cities Health Commission endorsed Article 31, a new environmental ordinance establishing for Parcel A residual soil concentrations and requirements for preparing plans and reports including site evaluation and mitigation, risk evaluation and closure reports. Article 31 was voted into law by the Board of Supervisors in December of 2004 and signed by the Mayor in 2005.

It mandates that health and safety plans address the hazards of each phase of construction site operations at the Shipyard and include requirements and procedures for employee protection, including health and safety risk or hazard analysis and medical surveillance. Article 31 also establishes residual soil screening criteria for Parcel A. Hazardous constituents listed including inorganic and bioaccumulative toxic substances, volatile organic pollutants, PCBs, Total petroleum hydrocarbons, pesticides, metals and radionuclides.

Article 31 directs the Director of Health the authority to bill the developer fees to defray the cost of document processing and review, consultation and administration of Article 31. For fiscal year 2007-2008 that fee is \$153 per hour. Section 3109 of Article 31 cites as violations "fraud, willful misrepresentation, or any willfully inaccurate or false statement in any report required by this article."

Article 31 confers upon the Health Commission the power to enforce developer compliance with deed restrictions, EIR mitigation measures and other city, state and federal laws. Enforcement mechanisms include withholding or denial of permits, work stoppages, penalties for permit violations and mandatory civil penalties.

Despite the documentation of an exposed symptomatic population of workers and children at the Parcel A site, Health Director Mitchell Katz and Rajiv Bhatia, Director of Occupational and Environmental Health, have failed to devise human exposure protocols for toxic dust exposure and failed to order standard of care tests for a population symptomatic of pneumoconioses - the deposition of dust particles in the human lung, including baseline chest xrays, pulmonary function tests, lead and arsenic testing.

Indeed, the city has taken the public stance that no harm has resulted from the particle pollution exposures in statements made by DPH, the Mayors Office and appointed members of the Mayor's Citizens Advisory Committee for the shipyard.

The EPA has released pamphlets and fact sheets on particle pollution identifying people with heart or lung disease, older adults, and children to be at greater risk from particles, especially when they are physically active. Short term exposures to particles within hours or days can aggravate lung disease, causing asthma attacks and acute bronchitis, and may also increase susceptibility to respiratory infections. In people with heart disease, short term exposures have been linked to heart attacks and arrhythmias. Long term exposures have been associated with reduced lung function, the development of chronic bronchitis and premature death.

Children are at increased risk because their lungs are still developing, they spend more time at high activity levels, and they are more likely to have asthma or acute respiratory diseases when particle levels are high.

Gary McIntyre is the former Parcel A project manager who filed lawsuit, along with three other African American high ranking employees this year, against Lennar Corporation in Superior court in a case scheduled to go forward in early 2008. He offers testimony in his deposition transcript that asbestos levels at Parcel A sensed by Lennar's air stations reached an astounding 58,000 structures per cubic meter in December of 2006. Additionally, McIntyre states he was diagnosed and treated by medical doctors for respiratory symptoms and that he and the other plaintiffs were held to a code of silence about the asbestos exceedences.

Mayor Newsom has proposed the dirty transfer of the remaining 430 land based acres of the shipyard - a federal Superfund site -to the city and county of San Francisco to meet the 49ers 2012 deadline for construction of a new stadium. He proposes that a "specialized environmental remediation firm be allowed to finish certain elements of the clean up" with the city providing "extensive oversight."

The shipyard's level of toxic contamination has not been fully characterized. It would be a liability to accelerate the transfer of a federal Superfund site from the National Priority List with the data gaps that exist in the characterization of this property. The city admits it cannot clean up the shipyards radiation contaminated sites which comprise the bulk of Parcels D and E. Parcel F, the shipyards underwater regions have not been adequately studied.

Once the shipyard is transferred out of federal control and becomes the property of Lennar BVHP, a limited liability, private, non-governmental corporation, government oversight will become as dangerously secretive as it is now on Parcel A.

Lennar Corporation of Miami, once one of the nations largest home builders is "bleeding" from profit losses that stem, in part, from a litany of lawsuits it has accrued including three filed in San Francisco in the last year. It is currently being sued for faulty home construction in San Francisco's South Beach community.

In 2006 an appliance deliveryman was electrocuted in a bizarre accident in Lennar's Lost Lake Reserve in Clermont Florida. A wrongful death lawsuit was filed when the deliveryman was

electrocuted even though the power to the room had been turned off. An investigation revealed that faulty wiring created a giant power surge that electrified the house and killed the serviceman as he took a dryer hose to a vent.

The Arizona Republics six month investigation in 2001 found that Lennar was forced to buy back parts of entire neighborhoods after lawsuits over problem homes. Lennar was accused of ~~fraud and negligence in three suits involving 44 West Valley homeowners who claimed their~~ homes have cracks in the driveways, stucco, foundations and interior walls because the homes were built on land with expansive soils. The Holderby family, owners of a Hampshire Home in a Miami suburb built by Lennar found a gigantic hole in their backyard filled with murky brown water and construction debris. Venomous snake, insects and amphibians emerge from the opening in the soils in the yard which was, in fact, a dump for garbage, tires and construction debris.

In 1998 Lennar escaped a class action fraud suite through a technicality in the village of Doral Sands, Miami where the builder constructed homes on land that had been filled with debris and trash.

The Wall Street Journal reported on 2/12/03 that Lennar corporation was granted the right to destroy fragile plants and animal dwellings on 174,000 acres in Riverside, California. And on September 19, 2003 the Phoenix office of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission announced the filing of a lawsuit against Lennar Homes of Arizona alleging discrimination by over 40 employees.

What should we do with the shipyard? The shipyard should be cleaned to residential standards per the Community Acceptance mandate of the Federal Superfund Act encoded in San Francisco's November 2000 voter mandate Proposition P. The shipyard should be developed under a Bayview Hunters Point Beneficiaries Economic Empowerment plan that establishes a Resident Stock Ownership Corporation that is 100% owned and controlled by its shareholders, the BVHP residents and small businesses.

The shipyard land is being transferred away from its designated beneficiaries and it will cause them irreparable economic, political and physical harm. This is a violation of trust law and the transfer of taxpayer owned, public assets to a private corporation.

Send e-mail faster without improving your typing skills. [Get your Hotmail® account.](#)

--Forwarded Message Attachment--

To: home@prosf.org

Subject: Dr. Sumchai: The LIARS CLUB!

From: ahimsa sumchai [mailto:asumchai@hotmail.com]

Sent: Monday, September 24, 2007 12:20 PM

Please distribute widely!

**THE LIARS CLUB
PARTS I and II**

"There was clear evidence levels of asbestos exceeded mandatory thresholds at both the fence line and in the community...the exposures did result in some increase risk to the community.... the concentrations of dust could not be interpreted because of their (Lennar Corporations) sampling methods."

Excerpts from letter written by Thomas Sinks, Ph.D California Department of Public Health

"We are heartened by the fact that the CDC and the California Department of Public Health...appear to agree with the San Francisco Department of Public Health...that there was no significant health risk created by the grading activities at the Shipyard." Excerpts from Press release issued by Mayor Newsom's Office of Communcations 9/21/07

In 2002 a Civil Grand Jury report on the Hunters Point Shipyard found "incomplete information, complex toxic testing requirements, failure to study and explain cluster illnesses among nearby long term residents." The CGJ recommended using commonly accepted scientific techniques to document and evaluate any evidence of clustered environmental illnesses among residents of BVHP.

According to a 2004 investigation published by the San Francisco Chronicle, "in Bayview Hunters Point each of these groups - African Americans, Asians, Pacific Islanders and Hispanics face infant mortality rates above what is expected for their race and ethnicity in California. Babies are 2.5 times more likely to die in their first year here than in other areas of San Francisco. A Chronicle analysis of 10 years of state data shows...within yards of each other around the barracks like Alice Griffith Housing Projects, five families have lost a total of eight babies"

. In 2003 the US. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Air an Radiation published a report on Particle Pollution which states,"scientists are evaluating new studies suggesting exposure to high particle levels may be associated with low birth weight in infants, pre-term deliveries and fetal and infant deaths".

As a physician and scientist I am deeply disturbed by Mayor Gavin Newsom and Health Director Mitchell Katz's unethical perpetuation of lies and misinformation to further their medicolegal, financial and political conflict of interest in the dirty development of the Hunters Point Shipyard.

In an unsigned fact sheet widely distributed to the Bayview Hunters Point Community this year, Katz stated "You may have heard there are reasons to worry about your health because of the construction dust generated by the redevelopment of Parcel A of the Hunters Point Shipyard. That is not true. After extensive analysis the Department of Public Health has concluded that the construction work at the Hunters Point Shipyard Parcel A is safe and will not cause long term or

serious health problems."

The single greatest failure of the Department of Public Health is its deliberate refusal to investigate the impact of particle pollution on a symptomatic population of children and adults residing immediately adjacent to the Parcel A grading and excavation site.

The mainstream scientific community has long recognized there is no safe level of exposure to asbestos. As noted by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, "Excessive cancer risks have been demonstrated for all fiber concentrations studied to date. Evaluation of all available human data provides no evidence for a "safe" level of asbestos exposure.

Last week the California Department of Public Health's Site Inspection Assessment, which is funded by the Agency for Toxic Substances Disease Registry, released its report on Parcel A construction activities. ATSDR evaluates the environmental and human components that lead to human exposure.

Authored by Thomas Sinks, Ph.D, the study found the community was placed at "increased risk" by the exposures to levels of asbestos that "exceeded mandatory thresholds both at the fence line and in the community".

On Friday, September 21, 2007 Mayor Gavin Newsom issued a press release that deliberately misinterprets the findings of the study and claims **"the CDC and the California Department of Public Health agree with the San Francisco Department of Public Health that there was no significant health risk created by the grading activities at the shipyard."**

Newsom deliberately misidentifies the study as having been conducted by the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta. The study investigation was conducted by the Site Assessment Section of the California Department of Public Health. I was contacted by the study investigators and forwarded comprehensive air monitoring data I had obtained from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and a litany of emails I have in storage from high ranking members of the Department of Public Health.

In yet another deliberately misleading statement published as a letter in last week's San Francisco Bay Guardian, Mitch Katz, M.D. Director of Health and Rajiv Bhatia, M.D. Director of Occupational and Environmental Health state, "Soil at Parcel A has been tested repeatedly over the past decades, demonstrating no unsafe levels of any artificial hazardous chemicals."

Ten years ago ATSDR conducted a Public Health Assessment of Hunters Point Shipyard and identified that completed and potential pathways of human exposure to contamination sources exist. Those pathways include soils at the shipyards Parcel E landfill and bay fill areas, as well as on-site and off site soils containing PCBs, metals and lead.

Despite assurances that grading is near completion, Lennar corporation continues it's reckless construction activities on Parcel A that have generated a grand total of 66 documented exceedences in asbestos levels mandating work stoppage and four notices of violation by the Department of Public Health including a 48 hour temporary shut down last month for dust emissions witnessed to cross onto Navy property.

Parcel A of the Hunters Point Shipyard was a "dirty transfer" of property from the Federal government to the City and County of San Francisco in 2004. Only two sites on Parcel A were carried through to the Remedial Investigation (RI) stage of the Federal Superfund or CERCLA act. Parcel A never underwent a full cleanup to the final remedy stage as required by CERCLA and was transferred with a litany of residual contaminants from lead and asbestos in buildings to arsenic, metals, motor oil and breakdown products of diesel in soil and groundwater.

PART II

The declaration statement of the Parcel A Record of Decision (ROD) published pursuant to the CERCLA Act on November 16, 1995 states, "Based on an evaluation of analytical data and other information, the Navy has determined that no remedial action is necessary to ensure the protection of human health and the environment at Parcel A."

The Parcel A ROD documents the soil analysis for metals at one of the two Parcel A RI sites conducted by the Navy. Numerous metals remained in concentrations exceeding their preliminary remediation goals as established by the EPA after the Navy had excavated the soil. Arsenic was detected in 40 of 41 samples, beryllium in 36 of 41 samples, chromium in 19 of 41 samples, manganese in 35 of 41 samples as was nickel.

Parcel A was transferred with deed restrictions notifying the public of lead based paint contamination in buildings. The lead based paint survey was conducted in 1997. According the Parcel A Finding of Suitability to Transfer or FOST, when the 1997 supplemental lead sampling was complete lead in concentrations exceeding the 221mg/kg EPA clean up goal was detected on Parcel A. Rather than clean it up the BRAC Cleanup Team reviewed all of the data on lead for Parcel A from both the 1993 and the 1997 sampling. The average concentration of lead in soils across Parcel A derived from the 1993 and 1997 sampling was calculated to be 215 mg/kg. Because it fell short of the 221 mg/kg clean up goal it was allowed to remain in the soil. Over the next decade Parcel A buildings were allowed to deteriorate without soil testing at the time of the transfer of the property in 2004. Thus, the Navy could not guarantee that lead based paint had not been released into Parcel A soils exceeding the 221mg/kg clean up requirement at the time of the Parcel A transfer ten years later!.

The Parcel A FOST identifies the presence of lead-based paint in buildings on Parcel A and prohibits use of these structures prior to demolition. The City was charged with responsibility for managing all lead-based paint hazards, including soil contamination in compliance with the Residential Lead Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992.

Parcel A buildings with lead based paint are being leased by the Redevelopment Agency to artists and other base tenants despite the risk of lead exposure.

On November 16, 2004 the cities Health Commission endorsed Article 31, a new environmental ordinance establishing for Parcel A residual soil concentrations and requirements for preparing plans and reports including site evaluation and mitigation, risk evaluation and closure reports. Article 31 was voted into law by the Board of Supervisors in December of 2004 and signed by the Mayor in 2005.

It mandates that health and safety plans address the hazards of each phase of construction site operations at the Shipyard and include requirements and procedures for employee protection, including health and safety risk or hazard analysis and medical surveillance. Article 31 also establishes residual soil screening criteria for Parcel A. Hazardous constituents listed including inorganic and bioaccumulative toxic substances, volatile organic pollutants, PCBs, Total petroleum hydrocarbons, pesticides, metals and radionuclides.

Article 31 directs the Director of Health the authority to bill the developer fees to defray the cost of document processing and review, consultation and administration of Article 31. For fiscal year 2007-2008 that fee is \$153 per hour. Section 3109 of Article 31 cites as violations "fraud, willful misrepresentation, or any willfully inaccurate or false statement in any report required by

this article."

Article 31 confers upon the Health Commission the power to enforce developer compliance with deed restrictions, EIR mitigation measures and other city, state and federal laws. Enforcement mechanisms include withholding or denial of permits, work stoppages, penalties for permit violations and mandatory civil penalties.

Despite the documentation of an exposed symptomatic population of workers and children at the Parcel A site, Health Director Mitchell Katz and Rajiv Bhatia, Director of Occupational and Environmental Health, have failed to devise human exposure protocols for toxic dust exposure and failed to order standard of care tests for a population symptomatic of pneumoconioses - the deposition of dust particles in the human lung, including baseline chest xrays, pulmonary function tests, lead and arsenic testing.

Indeed, the city has taken the public stance that no harm has resulted from the particle pollution exposures in statements made by DPH, the Mayors Office and appointed members of the Mayor's Citizens Advisory Committee for the shipyard.

The EPA has released pamphlets and fact sheets on particle pollution identifying people with heart or lung disease, older adults, and children to be at greater risk from particles, especially when they are physically active. Short term exposures to particles within hours or days can aggravate lung disease, causing asthma attacks and acute bronchitis, and may also increase susceptibility to respiratory infections. In people with heart disease, short term exposures have been linked to heart attacks and arrhythmias. Long term exposures have been associated with reduced lung function, the development of chronic bronchitis and premature death.

Children are at increased risk because their lungs are still developing, they spend more time at high activity levels, and they are more likely to have asthma or acute respiratory diseases when particle levels are high.

Gary McIntyre is the former Parcel A project manager who filed lawsuit, along with three other African American high ranking employees this year, against Lennar Corporation in Superior court in a case scheduled to go forward in early 2008. He offers testimony in his deposition transcript that asbestos levels at Parcel A sensed by Lennar's air stations reached an astounding 58,000 structures per cubic meter in December of 2006. Additionally, McIntyre states he was diagnosed and treated by medical doctors for respiratory symptoms and that he and the other plaintiffs were held to a code of silence about the asbestos exceedences.

Mayor Newsom has proposed the dirty transfer of the remaining 430 land based acres of the shipyard - a federal Superfund site -to the city and county of San Francisco to meet the 49ers 2012 deadline for construction of a new stadium. He proposes that a "specialized environmental remediation firm be allowed to finish certain elements of the clean up" with the city providing "extensive oversight."

The shipyard's level of toxic contamination has not been fully characterized. It would be a liability to accelerate the transfer of a federal Superfund site from the National Priority List with the data gaps that exist in the characterization of this property. The city admits it cannot clean up the shipyards radiation contaminated sites which comprise the bulk of Parcels D and E. Parcel F, the shipyards underwater regions have not been adequately studied.

Once the shipyard is transferred out of federal control and becomes the property of Lennar BVHP, a limited liability, private, non-governmental corporation, government oversight will become as dangerously secretive as it is now on Parcel A.

Lennar Corporation of Miami, once one of the nations largest home builders is "bleeding"

from profit losses that stem, in part, from a litany of lawsuits it has accrued including three filed in San Francisco in the last year. It is currently being sued for faulty home construction in San Francisco's South Beach community.

In 2006 an appliance deliveryman was electrocuted in a bizarre accident in Lennar's Lost Lake Reserve in Clermont Florida. A wrongful death lawsuit was filed when the deliveryman was electrocuted even though the power to the room had been turned off. An investigation revealed that faulty wiring created a giant power surge that electrified the house and killed the serviceman as he took a dryer hose to a vent.

The Arizona Republics six month investigation in 2001 found that Lennar was forced to buy back parts of entire neighborhoods after lawsuits over problem homes. Lennar was accused of fraud and negligence in three suits involving 44 West Valley homeowners who claimed their homes have cracks in the driveways, stucco, foundations and interior walls because the homes were built on land with expansive soils. The Holderby family, owners of a Hampshire Home in a Miami suburb built by Lennar found a gigantic hole in their backyard filled with murky brown water and construction debris. Venomous snake, insects and amphibians emerge from the opening in the soils in the yard which was, in fact, a dump for garbage, tires and construction debris.

In 1998 Lennar escaped a class action fraud suite through a technicality in the village of Doral Sands, Miami where the builder constructed homes on land that had been filled with debris and trash.

The Wall Street Journal reported on 2/12/03 that Lennar corporation was granted the right to destroy fragile plants and animal dwellings on 174,000 acres in Riverside, California. And on September 19, 2003 the Phoenix office of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission announced the filing of a lawsuit against Lennar Homes of Arizona alleging discrimination by over 40 employees.

What should we do with the shipyard? The shipyard should be cleaned to residential standards per the Community Acceptance mandate of the Federal Superfund Act encoded in San Francisco's November 2000 voter mandate Proposition P. The shipyard should be developed under a Bayview Hunters Point Beneficiaries Economic Empowerment plan that establishes a Resident Stock Ownership Corporation that is 100% owned and controlled by its shareholders, the BVHP residents and small businesses.

The shipyard land is being transferred away from its designated beneficiaries and it will cause them irreparable economic, political and physical harm. This is a violation of trust law and the transfer of taxpayer owned, public assets to a private corporation.

Life on your PC is safer, easier, and more enjoyable with Windows Vista®. [See how](#)
----- Message from Unknown on Unknown -----

To: <home@prosf.org>

Subject: Dr. Sumchai: The LIARS CLUB!

From: ahimsa sumchai [mailto:asumchai@hotmail.com]

Sent: Monday, September 24, 2007 12:20 PM

To: editor@sfbayview.com; asumchai@hotmail.com; asumchai@sfbayview.com; rtomp@sbcglobal.net; frandacosta@sbcglobal.net; marie@greenaction.org; gavin.newsom@sfgov.org; espanolajackson@sbcglobal.net; communityfirstcoalition@yahooogroups.com; publisher@sfbayview.com; m26sf@aol.com; iolmisha@cs.com; zurda@cal.berkeley.edu; board_of_supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us;

Subject: The LIARS CLUB!

Please distribute widely!

Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai NSCA-CPT

THE LIARS CLUB

PARTS I and II

"There was clear evidence levels of asbestos exceeded mandatory thresholds at both the fence line and in the community...the exposures did result in some increase risk to the community.... the concentrations of dust could not be interpreted because of their (Lennar Corporations) sampling methods."

Excerpts from letter written by Thomas Sinks, Ph.D California Department of Public Health

"We are heartened by the fact that the CDC and the California Department of Public Health...appear to agree with the San Francisco Department of Public Health...that there was no significant health risk created by the grading activities at the Shipyard." Excerpts from Press release issued by Mayor Newsom's Office of Communcations 9/21/07

In 2002 a Civil Grand Jury report on the Hunters Point Shipyard found "incomplete information, complex toxic testing requirements, failure to study and explain cluster illnesses among nearby long term residents." The CGJ recommended using commonly accepted scientific techniques to document and evaluate any evidence of clustered environmental illnesses among residents of BVHP.

According to a 2004 investigation published by the San Francisco Chronicle, "in Bayview

Hunters Point each of these groups - African Americans, Asians, Pacific Islanders and Hispanics face infant mortality rates above what is expected for their race and ethnicity in California. Babies are 2.5 times more likely to die in their first year here than in other areas of San Francisco. A Chronicle analysis of 10 years of state data shows...within yards of each other around the barracks like Alice Griffith Housing Projects, five families have lost a total of eight babies"

. In 2003 the US. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Air and Radiation published a report on Particle Pollution which states, "scientists are evaluating new studies suggesting exposure to high particle levels may be associated with low birth weight in infants, pre-term deliveries and fetal and infant deaths".

As a physician and scientist I am deeply disturbed by Mayor Gavin Newsom and Health Director Mitchell Katz's unethical perpetuation of lies and misinformation to further their medicolegal, financial and political conflict of interest in the dirty development of the Hunters Point Shipyard.

In an unsigned fact sheet widely distributed to the Bayview Hunters Point Community this year, Katz stated "You may have heard there are reasons to worry about your health because of the construction dust generated by the redevelopment of Parcel A of the Hunters Point Shipyard. That is not true. After extensive analysis the Department of Public Health has concluded that the construction work at the Hunters Point Shipyard Parcel A is safe and will not cause long term or serious health problems."

The single greatest failure of the Department of Public Health is its deliberate refusal to investigate the impact of particle pollution on a symptomatic population of children and adults residing immediately adjacent to the Parcel A grading and excavation site.

The mainstream scientific community has long recognized there is no safe level of exposure to asbestos. As noted by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, "Excessive cancer risks have been demonstrated for all fiber concentrations studied to date. Evaluation of all available human data provides no evidence for a "safe" level of asbestos exposure.

Last week the California Department of Public Health's Site Inspection Assessment, which is funded by the Agency for Toxic Substances Disease Registry, released its report on Parcel A construction activities. ATSDR evaluates the environmental and human components that lead to human exposure.

Authored by Thomas Sinks, Ph.D, the study found the community was placed at "increased risk" by the exposures to levels of asbestos that "exceeded mandatory thresholds both at the fence line and in the community".

On Friday, September 21, 2007 Mayor Gavin Newsom issued a press release that deliberately misinterprets the findings of the study and claims "**the CDC and the California Department of Public Health agree with the San Francisco Department of Public Health that there was no**

significant health risk created by the grading activities at the shipyard."

Newsom deliberately misidentifies the study as having been conducted by the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta. The study investigation was conducted by the Site Assessment Section of the California Department of Public Health. I was contacted by the study investigators and forwarded comprehensive air monitoring data I had obtained from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and a litany of emails I have in storage from high ranking members of the Department of Public Health.

In yet another deliberately misleading statement published as a letter in last week's San Francisco Bay Guardian, Mitch Katz, M.D. Director of Health and Rajiv Bhatia, M.D. Director of Occupational and Environmental Health state, "Soil at Parcel A has been tested repeatedly over the past decades, demonstrating no unsafe levels of any artificial hazardous chemicals."

Ten years ago ATSDR conducted a Public Health Assessment of Hunters Point Shipyard and identified that completed and potential pathways of human exposure to contamination sources exist. Those pathways include soils at the shipyards Parcel E landfill and bay fill areas, as well as on-site and off site soils containing PCBs, metals and lead.

Despite assurances that grading is near completion, Lennar corporation continues it's reckless construction activities on Parcel A that have generated a grand total of 66 documented exceedences in asbestos levels mandating work stoppage and four notices of violation by the Department of Public Health including a 48 hour temporary shut down last month for dust emissions witnessed to cross onto Navy property.

Parcel A of the Hunters Point Shipyard was a "dirty transfer" of property from the Federal government to the City and County of San Francisco in 2004. Only two sites on Parcel A were carried through to the Remedial Investigation (RI) stage of the Federal Superfund or CERCLA act. Parcel A never underwent a full cleanup to the final remedy stage as required by CERCLA and was transferred with a litany of residual contaminants from lead and asbestos in buildings to arsenic, metals, motor oil and breakdown products of diesel in soil and groundwater.

PART II

The declaration statement of the Parcel A Record of Decision (ROD) published pursuant to the CERCLA Act on November 16, 1995 states, "Based on an evaluation of analytical data and other information, the Navy has determined that no remedial action is necessary to ensure the protection of human health and the environment at Parcel A."

The Parcel A ROD documents the soil analysis for metals at one of the two Parcel A RI sites conducted by the Navy. Numerous metals remained in concentrations exceeding their preliminary remediation goals as established by the EPA after the Navy had excavated the soil. Arsenic was detected in 40 of 41 samples, beryllium in 36 of 41 samples, chromium in 19 of 41 samples, manganese in 35 of 41 samples as was nickel.

Parcel A was transferred with deed restrictions notifying the public of lead based paint contamination in buildings. The lead based paint survey was conducted in 1997. According to the Parcel A Finding of Suitability to Transfer or FOST, when the 1997 supplemental lead sampling was complete lead in concentrations exceeding the 221mg/kg EPA clean up goal was detected on Parcel A. Rather than clean it up the BRAC Cleanup Team reviewed all of the data on lead for Parcel A from both the 1993 and the 1997 sampling. The average concentration of lead in soils across Parcel A derived from the 1993 and 1997 sampling was calculated to be 215 mg/kg. Because it fell short of the 221 mg/kg clean up goal it was allowed to remain in the soil. Over the next decade Parcel A buildings were allowed to deteriorate without soil testing at the time of the transfer of the property in 2004. Thus, the Navy could not guarantee that lead based paint had not been released into Parcel A soils exceeding the 221mg/kg clean up requirement at the time of the Parcel A transfer ten years later!

The Parcel A FOST identifies the presence of lead-based paint in buildings on Parcel A and prohibits use of these structures prior to demolition. The City was charged with responsibility for managing all lead-based paint hazards, including soil contamination in compliance with the Residential Lead Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992.

Parcel A buildings with lead based paint are being leased by the Redevelopment Agency to artists and other base tenants despite the risk of lead exposure.

On November 16, 2004 the cities Health Commission endorsed Article 31, a new environmental ordinance establishing for Parcel A residual soil concentrations and requirements for preparing plans and reports including site evaluation and mitigation, risk evaluation and closure reports. Article 31 was voted into law by the Board of Supervisors in December of 2004 and signed by the Mayor in 2005.

It mandates that health and safety plans address the hazards of each phase of construction site operations at the Shipyard and include requirements and procedures for employee protection, including health and safety risk or hazard analysis and medical surveillance. Article 31 also establishes residual soil screening criteria for Parcel A. Hazardous constituents listed including inorganic and bioaccumulative toxic substances, volatile organic pollutants, PCBs, Total petroleum hydrocarbons, pesticides, metals and radionuclides.

Article 31 directs the Director of Health the authority to bill the developer fees to defray the cost of document processing and review, consultation and administration of Article 31. For fiscal year 2007-2008 that fee is \$153 per hour. Section 3109 of Article 31 cites as violations "fraud, willful misrepresentation, or any willfully inaccurate or false statement in any report required by

this article."

Article 31 confers upon the Health Commission the power to enforce developer compliance with deed restrictions, EIR mitigation measures and other city, state and federal laws. Enforcement mechanisms include withholding or denial of permits, work stoppages, penalties for permit violations and mandatory civil penalties.

Despite the documentation of an exposed symptomatic population of workers and children at the Parcel A site, Health Director Mitchell Katz and Rajiv Bhatia, Director of Occupational and Environmental Health, have failed to devise human exposure protocols for toxic dust exposure and failed to order standard of care tests for a population symptomatic of pneumoconioses - the deposition of dust particles in the human lung, including baseline chest xrays, pulmonary function tests, lead and arsenic testing.

Indeed, the city has taken the public stance that no harm has resulted from the particle pollution exposures in statements made by DPH, the Mayors Office and appointed members of the Mayor's Citizens Advisory Committee for the shipyard.

The EPA has released pamphlets and fact sheets on particle pollution identifying people with heart or lung disease, older adults, and children to be at greater risk from particles, especially when they are physically active. Short term exposures to particles within hours or days can aggravate lung disease, causing asthma attacks and acute bronchitis, and may also increase susceptibility to respiratory infections. In people with heart disease, short term exposures have been linked to heart attacks and arrhythmias. Long term exposures have been associated with reduced lung function, the development of chronic bronchitis and premature death.

Children are at increased risk because their lungs are still developing, they spend more time at high activity levels, and they are more likely to have asthma or acute respiratory diseases when particle levels are high.

Gary McIntyre is the former Parcel A project manager who filed lawsuit, along with three other African American high ranking employees this year, against Lennar Corporation in Superior court in a case scheduled to go forward in early 2008. He offers testimony in his deposition transcript that asbestos levels at Parcel A sensed by Lennar's air stations reached an astounding 58,000 structures per cubic meter in December of 2006. Additionally, McIntyre states he was diagnosed and treated by medical doctors for respiratory symptoms and that he and the other plaintiffs were held to a code of silence about the asbestos exceedences.

Mayor Newsom has proposed the dirty transfer of the remaining 430 land based acres of the shipyard - a federal Superfund site -to the city and county of San Francisco to meet the 49ers 2012 deadline for construction of a new stadium. He proposes that a "specialized environmental remediation firm be allowed to finish certain elements of the clean up" with the city providing "extensive oversight."

The shipyard's level of toxic contamination has not been fully characterized. It would be a

liability to accelerate the transfer of a federal Superfund site from the National Priority List with the data gaps that exist in the characterization of this property. The city admits it cannot clean up the shipyards radiation contaminated sites which comprise the bulk of Parcels D and E. Parcel F, the shipyards underwater regions have not been adequately studied.

~~Once the shipyard is transferred out of federal control and becomes the property of Lennar BVHP, a limited liability, private, non-governmental corporation, government oversight will become as dangerously secretive as it is now on Parcel A.~~

Lennar Corporation of Miami, once one of the nations largest home builders is "bleeding" from profit losses that stem, in part, from a litany of lawsuits it has accrued including three filed in San Francisco in the last year. It is currently being sued for faulty home construction in San Francisco's South Beach community.

In 2006 an appliance deliveryman was electrocuted in a bizarre accident in Lennar's Lost Lake Reserve in Clermont Florida. A wrongful death lawsuit was filed when the deliveryman was electrocuted even though the power to the room had been turned off. An investigation revealed that faulty wiring created a giant power surge that electrified the house and killed the serviceman as he took a dryer hose to a vent.

The Arizona Republics six month investigation in 2001 found that Lennar was forced to buy back parts of entire neighborhoods after lawsuits over problem homes. Lennar was accused of fraud and negligence in three suits involving 44 West Valley homeowners who claimed their homes have cracks in the driveways, stucco, foundations and interior walls because the homes were built on land with expansive soils. The Holderby family, owners of a Hampshire Home in a Miami suburb built by Lennar found a gigantic hole in their backyard filled with murky brown water and construction debris. Venomous snake, insects and amphibians emerge from the opening in the soils in the yard which was, in fact, a dump for garbage, tires and construction debris.

In 1998 Lennar escaped a class action fraud suite through a technicality in the village of Doral Sands, Miami where the builder constructed homes on land that had been filled with debris and trash.

The Wall Street Journal reported on 2/12/03 that Lennar corporation was granted the right to destroy fragile plants and animal dwellings on 174,000 acres in Riverside, California. And on September 19, 2003 the Phoenix office of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission announced the filing of a lawsuit against Lennar Homes of Arizona alleging discrimination by over 40 employees.

What should we do with the shipyard? The shipyard should be cleaned to residential standards per the Community Acceptance mandate of the Federal Superfund Act encoded in San Francisco's November 2000 voter mandate Proposition P. The shipyard should be developed under a Bayview Hunters Point Beneficiaries Economic Empowerment plan that establishes a Resident Stock Ownership Corporation that is 100% owned and controlled by its shareholders, the BVHP residents and small businesses.

The shipyard land is being transferred away from its designated beneficiaries and it will cause them irreparable economic, political and physical harm. This is a violation of trust law and the transfer of taxpayer owned, public assets to a private corporation.



ahimsa sumchai
<asumchai@hotmail.com>
12/27/2008 03:08 PM

To <board_of_supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us>
cc
bcc
Subject Shipyard/ toxic dust/katz DPH calendars- monette-shaw investigation

Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai NSCA-CPT

From: asumchai@hotmail.com
To: asumchai@hotmail.com
Subject: Shipyard/ toxic dust/katz DPH calendars- monette-shaw investigation
Date: Fri, 12 Dec 2008 01:00:10 +0000

Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai NSCA-CPT

Date: Tue, 7 Aug 2007 04:41:38 -0700
From: kimo@webnetic.net
To: Pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net; amanda@sfbg.com; bmw@greencampaigns.com; steve@sfbg.com; bruce@sfbg.com; tim_redmond@sfbg.com; tr@sfbg.com; splawrence@sbcglobal.net
Subject: shipyard/dust/katz DPH calendars- monette-shaw investigation
CC: frandacosta@att.net; espanolajackson@sbcglobal.net; grossman356@mac.com; chaffeej@pacbell.net; martin.macintyre@juno.com; libraryusers2004@yahoo.com; w_lanier@pacbell.net; MPetrelis@aol.com; mail@csrsf.com; asumchai@hotmail.com

Patrick Monette-Shaw - wonderful investigative work!!!

You might ask for agendas and meeting notes/minutes from anyone who participated and meeting attendee invites (in Lotus Notes/Outlook) or attendee sign-in list at any of these relevant meetings. Is there a record of a meeting room reservation? Where there participants by phone? You might ask for more detailed versions of calendars for specific days since often a meeting invite has an agenda and shows invitees. Any emails or text messages relevant to the meetings?

Also I wonder if any of these meetings were effectively Passive meetings - advising on public health/welfare or with any non city participants - like Lennar? - requiring advance passive meeting notice..

Lastly you could ask for a seven day statement (including quantity) info about info under

67.21c about anything pertaining to particular meetings including asking for Oral Public Info - specifically names of people who can provide more information about what happened at the meeting and departments who may have relevant records. To obtain Oral Public info ask for a 10-15 min phone call from each individual. See below

67.20

~~(b) "Public Information" shall mean the content of "public records" as defined in the California Public Records Act (Government Code Section 6252), whether provided in documentary form or in an oral communication. "Public Information" shall not include "computer software" developed by the City and County of San Francisco as defined in the California Public Records Act.~~

67.21c

(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.

67.22 Oral Info

b) The role of the person or persons so designated shall be to provide information on as timely and responsive a basis as possible to those members of the public who are not requesting information from a specific person. This section shall not be interpreted to curtail existing informal contacts between employees and members of the public when these contacts are occasional, acceptable to the employee and the department, not disruptive of his or her operational duties and confined to accurate information not confidential by law.

(c) No employee shall be required to respond to an inquiry or inquiries from an individual if it would take the employee more than fifteen minutes to obtain the information responsive to the inquiry or inquiries.

67.3

(5) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (4) above, "Passive meeting body" shall include a committee that consists solely of employees of the City and County of San Francisco when such committee is reviewing, developing, modifying, or creating city policies or procedures relating to the public health, safety, or welfare or relating to services for the homeless;

67.26

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.

67.25

(c) The person seeking the information need not state his or her reason for making the request or the use to which the information will be put, and requesters shall not be routinely asked to make such a disclosure. Where a record being requested contains information most of which is exempt from disclosure under the California Public Records Act and this article, however, the City Attorney or custodian of the record may inform the requester of the nature and extent of the non-exempt information and inquire as to the requester's purpose for seeking it, in order to suggest alternative sources for the information which may involve less redaction or to otherwise prepare a response to the request.

On 8/6/07, **pmonette-shaw** <Pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net> wrote:

Attached is Dr. Katz's June 2007 calendar. It's a two-page "monthly" view of his appointments. The second page is for those days when his calendar had enough appointments that they wouldn't print on a single sheet. Kind of hard to read that way, but there you have a limitation of whatever calendaring software program he is using.

Of particular interest (among others):

- There's an appointment with Rene Durazzo, for those of you who recognize the name, on 6/26.
- There's an appointment regarding the "Dust Issues" on 6/18 (I didn't recognize any of the meeting participants' names).
- There's a "Prep meeting re: Shipyard and dust" on 6/20 chaired by Phil Ginsburg, and "Health issues in the shipyard" on 6/21 with Supervisor Maxwell (from 4:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.). That Ginsburg chaired the prep meeting tells us the Mayor's office was watching this issue very closely. Notably, Gavin Newsom's calendar for 6/20 contained an appointment titled "MAYOR TO MEET WITH COMMUNITY LEADERS RE ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES" at 3:30 just after Katz's prep meeting with Ginsburg ended. "The Community Leaders Newsom met with on 6/20 are not named. The "Environmental Issues" in the Mayor's 6/20 entry seems suspect, as if he didn't want to tell the public the meeting *may* have actually been about the shipyard dust.

Oddly, Newsom's calendar for 6/21 was empty save for a single meeting with Katz at 5:00 p.m., listed as discussing the budget at City Hall. How could Katz have been at the Shipyard with Maxwell until 5:30 p.m. and somehow have raced (bicycled?) back to a meeting in some back-to-the-future moment with the Mayor at 5:00 p.m.? [Even if in the conversion of Newsom's calendar to the Prop G. format there was an error and Katz's meeting with the Mayor was to start at 5:30 p.m. rather than at 5:00 p.m., at what time would Katz have had to leave the Shipyard on bike or in an auto to get half-way across town to meet with the Mayor at City Hall? [One or the other of these two men appear not to be telling the truth on their calendars.]

It would be interesting to know if the Mayor participated in Supervisor Maxwell's event on 6/21, and it simply wasn't listed on the Mayor's 6/21 Prop G calendar. [Note: Neither the Friday 6/22 nor the 6/23 editions of the *Examiner* carried any news coverage of Maxwell's event in the shipyard.]

Patrick

You live life online. So we put Windows on the web. [Learn more about Windows Live](#)

Send e-mail anywhere. No map, no compass. [Get your Hotmail® account now.](#)



ahimsa sumchai
<asumchai@hotmail.com>
12/27/2008 03:10 PM

To <board_of_supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us>
cc
bcc
Subject Sunshine Ordinance violation complaint form-Supervisor
Maxwell Land Use 10.29/07

Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai NSCA-CPT

From: asumchai@hotmail.com
To: asumchai@hotmail.com
Subject: Sunshine Ordinance violation complaint form-Supervisor Maxwell Land Use
10.29/07
Date: Fri, 12 Dec 2008 00:56:57 +0000

Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai NSCA-CPT

To: board_of_supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us; sophie.maxwell@sfgov.org; aaron.peskin@sfgov.org;
frandacosta@att.net; marie@greenaction.org; patnlisa@sbcglobal.net; m26sf@aol.com;
editor@sfbayview.com; sotf@sfgov.org; asumchai@sfbayview.com; home@prosf.org;
communityfirstcoalition@yahoogroups.com; publisher@sfbayview.com
From: asumchai@hotmail.com
Date: Tue, 30 Oct 2007 21:47:04 +0000
Subject: [CommunityFirstCoalition] Sunshine Ordinance violation complaint form-Supervisor
Maxwell Land Use 10.29/07

I am submitting the third complaint I have filed against Supervisor Sophie Maxwell for yesterdays willful and deliberate delay of public testimony on the San Francisco Reliability Project that was officially posted on the agenda as item 1 and heard last and four hours after the 1pm start of the meeting. I will be submitting a complaint of flagrant racism in the decision exercised to delay this hearing and subject a predominantly African American constituency to obstruction in the governmental process. I waited for three hours and took time out of my work schedule to attend this hearing and was forced to leave early.

Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai NSCA-CPT

> Subject: Complaint Form & Process
> To: asumchai@hotmail.com
> From: sotf@sfgov.org

- > Date: Tue, 30 Oct 2007 09:07:52 -0700
- >
- > Hello Dr. Sumchai,
- >
- > Attached as you requested is the Sunshine Ordinance Task Forces complaint form and process. If mailing or faxing your complaint please send it to
- > ~~the SOTF Administrator at the address and telephone number listed below.~~
- > Also, please submit any new information and/or supporting documents when you file your complaint.
- >
- > (See attached file: Complaint Letter & Form.pdf)(See attached file: Complaint Process.pdf)
- >
- > You can also complete and submit your complaint on line by going to the following link.
- >
- > http://www.sfgov.org/site/sunshine_form.asp?id=18564
- >
- > Frank Darby, Administrator
- > Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
- > 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
- > City Hall, Room 244
- > San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
- > SOTF@SFGov.org
- > OFC: (415) 554-7724
- > FAX: (415) 554-7854
- >
- > Complete a SOTF Customer Satisfaction Survey by clicking the link below.
- > ~~http://www.sfgov.org/site/sunshine_form.asp?id=34307~~

Windows Live Hotmail and Microsoft Office Outlook – together at last. [Get it now!](#)

[Messages in this topic \(1\)](#) | [Reply \(via web post\)](#) | [Start a new topic](#)

[Messages](#) | [Files](#) | [Photos](#) | [Links](#) | [Database](#) | [Polls](#) | [Members](#) | [Calendar](#)

YAHOO! GROUPS

[Change settings via the Web](#) (Yahoo! ID required)

Change settings via email: [Switch delivery to Daily Digest](#) | [Switch format to Traditional](#)

[Visit Your Group](#) | [Yahoo! Groups Terms of Use](#) | [Unsubscribe](#)

[Visit Your Group](#)

Yahoo! Groups

[Dog Zone](#)

Connect w/others

who love dogs.

HDTV Support

[on Yahoo! Groups](#)

Help with Samsung

HDTVs and devices

Best of Y! Groups

[Check it out](#)

and nominate your

[group to be featured.](#)

Send e-mail faster without improving your typing skills. [Get your Hotmail® account.](#)

Send e-mail faster without improving your typing skills. [Get your Hotmail® account.](#)



Complaint Letter & Form.pdf Complaint Process.pdf



ahimsa sumchai
<asumchai@hotmail.com>

12/27/2008 03:10 PM

To <board_of_supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us>,
<communityfirstcoalition@yahoogroups.com>

cc

bcc

Subject Supervisor Maxwell Public Comment/Peskin Emails = Buck
Delventhal City Attorney advice

Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai NSCA-CPT

From: asumchai@hotmail.com
To: asumchai@hotmail.com
Subject: Supervisor Maxwell Public Comment/Peskin Emails = Buck Delventhal City Attorney
advice
Date: Fri, 12 Dec 2008 00:55:04 +0000

Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai NSCA-CPT

From: kimo@webnetic.net
To: grossman356@mac.com; mail@csrsf.com; asumchai@hotmail.com;
patnlisa@sbcglobal.net; jeffente@att.net
Subject: FW: Supervisor Maxwell Public Comment/Peskin Emails = Buck Delventhal City
Attorney advice
Date: Fri, 22 Feb 2008 16:13:23 -0800

From: Alexis Thompson [mailto:Alexis.Thompson@sfgov.org]
Sent: Friday, February 22, 2008 2:17 PM
To: kimo@webnetic.net
Subject: RE: Supervisor Maxwell Public Comment/Peskin Emails = Buck Delventhal City Attorney advice

Dear Mr. Crossman,

On February 14, 2008 we responded to your public records request related to "the Buck Delventhal meeting on 10/9 're Board of sups Sunshine Task Force hearings re Sup Peskin and Maxwell." Your email message below raises seven issues about our response.

1) You ask that we provide the legal basis for each redaction. Our response does so. As we note in the message we sent to you with the document, the redaction is based on the attorney-client privilege (we

also explained that we were not providing other documents based on the attorney work product doctrine). You ask that we "key" the different bases for the different redactions. Since there is only one basis with respect to the record produced, which we explained in our message to you, there is no need to "key" it. The method of explaining the basis for redaction is consistent with Section 67.26 of the Sunshine Ordinance (exempt information must be segregated and "keyed by footnote or other clear reference to the appropriate justification for withholding..."(emphasis added)).

2) You ask that we be aware under the Sunshine Ordinance, communications concerning Sunshine matters are not privileged or exempt. This office disagrees with your position, has asserted the work product doctrine in responding to the request in question and in responding to prior requests, and continues to maintain that withholding under the attorney work product doctrine is permissible.

3) You note that we have provided email but not calendars, notes, memo, voicemail, etc. In light of this comment, we again queried the deputies involved in the email exchange. We found only one other document: time billing entries for one of the deputies involved in the email exchange. A copy of those entries is sent with this message. The other deputies who participated in the email discussion did not have any time billing entries--nor other documents--referring to the email discussion.

4) You contend that you are entitled to have a 15-minute phone call with Deputy City Attorney Buck Delventhal to obtain oral public information. Our response noted that such action is not required under Section 67.22(a) of the Sunshine Ordinance. In your message below, you state that your request is made under 67.20(b), which defines "Public Information." Nothing in Section 67.20(b) gives you a right to meet with a specific attorney in this office. Our obligation regarding the release of oral public information is set forth in section 67.22, which does not require compliance with your request for the reasons provided to you in our response.

5) You ask for an indication that our search of records includes searching archive media and document search phrases and keywords used to perform the search. The policy and practice of this office is to make a reasonable, good faith effort to locate every document responsive to a public records request. We have done so in response to your request.

6) You ask, pursuant to Section 67.21(c) of the Sunshine Ordinance, for a written summary of all relevant records including quantity, whether or not exempt from disclosure. That provision is intended to assist requesters in finding out enough about categories of records in a department's possession so that the requester can then submit a request that reasonably identifies the record or categories of records being sought. It does not require the creation of a privilege log or similar listing of records withheld from disclosure (as we note in the *Good Government Guide*, 2007-2008 Edition, at page 71: "A responding department withholding records has no duty to create a privilege log identifying the withheld records.").

7) You ask for an explanation for why it took so long to respond to this request. During this time period, this office has also spent considerable time responding to complaints that you have filed at the Task Force, petitions you have submitted to the Supervisor of Records, and public records requests you have made of City departments we advise. We must allocate our limited resources in a manner that serves the needs of all San Franciscans, not simply the need to fulfill multiple requests of a single individual, which tend to expand into requests about requests that take up even more resources of this office. We recognize that there is a backlog of your requests that we are working on, and will do our best within the confines of our limited resources and other obligations to respond quickly.

Best,
ALEXIS THOMPSON
Deputy Press Secretary

OFFICE OF CITY ATTORNEY DENNIS HERRERA
San Francisco City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, California 94102-4682

(415) 554-4653 Direct
(415) 554-4700 Reception
(415) 554-4715 Facsimile
(415) 554-6770 TTY

<http://www.sfgov.org/cityattorney/>

"Kimo Crossman"
<kimo@webnetic.net>

02/14/2008 11:21 PM

Please respond to
<kimo@webnetic.net>

To:"Alexis Thompson" <Alexis.Thompson@sfgov.org>, <cityattorney@sfgov.org>,
<paula.jesson@sfgov.org>
cc:"Allen Grossman" <grossman356@mac.com>, "Christian Holmer" <mail@csrsf.com>,
<frandacosta@att.net>, <patnlisa@sbcglobal.net>, "Richard A. Knee" <rak0408@earthlink.net>,
<SCau1321@aol.com>, <Dougcoms@aol.com>, <elc@lrolaw.com>, <jeffente@att.net>
Subject:RE: Supervisor Maxwell Public Comment/Peskin Emails = Buck Delventhal City Attorney advice

Additionally I wish to know on what legal basis the Supervisor of Records refused to issue a determination in ten days nor referred to enforcement to the DA if for no response in another five days.

From: Kimo Crossman [mailto:kimo@webnetic.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2008 7:53 PM
To: 'Alexis Thompson'; cityattorney@sfgov.org; paula.jesson@sfgov.org
Cc: 'Allen Grossman'; 'Christian Holmer'; frandacosta@att.net; patnlisa@sbcglobal.net; 'Richard A. Knee'; 'SCau1321@aol.com'; Dougcoms@aol.com; elc@lrolaw.com; jeffente@att.net
Subject: Supervisor Maxwell Public Comment/Peskin Emails = Buck Delventhal City Attorney advice
Importance: High

Thank you for this attempted attached response.

- 1) The redactions in the document - under 67.26, please key them specifically with and provide legal basis for each redaction with specific facts and applied balancing tests with express permissive exemptions. per 67.27
- 2) Please be aware that under 67.24 (b) and 67.21 I, communications on Sunshine matters are not privileged or exempt.
- 3) While you have provided emails you have not provided any other relevant records including calendars, notes, memos, voicemails
- 4) The request for Oral information from Mr. Delventhal is under 67.20 b which defines Public

Information as including Oral Communication and under 67.22 b & c for that information, not under 67.22 a

5) This request included searching archive media and documenting search phrases and keywords used to perform the search.- there is no indication that his has occurred.

6) Under 67.21c I request a written summary of all relevant records including quantity whether or not exempt from disclosure.

7) ~~Please explain why your office of 200 lawyers + staff took roughly 76 days to respond to this request especially since you agreed to provide daily incremental response.~~

From: Alexis Thompson [mailto:Alexis.Thompson@sfgov.org]

Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2008 11:31 AM

To: kimo@webnetic.net

Subject: November 30, 2007 Request for Records

Dear Mr. Crossman,

Your request, citing a time billing entry for Deputy City Attorney Buck Delventhal, seeks materials related to "the Buck Delventhal meeting on 10/9 're Board of Sups Sunshine Task Force hearings re Sup Peskin and Maxwell." The meeting was an email exchange among several Deputy City Attorneys. The emails that constituted that exchange are attorney work product, which the law protects from disclosure. (Cal. Gov. Code Section 6254(k); Cal. Code Civ. Pro. Section 2018.030.) Accordingly, we decline to disclose them.

You have also asked for materials and communications "before or after" the October 9th, 2007 "meeting" that relate to the matters discussed. ~~Email inquiries from our clients instigated the October 9th email discussion.~~ We have located those communications and they are attached in redacted form. The redacted material consists of communications about matters that were not the subject of the October 9th email discussion, are unrelated to public records, public meetings or ethics issues, and are protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege. (Cal. Gov. Code Section 6254(k); Cal. Evid. Code Section 954.) We have located no responsive documents created after the October 9th email discussion.

You also request a "15 minute phone call with Mr. Delventhal to obtain Oral public info." We assume that you are making this request under San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.22(a). That Section requires each City department to designate "a person or persons knowledgeable about the affairs of the department, to provide information, including oral information, to the public about the department's operations, plans, policies and positions."

Under Section 67.22(a), each department must assign a department employee who is generally knowledgeable about the department's affairs to provide oral information to members of the public seeking public information. Section 67.22 (a) does not compel a City department to make available to the public a specific employee who has been requested. If you wish to receive oral public information about the Office of the City Attorney, please contact me directly at (415) 554-4653.

Best,
ALEXIS THOMPSON
Deputy Press Secretary

OFFICE OF CITY ATTORNEY DENNIS HERRERA
San Francisco City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, California 94102-4682

(415) 554-4653 Direct
(415) 554-4700 Reception
(415) 554-4715 Facsimile
(415) 554-6770 TTY

<http://www.sfgov.org/cityattorney/>

You live life online. So we put Windows on the web. [Learn more about Windows Live](#)



Send e-mail anywhere. No map, no compass. [Get your Hotmail® account now.](#) DGTIME.pdf



ahimsa sumchai
<asumchai@hotmail.com>
12/27/2008 03:11 PM

To <board_of_supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us>,
<communityfirstcoalition@yahoogroups.com>
cc
bcc
Subject Order of Determination: #07040_Ahimsa Sumchai v DPH &
Supervisor Maxwell

Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai NSCA-CPT

From: asumchai@hotmail.com
To: asumchai@hotmail.com
Subject: Order of Determination: #07040_Ahimsa Sumchai v DPH & Supervisor Maxwell
Date: Fri, 12 Dec 2008 00:54:28 +0000

Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai NSCA-CPT

> Subject: Order of Determination: #07040_Ahimsa Sumchai v DPH & BOS
> To: asumchai@hotmail.com; sophie_maxwell@sfgov.org; Katherine.Higgins@sfgov.org
> From: sotf@sfgov.org
> Date: Fri, 6 Jul 2007 12:36:58 -0700
>
>
> Attached is the Order of Determination from the Sunshine Ordinance Task
> Force, regarding the above titled complaint.
>
> (See attached file: 07040_Dr Ahimsha Sumchai vs Sup Maxwell.pdf)
>
> A hearing has been scheduled with the Compliance and Amendments Committee
> of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, regarding the status of the Order of
> Determination.
>
> The hearing is scheduled as follows:
>
> Date: Wednesday, July 11, 2007
> Location: City Hall, Room 406
> Time: 4:00 p.m.
>
> Complainants: Your attendance is required at this meeting/hearing.
>
> Respondents/Departments: The custodian of records or a representative of

- > your department, who can speak to the matter, is required at the
 - > meeting/hearing.
 - >
 - > To access the agenda please click on the link below. Then click on the
 - > associated item number to access the packet material relating to your
 - > complaint.
-

> http://www.sfgov.org/site/sunshine_page.asp?id=63568

- >
- > Frank Darby, Jr., Administrator
- > Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
- > 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
- > City Hall, Room 244
- > San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
- > SOTF@SFGov.org
- > OFC: (415) 554-7724
- > FAX: (415) 554-7854

- >
 - > Complete a SOTF Customer Satisfaction Survey by clicking the link below.
 - > http://www.sfgov.org/site/sunshine_form.asp?id=34307
-

Send e-mail anywhere. No map, no compass. [Get your Hotmail® account now.](#)

It's the same Hotmail®. If by "same" you mean up to 70% faster. [Get your account now.](#)



07040_Dr Ahimsha Sumchai vs Sup Maxwell.pdf



ahimsa sumchai
<asumchai@hotmail.com>
12/27/2008 03:12 PM

To <communityfirstcoalition@yahoogroups.com>,
<board_of_supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us>
cc
bcc
Subject Order of Determination: #07040_Ahimsa Sumchai v DPH &
BOS

Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai NSCA-CPT

From: asumchai@hotmail.com
To: asumchai@hotmail.com
Subject: Order of Determination: #07040_Ahimsa Sumchai v DPH & BOS
Date: Fri, 12 Dec 2008 00:52:37 +0000

Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai NSCA-CPT

> Subject: Order of Determination: #07040_Ahimsa Sumchai v DPH & BOS
> To: asumchai@hotmail.com; sophie_maxwell@sfgov.org; Katherine.Higgins@sfgov.org
> From: sotf@sfgov.org
> Date: Fri, 6 Jul 2007 12:36:58 -0700
>
>
> Attached is the Order of Determination from the Sunshine Ordinance Task
> Force, regarding the above titled complaint.
>
> (See attached file: 07040_Dr Ahimsha Sumchai vs Sup Maxwell.pdf)
>
> A hearing has been scheduled with the Compliance and Amendments Committee
> of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, regarding the status of the Order of
> Determination.
>
> The hearing is scheduled as follows:
>
> Date: Wednesday, July 11, 2007
> Location: City Hall, Room 406
> Time: 4:00 p.m.
>
> Complainants: Your attendance is required at this meeting/hearing.
>
> Respondents/Departments: The custodian of records or a representative of

- > your department, who can speak to the matter, is required at the
 - > meeting/hearing.
 - >
 - > To access the agenda please click on the link below. Then click on the
 - > associated item number to access the packet material relating to your
 - > complaint.
-

> http://www.sfgov.org/site/sunshine_page.asp?id=63568

- >
- > Frank Darby, Jr., Administrator
- > Sunshine Ordinance Task Force
- > 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
- > City Hall, Room 244
- > San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
- > SOTF@SFGov.org
- > OFC: (415) 554-7724
- > FAX: (415) 554-7854

- >
- > Complete a SOTF Customer Satisfaction Survey by clicking the link below.
- > http://www.sfgov.org/site/sunshine_form.asp?id=34307

You live life online. So we put Windows on the web. [Learn more about Windows Live](#)

It's the same Hotmail®. If by "same" you mean up to 70% faster. [Get your account now.](#)



07040_Dr Ahimsha Sunchai vs Sup Maxwell.pdf



ahimsa sumchai
<asumchai@hotmail.com>
12/27/2008 03:27 PM

To <board_of_supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us>
cc
bcc

Subject Asbestos air monitoring data Hunters Point Shipyard

Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai NSCA-CPT

> Date: Mon, 4 Jun 2007 15:15:49 -0600
> Subject: Asbestos air monitoring data Hunters Point Shipyard
> From: asumchai@sfbayview.com
> To: asumchai@hotmail.com; rtomp@aol.com; mecsoft@pacbell.net
> CC: frandacosta@att.net; espanolajackson@sbcglobal.net; m26sf@aol.com

> ----- Original Message -----

> Subject: Here are the results
> From: "Public Records" <PublicRecords@baaqmd.gov>
> Date: Mon, June 4, 2007 2:05 pm
> To: asumchai@sfbayview.com

> -----
>

>
>
> Here is the results, let me know if you need any more information.
> Thanks.

>
>
> Rochelle Henderson

> Public Records Coordinator

> publicrecords@baaqmd.gov

>
>
> 415.749.4784

> -----Original Message-----

> From: asumchai@sfbayview.com [mailto:asumchai@sfbayview.com]
> Sent: Tuesday, May 29, 2007 2:59 PM
> To: Public Records
> Cc: asumchai@sfbayview.com; sotf@sfgov.org
> Subject: Results of HV1-HV5 air monitoring stations at Hunters Point
> Shipyard

>

>
>
> Dear Public Records Bay Area Air Quality Management District,
>
> I am requesting the data documenting the results from air
> monitoring

> stations located at the perimeter of Parcel A of the Hunters Point
>
> Shipyard designated HV1-HV5. This information is needed to
>
> substantiate complaints before the California Board of Professional
>
> Engineers and Land Surveyors and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force of
>
> San Francisco county. Please forward this information as soon as
>
> possible and before June 10, 2007. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai, M.D.
>

It's the same Hotmail®. If by "same" you mean up to 70% faster. [Get your account now.](#)



untitled-1.2 PRR 07-05-93 - BAAQMD Hunters Point Air Monitoring Results.pdf



ahimsa sumchai
<asumchai@hotmail.com>
12/27/2008 03:29 PM

To <board_of_supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us>
cc
bcc
Subject Employees sue Hunters Point developer for discrimination -
Examiner.com
http://www.examiner.com/a-624347~Employees_sue_Hunters_Point_developer_for_discrimination.html

Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai NSCA-CPT

From: asumchai@hotmail.com
To: asumchai@hotmail.com; jdiaz@sfchronicle.com; rselna@sfchronicle.com;
pbronstein@sfchronicle.com; gavin.newsom@sfgov.org; mitch_katz@dph.sf.ca.us
CC: john.stcroix@sfgov.org; kamala.harris@sfgov.org; davin.pujari@sfgov.org;
fmsbw@yahoo.com; angelaav@aol.com
Subject: Employees sue Hunters Point developer for discrimination - Examiner.com
http://www.examiner.com/a-624347~Employees_sue_Hunters_Point_developer_for_discrimination.html
Date: Mon, 19 Mar 2007 21:16:23 +0000

The Department Of Public Health is liable and minimizes the human risk of exposure to toxic dust because under Article 31 the Health Department gets money from the developer for disturbing a specific volume of soil in cubic meters - toxic or not!

Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai NSCA-CPT

From: "MEC" <mecsoft@pacbell.net>
To: "Teresa Golebiewska" <goleb22yt@yahoo.com>, <mecsoft@pacbell.net>, "ahimsa sumchai" <asumchai@hotmail.com>
Subject: Emailing: Employees sue Hunters Point developer for discrimination - Examiner.com
http://www.examiner.com/a-624347~Employees_sue_Hunters_Point_developer_for_discrimination.html
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2007 19:38:38 -0700

Local
**Employees sue Hunters
Point developer for
discrimination**

15 hrs ago

**Employees sue
Hunters Point
developer for
discrimination**

[Printer Friendly](#) | [PDF](#) | [Email](#)
Mar 17, 2007 3:00 AM (15 hrs ago)
by [Bonnie Eslinger](#) , The Examiner

F
o
n
t
S
i
z
e
:
a
a
A
A
C
u
r
r
e
n
t
r
a
n
k
:

5
3
o
f
1
5
,
8
9
7

SAN FRANCISCO - The company handling the development of the Hunters Point shipyard, Candlestick Point and Treasure Island was sued Friday by three African-American employees who claim they were victims of racial discrimination and harassment for being whistleblowers, among other allegations.

The plaintiffs are Gary McIntyre, a project manager; Clementine Clark, a community benefits manager and a

member of San Francisco's Fire Commission; and Ceola Richardson, an administrative assistant. All three employees worked for Lennar Corp. on behalf of the development project at the Hunters Point shipyard.

In addition to claiming that all three employees were subjected to racial discrimination and harassment, McIntyre and Clark say they were demoted after they alerted their supervisor, Paul Menaker, about the possibility that dust from the construction site contained toxic asbestos.

A spokesman for Lennar, Sam Singer, said the allegations are untrue.

"Lennar does not tolerate discrimination of any kind," Singer said. "In fact, its leadership in San Francisco is Kofi Bonner, one of the leading African-American executives in the nation."

Although all 500 acres of the former shipyard are scheduled for redevelopment, the work is being done in parcels, with a housing development now under construction.

Bonner, president of Lennar's urban land division for Northern California, said Thursday, before the lawsuit was

filed, that some of the company's contractors responsible for monitoring the air and controlling construction dust "made some mistakes." But he said that whenever the company learned of problems, it worked to fix them.

McIntyre alleges that during a large meeting in March 2006 with Lennar's environmental attorneys and subcontractors, Menaker joked that the shipyard was so hazardous that McIntyre, who is bald, "had hair when he started working there."

Phone calls Friday to the law firm headed by Angela Alioto, which is representing the plaintiffs, were not returned in time for deadline. The plaintiffs are seeking a financial award, including attorney's fees.

<http://www.examiner.com/beslinger@examiner.com>

Examiner

Get a FREE Web site, company branded e-mail and more from Microsoft Office Live!

It's the same Hotmail®. If by "same" you mean up to 70% faster. [Get your account now.](#)



image001.gif



image002.gif



image003.png