090352

Petitions and Communications received from March 10, 2009 through March 16, 2009 for reference by the President to Committee considering related matters or to be ordered filed by the Clerk on March 24, 2009.

From concerned citizens, submitting support for the proposed development of the 110 Embarcadero Project. File 090159, Copy: Each Supervisor, 6 letters (1)

From Marvis Phillips, submitting opposition to the proposed development of the 110 Embarcadero Project. File 090159, Copy: Each Supervisor (2)

From Department of Public Works, submitting report on the use of funds appropriated from the Local Street and Road Improvement, Congestion Relief and Traffic Safety Account of 2006. (3)

From Ria Tajbl, submitting support for restoring Sharp Park. (4)

From Fergison Family, submitting opposition to the proposed closure of Park Branch Library. (5)

From Patricia Campbell, submitting opposition to renaming Third Street after Willie Brown. (6)

From Jane Bliss, submitting support for full funding of the Neighborhood Emergency Rescue Team (NERT) program. (7)

From Terrie Frye, commenting on the gravel that replaced the Victory Garden in Civic Center. Copy: Each Supervisor (8)

From concerned citizens, submitting opposition to cutting Recreation and Park directors from the latchkey and playground programs. 2 letters (9)

From concerned citizens, commenting on the management at the San Francisco Zoo. 2 letters (10)

From Kimo Crossman, regarding the free Wi-Fi network at the public library. (11)

From Kimo Crossman, commenting that the Prop G calendar in San Francisco requires an extremely large amount of detail including any meeting even if solely personal in City Hall, including phone calls or text message conversations. (12)

From Bernard Choden, commenting that development should not exceed the city's holding capacity for infrastructure or services as measured by law and best practices for health, safety and welfare. (13)

From Ahimsa Sumchai, proposing a boycott of the SF Chronicles role in alleged concealment and complicity in violation of State and local Ethics, open government and environmental laws. (14)

From Ahimsa Sumchai, commenting on the six members of the Board of Supervisors that went to Washington D.C. (15)

From Aline Dinoia, commenting that San Francisco City Attorney Herrera spent most of his time last year on fighting Proposition 8 at taxpayer expense. (16)

From Police Department, responding to request for information regarding cultural competency training in the Police Department. (Reference No. 20090210-006) Copy: Supervisor Campos (17)

From Police Department, responding to request for information regarding the death of Mr. Hugues de la Plaza in San Francisco on June 2, 2007. (18)

From Parkmerced Residents' Organization, submitting support for proposed resolution regarding a street encroachment at 19th Avenue and Crespi Drive. File 090252, Copy: Each Supervisor, 2 letters (19)

From Office o the Controller-City Services Auditor, submitting report on the compliance audit of China Cargo Airlines Ltd. (20)

From Office o the Controller-City Services Auditor, submitting copy of report presented to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors on March 16, 2009. (21)

From Public Utilities Commission, submitting the GoSolarSF status report, which provides an update on the first six months of the solar energy incentive program, and serves as the status report required in the solar energy incentive ordinance. (22)

From Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board, submitting the annual report on eviction notices.. (23)

From the Film Commission, submitting the San Francisco Film Production Rebate Program Report for April 2006 through February 2009. (24)

From Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs, submitting resolution requesting the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to "urge the United States Congress and President Obama to pass the Uniting American Families Act and support the removal of legal barriers to immigration by permanent same-sex partners." (25)

From Office of the Controller, submitting a cost analysis of Amendment #1 to the MOU between the City and County of San Francisco and Teamsters, Local 856,

Supervising Registered Nurses, Unit 11.B. File 090230, Copy: Each Supervisor (26)

From Capital Planning Committee, submitting resolution adopting the City's draft ten-year capital expenditure plan for fiscal years 2010-2019. Copy: Each Supervisor (27)

From Municipal Transportation Agency, submitting request for waiver of Administrative Code Chapter 12B for Star Machine and Tool Company. (28)

From Office of the Controller, submitting notice that the budget for fiscal year 2009-2010 is now available in the budget system for the Mayor's Office review and consideration. (29)

From Ahimsa Sumchai, commenting on the reinvestigation of toxic dust exposure at the Lennar Development Site in Hunters Point. (30)

From concerned citizens, urging the Recreation and Park Commission not to layoff Carli Fullerton, the director of the Golden Gate Park Senior Community Center. Approximately 27 letters (31)

From Clerk of the Board, submitting notice that the following individuals have submitted a Form 700 Statement of Economic Interests: (32)
Gabriel Cabrera (Annual)
Dawn Duran (Annual)
Chris Rustom (Annual)
Nicholas Goldman (Annual)
Doyle Johnson (Annual)
Stanton Jones (Annual)
John Avalos (LAFCo-Assuming)
David Campos (LAFCo-Assuming)
Eric L. Mar (LAFCo-Assuming)
Chris Daly (LAFCo-Leaving)

File 090159
C: BOS-11, C-Page

DPR Construction, Inc.
1050 Sansome St., Suite 600
San Francisco, CA 94111
Tel: (415) 782-3700
Fax: (415) 782-3715

(1) -

March 12, 2009

Mr. David Chiu, President
Honorable Members
Board of Supervisors
City Hall
1 Carleton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2009 MAR 13 AM 11: 22
BY

Re: 110 The Embarcadero

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am writing in strong support of 110 The Embarcadero and ask that you vote in favor of this project which will bring a remarkably designed and engineered building, meeting the highest level of sustainability, to San Francisco's Financial District.

San Francisco should embrace projects such as this that will provide jobs and that will also set San Francisco apart as a leader in green building. Further, this small project has no new environmental impacts and will mean the redevelopment of a vacant building.

DPR has extensive experience in these type of projects in San Francisco for the past 18 years, most recently constructing and renovating the new 11-story building at 710 Market St./1 Kearny.

We are a leader in the greening of the construction industry, both in San Francisco and the nation. San Francisco needs to support and encourage more projects like this and the developers who are willing and able to build them.

Regards,
DPR Construction, Inc.

Rocky Moss
Regional Manager

C: All Board Members
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

(1)

File # 090157
C: BOS-11
DR
Copy

SWINERTON
INCORPORATED

INNOVATION
INTEGRITY
EXPERIENCE

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2009 MAR 13 AM 11:26
BY

March 11, 2009

President David Chiu
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: 110 The Embarcadero

Dear President Chiu:

I write to you in support of 110 The Embarcadero. I was surprised to hear of the controversy over this small project with no significant impacts in the Financial District. This project has the opportunity to create numerous jobs and generate economic activity at a time when it is desperately needed. In addition to providing positive economic benefits to San Francisco, 110 The Embarcadero will be the first LEED-CS Platinum project on the West Coast. This is an incredible distinction and one that does not come without added costs.

Swinerton has long been at the forefront of green building and we remain a national leader in sustainability. In 2004, Swinerton received LEED-EB Gold for its San Francisco corporate office and we are incredibly proud of this distinction. At Swinerton we look for greening opportunities on all our projects and believe it is our responsibility, as a General Contractor and Construction Manager, to help ensure the highest standard of environmental performance on our projects. We all need to take responsibility for protecting San Francisco and the environment.

Please support 110 The Embarcadero. Its positive economic benefits should be embraced. Its sustainability objectives are unparalleled and offer a powerful message for a city that will be an important statement well beyond the boundaries of the City and County.

Sincerely,

Jeff Hoopes
President, Swinerton Incorporated

cc: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Swinerton Incorporated
260 Townsend Street, San Francisco, CA 94107-1790
Tel: 415.421.2980 Fax: 415.433.0943 www.swinerton.com

orig
cpage File 090159



March 7, 2009

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

Re: 110 The Embarcadero

Dear Supervisors Chiu, Alioto-Pier, Avalos, Campos, Chu, Daly, Dufty, Elsbernd, Mar, Maxwell, and Mirkarimi:

Please uphold the Planning Commission finding regarding the Mitigated Negative Declaration for 110 The Embarcadero so that this exceptional project can be built. San Francisco claims it is a leader in sustainable buildings and at the forefront of the green building movement. What better way to affirm this than to approve a LEED Platinum project.

The controversy over the project comes without merit. This small project in the Financial District has no impacts. It will replace an unoccupied, underutilized site with a small but gorgeous office building designed by Pelli Clarke Pelli, the world famous architectural firm that is currently working on the new Transbay Transit Center. The opportunity to have a building of this quality in San Francisco will allow San Francisco to continue to be the vibrant, dynamic city that it is. I am proud to call San Francisco my home and hope that the City will enable projects such as 110 The Embarcadero to be built.

I want to point out specifically the contribution the project will have to the City's rich web of public open spaces. The rooftop terrace is a place I look forward to going since it provides views of the City that are hard to duplicate. Public amenities like this are another contributor to making San Francisco a world class city.

Please support 110 The Embarcadero.

Very truly yours,

Ruben Santiago

Ruben Santiago

C: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

File 090159

"Annie Kim"
<annie7k@pacbell.net>
03/16/2009 02:35 PM

To "'Annie Kim'" <annie7k@pacbell.net>
cc
Subject 110 The Embarcadero - Tuesday, March 17, 2:00 PM

Dear Supervisors and City officers,

I think it is a great project in San Francisco. 110 The Embarcadero brings new look to the area and it creates the job in this town. The innovative "living wall" of the building is unique and it is very much San Francisco building.
I hope you support this project.

Sincerely,

**Annie Kim**
Vice President

Hancock Properties, Inc.
(415)962-0174 Office

**http://www.sfproperty.net**
annie7k@pacbell.net

110 Renderings.pdf 110 - BOS Meeting - Fact Sheet.pdf

File # 090159
C: Bos11, DR
C: Page

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2009 MAR 16 PM 2:33
BY

March 11, 2009

President Chiu
Honorable Members
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: 110 The Embarcadero

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen of the Board of Supervisors,

The Ferry Building is one of the city's most important projects and certainly a landmark achievement for Equity Office. The restoration of the Ferry Building is the result of an unprecedented collaboration between public and private interests that was led by the Port of San Francisco and the City & County of San Francisco's Government Agencies, which generated a groundswell of public participation and support for the re-development effort. As developers of the Ferry Building we know the public process of rebuilding along the waterfront very well.

As the owner of the Ferry Building we are delighted to support a quality project like 110 The Embarcadero. A LEED Platinum project at this location will bring a new 'green' landmark to the City of San Francisco and further enhance the vibrant waterfront. The building's proposed design and sustainable objectives are commendable and in particular we look forward to the replacement of the unappealing view of the two large billboard advertisements in this location with a new architecturally significant structure.

We welcome the opportunity to consider new developments along the waterfront. Nearby urban density is essential to the Ferry Building Marketplace success. 110 The Embarcadero is worthy of consideration.

Most Sincerely,

Jane Connors

Jane Connors
Property Manager
The Ferry Building

C: C. page File 090159

GREYSTONE
HOTELS
*experience exceptional service*

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2009 MAR 11 AM 11:27
BY

March 9, 2009

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

Re: 110 The Embarcadero

Dear Supervisors:

I am a local business owner representing the ownership of multiple hotels in San Francisco including Hotel Griffon at 155 Steuart Street. Please accept this letter of support for our neighbor at 115 Steuart Street (110 The Embarcadero).

In these challenging times San Francisco should be embracing new development that will bring economic growth and activity to the city. The project will provide jobs during the design and construction and will bring state of the art office and pedestrian level retail space to the market. The area around the project will benefit from this increased activity and pedestrian flow. More people in the area means more support for local businesses such as restaurants, convenience retail and hotels.

Having a vacant building in the Financial District that is designated as the zone for the highest density in the city is not a productive use of the land and is a lost opportunity for improving the area. San Francisco needs to embrace the opportunity for economic growth which means fees and an increased tax base for the city and jobs and activity to support existing businesses.

Please support economic growth and vote in favor of allowing 110 The Embarcadero to proceed as it is proposed.

Kind regards,

Eric Horodas
President

C: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

51 Federal Street, Suite 207 * San Francisco, CA 94114 * Phone 415.547.1650 * Fax 415.442.0159
www.greystonehotels.com

File 090159
C:BOS 11
DR, C page
2045 HRS
6 MARCH 2009
(2)

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
CITY HALL ROOM 244
1 DR CARLTON B GOODLETT PL
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4689
ATTN: ANGELA CALVILLO, CLERK OF THE BOARD

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2009 MAR 13 AM 11:23
BY

DEAR MS CALVILLO

I'M WRITING ABOUT FILE 090159
APPEAL OF MITIGATED NEG DEC FOR 110
EMBARADERO (PLANNING CASE 2006.1294E)
AS THE LAND USE CHAIR FOR THE ALLIANCE
FOR A BETTER DIST 6 WE DISCUSSED THIS ISSUE
AND DETERMINED THAT THIS PROJECT IS
OUT OF CHARACTER FOR THE WATERFRONT,
OVER-SHADOWS ALL OTHER BUILDINGS EXCEPT
THE YMCA AND SHOULD NOT BE BUILT AT
THIS LOCATION, IF THE PROJECT WAS RELOCATED
SEVERAL BLOCKS IN FROM THE WATERFRONT
WE WOULD NOT HAVE A PROBLEM WITH IT
BUT AT ITS PROPOSED LOCATION WE COULD
NOT APPROVE IT.

THANK YOU - MY BUSINESS CARD IS ENCLOSED ~~FOR EACH~~ SUPERVISOR
PLEASE FORWARD TO ALL SUPERVISORS
SINCERELY
MARIA J PHILLIPS, LAND USE CHAIR
ALLIANCE FOR A BETTER DIST 6

CC: FILE
(2)

City and County of San Francisco

Gavin Newsom, Mayor
Edward D. Reiskin, Director

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

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

3

**February 11, 2009**

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

**Subject:** **Administrative Code Article XV.Sec.10.170-1.(i) Certain Transportation Funds (Proposition 1B Funds)**

**Dear Ms. Calvillo:**

Pursuant to Administrative Code Article XV.Sec.10.170-1.(i), please find attached, a report on the use of funds appropriated from the Local Street and Road Improvement, Congestion Relief, and Traffic Safety Account of 2006 by the Department of Public Works.

According to the subject Administrative Code, any department receiving an appropriation of Proposition 1B Local Street and Road funds shall report back to the Board of Supervisors beginning six months from the date of the appropriation and at six-month intervals thereafter with the following information:

- the amount of Proposition 1B Local Street and Road (LSR) Improvement Funds expended as of the reporting date
- progress on projects
- projected date of completion

To date, a total of $33 million has been appropriated to San Francisco from the State Prop 1B LSR account. Of this amount, DPW has received payments totaling $20 million. San Francisco's share of the FY 2008-09 Prop 1B LSR appropriation —approximately $13 million— has been delayed because of the State's fiscal crisis. The attached report details the expenditure of the subject funds. Please contact me if you have any questions about this report or would like additional information.

**Sincerely,**

**Edward Reiskin,**
**Director**



3

# Appropriated State Bond (Prop 1B) Funds
## For Paving Projects

| JO# | Project Name | Budgeted | Expended* | Encumbered | Balance | Project Status |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1325J | Various Locations #12 | $3,100,000 | $66,262 | $0 | $3,033,738 | Project is being awarded. Anticipated construction completion is September 2009 |
| 1327J | Lincoln Way - 3rd Ave/Kezar to 36th Ave. | $3,500,000 | $2,163,168 | $540,634 | $796,198 | Project is in the construction phase. Anticipated construction completion is March 2009 |
| 1354J | Local Match, SOMA Pavement Renovation | $1,300,000 | $146,320 | $415,744 | $737,936 | Project is in the construction phase. Anticipated construction completion is March 2009 |
| 1393J | North University Mound (Joint PUC Project) | $1,450,000 | $70,507 | $1,113,895 | $265,598 | Project is in the construction phase. Anticipated construction completion is June 2010 |
| 1440J | Taylor St - Ellis to Pine<br>Sansome St - Sutter to California | $1,330,000 | $126,852 | $814,512 | $388,636 | Project was awarded and is in the construction phase. Anticipated construction completion is July 2009 |
| 1442J | Folsom St - 10th to 19th<br>13th St - South Van Ness to Folsom St | $320,000 | $22,238 | $0 | $297,762 | Project is in the design phase. Anticipated design completion is May 2009 |
| 1443J | 11th St - Mission St to Harrison St | $178,672 | $136,292 | $0 | $42,380 | Project is being awarded.. Anticipated construction completion is September 2009 |
| 1444J | Various Locations #13 | $300,000 | $41,971 | $0 | $258,029 | Project is in the design phase. Anticipated design completion is September 2009 |
| 1449J | Laguna St. - Geary Blvd to Sutter St (Joint PUC Water Contract Phase I) | $33,408 | $0 | $0 | $33,408 | Project is lead by PUC. Anticipated project construction is pending PUC schedule |
| 1462J | SOMA West Ancillary Paving Project | $500,000 | $0 | $0 | $500,000 | Project is in the design phase and is 90% complete. Anticipated construction to start December 2009 |
| 1474J | Geary Blvd. Intersection Paving | $100,000 | $57,599 | $0 | $42,401 | Project is in the design phase. Anticipated design completion is February 2009 |
| 1492J | BSSR Various Locations | $3,800,000 | $3,731,814 | $17,685 | $50,501 | Project is in the construction phase. Anticipated construction completion June 2009 |
| 1501J | Noriega St - 35th Ave to Great Highway | $2,300,000 | $18,040 | $1,358,223 | $923,737 | Project was awarded and is in the construction phase. Anticipated construction completion is April 2009 |
| 1527J | Valencia St - 15th St to 19th St (Joint Streetscape Project) | $616,592 | $0 | $0 | $616,592 | Project is lead by DPW Streetscape. Anticipated project construction is pending Streetscape schedule |
| 1564J | Various Locations Preventative Maintenance | $1,265,627 | $3,214 | $0 | $1,262,413 | Project was advertised 2/3/09 and bids to be received 2/25/09. Anticipated construction completion is June 2009 |
| | ON HOLD Appropriated $13,222,746 State Bond (Prop 1B) | $13,222,746 | $0 | $0 | $13,222,746 | ON HOLD |
| | **Total** | **$33,317,045** | **$6,584,277** | **$4,260,693** | **$22,472,075** | |

*** As of 2/9/2009 from FAMIS Database**

| Year of appropriation | Total |
|---|---|
| FY 2007-08 | $ 18,828,672 |
| FY 2008-09 | $ 14,488,373 |
| | $ 33,317,045 |

**"Jacques, Simone" <Simone.Jacques@sfdpw.org >**

02/12/2009 02:03 PM

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

cc

bcc

Subject Administrative Code Article XV.Sec.10.170-1.(i) Certain Transportation Funds (Proposition 1B Funds)

Hi,

I am submitting the attached report on behalf of DPW. The report details the use of Proposition1B Local Streets and Roads Funds pursuant to Administrative Code Article XV.Sec.10.170-1.(i).

Thank you,

Simone

---

Simone F. Jacques
Transportation Finance Analyst
Budget, Finance & Performance Section
Department of Public Works
City & County of San Francisco
30 Van Ness Ave, Suite 5100
San Francisco, CA 94102
direct: 415.558.4034
fax: 415.558.4519
simone.jacques@sfdpw.org

Prop 1B Report to BOS 2-09.pdf

4

**Ria Tajbl**
<
03/11/2009 10:03 PM
Please respond to

To board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org
cc
bcc
Subject Restore Sharp Park

I understand the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department is weighing the future of the City's municipally owned golf courses, including the financially and ecologically mismanaged Sharp Park Golf Course. I urge the City and County of San Francisco to restore Sharp Park as a coastal lagoon and wetland habitat for endangered species.

Sharp Park Golf Course has a long history of environmental problems because of its poor design and unfortunate placement on a coastal lagoon. The course has had problems with flooding and drainage ever since opening, and the Department has created new and significant environmental impacts. The current operation of the golf course harms the wetland habitat and causes illegal take of two federally listed species, the California red-legged frog and the San Francisco garter snake.

Restoration of this area to a natural state is the best option for Sharp Park. Restoration will provide access to hiking trails, picnicking spots, camping facilities and educational opportunities sorely needed in San Mateo County. Restoration will also ensure the continued existence and abundance of endangered species at Sharp Park.

Ecological restoration is also the most fiscally responsible method of managing Sharp Park and dealing with flood management issues at the site. Compared to the costs of implementing capital improvements necessary to maintain the golf course combined with the high potential for massive civil penalties for harming endangered species, restoration alternatives seem to be the most fiscally prudent method for retaining recreational uses of the area.

Please fully consider restoration alternatives at Sharp Park before any long-term decisions about the future of the area are made.

Ria Tajbl

Pacifica, CA 94044

4

**Kim and Larry Fergison**

03/10/2009 09:24 PM

To Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

cc Ross Mirkarimi <Ross.Mirkarimi@sfgov.org>, hancsf <hancsf(_ _ ', libraryusers2004(

bcc

Subject Proposed Park Branch Library Closure

(5)

Dear Supervisors,

I am a long-standing resident of the Haight Ashbury, and am writing to tell you that I am concerned, very concerned about the plans to close our beloved and historic Park Branch Library. As I see it, the Library has gotten itself into a bit of trouble due to the mis-handled execution of the public input process (too few meetings/rushed agenda), a layout that is not as user-friendly as the current design, and having 2 "self-checkout" kiosks. Yikes.

Also, my two children participate in the annual summer reading program, and I am unsure of how they, or other children served by this branch will be able to participate in this very important literacy program. There are many families with young children in the Haight , North of Panhandle and Cole Valley neighborhoods who utilize the weekly lap sit programs. How will families be accommodated during the construction? I understand that there will be a bookmobile provided, but how will the library realistically be able to accommodate a weekly reading program and serve the needs of other patrons at the same time with a bookmobile. It would be ideal if a local, under-utilized space could be used during the closure of the library to accommodate needs of all library-users, large and tiny.

Sincerely, Larry Fergison and Family.

(5)

**Patricia Campbell <campbell>**

03/14/2009 08:20 AM

Please respond to

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

cc

bcc

Subject Renaming Third Street

(6)

I just read in the SF Chronicle that the City of San Francisco is considering renaming Third Street after Willie Brown.

THIS IS AN ABOMINATION!!!!! As a native San Franciscan and Democrat, I protest naming anything after Willie Brown! WILLIE BROWN HAS NEVER CARED ABOUT HELPING ANYONE BUT HIMSELF!!!! EVEN MY AFRICAN-AMERICAN VOTER FRIENDS IN SAN FRANCISCO FELT THIS WAY ABOUT HIM!!!! I AM ALL FOR SENDING WILLIE BACK TO TEXAS AND GETTING HIM OUT OF CALIFORNIA POLITICS!!!!

Patricia A. Campbell

Lincoln, CA 95648
(Senior Citizen)

(6)

"Jane Bliss"
<blissjan(
03/12/2009 10:36 AM

To <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
cc
bcc
Subject NERT Training Program

(7)

**Please see the attached and register my vote for full funding of the Neighborhood Emergency Rescue Team program. Thank you.**

Jane M. Bliss

Prosper Lt. Erica.docx

(7)

C : BOS

(8)

**terrrie frye**

03/10/2009 12:19 PM

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

cc Mark Leno <mark@markleno.com>, Tom Ammiano <Assemblymember.Ammiano@assembly.ca.gov>, Gavin Newsom <gavin.newsom@sfgov.org>

bcc

Subject "Gravel" in Civic Center

Hello Supervisors, Assemblyman Ammiano, Senator Leno and Mayor Newsom,

When they dismantled the Victory Garden in Civic Center, they put a sign on the fence that said something like "We will be returning this area to its original condition before the Victory Garden, which was gravel."

This is not true. It was a lawn, and before that a reflecting pool. Maybe it was gravel waaaay back before the reflecting pool, but who remembers?

Most recently it was a lawn - I have the photos of folks sitting on that lawn to prove it. Now it is disgusting brown stuff which is not even real gravel.

What is going on with Civic Center? Is this brown ugly stuff going to stay there through all the summer events season? Is it something folks would want to sit on? Yech!!!

Please, bring the lawn back!!

Sincerely,

Terrrie Frye

San Francisco, CA 94109-7416

(8)

March 9, 2009

(9)

Supervisors @ City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place Rm 244
San Francisco, Ca 94102

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2009 MAR 11 AM 11:23
BY

DC

On Feb 27th, many of our local Rec Directors received "Pink Slips". May 1st will be their last day of work. Starting May 4th, many Clubhouses and Playgrounds will be open only 3-4 hours each day. Reducing our Playgrounds hours and cutting the Directors who work directly with our children and our communities is not the answer to the Budget Problems.

Yours
Nadine L. Arnold

S. F., Ca 94132

(9)

*San Francisco, CA 94112*

***March 6, 2009***

Dear Board of Supervisors:

My name is Angela Blackwell and I have been a resident of San Francisco for 25 years. My daughter attends the Latchkey program run by San Francisco Recreation and Park at Miraloma playground. This is her fifth year attending this program.

I am writing to you regarding the recent cuts made to the San Francisco Recreation and Park staff, which will undoubtedly affect the quality and the quantity of programming in our community. I would like to ask you to please consider the following:

• Please do not change staff and reduce hours in the after-school programs so close to the end of the school year. Losing a beloved caregiver is tragic for the children already enrolled in the programs, and a nightmare for working parents who will now have to scramble to find an alternative.

• Please allocate Proposition J Children's Fund dollars to youth and children's programming facilitated by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department as the voters originally intended.

• Please keep departmental employees in place. Many of them have years of experience in their positions. This maintains a level of accountability. Their positions should not be turned over to non-profits funded by taxpayer dollars.

• Please make funding of the Recreation and Park Department a priority in the city of San Francisco. Recreation programming facilitated by SFRPD staff provides a quality, non-discriminatory affordable alternative to private and non-profit sector programs. This in turn has raised the quality of life for all San Franciscans.

Sincerely,

***Angela Blackwell***

*San Francisco, CA 94112*

(10)

Emma King

Atlanta, GA 30307

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
C/O Dr. Carlton B, Goodlet Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The conditions at the San Francisco Zoo are horrible. Many of the animals at the zoo are improperly taken care of. If the zoo is unable to provide for an animal, it should not take in that species in the first place. The IDA has already tried to help this rapid growing problem, by sending in international zoo directors. The zoo directors were so appalled with the conditions some even called it, "Third world." One went as far as to say, "Of the major zoos that I've seen, over the last 20 to 15 year, San Francisco's zoo is the worst." Especially considering recent events involving Tatiana, the need for the zoo to change is of the most importance.

When Tatiana (The Endangered Siberian Tiger) got out of her cage, this was due ignorance of the work staff. It showed how unhappy this wild animal was to be locked up and imprisoned, even willing to risk her own life to get out, of a cage that was inadequate and not a natural habitat for a tiger. The tiger was the shocking age of four, when she was shot and killed. What an unnecessary death! With the tools available, the tiger could have been safely tranquilized, returned to her cage, and not harmed at all.

This death signifies all that is unjust in the zoo. The zoo took in this poor tiger, and later ended up being the one to kill her. A zoo is supposed to be a caring, nurturing environment for animals, not somewhere, where they have to worry for their lives. I'm from Atlanta, and we had a situation like this a while ago, but the Atlanta Zoo cleaned up its act, so I hope you can clean up yours. I will definitely not visit your zoo until it's more humane and better managed.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Emma K. B

Emma King

(10)

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

February 9, 2009

Atlanta, GA 30307

Dear Sir or Madam,

It is sad that Tatiana was shot for escaping. She was only 4 years old. It is only natural that she wanted to escape from her prison. All animals and humans want to escape when they are imprisoned. Zoos are basically prisons for animals that have an illusion of beauty.

Zoos should focus on rescuing and rehabilitation of animals. They should also teach the public about animal welfare and their needs. The animals need environments that satisfy their physical, social, and psychological needs and so far most haven't provided this.

You should hold hearings to see if the intentions and practices at the San Francisco zoo are what they should be. Animal welfare is what should be at the top of their list. You also should replace the existing zoo managers with ones that are going to change the zoo into a zoo that animal welfare is first.

Finally, please let me know why Tatiana was killed. Why didn't the officers use tranquilizer darts to subdue her?

I certainly will not visit the San Francisco zoo until you change management and philosophy.

Sincerely,

Megan Herrmann

Megan Herrmann

(11)

**kimo <kimo**
Sent by:
kimocrossman(  n

03/11/2009 03:13 PM

Please respond to

To sblackman@sfpl.org, "Nicole A. Ozer" Peter Warfield James Chaffee 'Deetje(

cc

bcc

Subject Congratulations SFPL Re anonymous WiFi at Main Branch - No Login now required now

*(Clerk: Please make this part of the Library Commission communications file and forward a copy to each commissioner and relevant staff in real-time and CC me.)*

Dear San Francisco Library Commission and Staff:

Today I used my laptop in the Main branch, 3rd floor and received a pleasant surprise! In the past the free Wi-Fi network has required a sign-in with a valid library id number.

Apparently that "login wall" has now come down. That is excellent because it addresses concerns ACLU, EFF, & EPIC as well as local privacy advocates have raised that requiring a login with a personal identifier like a library ID for WiFi allowed the possibility of tracking and saving all internet access by user.

Many of the best practices regarding Wi-Fi privacy are located here at the ACLU Northern California website: Technology Issues and their Bytes and Pieces blog

http://www.aclunc.org/issues/technology/blog/index.shtml

http://www.aclunc.org/issues/technology/dont_let_internet_hot_spots_chill_privacy_and_free_speech.shtml

http://www.aclunc.org/issues/technology/index.shtml

I would love to know when this change was made and any communications that precipitated it.

Thank you once again for dong more to preserve library patrons privacy.

Kimo Crossman
San Francisco, CA

(11)

(12)

**kimo <kimo**
Sent by:
kimocrossman

03/10/2009 11:07 PM
Please respond to

To Kimo Crossman <

cc
Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org,
eileenhansensf8@yahoo.com, "John St.Croix"

bcc

Subject Re: SFBG Editorial - "Newsom's state secrets" - Newsom/Ballard's dirty bomb

I would add that the Prop G calendar in San Francisco requires an extremely large amount of detail including any meeting even ifsolely personal in City Hall and I believe that includes phone calls or text message conversations.

As well as any meeting outside of city hall if meeting with people who do substantial business with the city or are substationally financially affected by city actions -

Certainly any meeting with a lobbyist, reporter and even political meetings if they involve plans regarding legislation or plans for appointments to comissions/boards for example.

The Mayor's destruction of his 'working calendar' is prohibited under state law as a misdeamanor and willful refusal to preserve and provide these records is Official Misconduct which should result in removal from office.

Look at all the hubub over "lost emails" in the White House or even destroyed CIA torture tapes - destruction of records is serious business.

Recently, governors in Missouri, North Carolina, and New Jersey have lost their office or been put in legal jeopardy for their refusal to provide or destruction of public records.

# This is Newsom and Ballard's ticking timebomb which certainly a competitor for the govenership will put to good use.

On Tue, Mar 10, 2009 at 10:49 PM, Kimo Crossman <kimo@webnetic.net> wrote:
http://www.sfbg.com/entry.php?entry_id=8197
<http://www.sfbg.com/entry.php?entry_id=8197&catid=4&volume_id=398&issue_id=422&volume_num=43&issue_num=24>
&catid=4&volume_id=398&issue_id=422&volume_num=43&issue_num=24

(12)

(13)

**BERNARD CHODEN**

03/12/2009 05:54 PM
Please respond to
choden(

To <sfjberk Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org,
cc "Bruce B. Brugmann" , Kathryn Rose
bcc
Subject As requested

To: J. Clary
Fr: B. Choden
Re: SFT BOS HSG PROPOSALS.
3/12/09

1. **Development should not exceed the city's holding capacity for infrastructure or services as measured by law and best practices for health, safety and welfare.**

   Currently the city does not have adequate holding capacity for its residents for infrastructure, such as sewer and water, or services such as schools. The city has indicated that it is not willing or unable to finance such capacity on a sustainable basis nor is the city willing to commit to such funding and other necessary development resources to such future needs.

   Therefore, the city should not commit to further development in the absence of such holding capacity.

   Should holding capacity be made available on a long-term, sustainable basis, then development should only be granted on a measurable pro-quid-pro basis by priority quota as determined overall by public needs criteria for housing and employment inter-related citywide and by neighborhoods either on a first come basis or by lottery and by development as best relates to the development pattern of each area. This method of land control is termed "quota zoning."

   Development should contribute to the resource and funding of the holding capacity needs of the city in accord with the city's needs for such development including subsidies or surplus values.

2. **Health facilities for emergencies should be facilitated by a city "Master Plan" and development and financial assistance resources institutional pool according to geographical, social and economic needs or each area of the city**.

   With the onset of federal health financing, the city should be prepared to equitably ration its public financing and other resources with those it receives from the state or federal government as best serves its residents.

   This is best done through a "Master Plan" provided through the city and in collaboration

(13)

with all health providers and expertise. Further, health providers should pool their resources as best meets their abilities and needs with a city institutional format.

3. **Seismic safety assistance for rent controlled below market housing should be subsidized in a manner that preserves the affordability of those housing units.**

Approximately 3,000 residential buildings with about 9,000 units under rent control and that are presently affordable require seismic retrofit subsidies in order to both achieve seismic safety and affordability of that housing. It is unlikely that most of these units would remain affordable with such assistance that might include:

1. Rehabilitation pooling of construction resources and techniques such "mass production" and builders' insurance and architectural and permit assistances.
2. Applying for federal stimulus assistance for aid to contractors and owners to offset costs given guarantees of tenant affordability. These projects would be shovel ready and income beneficent.

14

**"Dr. Ahimsa Sumchai"**

03/12/2009 02:30 PM

To San Francisco Chronicle <letters@sfchronicle.com>, San Francisco Chronicle <forum@sfchronicle.com>, John Diaz <jdiaz@sfchronicle.com>, Parkside Listserve

cc

bcc

Subject Majority delegation of Board Members Violates Ethics Open Government Laws

I am proposing a boycott of the S.F.Chronicles role in concealment and complicity in violations of State and local Ethics, open government and environmental laws and have forwarded information to President Barack Obama!

---

To: letters@sfchronicle.com; forum@sfchronicle.com; jdiaz@sfchronicle.com; home@prosf.org; ethics.commission@sfgov.org; john.st.croix@sfgov.org; sotf@sfgov.org; board_of_supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us; chris.daly@sfgov.org; john.chiu@sfgov.org; gavin.newsom@sfgov.org; michael.cohen@sfgov.org; asumchai@sfbayview.com; communityfirstcoalition@yahoogroups.com
From:
Date: Wed, 11 Mar 2009 18:34:24 -0700
Subject: [CommunityFirstCoalition] Majority delegation of Board Members Violates Ethics Open Government Laws

Dear Editors,

The six member majority of the San Francisco Board Of Supervisors who neglected city business during a fiscal crisis to travel impulsively to Washington, D.C. to lobby for federal funds violated state and local ethics and open government laws. Both the Sunshine Ordinance of the San Francisco Municipal Code and the State Brown Act Public Meeting Laws prohibit a majority of officials on an elected or appointed body from meeting without 72 hours public notice of agenda, public comment and input on actions taken by that body.

The San Francisco Chronicle and its editorial board has acted in an equally unethical manner in celebrating the illegal activities of the six member BOS delegation and their federal counterparts and suggesting in an absurd front page study that a relationship somehow exists between the rebound of the stock market and their trip to D.C.!

**AHIMSA PORTER SUMCHAI, M.D.**
**San Francisco**

14

15

**Board of Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV**
03/12/2009 02:13 PM

To BOS Constituent Mail Distribution,
cc
bcc
Subject Fw: Majority delegation of Board Members Violates Ethics Open Government Laws

**"Dr. Ahimsa Sumchai"**

03/11/2009 06:34 PM

To San Francisco Chronicle <letters@sfchronicle.com>, <forum@sfchronicle.com>, <jdiaz@sfchronicle.com>, Parkside Listserve <ethics.commission@sfgov.org>, <john.st.croix@sfgov.org>, Sunshine Task Force <sotf@sfgov.org>, Board Supervisors <board_of_supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us>, Chris Daly <chris.daly@sfgov.org>, <john.chiu@sfgov.org>, Gavin Newsom <gavin.newsom@sfgov.org>,

cc
Subject Majority delegation of Board Members Violates Ethics Open Government Laws

Dear Editors,

The six member majority of the San Francisco Board Of Supervisors who neglected city business during a fiscal crisis to travel impulsively to Washington, D.C. to lobby for federal funds violated state and local ethics and open government laws. Both the Sunshine Ordinance of the San Francisco Municipal Code and the State Brown Act Public Meeting Laws prohibit a majority of officials on an elected or appointed body from meeting without 72 hours public notice of agenda, public comment and input on actions taken by that body.

The San Francisco Chronicle and its editorial board has acted in an equally unethical manner in celebrating the illegal activities of the six member BOS delegation and their federal counterparts and suggesting in an absurd front page study that a relationship somehow exists between the rebound of the stock market and their trip to D.C.!

**AHIMSA PORTER SUMCHAI, M.D.**
**San Francisco**



15

**<Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org>**
03/12/2009 07:18 AM

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

(16)

Submitted on: 3/12/2009 7:18:12 AM

Additional_Comments: Issue of allowing government official
to use tax payer money to fight a proposition
Prop 8 passed 52 to 48%, yet, the city is paying Herrera to fight it.
He admitted that last year he spent most of his time on this issue at tax
payers expenses.
There is nowhere in his job description that says he has to fight for the
minority voters.
Government officials should not be paid to fight against what the majority
wants.
It is stealing their taxpayer's money and should be illegal.
a

Name: aline dinoia

Number:

Mailing_Address:
san francisco ca 94115

Email:

(16)

C' Sup Campos

(17)

POLICE DEPARTMENT
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
THOMAS J. CAHILL HALL OF JUSTICE
850 BRYANT STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94103-4603

GAVIN NEWSOM
MAYOR

HEATHER J. FONG
CHIEF OF POLICE

March 12, 2009

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2009 MAR 16 PM 3:12
BY

Ms. Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, California 94102-4689

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

I am writing in response to your inquiry dated February 12, 2009, Reference 20090210-006. Supervisor Campos requests information regarding cultural competency training, policies and procedures of the San Francisco Police Department.

Please refer to the attached information for the answers to his questions. If you have any further questions, please contact Commander Sylvia Harper, Administration Bureau, at (415) 553-9049.

Sincerely,

Charles J. Keohane
Deputy Chief of Police

Attachments

CJK/SH/mn

(17)

Board of
Supervisors/BOS/SFGOV
02/12/2009 12:20 PM

To Heather.Fong@sfgov.org
cc david.campos@sfgov.org
bcc
Subject BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY

# BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INQUIRY

For any questions, call the sponsoring supervisor

TO: Heather Fong
Police

FROM: Clerk of the Board
DATE: 2/12/2009
REFERENCE: 20090210-006
FILE NO.

Due Date: 3/14/2009

This is an inquiry from a member of the Board of Supervisors made at the Board meeting on 2/10/2009.

Supervisor Campos requests the following information:

*Supervisor Campos is requesting the following information:*
*a. What cultural competency or other training does the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) provide to its cadets and officers regarding the treatment of immigrants, regardless of immigration status?*
*b. What cultural competency or other training does the San Francisco Police Department provide to its cadets and officers to prevent racial profiling and ensure fair and impartial policing?*
*c. What kind of training does the SFPD provide to its cadets and officers regarding compliance with San Francisco's sanctuary city policies?*
*d. For the years 2007 and 2008, broken down per month, how many people has SFPD cited for "obstruction of view" or other minor traffic violations per police district in San Francisco?*
*e. What is the racial and ethnic breakdown of people cited in 2007 and 2008, broken down per month and per police district?*
*f. When SFPD records the race and/or ethnicity of people cited for traffic violations, does SFPD include a category for Latino/Hispanic or does SFPD include these individuals in the Caucasian/White group?*
*g. What, if any, steps has SFPD taken within the last year to enhance its relationships with San Francisco's immigrant communities and to ensure that victims and witnesses of crimes who are immigrants feel comfortable coming forward and reporting these crimes to SFPD?*
*h. What is the budget of the Violence Reduction Unit in SFPD?*

*i. In the last year, how many traffic, misdemeanor, and felony cases has this unit issued/initiated, broken down by police district, and by race and ethnicity.*
*j. What are SFPD's policies and practices regarding taking identification cards (including green cards, drivers licenses, etc.) of people that SFPD stops, cites, or arrests?*
*k. Does SFPD keep a record of the identification cards that have been confiscated? If so, how many identification cards did SFPD confiscate in 2008, broken down per month, per race and ethnicity, and per police district?*
*l. How many vehicles did SFPD impound in 2007, 2008, and current year, broken down per month, per race and ethnicity, and per police district?*
*m. What is SFPD doing to ensure that eligible youth are being referred to CARC (city's delinquency diversion program)?*
*n. Before SFPD engage in any collaboration with ICE, including collaboration on ICE raids, what, if any, steps does SFPD take to ensure that the raid will not result in collateral detentions (i.e., detentions of family members, bystanders, children, neighbors)?*
*o. What, if any, concrete steps does SFPD plan to take to address racial profiling concerns raised during the February 9, 2009 meeting of the Board of Supervisors' Public Safety Committee?*

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 3/14/2009

**SFPD RESPONSES TO SUPERVISOR CAMPOS' INQUIRY REFERENCE 20090210-006**

a. **What cultural competency or other training does the SFPD provide to its cadets and officers regarding the treatment of immigrants regardless of immigration status?**

The San Francisco Police Department provides proactive, comprehensive and continual cultural competency training to recruits (cadets) and veteran officers. Listed is some of the training received:

**Recruit:** Academy Recruit Officer Training incorporates a variety of classes that focus on the treatment of all persons regardless of immigrant status. These classes include; Ethics, (6hrs), Professionalism – Professional Conduct (2 hrs), Interpersonal Communications (2hrs), Issues and Impacts of Bias Policing / Racial Profiling (4hrs), Hate Crimes (2hrs), Cultural Competency (2hrs), EEO/Discrimination (2hrs) and Cultural Competency & Limited English Proficiency (4hrs). Additionally, various community/cultural groups provide presentations (20hrs). The community representatives who come into the Academy to facilitate training are: African American; Chinese; Filipino; Gay & Lesbian; Japanese; Islam/Arab; and Transgender members. Practical exercises (Simulations) allow recruits to practice the skill learned.

During the basic Field Training Office Program (FTO), the recruit officers are evaluated daily on the learning components, in which they demonstrate the ability to interact appropriately with the varying persons of ethic, cultural, and social groups. Recruits who are deficient receive further training. Recruits in the FTO program receive additional training on investigative detentions that shall not be based on Appearance, Racial Profiling, Foreign Nationals, and Cultural Competency.

**Officers:** Veteran officers attend a 40 hours Continued Professional Training (CPT) every two years. CPT includes classes that incorporate training that focus on the treatment of all persons including immigrants, regardless of immigrant status. These classes include; "Issues and Impacts of Bias Policing / Racial Profiling" (2hrs), Community Policing/Cultural Competency/ Limited English Proficiency (2hrs), and Interpersonal Communications (2hrs).

In addition, the SFPD has written directives – Department General Orders (DGOs) and a Department Bulletin establishing policies regarding the enforcement of immigration laws and cooperation with the Immigration and Naturalization, and Customs (ICE) in conformity with State and Federal laws and the City of Refuge Ordinance, San Francisco Administrative Code Section 12H.2-1.

In particular, DGO 5.15 (*Enforcement of Immigration Laws*) reminds police officers that investigation and detention of any individual solely because of their national origin, appearance, inability to speak English, or their immigration status is strictly prohibited states....."It is the policy of the San Francisco Police Department to foster trust and cooperation with all people of this City and to encourage them to communicate with San Francisco police officers without fear of inquiry regarding their immigration status. It is also Department policy, consistent with its obligations under state and federal law to adhere to the City of Refuge Ordinance."

Department Bulletin 06-176 (*Immigration Customs Enforcement (ICE)*) states "Enforcement of immigration law is now the primary responsibility of ICE. Police officers are reminded that San Francisco is a designated "City and County of Refuge" as it pertains to the investigation and enforcement of federal immigration laws".

b. **What cultural competency or other training does the SFPD provide to its cadets and officers to prevent racial profiling and ensure fair and impartial policing?**

All of the extensive training enumerated in response (a) above was also selected to prevent racial profiling and to ensure fair and impartial policing.

In addition, Lorie Fridell, Ph.D. was asked to assist San Francisco by conducting a preliminary review of the efforts on the part of the SFPD to promote fair and impartial policing and to make recommendations for the City and Police Department. In March 2007, Dr. Fridell submitted to the Mayor of San Francisco her completed documentation. (*Fair and Impartial Policing Recommendations for the City and Police Department of San Francisco submitted to the San Francisco Office of the Mayor March 2007*). In her Summary and Conclusions she wrote:

*"I conducted a preliminary assessment of the SFPD and determined that it has already taken some important steps to promote and facilitate fair and impartial policing. For example, the department has a solid anti-based policing policy, the POST training for all recruits is strong, Chief Fong is perceived as committed to fair and impartial policing, the agency has impressive diversity among sworn personnel, the agency and City are committed to community policing principles, and the department has been collecting vehicle stop data since 2001."*

c. **What kind of training, does the SFPD provide to its cadets and officers regarding compliance with San Francisco's sanctuary city policies?**

The San Francisco Police Department provides proactive comprehensive and continual training to ensure compliance with San Francisco Sanctuary City Policies to recruits (cadets) and veteran officers. Listed is some of the training received:

**Recruit:** Academy Recruit Officer Training incorporates a variety of classes that include issues involving compliance with San Francisco's Sanctuary City Policies. These classes include; Issues and Impacts of Bias Policing / Racial Profiling (4hrs), Hate Crimes (2hrs), EEO/Discrimination (2hrs) and Cultural Competency & Limited English Proficiency (4hrs). Additionally, specific community/cultural groups provide presentations (20hrs). The community representatives who come into the Academy to facilitate training are: African American; Chinese; Filipino; Gay & Lesbian; Japanese; Islam/Arab; and Transgender members. Practical exercises (Simulations) allow recruits to practice the skill learned.

During the FTO program, recruit officers are evaluated daily on these areas, in which they demonstrate the ability to interact appropriately with persons of ethic, cultural, social groups. Recruits who are deficient receive further training. Recruits in the FTO program receive additional training during their tenure specifically on investigative detentions that are not based on Appearance, Racial Profiling, Foreign Nationals and Cultural Competency.

**Officers:** Veteran officers attend a 40 hours Continued Professional Training (CPT) every two years. Current CPT Classes incorporate training that includes training on the San Francisco Sanctuary City Policies. These classes include; Issues and Impacts of Bias Policing / Racial Profiling (2hrs), Community Policing/Cultural Competency Limited English Proficiency (2hrs), and Interpersonal Communications (2hrs).

In addition, when Mayor Newsom launched his Sanctuary City Outreach Campaign in April 2008, the SFPD willingly and enthusiastically participated by distributing and notifying the public that they have safe access to public services. Sanctuary City brochures were posted and displayed at all of the police department's district stations' lobbies, community rooms, and front counters – wherever the pubic had access.

d. **For the year 2007 and 2008 broken down per month, how many people have SFPD cited for "obstruction of view" or other minor traffic violations per police district in San Francisco?**

The SFPD cites people who commit violations of the law. The SFPD does not maintain the requested information regarding section 26708 (Material

Obstructing or Reducing Driver's View) of the California Vehicle Code. The requested information may be available from the Superior Court.

e. **What is the racial and ethnic break down of people cited in 2007 and 2008, broken down per month per police district?**

The attached excel spreadsheet shows the racial and ethnic breakdown of people cited for traffic related offenses for 2007 and 2008, divided by month and district of occurrence. It should be noted that these statistics only reflect traffic related offenses and do not take into account any other citations that are non traffic related (ie:criminal misdemeanor cite and release, Juvenile cite and release).

f. **When SFPD records the race and/or ethnicity of people cited for traffic violations, does SFPD include a category for Latino/Hispanic or does SFPD include these individuals in the Caucasian/White group?**

The San Francisco Police Department Traffic Stop Data Collection Worksheet instructs police officers to use the following codes when reporting the race of the driver:
A = Asian
B = Black
H = Hispanic
O = Other
W = White

g. **What, if any, steps has the SFPD taken within the last year to enhance its relationships with San Francisco's immigrant communities and to ensure that victims and witnesses of crimes, who are immigrants feel comfortable coming forward and reporting these crimes to the SFPD?**

The SFPD has implemented a Department General Order (DGO) 5.20, (*Limited English Proficient Persons (L.E.P.)*) to assist the public and the police to better communicate with each other. If the immigrant communities know that their words and messages are understood by the police, there will be less reluctance in them talking to the police. DGO 5.20 was adopted on October 16, 2007. This DGO was adopted in response to the cultural diversity within the community of San Francisco and sets forth the Department's policies when police officers interact with and provide services to persons with limited or no English proficiency.

Listed below are the steps taken by the SFPD to introduce the Department's L.E.P. policies to the community:

- A press release regarding DGO 5.20 (*Language Access Services for Limited English Proficient Persons")* was issued on November 29, 2007.
- A press conference was held in February 2008 at the Chinatown Office of Chinese for Affirmative Action.
- Monthly meetings are held to discuss the SFPD's role with the L.E.P community.

    - A L.E.P. Reference Guide which highlights the key provisions of Department General Order 5.20 was issued to officers.
    - Roll call training on Department General Order 5.20 L.E.P. is conducted at the SF Police Academy with both veteran officers and new recruits.
    - Language Line Dual Handsets are available at all district stations.
    - Training Videos (Verbal Dispute, Juvenile in Custody and Counter Report) are being compiled and will be presented to officers.
    - A L.E.P. Community Brochure has been crafted and will be available in 5 languages: Tagalog, Chinese, Vietnamese, Spanish and Russian.
    - The Department's Language Access Liaison Officer attends community meetings to introduce the Department's L.E.P. services.
    - The Department's Language Access Liaison Officer, in cooperation with Tomas Lee of the City's Department of Language Services, introduced a Spanish language class to Department members. Beginning Spring 2009, two additional beginner Spanish classes as well as an advanced Spanish class will get underway.
    - Tomas Lee is assisting with the website translations into Spanish and Chinese which is in process.

h. **What is the budget of the violence reduction unit in SFPD?**

The SFPD does not have a violence reduction unit therefore there is no budget.

i. **In the last year. How many traffic, misdemeanor, and felony cases has this unit issued/initiated, broken down by police district, and by race and ethnicity?**

N/A. There is no such unit.

j. **What are SFPD's policies and practices regarding taking identification cards (including green cards, driver licenses, etc.) of people that SFPD stops, sites, or arrests?**

If identification cards are evidence of a crime, they are booked as such.

If an individual is arrested for anything except DUI, their identification cards are booked with the rest of their personal property.

If an individual is arrested for DUI, pursuant to the mandates of Sections 13353 (Refusal of Chemical Test) and 13353.2 (Immediate Suspension) of the California Vehicle Code, their license is seized and forwarded to DMV. When the license is seized the person is given the pink copy of Form DS 367 (DMV Administrative Per Se Suspension/Revocation Order and Temporary Driver License), which serves as a temporary California driver license for thirty days.

k. **Does SFPD keep a record of the identification cards that have been confiscated? If so, how many identification cards did SFPD confiscate in 2008, broken down per month, per race and ethnicity, and per police district?**

The SFPD does not confiscate identification cards.

l. **How many vehicles did SFPD impound in 2007, 2008, and current year, broken down per month, per race and ethnicity, and per police district?**

Comprehensive data for the vehicles impounded is not available through any business process in the Traffic Company of the SFPD. Some of the data is collected through the E-585 mask which only covers traffic stops and does not include vehicles impounded for:

1. Prohibited parking.
2. Tows for hazards and traffic collisions.
3. Tows incident to arrests.

m. **What is SFPD doing to ensure that eligible youth are being referred to CARC (City's Delinquency Diversion Program)?**

Department Bulletin 08-116 (*Juvenile Procedures Arrests Community Assessment and Referral Center (CARC)*) mandates the procedure is

police officers follow when arresting a juvenile. This procedure will be followed for any arrest except for minor traffic infractions. Police Officers who arrest a juvenile, regardless of the day or time of the arrest, shall phone the Community Assessment and Referral Center (CARC) during operating hours (0900-2400) or a Juvenile Justice Center (JJC) juvenile probation officer when CARC is closed. In either case, a juvenile probation officer will, using available information regarding the arrest and the juvenile, make a determination as to whether the juvenile should be booked at JJC, brought to CARC, cited to CARC, or cited to Juvenile court. The police officer completing the police arrest report shall indicate the name of the official (at CARC or JJC) who authorized the action taken with the arrested juvenile.

n. **Before SFPD engage in any collaboration with ICE, including collaboration on ICE raids, what, if any, steps does SFPD take to ensure that the raid will not result in collateral detentions (i.e., detentions of family members, bystanders, children, neighbors)?**

The Department has specific guidelines when working with ICE agents. Police officers, through various sources, including Department policy and roll call trainings, are well aware of their role and responsibility. The ICE agents work separately and independently when performing their duties.

Police officers of the San Francisco Police Department comply with Department General Order (DGO) 5.15 (*Enforcement of Immigration Laws*) when acting in official capacity as police officer during the performance of their duties.

Before working with an outside agencies, police officers must obtain interagency operation approval from that police officer's Deputy Chief as outlined in Department General Order 5.14 (*Interagency Operations*). Once approved, the police officer would explain to the outside agency that he/she (the SFPD police officer) must comply with all policies and procedures of the SFPD.

**Police officers work with ICE in only two separate capacities**:

Police officers of the Department will only work with ICE related to a matter involving an individual who is detained or arrested for committing a crime (e.g. suspected gang member etc).

Police officers are authorized to assist ICE, when ICE is performing their duties, when the police officer determines that ICE personnel are in "significant danger or personal injury" or if there is a possibility for serious property damage. This is limited to when a firearm or weapon is involved,

the subject has a history of violence or when ICE agents are physically attacked. (Reference DGO 5.15.)

The SFPD has made it clear to ICE that police officers will not participate or facilitate any raids only for the purpose of detaining individuals who are in the United States illegally. As outlined in Department General Order 5.15. "Police officers shall not enforce immigration laws or assist the INS in the enforcement of immigration laws."

o. **What, if any, concrete steps does SFPD plan to take to address racial profiling concerns raised during the February 9, 2009 meeting of the Board of Supervisors' Public Safety Committee?**

Every police officer has taken the Issue and Impact Bias Policing/Racial Profiling Training. POST (Police Officer Standards and Training) Subject Matter Expert, Inspector Clemons is in the process of preparing a refresher course on the same topic.

In addition, the SFPD will continue to develop and implement the following:

1. Conduct roll call training on racial profiling.

2. Work with the Office of Citizen Complaints to review incidents and resolve issues as they arise.

3. Meet with the various Advocacy Groups.

4. Meet and work collaborately with *Limited English Proficient Persons (L.E.P)* focus groups. The LEP focus group members include representatives from:

    - OCC
    - Asian Law Caucus
    - Department of Human Resources
    - RAMS, Inc. (Richmond Area Multi-Services)
    - Sunset Neighborhood Beacon Center
    - Chinese Affirmative action
    - Department of the Status of Women
    - Instituto Familiar de la Raza
    - IFR/SBHS
    - San Francisco District Attorney's office
    - API (Asian Pacific Islander) Legal Outreach

5. Provide training for the Advocacy Groups.

6. Solicit input from the various Advocacy Groups for improving training/roll call.

Most importantly, the SFPD will continue to follow our Statement of Purpose and Values which guide our police officers in executing their public duties:

*"We, the members of the San Francisco Police Department, working in partnership with the community, are committed to excellence in law enforcement and are dedicated to the people, tradition and diversity of our City. It is our fundamental belief that we treat members of the public with respect and dignity".*

| Race of Driver | Sex of Driver | Year | Month | Result of Contact | Total | Bayview | Central | Ingleside | Mission | Northern | Park | Richmond | Southern | Taraval | Tenderloin |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| African American | F | 2007 | 1 | Citation | 334 | 106 | 11 | 37 | 22 | 30 | 26 | 12 | 50 | 15 | 25 |
| African American | M | 2007 | 1 | Citation | 781 | 268 | 44 | 68 | 46 | 67 | 41 | 24 | 101 | 37 | 85 |
| Asian | F | 2007 | 1 | Citation | 455 | 29 | 43 | 70 | 19 | 38 | 29 | 52 | 61 | 102 | 12 |
| Asian | M | 2007 | 1 | Citation | 1105 | 92 | 125 | 173 | 37 | 98 | 43 | 139 | 136 | 215 | 47 |
| Hispanic | F | 2007 | 1 | Citation | 210 | 23 | 2 | 65 | 41 | 20 | 8 | 6 | 25 | 16 | 4 |
| Hispanic | M | 2007 | 1 | Citation | 727 | 98 | 24 | 217 | 122 | 38 | 24 | 24 | 114 | 43 | 23 |
| Other | F | 2007 | 1 | Citation | 148 | 20 | 12 | 22 | 7 | 20 | 5 | 9 | 35 | 10 | 8 |
| Other | M | 2007 | 1 | Citation | 570 | 37 | 64 | 73 | 39 | 64 | 33 | 43 | 138 | 44 | 35 |
| White | F | 2007 | 1 | Citation | 1204 | 79 | 43 | 130 | 101 | 168 | 98 | 133 | 251 | 155 | 46 |
| White | M | 2007 | 1 | Citation | 2422 | 191 | 169 | 240 | 213 | 265 | 216 | 225 | 565 | 216 | 122 |
| African American | F | 2007 | 2 | Citation | 321 | 67 | 10 | 43 | 29 | 72 | 20 | 4 | 53 | 6 | 17 |
| African American | M | 2007 | 2 | Citation | 651 | 155 | 31 | 69 | 58 | 107 | 47 | 13 | 111 | 6 | 54 |
| Asian | F | 2007 | 2 | Citation | 354 | 11 | 23 | 60 | 20 | 67 | 23 | 37 | 57 | 45 | 11 |
| Asian | M | 2007 | 2 | Citation | 959 | 48 | 131 | 149 | 48 | 116 | 60 | 81 | 133 | 145 | 48 |
| Hispanic | F | 2007 | 2 | Citation | 179 | 12 | 9 | 58 | 32 | 16 | 6 | 2 | 29 | 11 | 4 |
| Hispanic | M | 2007 | 2 | Citation | 634 | 41 | 34 | 174 | 102 | 91 | 22 | 24 | 107 | 16 | 23 |
| Other | F | 2007 | 2 | Citation | 133 | 15 | 7 | 28 | 13 | 29 | 12 | 4 | 18 | 5 | 2 |
| Other | M | 2007 | 2 | Citation | 485 | 22 | 62 | 95 | 20 | 63 | 40 | 19 | 95 | 37 | 32 |
| White | F | 2007 | 2 | Citation | 1152 | 49 | 65 | 132 | 85 | 221 | 156 | 91 | 211 | 97 | 45 |
| White | M | 2007 | 2 | Citation | 2391 | 103 | 182 | 260 | 215 | 471 | 238 | 150 | 477 | 161 | 134 |
| African American | F | 2007 | 3 | Citation | 376 | 118 | 5 | 41 | 21 | 96 | 27 | 7 | 39 | 4 | 18 |
| African American | M | 2007 | 3 | Citation | 806 | 264 | 37 | 81 | 56 | 141 | 46 | 12 | 107 | 15 | 47 |
| Asian | F | 2007 | 3 | Citation | 362 | 33 | 19 | 58 | 14 | 60 | 22 | 44 | 38 | 61 | 13 |
| Asian | M | 2007 | 3 | Citation | 898 | 81 | 72 | 204 | 39 | 127 | 37 | 82 | 90 | 133 | 33 |
| Hispanic | F | 2007 | 3 | Citation | 215 | 31 | 7 | 82 | 18 | 28 | 8 | 4 | 22 | 7 | 8 |
| Hispanic | M | 2007 | 3 | Citation | 660 | 95 | 28 | 191 | 104 | 89 | 19 | 8 | 76 | 27 | 23 |
| Other | F | 2007 | 3 | Citation | 144 | 7 | 5 | 40 | 9 | 23 | 6 | 7 | 25 | 15 | 7 |
| Other | M | 2007 | 3 | Citation | 508 | 26 | 39 | 113 | 38 | 87 | 35 | 23 | 97 | 28 | 22 |
| White | F | 2007 | 3 | Citation | 1078 | 73 | 56 | 166 | 82 | 239 | 117 | 81 | 165 | 66 | 33 |
| White | M | 2007 | 3 | Citation | 2234 | 203 | 125 | 275 | 158 | 456 | 230 | 150 | 411 | 125 | 101 |
| African American | F | 2007 | 4 | Citation | 561 | 222 | 16 | 88 | 21 | 38 | 42 | 4 | 68 | 26 | 36 |
| African American | M | 2007 | 4 | Citation | 1190 | 538 | 43 | 114 | 67 | 84 | 82 | 18 | 132 | 42 | 70 |
| Asian | F | 2007 | 4 | Citation | 620 | 98 | 30 | 113 | 19 | 45 | 51 | 47 | 64 | 136 | 17 |
| Asian | M | 2007 | 4 | Citation | 1388 | 158 | 67 | 327 | 48 | 91 | 97 | 152 | 151 | 265 | 32 |
| Hispanic | F | 2007 | 4 | Citation | 379 | 59 | 11 | 161 | 17 | 21 | 31 | 3 | 44 | 19 | 13 |
| Hispanic | M | 2007 | 4 | Citation | 1027 | 237 | 45 | 306 | 101 | 61 | 36 | 14 | 132 | 51 | 44 |
| Other | F | 2007 | 4 | Citation | 234 | 41 | 16 | 51 | 8 | 22 | 18 | 8 | 42 | 20 | 8 |
| Other | M | 2007 | 4 | Citation | 840 | 103 | 76 | 189 | 34 | 85 | 59 | 47 | 121 | 74 | 52 |
| White | F | 2007 | 4 | Citation | 1575 | 155 | 57 | 257 | 82 | 213 | 230 | 86 | 280 | 156 | 59 |
| White | M | 2007 | 4 | Citation | 3399 | 425 | 165 | 409 | 243 | 426 | 437 | 238 | 537 | 339 | 180 |
| African American | F | 2007 | 5 | Citation | 380 | 111 | 11 | 64 | 28 | 48 | 17 | 4 | 66 | 11 | 20 |

| Race of Driver | Sex of Driver | Year | Month | Result of Contact | Total | Bayview | Central | Ingleside | Mission | Northern | Park | Richmond | Southern | Taraval | Tenderloin |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| African American | M | 2007 | 5 | Citation | 694 | 162 | 16 | 79 | 74 | 90 | 35 | 6 | 167 | 24 | 41 |
| Asian | F | 2007 | 5 | Citation | 372 | 22 | 21 | 56 | 25 | 37 | 20 | 23 | 64 | 91 | 13 |
| Asian | M | 2007 | 5 | Citation | 977 | 55 | 63 | 157 | 70 | 82 | 52 | 105 | 167 | 186 | 40 |
| Hispanic | F | 2007 | 5 | Citation | 263 | 20 | 5 | 78 | 60 | 22 | 8 | 3 | 50 | 11 | 6 |
| Hispanic | M | 2007 | 5 | Citation | 718 | 78 | 17 | 173 | 172 | 54 | 20 | 9 | 141 | 27 | 27 |
| Other | F | 2007 | 5 | Citation | 198 | 10 | 9 | 41 | 32 | 30 | 12 | 9 | 43 | 7 | 5 |
| Other | M | 2007 | 5 | Citation | 674 | 49 | 38 | 109 | 79 | 103 | 21 | 37 | 168 | 37 | 33 |
| White | F | 2007 | 5 | Citation | 1181 | 66 | 40 | 151 | 151 | 204 | 97 | 73 | 258 | 90 | 51 |
| White | M | 2007 | 5 | Citation | 2549 | 148 | 129 | 228 | 346 | 412 | 237 | 161 | 640 | 145 | 103 |
| African American | F | 2007 | 6 | Citation | 258 | 54 | 4 | 48 | 18 | 44 | 16 | 5 | 47 | 9 | 13 |
| African American | M | 2007 | 6 | Citation | 567 | 102 | 34 | 84 | 30 | 96 | 49 | 6 | 104 | 20 | 42 |
| Asian | F | 2007 | 6 | Citation | 309 | 13 | 10 | 57 | 9 | 52 | 22 | 32 | 47 | 60 | 7 |
| Asian | M | 2007 | 6 | Citation | 726 | 27 | 61 | 124 | 29 | 93 | 45 | 95 | 94 | 131 | 27 |
| Hispanic | F | 2007 | 6 | Citation | 148 | 9 | 2 | 65 | 26 | 14 | 5 | 1 | 19 | 5 | 2 |
| Hispanic | M | 2007 | 6 | Citation | 507 | 52 | 40 | 146 | 65 | 51 | 23 | 19 | 75 | 16 | 20 |
| Other | F | 2007 | 6 | Citation | 154 | 9 | 1 | 35 | 11 | 38 | 7 | 8 | 34 | 9 | 2 |
| Other | M | 2007 | 6 | Citation | 423 | 18 | 32 | 86 | 35 | 72 | 30 | 11 | 75 | 26 | 38 |
| White | F | 2007 | 6 | Citation | 907 | 27 | 39 | 118 | 39 | 195 | 114 | 63 | 199 | 72 | 41 |
| White | M | 2007 | 6 | Citation | 1850 | 85 | 103 | 209 | 119 | 356 | 254 | 137 | 365 | 131 | 91 |
| African American | F | 2007 | 7 | Citation | 269 | 51 | 4 | 45 | 13 | 48 | 19 | 3 | 54 | 14 | 18 |
| African American | M | 2007 | 7 | Citation | 537 | 104 | 25 | 70 | 40 | 92 | 40 | 4 | 73 | 44 | 45 |
| Asian | F | 2007 | 7 | Citation | 303 | 12 | 10 | 74 | 5 | 50 | 17 | 26 | 51 | 48 | 10 |
| Asian | M | 2007 | 7 | Citation | 690 | 26 | 46 | 163 | 27 | 118 | 30 | 70 | 85 | 98 | 27 |
| Hispanic | F | 2007 | 7 | Citation | 158 | 9 | 2 | 59 | 21 | 22 | 7 |  | 25 | 8 | 5 |
| Hispanic | M | 2007 | 7 | Citation | 491 | 50 | 29 | 159 | 64 | 49 | 21 | 10 | 55 | 28 | 26 |
| Other | F | 2007 | 7 | Citation | 136 | 11 | 4 | 35 | 5 | 23 | 4 | 7 | 30 | 12 | 5 |
| Other | M | 2007 | 7 | Citation | 426 | 29 | 44 | 85 | 31 | 49 | 21 | 17 | 88 | 33 | 29 |
| White | F | 2007 | 7 | Citation | 780 | 33 | 31 | 125 | 65 | 139 | 90 | 54 | 167 | 53 | 23 |
| White | M | 2007 | 7 | Citation | 1625 | 71 | 110 | 223 | 149 | 280 | 172 | 84 | 323 | 118 | 95 |
| African American | F | 2007 | 8 | Citation | 291 | 55 | 5 | 76 | 20 | 36 | 22 | 6 | 37 | 10 | 24 |
| African American | M | 2007 | 8 | Citation | 585 | 111 | 28 | 113 | 40 | 55 | 42 | 7 | 86 | 42 | 61 |
| Asian | F | 2007 | 8 | Citation | 326 | 17 | 13 | 73 | 14 | 24 | 24 | 49 | 40 | 66 | 6 |
| Asian | M | 2007 | 8 | Citation | 814 | 49 | 54 | 189 | 38 | 64 | 56 | 113 | 64 | 161 | 26 |
| Hispanic | F | 2007 | 8 | Citation | 173 | 16 | 2 | 72 | 23 | 7 | 8 | 3 | 24 | 13 | 5 |
| Hispanic | M | 2007 | 8 | Citation | 552 | 59 | 29 | 172 | 102 | 30 | 19 | 15 | 79 | 27 | 20 |
| Other | F | 2007 | 8 | Citation | 122 | 8 | 6 | 32 | 6 | 11 | 6 | 7 | 20 | 17 | 9 |
| Other | M | 2007 | 8 | Citation | 412 | 17 | 40 | 79 | 25 | 39 | 37 | 30 | 70 | 43 | 32 |
| White | F | 2007 | 8 | Citation | 836 | 47 | 38 | 104 | 69 | 117 | 132 | 72 | 132 | 89 | 36 |
| White | M | 2007 | 8 | Citation | 1776 | 69 | 117 | 211 | 157 | 212 | 230 | 173 | 339 | 176 | 92 |
| African American | F | 2007 | 9 | Citation | 237 | 72 | 7 | 45 | 9 | 12 | 21 | 4 | 39 | 10 | 18 |
| African American | M | 2007 | 9 | Citation | 522 | 118 | 22 | 122 | 30 | 24 | 37 | 9 | 86 | 39 | 35 |

| Race of Driver | Sex of Driver | Year | Month | Result of Contact | Total | Bayview | Central | Ingleside | Mission | Northern | Park | Richmond | Southern | Taraval | Tenderloin |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Asian | F | 2007 | 9 | Citation | 340 | 20 | 21 | 76 | 15 | 30 | 21 | 46 | 41 | 66 | 4 |
| Asian | M | 2007 | 9 | Citation | 877 | 40 | 104 | 196 | 22 | 70 | 47 | 100 | 88 | 178 | 32 |
| Hispanic | F | 2007 | 9 | Citation | 151 | 10 | 3 | 56 | 25 | 11 | 9 | 1 | 17 | 15 | 4 |
| Hispanic | M | 2007 | 9 | Citation | 547 | 65 | 32 | 177 | 74 | 42 | 20 | 5 | 85 | 30 | 17 |
| Other | F | 2007 | 9 | Citation | 144 | 5 | 3 | 34 | 17 | 12 | 7 | 16 | 32 | 10 | 8 |
| Other | M | 2007 | 9 | Citation | 393 | 24 | 30 | 69 | 25 | 48 | 22 | 34 | 71 | 43 | 27 |
| White | F | 2007 | 9 | Citation | 797 | 43 | 40 | 106 | 59 | 89 | 92 | 82 | 185 | 78 | 23 |
| White | M | 2007 | 9 | Citation | 1719 | 82 | 134 | 214 | 159 | 199 | 169 | 146 | 356 | 194 | 66 |
| African American | F | 2007 | 10 | Citation | 263 | 60 | 9 | 55 | 16 | 19 | 15 | 8 | 51 | 17 | 13 |
| African American | M | 2007 | 10 | Citation | 561 | 123 | 46 | 85 | 54 | 38 | 37 | 10 | 97 | 28 | 43 |
| Asian | F | 2007 | 10 | Citation | 362 | 10 | 25 | 67 | 18 | 27 | 26 | 34 | 44 | 98 | 13 |
| Asian | M | 2007 | 10 | Citation | 868 | 28 | 72 | 165 | 47 | 41 | 52 | 101 | 90 | 241 | 31 |
| Hispanic | F | 2007 | 10 | Citation | 171 | 15 | 3 | 71 | 30 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 19 | 15 | 4 |
| Hispanic | M | 2007 | 10 | Citation | 566 | 47 | 31 | 170 | 99 | 34 | 20 | 10 | 83 | 49 | 23 |
| Other | F | 2007 | 10 | Citation | 162 | 13 | 8 | 32 | 19 | 9 | 7 | 13 | 33 | 17 | 11 |
| Other | M | 2007 | 10 | Citation | 503 | 12 | 74 | 73 | 39 | 40 | 27 | 35 | 85 | 78 | 40 |
| White | F | 2007 | 10 | Citation | 979 | 49 | 61 | 110 | 73 | 88 | 120 | 106 | 172 | 151 | 49 |
| White | M | 2007 | 10 | Citation | 1859 | 73 | 171 | 171 | 199 | 206 | 171 | 149 | 366 | 265 | 88 |
| African American | F | 2007 | 11 | Citation | 248 | 41 | 2 | 46 | 15 | 26 | 23 | 5 | 42 | 20 | 28 |
| African American | M | 2007 | 11 | Citation | 583 | 122 | 27 | 77 | 50 | 54 | 42 | 10 | 69 | 48 | 84 |
| Asian | F | 2007 | 11 | Citation | 364 | 15 | 16 | 61 | 20 | 38 | 32 | 38 | 36 | 91 | 17 |
| Asian | M | 2007 | 11 | Citation | 790 | 45 | 56 | 127 | 36 | 58 | 46 | 119 | 65 | 180 | 58 |
| Hispanic | F | 2007 | 11 | Citation | 152 | 15 | 3 | 62 | 25 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 14 | 16 | 4 |
| Hispanic | M | 2007 | 11 | Citation | 581 | 60 | 35 | 156 | 88 | 46 | 16 | 13 | 69 | 56 | 42 |
| Other | F | 2007 | 11 | Citation | 153 | 10 | 3 | 24 | 17 | 19 | 10 | 16 | 19 | 28 | 7 |
| Other | M | 2007 | 11 | Citation | 483 | 18 | 49 | 61 | 50 | 64 | 20 | 44 | 77 | 75 | 25 |
| White | F | 2007 | 11 | Citation | 903 | 24 | 39 | 108 | 115 | 144 | 110 | 90 | 108 | 123 | 42 |
| White | M | 2007 | 11 | Citation | 1966 | 74 | 116 | 184 | 258 | 249 | 210 | 191 | 277 | 260 | 147 |
| African American | F | 2007 | 12 | Citation | 34 | 1 | 4 | 1 |  | 8 | 1 |  | 18 |  | 1 |
| African American | M | 2007 | 12 | Citation | 79 | 9 | 6 |  | 2 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 42 | 3 | 3 |
| Asian | F | 2007 | 12 | Citation | 62 | 2 | 17 |  | 3 | 9 |  | 3 | 23 | 4 | 1 |
| Asian | M | 2007 | 12 | Citation | 124 | 6 | 34 | 4 | 1 | 15 | 1 | 11 | 32 | 13 | 7 |
| Hispanic | F | 2007 | 12 | Citation | 17 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 |  |  | 7 |  |  |
| Hispanic | M | 2007 | 12 | Citation | 66 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 11 |  | 5 | 21 | 5 | 1 |
| Other | F | 2007 | 12 | Citation | 30 |  | 7 |  | 1 | 3 |  |  | 19 |  |  |
| Other | M | 2007 | 12 | Citation | 60 | 2 | 11 | 1 | 3 | 9 |  |  | 32 |  | 2 |
| White | F | 2007 | 12 | Citation | 149 | 5 | 33 | 2 | 11 | 28 | 1 | 7 | 53 | 8 | 1 |
| White | M | 2007 | 12 | Citation | 325 | 1 | 69 | 4 | 17 | 52 | 2 | 6 | 139 | 22 | 13 |
| African American | F | 2008 | 1 | Citation | 317 | 93 | 5 | 47 | 30 | 60 | 18 | 4 | 24 | 21 | 15 |
| African American | M | 2008 | 1 | Citation | 741 | 169 | 24 | 66 | 96 | 123 | 44 | 9 | 87 | 59 | 64 |
| Asian | F | 2008 | 1 | Citation | 445 | 16 | 22 | 73 | 20 | 64 | 24 | 60 | 38 | 114 | 14 |

| Race of Driver | Sex of Driver | Year | Month | Result of Contact | Total | Bayview | Central | Ingleside | Mission | Northern | Park | Richmond | Southern | Taraval | Tenderloin |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Asian | M | 2008 | 1 | Citation | 992 | 47 | 75 | 155 | 42 | 126 | 42 | 133 | 71 | 270 | 31 |
| Hispanic | F | 2008 | 1 | Citation | 191 | 10 | 2 | 53 | 54 | 19 | 5 | 6 | 20 | 15 | 7 |
| Hispanic | M | 2008 | 1 | Citation | 675 | 83 | 34 | 175 | 155 | 73 | 18 | 16 | 46 | 50 | 25 |
| Other | F | 2008 | 1 | Citation | 159 | 13 | 3 | 31 | 22 | 25 | 6 | 17 | 16 | 22 | 4 |
| Other | M | 2008 | 1 | Citation | 499 | 40 | 46 | 64 | 37 | 95 | 17 | 36 | 38 | 73 | 53 |
| White | F | 2008 | 1 | Citation | 1058 | 40 | 51 | 118 | 142 | 204 | 85 | 101 | 98 | 172 | 47 |
| White | M | 2008 | 1 | Citation | 2163 | 86 | 125 | 179 | 273 | 405 | 216 | 165 | 261 | 343 | 110 |
| African American | F | 2008 | 2 | Citation | 331 | 83 | 8 | 67 | 35 | 30 | 19 | 4 | 36 | 25 | 24 |
| African American | M | 2008 | 2 | Citation | 660 | 167 | 30 | 79 | 71 | 53 | 38 | 9 | 80 | 72 | 61 |
| Asian | F | 2008 | 2 | Citation | 411 | 15 | 20 | 69 | 25 | 32 | 22 | 57 | 33 | 128 | 10 |
| Asian | M | 2008 | 2 | Citation | 904 | 55 | 72 | 148 | 42 | 60 | 44 | 137 | 39 | 268 | 39 |
| Hispanic | F | 2008 | 2 | Citation | 183 | 22 | 4 | 52 | 43 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 18 | 22 | 4 |
| Hispanic | M | 2008 | 2 | Citation | 624 | 54 | 29 | 149 | 167 | 26 | 19 | 16 | 63 | 66 | 35 |
| Other | F | 2008 | 2 | Citation | 129 | 13 | 5 | 29 | 13 | 15 | 5 | 13 | 18 | 16 | 2 |
| Other | M | 2008 | 2 | Citation | 537 | 37 | 46 | 70 | 53 | 49 | 21 | 54 | 78 | 95 | 34 |
| White | F | 2008 | 2 | Citation | 967 | 33 | 39 | 127 | 120 | 108 | 101 | 105 | 93 | 203 | 38 |
| White | M | 2008 | 2 | Citation | 1958 | 103 | 132 | 164 | 280 | 174 | 220 | 177 | 252 | 361 | 95 |
| African American | F | 2008 | 3 | Citation | 316 | 61 | 13 | 63 | 18 | 33 | 27 | 7 | 43 | 36 | 15 |
| African American | M | 2008 | 3 | Citation | 689 | 163 | 31 | 71 | 52 | 75 | 43 | 16 | 113 | 81 | 44 |
| Asian | F | 2008 | 3 | Citation | 455 | 22 | 28 | 70 | 24 | 29 | 34 | 52 | 32 | 145 | 19 |
| Asian | M | 2008 | 3 | Citation | 1016 | 48 | 73 | 163 | 46 | 75 | 43 | 139 | 73 | 312 | 44 |
| Hispanic | F | 2008 | 3 | Citation | 199 | 14 | 3 | 72 | 43 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 21 | 22 | 6 |
| Hispanic | M | 2008 | 3 | Citation | 603 | 60 | 31 | 142 | 142 | 39 | 17 | 16 | 74 | 65 | 17 |
| Other | F | 2008 | 3 | Citation | 170 | 18 | 9 | 32 | 16 | 19 | 8 | 8 | 22 | 31 | 7 |
| Other | M | 2008 | 3 | Citation | 630 | 29 | 64 | 82 | 44 | 57 | 35 | 46 | 103 | 129 | 41 |
| White | F | 2008 | 3 | Citation | 1102 | 35 | 56 | 116 | 91 | 136 | 128 | 92 | 179 | 222 | 47 |
| White | M | 2008 | 3 | Citation | 2199 | 80 | 167 | 185 | 202 | 259 | 232 | 207 | 351 | 409 | 107 |
| African American | F | 2008 | 4 | Citation | 269 | 74 | 14 | 37 | 31 | 29 | 14 | 2 | 29 | 29 | 10 |
| African American | M | 2008 | 4 | Citation | 618 | 153 | 39 | 69 | 73 | 56 | 26 | 12 | 92 | 51 | 47 |
| Asian | F | 2008 | 4 | Citation | 419 | 22 | 33 | 58 | 22 | 24 | 19 | 67 | 35 | 136 | 3 |
| Asian | M | 2008 | 4 | Citation | 969 | 37 | 87 | 134 | 28 | 77 | 40 | 127 | 82 | 329 | 28 |
| Hispanic | F | 2008 | 4 | Citation | 207 | 21 | 9 | 64 | 45 | 8 | 9 | 5 | 26 | 18 | 2 |
| Hispanic | M | 2008 | 4 | Citation | 640 | 58 | 50 | 171 | 103 | 41 | 33 | 13 | 79 | 85 | 7 |
| Other | F | 2008 | 4 | Citation | 178 | 15 | 12 | 35 | 20 | 19 | 8 | 14 | 26 | 26 | 3 |
| Other | M | 2008 | 4 | Citation | 528 | 29 | 65 | 71 | 48 | 46 | 32 | 55 | 77 | 86 | 19 |
| White | F | 2008 | 4 | Citation | 1103 | 37 | 44 | 136 | 109 | 164 | 124 | 125 | 150 | 187 | 27 |
| White | M | 2008 | 4 | Citation | 2079 | 71 | 173 | 169 | 203 | 221 | 201 | 234 | 379 | 375 | 53 |
| African American | F | 2008 | 5 | Citation | 298 | 79 | 14 | 33 | 25 | 29 | 16 | 13 | 35 | 30 | 24 |
| African American | M | 2008 | 5 | Citation | 662 | 194 | 49 | 69 | 41 | 68 | 23 | 11 | 91 | 59 | 57 |
| Asian | F | 2008 | 5 | Citation | 444 | 17 | 21 | 58 | 20 | 23 | 13 | 77 | 38 | 167 | 10 |
| Asian | M | 2008 | 5 | Citation | 1023 | 50 | 69 | 120 | 42 | 78 | 36 | 181 | 89 | 314 | 44 |

| Race of Driver | Sex of Driver | Year | Month | Result of Contact | Total | Bayview | Central | Ingleside | Mission | Northern | Park | Richmond | Southern | Taraval | Tenderloin |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hispanic | F | 2008 | 5 | Citation | 198 | 9 | 9 | 67 | 49 | 9 | 5 | 4 | 17 | 26 | 3 |
| Hispanic | M | 2008 | 5 | Citation | 663 | 62 | 56 | 148 | 131 | 45 | 19 | 24 | 93 | 64 | 21 |
| Other | F | 2008 | 5 | Citation | 165 | 20 | 14 | 27 | 12 | 17 | 7 | 22 | 12 | 32 | 2 |
| Other | M | 2008 | 5 | Citation | 612 | 35 | 76 | 69 | 33 | 51 | 23 | 71 | 102 | 86 | 66 |
| White | F | 2008 | 5 | Citation | 999 | 26 | 74 | 84 | 87 | 137 | 76 | 165 | 113 | 200 | 37 |
| White | M | 2008 | 5 | Citation | 2085 | 68 | 174 | 156 | 207 | 273 | 133 | 323 | 311 | 350 | 90 |
| African American | F | 2008 | 6 | Citation | 238 | 60 | 9 | 33 | 11 | 21 | 10 | 18 | 43 | 22 | 11 |
| African American | M | 2008 | 6 | Citation | 580 | 139 | 31 | 54 | 61 | 38 | 29 | 28 | 112 | 43 | 45 |
| Asian | F | 2008 | 6 | Citation | 362 | 17 | 14 | 40 | 9 | 25 | 8 | 109 | 26 | 106 | 8 |
| Asian | M | 2008 | 6 | Citation | 888 | 48 | 35 | 101 | 40 | 49 | 17 | 237 | 70 | 268 | 23 |
| Hispanic | F | 2008 | 6 | Citation | 122 | 16 | 3 | 38 | 20 | 5 |  | 4 | 17 | 13 | 6 |
| Hispanic | M | 2008 | 6 | Citation | 489 | 53 | 20 | 126 | 93 | 27 | 10 | 33 | 62 | 47 | 18 |
| Other | F | 2008 | 6 | Citation | 138 | 11 | 3 | 22 | 7 | 14 | 5 | 23 | 16 | 32 | 5 |
| Other | M | 2008 | 6 | Citation | 497 | 24 | 39 | 58 | 52 | 45 | 31 | 66 | 68 | 74 | 40 |
| White | F | 2008 | 6 | Citation | 972 | 34 | 30 | 81 | 96 | 91 | 62 | 239 | 130 | 172 | 37 |
| White | M | 2008 | 6 | Citation | 1794 | 58 | 98 | 144 | 185 | 177 | 95 | 346 | 284 | 339 | 68 |
| African American | F | 2008 | 7 | Citation | 294 | 87 | 8 | 48 | 23 | 15 | 23 | 12 | 39 | 17 | 22 |
| African American | M | 2008 | 7 | Citation | 574 | 175 | 24 | 54 | 57 | 32 | 39 | 15 | 77 | 47 | 54 |
| Asian | F | 2008 | 7 | Citation | 349 | 19 | 15 | 50 | 14 | 25 | 21 | 56 | 23 | 108 | 18 |
| Asian | M | 2008 | 7 | Citation | 829 | 59 | 50 | 100 | 35 | 54 | 42 | 152 | 55 | 249 | 33 |
| Hispanic | F | 2008 | 7 | Citation | 143 | 17 | 7 | 48 | 19 | 3 | 10 | 7 | 13 | 19 |  |
| Hispanic | M | 2008 | 7 | Citation | 529 | 58 | 29 | 131 | 128 | 23 | 21 | 15 | 53 | 42 | 29 |
| Other | F | 2008 | 7 | Citation | 157 | 11 | 13 | 32 | 21 | 8 | 6 | 15 | 17 | 24 | 10 |
| Other | M | 2008 | 7 | Citation | 545 | 36 | 62 | 70 | 41 | 27 | 36 | 54 | 73 | 100 | 46 |
| White | F | 2008 | 7 | Citation | 907 | 32 | 47 | 69 | 116 | 78 | 107 | 144 | 117 | 171 | 26 |
| White | M | 2008 | 7 | Citation | 1768 | 73 | 108 | 158 | 196 | 146 | 196 | 255 | 251 | 295 | 90 |
| African American | F | 2008 | 8 | Citation | 281 | 77 | 7 | 47 | 30 | 35 | 19 | 8 | 23 | 18 | 17 |
| African American | M | 2008 | 8 | Citation | 550 | 161 | 39 | 65 | 38 | 47 | 30 | 12 | 56 | 57 | 45 |
| Asian | F | 2008 | 8 | Citation | 315 | 11 | 28 | 43 | 11 | 19 | 16 | 50 | 12 | 112 | 13 |
| Asian | M | 2008 | 8 | Citation | 899 | 63 | 79 | 103 | 33 | 57 | 36 | 135 | 44 | 311 | 38 |
| Hispanic | F | 2008 | 8 | Citation | 121 | 14 | 4 | 48 | 12 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 9 | 11 | 7 |
| Hispanic | M | 2008 | 8 | Citation | 463 | 58 | 37 | 119 | 84 | 27 | 14 | 24 | 33 | 47 | 20 |
| Other | F | 2008 | 8 | Citation | 133 | 6 | 8 | 30 | 10 | 5 | 7 | 14 | 7 | 31 | 15 |
| Other | M | 2008 | 8 | Citation | 555 | 18 | 88 | 91 | 27 | 47 | 40 | 40 | 56 | 99 | 49 |
| White | F | 2008 | 8 | Citation | 874 | 29 | 49 | 96 | 67 | 105 | 103 | 118 | 83 | 180 | 44 |
| White | M | 2008 | 8 | Citation | 1730 | 63 | 139 | 148 | 145 | 197 | 201 | 212 | 195 | 323 | 107 |
| African American | F | 2008 | 9 | Citation | 241 | 63 | 16 | 33 | 23 | 16 | 15 | 10 | 26 | 17 | 22 |
| African American | M | 2008 | 9 | Citation | 504 | 132 | 34 | 54 | 58 | 38 | 28 | 21 | 52 | 42 | 45 |
| Asian | F | 2008 | 9 | Citation | 362 | 14 | 18 | 62 | 10 | 24 | 28 | 59 | 21 | 91 | 35 |
| Asian | M | 2008 | 9 | Citation | 837 | 32 | 57 | 100 | 35 | 66 | 35 | 140 | 39 | 276 | 57 |
| Hispanic | F | 2008 | 9 | Citation | 152 | 12 | 5 | 48 | 34 | 11 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 13 | 11 |

| Race of Driver | Sex of Driver | Year | Month | Result of Contact | Total | Bayview | Central | Ingleside | Mission | Northern | Park | Richmond | Southern | Taraval | Tenderloin |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hispanic | M | 2008 | 9 | Citation | 497 | 42 | 36 | 117 | 112 | 25 | 21 | 25 | 42 | 51 | 26 |
| Other | F | 2008 | 9 | Citation | 158 | 10 | 13 | 31 | 19 | 11 | 18 | 16 | 10 | 24 | 6 |
| Other | M | 2008 | 9 | Citation | 562 | 31 | 79 | 65 | 72 | 44 | 34 | 43 | 55 | 87 | 52 |
| White | F | 2008 | 9 | Citation | 875 | 20 | 46 | 110 | 92 | 100 | 100 | 111 | 80 | 158 | 58 |
| White | M | 2008 | 9 | Citation | 1604 | 73 | 114 | 153 | 176 | 178 | 182 | 216 | 138 | 257 | 117 |
| African American | F | 2008 | 10 | Citation | 268 | 83 | 7 | 47 | 25 | 22 | 15 | 6 | 15 | 22 | 26 |
| African American | M | 2008 | 10 | Citation | 741 | 249 | 45 | 65 | 79 | 51 | 41 | 26 | 82 | 46 | 57 |
| Asian | F | 2008 | 10 | Citation | 425 | 19 | 18 | 61 | 22 | 29 | 28 | 81 | 14 | 131 | 22 |
| Asian | M | 2008 | 10 | Citation | 893 | 42 | 45 | 113 | 43 | 48 | 59 | 201 | 54 | 226 | 62 |
| Hispanic | F | 2008 | 10 | Citation | 215 | 18 | 4 | 79 | 46 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 13 | 18 | 6 |
| Hispanic | M | 2008 | 10 | Citation | 583 | 64 | 21 | 152 | 174 | 23 | 24 | 18 | 34 | 40 | 33 |
| Other | F | 2008 | 10 | Citation | 150 | 9 | 8 | 28 | 19 | 9 | 10 | 19 | 18 | 23 | 7 |
| Other | M | 2008 | 10 | Citation | 643 | 31 | 69 | 93 | 71 | 44 | 51 | 73 | 81 | 76 | 54 |
| White | F | 2008 | 10 | Citation | 1037 | 39 | 50 | 109 | 109 | 89 | 137 | 172 | 109 | 166 | 57 |
| White | M | 2008 | 10 | Citation | 1985 | 80 | 136 | 192 | 256 | 198 | 222 | 304 | 217 | 266 | 114 |
| African American | F | 2008 | 11 | Citation | 302 | 81 | 7 | 70 | 18 | 31 | 19 | 4 | 31 | 16 | 25 |
| African American | M | 2008 | 11 | Citation | 629 | 163 | 35 | 82 | 61 | 58 | 36 | 18 | 82 | 30 | 64 |
| Asian | F | 2008 | 11 | Citation | 390 | 22 | 10 | 79 | 19 | 23 | 20 | 58 | 17 | 123 | 19 |
| Asian | M | 2008 | 11 | Citation | 863 | 40 | 42 | 157 | 35 | 48 | 52 | 152 | 49 | 250 | 38 |
| Hispanic | F | 2008 | 11 | Citation | 210 | 16 | 6 | 98 | 26 | 11 | 6 | 9 | 16 | 14 | 8 |
| Hispanic | M | 2008 | 11 | Citation | 633 | 52 | 32 | 220 | 136 | 22 | 22 | 30 | 53 | 40 | 26 |
| Other | F | 2008 | 11 | Citation | 197 | 9 | 12 | 69 | 21 | 13 | 12 | 16 | 15 | 21 | 9 |
| Other | M | 2008 | 11 | Citation | 570 | 33 | 72 | 119 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 46 | 60 | 70 | 38 |
| White | F | 2008 | 11 | Citation | 973 | 29 | 54 | 141 | 145 | 84 | 134 | 127 | 95 | 132 | 32 |
| White | M | 2008 | 11 | Citation | 2039 | 70 | 127 | 257 | 238 | 196 | 265 | 260 | 259 | 239 | 128 |
| African American | F | 2008 | 12 | Citation | 318 | 98 | 11 | 61 | 20 | 22 | 23 | 7 | 23 | 23 | 30 |
| African American | M | 2008 | 12 | Citation | 530 | 157 | 30 | 74 | 40 | 43 | 23 | 16 | 61 | 48 | 38 |
| Asian | F | 2008 | 12 | Citation | 362 | 25 | 12 | 62 | 19 | 17 | 13 | 77 | 12 | 117 | 8 |
| Asian | M | 2008 | 12 | Citation | 924 | 58 | 46 | 137 | 42 | 39 | 45 | 182 | 35 | 314 | 26 |
| Hispanic | F | 2008 | 12 | Citation | 139 | 18 | 6 | 42 | 27 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 9 | 15 | 2 |
| Hispanic | M | 2008 | 12 | Citation | 473 | 50 | 18 | 149 | 86 | 17 | 14 | 23 | 46 | 47 | 23 |
| Other | F | 2008 | 12 | Citation | 155 | 10 | 5 | 28 | 13 | 16 | 13 | 18 | 18 | 28 | 6 |
| Other | M | 2008 | 12 | Citation | 486 | 32 | 64 | 70 | 51 | 31 | 26 | 39 | 46 | 84 | 43 |
| White | F | 2008 | 12 | Citation | 936 | 37 | 47 | 120 | 129 | 67 | 108 | 157 | 58 | 172 | 41 |
| White | M | 2008 | 12 | Citation | 1824 | 74 | 104 | 234 | 233 | 145 | 167 | 310 | 179 | 274 | 104 |
| | | | | **Total** | **157319** | **14210** | **9765** | **23627** | **14819** | **17263** | **12052** | **13970** | **21907** | **21734** | **7972** |

POLICE DEPARTMENT
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
THOMAS J. CAHILL HALL OF JUSTICE
850 BRYANT STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94103-4603

GAVIN NEWSOM
MAYOR

HEATHER J. FONG
CHIEF OF POLICE

18

March 9, 2009

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2009 MAR 11 AM 10:13
BY

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

Re: 20090127-013, February 5, 2009 (Supervisor Mirkarimi)

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

The Chief of Police forwarded the above-referenced Board of Supervisors inquiry to me for response to the request by Supervisor Mirkarimi for information regarding the death of Mr. Hugues de la Plaza in San Francisco on June 2, 2007.

Specific to the requests contained in the attached February 5, 2009 electronic mail on this issue, the following information is provided:

*Requesting the report from the Commission Rogatoire*

As referenced in the February 5th, electronic mail, the San Francisco Police Department did not originate this report and thus cannot provide it. The Department does not have any insight into the ability or willingness of the appropriate French authorities to respond to this request. The disclosure of any information the Department might have from the report or information contained therein will be addressed below.

*Further requesting a response to the Public Safety Committee by the SF Police Department, regarding corrective and/preventative action to protect the integrity of this particular homicide investigation, . . .*

This inquiry touches directly upon an active investigation into the circumstances involved in Mr. de la Plaza's death; in order to avoid confidentiality breaches of information gleaned in this investigation, the Department cannot divulge information contained in the investigative file.

The Department is not aware of any actions of a corrective or preventative nature necessary to protect this or any other such investigation, nor of any discussions of such steps.

18

The Department has provided assistance to the Office of Citizen Complaints in their investigation related to this incident. Such proper cooperation, if extended beyond the right and necessity to share such information with the OCC, would be improper and could compromise both their investigation and the rights of any Department personnel involved in that investigation.

I hope this information has been helpful and responsive to your request of the Police Department. Please contact me directly should you wish any further assistance in this matter. I can be reached at david.shinn@sfgov.org or 553-1484.

Sincerely,

DAVID SHINN
Deputy Chief of Police
Investigations Bureau

cc: Office of the Chief
Office of the Mayor
Doctor Hart
Supervisor Mirkarimi

File 090252
C: BOS 11

THE PARKMERCED RESIDENTS' ORGANIZATION!
P.O. Box 27609, San Francisco, CA 94127-0609 Voice Mail: 415-267-3961

Tuesday March 17, 2009 2:00pm

19

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
c/o angela.calvillo@sfgov.org City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca 94102-4689

SF Board of Supervisors;

The Parkmerced Residents' Organization representing the interests of the tenants/residents of Parkmerced want to comment on the street resolution submitted for the improvements by the Parkmerced Investors Properties, LLC 090252 [Street Encroachment at 19th Avenue and Crespi Drive] Resolution granting revocable permission to Parkmerced Investors Properties LLC, to occupy portions of the public right-of-way to construct, realign, and maintain existing paved curb islands to improve pedestrian accessibility and vehicular traffic circulation and safety, resurface portions of Crespi Drive with new Bomanite stamped concrete paving and install three (3) decorative columns at the entry way to Crespi Drive public right-of-way, between 19th Avenue and Serrano Drive, to enhance the Property at 3711 19th Avenue (Assessor's Blocks 7315, 7316, 7320), conditioned upon the payment of an annual assessment fee; and making environmental findings and findings of consistency with the General Plan and the priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1. (Public Works Department) 3/9/2009, RECEIVED AND ASSIGNED to Land Use and Economic Development Committee.

The noted resolution was presented to the PRO group at prior meetings during discussions of "improvements" being done for tenants and businesses in the Parkmerced district. We strongly support the proposed changes to help in controlling the entry of 19th avenue traffic into Parkmerced through "calming" devices and changes proposed by the Parkmerced Investors LLC, as noted below. The one item that was not "presented" was the described ["3 decorative columns"] that are mentioned as part of the changes below. The visual information at the time was not shown to tenants at meetings in the form of elevations, or any proposed montage of the existing entry elements, as a photograph or proposed visual size and scale of changes.

We already have numerous "entry" signage features for the leasing office at 19th and Holloway, and are concerned mainly for the overall appearance and scale of any proposed changes at the entry to Crespi drive. The Parkmerced development was always noted as a "modern-simple-utilitarian" development and the concern is that too much street signage detracts from the neighborhood and makes it appear more of a "used-car-lot" than a neighborhood entry such as the "Ingleside terraces" or other district 7 neighborhoods. We would like to see a consistent and "minimal" approach because until the issue of preservation or land marking of Parkmerced becomes clearer.

Seth Mallen of Stellar Management noted that he would show us the image at a later date, March 30, however we want to be sure that our concerns are raised to such a reso-

PRO at 35
1974 - 2009



19

lution so that any design changes being made are reviewed by the Land-Use committee or appropriate agency according to the scale and proportion of existing signage. Mr. Mallen noted it will be scaled and used to unify the existing signage. While this may seem acceptable, without any visual information besides the plan views we have seen, we can neither fully support, nor abjectly oppose the proposed changes except for the elements that improve safety of pedestrians crossing the intersection.

To date the entry changes on the towers in Parkmerced have been received with positive response by residents. We do strongly believe that the efforts of Parkmerced Investors, LLC are sincerely in the best interest of the residents and we hope they will continue with positive efforts to improve our neighborhood. . We hope you will advise or edit the proposed legislation in committee to serve the best interests of the city and neighborhood in the changes proposed.

Sincerely,

Daniel W. Phillips

Daniel W. Phillips, President,
The Board of Directors,
The Parkmerced Residents' Organization

Aaron Goodman, First Vice President,
The Board of Directors,
The Parkmerced Residents' Organization

cc: PRO File; Supervisor Sean Elsbernd District 7, sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org; Land-Use Committee Supervisors: Sophie.Maxwell@sfgov.org, Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org, and David.Chiu@sfgov.org

Rule 090252
L Law

# THE PARKMERCED RESIDENTS' ORGANIZATION!

P.O. Box 27609, San Francisco, CA 94127-0609 Voice Mail: 415-267-3961

Tuesday March 17, 2009 2:00pm

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
c/o angela.calvillo@sfgov.org City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, Ca 94102-4689

SF Board of Supervisors;

The Parkmerced Residents' Organization representing the interests of the tenants/residents of Parkmerced **have no objection** on the street resolution submitted for the improvements by the Parkmerced Investors Properties, LLC 090252 [Street Encroachment at 19th Avenue and Crespi Drive] Resolution granting revocable permission to Parkmerced Investors Properties LLC, to occupy portions of the public right-of-way to construct, realign, and maintain existing paved curb islands to improve pedestrian accessibility and vehicular traffic circulation and safety, resurface portions of Crespi Drive with new Bomanite stamped concrete paving and install three (3) decorative columns at the entry way to Crespi Drive public right-of-way, between 19th Avenue and Serrano Drive, to enhance the Property at 3711 19th Avenue (Assessor's Blocks 7315, 7316, 7320), conditioned upon the payment of an annual assessment fee; and making environmental findings and findings of consistency with the General Plan and the priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1. (Public Works Department) 3/9/2009, RECEIVED AND ASSIGNED to Land Use and Economic Development Committee.

Sincerely,

Daniel W. Phillips

Daniel W. Phillips, President,
The Board of Directors,
The Parkmerced Residents' Organization

Aaron Goodman, First Vice President,
The Board of Directors,
The Parkmerced Residents' Organization

cc: PRO File; Supervisor Sean Elsbernd District 7, sean.elsbernd@sfgov.org; Land-Use Committee Supervisors: Sophie.Maxwell@sfgov.org, Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org, and David.Chiu@sfgov.org

PRO at 35
1974 - 2009

To: Angela Calvillo,
Clerk of the Board
From: Office of the Controller
City Services Auditor

(26)

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2009 MAR 16 AM 11:46
BY

City and County of San Francisco

Office of the Controller—City Services Auditor

# AIRPORT COMMISSION:

## Compliance Audit of China Cargo Airlines Ltd.

*March 16, 2009*

(20)

**CONTROLLER'S OFFICE**
**CITY SERVICES AUDITOR**

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

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

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

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

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

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

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

**Ben Rosenfield**
**Controller**

**Monique Zmuda**
Deputy Controller

March 16, 2009

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

President and Members:

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

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

**Landing Fees Paid:** $826,958

**Results:**

From July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2007, China Cargo reported 539 revenue aircraft landings, and paid $826,958 in landing fees to the Airport. However, we were unable to determine the accuracy of most reported aircraft landings and fees, because China Cargo did not maintain complete records of its operations at the Airport during that period, as required by its operating permit. Further, China Cargo relies on another agency to compile and report its aircraft landings to the Airport, and this agency also did not maintain complete records of China Cargo's aircraft landings.

Based on the six months of records that China Cargo's reporting agency provided for January through June 2007, we found that the agency over reported two aircraft landings, which resulted in an overpayment of $3,146. Further, for this six month period we found that nine landings of aircraft China Cargo leased from Southern Air, Inc. were not reported by Southern Air, an airline with its own operating permit at the Airport. Thus, the Airport should bill Southern Air $18,915 for those aircraft landing fees.

Responses from the Airport and China Cargo are attached to this report. The Controller's office, City Services Auditor, will follow up on the status of the recommendations made in this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Tarsia
Deputy Audit Director

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

# INTRODUCTION

**Audit Authority**

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

**Background**

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

**Scope and Methodology**

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

To conduct the audit, we examined the applicable terms of China Cargo's permit, and the adequacy of its procedures for recording, summarizing, and reporting revenue aircraft landings. We tested whether China Cargo accurately reported on its Monthly Air Traffic Activity Reports (MATARs) its revenue aircraft landings and the maximum landing weights of its aircraft landed at SFO. We also determined whether China Cargo had any outstanding payments due to the Airport for the audit period.

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to

obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

# RESULTS

**China Cargo Did Not Comply With Certain Provisions of Its Permit and Made Errors in Reporting Aircraft Landings**

From July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2007, China Cargo reported 539 revenue aircraft landings and paid $826,958 in landing fees to the Airport. The exhibit below shows the aircraft landings China Cargo reported to the Airport, and the associated landing fees.

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

| Period/Aircraft Type | Landing Weight (in lbs) | # of Landings | Total Landing Weight (in lbs) | Rate per 1,000 lbs | Landing Fees Due |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005 | | | | | |
| MD 11 | 471,500 | 187 | 88,170,500 | 3.214 | $283,380 |
| July 1, 2005, through June 30, 2006 | | | | | |
| MD 11 | 471,500 | 174 | 82,041,000 | 3.213 | 263,598 |
| July 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007 | | | | | |
| MD 11 | 471,500 | 178 | 83,927,000 | 3.336 | 279,980 |
| **Total** | | **539** | **254,138,500** | | **$826,958** |

Source: Airport reports on landing fees and aircraft landings.

**China Cargo Did Not Keep Complete Records of Its Airport Operations**

China Cargo did not comply with certain provisions of its operating permit by not keeping complete records of its operations at the Airport. Consequently, we were unable to determine the accuracy of the reported landings and the fees paid for most of the audit period. China Cargo's operating permit requires it to maintain records pertaining to its operation at the Airport for a period of five years after the termination of its permit. China Cargo's sales manager advised us that China Cargo relies on another agency, Pacific Aviation Corporation (Pacific Aviation), to prepare its MATARs for submission to the Airport. However, Pacific Aviation could only provide us records it used to prepare the MATARs from January 1, 2007, through June 30, 2007. Pacific Aviation's airport manager said that their office did not have records prior to this date, because the person in charge of those records is no longer with their agency. Although the records provided for the six-month period enabled us to complete most of our audit tests for that period, the records did not include information on aircraft type and aircraft tail numbers.

**Errors in Reporting Aircraft Landings Occurred**

For the six-month period that Pacific Aviation was able to provide the records it used to prepare China Cargo's MATARs, we found that it over reported one aircraft landing in January 2007 and one in February 2007, for a total of two over reported landings, resulting in an overpayment of $3,146.

Further, for the six-month period reviewed, we found nine unreported landings of aircraft that China Cargo leased from Southern Air, Inc. (Southern Air), an airline with its own operating permit at the Airport. Representatives from both China Cargo and Southern Air stated that they were not responsible for reporting those landings and paying the landing fees. However, the Airport issued a memorandum dated August 11, 2004, to all airlines which states, "If a Permitted Carrier operates a flight on behalf of another Permitted Carrier, the airline that actually operates the flight accounts for the flight information on its MATAR and is responsible to pay the associated landing and parking fees." Airport management further explained to us that the "airline that actually operates the flight" refers to the owner of the aircraft, regardless of the commercial flight numbers (China Cargo's) used for the flights. Therefore, Southern Air owes the Airport $18,915 for landing fees for the nine unreported flights during the six month period we reviewed.

**Recommendations**

The Airport should take the following actions:

1. Require China Cargo to maintain complete records of its Airport operations until 5 years after the expiration of its permit, as required by its permit.

2. Credit China Cargo for the overpaid landing fees of $3,146 for the period from January 1, 2007, through June 30, 2007.

3. Bill Southern Air, Inc. for unpaid landing fees of $18,915 for the nine unreported aircraft landings during the period from January 1, 2007, through June 30, 2007.

# ATTACHMENT: AIRPORT'S RESPONSE

San Francisco International Airport

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

February 26, 2009

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

Subject: Audit of China Cargo Airlines, Ltd.



Dear Mr. Tarsia:

Thank you for your report on the audit of China Cargo Airlines, Ltd. which covers the period July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2007. We accept your findings and will implement your recommendations upon receipt of the final report.

A copy of the "Audit Recommendation and Response Form" is attached for your reference; this form was submitted earlier under separate cover.

Very truly yours,

Cesar K. Sanchez
Accounting Manager

Attachment

cc: Gary Franzella
Dorothy Bon Shao
Ivo Castellanos
Edwin De Jesus
Elisa Sullivan

| Recommendation | Responsible Agency | Response |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Require China Cargo to maintain complete records of its Airport operations until 5 years after the expiration of its permit, as required by its permit. | Airport Aviation Management | Agree. Upon formal distribution of the Audit Report to the Tenant, staff will prepare a letter requiring the Tenant to comply with the Terms & Conditions of its Airline Operating Permit |
| 2. Credit China Cargo for the overpaid landing fees of $3,146 for the period from January 1, 2007, through June 30, 2007. | Airport Accounting Department | Agree; the Airport will issue the credit of $3,146 to China Cargo Airlines upon receipt of the final audit report. |
| 3. Bill Southern Air, Inc. for the unpaid landing fees of $18,915 for the nine unreported aircraft landings during the period from January 1, 2007, through June 30, 2007. | Airport Accounting Department | Agree; the Airport will bill Southern Air, Inc. the underpaid landing fees of $18,915 upon receipt of the final audit report. |

# ATTACHMENT: CHINA CARGO'S RESPONSE


## CHINA CARGO AIRLINES

618 S. Access Rd. CHICAGO, IL 60666
Tel: (773)894-3540 . Fax: (773)894-3541


**Re: Audit Report**
**Date: Feb. 17, 2009**

**This is to response SFO airport commission audit report.**

**First, we don't agree with that we didn't keep complete records of our Airport operations in the period of year 2004 to year 2007. According to our manager-Jerry Hsu, he did apply most of electronic format records and some of it was in excel format. But due to computer hard drive failure, He lost some data in that period.**

**Second, we agree with the errors in the landing reports and overstated two flights because of double booking in the audit period of reports.**

**Therefore, we accept the audit report recommendations.**

**Thanks you and best regards,**


**China Cargo Airlines**
**San Francisco Station**
**Tel: 650-872-8088 Fax: 650-872-8068**

(21)



# Budget Improvement Project

## Presentation to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors

March 16, 2009

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

City and County of San Francisco

Controller's Office



(21)

(22)

SFPUC

WATER

POWER

# SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

1155 Market St., 4th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103 • Tel. (415) 554-0725 • Fax (415) 554-3280



March 10, 2009

Honorable Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
David Chiu, President
Michela Alioto-Pier
John Avalos
David Campos
Carmen Chu
Chris Daly
Bevan Dufty
Sean Elsbernd
Eric Mar
Sophie Maxwell
Ross Mirkarimi

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2009 MAR 16 PM 3:00
BY

Dear Members:

Attached is the GoSolarSF status report, which provides an update on the first six months of the solar energy incentive program, and serves as the status report required in the solar energy incentive ordinance. The report highlights various aspects of GoSolarSF and lists the changes that were implemented since its inception. The report includes proposed program changes that require Board approval.

In June 2008, the Board of Supervisors passed ordinances establishing a long-term Solar Energy Incentive Program and a Solar Energy Incentive Pilot Program. The SFPUC allocated $3,000,000 from its net operating revenues appropriated to its Sustainable Energy Account to fund the first year of the GoSolarSF program. The program launched on July 1, 2008.

From July to December 2008, 388 applications were received resulting in 1.2 MW of power installed or committed. In addition, 22 new green-collar jobs were created through the Workforce Development aspect of the GoSolarSF program.

Please contact my office at 415-554-1600 if you have questions about the GoSolarSF program or the six month status report.

Sincerely,

Ed Harrington
General Manager

cc: Honorable Mayor Gavin Newsom
Honorable Members of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

(22)

# GoSolarSF

SFPUC
WATER
WASTEWATER
POWER

**City and County of San Francisco**
**GoSolarSF Solar Incentive Program**

## Status Report
## July to December 2008

Submitted to the Board of Supervisors
In Compliance with Ordinance 106-08, Section 18-7

**SFPUC Power Enterprise**
March 2009

City and County of San Francisco

# GoSolarSF Solar Incentive Program Status Report

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In June 2008, the Board of Supervisors passed ordinances establishing a long-term Solar Energy Incentive Program and a Solar Energy Incentive Pilot Program. The program is administered by the SFPUC, which allocated $3,000,000 from its net operating revenues appropriated to its Sustainable Energy Account to fund the first year of the program. Subsequent funding will be recommended in light of demand and will be subject to the City budget approval process. The long-term Solar Energy Incentive Program (Supervisor Dufty) provides non-additive residential incentives and a business incentive. The Solar Energy Incentive Pilot Program (Supervisor Mirkarimi) provides a supplementary residential low-income incentive as well as non-profit incentives. Taken together, these programs are called the GoSolarSF program.

The GoSolarSF solar incentive program encourages installations of solar power systems in San Francisco. GoSolarSF, coupled with the California Solar Initiative and federal tax credits, could pay half the cost or more of a residential solar system in San Francisco. The program was launched on July 1, 2008 and was successful in its first six months in creating green jobs and increasing the amount of residential solar in San Francisco.

- ☼ 388 applications received
- ☼ 1.2 MW (1221 kW) of power installed or committed
- ☼ 22 jobs created

The GoSolarSF program was less successful in encouraging solar installations on properties occupied by businesses, non-profit organizations and low-income households. The SFPUC recognized several barriers to participation and, in its role as administrator, made changes in order to improve the program. However, there are outstanding issues that require input from the Board of Supervisors. This report will provide SFPUC's recommendations to the Board of Supervisors, and is submitted in response to Ordinance 106-08, section 18.7, six-month status report requirement.

## OVERVIEW OF SOLAR INCENTIVES

The following incentive levels were available from July 1 – December 31, 2008. In December 2008, the SFPUC approved reductions to the incentive levels.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Residential | | |
| Basic | $3,000 | Applies to all qualifying installations. |
| City Installer | $4,000 | Installer with principal place of business in SF. |
| Environmental Justice | $5,000 | CARE or CALHome enrollee, or residence in 94107 or 94124. |
| Workforce Development | $6,000 | Installer hires workforce development program graduates. |
| Low-income | $5,000 | Additional incentive for applicants below median income. |
| Business | $1,500/kW | Up to $10,000. |
| Nonprofit | $1,500/kW | Property owned & operated by nonprofit organization. No cap. |
| Nonprofit Residential | $4,500/kW | Multi-unit residential property owned & operated by non-profit organization. Up to $30,000 per organization. |

## PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION & APPLICATION PROCESS

### Administration

GoSolarSF is administered by SFPUC Power Enterprise staff in partnership with the Department of Workforce Development, Mayor's Office of Housing, and Controller's Office. Program support is provided by the City Attorney's Office, PUC Accounting and Finance, PUC Communications, Department of Building Inspection, and Department of Environment.

### Application Process

The solar incentive program consists of a two-step process:

**Step 1** -- Applicant submits:

- GoSolarSF application
- Copy of California Solar Initiative application
- Copy of California Solar Initiative reservation letter

After reviewing and approving the application, the SFPUC sends a reservation letter confirming that funds are being reserved for one year and identifying for the applicant additional documents that must be submitted after the project is completed to receive payment.

**Step 2** -- Applicant submits:

- GoSolarSF program agreement
- Copy of insurance listing City as additional insured or insurance waiver
- W-9 tax form signed by designated payee
- Copy of California Solar Initiative approval of incentive payment letter

Once the applicant completes the payment request package and it is received and processed by the SFPUC, the Controller's Office issues the incentive check to the designated payee.

## INCENTIVE APPLICATIONS & PAYMENTS

388 GoSolarSF applications were received during the first six months of the program for a total of $2,380,370 in incentive requests. 21 incentive payment checks were issued between October and December 2008, totaling $111,000. It usually takes several months for the solar project and payment request package to be completed by the applicant so the majority of the 388 applicants will likely be paid in the second half of FY 2008-09.

### Residential Applications

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **TOTAL** | **370 applications** | $2,191,000 | 856.9 kW |
| **Basic** | 35 applications | | |
| **City installer** | 25 applications | | |
| **Environmental justice** | 11 applications | | |
| **Workforce development** | 299 applications | | |
| **Low income** | 27 applications (included with the base incentives above) | | |

### Business & Nonprofit Applications

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Business** | **13 applications** | $ 90,151 | 300 kW |
| **Nonprofit** | **5 applications** | $ 99,219 | 64.4 kW |
| **Nonprofit Residential** | **0 applications** | $ 0 | |

Business and non-profit participation have been lower than residential participation. The biggest challenge for non-profit organizations is that they do not pay federal taxes so they are unable to receive the federal solar tax credit which is currently 30% of the total project cost. In addition,

properties occupied by non-profits and businesses are often not owned by the organization or business, making the solar project more challenging and complicated than the average owner-occupied project. The solar incentive ordinance requires that the properties be both owned and operated by a non-profit organization in order to be eligible for the non-profit incentives. This requirement resulted in several non-profits being ineligible for the GoSolarSF program. Another challenge is that many non-profits and businesses have shrinking revenues due to the current economic climate and are unable to invest in solar generation even after the California Solar Initiative (CSI) rebate and GoSolarSF incentives are applied.

The SFPUC will focus on overcoming these challenges by conducting targeted outreach. The City of San Francisco and the CPUC are also working to address the needs of non-profits and businesses. The City of San Francisco is addressing the business challenges through the Mayor's Solar Founders' Circle, a program that challenges the city's 1500 largest businesses to install a total of 5 MW of solar within a year. Members of the Solar Founders' Circle receive free solar assessments and energy efficiency audits from the San Francisco Department of the Environment. Development of the CPUC's Multifamily Affordable Solar Housing (MASH) program will help to make solar more feasible for multi-unit affordable housing. In fall 2008, the CPUC adopted the MASH program, which is administered by PG&E. The program began accepting applications for two of its three expected incentives on February 17th, 2009. The third incentive will be available later this year. Virtual Net Energy Metering (VNEM) will allow MASH program participants to apply the credits from a single solar system to multiple accounts at an eligible low-income building. The utilities are currently drafting a tariff on virtual net metering. Once the tariff is approved by the CPUC, virtual net metering will be available to MASH participants. VNEM is expected to be available later this year.

## Workforce Development Program

The Workforce Development aspect of the GoSolarSF residential program is developed and operated by the Department of Economic and Workforce Development (DEWD). Residents who contract with eligible installers received a $6,000 incentive payment for their solar system installed by an individual trained under the City workforce development program.

### Workforce Development Incentive Administration and Criteria

The Department of Economic and Workforce Development (DEWD), which directs the City's workforce development efforts, is responsible for ensuring compliance with workforce criteria. The criteria for the program include a minimum requirement for hours worked on the solar installation by an individual hired through the City workforce development system, as well as a requirement that individuals hired through the City workforce development system to perform skilled work on the installation. Additionally, workforce training programs prioritize San Francisco residents who are low income and/or have barriers to employment.

Solar contractors must maintain certification for the Workforce Development Incentive program with DEWD and hire workers from a DEWD-approved workforce development program. DEWD provides an updated list of the certified Workforce Development Incentive contractors which is available through the GoSolarSF website at www.solarsf.org.

### Workforce Development Participating Installers

From July to December 2008, the following fifteen installers became fully certified for the workforce development program by hiring at least one workforce development graduate.

Akeena Solar
Borrego Solar Systems, Inc
Danlin Corp

Fresco Solar
J & J Owens Electric Inc
Luminalt
NextEnergy Solar
Occidental Power
Petersen Dean Roofing & Solar
Real Goods Marin Solar
Regrid Power
Solar City
Sungevity Inc
Sunlight & Power
Sun's Free Solar

The following five installers were provisionally certified as of December 2008, meaning that the companies committed to program participation but had not yet hired a workforce development graduate.

Pro Solar
Shamrock Renewable Group
Sky Tech Solar
Solar API
Sun First Solar

**Participating Training Organizations**

The DEWD works with the following organizations to match workers from the community who have barriers to entry with installer's needs.

Young Community Developers
SF Conservation Corps
Charity Cultural Center
Mission Hiring Hall
Asian Neighborhood Design
Chinese for Affirmative Action
Visitacion Valley Community Development Center

**Workforce Development Program Created 22 New Jobs**

From the program's inception through December 2008, a total of 22 Green Collar jobs have been created through the Workforce Development aspect of the GoSolarSF program. The goal of the program was to create jobs for those who have barriers to entry for such positions. In that regard, the program has been successful in creating sustainable jobs in a difficult economic climate. The map shows residents from various San Francisco neighborhoods have become employed from the program.

| Zip Code | # of Hires (as of 12/16/08) |
|---|---|
| 94112 | 5 hires |
| 94117 | 3 hires |
| 94124 | 3 hires |
| 94134 | 1 hire |
| 94115 | 1 hire |
| 94110 | 1 hire |
| 94132 | 1 hire |
| 94122 | 1 hire |
| 94121 | 1 hire |

Note:
1 hire – zip code unknown
4 hires – no longer SF residents



## Low Income Incentive

As part of the GoSolarSF residential program, low income households can qualify for a supplemental low income incentive in order to make solar installations a more viable opportunity. During the program's first six months, the supplemental low-income incentive was $5000 (in addition to the base incentives ranging from $3000 to $6000). 41 low income applications were submitted to the Mayor's Office of Housing. The GoSolarSF program received 27 GoSolarSF low income applications. In addition, the GoSolarSF program resulted in four applicants to the MOH loan program.

### Low Income Administration and Criteria

The MOH set the criteria for determining an applicant's qualification for low income (see chart below). These figures are based on the median income for San Francisco residents. Residents can also qualify for low income incentive levels if they receive CARE rates from PG&E which are reduced electricity rates for low income individuals.

| *Household Size* | *Annual Gross Income* |
|---|---|
| 1 | $63,350 |
| 2 | $72,400 |
| 3 | $81,450 |
| 4 | $90,500 |
| 5 | $97,700 |

The low income incentive program had challenges during the first six months. Low income participants do not have as strong an incentive to participate in the program as they do not have high tax liability, and therefore, are unable capture the federal incentive. In addition, during this period, there was no low income program for the CPUC California Solar Incentive program, although two programs were under development. This void decreased the overall incentive for low-income individuals to purchase solar installations. The Single-Family Affordable Solar Housing (SASH) program, expected to be available later this calendar year, will offer incentives to eligible participants that range from $4.75-7.00 per watt. The program will also offer fully-subsidized 1kW systems for very low-income households. An increase in low income applicants is expected when the CPUC finalizes their programs for low income residents.

According to the Mayor's Office of Housing, many households are currently choosing to address deferred maintenance. They are fixing heaters and plumbing, and making their homes more livable. In some cases, energy efficiency upgrades serve as a more cost effective way to cut an energy bill. The Mayor's Office of Housing believes that in order to increase the number of low income participants in the GoSolarSF program, it is important we clarify the message. This begins with informing the population of how much out of pocket cost there will be associated with the program as well as how much of a benefit, in terms of reduced energy bills, they can expect. The SFPUC, along with the Mayor's Office of Housing, will conduct targeted outreach to the low income community with the goal of increasing program participation among low income households.

## GoSolarSF Applications by Zip Code

From July to December 2008, solar incentive applications were submitted by applicants throughout the City. The program received applications from the majority San Francisco zip codes.

The highest amount of kW installed or committed were in the following areas:

94107 – 163.2 kW
94110 – 147.9 kW
94124 -- 128.3 kW

The highest dollar amounts applied for were in:

94110 – $434,785
94114 – $277,000
94131 – $255,000



## California Solar Initiative Applications

The following graph shows the number of San Francisco applications for the California Solar Initiative (CSI) from February 2007 to November 2008. The number of applications increased dramatically when GoSolarSF was launched in July 2008 and continued to increase throughout the program's first six months.



## PROGRAM CHANGES BY SFPUC

As the program administrator, the SFPUC Power Enterprise has the authority to make administrative changes to GoSolarSF. Changes to the incentive levels and any changes to the program funding must be approved by the Commission and/or the Board of Supervisors.

During the first several months of the program, SFPUC Power Enterprise staff addressed challenges by implementing changes:

| Challenge | Solution |
|---|---|
| Incentive payment recipient limited to host customer. | Provide additional payee options: property owner, system owner, installer, solar company. |
| Insurance requirement to add City as additional insured on homeowner insurance. | Waiver option if insurance company will not add City as additional insured. |
| Low income owners do not receive additional incentives from the CPUC's California Solar Initiative Program. | Work with the CPUC on developing a viable program to increase the number of low income individuals placing PV systems on their roof. |

In December 2008, the Commission approved program changes recommended by staff:

| Program Change | Justification |
|---|---|
| Make payments earlier in the process – change payment trigger from CSI payment verification letter to Permission to Operate letter. | Earlier payments improve cash flow for installers and customers.<br>Shorter processing time makes the program more efficient. |
| Allow solar panel manufacturers and distributors to be designated payees. | Improves cash flow for installers and customers.<br>Allows small businesses to be more competitive and to work with low income applicants (highest incentive amount). |
| Reduce incentive amounts:<br>Basic incentive from $3000 to $2000<br>City installer incentive from $4000 to $3000<br>Environmental justice from $5000 to $3500<br>Workforce development from $6000 to $4000 | Offsets additional project funding provided by 2009 federal solar tax credit.<br>Makes GoSolarSF funding available to more applicants. |

## PROGRAM CHANGES RECOMMENDED TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

After 6 months of implementation of the Solar Energy Incentive Program and the Solar Energy Incentive Pilot Program, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission seeks the following statutory improvements:

| Program Change | Justification |
|---|---|
| Increase the additional incentive available to low-income applicants from $5,000 to $7,000 for applications received after February 1, 2009. | Offsets the decrease in incentive level for low-income applicants. |
| Extend the Solar Energy Incentive Pilot Program for non-profit applicants. Instead of ending after one year, the Pilot Program should continue until funding is fully expended. | Allows for all program funds to be used within the program; extends outreach and education timeframe. |
| Extend eligibility for non-profit multi-unit residential building incentives to for-profit building owners if 75% of the units are designated as affordable housing for a period of no less than 50 years. | Extends the non-profit incentive to the types of projects the ordinance intended. |
| Increase the cap on incentives for non-profit multi-unit residential buildings from $30,000 to $250,000 to encourage greater utilization of non-profit program funds. | Non-profits do not benefit from the federal tax credit which is 30% of the total project cost. The $30k cap covers only a small fraction the cost of most multi-unit projects. For-profit multi-tenant application projects qualify for greater incentives than non-profits due to the cap. |
| Clarify that non-profits housed in government-owned buildings are eligible for non-profit incentives. | Extends the non-profit incentive to the types of projects the ordinance intended. |
| Allow the use of a new financial credits mechanism recently approved by the California Public Utilities Commission called Virtual Net Energy Metering (VNEM). Using VNEM will reduce the cost of installing solar in multi-unit buildings. | Reducing cost of installing solar in multi-unit buildings will increase the number of solar installations. Ensures City program leverages state-approved program funds. |
| Change the incentive paid for use of an in-City installer from a tier of possible incentives to an adder of $1,000 paid whenever a City installer is used. | Increases the benefit for city installers in order to provide stimulus for the in-City installation industry that the ordinance intended. |
| Clarify that incentives may be made not only to applicants and installers, but also to other entities incl. solar equipment manufacturers and distributors. | Overcomes barriers individuals and installers face in the financing of solar installations. |
| Clarify that incentives may be paid for systems installed as part of new construction. | Allows for increased solar participation by new construction. |
| Merge various changes made in Ordinance 106-08 (Mirkarimi) into the general statute for the Solar Energy Incentive Program while preserving the pilot program statute for non-profit applicants. | Clearer legislative direction. |
| Shift $1 million from the Power for Resale appropriation and shift $500,000 from the $1.5 million earmarked for the pilot program to the long-term incentive program. If the remaining $1 million allocated for the pilot program is expended by June 30, 2009, the SFPUC will request an additional $500,000 reappropriation for the pilot program. | The long-term incentive program will expend the $1.5 million in allocated funds before the end of the fiscal year. Freezing payments until next fiscal year would be disruptive to the program, the City's solar businesses, the City's Workforce Development Program, and the applicants awaiting payment on completed projects. |

City and County of San Francisco

Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board

23

March 13, 2009

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2009 MAR 12 PM 3:16
BY

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

Re: Rent Board Annual Report on Eviction Notices

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

Pursuant to Section 37.6(j) of the Rent Ordinance, Chapter 37 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, the Rent Board is providing its annual report on the number of eviction notices filed with the Department. During the period from March 1, 2008 through February 28, 2009, a total of 1,430 eviction notices were filed with the Department. This figure includes 102 notices given due to failure to pay rent, which are not required to be filed with the Department. The number of notices filed with the Department this year represents a 14.1% decrease from last year's total filings of 1,665, and is close to the prior year's total of 1,476 filings. The largest decrease was in temporary capital improvement eviction notices which decreased by 43% to 34 notices. Ellis eviction notices decreased by 24% to 192 notices and owner or relative move-in eviction notices decreased by 13% to 159.

The list on the following page gives the total number of eviction notices filed with the Department, the stated reason for the eviction and the applicable Ordinance section.

23

| Number | Reason | Ordinance Section |
|---|---|---|
| 102 | non-payment of rent | 37.9(a)(1) |
| 83 | habitual late payment of rent | 37.9(a)(1) |
| 357 | breach of rental agreement | 37.9(a)(2) |
| 311 | committing a nuisance | 37.9(a)(3) |
| 42 | illegal use of rental unit | 37.9(a)(4) |
| 2 | failure to renew agreement | 37.9(a)(5) |
| 16 | failure to permit landlord access | 37.9(a)(6) |
| 18 | unapproved sub-tenant | 37.9(a)(7) |
| 159 | owner/relative move-in | 37.9(a)(8) |
| 3 | condo conversion sale | 37.9(a)(9) |
| 34 | demolish or remove from housing use | 37.9(a)(10) |
| 34 | capital improvement work | 37.9(a)(11) |
| 0 | substantial rehabilitation | 37.9(a)(12) |
| 192 | Ellis (withdrawal of unit) | 37.9(a)(13) |
| 1 | lead remediation | 37.9(a)(14) |
| 28 | roommate eviction | 37.9(b) |
| 48 | other or no reason given | |
| **1,430** | **Total Eviction Notices** | |

The increase or decrease since last year for each just cause (excluding categories for which the Department did not receive at least ten notices in both years) is as follows:

| Just Cause Reason | 2007/08 | 2008/09 | Percent Decrease/ Increase |
|---|---|---|---|
| Capital improvement | 60 | 34 | -43% |
| Demolish or remove from housing use | 46 | 34 | -26% |
| Failure to permit landlord access | 21 | 16 | -24% |
| Ellis withdrawal of unit | 252 | 192 | -24% |
| Breach of rental agreement | 427 | 357 | -16% |
| Owner or relative move-in | 183 | 159 | -13% |
| Habitual late payment | 88 | 83 | -6% |
| Nuisance | 325 | 311 | -4% |
| Illegal use of rental unit | 40 | 42 | +5% |
| Unapproved sub-tenant | 17 | 18 | +6% |
| Roommate eviction | 20 | 28 | +40% |

During the period March 1, 2008-February 28, 2009, tenants filed a total of 524 Reports of Alleged Wrongful Eviction with the Rent Board. Of the 524 reports filed, 76 reports or 14.5% involved school-age children, with 57 reports or 10.9% relating to evictions occurring during the school term. Of the 524 total reports, 49 reports specifically objected to no-fault evictions, and 8 of these 49 reports or 16.3% involved school-age children, with 7 reports or 14.3% relating to evictions occurring during the school term.

This eviction report can also be found on our web site under "Statistics", Annual Eviction Report. A monthly breakdown of all eviction filings by category is also enclosed with this report. Please call me at 252.4650 should you have any questions concerning this report.

Very truly yours,

Delene Wolf
Executive Director
Rent Stabilization and
Arbitration Board

Mayor Gavin Newsom
Supervisor David Chiu
Supervisor Michela Alioto-Pier
Supervisor John Avalos
Supervisor David Campos
Supervisor Carmen Chu
Supervisor Chris Daly
Supervisor Bevan Dufty
Supervisor Sean Elsbernd
Supervisor Eric Mar
Supervisor Sophie Maxwell
Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi
Commissioner Brooks Beard
Commissioner David G. Gruber
Commissioner Deborah Henderson
Commissioner Jim Hurley
Commissioner Anthony Justman
Commissioner Polly Marshall
Commissioner Cathy Mosbrucker
Commissioner Neveo Mosser
Commissioner Bartholomew Murphy
Library Documents Dept.

# City and County of San Francisco
# Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
# Annual Eviction Notice Report

3/1/2008 Through 2/28/2009

| | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **No-Pay** | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 14 | 9 | 7 | 11 | 20 | 9 | 10 | 6 | **102** |
| **Late Pay** | 9 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 8 | **83** |
| **Breach** | 29 | 27 | 25 | 28 | 42 | 35 | 27 | 31 | 32 | 21 | 39 | 21 | **357** |
| **Nuisance** | 33 | 30 | 26 | 25 | 34 | 19 | 30 | 36 | 29 | 11 | 24 | 14 | **311** |
| **Illegal** | 2 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | **42** |
| **Agreemt.** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **2** |
| **Access** | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | **16** |
| **Sub** | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | **18** |
| **Own-Occ** | 15 | 13 | 11 | 11 | 20 | 20 | 19 | 10 | 8 | 14 | 6 | 12 | **159** |
| **Condo** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | **3** |
| **Demol** | 4 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | **34** |
| **Cl** | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 8 | **34** |
| **Rehab** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **0** |
| **W-Draw** | 22 | 25 | 47 | 3 | 17 | 18 | 11 | 9 | 12 | 7 | 3 | 18 | **192** |
| **Roommate** | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | **28** |
| **Lead** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | **1** |
| **Other** | 3 | 1 | 11 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | **48** |
| **Total** | **126** | **126** | **147** | **93** | **154** | **126** | **113** | **133** | **124** | **80** | **110** | **98** | **1430** |

SAN FRANCISCO
FILM COMMISSION

24

Date: Thursday, March 12, 2009
To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
From: Stefanie Coyote, Executive Director, SF Film Commission
Re: Film Production Rebate Program Report Sec. 57.8 (d)
Ordinance File # 70-06 April 06 – February 09

---

The Scene in San Francisco film production rebate program has had 3 qualified film production rebates processed. Two of these were in FY 08-09, *Milk* and *Mission Street Rhapsody*. *Milk* won 2 Academy Awards for Best Screenplay – Dustin Lance Black and Best Actor – Sean Penn. Mission Street Rhapsody, now titled *La Mission* is the Opening Night film of the 51st Annual San Francisco International Film Festival on April 23, 2009.

There is one pending application for FY 08-09 for an NBC Universal TV Pilot, "Trauma," that begins filming March 23, 2008.

Below please find the budget and employment information for each of the processed qualified productions for the program. There was one rebate processed in FY 06-07 and zero rebates processed in FY 07-08. The total expended of the $1.8 million appropriated for the program is $151,730.13.

## ***Milk*** FY -08-09

Total Final Budget $22 million

Employee Information

| | # employees | #days | wages/comp |
|---|---|---|---|
| Above the Line Employees | | | |
| SF Resident Employees | 37 | | $301,500.00 |
| All NON-SF Resident Employees | 42 | | $4,095,000.00 |
| | | | |
| Below the Line Production Employees | | | |
| All production employees | 191 | | $5,661,022.00 |
| All background actors | 2,688 | 38 | $508,111.00 |
| SF resident production employees | 151 | 39 | $4,071,322 |
| SF resident background employees | 2,688 | 38 | $508,111.00 |
| | | | |
| Total Production Employees | | | |
| Total above & below the line SF employees | 2876 | | $4,880,933.00 |
| Total above & below the line non-SF employees | 82 | | $5,176,589.00 |

Submitted production costs: $106,241.41
Actual paid out: Amount: $99,215.47 Date: 07/08/2008
Amount due (if no cap): $188, 630.98

24

## *Mission Street Rhapsody AKA La Mission* FY 08-09

Total Final Budget $1,883,146

Employee Information

| | # employees | #days | wages/comp |
|---|---|---|---|
| Above the Line Employees | | | |
| SF Resident Employees | 24 | | $44,088.49 |
| All NON-SF Resident Employees | 11 | | $52,209.59 |
| | | | |
| Below the Line Production Employees | | | |
| All production employees | 111 | | $574,728.94 |
| All background actors | 53 | 97 | $18,718.47 |
| SF resident production employees | 62 | 26 | $311,047.99 |
| SF resident background employees | 37 | | $15,204.02 |
| | | | |
| Total Production Employees | | | |
| Total above & below the line SF employees | 123 | | $370,340.50 |
| Total above & below the line non-SF employees | 76 | | $319,404.99 |

Submitted production costs: $15,344.85
Actual paid out: Amount: $10,363.67.00 Date: 7/18/2008
Amount due (if no cap): $65,322.81.00

## *Harrison Montgomery* FY 06-07

Total Final Budget $907,486

Employee Information

| | # employees | #days | wages/comp |
|---|---|---|---|
| Above the Line Employees | | | |
| SF Resident Employees | 10 | | $9,255.00 |
| All NON-SF Resident Employees | 24 | | $178,275.00 |
| | | | |
| Below the Line Production Employees | | | |
| All production employees | 97 | | $148,327.00 |
| All background actors | 10 | | $1.367.00 |
| SF resident production employees | 37 | | $51,481.00 |
| SF resident background employees | 1 | | $268.00 |
| | | | |
| Total Production Employees | | | |
| Total above & below the line SF employees | 50 | | $61,004.00 |
| Total above & below the line non-SF employees | 93 | | $276,220.00 |

Submitted production costs: $42,162.67
Amount due (if no cap): $18,246.00
Actual paid out: Amount: $42,150.99 Date: 12/11/2006
** With cap applied, would have been paid: $5,277.00 (cap was not applied and payroll tax was calculated at 15%, not 1.5%)

Summary

There is pending legislation to exchange the per production cap from taxes paid to the city to a maximum of $600,000 per production. If the legislation is passed, the program will be a much more effective program and will bring more productions to the city. No funds are expended until production is completed, after jobs have been created and the production budgets have been expended in the city.

Gavin Newsom, Mayor

Edwin M. Lee, City Administrator

(25)

March 11, 2009

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2009 MAR 12 AM 10: 01
BY

Honorable David Chiu
President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Suite 244
San Francisco, Ca 94102

***RE: Resolution Supporting Uniting American Families Act***

Honorable President Chiu:

On March 9, 2009, the San Francisco Immigrant Rights Commission approved resolution #09-00004 requesting the Mayor of San Francisco and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to "urge the United States Congress and President Barak Obama to pass the Uniting American Families Act at the earliest possible date and support the removal of legal barriers to immigration by permanent same-sex partners"

Enclosed is a copy of the adopted resolution for your consideration and review. If you have questions, please feel to contact my staff Sally Leung at 415-554-4884 or email Sally.Leung@sfgov.org.

Sincerely,

Adrienne Pon

Adrienne Pon
Executive Director
Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs

*cc: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors*



(25)

FILE NO. 090309-01 RESOLUTION NO. 09-00004

**[Resolution Supporting Uniting American Families Act]**

WHEREAS, every American is entitled to equal protection under the law; and

WHEREAS, the U.S. immigration system is largely based upon the principle of family unification; and

WHEREAS, federal law does not currently recognize permanent same-sex partners for immigration purposes; and

WHEREAS, this results in thousands of US citizens being forced into exile to be with foreign-born partners, causing unnecessary hardship, separation from family members and careers, and loss of valuable skills and resources for our country; and

WHEREAS, the Uniting American Families Act (UAFA) has been introduced in Congress by Senators Leahy (D-VT) and Rep. Nadler (D-NY) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act and allow U.S. citizens and legal permanent residents to sponsor same-sex partners for immigration; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED that the San Francisco Immigrant Rights Commission requests the Mayor of San Francisco and the Board of Supervisors to urge the United States Congress and President Barak Obama to pass the Uniting American Families Act at the earliest possible date and support the removal of legal barriers to immigration by permanent same-sex partners; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Immigrant Rights Commission directs the Clerk of the Immigrant Rights Commission to forward this resolution to offices of Senators Barbara Boxer and Dianne Feinstein and House of Representatives Speaker Nancy Pelosi.

my File 090230
cl BOS-11, c page

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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2009 MAR 11 PM 3:54
BY

**Ben Rosenfield**
**Controller**

**Monique Zmuda**
**Deputy Controller**

26

March 10, 2009

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

RE: Amendment to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Teamsters, Local 856, Supervising Registered Nurses, Unit 11.B.

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

In accordance with Ordinance 92-94, I am submitting a cost analysis of Amendment #1 (amendment) to the MOU between the City and County of San Francisco and Teamsters, Local 856, Supervising Registered Nurses, Unit 11.B. The amendment applies immediately through June 30, 2011, affecting 126 authorized positions with a salary base of approximately $18.9 million and an overall pay and benefits base of approximately $22.7 million for FY2009-2010.

Based on our analysis, the amendment will result in a cost savings of $111,000 in FY 2008-2009, an additional savings of $817,000 in FY 2009-2010 and a cost FY 2010-2011 of $502,000. The amendment reduces the remaining FY 2008-2009 wage increase by half, eliminates all but a 1% wage increase in FY 2009-2010, and in FY 2010-2011, provides wages increases of 2% and 3%. The amendment does not allow for reopening for the remainder of the term of the contract and eliminates the Nursing Leadership Incentive Program for FY 2009-2010 and FY 2010-2011.

The cost of continuing existing health and dental benefits provided in the MOU will increase by approximately $53,000 in FY 2009-2010. If you have additional questions or concerns please contact me at 554-7500 or Peg Stevenson of my staff at 554-7522.

Sincerely,

for Ben Rosenfield
Controller

cc: Micki Callahan, ERD
Harvey Rose, Budget Analyst

26

Orig Gail
c: BOS11
c page
27

# Capital Planning Committee

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2009 MAR 11 PM 4:02

BY

Edwin M. Lee, City Administrator, Chair

## MEMORANDUM

February 25, 2009

**To:** Supervisor David Chiu, Board President

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

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

**Regarding:** Adoption of the FY 2010-2019 Draft Capital Plan

---

In accordance with Section 3.21 of the Administrative Code, on February 25, 2009, the Capital Planning Committee (CPC) reviewed one action item under consideration by the Board of Supervisors – the resolution adopting the City's draft ten year capital expenditure plan for fiscal years 2010-2019. The CPC's recommendations are set forth below as well as a record of the members present.

**1. Board File Number TBD:** **Resolution adopting the City's draft ten year capital expenditure plan for fiscal years 2010-2019.**

Recommendation: Recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the resolution adopting the FY 2010-2019 Draft Capital Plan.

Comments: The CPC separately voted and, by a vote of 10-0, recommended approval of the following components of the Capital Plan:

1. To adopt the debt program and G.O. bond schedule with language qualifying the importance of keeping long-term property tax rates level and enabling the order of the bonds scheduled for November 2009 and June 2010 to switch order prior to the publication of the Proposed FY 2010-2019 Capital Plan.
2. To adopt the pay-as-you-go program. The CPC adopted the policy statement that the City should approve a dedicated funding source for streets by 2015. This is a high priority for the Plan but will not supplant General Fund investments in streets should the City fail to secure a dedicated source.
3. To include job creation estimates in all financial schedules based on the REMI Policy Insight Model used by the Controller's Office of Economic

27

# CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
# HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

(28)

## S.F. ADMINISTRATIVE CODE CHAPTERS 12B and 14B WAIVER REQUEST FORM

(HRC Form 201)

| FOR HRC USE ONLY |
|---|
| Request Number: |
| |

**➢ Section 1. Department Information**

Department Head Signature: Hermilo Rodis

Name of Department: Muni

Department Address: One South Van Ness, Rm 1058, San Francisco, CA 94103

Contact Person: Hermilo Rodis/Bart Murphy

Phone Number: (415) 701-4705 Fax Number: (415) 701-4729

**➢ Section 2. Contractor Information**

Contractor Name: Star Machine & Tool Co. Contact Person: Richard Wisti

Contractor Address: 215 6th St., SE, Minneapolis, MN 55414

Vendor Number (if known): 17602 Contact Phone No.:(612) 378-3232

**➢ Section 3. Transaction Information**

Date Waiver Request Submitted: 1/7/09 Type of Contract: Purchase Order

Contract Start Date: When approved End Date: 7days ARO Dollar Amount of Contract: $2,042.19

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

☒ Chapter 12B

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

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

☐ A. Sole Source

☐ B. Emergency (pursuant to Administrative Code §6.60 or 21.15)

☐ C. Public Entity

☒ D. No Potential Contractors Comply – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on: 1/11/09

☐ E. Government Bulk Purchasing Arrangement – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on:

☐ F. Sham/Shell Entity – Copy of waiver request sent to Board of Supervisors on:

☐ G. Local Business Enterprise (LBE) (for contracts in excess of $5 million; see Admin. Code §14B.7.I.3)

☐ H. Subcontracting Goals

**HRC ACTION**

12B Waiver Granted: _____ 14B Waiver Granted: _____

12B Waiver Denied: _____ 14B Waiver Denied: _____

Reason for Action: _____

HRC Staff: _____ Date: _____

HRC Staff: _____ Date: _____

HRC Director: _____ Date: _____

**DEPARTMENT ACTION – This section must be completed and returned to HRC for waiver types D, E & F.**

Date Waiver Granted: _____ Contract Dollar Amount: _____

(28)

Municipal Transportation Agency
Purchasing Department
One South Van Ness, Room 3097
San Francisco, CA 94103

**City and County of San Francisco**

# Memo

**Date:** March 11, 2008

**To:** **Clerk, Board of Supervisors** (415) 554-5163

**From:** Hermilo Rodis, Purchaser
S.F. Municipal Transportation Agency

**Subject: Award of Purchase Order to Non-Compliant Vendor (Equal Benefits)**
**(Reference RQPT09001008 / ITSF09000472/SQ)**

---

This memo serves as notification that an award of a purchase order for "Carbide Tool Bits" to Star Machine & Tool Co. will be made upon approval of the "No Potential Contractors Comply Waiver" by the Human Rights Commission.

Please reference the attached copies of the waiver request and supporting justification.

Municipal Transportation Agency
Purchasing Department
One South Van Ness, Room 3097
San Francisco, CA 94103

**City and County of San Francisco**

# Memo

**Date:** March 11, 2009

**To:** Tamra Winchester **FAX No. (415) 431-5764**

**From:** Hermilo Rodis, Purchaser
S.F. Municipal Transportation Agency

**Subject:** Waiver Request for Star Machine & Tool Co.: ITSF09000472/SQ – RQPT09001008

---

On February 3, 2009, the Office of Contract Administration publicly solicited for "Carbide Tool Bits", a repair part for the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency. The sole bid received was from Star Machine & Tool Co., a non-compliant vendor.

The vendor was sent a 10-day notification of NON-RESPONSIVENESS stating that they had to comply in 10-days with the requirements of San Francisco regarding the requirements of Admin. Code 12B. As of today's date, they did not respond and therefore continue to be non-compliant to the City's requirements.

To proceed with these requirements for the SFMTA, it is necessary to request that the Human Rights Commission grant a waiver per the requirements of Chapter 12B of the Admin. Code.

Once approved, please fax the waiver to my attention at 701-4729.

Thank You.

29

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

**Ben Rosenfield**
**Controller**

**Monique Zmuda**
**Deputy Controller**



March 2, 2009

The Honorable Gavin Newsom
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco
Room 200, City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mayor Newsom,

Pursuant to the Administrative Code Section 3.3(b), the Controller shall consolidate and transmit the budget to the Mayor by the first working day in March. I am pleased to advise you that the budget for Fiscal Year 2009-10 (FY 2009-10) is now available in the budget system for the Mayor's Office review and consideration.

Please note:

- Our office is conducting our annual review of proposed departmental and citywide revenues. This review will occur over the next three months. In early June, the Controller will publish our Revenue Letter as required under Charter Section 9.102, which provides the Controller's opinion regarding the accuracy of economic assumptions underlying the revenue estimates and the reasonableness of such estimates contained in the FY 2009-10 Proposed Budget;

- To bring the FY 2009-10 Proposed Budget into balance, additional entries will be required;

- We have received budget submissions from all departments, except the Asian Art Museum.

We will continue to work with your staff and departments to prepare an accurate and complete budget.

Respectfully submitted,

Ben Rosenfield
Controller

cc: The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Nani Coloretti, Mayor's Budget Director
Harvey Rose, Budget Analyst

29

(30)

"Dr. Ahimsa Sumchai"

03/09/2009 02:19 PM

To Barack Obama <info@barackobama.com>, Board Supervisors <board_of_supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us>,

cc

bcc

Subject FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE - ATSDR ANNOUNCES REINVESTIGATION OF LENNAR DEVELOPERS TOXIC DUST EXPOSURES AT HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD

# AHIMSA PORTER SUMCHAI, M.D.

From: asumchai@live.com
To: asumchai@sfbayview.com; asumchai@live.com; editor@sfbayview.com; communityfirstcoalition@yahoogroups.com; letters@thecitystarsf.com
Subject: FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE - ATSDR ANNOUNCES REINVESTIGATION OF LENNAR DEVELOPERS TOXIC DUST EXPOSURES AT HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD
Date: Mon, 9 Mar 2009 14:18:44 -0700

**AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES DISEASE REGISTRY TO REINVESTIGATE TOXIC DUST EXPOSURES AT LENNAR DEVELOPMENT SITE HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD**

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Contact: Ahimsa Porter Sumchai, M.D.
Health and Environmental Science Editor
SF Bayview Newspaper
asumchai@sfbayview.com or ahimsa.sumchai@ucsf.edu

In a letter dated February 11, 2009 the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services Agency For Toxic Substances and Disease Registry in Atlanta Georgia, documents its intent to reinvestigate complaints that community residents, workers and children attending 17 schools and daycare centers within a one mile radius of a federal superfund site - the Hunters Point Shipyard are being exposed to exceedences of toxic dust and particulates documented by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and the Department of Public Health.

Under CERCLA, also known as Superfund, Congress provided ATSDR with the authority to conduct certain public health assessment activities following a request from community representatives. ATSDR conducts public health assessment activities such as health consultations to determine whether people have been, or are currently being exposed to hazardous materials released into the environment from a hazardous waste site.

(30)

ATSDR announced it will begin by working with the California Department of Public Health and the San Francisco Department of Public health and review the findings of other relevant state and federal agencies including BAAQMD which fined Lennar $515,000 for violations of the state Health and Safety Code for it's activities at the Hunters Point Site.

An ATSDR assessment conducted in September of 2007 reviewed DPH data and made specific recommendations, many of which were not adopted by the San Francisco Department of Public Health. Despite assurances to the public that grading of asbestos and arsenic containing rock had been completed, Lennar has engaged in grading activities since December of 2008 generating exceedences in toxic dust and asbestos levels documented by BAAQMD data. The exceedences have surpassed shut down level. During a five day period in late December the developer generated exceedences on three days exceeding shut down level yet continued to operate for five days without instituting a mandated workk stoppage.

The Hunters Point Shipyard is a federal superfund site that has not been fully characterized or cleaned to residential standards. The Sierra Club Yodler announced that15 environmental and community groups have asked the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to take no acion on clandestine efforts by the Developer and Mayor Gavin Newsom to approve the Candlestick Park/ Hunters Point Plan without an EIR later this month.

The Planning Departments Major Environmental Analysis Division require an EIR for the shipyard candlestick project because it fulfills requirements for a soil report and geotechnical study, a hazardous materials study, a wind tunnel analysis, a biological resources study and a historic/architectural study.

The proposed plan would endanger health and safety of the public, chop up a state park and erect a six lane highway and bridge thorugh a wildlife habitat along the cities southeast shoreline.

Additionally, EPA administrator Lisa Jackson has been asked, by environmental activists and health experts to prioritize 17 schools and daycare centers under the Obama EPA's plans to monitor the air of up to 100 of the nation's schools. In one school, the Dr. George Washington Carver Academic Elementary School, childhood asthma rates exceed 25% and an independent in-door air monitoring study conducted by San Francisco State chemistry professor Dr. Peter Palmer detected levels of the cancer causing volatile organic compound exceeding EPA levels for carcinogenic exposure.

Community residents, environmental and health activists, scientists and members of the shipyards Restoration Advisory Board are calling for the Obama administration to address the complex health, safety, economic and political crises this project has stimulated.

**AHIMSA PORTER SUMCHAI, M.D.**

From:
To: ahimsa.sumchai@ucsf.edu; asumchai@live.com; asumchai@sfbayview.com
Subject: Office photo for email

Mayor Gavin Newsom
Members of the Board of Supervisors
Recreation & Park Commissioners
Mrs Nani Coloretti

3-11-09 (31)
11 am, meeting



Subject: Carli Fullerton, Recreation Director, GGPSC

Seniors are a fast growing population. At Golden Gate Park Senior Center (GGPSC) we have a whopping 1300+ seniors of which at least 24 of these seniors are 90+ years of age.

They appreciate the many age-appropriate activities, programs & services being offerred to benefit them.

These activities, programs & services are also incentives for seniors to get out of their homes & out of their isolation. Some would even consider GGPSC a place of refuge. They can mix socially, exercise their mind & body, be a participant, & gratefully stave off loneliness.

Carli Fullerton is a great asset. Without her guidance & input, many of the activities, programs & services will cease. A great loss for seniors. PLEASE KEEP CARLI FULLERTON, RECREATION DIRECTOR, GGPSC.

Sincerely
E. Chow

SF CA 94121



31

BOARD of SUPERVISORS

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

32

Date: March 18, 2009

To: Members of the Board of Supervisors

From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Subject: Form 700

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

Gabriel Cabrera (Annual)
Dawn Duran (Annual)
Chris Rustom (Annual)
Nicholas Goldman (Annual)
Doyle Johnson (Annual)
Stanton Jones (Annual)
John Avalos (LAFCo-Assuming)
David Campos (LAFCo-Assuming)
Eric L. Mar (LAFCo-Assuming)
Chris Daly (LAFCo-Leaving)

32